CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND METHODOLOGY

The phenomenon of migration is a well known and widespread one. It has been observed in various societies and studies have been conducted regarding its different aspects. While a majority of these studies have considered rural-urban migration, both in the developing and developed countries, though mostly in the latter, rural – rural migration has also been studied. Migration of labour which forms one aspect of such migration has been the focus of a number of studies on plantation labour in Africa and India, as well as labour employed in large farms such as in the United States of America. Although much of the literature is based on macro-level statistics such as census data, a number of case studies have recently emerged with their focus on particular communities or specific geographical areas which have contributed to the migration flows.

A number of different perspectives have been adopted in these studies depending on the concerns with which they were undertaken. Since migration basically involves the territorial redistribution of population, it has been one of the primary concerns of a spatially-oriented discipline such as geography as well as of demography with its focus on population. Besides these, there are also other perspectives which can be brought to bear on the phenomenon. Since a majority of these shifts in population are a result of economic
imbalances, the problem can also be considered from the purely economic point of view in terms of levels of development, employment opportunities and wage differentials. At the same time, the issue can be considered in the broader sociological context as the existing social and cultural systems influence migration and are in turn affected by it since such movements give rise to social change and raise problems such as those of cultural assimilation and integration in the long run. Further, the phenomenon has social-psychological ramifications as it concerns processes of decision-making and adaption. There are also political dimensions to the phenomenon particularly in the case of international migration where it involves the crossing of national boundaries.

In short, it will be seen that, whereas, on the one hand, migration can be treated purely as the geographical or spatial mobility of population, on the other hand, it can also be considered in the broader socio-economic context of social and occupational mobility. The variety of perspectives that have been brought to bear on the phenomenon are basically the result of the different concerns with which the existing studies were undertaken. This is, however, not to state that these approaches are mutually exclusive or incompatible. But the diversity has, while adding to the richness of the field, to some extent raised difficulties in the attempt at theory-building, in defining the phenomenon, and classifying its several types, as well as in postulating causal models.
Before we take up further these considerations of definition and theory, mention should be made of the main perspectives that have informed migration studies in India.

In India sociology, migration studies have only recently been receiving the attention they deserve. Given the ethnic and regional diversity of the subcontinent, it is not surprising that the main interest in these studies has been the phenomenon of urban migration and the continuities of cultural affinities and divisions noticed in the migrant group even after it has moved permanently to the new place of destination. In other words, the dominant theme has been the concept of "little Madras in Bombay City". Rural-rural and seasonal migration has received less attention, though Rao, Pathare, and Breman must be mentioned as notable exceptions. However, none of the case studies in India, so far, has analysed seasonal migration from the perspective of the push-pull theory of migration (which is discussed further below in this Chapter).

First, however, we shall return to a consideration of the problems of definition and classification of the phenomenon of migration.

**DEFINITION**

The variety of perspectives outlined above that have been brought to bear on the phenomenon, as well as the different disciplinary concerns with which the existing studies were undertaken, have led to the adoption of very different definitions of the phenomenon of migration. A review of some of these definitions of migration indicates the great diversity in perspective and content:
1) "We define migration as the physical transition of an individual or group from one society to another. This transition usually involves abandoning one social setting and entering another."

ii) "Henceforth, we will use the term 'migration for the change of residence of an individual from one parish or commune to another'"

iii) "Human migration is the changing of the place of abode permanently or, when temporarily, for an appreciable duration as for example in the case of seasonal workers. It is used symbolically in the transition from one surrounding to another in the course of human life."

iv) "Migration is a relatively permanent moving away of a collectivity, called migrants, from one geographical location to another preceded by decision making on the part of the migrants on the basis of a hierarchically ordered set of values or valued ends and resulting in changes in the inter-actional system of the migrants."

v) "Genuine migration obviously means the perceptible and simultaneous shifts in both spatial and social locus, so that the student cannot realistically measure one kind of movement while he ignores the other."

An analysis of the definitions of migration quoted above indicates that these have varied from the simplest "change of residence of an individual" to more complex considerations such as "relative permanence," "precedence by decision-making" etc., and have also related migration to social mobility, change in interactional systems and so on. Whereas some definitions employ the term migration with reference to the movement of individuals, others reserve it for the movement of a collectivity though the criteria that distinguishes a collectivity is not specified. It would, therefore, be seen that there is no universally accepted definition of migration nor a consensus on what is to be included in this phenomenon. Nor is any such
comprehensive definition attempted in this study. However, certain of the elements which are present in various definitions have been more fully discussed below in order to examine their relevance to the particular phenomenon which is the subject of this enquiry so as to later evolve a typology that would assist in identifying the important features of the migration and enable its comparison with other related types of migration.

