

**Papers of the
East-West Population Institute, no. 53**

**Circulation in the context
of total mobility
in Southeast Asia**

Sidney Goldstein



**EAST-WEST CENTER
HONOLULU HAWAII**

Circulation in the context of total mobility in Southeast Asia

Sidney Goldstein

Number 53 • August 1978

PAPERS OF THE EAST-WEST POPULATION INSTITUTE

SIDNEY GOLDSTEIN is Professor of Sociology and Director of the Population Studies and Training Center at Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Goldstein, Sidney, 1927-

Circulation in the context of total mobility in Southeast Asia.

(Papers of the East-West Population Institute ; no. 53)

Bibliography: p. 62-69.

I. Migration, Internal—Asia, Southeastern. I. Title.

II. Series: East-West Population Institute. Papers of the East-West Population Institute ; no. 53.

HB2101.G64 301.32'6'0959 78-10218

CONTENTS

Preface	v
Abstract	1
Urbanization in Southeast Asia	3
Sources and limitations of data	7
Studies of population movement	16
Thailand	20
The Philippines	30
Malaysia	33
Indonesia	39
Some comparisons with South Asia	52
Overview	54
Research priorities	57
Policy concerns	59
Bibliography	62

PREFACE

This paper was prepared for the International Seminar on the Cross-Cultural Study of Circulation, sponsored by the East-West Population Institute and the Institute of Applied Social and Economic Research, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea. The seminar was held in Honolulu, Hawaii, April 1978. Comments by Murray Chapman, Judith Strauch, and the participants of the seminar proved most helpful. The research was facilitated by a Ford Foundation grant to the Population Studies and Research Center at Brown University.

ABSTRACT *There is general consensus that return migration and cyclical migration have been largely ignored by analysts of Asia. Stability of rural population has often been cited as a characteristic of many countries, but whether it reflects the actual behavior of the population or is largely an artifact of the data available for analysis has justifiably begun to be questioned. A considerable part of the total movement seems to be hidden by the failure to establish the correct research designs, to ask the right questions, and to use the correct political or geographic units of measurement.*

Where relevant data have been obtained, the evidence seems strong for Asia generally and for Southeast Asia in particular that the general patterns of movement on the part of the rural population closely follow those in Africa and Melanesia. Quite consistently, measured levels of mobility rise as the size of the spatial units under analysis are reduced. The extent of movement identified also increases as the opportunity to record or to observe short-term movements is enhanced. The extent of circulation or return migration is far greater than censuses reveal. Recent studies, using residential histories or research designs that allow prospective observation, which permit better assessment of the temporary or permanent character of a move, lend strong support to the conclusion that population movement in Southeast Asia covers a spectrum from the seasonal or sporadic short-term moves by people seeking to supplement a meager rural income to permanent migration by those attempting to substitute one set of lifetime prospects for another. What evidently varies from country to country is not the variety of forms of movement relied upon, but rather the particular mix of alternatives and the exact conditions under which one or another is relied upon more heavily. These conditions suggest that research attention should be focused on the factors explaining both the variation in patterns that seem to exist and the differences in characteristics of people who undertake different forms of population movement.

A pressing need also exists for more attention to the theoretical concerns related to the conditions under which given populations resort to commuting, circulation, circular migration, and permanent migration. The evidence available to date for Southeast Asia suggests that traditional patterns are persistent and interdependent with modern ones. But research is needed to test the extent to which and the conditions under which circular migration between rural and urban areas paves the way for the urbanization transition by developing an individual's

familiarity with different residential and work environments, contributes to the modernization of values, and provides the opportunity for chain migration and permanent migration to ensue. Highest priority needs to be given to the ways in which circular migration, commuting, and permanent migration differ in the social and economic impact they have on places of origin and destination and on the migrants themselves. The resulting insights could prove most valuable in policy formation designed to control migration and urban and rural development.

Although still one of the least urbanized regions in the world, Southeast Asia has begun to experience rapid urban growth. At the same time, the rural population of Southeast Asia also continues to grow at a high rate. Leaders in many of the Southeast Asian countries have recognized that unchecked population increase poses a major threat to the achievement of their economic goals; and as a result, a number of nations have initiated vigorous efforts to limit population growth (Stamper, 1973; Keeny, 1973; Whitney, 1976). Much less attention has been given, however, to the differential pace of population growth in urban and rural places, to the volume and character of movement between rural and urban places or between rural locations themselves, and to the implications for development of the changing patterns of population distribution.

In part, the lack of policy concern with these issues reflects the data deficiencies in many of the countries of the region and the consequent absence of adequate research on the levels, patterns, and determinants and consequences of population movement. The problems stemming from the general absence of definitive studies of the role of population movement in population change and development are undoubtedly compounded by serious deficiencies in the appropriateness of the concepts employed in measuring population movement. All too often, when data are collected and analyzed, concepts developed for research on the western world have been employed uncritically in the Southeast Asian countries. As a result, the value of whatever data are collected is seriously limited by the definitions used, by the political or geographical units in terms of which movement is measured, and by the scope of movement encompassed in the analysis. Restricting the definition of migration to permanent moves involving the crossing of boundaries, which generally encompass large areas such as provinces,

insures the exclusion of most short-distance moves and those more temporary in character. Yet such omitted mobility may constitute a very high percentage of all moves and may have significant implications for the mover and for the places of origin and destination.

Given the evidence, even though limited, of the growing importance of movement in population dynamics in Southeast Asian countries and the pressing need to incorporate attention to such movement into general development plans, it becomes particularly crucial that a critical examination be undertaken of existing data sources on population movement in the region and the way in which they are used. Innovative attempts are also needed to overcome the limitations inherent in existing data sets through the collection of new types of information on population movement or the fuller exploitation of older data sets. With these goals in mind, this paper (1) presents an overview of the population situation in Southeast Asia, with special reference to changing patterns of rural-urban distribution; (2) assesses the strengths and limitations of illustrative data sets on movement available in some of the countries of the region; (3) reviews a series of recent studies in the region that were designed to provide more comprehensive evaluations of the full range of population movement, including migration, temporary movement or circulation, and commuting; and (4) assesses these studies for the insights they provide on movement patterns in relation to the development process, for the implications the findings have for policy concerns, and for the needs they identify with respect to future research designs and data generation.

URBANIZATION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

At mid-century, only 13 percent of Southeast Asia's total population of 173 million persons were living in urban places.¹ By 1975 the level had risen to 22 percent (United Nations Population Division, 1975b). Because Southeast Asia is expected to have a faster pace of urbanization in the last two decades of the century, its level of urbanization is projected to rise to 35 percent by the year 2000. If these projections prove correct, Southeast Asia will still be heavily rural as it moves into the twenty-first century. Such a situation must be anticipated in any concern for development and planning in the last quarter of this cen-

1 The United Nations statistics on urban and rural population cited in this section rely upon each individual country's definition of urban; thus no single definition applies to the entire set of data. For a fuller discussion of the range of definitions and the problems of defining urban populations, see Goldstein and Sly, 1975.

tury. It also has special relevance for any assessment of the role of population movement in the development process.

