

INTRODUCTION

For some of us who are contributing to this volume, the issues we address go back to conversations we had as graduate students preparing for field work in the late 1960s. Over the years, the conversations have continued, with each of the present contributors eventually joining the discussion. We have in common at least two things: all of us are studying, or have studied, people who have been defined as migrants; and all of us are dissatisfied with the present lack of theory about migrants and migration. That most of the papers use Latin American research reflects the way we have met—in school, in the field, and at conferences. The Latin American bias is a handicap that we invite others to help us overcome, but for present purposes we do not see it as a serious drawback. While we feel that we have made progress, the papers in this volume address most of the same questions that we encountered in the 1960s:

1. How should we define “migrants” and “migration”?
2. Where, if at all, can ethnographic data about migrants be fitted into the macro-models of economists, geographers, and demographers?
3. How may the choices migrants make, and the external constraints on those choices, be included in theoretical formulations without having their meanings changed?
4. What does the information we, as ethnographers, gain about migrants tell us about social science theory in general?

Examining the literature dealing with migrants, we find reports of a great number of studies, but no answers to our questions. We are still working, as are others. No final answers have been found. But we feel that the papers in this volume will show that hard theoretical issues are being grappled with, and that progress is being made. We hope that they will also suggest directions that we and others may profitably take in the future.

This introduction will be divided into two parts. First we will provide a background sketch of anthropological studies of migrants, explaining reasons for our interest, and pointing out some of the failures of past studies. Next, we will discuss the issues raised in the papers. Along the way, we will informally set out theoretical propositions that we feel derive from the papers.¹ The majority of the papers were presented at a symposium at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association in San Francisco in December 1975. We are very fortunate to be able to include in

this volume the response of one of the two discussants at that symposium, Leonard Plotnicov. One of the papers presented at the symposium, that of Alex and Carol Stepick (1975), for reasons not entirely clear to us was not accepted for publication by the RICE UNIVERSITY STUDIES Review Board. We believe the Stepicks made an important contribution to the symposium, and are confident that their paper will soon be published elsewhere.

WHY MIGRATION STUDIES?

One of the most widespread and explosive social phenomena of the twentieth century has been the movement of large population segments, not only from rural to urban areas and from non-industrial to industrial areas, but also among cities and among rural places. Economists, demographers, and geographers have a fairly well developed array of techniques for describing migration patterns in global terms. Though useful, those techniques typically require conceptualizing migration in such a way that they leave out of account, or at least fail to provide a basis for investigating, the individual actions from which the larger events develop.

Anthropologists, coming somewhat later to studies of migration, and focusing for the most part on developing areas of the world, have tended to concern themselves with the activities of individuals and sociocultural constraints upon such activities. Anthropological field research has run ahead of the development of theory, however, and where attempts at theoretical formulations have been made, they have been fragmented and isolated. We have not specified adequately how what we learn about migration is to be related to social science theory in general. We have generated bodies of data that cannot fully be used because of the relative theoretical disarray. And we have failed to discover how to mesh our data and formulations on migration with more comprehensive formulations in anthropology and with the global conceptualizations of migration in the other social sciences.

Anthropologists became interested in migration in the early 1950s, when increasing numbers of their informants began to move from the countryside to the cities. The first question these anthropologists asked was what effect residence in an urban place had upon the lives of formerly rural people. This basic theme continues to be popular (Graves and Graves, 1974; Simic, 1973; Rew, 1974; Mayer, 1961; and papers by Lobo and M. Whiteford in this volume). In answering this question, many began to rethink the notions of a folk-urban continuum, as formulated by Robert Redfield, and its implications for rural-urban migration. Despite Redfield's predictions, studies showed that rural folk in Latin America who moved to the city adjusted, in fact, quite well (Lewis, 1952; Butterworth, 1970; Mangin, 1960 and 1967). The next task was to determine the mechanisms through which they made their adjustment to the city. This search led to an examination of the

fate of rural institutions and, eventually, to a wholesale ferreting out of bits and pieces of rural culture in the urban environment (see McGee, 1973, for a counterview). This focus on institutions and other culture "traits" was consistent with treatment by many cultural anthropologists of "culture contact" in general.

Just why the bias began to change is difficult to explain. Perhaps the change grew out of a belated acceptance of one of the chief tenets of cultural relativism: that a cultural trait may be understood only within its cultural or sub-cultural context. Perhaps it was due to the realization, expressed by such investigators as Aidan Southall and J. Clyde Mitchell, that people, not cultures, migrate (Mitchell, 1966). For whatever reason, throughout the 1960s, adaptation studies were increasingly directed toward the behavior of individuals and groups, and the strategies through which they "coped" with the new urban environment. As Graves and Graves say, after a careful search of recent studies of adaptation,

"Adaptation" nicely captures a growing consensus [sic] among anthropologists that the nature of man is best described as neither totally active nor passive but interactive. Operating within the many constraints which his physical and social environments impose, he seeks to overcome the problems confronting him by choosing among perceived available options. Through the aggregation of such choices man modifies and is modified by the world around him in a mutually evolving system. (1974, p. 117)

Part of the legacy of the Redfieldian folk-urban continuum, and, in extension, the sociological tradition of Durkheim and Tonnies, is a tendency to force an unnecessary and misleading dichotomy onto our perception of the space in which migration occurs. This has had two important implications for our understanding of migration: it has introduced a bias in our conceptualization of the physical space in which it occurs, and it colors our understanding of the dynamics of such localities. In the latter case, the work of Redfield's critics (see Heath and Adams, 1965:7-8) has made us aware of the weaknesses of the continuum as a guiding image. The polarization of space, however, continues to influence virtually all analyses of migration to be found in the social science literature. This perception of migration is inherent in the "push-pull" models of economists (see Fischlowitz, 1965) and in the later gravity models of the demographers (see Lee, 1966). Presumably the poles of the migration image remain the same, or we speak of change in one or the other, usually the city.