TEMPORARY/PERMANENT:

One of the elements frequently employed in defining migration is the duration of time spent at the place of destination. While Connell, Jansen and Jackson would consider migration to include all types of movements both temporary and permanent, others such as Kosinski and Prothero employ the terms mobility or circulation as a general term to refer to such movements but employ the term migration in a specific sense to refer to only permanent changes in residence. However, in the case of a definition such as the latter one, it becomes necessary to define "permanence" in terms of the period of residence. This poses a number of problems and though the U.N. demographic dictionary has for the purposes of a common definition, considered those movements involving a period of more than one year at the new location as migration, this is not wholly satisfactory as there is no reason why a period of one year should be taken in preference to any other length of time. On the other hand, Gould and Prothero suggest that rather than stipulating a particular period of residence in the
new location, the presence or absence of the intention to return should be employed to determine whether the movement is a circulatory or migratory one. Again such a distinction does not appear to be tenable and amounts, in our view, to making an artificial distinction that is not valid or justified by the actual phenomenon. Consequently, the periodic movement of the Lemans which is the subject of this study, has been treated as migration, although it involves a period of stay less than a year in the Konkan, and although the migrants leave their home settlements with the knowledge or "decision" that they would return.

MOBILITY|MIGRATION

Another distinction found in the literature has significant implications. Meyer Fortes has distinguished between mobility, which represents movement within boundaries, and migration, which represents movement across boundaries. Such boundaries may be geographical, structural, ethnic, or some other division which is recognised by the actor as setting him apart. This distinction has had considerable influence in the studies on urban migration where the migrant is seen to have moved from the rural setting into city life, requiring a new life-style, new attitudes and new behavioural patterns. However, from the point of view of the present study, this distinction between mobility and migration does not appear to be valid because the movement of the Lemans has elements, or rather aspects, of both and the distinction serves no purpose. In other words, the migration of the Lemans takes them across
some physical boundaries but not other (social) ones and the crossing or non-crossing of these boundaries has no significance. For example, the migrant Laman do cross district and regional boundaries when they move from the Ahmednagar district in the Deccan hinterland to the Ratnagiri district in the coastal Konkan region. But these crossings are not significant because the movement remains within the state's and the country's boundaries which are the more significant economic and administrative divisions. Secondly, although they go across district and regional boundaries, because they move with their families and camp in exclusive Leman encampments with only the minimal interaction with the Konkan villages, their migration does not significantly involve the crossing of any social, ethnic or structural boundaries. This aspect, therefore, has no relevance and does not lead to any conclusion or explanation of the phenomenon, and hence the distinction between Fortes' mobility and migration has been discarded and the Laman movement has been treated simply as migration.

Having illustrated the field of migration studies in the preceding paragraphs, it becomes necessary to consider certain general theoretical issues. Since, as the discussion above reveals, the phenomenon of migration is complex by nature and capable of interpretation from many perspectives, a theoretical system is necessitated in order to narrow the range of facts to be considered.
"It is clear that if knowledge is to be organised, there must be some system imposed upon the facts which are observable. As a consequence, a major task in any science is the development of systems of classification, a structure of concepts and an increasingly precise definition for these terms."  

**TYPOLOGY**

The function of classification is to systematise the manifestations of the phenomenon without distorting experience and assist in arriving at explanations of the phenomenon examined. However, the key problem in classification arises in identifying the characteristics according to which the various types are to be distinguished. The question, therefore, arises as to what criteria should be employed in making the classification and in the literature on migration, several different typologies have been offered.

The earliest typology is by Fairchild based on the level of culture and the presence or absence of the factor of violence. Thus migration from a 'low' culture to a 'higher' one in a warlike movement was designated as 'invasion', migration from a 'high' to a 'low' culture, if peaceful, was "colonization" and if violent "conquest", while migration between cultures on the same level was termed "immigration". Since the terms "high" or "low" culture involve value judgements, such a typology serves no analytical purpose and indeed can distort descriptions of historical movements.

Kant based his typology on the areal units between which a movement takes place: intra-local or intra-regional and inter-local or inter-regional. However, this does not
carry the discussion very far unless these categories are related to other significant criteria which would have analytical value. Beltramone suggested a typology on similar lines with the two categories extra-muros and intramuros based on the criteria of space, but, in addition to this, included the temporal aspect by the criteria 'temporary' versus 'definitive'. Others such as George distinguished between movements prompted primarily by economic factors and those prompted by non-economic factors. Although such a distinction appears to attempt a causative model of migration, it is not satisfactory because it does not adequately differentiate between such widely disparate manifestations of the phenomenon as rural-urban migration and farm to plantation migration. Nor is it, on closer analysis, very easy to classify migrations along this criterion of economic or non-economic factors because there is often a hiatus between the economic reasons as objectively viewed by the analyst and those as subjectively perceived by the migrant-actor. The fact that some members of the Indian middle-class migrate to the U.S.A. while others similarly circumstanced choose to stay behind, would make it difficult to classify the migration as dependent on "primarily economic factors."

One of the most elaborate typologies of migration is the one propounded by Petersen. He introduced the distinction between "innovative" or that which is undertaken in order to change the way of life and "conservative migration", that which helps to maintain the existing pattern. The typology also
introduces several new dimensions of classification such as "migratory force" (ecological push, migration policy, higher aspirations or social momentum) and "type of interaction" (Nature and man, State and man, Man and his norms, or Collective Behaviour). However, the criteria chosen by Petersen to classify migrations involve value judgements and the typology on the whole is obviously unsatisfactory in view of its vague and generalised schema. (See Figure 1 below).