As significant as the changing levels of urbanization, and perhaps even more so, is the very marked increase in the absolute size of both the urban and the rural populations of the region. In the 25 years between 1950 and 1975, Southeast Asia's urban population has almost tripled, from 23 to 72 million persons; in the next 25 years it is projected virtually to triple again, reaching 207 million by the year 2000, a number equal to the total population of Southeast Asia in about 1957. While increasing at a slower rate, the rural population is undergoing an even greater absolute increase, rising from 150 million in 1950, to 252 million in 1975, to a projected 385 million by the year 2000. According to these projections, the rural population at the turn of the century will exceed by about 20 percent what the total population of Southeast Asia was in 1975.

In contrast to the more developed countries, where the rate of urbanization has been a function of high rates of urban growth coupled with rural decline, in Southeast Asia, as in less developed countries (LDCs) generally, the high levels of urban growth are accompanied by continuing growth in rural areas as well. It is only because the urban rates so far exceed the rural rates that increasing urbanization occurs at all. This pattern strongly emphasizes the need for concern both with rural population growth and the ways in which the rural population responds to the conditions resulting from such rapid growth and with the rising level of urbanization, the significant absolute growth of urban places, and the comparative impact of migration on urban and rural growth rates.

Of particular importance in the analysis of urbanization in Southeast Asia, especially given the focus of this paper on the various types of population movement in the region, is the comparative contribution of migration and natural increase to urban growth. To assess the impact of migration on urban growth in Southeast Asia and to evaluate whether its contribution has changed over time, a set of estimates has been prepared for this analysis for the periods 1950-60 and 1970-75, relying on the national growth rate method (Shryock and Siegel, 1971: 65). These estimates indicate that during 1950-60, migration resulted, on the average, in an annual movement of 33.5 persons per thousand to urban places in Southeast Asia (Goldstein, 1975). In 1970-75, the rate of net urban population transfer for the region as a whole had declined by 30 percent to 22.4 per thousand. It must be stressed, however, that this does not reflect a decline in the actual number of rural-

to-urban migrants. In the 1950–60 decade, the average annual number of net urban migrants was 778,000, whereas in the 1970–75 period the annual average was 1.3 million. The reduction in rate reflects the tremendous growth of the urban population in the intervening period; as a result, the base on which the rates were computed was so much larger in the second period than the first that the rates of *in-migration* were lower despite the larger absolute number of migrants.

The percentage of total urban growth attributable to migration was also lower in 1970–75 than in 1950–60, having declined from 57 to 47 percent of total growth. The population growth of urban places during 1950–70 included the addition of a large number of persons in the reproductive ages who subsequently contributed to further growth through their own fertility. As a result, migration became less important in accounting for total urban growth. At the same time, although migration has played and continues to play an important role in urban growth, the exodus from rural areas has been comparatively small, relative to the total rural population. During the 1950–60 period, the average annual net out-migration rate for rural areas of the region was only 5.2 per thousand population; and in 1970–75, it had risen only slightly to 5.9 per thousand population. In all, therefore, net out-migration accounted for a reduction of only 20 percent of the rural increase during both 1950–60 and 1970–75. The substantial portion of the natural increase retained by rural areas accounts for the continuing high rates of rural population growth in the region and, in turn, for the earlier noted relatively low overall level of urbanization. It also stresses the burdens imposed on rural areas by the need to absorb this surplus population and the attendant implications for population movement within the rural areas themselves; higher rates of rural-to-urban migration or the substitution of types of movement other than permanent migration, or both, may result from efforts to adjust to the increasing demand placed on rural resources.

The marked shift in rural-urban population distribution takes on added significance because so much of the urban growth is concentrated in big cities of one million or more residents. Many of these big cities dominate both the urban structure and the economic, social, and political life in their respective countries. Moreover, most are characterized by wide disparities in level of living; most have inadequate housing, public utilities, job opportunities, educational facilities, and transport systems, reflecting the considerable part of their growth that is due to population increase rather than industrialization and modernization in the cities themselves.

As a reflection of its overall low level of urbanization, Southeast Asia at mid-twentieth century had only two million-plus cities (United Nations Population Division, 1975a); but by 1975 this number had increased to nine. The trend toward an increasing concentration of population in large cities is expected to continue, as evidenced by the United Nations estimate that by the year 2000 Southeast Asia will have 23 such cities. Moreover, many of the cities that had attained million-plus status earlier will have grown to 5 or more million persons.

The increasing importance of big cities in the urban hierarchy of Southeast Asia is clearly evident in the statistics showing the percentage of the total urban population living in million-plus cities. In 1950, it amounted to only 13 percent. By 1975, just over one-third of Southeast Asia's urban population lived in million-plus cities, and United Nations estimates indicate that by 2000 almost half of all the region's urban dwellers will be in big cities. Clearly, then, in any planning for future urban and economic development in Southeast Asia, special attention must be given to the sharp rise in the number of big cities; to the increase in the proportion of population contained within them; to the links they have to rural areas, both through the rural population moving permanently to these cities and through the exchanges resulting from temporary movements of various kinds and from other forms of communication; and to the role that migrants play in the urbanization and development processes.

The foregoing review of urban-rural population distribution in Southeast Asia and of the role of migration in this redistribution should not be interpreted to imply that all of the countries within the region are experiencing identical patterns. In fact, countries vary considerably in geographic size and features, total population and rate of growth, level of development, natural resources, and political, social, religious, and economic history. That variations in level and tempo of urbanization exist and that they are likely to continue to do so is clearly documented by all available data showing past and projected levels and rates of urbanization for each of the countries of the region between 1950 and 2000 (Goldstein, 1976). Except for the city-state of Singapore and the sultanate of Brunei, levels of urbanization in Southeast Asia varied from a low of 11 percent in Laos to a high of only 36 percent in the Philippines. During 1970-75, the average rate of urbanization ranged between 2.2 for the Philippines and 4.5 for the Khmer Republic. If United Nations projections prove correct, the levels of urbanization in the year 2000 will vary between 20 percent for Laos and 51 percent for the Philippines. Despite individual varia-

tions, during the second half of the twentieth century, in virtually all countries in the region, although at a varying pace, urbanization will have moved ahead with almost uninterrupted momentum.