Social scientists have asked *who* migrates and *why*; the answers have not always been as illuminating as one might have hoped. In part, this can be attributed to the use of questionnaires and superficial interviews to gather quantitative data. This practice raises the problem, common to all such techniques, of interpreting the brief responses accurately. More importantly, the causes and characteristics of migration *to* cities have usually been sought through research among migrants *in* cities. For example, the soci-

ologists Browning and Feindt, using data from an extremely thorough and sensitive survey in Monterrey, Mexico (1969 and 1971), say that 70% of their sample rated obtaining employment as the most important reason for their migration, and that other considerations connected with "family," "education," "community," and "other" matters were so rated by the other 30% (1971:50). In a peasant village, however, factors that would free one to seek employment elsewhere, such as lack of land, likely result from one's patrimony, birth order, selection of spouse, or other characteristics, rather than outright lack of gainful employment. Furthermore, the decision to migrate to look for work is affected by information about opportunities for employment in the city and by sources of aid there, such as helpful kinsmen (see papers by Lomnitz, Provencher, and Schreiber). Thus, although obtaining employment may be the stated reason for migration in 70% of the cases, this explanation probably masks a very complex system of factors, economic and other, which must be known before the reasons for migration can be fully understood.

Before we can hope to understand how people decide to migrate, we must know something of the options among which they choose. We need to know something of the opportunities that they perceive to be available to them both at home and in other places where they consider moving. This is not just a matter of counting job openings, available housing, and transportation. The question of how a job opening, for example, becomes a perceived opportunity for a given person involves a complex set of issues, including information systems, values, and systems of aid and support. The context within which decisions are made and acted upon is really a hierarchy of contexts, personal, local, regional, national, and international, characterized at each level by constant change.

The problem of interpreting informants' responses plagues all surveys, and, of course, the problem of understanding the context within which migrants choose to migrate cannot be solved by studies conducted solely in the cities receiving them. Even if we know the reasons migrants give retrospectively for having migrated, we still know very little about the factors involved in migration until we discover why other residents of the migrants' locality *did not* migrate.²

The polar view of migration is at best confusing, at worst misleading, and in need of considerable revision in light of current research. Throughout the world there are indications that, among rural populations formerly depicted as static and isolated, migration has been going on for some time, and may, in fact, be culturally sanctioned or even required (see the papers by Provencher and Schreiber in this volume). The economic options available to village populations are not only extremely heterogeneous but also multilocal. The resulting variety of movements of the people conflicts with our standard notions of the spatial aspects of

migration. In fact, the social networks and perceived economic resources of both peasants and urban migrants (and even the urban-born) often are spatially widespread (Watson, 1975; Grillo, 1973:47-61; Guillet, 1976b; see papers by Lomnitz, Lobo, S. Whiteford, Tobias, Provencher, and Uzzell in this volume). Furthermore, maintenance and utilization of those socioeconomic resources may not involve migration in the ordinary sense. For example, the diversified economic activities of some peasant families in the Oaxaca Valley of Mexico are administered corporately by families whose members live in several localities. Family members move from one locality to the other as they are needed to further family enterprises.³ In Lima, a considerable portion of the self-built housing in the irregular settlements may have been financed by sale or rental of rural property. There are cases of poor families holding lots in more than one irregular settlement in Lima and also holding lots in irregular settlements in more than one city. For the researcher to understand the behavior of migrants, then, seems to require both an acquaintance with their home communities and a spatial perspective that is at least as broad as that of the migrants themselves.

The polar view of rural-urban migration is the result of considering the phenomenon etically (from the analyst's point of view, not that of the people being studied), without recourse to the complex contexts within which rural people choose to migrate or not to migrate.

How do we begin to approximate the spatial structure perceived by a prospective migrant? It seems obvious that there is a finite set of localities to which an individual might choose to "migrate." Each of these localities has a particular set of characteristics, an opportunity structure as it were, that is meaningful to the individual. Each locality, further, is not an isolated unit, but, rather, is set within a system of interacting localities. Geographers find it convenient to refer to such systems as constituting an urban hierarchy containing lower order, intermediate, and higher order systems, which interact at different points. From the perspective of any given locality in such a hierarchy, one can speak of its "hinterland." On the basis of the spatial properties of such systems, geographers have devised models that predict migration flow. Like the models of the demographers, such as the venerable push-pull model, they are largely elaborated using census and survey data to meet their requirements for quantification. They are useful, however, in forcing anthropologists to seek out systemic properties of sets of localities as our informants describe them to us.

Fortunately, anthropologists have in the past decade turned to complementary studies of hinterlands, and of both city and hinterland. Studies that have been conducted since 1970 include Feindt and Browning's inquiry into return migration (1972), Rollwagen's work in Jalisco

(1974), S. Whiteford's work with Bolivian rural-rural migrants (Whiteford and Adams, 1974; and S. Whiteford's paper in this volume), Guillet's study of return migration (1976b), a long-range study by Salisbury and Salisbury (conducted earlier, but reported in 1972), and another long-range study by Friedl (1974) in Greece. Bryan Roberts's study of a region in Peru points to the kind of large scale analysis that may be made (1974). A study on a regional scale recently undertaken by Sylvia Cone in Mexico may provide the most comprehensive information so far acquired about the systemic properties of the structure of rural-urban migration in that country (reported in *Urban Anthropology Newsletter* 2[2]:113 [1973]).