Kosinski and Prothero have suggested a typology of migration which would be a multi-dimensional matrix with some cells empty and the rest occupied by distinguishable types. The dimensions of such a matrix would be designated by time (temporary, permanent), distance (long, short), aerial units involved (between communities, countries, states), decision-making (voluntary, impelled, forced), numbers involved (individual, mass), social organisation of migrants (family, clan, individual), political organisation of migrations (sponsored, free), causes (economic, non-economic), aims (conservative, innovative).

Clearly, such a complex matrix diminishes the goal of simplification that a typology is put forth for, and the number of criteria that can be introduced into the matrix would very depending on the perspective of the studies. The usefulness of a typology lies in highlighting the relatedness between at least some of the dimensions, rather than in listing out all the dimensions possible in the study of the phenomenon.

"It will only be truly useful if it permits us to classify other characteristics than those serving as its basis and if it procures for us a framework for the facts to come ............."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General typology of migration</th>
<th>Migratory selection by type of migration</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Innovating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of migration</td>
<td>Class of inter-party migration force</td>
<td>Type of migration</td>
<td>Best-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wander</td>
<td>(Wander)</td>
<td>Wander (people)</td>
<td>(Survive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ing</td>
<td>-ing</td>
<td>-ing</td>
<td>-val</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>of the migrant-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(wander-</td>
<td>(ing</td>
<td>est))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature and Man</td>
<td>Ecological push</td>
<td>Primitive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Migration</td>
<td>Impelled</td>
<td>Flight</td>
<td>Place of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or equla-policy) &amp; Man</td>
<td>Forced</td>
<td>Displace</td>
<td>any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man &amp; Higher Free</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>New Dissident</td>
<td>Pioneer. Frontier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social norms</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Rural areas</td>
<td>Young Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective momentum</td>
<td>behaviour.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbani-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

it must be made not from a complete inventory of all the individual characteristics but from a small number of them carefully chosen. We must, then, choose the most essential characteristics for our classification. It is true that we can know them when the explanation of facts is sufficiently advanced."

For the purposes of this study, the typology of Gould and Prothero, based on the dimensions of space and time and derived from the study of population movements in tropical Africa, is found to be the most useful and this has been modified and developed so as to enable a classification/comparison of the Laman migration and other such similar migrations.

The first dimension in the Gould and Prothero two-dimensional typology is space. (See Figure 2 below) Since migration involves the movement of people over geographic areas, space is a basic criterion in classifying the phenomenon. However, space can be considered in terms of either distance and/or direction. The earlier typologies of Kant and Beltramore have considered space in terms of distance either as length of migratory path or the crossing of boundaries of areal, administrative or economic units. However, physical distance is at best a relative concept and, as already discussed above, the crossing of boundaries, in this particular case, is of no relevance. On the other hand, space conceived in terms of direction: from rural to urban areas or vice-versa provides a significant criterion for classifying migration 'types'. Admittedly, rural - urban is more a continuum rather than the dumb-bell model in which the two are conceived as distinct or exclusive sets. But in actual use, the terms "rural" and "urban" lend themselves to generally accepted operational
### Typology of Migration

**Population Mobility in Africa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPACE</th>
<th>CIRCULATION</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Periodic</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban-rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban-urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

definitions, and there is evidence to show that migrations from rural to urban habitats will be significantly different from rural-rural migrations. Further, these types can be regarded as ideal types in the Weberian sense. Thus following Gould and Prothero, we may consider space in four categories: rural-urban, rural-rural, urban-rural and urban-urban. Seen in the context of this categorization of space, the Laman migration is classified as rural to rural migration since it involves moving from the native villages in the Deccan to the forest encampments in the Konkan.

While the concept of rural-rural migration generally implies movement within the farm sector though from the original residence to another work site, a more detailed analysis becomes necessary to differentiate movements from traditional agriculture to the modern farm sector or to rural areas with plantations or cash crop economies or even to the agro-based industrial sector located in the rural areas. It could even involve a shift to the construction sector in the rural areas particularly as large irrigation and industrial projects are being implemented in these areas as a part of the developmental policies. In such circumstances, merely describing the movement in terms of rural-rural migration is not very indicative without a further differentiation as to whether the movement involves a shift from the traditional/farm sector to a non-traditional/non-farm sector. As yet, the bulk of rural-rural migrations are farm to farm movements so as to take advantage of the differential labour demands of different crops over time. However, with the dispersal of industry as well as infrastructural activity
such as the construction of roads through rural areas or that of irrigation projects, it is possible for shifts of population to take place within the rural areas but from farm to non-farm sectors. In the case of the Lamas, their migration is rural-rural, but from the agricultural to the non-agricultural sector, from traditional farming to an even more traditional occupation of pack-bullock transportation. And this distinguishes it from the seasonal migration noticed in Ahmednagar district of the Maratha peasants and labourers from farm to sugar factories. Similarly, it distinguishes the Laman migration from that of other pastoralists such as Gopala, Dhangars (and even the Vaidus) whose migration does not involve a shift in occupation.