The role of migration² in urban growth and in the pace of rural growth also displays considerable variation among the countries of the region. During 1950–60 the rate of net migration to urban places varied from a high of 53 per thousand in Burma to a low of only 19 per thousand in the Philippines. By 1970–75, the rate of net migration declined for all but the Khmer Republic, although the rate of decline varied considerably. In 1970–75, the rates varied from a high of 39 per thousand in the Khmer Republic to only 16 per thousand in the Philippines. The percentage of total urban growth attributable to migration was also lower in 1970–75 than in 1950–60 in every country of Southeast Asia, except the Khmer Republic. In 1950–60, the contribution of migration to urban growth ranged between 38 percent in the Philippines and 71 percent in Burma; by 1970–75, the range was from a low of 31 percent in the Philippines to 57 percent in Laos. These declines do not reflect an absolute decline in migration, for the numbers of migrants actually increased. Rather, the lesser role of migration in urban growth reflects the larger contributions to natural increase that resulted from the increasing numbers of persons resident in urban places. This suggests that efforts to control urban growth must give due weight to the role of natural increase and not focus exclusively on migration. At the same time, since net out-migration cancels out only a comparatively small part of the total rural natural increase, permanent migration cannot be looked to as the major mechanism with which to solve the problems of rapid population growth in rural areas. It gives added importance to the need for attention to other forms of population movement.

SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS OF DATA

One of the major challenges in undertaking research on migration and other forms of population movement in Southeast Asia, as elsewhere, is the significant lack of information of any kind for a number of countries, and the considerable variation in the type of data available and their quality for those countries that have collected some information on population movement through censuses, registration systems, or

2 Reflecting the absence of direct data on migration for many countries of the region, the migration estimates used here represent the combined effects of population gains or losses from rural-to-urban migration and rural-to-urban reclassification.

special surveys. No detailed assessment will be undertaken here of the strengths and limitations of censuses, registers, and surveys as sources of data on population movement, except as they relate to the specific concerns of this paper—namely, the prevalence of various forms of population movement, how they serve as alternatives for each other, and what significance differential reliance upon the varied forms of movement has for the places of destination and origin as well as for the movers.

Reflecting the growing recognition that information on population distribution and on migration is increasingly relevant to demographic analysis and policy formation, the United Nations (1967) Principles and Recommendations for the Population Censuses included (1) place where found at the time of the census, place of usual residence, or both; (2) place of birth; (3) duration of residence; (4) place of previous residence; and (5) place of work. Only the first two items are starred by the United Nations as highly recommended. The others are regarded as useful but not warranting the highest priority. For measuring internal migration, the United Nations suggests that data on place of birth be supplemented by information on duration of residence or place of previous residence (or both). The United Nations also indicates that information on place of previous residence is irrelevant for persons who were only visiting at the time of the census or transient in the civil division at which they were enumerated. Such persons must, according to the United Nations (1967:55), be identified on the questionnaire as visitors or transients so that they will not erroneously be noted as migrants.

The recognition given by the United Nations to this problem points to the basic conceptual dilemmas faced by both data collectors and analysts about who is to be considered a mover. The dilemma is underscored further by the question of what constitutes "place of usual residence." The United Nations (1967:55–56) points out,

Although most persons will have no difficulty in stating their place of usual residence, some confusion is bound to arise in a number of special cases, where persons may appear to have more than one usual residence. These cases might include persons who maintained two or more residences, students living at a school away from their parental home, members of the armed forces living at a military installation but still maintaining private living quarters away from their installation, and persons who sleep away from their homes during the working week but return home for several days at the end of each week. . . . Problems may also arise with persons who have been at the place where they are enumerated for some time but do not consider themselves to be residents of this place because they intend to return to their previous residence at some future time, and also with

persons who have left the country temporarily but are expected to return after some time. In such instances, clearly stated time limits of presence in, or absence from, a particular place must be set, in accordance with the prevailing circumstances in the country, to determine whether or not the person is usually resident at that place.

Clearly, these concerns have relevance not only for the number of persons enumerated at given locations but for whether individuals regard themselves as migrants. Inconsistencies may well arise between classifications based on place of residence and those based on more direct questions related to migration.

Place of work is not regarded by the United Nations as having international significance. For this reason, emphasis is placed on reliance on national needs as the basis for determining the specific kinds of information to be collected and the types of tabulations to be made for place of work information.

As the United Nations (1971) manual *Methods of Measuring Internal Migration* points out, census data have been and still are a major source of information on internal migration in most countries of the world. Until the time when more countries are able to set up efficient systems of population registration, it is likely that censuses will remain the best source of such information. The census data on internal migration are obtained directly by including a question on migration, and indirectly through estimation procedures that use data obtained for other purposes. Usual direct questions on internal migration have to do with: place of birth, place of last residence, duration of residence in the place of enumeration, and place of residence on a specific date before the census.

The volume of migration observed in any given country is greatly affected by the nature of the census or survey questions asked. It is obviously colored by what the respondent considers to be his or her usual place of residence. Beyond this, if population movement is measured on the basis of the question "Where were you born?" the amount of movement recorded will generally be considerably greater than that recorded on the basis of the question "Where were you living five years ago?" The older a person is, the more opportunity there has been to move in the interval between birth and time of the last census. Place of birth tabulations will therefore generally identify more persons as migrants, in the absence of a significant return movement to the place of origin, than will a question referring to a place of residence at a fixed prior date.

Another basic consideration relates to the areal unit used in the mi-

gration data. Place of birth or origin of the move at a fixed date may be recorded as village, town, district, or province. Other things being equal, the smaller the areal units used, the larger will be the volume of migration recorded since the opportunity to cross a boundary generally increases as the size of the areal unit decreases. If movement from a village of residence is measured, for example, there will generally be more movement recorded than if the question concerns movement from a province. Many individuals might have moved from village to village within a province, and yet, in response to the census question, correctly report that they were living in the same province as before and, as a result, be classified as nonmigrants. In India, for example, in the 1961 census, when the state of birth was used as the unit, only 3.3 percent of all persons were counted as migrants; when place of enumeration was used instead, the level of migration was increased almost tenfold, to 30.7 percent (Bose, 1975:78–79). Clearly, then, both time and space are crucial considerations affecting the volume of migration.

Regardless of the time interval or the spatial units that are used in determining whether migration has in fact occurred, a key concern is the intended permanence of the move. Many persons may have moved over very short distances but have intended the move to be “permanent,” whereas others may have traveled much greater distances, but considered the change in residence as only temporary and intended either to return to their place of origin or to move on to some other destination. Permanence therefore often constitutes a major criterion in determining whether or not migration has occurred; for this aspect, perhaps more than for any other, considerable variation exists among different data sets and studies. Because the question of permanency takes on special importance in considering the distinction between migration and other forms of movement, including commuting, it is a key point to which repeated attention will be given in the succeeding sections of this paper.

With the possible exception of the population register and, to a lesser extent, the duration of residence question “How long have you been living in this place?”, most sources of data on migration are likely to underenumerate the total volume of migration during any given period because the nature of the question does not provide information on moves made in the interval between the time references used. This is a shortcoming that particularly affects the place of birth question, since the interval is long for all but the youngest persons. Among the moves that may be missed are return migrations to the place of residence at the reference point in the question.