The analysis of interrelationships between settlements and their hinterlands will continue to inform migration studies, and fortunately so. Increasing attention must be paid, however, to the complexity of these interrelationships. Simplistic unidimensional models such as the folk-urban continuum will prove of limited usefulness in aiding our understanding of these interrelationships. Anthropologists must now look to the macro-models of the economist, the demographer, the political scientist, and the geographer, to refine our understanding of these systemic properties.

One of the problems of the past in migration studies of the polar persuasion has been the inability to decide what "rural" and "urban" mean, where a locality under consideration "fits" on the continuum, and what this implies for an individual assessing migration to it as one of a set of goal-oriented strategies. Indeed, much of the criticism of the folk-urban continuum has been directed toward the characteristics, social and other, of the poles. Outstanding in this regard is the well known Lewis-Redfield debate over the nature of social relations in the rural (peasant) community and the criticism (see Gans, 1974, among others) levied against Wirth's treatment of urbanism from which Redfield's was derived. Applying the concept to empirical cases deepens the confusion, and we find contention over whether Yoruba settlements are "urban" (Lloyd, 1973) and whether African cultivators are to be called "peasant" (Fallers, 1961) and thus allowed to be called folk communities.

There are two standard procedures to follow if we are to continue to use, and necessarily improve upon, the rural-urban continuum, or indeed any kind of hierarchy of settlement types. The first is to elicit folk continua from native informants, or, barring that, to reconstruct them from available linguistic materials, as for example is done in Yusuf's work with Hausa settlement categories (1974). The second is to construct etic continua based on indices that can be more accurately applied to existing empirical situations. One way of doing this involves analysis of significant social roles. Two examples of the use of role analysis come to mind. Aidan Southall

(1973) has constructed an index based upon the "density of role relationships," or the number of role relationships activated by an aggregate of persons within a particular space. This index allows the analyst to clarify the ambiguity of Wirth's heterogeneity as the most important component of his definition of urbanism: "in [Southall's] formulation urban communities are more heterogeneous than rural communities in the sense that they comprise a larger number and greater variety of differentiated roles and also a larger number of role-relationships played in terms of them" (Southall, 1973:83). An example of its utility can be seen in Frankenberg's analysis of a range of rural and small urban communities in Britain (1966). Taking a different tack, Banton (1973) concentrates on the differentiation of roles, as opposed to Southall's emphasis on the total content of roles. His description of role types, based on their degree of differentiation, clarifies some of the issues in the rural-urban continuum and produces propositions that can be put to an empirical test.

One of the main directions anthropological studies of migration can take is to utilize ethnographic data to expand our knowledge of the properties of settlements, their spatial structure and interaction, and, most importantly, how they are perceived by migrants and non-migrants alike. To the extent that this information will bear upon existing macro-models of migration in economics, demography, and geography, it behooves anthropologists to become aware of those theories and to attempt to mesh ethnographic information with them. Just how to go about such a merger involves serious theoretical problems, as will be shown below and in a majority of the papers in this volume.⁴

This process of adaptation should be reciprocal, however. One point that was made at the 1975 symposium in San Francisco is that much of the variability introduced by data collected by anthropologists is dismissed as "noise" in the data of other social scientists, particularly economists. No advance is to be anticipated if we receive such a notion with either smugness or despair. The research techniques of anthropologists are peculiarly adapted to finding out about the lives of individual people and groups. If the information we glean from our research turns out to be irrelevant to other social scientists, either their models are at fault or ours are. The push-pull and gravity models of economists and demographers must at some point include the actions of individuals. Otherwise, they must perpetually play an empty game of numbers.

In order to contribute to the development of migration theory, anthropologists must assess migration as one of a set of strategies directed toward goals shared by the residents of a locality (subculture, village, town, city). The study of the context of these decisions is potentially one of the greatest contributions anthropologists can make to migration theory, but at the same time it is fraught with conceptual and methodological difficulties

(see papers by L. Whiteford and Tobias in this volume). A refined understanding of decisions and their contexts will enable us to speak more precisely about the relative importance of factors that have traditionally been assigned importance in migration theory; for example, the role of gainful employment in economic "push-pull" models. We can expect to find other factors, such as "values," motivation for economic achievement, and stage in the life cycle, and to evaluate their importance in the decisions to migrate or not to migrate.

Contexts change and perforce decisions change. To understand migration, we need also to learn how changes in those contexts affect the number of people who choose to leave and the characteristics of those people who choose to remain at home. With that knowledge, we will be in a better position to learn something about the processes of decision-making of migrants and, at the same time, to gain insight into the mechanisms through which macro-economic, political, and other factors directly and indirectly affect rates and kinds of migration.

How do we move from the intimate locale of our informants, which we have come to know during the course of fieldwork, to the cold and unflinching world of numbers? Or what good is a thorough knowledge of the strategies, including migration, and their relation to the life goals of a limited number of informants, if we are seeking to contribute to macro-models that require quantification? To answer this question we must remember that the aggregated data used in these models are the outcome of the totality of decisions made by individual actors. With this in mind, some suggest sketching in "linkages" between the micro- and the macro-levels of data analysis.

First, micro-analysis can suggest patterns to look for in aggregated data. For example, in some societies (Watson, 1975; Philpott, 1974) passport data combined with postal and bank records has revealed a "remittance" pattern in which "outmigrants" continue to maintain ties with their home communities through the periodic sending of money. In other societies, remittances can continue to be important in the economy of the sending society, and can be revealed in other types of aggregated data, such as in the licensing required for small entrepreneurial operations where informal channels are utilized to send funds and records are not kept.