The second dimension in the typology evolved by Gould and Prothero is that of time and this has been categorised into "circulation" and "migration", the former being further subdivided into daily, periodic, seasonal and long-term, and the latter into either irregular or permanent. Gould and Prothero base this distinction between circulation (short-term, cyclical movements) not on any index or criterion of time but on the absence or presence of the intention to return at the time of departure. Thus,

"We suggest that if there is a specific desire on the part of the individuals who are moving to return to their place or origin, and when, before leaving in the first place, this intention is clear, then the movement may be considered as circulation rather than migration" 27 28

However, as discussed in the preceding section, such a distinction does not appear feasible or useful, and in operational terms, it would be difficult to differentiate between Gould and Prothero's "long-term circulation" and their
"irregular migration," for as they admit "some circulatory movements may last longer than migratory ones".

For this reason, Gould and Prothero's typology may be modified here to make the differentiation along the temporal axis more conceptually and operationally precise. The criterion of time can, therefore, be employed to classify migrations simply as either seasonal or permanent. The term seasonal can be used inter-changeably with cyclical or periodic, and it implies that the migrant returns (after whatever interval of time) to work in the place of origin. Normally, the periodicity in seasonal migrations is governed by the annual climatic changes, but the term can be used as well to cover migrations where the periodicity is greater than the annual cycle - as in the case of drought-prone areas where the incidence of drought occurs in fairly regular patterns of three or four years and causes the population to move away for several agricultural seasons at a time. The term cyclical can be used in preference to seasonal to describe these migrations if a very fine distinction needs to be made. Permanent migration, on the other hand, in our typology, cannot be that the migrant does not return to take up work in the place of origin, thus excluding home visits non-related to his occupation.

These sets thus enable us to classify migrations according to the direction of the movement and the periodic or permanent nature of the shift. They enable us, further, to postulate certain hypothesis about the inter-relationship between these dimensions. Thus, for example, rural-rural migration (particularly
where it is farm to farm) is likely to be more frequently seasonal rather than permanent, given the frequently noticed strong attachment to land, and being dependent on the agro-climatic factors. Similarly, rural-urban migrations are likely associated with to be more often/inter-occupational shifts as well, and more often permanent rather than seasonal, and so on. (See Figure 3)

While the function of typologies is to thus highlight certain patterns of frequency between the chosen dimensions and indicate probabilities, they remain analytical classifications and are not causal models. Some authors, in their eagerness to make typologies into explanatory models, have included another criterion: the motivational aspect or the extent to which the decision to migrate was voluntary on the part of the migrant or forced by circumstances. Thus, Petersen in suggesting a general typology of migrations, has stressed the importance of this dimension:

"In particular, if we fail to distinguish between the immigrant's motives and the social causes of migration - that is, if we do not take the migrant's levels of aspirations into account - our analysis lacks logical clarity".28

He, therefore, introduces a four-fold distinction along the dimension of decision-making: primitive, forced, impelled and voluntary. The same distinction has been echoed in several other typologies as discussed above, and has informed several studies classifying migrations as politically-forced or drought-induced or as caused primarily by economic factors.

Although this distinction between 'forced' versus 'voluntary' migration is at first sight attractive and one is
Figure 3

A TYPOLOGY OF MIGRATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural - Rural</th>
<th>Rural - Urban</th>
<th>Urban - Rural</th>
<th>Urban - Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-occupational</td>
<td>Intra-occupational</td>
<td>Inter-occupational</td>
<td>Intra-occupational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cane-cutters</td>
<td>2. Gopals</td>
<td>1. Construction work labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>3. Vaidus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Farm Labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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tempted to introduce this dimension in the typology so as to classify the Laman migration as 'forced' – compelled by agro-climatic and socio-economic factors or the traditional vagabondness of their culture. We find the differentiation lacks conceptual clarity and is fraught with problems of tautology. Every decision to move is forced in the sense of caused by some circumstances, economic, social, or political. Yet there is a hiatus between the objective 'forces' identified by the social scientist and those perceived as such by the migrant-actor, for there is always a personal decision to be taken by the potential migrant in regard to whether to move or not. In other words, every migration is undoubtedly explainable in terms of certain external 'forces' as well as an individual 'decision to move'. And the proportion of these two elements in the private calculus of any particular migrant, besides being well-nigh impossible to estimate, would vary tremendously from migrant to migrant. In our view, there is seldom, in migration, volition versus force, but it is some combination of the two that results in migration. If one accepts the premise of the "economic man", then a person would voluntarily decide to migrate if the objective economic circumstances were such as to force him to migrate, and here we come upon a tautology. In short, therefore, while this study is an examination of the reasons/circumstances that explain the Laman migration, we have not used the dimension of decision-making (whether forced or free) in formulating a typology of migrations because it does not help in differentiating the Laman migration from other migrations and is thus useless as an analytical tool. Rather than attempting to judge whether it is forced or voluntary, our
view of the Laman migration is close to Gould and Protheroe's observation:

"Patterns of movements in the traditional sector have tended to be associated with the economic mechanisms required to overcome or exploit ecological variations within the area occupied by the group, but it is increasingly clear that within the limitations of the natural environment, flexibility is possible in the direction and periodicity of movement influenced by social considerations and individual decisions".  

With this background, in order to look for causal models of migration, it is necessary to move from typology to theory.