Because migration is associated with a wide range of social and economic conditions and itself can be a stimulus for further change in the individual migrants and in their places of final settlement, the intervening moves and especially return moves may be important for the insights they provide both on the effect of environmental conditions on migration and the effect of the migrant on his place of origin. To assume that a person who has returned to his place of origin is like those who never left and that the move had no effect either on him or on the place seems an oversimplification. To the extent that all measures of net migration and many census-type questions fail to identify this segment of the migrant population, the overall assessment of the significance of migration for population redistribution and especially of its potential as an agent of social change is hampered. The problems confronted by migration analysts are even more severe than those implied by this very brief review of the nature of data sources. Too often the direct sources do not exist, and the only insights to be gained on migration are through reliance upon indirect procedures. The resulting estimates are limited by their restriction to net migration, and by their inability to identify streams of migration or to yield information on many key characteristics of the migrant and nonmigrant population.

These data deficiencies on population movement are compounded when interest focuses on movement specific to rural or urban places of origin and destination. A number of countries fail to tabulate migration data by rural and urban places of residence. In some instances, this situation has reflected a lack of interest in rural-urban differentials; in others it stems from the absence of a clear-cut rural-urban delineation of the population in the official statistics. Generally, however, there is no problem in identifying the urban-rural residence of the migrant population at the time of the census if the census employs a rural-urban classification system. More difficult is classification of the rural-urban place of origin of the migrants and measurement of the various streams of movement between rural and urban places—rural-to-rural, rural-to-urban, urban-to-rural, and urban-to-urban.

Obtaining information on the rural-urban character of the place of origin presents particular difficulties. Respondents are often unable to provide exact information on whether their place of origin was rural or urban, especially since the character of many places has changed over time, and what may have been rural at the time of out-migration may be urban at the time of the latest census. Use of current status therefore does not serve the purpose of an assessment of rural-to-urban migration; and reliance on the respondents may lead to considerable

response error, particularly where urban boundary changes have been frequent and in those many situations where a respondent may not know whether his or her previous residence was inside or outside a given urban place.

Given the several problems of measuring population movement generally and rural-urban movement in particular, it is understandable that researchers in Southeast Asia and other regions have had comparatively poor data, especially on movement between rural and urban places. It explains why so much of our knowledge of the role of population redistribution and urban and rural growth relies heavily on very indirect information—either estimates of net migration or comparative growth rates of urban and rural places. In attempts to rectify this situation, growing attention has been given to the incorporation in censuses of migration questions and to their appropriate wording. In several countries of the region, including the Philippines, Thailand, and Indonesia, national surveys have been undertaken in which even greater attention has been given to migration. Yet to date, we must continue to rely heavily on the much more limited information available from official censuses to gain insights into the overall patterns of rural-urban migration and urbanization. Overall, however, these have not permitted in-depth evaluation of the character of the movement, of the causes and consequences either for the migrants themselves or for the places of origin and destination, or of the relation between migration and economic and social development.

The limitations of these data, even when they are available, thus remain serious. As Zelinsky (1971) has argued, reliance upon official practice and statistics for our definitions of migration very much restricts the volume and the kinds of population movement that can be identified. To the extent that migration is defined in terms of permanency of move, the coverage omits "a great variety of movements, usually short term, repetitive or cyclical in character, but all having in common the lack of any declared intention of a permanent or long-standing change of residence" (Zelinsky, 1971:225–26). Moreover, the definition of what constitutes a permanent move has not been standardized either within or between countries. As a result, a number of persons are not identified as migrants because the type of move that they make is too short in duration and also often in distance to qualify as migration, being considered too impermanent to have an impact on either the individual or the places of origin and destination.

To overcome the difficulties inherent in the absence of a universally accepted definition of permanence, Gould and Prothero (1975:42)

suggest that "If there is a specific desire on the part of the individual or group of individuals who are moving to return to their place of origin, and when before leaving in the first place this intention is clear, then the movement may be considered as circulation rather than migration." Their suggestion that permanence be defined by desires or intentions to return to place of origin as expressed before the initial move is made requires information that is rarely available in censuses or surveys, except on a retrospective and therefore distorted basis. More seriously, there can be no assurance that moves intended to be temporary do not in fact become permanent, and that many of those initially planned to be permanent do not become temporary when disillusionment sets in because of unachieved goals. The use of desire or intention would, in my opinion, be a very dangerous basis on which to distinguish between migration and other forms of population movement, at least in the Asian setting.

Since we still know so little about forms of movement in Asia other than those identified as migration by censuses or surveys, much more exploratory research and evaluation is essential before firm criteria for distinguishing migration from circulation can be determined. The absence of standardized criteria does not negate the importance of giving attention to all those forms of movement not encompassed by the traditional kinds of census questions or by registration statistics. We need to know much more about the extent and character of circulation, including that particular category of circulation categorized as commuting. All too often commuting has been regarded as a phenomenon common only in more developed countries; yet there is growing evidence to suggest that it is becoming increasingly prevalent in less developed countries (Liu and Speare, 1973). In fact, the slowdown in the growth of some big cities in less developed nations has been partly explained by greater reliance on commuting; Bombay is a case in point (Zachariah, 1966). As the problems associated with urban residence worsen and as the opportunities for employment in the nonagricultural activities expand, commuting may well increase rapidly in less developed countries.

Yet even the most comprehensive data will yield only limited results without extensive rethinking of our basic concepts of migration and population movement. Although it is tempting to do so, we must be particularly careful not to generalize too freely to the less developed countries the migration and urbanization experience of the more developed regions. As in other areas of demographic concern, there seems little firm basis for believing that migration patterns in the less devel-

oped countries will follow the same path as those experienced by the more developed. Indeed, the limited evidence emanating from the less developed countries generally, and Southeast Asia in particular, indicates that both for historical reasons and because sociocultural factors overlie economic pressures, the patterns of movement may be very different from what might be expected given the level of modernization and development. Such countries may experience much more circulatory movement, may witness the operation of considerable urban as well as rural "push" factors, and may resort to a heavier reliance on commuting at a much earlier stage of development. The norms influencing the form and volume of movement in Southeast Asia undoubtedly vary considerably from those in other regions of the world and within the region itself, depending on the social, economic, technical, and political circumstances of particular communities over time and space (Pryor, 1975).

Among the greatest faults of which we are guilty in migration research is being locked into the same kinds of questions related to the same concepts of migration that were developed years ago for a particular setting at a particular time (Goldstein, 1976: 18). This may go far in explaining why we know so little about population movement in less developed countries. The growing recognition of this tendency and the efforts initiated in recent years in Southeast Asia and elsewhere to correct it by rethinking our concepts and by collecting new kinds of data on population movement give reason for hope that we will better understand the processes of population redistribution and their role in the development of both rural and urban locations as well as their implications for future policy formulation.