Second, one can be led to re-examine current behavioral explanations of aggregated data. For example, seasonal migration is often assumed to represent a response by peasant agriculturalists to employment opportunities elsewhere, during a "dead" period in their agricultural cycle. Guillet, in examining seasonal migration from a highland peasant community in Peru to a lowland colonization zone, found that young single males migrated in order to "broaden their horizons," and that once saddled

with a family, they became more sedentary and did not maintain the migratory pattern. Stage in the life cycle, thus, was one of a complex set of factors, including employment opportunities, involved in the seasonal migration pattern (1976a; see also papers by Provencher and Schreiber).

Third, micro-analysis can suggest factors that are often not included in macro-models. Unemployment, underemployment, and full employment are usually measured by the labor force method based on the "principal occupation" of an individual. This causes one to overlook mixed strategies of employment, found in both rural and urban contexts, which can only be revealed in micro-analysis (see paper by Uzzell). Moreover, this method tends to focus on the individual rather than the family, which in many societies budgets as a group and plans production strategies jointly. Through micro-analysis, labor utilization models can be "opened up" to include all the strategies, including migration, that individuals and families devise to utilize their human resources.

Finally, micro-analysis of decisions and contexts can refine our understanding of gross demographic processes such as migrant selectivity. Only through close contextual analysis can factors such as patrimony, birth order, stage in the life cycle, and selection of one's spouse, among others, be understood in relation to "who migrates."

The progress of scientific knowledge in part consists of temporarily putting some sets of phenomena in "black boxes" and then, one by one, illuminating the boxes. As Gregory Bateson says of black boxes, "A 'black box' is a conventional agreement between scientists to stop trying to explain things at a certain point. I guess it's usually a temporary agreement" (1972:39-40). In large measure, one possibility that we are suggesting in this book is the illumination of a set of black boxes in existing notions of migration.

But we go further than that. The logical outcome of stressing the contexts, both within individuals and external to them, of the decisions that lead to migration is the realization expressed by Plotnicov, Forman, and L. Whiteford that properly speaking "migration" *per se* is a false subject: the contexts are our proper fields of research and the physical movements of people are epiphenomenal. Such a conclusion is neither sophistic nor a denigration of our work—it underscores our shift of interest. If the study of migration is properly to be embedded in other studies, it follows that what we learn about migration will be useful for the understanding of phenomena that are more general in scope than the physical movement of people.

THEORETICAL ISSUES IN THIS VOLUME

The foregoing brief discussion does not exhaust the array of theoretical issues that have been raised by anthropologists in the study of migration.

It does provide a background for the specific issues addressed by the papers in the present collection. We now turn to a discussion of the papers and attempt to show ways in which points in the papers may be related to each other.

The best word for characterizing the central concern of the papers is "meaning." In one way or another, all of the authors ask, "What does migration (or some aspect of the process) *mean*?" The questions about meaning range from a consideration of the nature of "migration" as social scientists use the term to the meanings of macro-events as shapers of the situations within which people choose to move, and from the meaning of residential change in the life of an individual to the meaning of the reasons an individual gives for moving. Obviously, we are talking about meaning in several senses and from more than one point of view. In the papers, these approaches to meaning may be grouped under the headings The Decision to Migrate, The Contexts of the Decisions, Problems of Data Gathering and Analysis, Conceptualizations of Migration, Linkages between the Micro- and the Macro-Levels of Analysis, and The Imbeddedness of Migration in Other Cultural Phenomena. These headings provide nothing more than rhetorical convenience. The actual issues meander among them.

The Decision to Migrate

The most basic notion, common to all definitions of migration, is the movement of an individual from one place to another. Unless the person was transported against his or her will, a *decision* to move is implied. Such a decision may be thought of as a calculated choice as a means to obtain a culturally defined goal shared by the members of a larger reference group to which the individual belongs. How the choice to migrate is made is a fertile area of study, as the papers in this volume indicate. The decision can be made by an individual or a group. The papers here have dealt, by and large, with decisions of individuals.

Migration is not random behavior and individuals who decide to migrate can be assumed to be self-selected in some fashion from among a larger population. Most of the authors in this volume treat the question of why people migrate and to what extent they are "selected" in the process. Many researchers have approached these questions by asking people in a particular place why they came there, or by searching for "characteristics" of a population, such as age, sex, marital status, or education, from which inferences are made about why people migrate. There is a refreshing attempt in the present volume to search out new techniques to solve these old problems. Using the ethnographic literature and his own research, Provencher presents a folk model of Malayan mi-

gration. Numerous forms of population movement in Malay society are traditional and normative. For example, adolescent males are expected to undertake a long journey or period of wandering called *merantau* to gain experience worthy of an adult male. Each type of movement is related to a stage in the life cycle and no one move implies a permanent commitment to residence in a distant place. Tobias, also, finds in his elucidation of a folk model of migration among Grenadians that individuals do not intend to remain abroad, but rather see themselves as visitors overseas until they come home "after a while." Tobias and Schreiber question the validity of the reasons given publicly for migrating. Together with Provencher, they imply that ethnographer and survey team alike must be attuned to folk explanations, which are derived ultimately from folk models of migration, which, as Tobias shows, can be highly specific to a social situation.

Following closely upon study of the reasons for migration comes a concern for the process of decision-making by individuals or groups. L. Whiteford approaches the question directly, proposing that by analyzing the content of people's speech, we might infer ways in which their beliefs change, and thereby how they decide, among other things, to migrate.

At first glance, it might appear that if we could only compile a list of all the "true" reasons or all the right population characteristics, we would know why people move, if not how they decide to move. The same forces that impel social scientists towards such a compilation also invite us to create systems of referential semantics, and the same fallacy would foredoom such efforts to failure. Just as no list of kinship terms can explain the meaning to me of this aunt, in this situation, on this day, so no list of reasons for moving can explain the meaning of this particular decision to move. Meaning grows out of, and remains situated in, context.