THEORIES OF MIGRATION

Coming to general theories of migration, there have been few attempts to arrive at a general theory of migration. The reasons for this are understandable as migration is a complex and multivariate phenomenon that does not easily conform to any procrustean theoretical formulation. Further most models being constructed on the basis of specific micro-analysis, their general applicability is quite limited, particularly when they involve single variable explanations. However, depending on the degree of abstraction and the focus, it is possible to have a general theory on the basis of which the aspects relevant for the purpose of the particular study can be understood.

The classical "push-pull" theory of migration is one such general theory. It suggests that migration takes place as a result of certain factors tending to "push" persons away from the area of origin while there are other factors which
tend to "pull" these persons to the area of destination. Further, such movements take place when an individual decides that it is preferable to move rather than to stay and when the difficulties inherent in moving seem to be more than offset by the expected advantages at the other end.

As a general statement, this explanation is valid provided of course that the assumptions underlying such a statement and the ensuing limitations are borne in mind. The first is an assumption of inertia: that most individuals have a permanent residence and that this is the normal state of affairs. While this may be the case in most societies today, it would have to be examined whether this assumption holds good for the particular case that may be under consideration, for in the case of certain gypsy communities or an extremely mobile society such as some sectors in the USA, such an assumption may not be valid at all.

In the push-pull theory, this 'normal' state is seen to be altered if a new factor appears, which could be something as obvious as loss of employment, political/religious persecution or natural disaster, or could for example even be a change in the individual's set of expectations leading him to believe that his needs cannot be satisfied at the place of residence. In such a case, the individual may consider a move somewhere else and such factors are, therefore, referred to as push-factors. At the same time, some factors in respect of the potential destination act on the individual and attract him, and are, therefore, termed as the pull factors. Each person is thus seen as constantly exposed to factors at the place of residence some of which inhibit movement and others which encourage it.
Similarly, there are also numerous positive and negative impulses coming from the various potential destinations. The outcome depends on the evaluation of all these factors by the individual, and may not be carried out objectively but depends on a host of variables such as cultural or environmental conditioning, group reaction, state in life etc. Decisions may also be modified by real or perceived obstacles such as the cost of moving, legal restrictions, fatigue etc. The theory so stated lends itself to a neat conceptual framework and, following Lee, can be expressed diagrammatically as:

**Figure 4**

*The Push-Pull Theory of Migration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Intervening Obstacles</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It is possible to criticise such a conception of migration as too mechanistic and such a criticism is to some extent valid. Taylor, for example, criticised this approach on the ground that it subsumes all motives under the assumption of maximisation of want satisfactions. This criticism was perhaps more valid when, in its earliest formulation, the push-
Pull concept was evolved from an economic perspective on migration, and the push or pull factors were enumerated basically as economic factors of employment opportunities, wage differentials between the place of origin and that of destination etc. Such a definition of these factors naturally limited the applicability of this theory. However, this can be circumvented if the factors are considered from the broader viewpoint and all socio-economic as well as political and other factors included. However, the criticism levelled by Taylor remains, for there is an underlying assumption in the push-pull theory that the choice of migration is a decision in favour of the better of two options. In real life, on the other hand, case studies have revealed that the objective is at times far from maximisation of wants but a such more limited one, even of mere survival, and may at times be the outcome of an impulsive, ill-informed decision or sense of frustration.

A less severe criticism of the push-pull theory has come from Connell. He has, while implicitly using the push-pull framework himself, criticised it as illegitimately separating into two (either push factors or pull factors). What is, in fact, according to Connell, a single act of preference of the place of destination over that of origin. However, this criticism is quickly answered for the distinction between push and pull is only analytical, and helps to explain the phenomenon of migration - that single act of preference of the destination over the place of origin - as a summation, in theory, of all the plus and minus factors of both the places. One may agree, however,
that a distinction requires to be maintained between the
decision to migrate per se and the choice of the destination —
although the two decisions are closely related. Wolpert has, in fact formulated the concept of place utility to meet
such a difficulty and states that every place has a certain
utility value seen from the individual's point of view. Thus
separate, in theory, from the decision to leave a place, may
be the further consideration and actual choice of the place to
which to migrate, based on the utility values of all the
places considered.

What is perhaps a more serious difficulty inherent in
the push-pull theory of migration is the enumeration and
weightage of the various factors in studying a particular case
of migration. At one level, the push-pull factors are capable
of being identified by studying the objective situation as it
exists in the place of origin as well as in the area of desti-
nation. However, solely depending on these objective factors
and presuming that they alone cause the migration amount to
overlooking the factor of individual psychologies, and the
possibility of inter-personal differences of perception and
evaluation of the same objective situation. At another level,
however, it is possible to accept the migrant's own statement
of his motives in moving and thus studying the migration by
taking the migrant's own definition of the situation into
account. These two approaches are not of course mutually
exclusive and it is possible to combine the migrant's own
account with inferences from the objective study of the structural
determinants of the situation. But there is a further problem inherent in depending on the migrant's own account and the researcher may be confronted with the problem of "stated" versus "real" objectives and motives. However, this difficulty is ubiquitous, and exists in the field of sociological analysis. A second and greater problem lies in the weightage to be given to individual factors and their relative importance in arriving at the final decision to migrate. Here again the 'combination' approach reduces the problems considerably as compared with studies which are based exclusively on the one or the other approach, and there are various sophisticated conceptual framework based on this approach such as that by Germani.