Although considerable progress has been made in the last few decades (Goldstein, 1976), the improvement in the quantity and quality of our information on population movement has not kept pace with the increasing significance of movement itself as a component of demographic change. We urgently need a wide range of data that will permit us to relate our basic research on the volume, form, characteristics, and motivation for movement to the problems of urban and rural development. Only then will we be better able to understand population movement as a part of the larger process of development and modernization. Only then, too, can we begin to understand how the various forms of movement relate to each other; how they relate to changing levels of fertility and mortality and to population composition; and how they are affected by changes in social, economic, technological, and political conditions. As Chapman (1977a:3) has said,

On both theoretical and practical grounds, the urgent need is for intensive studies of movement behavior, pursued inductively from the real world up, that produce both cross-sectional and longitudinal data, that encompass places of both origin and destination as well as the ongoing linkages between them, that capture the meaning of movement in both its linguistic expression and local conceptualization, and permit various levels of analysis along the continuum between the individual mover and the migration aggregate. Such studies could then test the transferability to Asia of the concept of circulation, which has been developed mainly on the basis of Black African and Island Pacific experience.

The notion can also be advanced that Third World societies may be increasingly characterized as bi-local populations, relatively stable in their demographic composition, but composed of individuals in constant motion between village and nonvillage places. In reviewing the work of the session of the Eighth Summer Seminar in Population that focused on circular mobility and policy, Chapman (East-West Population Institute, 1978:26) pointed out that "throughout Asia and the Pacific, . . . the full range of population movement remains largely unspecified, yet is hinted in the research literature through such terms as repeat migration, circular migration, wage-labor migration, seasonal mobility, sojourner movements, commuting, and transhumance." The insights gained at that workshop suggested that

macro- and meso-level research could rely heavily upon specialized censuses and movement registers but be complemented by local-level investigations that utilized such intensive approaches as life-history and household reconstruction, retrospective movement histories, key informants, and participant observation. Attempts to identify the functional meaning of recurring mobility might focus upon the level of commitment to places of both origin and destination (East-West Population Institute, 1978:27).

Given the high rates of urban growth noted earlier for Southeast Asia and the substantial contribution of migration to that urban growth, the extent to which "urbanizing villagers," as Lipton (1977) described them, have no intention of staying in the cities and the extent to which many of those who do intend to stay are, in fact, driven to return to the villages by the growing shortage of urban jobs takes on particular importance. For one thing, it means that the actual movement into and out of cities is substantially greater than the available data from censuses and surveys would indicate. Furthermore, such high turnover rates could also mean that a substantial self-correcting factor operates in the migration process so that the net results are not so injurious either to the cities as a whole or to the individual migrants who settle in them as might be expected. Population movement may

very well be much more of an adjustment factor in population dynamics than has been posited for it heretofore because it entails so many different forms of movement, ranging from a permanent migration at one extreme to daily commuting at the other. Such a range of movement would allow a maximum number of individuals to take advantage of the strengths of both the urban places of temporary destination and the rural places of more permanent residence. Moreover, upon returning to the village temporary migrants may be able to spread urban benefits, income, and knowledge, and in this way achieve far more than would result from the settlement in the cities of a smaller number of permanent migrants (Lipton, 1977:227). The problem is that many of those who return may be the less successful, and that many, because of the strong rural ties they have maintained and the isolated residential patterns adopted in the city, have in fact participated minimally in urban life. Much of this remains speculative and raises questions of how much is known and what needs still to be ascertained for Southeast Asia.

STUDIES OF POPULATION MOVEMENT

The idea of population movement as circulation was first conceptualized in the 1940s by Godfrey Wilson, and later amplified by J. Clyde Mitchell. Wilson's (1941, 1942) insightful work pointed to circulation as the keystone to the Northern Rhodesian economy. It served as a natural concomitant of the uneven investment of capital in the mining industry rather than in rural development. Mitchell (1961:259) in turn observed that approximately half of the able-bodied men in different parts of Africa were absent from their tribal homes at any given time and that virtually all of the male population had been away at one time or another. This interplay of centrifugal and centripetal influences reflected the desire of the movers to hold strongly to their tribal heritage while attempting to benefit from the money economy by engaging in temporary employment outside the village.

The concept of circulation was expanded when efforts were made to apply it to Melanesia and to embrace all movements that both began and terminated in the local community, on the grounds that tribesmen return to their homes no matter what the reasons for their departure nor for how long they have been absent. Here, as in Africa, the "constant mobility reflects the conflict between the centrifugal attraction of commercial, social, and administrative services and wage employment, and the centripetal power of village obligations, social relationships, and kinship ties" (Chapman and Prothero, 1977:3).

Coinciding with the work of Chapman (1974, 1976) and Bedford (1973a, 1973b) in Melanesia, Wilbur Zelinsky (1971) proposed his "hypothesis of the mobility transition," which argued that "there are definite patterned regularities in the growth of personal mobility through space-time during recent history, and these regularities comprise an essential component of the modernization process" (Zelinsky, 1971:221-22). Intended as a highly idealized, flexible scheme that affords a general overview of a variety of places and periods, Zelinsky's hypothesis posits, among other things, that for any specific community the course of the mobility transition closely parallels that of the demographic transition and that of other transitional sequences not yet adequately described.

Both Mitchell and Zelinsky assumed that circulation is a transitory form of population movement linked to particular processes and phases of socioeconomic change—notably urbanization, modernization, and industrialization. But as Chapman and Prothero (1977:5) have argued, circulation, rather than being transitional or ephemeral, seems to be a "time honored and enduring mode of behavior, deeply rooted in a great variety of cultures and found at all stages of socioeconomic change." Aside from the question of whether circulation is in fact a transitory or enduring form of population movement is the question of what constitutes circulation itself. The concept has been used to encompass a considerable variety of movements, usually characterized by being short-term, repetitive or cyclic, and lacking any declared intention of a permanent or long-lasting change in residence. Research conducted in Southeast Asia, as in other parts of the world, demonstrates that there is still no consistency in what is to be regarded as permanent or temporary nor, for that matter, is there consistency with respect to the exact kinds of moves that are to be encompassed by the label of circulation, even when their temporary character is quite clear. Research on Africa and Melanesia has given substantial attention to the extent and character of circulation; but despite clear evidence of the importance of recurrent forms of mobility, most demographers working on other areas of the world, including Southeast Asia, continue to devote little attention to movement other than permanent migration as defined by the census and other official data collection systems. Failure to do so must be seen within the context of the development of data collection systems in this region and the comparative recency with which any attention to migration itself has been incorporated in the census or registry systems. This is illustrated by the Indonesian and Thai situations.