The Context of the Decision to Migrate

The choice of migration as a means to a culturally defined goal implies that there are other possible strategies against which migration must be evaluated. Context, in one sense, refers both to the set of possible strategies for obtaining a goal that are available to the individual, and to the evaluation of each strategy. As we have said earlier, it is possible analytically to discriminate a hierarchy of contexts, including individual, familial, communal, regional, national, and international contexts, within which individuals commonly perceive different sets of strategies.

Shoemaker and S. Whiteford treat the national and the international levels and argue that migration behavior reflects changes at each level. Shoemaker argues that the dynamics of localities in the national system are based on a structurally created antagonism between metropolis and

satellite; in the specific case he studied, the basic conflict is between the growth and development of Lima and the stagnation of the depressed frontier settlement. In rejecting the rural-urban paradigm and what he considers to be its assumptions of "functional equilibrium," he follows a current interest in the antagonism between town and countryside. This antagonism is particularly apparent in the first stage of capitalist penetration into agrarian societies (Ferguson, 1976:107-109). S. Whiteford discusses the social and economic factors, at the international and the national levels, that have led to the present situation of Bolivian farm workers in Argentina. For him, migration is a symptom that indicates the perceptions that people have of differences among resources available in various localities. These differences, real or imagined, reflect processes at work from the individual to the international level. Thus migration becomes one of the processes interacting with the others and should be studied in conjunction with them. S. Whiteford's conclusions are therefore quite similar to Shoemaker's contention that population movements can be a point of departure for the study of hinterland and urban development.

The extent to which migration can become a "normative" option is apparent from the papers by Schreiber and Provencher. In Malay society, according to Provencher, the decision regarding migration is not whether to migrate, but rather when and where to migrate. Migration is so pervasive in southern Italy, according to Schreiber, that children play migration games and are taught to expect to move at one time or another, usually during a life crisis. Lomnitz discusses the importance of rural networks with urban components for individuals moving to Mexico City, and suggests that such networks strongly influence the migrant's perception of the city and the likelihood that he or she will achieve his or her goals. These three papers taken together lead one to the conclusion that migration can become a routinized option, and essentially normative. It would follow that, whatever the stated reason, the meaning of the decision to migrate would certainly be different, in these contexts, from the meaning of an analogous decision by a member of a locality in which migration is not a standard option and social ties are not maintained with individuals in the place of destination.

Problems of Data Gathering and Analysis

All of the authors in this volume are anthropologists, and in their substantive papers they draw heavily on participant observation as a primary technique for data gathering. Many have used other techniques, however. We find the use of surveying techniques (M. Whiteford, Shoemaker); life histories; ecological analysis (Lomnitz); and the use of ethnographic data in conjunction with census and historical materials (S. Whiteford, Pro-

vencher). An innovation suggested by L. Whiteford is the recording of natural language interactions, which it is hoped will provide new insights into the cognitive factors affecting the decision to migrate. Ethnographic field work, however, is a slow and tedious enterprise, whatever techniques are used; and it will continue to pose problems for anyone who hopes to fit its results into macro-models of migration.

Besides their concern with kinds of data, many of our authors worry about the reliability, or the "meaning" of their data. Tobias discusses a folk model according to which explanations of the factors leading to a given person's deciding to migrate are grouped in one of two categories according to their credibility. "Old talk" refers to the standard, ideal explanations given by the individual to put the decision in the most favorable light. "The truth" is a set of explanations arrived at in informal gossip sessions in which the individual's known personal history is examined for idiosyncratic factors that will give locally believable explanations. Interestingly, the explanations used in "old talk" sound very much like the categories of factors found on many survey questionnaires. Schreiber also discusses discrepancies between reasons given publicly and those that are given to people with whom one has close relationships. The former seem similar to Tobias's "old talk," and the latter seem similar to "the truth." Both papers, by implication, suggest that the ethnographer and the survey team must be attuned to folk models and their situational determinants to make sense of explanations given by informants and respondents. Problems of collecting and interpreting data are certainly not unique to studies of migration, but they do bear directly upon the difficulties anthropologists face in linking up their studies of migration with the models of the economist, demographer, and geographer.

Conceptualizations of Migrations

One of the most provocative activities of our authors, and the one that evoked the most discussion at the 1975 symposium, has been to consider just how migration should be defined. Thus, rather than remaining at the micro-level of description and analysis, our authors have entered into the larger issues of the modeling of migration itself. Most of them seem to agree that statements of the form "migration equals x ," or "migration may be divided into types 1, 2, . . . , n ," are unproductive and perhaps conceptually unsound. Such a consensus, however, comes from a variety of directions.

The theoretical literature on migration is beset with imprecision and confusion in its definitions. In a paper presented at the symposium in San Francisco, but not published in this volume, Stepick and Stepick (1975) attempt to clarify some of the ambiguities by constructing a formal ac-

count of migration. They reach the interesting conclusion, in implicit agreement with many of the papers found in this volume, that there are few intrinsic properties of migration that lead readily to formulation. In particular, opportunities and population characteristics, basic concepts necessary for the construction of their formal model, are not easy to quantify mathematically and are open to arbitrary definition and description by the analyst. Certainly any anthropologist who has been faced with the problem of deciding what opportunities and characteristics *mean* in a given empirical context can readily agree.

Forman criticizes existing conceptualizations of migration on several counts, only two of which we shall mention here. First, she points out that the concept "migrant," which is non-unitary with respect to time and population membership, is regularly used as if it were in the same class as birth, death, sex, and other demographic variables that are unitary. Second, she argues that the arbitrariness of drawing boundaries, the crossing of which defines one as this or that kind of migrant, obscures qualitative differences in the significance of individual movements.