A distinct advantage of the push-pull theory of migration, albeit an area where little emphasis has yet been given, is that it enables a consideration of the costs of migration. Seen from the perspective of the individual, the cost of migration is the summation of all the disadvantages (i.e. the positive features of his place of residence which he has to leave behind, the negative features of the prospective destination which he has to put up with, and the intervening obstacles) vis à vis the advantages to be gained from moving. Admittedly, the exact weightage to be given to these factors remains a problem, and at times, the researcher is forced to resort to descriptive analysis. However, it would be possible with the approach of the push-pull theory to describe the cost of migrations in more precisely mathematical formulations. Moreover, it enables at the societal level, the computation of the cost of migration to society as a whole.
In view of the above discussion, this study is based on the conceptual framework of the push-pull theory of migration. There is an assumption that the Laman's home base is their tandas in Pathardi taluka of Ahmednagar district, and that their annual migration to the Konkan lends itself to explanation on a computation of all the positive and negative factors attaching to the two places as well as the intervening obstacles of the biannual march to and from. An attempt has also been made to consider the cost of migration both at the individual and societal levels. The push-pull theory of migration and the typology earlier presented (in Figure 3) thus form the theoretical framework for this study.

We have dwelled at some length on the push-pull theory of migration since it forms the conceptual framework of this study. Two other notable theories should be mentioned in passing. The first is a model of rural-urban migration provided by Mabogunje, derived from the General Systems Theory. He sees the migration system as being influenced by an economic, social, political and technological environment (See Figure 5). The exchange between this environment and the migration system is open and continuous. On receiving a stimulus from the environment, the potential migrant (a rural resident) is first influenced by the rural contr 1 sub-system (family, local community) in taking the decision of whether to move or not. If he moves, he enters the urban sub-system, whose control mechanism (economic opportunities, housing etc.) help him to adjust to the new system and eventually to become a true urbanite. Whether he succeeds or not is transmitted to the home community via positive
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A general systems Theory Model of Migration.
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or negative feedback which in turn would affect further migrations from the community.

Mobugunje has claimed for this model that it "enables consideration of rural-urban migration no longer as a linear, un-directional, "push-and-pull" cause-effect movement, but as a circular inter dependent, progressively complex, and self-modifying system in which the effect of changes in one part can be traced through the whole of the system".

While Mobugunje's model is relevant to permanent rural to urban migrations, his criticism of the push-pull theory is not valid. For the positive/negative impulses emanating from the potential destination, in the push-pull formulation, also implies the concept of positive/negative feedback from earlier migrations. Further what Mobugunje's theory perhaps lacks is an adequate consideration of the personality or individual psychological factors, and the potential migrant is seen as merely responding to stimuli from the environment or the control mechanisms of the rural or urban-sub-systems. In this sense, the theory is deterministic, and in any case limited to only one type of migration.

A different approach has been outlined by Mangalam in his social organizational theory of migration. Here, every society is seen to undergo social change. Social change is described as the "difference between social organization of given society at two different points in time, comprising changes in any or all the three component systems, namely the
culture, social and personality systems. In the process, migration takes places.

Mangalam thus conceives migration as "an adaptive process whose major objective is maintaining the dynamic equilibrium of a social organization with a minimum of changes and at the same time, providing those members ways to overcome their deprivations." Migration affects and is affected by social organization of the society of origin and destination. Also, the cultural values, norms and goals of migrants change in the process. The Migration System includes all three elements - Society of origin, Society of destination and migrants themselves - in mutual dynamic equilibrium.

As a macro-level theory, the social organizational concept of migration is a comprehensive explanatory models, provided one is in agreement with its basic postulate that social organizations are always in a state of dynamic equilibrium. However, its utility in explaining a particular case - such as seasonal migration is somewhat limited because it does not lend itself to a simple differentiation between cause and effect, nor does it help in giving weightages to the various factors contributing to migration.

While these two theories can be described as deductive models of migration, from the inductive approach, too, several attempts have been made to postulate the "laws of migration", which may also be mentioned in passing. The earliest of these are the two papers published by Ravenstein in 1885 and 1889. Recently, Lee has restated Ravenstein's laws in a series of
hypotheses about the volume of migration under varying conditions, the development of stream and counterstream and the characteristics of migrants. Thus:

On the **volume of migration**:

i. The volume of migration within a given territory varies with the degree of diversity in areas included in that territory.

ii. The volume of migration is related to the difficulty of surmounting the intervening obstacles.

iii. The volume of migration varies with the diversity of people.

iv. The volume of migration varies with fluctuations in the economy.

v. Unless severe checks are imposed, both volume and rate of migration tend to increase with time.

vi. The volume and rate of migration vary with state of progress in a country or in an area.