Although Indonesia has had a question on place of birth in a number of its censuses, giving the basis for measuring lifetime migration, it was not until 1971 that a second question was included to determine whether respondents had ever lived in a province other than that of their present residence and/or birth, and if so the name of their last province of residence and the length of time they had lived in their present province. Thus, for the first time in a census, it became possible to identify individuals who had returned to their province of birth. Yet these data had all of the limitations inherent in the use of provinces as units of analysis and in the failure to take account of additional moves that could have been made in the interval between birth and the last previous move.

The situation in Thailand is similar. A place of birth question was asked for the first time in the 1947 census, but no tabulation of this information was made (Prachuabmoh and Tirasawat, 1973:19). Since 1910 Thailand has had a population registration system that records a wide range of information on migrants and their moves. However, the published registration data provide statistics only on the number and sex of in- and out-migrants for each district, and the official reports of the population registration provide the statistics at the provincial level. Moreover, the quality of these data is questionable, particularly if they are to be used as sources of information on temporary movement. As Prachuabmoh and Tirasawat (1973:15) point out, register data generally provide incomplete coverage of movement because of indecision on the part of migrants about whether the new residence will be permanent, the tendency of the rural-to-urban migrant to maintain registration in the home district in case of a return move, and the frequent delays by the migrant in registering a move until the full family has also moved.

Not until 1954, when the National Demographic and Economic Survey was undertaken, were questions on both place of birth and place of previous residence asked as part of any national population study in Thailand. But the first comprehensive set of data on migration did not become available until the 1960 census, which asked questions on both place of birth and place of residence five years prior to the census. Migration in both instances was defined as a change in residence between provinces.

The 1970 census retained the question in basically the same form, except that the five-year question was replaced by one asking length of residence in present village or municipal area. A major improvement in 1970 was the attempt to identify, for those who had moved within

the previous five years, whether the place of origin was urban or rural. Moreover, the wording of the question allowed determination of whether the move within the last five years was within or between provinces. Nonetheless, in the published data for both the 1960 and 1970 Thai censuses, no attempts were made to use either the place of birth or the place of residence question to ascertain the extent of repeat or return migration. The availability of the 1970 census data on tape did make such cross-tabulations possible and they have begun to be exploited for this purpose (e.g., Arnold and Boonpratuang, 1976; Goldstein, 1977).

Each country of Southeast Asia has its own history of census development and the extent to which attention to migration has been given in the census and other official statistics. A separate assessment of each cannot be undertaken here.³ The fact that the illustrative Indonesian and Thai situations discussed above are probably among the best in the region, together with the Philippines, gives some indication of the severe restrictions placed on researchers interested in assessing the volume, character, and impact of migration and other forms of movement on population redistribution.

This situation does not necessarily reflect a failure to recognize the complexity of migration and population movement. In part, it stems from the inability of a census system to give adequate attention within the confines of a few questions to a process as complex as migration; to do so would require fuller residential histories and the use of small geographical or political units as the basis for measuring migration. At best, one can hope for fuller exploitation of census materials for Southeast Asia on current place of residence in relation to place of birth, place of residence at a fixed time preceding the census, and duration of residence at current address. Through integrated use of such data where they exist, fuller insights can be gained into the extent of repeat and return migration and perhaps ultimately into the relation between migration and journey to work, if a question on the latter is incorporated into some of the censuses in the region.

As in Africa and in Melanesia, it will most likely be through much greater reliance on surveys, at both the community and national levels, that the full range of information needed to assess the extent of migration, circulation, commuting, and the interrelations among them will have to be pursued. To date, only a limited number of surveys collecting data relevant to these different forms of population movement

3 For a full review of the design and contents of Asian censuses conducted during 1970-74, see Cho (1976).

have been undertaken in Southeast Asia. As more are initiated and as more census data become available on tapes, one can look forward with greater optimism to achieving better identification of the various kinds of movement experienced by population and to testing the appropriateness of the conceptual distinction between circulation and migration through interlocking sets of complementary data derived from a variety of sources (Chapman, 1977a:2).

Given the limited data available for Southeast Asia, what do we presently know about the extent of circulation and commuting and how do these relate to migration? In attempting to answer these questions, the findings for each of several Southeast Asian countries will be reviewed to identify both the "general" patterns that emerge from the limited evidence, and the research problems that characterize these studies. In turn, the latter will serve to point to the research concerns that need to be taken into account as future studies focusing on circulation and commuting are initiated.

Thailand

In the 1950s concern arose in Thailand about the large number of migrants from the northeast who were moving into or passing through the capital city. Textor's (1956) study of some 12,000 pedicab drivers confirmed that a majority of all the pedicab drivers in the capital had moved from the northeast and that most of the other pedicab drivers were in-migrants from other parts of Thailand. Textor's study provided strong confirmation for Thailand that circulation was a common form of movement in that country; his evidence clearly showed that the movement of pedicab drivers from the northeast of Thailand to Bangkok was a back-and-forth migration rather than one involving permanent settlement in the capital. For example, of all the drivers who had first come to the capital before 1946, a large number had moved into and out of Bangkok between five and ten times, and the number of years actually lived in the capital averaged only four.

Motivated to move first by economic incentives associated with the depressed conditions in rural areas of the northeast and second by considerations of kinship ties, adventure, and the prestige achieved by moving to the capital, the migrants nevertheless had great difficulty adjusting to Bangkok. Because most considered their move as temporary, few brought their wives and children with them. Many traveled together to Bangkok and maintained friendship ties among themselves for social and psychological security and the sharing of dialect, food, housing, and the experiences stemming from a common occupation.

The incomes obtained in Bangkok, beyond those needed for basic needs, were used to buy goods for consumption back in the northeast. Often a migrant saved money either to build a new house there or to add to the existing structure. A number of drivers accumulated money to use as a bride price.

Although engaged as pedicab drivers, the migrants continued to consider themselves farmers and planned to return to that occupation. As a result, they learned few new trades or skills that could later be used in their village. When Textor interviewed returned migrants in the northeast, he found few who reported themselves to be unhappy. On the contrary, they indicated that they did not miss city life and were quite satisfied with the villages in which they were again living. In their villages, the returned drivers represented a potential asset for social change, bringing back with them new food tastes, clothing styles, items of technological efficiency, and more hygienic habits. Since Textor's conclusions are based on limited data, their major value lies in the insights provided on the extent to which the pedicab drivers in Bangkok were temporary residents and the possibility that similar forms of circular movement characterized many of the other migrants moving to the capital.

Soon after Textor completed his study, another was initiated by Marian Meinkoth (1962). Undertaken in July 1957, it focused on migrants from the northeast to Bangkok and the coastal provinces in the central region, but was not restricted to pedicab drivers. The crude study design tried to take advantage of the fact that almost all migrants from the northeast came to Bangkok by train. During the interview period teams of interviewers met incoming trains several times and interviewed as many as possible of the disembarking migrants. A team of interviewers was later also sent to conduct a survey in the migrants' provinces of origin in the northeast (Meinkoth, 1962:4-5).