Several authors go beyond a criticism of the prevailing conceptualizations of migration to suggest other directions. In undertaking a study of migration in a colonization zone in eastern Peru, Shoemaker initially attempted to use a research design based on the traditional rural-urban continuum, i.e., a concern for the sources and rates of migration, "push-pull" factors, and migrant adaptation at the place of destination. It soon became apparent that neither he nor his informants were satisfied with such a characterization. He finds that a conflict model of metropolis-satellite relations agrees more with "reality" as perceived by himself and his informants. Provencher contrasts the Malay folk model of migration with the prevailing etic definitions, particularly the elaborate multi-dimensional matrix of Kosinski and Prothero (1975). Both Tobias and Provencher argue that folk models of migration from "exotic" societies are of the same level of validity as the Western "folk" models of social science. They do not take their proposition further, but it is implied that comparative analysis of folk models of migration would be a productive field of inquiry. Such a strategy would involve procedures similar to those used in ethnoscience, which have been alluded to earlier in our discussion of folk categories and the rural-urban continuum.

Tobias, agreeing that migration is best seen as an epiphenomenon, specifies at least three "definitions" of migration: that of the social scientist, that presented publicly by the Grenadian migrant, and that negotiated by local gossips who have privileged information about the migrant. That each of these three is arbitrary and potentially expandable seems obvious. What is more piquant is that Tobias seems to be defining migration in terms of the reasons given for it, and not, as is usual, the

reverse. In another sense, however, it is not the migration that is being defined by the reasons, but the reasons-for-the-reasons. At this point, we are teetering on the brink of an infinite regress. Such phenomenological approaches are welcome, though, because they make us aware of the effects of our conceptualizations.

One of the conceptual traps that our Western folk notions of migration lead us into is the dichotomization of the space in which migration occurs. Uzzell's paper addresses this problem directly, and we have already repeated his major points in this introduction. Other authors, particularly M. Whiteford, Lomnitz, and Lobo, also present data that indicate clearly that the individual's life in his place of destination is intimately tied to his life in his place of origin, and that neither, much less the act of migration itself, can be properly understood unless both are taken into consideration simultaneously. Lomnitz develops this idea most straightforwardly by proposing that places of origin and destination be combined analytically into a single ecological system with mutually interactive elements.

Until better definitions and measures of *rural* and *urban* are available to us, their meaning will continue to be a subject of dispute, and our use of them in migration studies will continue to reflect their conceptual disarray. Precisely because we are concerned about learning the meanings of migration, most of us seem to oppose the proliferation of "types" of migration, such as permanent, temporary, seasonal, return, rural-rural, rural-urban, urban-urban, urban-rural, and their permutations. As Provencher says for the Malays, "migration is more a matter of not returning than it is a matter of leaving in the first place." It is clear that permanent migration can be permanent only in retrospect, and even the seasonal migrant may not see himself as such until he is well into the pattern. It is equally clear from data presented by M. Whiteford, S. Whiteford, Lomnitz, Schreiber, Tobias, and Uzzell that the process of migration may be gradual (not just in "steps"), accidental, and multi-directional for any given individual. It is only by counting noses at given places at given times that behavior can be artificially cut up to fit into the classificational boxes.

Linkages Between the Micro- and the Macro-Level of Analysis

All the authors in the present volume agreed that it was of utmost importance to find ways of connecting the micro-level—that with which the anthropologist has traditionally been concerned—and the macro-level—as epitomized by the migration models of geographers, demographers, and economists—in such a way as to make the two mutually informative. The difference is not merely one of scale. Macro-studies utilize aggregated

statistics, while micro-studies may deal with contextually situated decisions of individuals. As Stepick and Stepick make clear by their attempts (1975), formal models of decision making, at their present level of development, cannot be used with a great number of individuals, simply because the requirements for data are too great. Nor is the problem one of simply mapping each individual's utilities (perceptions of what is personally useful) onto a fixed set of opportunities present in an array of localities, even if the utilities could be elicited. Such a formulation would assume opportunities to be objective and constant for all individuals, while only the utilities (and probabilities of pay-offs) are subjective. As S. Whiteford suggests, perceived opportunities can be a component of a process of natural decision-making, and an individual's lexicon of possible actions is conditioned both by his access to information (being aware of the opportunities) and by factors which cause him to assign to certain "opportunities" probabilities that fall below a threshold beyond which the "opportunities" are no longer perceived as such. Thus, we are suggesting that instead of mapping a set of subjective elements onto a set of objective elements, we must find a way of mapping a subjective set onto another subjective set. This complicates the issue in two ways. If it is not feasible in the present context to put a utility theory into practice, it may be equally infeasible to operationalize the concept of perceived opportunities (or "plays," see Uzzell, 1974). And if data could be gathered for these two subjective sets, the analytical operations would become even more complex.

Various authors attempt to connect the micro- and macro-levels in a particular substantive problem. Provencher traces the implications of traditional Malay perceptions of migration for aggregated data. First, the widespread expectation that an individual will return to his native place results in his not being counted in censuses, and thus the amount of Malay migration is underrated. Second, shifts in the density of Malay communities result from individuals making decisions about where and when to migrate. Provencher follows this up with an explanation of fluctuations in the number of young men in the city and an increase of young unmarried women in the city. S. Whiteford begins with an analysis of the history of social and economic trends of Bolivian and Argentine society and then moves to a more immediate context. He finds that as a result of macro-level changes a large number of temporarily employed Bolivians currently reside in Argentina. Looking at the implications of the structural changes further, he describes a process called "breakdown before urbanization," stemming from the effects of proletarianization of rural laborers and prolonged temporary migration on the nuclear family.