On the **stream and counterstream**:

i. Migration tends to take place largely within well-defined streams.

ii. For every major migration stream, a counterstream develops.

iii. The efficiency of the stream (ratio of stream to counterstream or the net redistribution of population affected by the opposite flows) is high if the major factors in the development of a migration stream were minus factors at origin.

iv. The efficiency of stream and counterstream tends to be low if origin and destination are similar.

v. The efficiency of migration streams will be high if the intervening obstacles are great.

vi. The efficiency of a migration stream varies with economic conditions, being high in prosperous times and low in times of depression.
On the characteristics of migrants:

i. Migration is selective.

ii. Migrants responding primarily to plus factors at origin tend to be negatively selective, or, where the minus factors are overwhelming to entire population groups, they may not be selected at all.

iii. Taking all migrants together, selection tends to be bi-modal.

iv. The degree of positive selection increases with the difficulty of the intervening obstacles.

v. The heightened propensity to migrate at certain stages of the life cycle is important in the selection of migrants.

vi. The characteristics of migrants tend to be intermediate between the characteristics of the population at origin and the population at destination.

These are interesting hypotheses that can be tested if there is comparable data for an appreciable number of migrations. Some work has already been done in this regard giving mathematical values to the descriptive data in order to precisely test these hypotheses. However, the present research was not undertaken with the objective of testing any of these 'laws of migration'.

One is tempted to make one more observation based on the review of the field of migration studies discussed above. Migration studies in the West, after some initial work on the migrant farm labour in the USA, the Depression - affected workforce, and the politically induced international migration in the post-war period, have focused more recently on intra-metropolitan flows, and these have been analyzed with the help of sophisticated mathematical tools. On the other hand, in the developing countries, studies have been concerned more with rural-rural migration, rural-urban migration and the seasonal
movements of rural populations such as nomads and pastoralists.

However, in many of these studies, there is an implicit view linking migration with social change or modernization. The most explicit statement in this regard is in the work of Zelinsky who states that:

"there are definite, patterned regularities in growth of personal mobility through space-time during recent history, and these regularities comprise an essential component of the modernization process."

Zelinsky has postulated five stages of mobility transition which parallel five stages of socio-economic development of a society. In the first stage, the pre-modern traditional society has little genuine residential migration but merely some limited movements sanctioned by custom. In the second stage, the early transactional society exhibits sudden increase in fertility, characterised by massive rural-urban migration, colonization of domestic and foreign frontier lands. Next, in the late transitional society, as fertility rates decelerate, rural-urban migration and colonization also slacken, but various forms of circulation increase in volume and complexity. In the advanced society, residential mobility levels off and oscillates at a high level, especially of the inter-urban and intra-urban kind.

The same discussion on the relationship between migration and modernization is to be found in the work of Pryor. However, there is in such discussions, an assumption that in the developing countries, increased migration is an indicator of increased economic activity and hence a sign of social
modernization. Based on this belief, little emphasis has been laid on the cost of migration, since the focus is on its positive impact on the mobilized economy. These are debatable assumptions. As several Indian studies have shown, and as this study hopes to also indicate, no facile connection can be made between migration and modernization or migration and economic development. Rather, it is the cost, both individual and societal, of migration that requires more attention for in some cases it is extremely high and indicative rather of a desperate economic situation.

Having discussed above the general theoretical concerns underlying studies on migration, and interalia stated the typology and theory of migration that underlie this particular study, we may now turn to explaining the sample and methodology used in the collection of the data for this study.

THE SAMPLE AND METHODOLOGY

This report is based on close discussions with some 110 heads of Laman families from Manikdaundi village in Pathardi taluka. It was decided to draw the sample from the village of Manikdaundi alone as the groups of Lamas settled in other villages of the taluka are in very small numbers and would not, therefore, have made a study of the social-economic indices of these villages worth while. Manikdaundi on the other hand, has 9 tandas (Laman settlements) comprising approximately 244 households. We were able to conduct 40, randomly selected indepth interviews (making the sampled households 16% of the total), although extensive general discussions were held, in addition, with the larger groups of villagers.
The respondents were interviewed with the help of an interview schedule. The schedule was drawn up, strictly keeping in mind the objectives of the study. Hence, questions were grouped under the headings of (i) general information (ii) information regarding the family assets and income, (iii) employment, (iv) indebtedness, (v) migration data, (vi) reasons for migration and (vii) awareness of government schemes for development. The interview schedule was pretested and certain modifications made in the light of these early interviews. The schedule is given in Appendix.

In the first category, such general data as the name of the respondent, his age, native land, whether migrating and the type of work done at the place of destination, were sought with a view to identify and categorise the respondent. As regards the family, information was sought on the number of members in the family, their age, level of education and whether they migrated or stayed behind in the home land. In order to understand the economic position of the family a careful listing of the land holding, whether individually or jointly owned, whether irrigated, the crop yields, other indicative assets such as type and value of dwelling unit, number of farm implements owned, number of animals owned and incidental income from them, if any, was made. As regards, the structure of employment, data on both on farm and non-farm employment, the duration of such employment, the nature of work, wage rates and the members of the family who were thus engaged have been taken. On the point of indebtedness what
was sought to be revealed is the type of source and reason for raising the loan (whether co-operative credit, bank, private moneylender etc.), the amount, interest rate and mode of repayment. Under the category of migration data, information was gathered regarding the time of departure and return, the route followed, the contractual relationships, nature of work done, and the system of wages. Since the respondents could not specify the rate of wages, a number of indirect questions had to be asked regarding the various amounts of cash advances taken from the contractors, the approximate number of days of work put in the season, the approximate output of work, the quantities of wages received in kind, their value and the final settlement outcomes. In many cases, it was found that the Lambans had not done such an exercise themselves although many complained in a general way that they were exploited by the contractors. Finally some questions regarding reasons for migrating, alternatives conceived, and awareness of and benefits actually derived from the various government schemes were posed with the objective of eliciting their own perceptions on these issues.