Of 537 migrants interviewed, 62 percent planned to stay in Bangkok one week or more and another 22 percent intended to go on to other urban centers. Of those saying they planned to stay one week or more, only 2 percent indicated that they planned to become permanent residents of the capital. This finding is quite different from evidence available from the Central Bureau of Statistics, which indicates a substantial number of northeastern migrants to Bangkok qualified as "permanent" residents of the capital. Does this mean that many of the "temporary" migrants do in fact change their plans? More likely, the difference lies in study designs and in problems of conceptualization.

Other results of Meinkoth's study also stress the temporary charac-

ter of many of the moves to Bangkok. Thirty percent of the interviewees reported previous migrations to the capital, a pattern quite similar to that found by Textor. The insights gained through interviews conducted at place of origin support those of Textor. Limited opportunities for economic expansion and the generally low standard of living characterizing the northeast stimulated a number of individuals to migrate temporarily to the capital in search of additional income for their families, especially during periods of slack agricultural activity. Most important for most of the migrants, the move was seen as temporary and the preference was clearly for continued permanent residence in villages in the northeast.

As noted earlier, the first comprehensive opportunity to assess migration in Thailand resulted from the availability from the 1960 census of data on migration based on questions of province of birth and province of residence five years earlier. (The following discussion of data from the Thai censuses and the Longitudinal Study are based on material in Goldstein, 1977.) Analysis of both questions documented high levels of migration for metropolitan Bangkok. As many as one-third of all persons living in the capital had been born in a different province, and about 8 percent of Bangkok's 1960 population reported themselves as having moved in within the previous five years. By contrast, only 7 percent of those living in rural, agricultural households indicated that they had been born in a different province, and less than 2 percent reported that they had moved to their present province of residence within the last five years.

These findings led to the conclusion that rural Thailand was characterized by a high degree of stability. Yet the results are clearly influenced by the emphasis of the census on "permanent" migration, as well as by the use of province as the unit for measuring movement. The first factor may also have accounted for what was regarded as a comparatively low level of recent migration into the capital city, especially in the light of its very high rate of population growth. Most likely many of the respondents of the 1960 census were either not enumerated because of the temporary character of their residence in the capital or, if enumerated, were treated as usual residents at their place of origin.

The 1970 Thai census, which used not only the province but also the village or municipal area as the unit of analysis for determining migration, found that of the population five years of age and over, 19.2 percent of those living in all municipal areas had changed residence within the five years preceding the census as did 10.4 percent of

those living in rural locations. The much higher levels of migration in 1970 than in 1960 for the five-year question both reflect the change in units for which migration was measured and also seem to reflect some increase in the levels of migration between the two census periods. These data still preclude adequate attention to temporary moves. Some insights can be gained by joint use of the place of birth and five-year migration data to identify return migration.

Special, still unpublished, tabulations made for such purposes that use provinces as units of analysis show that 86 percent of all persons five years of age and over had not moved at all; 4 percent qualified as primary movers, that is, living in their province of birth in 1965 but in a different province in 1970; and 9 percent were classified as settled migrants, living in the same province in 1970 and 1965 but not in their province of birth. In all, less than 1 percent qualified as return migrants, that is, living in 1970 in the province in which they had been born, after reporting they had lived in a different province in 1965. A similarly small percentage, about 1 percent, was classified as repeat migrants, being reported in three different provinces at the three reference points. If the comparisons are restricted to adults, the only noteworthy changes are a slight decline in the percentage of nonmigrants, and a more substantial decline in the percentage of primary migrants, complemented by a rise in the percentage of settled migrants. The percentages of return and repeat migrants remain very low. These data suggest that in Thailand return migration is not a particularly common phenomenon, but the fact that return migration was measured by means of a comparison between province of birth and province of residence five years before the census restricts their value.

In 1968, the Institute of Population Studies at Chulalongkorn University initiated its Longitudinal Study of Social, Economic, and Demographic Change in Thailand. As part of that study, detailed residential histories were collected, especially of household heads. Classifying anyone who had been away from home for longer than one month as a permanent migrant, the survey enumerated only 2.9 percent of the rural population and 1.7 percent of the urban population as temporarily absent from home. Conversely, only 1 percent of the individuals counted in rural households and 2.9 percent of those in urban households were identified as temporary residents of those units. Overall, these data suggest only a limited amount of temporary movement, although obviously the percentages are affected by the minimum time period used for defining permanent migration and also by the way in which the question itself was worded.

The data on population movement in the Longitudinal Study, rich as they were, were not collected with a view toward assessing the extent and character of circulation and therefore, in the absence of recoding, can be used only to gain some superficial insights into the extent of temporary movement. Moreover, the study placed heavy emphasis on urbanization, so that the insights gained are very largely restricted to migrants who were still living in urban locations at the time of the survey.

Perhaps the best indication of the temporary character of many moves is the finding that as many as 49 percent of the migrants resident in Bangkok and 46 percent of those in smaller urban places had, during the course of their lives, lived in three or more provinces. Moreover, a history of repeated moves was much more characteristic of migrants who originated in urban locations than of those born in rural places. For example, of the migrants in Bangkok, 63 percent of those of urban origin but only 41 percent of those of rural origin had lived in as many as three provinces.

The extent of repeated movement can also be assessed by the number of different urban places of residence that migrants reported in their residential histories. Among those living in Bangkok, as many as 25 percent of all migrants reported having lived in three or more different urban places. In smaller urban places, as many as 31 percent did so. Again, the frequency of repeated moves indicated by this measure was much greater for those of urban compared with rural origin.

To provide insights not only on repeated movement but also on return movement, data were also prepared on the number of times migrants reported themselves as residing in Bangkok. As might be expected, repeated residence in Bangkok was reported more frequently by those actually living in the capital at the time of the survey than by others; 27 percent of the Bangkok migrants said that they had lived in Bangkok at least twice during their lifetime. Among migrants living in provincial urban places, 7 percent reported that they had lived in Bangkok at least twice, and another 25 percent reported having lived there once. Because these data pertain only to migrants who were living in urban places at the time of the survey, they can provide few insights about the extent of repeat migration on the part of the rural population. Nonetheless, the evidence seems substantial that a considerable part of repeat movement among urban resident migrants involves moves to and from the same location, especially an urban one.

The finding that migrants with a history of multiple moves charac-

teristically have higher education suggests that multiple movement may be attributable to the unique role played by a substantial number of the multiple migrants in the economic, educational, and government structures of urban places. The disproportional number of government officials among the multiple migrants suggests that a career in government is especially associated with repeated movement. Moreover, the particularly sharp differentials with respect to the proportion of professional, administrative, and government officials who are multiple migrants in smaller urban places suggests that repeated movement into and out of these locations is fairly common among individuals meeting needs associated with the growing importance of these locations in Thailand's urban hierarchy.