The problems of connecting the two levels of analysis seem in retro-

spect to be twofold. First, there is the difficulty of collecting meaningful quantitative data necessary for the macro-models. The slowness and tedium of good ethnographic field work does not help matters any. Second is the problem of relating folk models of migration to higher order theoretical generalizations. We feel that it would be a mistake to sacrifice the richness of the qualitative data that ethnographers provide to meet demands for quantification. Nor is it reasonable to assume that economists, geographers, and demographers are likely to reduce the scope of their studies to match ours. We will both continue to do what we do best. One way out may be to shift our emphasis from why people move to how, in their cultural contexts, they reach the decision. Such principles, if discovered, could be built into the larger analytical systems as elements in the systems rather than as data.

Imbeddedness of Migration in Other Cultural Phenomena

Because of reasons associated with the evolution of their discipline, anthropologists are often wary of drawing boundaries around a particular subject of inquiry. In anthropological study of leadership, for example, the subject's position in a kinship system, the nature of the distributive mechanisms in an economy, the type and characteristics of the ecology, and the belief system of a people may all provide data that will be considered. Anthropologists usually distinguish between their own perspective and those of the other social sciences, which are felt to be too limited in scope and depth. In the anthropological perspective, cultural phenomena are related to other cultural phenomena.

This conviction has permeated our introduction and the papers presented in this volume. It is consistent with our preoccupation with meanings, our location of meaning in context, and our reluctance to render definitions based on externally derived traits. Several papers are quite explicit about the implications for their treatment of migration. Both S. Whiteford and Shoemaker argue that migration should be treated as a symptom or point of departure for the study of the dynamics of higher order systems; their explication of these factors challenges the "functional equilibrium" of the folk-urban continuum, which has informed most migration studies. Provencher sees migration as normative in Malay society and closely related to stages in the life cycle of Malays, or, historically, as occasioned by large-scale forces of the nature of those described by S. Whiteford and Shoemaker. At a lower analytical level, Uzzell sees migration as one of a set of strategies available to the household or individual; many of these strategies involve widespread social networks and activities in neighboring villages and one or more cities.

Many implications for future studies arise from the view that migration is

embedded in other cultural phenomena. Only some of these implications are worked out in the present volume.

Forman, for example, argues that because migration may be thought of as a symptom of cultural change, the change, rather than the migration itself, should be the subject of study. By pointing out that cultures change constantly, however, she deprives her suggestion of specificity. We feel, though, that by raising the question of meaning, which leads to the question of context, which leads to the notion of imbeddedness, the authors whose papers appear here are making theoretical statements that, if followed out, could lead to enormous improvements in the ways in which migration is thought about and studied. And we feel that the changes would be most beneficial. Working out the implications of their suggestions should be the next step in our continuing dialogue. By making the dialogue public, we invite the reader to join it.

DAVID GUILLET
DOUGLAS UZZELL
EDITORS

NOTES

1. Our thanks go to Robert Van Kemper, one of the conversationalists mentioned above, for suggesting that we include a set of propositions in our theoretical discussion.

2. In various parts of the world, anthropologists have addressed this question with varying degrees of operational sophistication (see duToit, 1973; Friedl, 1974; Salisbury and Salisbury, 1972; Taylor, 1969; Weppner, 1972). Of these, the studies by Taylor, Friedl, and the Salisburys stand out. In Mexico, Selby, Stepick, and Murphy have dealt with this subject as part of people's overall life strategies, but have slighted migration as a strategy.

3. See Friedmann and Wulff (1974:34-35) on this point.

4. In a recent paper reviewing the relationship between economists and economic anthropologists, T. Scarlett Epstein concludes that a marriage of convenience has yet to emerge and that "the wooing by anthropology of economics has thus continued, in spite of the fact that economics played hard to get" (1975:33). Why has it not taken place? "The major obstacles seem to be timing, quantifying, and planning. Macro-economists, and in particular, planners, usually turn to microstudies when encountering a problem which does not lend itself readily to analysis within the narrow boundaries of economics. They expect microresearch to have the answers not only readily available but also in quantifiable form. They do not seem to appreciate that good microstudies involve a lengthy spell of fieldwork. Serious microresearchers refuse to be bulldozed into producing quick results. This difficulty of timing and quantifying is responsible for much of the antagonism and mutual resentment existing between macroeconomists and social anthropologists" (Epstein, 1975:45).

REFERENCES CITED

- Banton, Michael
1973 *Urbanization and Role Analysis*. In *Urban Anthropology*. Aidan Southall, ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bateson, G.
1972 *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. San Francisco: Scranton.
- Browning, Harley L. and Waltraut Feindt
1969 Selectivity of Migrants to a Metropolis in a Developing Country: A Mexican Case Study. *Demography* 6(4):347-357.
1971 The Social and Economic Context of Migration to Monterrey, Mexico. In *Latin American Research*, Vol. I. Francine F. Rabinowitz and Felicity M. Trueblood, eds. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Butterworth, Douglas S.
1970 A Study of the Urbanization Process among Mixtec Migrants from Tlaltongo in Mexico City. In *Peasants in Cities: Readings in the Anthropology of Urbanization*. William Mangin, ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cone, Sylvia
1973 Report in *Urban Anthropology Newsletter* 2 (2):113.
- du Toit, B. M.
1973 Language and Ethnicity as Factors in African Urban Migration in Southern Africa. Paper presented to the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Chicago.
- Epstein, T. Scarlett
1975 The Ideal Marriage Between the Economist's Macroapproach and the Social Anthropologist's Microapproach to Development Studies. *Journal of Economic Development and Culture Change* 24 (1):29-45.
- Fallers, L. A.
1961 Are African Cultivators to be Called "Peasants"? *Current Anthropology* 2:108-110.
- Feindt, Waltraut and Harley L. Browning
1972 Return Migration: Its Significance in an Industrial Metropolis and in Agricultural Towns in Mexico. *International Migration Review* 6:158-165.
- Ferguson, D. Frances
1976 *Rural/Urban Relations and Peasant Radicalism: A Preliminary*

Statement. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 18(1):106-118.