Although the sets of questions yielded adequate data on all the points that we wished to study, certain limitations of the schedule and method difficulties should be mentioned. The interview schedule was drawn up in English. (See Appendix I) However, the interview as such was conducted in Marathi and the need to establish rapport as well as the difficulty on the part of the respondents in articulating their replies in regard to household budgets or their perceptions of their difficulties etc., meant that the interview often lapsed into a
wide-spectrum discussion of their multiple problems, actions and decisions and it is from these that the general economic condition and an idea of the annual family budget for the year 1977-78 of these families has been gleaned.

Yet another point needs to be clarified in regard to the sample households. In order to determine the household budget etc. it was necessary to determine whether the family was nuclear or joint. The close kinship ties maintained between adult brothers made it difficult to obtain straight answers. Moreover, a phenomenon probably peculiar to this group is that sometimes, on division, the brothers live in adjacent huts and cook separately (not infrequently in separate corners of a single shared hut), the wages earned are kept individually, but the ancestral land is tilled together and the produce then divided among the members according to each person's share. In this type of an arrangement, even if the brothers were living in one hut or partitions thereof, and the land was apparently still owned jointly, the family was considered as divided into nuclear units since the decision making as regards the household budget was done by the head of the nuclear unit.

The random sample of 40 in depth interviews brought up to 31 families who migrated to the Konkan, one who went to a Sugar Factory, and 8 who did not migrate during the relevant year. Of these who migrated to the Konkan, 6 families who were wood-cutters and charcoal burners in the Konkan, 19 who transported the coal up the main road on pack bullocks,
who worked as Mukadams or labour contractors themselves and one was a salarised Diwanji (accounts clerk) with a coal merchant. The general discussions held with a number of people on these proportions indicate that the sample was fairly representative of the actual structure of employment among this group.

While these interviews were conducted in the course of a number of trips to the village of Manikdaundi extending from August to December, the period of these visits coincided with the agricultural operations towards the close of the monsoons. First-hand impressions were, therefore, gained through the non-participant observation method, of the agricultural practices, the quality of life in the tandas, the division of work among the family members, and an occasional glimpse into such social rites as wedding ceremonies. Besides the main village, four of the 9 tandas were covered for detailed group discussions.

The documented primary data researched into consists of various basic information maintained in the Revenue and Zilla Parishad Offices both at the Tahsil and village levels. In some instances such as the agricultural census data or the decadal rainfall figures, the information maintained in these offices is not merely the only one available but is, at the same time, fairly comprehensive, reliable and, therefore, invaluable. The costs to an individual or private organisation of independently maintaining/obtaining such data would be prohibitive. The researcher's only regret is that these offices
themselves are unaware of the significance of this data and adequate provisions are not made for their proper maintenance. In other instances where Revenue figures have been utilised, such as the number of Laman households in a particular village, note has been made that these should be used only to indicate approximations. They have been used only in the absence of any other reliable data.

At the end of the field work in Rathardi taluka, in order to tie up impressions and reported facts of life at the other end, it was felt necessary that the actual place of work of these migrants should be visited. Accordingly, a short trip was made to Khed in Ratnagiri District. Although the interview schedule was not designed to cover questions regarding the current year's contract and hence there was no need to follow the same respondents into the Konkan, with the help of known Laman contractors and labourers we were able to visit at random a few of the forest campsites where the Lamans live and work for the better part of the year. In that sense, this is a two-ended analysis and an attempt was made to verify the descriptions of life at the place of migration. At the taluka headquarters of Khed, discussions on the impact of this migrant labour on the local economy as well as the migrant's problems and the facilities extended to them were held with the Tahsildar, his staff and the Block Development Officer.

To summarise, the methodology followed in this study is:-
i. Intensive field study through structured interview schedules to identify the nature and dimensions of poverty among this group and to array the causes of their seasonal migration. (Based on simple random method, field data on the relevant indices of landholding, employment opportunities at home, indebtedness and annual family budgets was collected from 40 households in 4 tandas in the village).

ii. Case studies of selected institutions - a landless labourers' farming co-operative and an ashram shala.

iii. A sociological study of the pattern of migration, the work campaign and the life in particular of the Laman child, based on both interviews and participation-observation method.

iv. Discussions and case method to study the working, effectiveness and potentially of various development schemes in progress in the area.

v. Non-participant observation of the life of the Laman in their home tandas as well as at their campsites in Konkan where they usually migrate.

vi. Research into relevant documentary evidence in order to both simplify and cross-check the reliability of interview data.
CHAPTER II
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