Fischlowitz, Estanislao

1965 Driving Forces in Internal Migration in Brazil. *Migration News* 15:1.

Frankenberg, Ronald

1966 British Community Studies: Problems of Synthesis. *In* *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*. Michael Banton, ed. A.S.A. Monograph No. 4. London: Tavistock Publications.

Friedl, E.

1974 Kinship, Class, and Selective Migration. *In* *Family in the Mediterranean*. J. Peristany, ed. London: Cambridge University Press.

Friedman, J. and R. Wulff

1974 *The Urban Transition: Comparative Studies of Newly Industrializing Societies*. Los Angeles: School of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of California, Los Angeles.

Gans, Herbert J.

1974 Urbanism and Suburbanism as Ways of Life: A Re-evaluation of Definitions. *In* *City Ways: A Selective Reader in Urban Anthropology*. John Friedl and Noel J. Chrisman, eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

Graves, N. B. and T. D. Graves

1974 Adaptive Strategies in Urban Migration. *In* *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 3. B. J. Siegel, ed. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Grillo, R. D.

1973 African Railwaymen: Solidarity and Opposition in an East African Labour Force. London: Cambridge University Press.

Guillet, David

1976a Cash Cropping Among Andean Peasants: Some Implications for Labor Use. *In* *Anthropological View of Labor*. Ray Owens and Angel Palerm, eds. Mexico: Centro de Investigaciones Superiores. Instituto de Antropología y Historia.

1976b Migration, Agrarian Reform, and Structural Change in Rural Peru. *Human Organization* (in press).

- Heath, D. B. and R. N. Adams
1965 *Contemporary Cultures and Societies of Latin America*. New York: Random House.
- Kosinski, L. A. and R. M. Prothero
1975 *People on the Move: Studies on Internal Migration*. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd.
- Lee, Everett S.
1966 *A Theory of Migration*. *Demography* 3(1):47-59.
- Lewis, Oscar
1952 *Urbanization Without Breakdown: A Case Study*. *Scientific Monthly* 75:31-41.
- Lloyd, Peter C.
1973 *The Yoruba: An Urban People?* *In* *Urban Anthropology*. Aidan Southall, ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mangin, William
1960 *Mental Health and Migration to Cities*. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 84(17):911-917.
1967 *Latin American Squatter Settlements: A Problem and a Solution*. *Latin American Research Review* 2:65-98.
- Mayer, Philip
1961 *Townsmen or Tribesmen*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- McGee, T. G.
1973 *Peasants in the Cities: A Paradox, a Most Ingenious Paradox*. *Human Organization* 32(2):135-142.
- Mitchell, J. Clyde
1966 *Theoretical Orientations in African Studies*. *In* *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*. Michael Banton, ed. London: Tavistock.
- Philpott, Stuart
1974 *West Indian Migration: The Montserrat Case*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press.
- Rew, Alan
1974 *Social Images and Process in Urban New Guinea: A Study of Port Moresby*. *American Ethnological Society Monograph* 57. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.
- Roberts, Bryan R.
1974 *The Provincial Urban System and the Process of Dependency*.

Paper presented at the Seminar on New Directions of Urban Research, Institute of Latin American Studies, Austin, May 16-18.

Rollwagen, J. R.

1974 Mediation and Rural-Urban Migration in Mexico: A Proposal and a Case Study. *In* Latin American Urban Research, Vol. IV. W. Cornelius and F. M. Trueblood, eds. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Salisbury, R. E. and M. Salisbury

1972 The Rural-oriented Strategy of Urban Adaptation: Siane Migrants in Port Moresby. *In* The Anthropology of Urban Environments. R. Weaver and D. White, eds. Boulder: The Society for Applied Anthropology.

Simic, Andrei

1973 The Peasant Urbanites: A Study of Rural-Urban Mobility in Serbia. New York and London: Seminar Press.

Southall, Aidan

1973 The Density of Role-Relationships as a Universal Index of Urbanization. *In* Urban Anthropology. Aidan Southall, ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stepick, Alex and Carol Dutton Stepick

1975 Intrinsic Limitations of Migration Theories. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, December.

Taylor, R. C.

1969 Migration and Motivation: Study of Determinants and Types. *In* Migration. J. A. Jackson, ed. London: Cambridge University Press.

Uzzell, J. Douglas

1974 From Play Lexicons to Disengagement Spheres in Peruvian Society. Paper presented to the XLI Congreso Internacional de Americanistas. Mexico, D.F., September. Printed as Paper No. 72, Program of Development Studies, Rice University, Houston, Spring, 1976.

Watson, James L.

1975 Emigration and the Chinese Lineage: The Mans in Hong Kong and London. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Weppner, R. S.

1972 Socioeconomic Barriers to Assimilation of Navajo Migrant Workers. *Human Organization* 31:303-314.

Whiteford, S. and R. N. Adams

1974 Migration, Ethnicity and Adaptation: Bolivian Migrant Workers in Northwest Argentina. *In Migration and Ethnicity: Implications for Urban Policy and Development*. H. Safa and B. M. du Toit, eds. The Hague; Mouton Publishers.

Yusuf, Ahmed Beitallah

1974 A Reconsideration of Urban Conceptions: Hausa Urbanization and the Hausa Rural-Urban Continuum. *Urban Anthropology* 3(2):200-221.