The Longitudinal Study asked urban male household heads how far they lived from their place of work and how long it took them to travel to their place of work. The inclusion of such a question reflected interest in the extent to which work and residence were separated as part of the urbanization process. Comparable data were not available for the rural sample. The majority of male household heads held jobs away from home, and men in Bangkok were likely to have a longer journey to work than those in smaller urban places. In part this finding reflects the much larger geographical area encompassed by Bangkok than by other cities; but it is also related to the different types of job opportunities in the capital compared with smaller urban locations, as well as to the transportation facilities available for moving between place of work and place of residence.

To the extent that circular movement can be defined as involving any absence from home, even for comparatively short periods of time, some scholars include visits as part of circular movement. In my view, interest in visits as a form of movement is justified only to the extent that such information provides a basis for measuring contacts between residents of one type of area with both the residents and the way of life of a different type place. Since the very process of migration usually means that individuals are separated from relatives and friends, even if only temporarily, migrants more than nonmigrants might be expected to need exchange visits with persons living outside urban areas. Of the migrants living in Bangkok, 58 percent reported having had visits from friends and relatives from rural areas, compared with only 42 percent of the nonmigrants. The pattern and level of differences are about the same for provincial urban places. The same pattern characterized the reverse process—that is, visits to friends and relatives by migrants and nonmigrants. Clearly, migration produces a compara-

tively high degree of interaction between the migrants living in urban places and relatives and friends living in villages. The extent to which this leads to exchange of ideas, material items, and financial resources could not be ascertained from the Longitudinal Study data.

The heavy reliance on census data as a basis for assessing population movement in Thailand and the limitations inherent in the available Longitudinal Study materials, as coded, for purposes of measuring circulation means that to date there has been no well designed study purposely undertaken to evaluate the extent of circulation and commuting in comparison with permanent migration and focusing especially on the rural population. Steps toward providing useful insights on these concerns have, however, been initiated through two dissertation projects. The first, by Donald Lauro (1977a), challenges the claim of a high degree of stability in the rural Thai population. Relying heavily on the life history matrix and on a concisely formulated instrument for ordering, stimulating, and cross-checking an individual's recall of his or her own life-cycle events, Lauro has collected a rich body of data on a village in central Thailand. The life histories encompass information on fertility, mortality, mobility, occupation, and land ownership and use. The study's high degree of promise lies in the opportunities it provides for both cross-sectional and cohort analyses. In addition to the 819 completed life histories, Lauro has compiled about 5,000 genealogical linked records for individuals who ever lived in the village, thereby providing the basis for reconstruction of the demographic history of the village and identifying the population at risk of particular events, including movement.

Lauro recognizes that for analyzing migration this approach presents some serious problems. Reliance on survivors as a source of information may introduce serious bias through the omission of those out-migrants who left no families behind. Problematic, too, is the reliance of such genealogical information on retrospective data. This may be a particular problem in Thailand, where, as Lauro acknowledges, the shallowness of Thai lineages places serious time constraints on historical reconstruction. Still another problem characterizing this and other studies in Thailand and elsewhere is that, although there are great advantages to be gained by the intensive type of research that can be undertaken in a single village, the choice of a particular village—in this case a remote one with reasonably detailed and accurate written records—inevitably raises the question of the extent to which such a location is typical. This problem is especially relevant if the focus of the research is on the process of migration. Nevertheless, Lauro's particular

data sources, the wealth of data he has collected through their use, and their potential for identifying the paths that migrants have taken to arrive at their latest destination should, in combination, provide a number of insights on migration, circulation, and commuting in relation to the changing social and economic conditions in the village.

The second dissertation, by Anchalee Singhanetra-Renard (1977), had progressed further than Lauro's by the time this report was being prepared and provides us with some of the first definitive insights on patterns of circulation in Thailand. Consequently, it has significance both substantively and because of the research procedures followed. Legitimately critical of the heavy reliance placed by migration researchers in Thailand to date on models developed in the western world, especially with respect to census materials, Singhanetra-Renard argues that population movement constitutes a very common part of peasant life in Thailand but that a considerable part of such movement is overlooked because of its temporary character. Casual observations of the northern Thai rural population impressed Singhanetra-Renard as presenting striking similarities to the patterns of circular movement noted in the Pacific region and suggested that in Thailand short-term, repetitive, and cyclic varieties of movement may be more significant than permanent migration. Her research therefore seeks to identify and assess the complete range of moves made by residents of a series of northern Thai villages. This approach includes attention to how the villagers conceptualize varieties of move experiences; comparison of a number of villages for conventional population movement, circulation, and commuting; and testing the mobility transition hypothesis to ascertain whether the stage-type model of mobility posited by Zelinsky holds for northern Thailand. To obtain comprehensive coverage of all types of movement, Singhanetra-Renard defined population mobility as all moves from a given place resulting in an absence of six or more hours, circulation as all moves that originated and ended in the same place, and commuting as a form of cyclical circulation mobility.

The key village in her study is Mae Sa, located some 13 kilometers from Chiang Mai, the major urban center in northern Thailand and second largest city in the kingdom. Singhanetra-Renard collected a wide range of data in the village, including a complete census, a record of moves of at least six hours' duration into and out of the village, life histories obtained from 150 residents, and observations and interviews by key informants. The investigator also followed movers to Chiang Mai, to *miang* (tea) villages, and to the gardens where a number of them worked. She spent seven months outside Mae Sa interviewing

employees in Chiang Mai, managers of large firms (to evaluate job opportunities), workers engaged in agricultural activities, and 60 headmen of other villages in the general area.

The underlying hypothesis of the study is that circular mobility is the result of perceived complementarity between the place of origin and the place of destination. The point of origin provides rights, privileges, and security offered by land and family; the point of destination provides jobs, educational opportunities, services, and facilities. Circulation is seen as a way to obtain the maximum benefits at both locations. But it means in turn that (1) circulation is infrequent where economic and other needs can be successfully met in the place of origin; (2) circulation occurs in the absence of alternative opportunities; and (3) as the mover becomes involved in a set of social relations at the point of destination and acquires prestige and security, he or she gradually withdraws from the village and becomes a permanent out-migrant.

Singhanetra-Renard distinguishes among commuters, as persons who are still part of ongoing village life; circulators, those temporarily out of the village who plan to return and consider the village their home; and migrants, who have left the village and do not plan to return. In this study the three categories are not entirely distinct. Commuters are subdivided according to whether they commute daily, periodically, or on a seasonal basis. Circulation, in turn, varies from as short a period as one month to as long as 30 or 40 years; and migration, depending on intent, could also vary from a short period to the entire life of the migrant.

This typology attempts to articulate "movement sets" in local terms, to which the conventional coordinates of time, space, and purpose were subsequently fitted. Singhanetra-Renard's observation that the villagers themselves do not classify moves in discrete categories by time of move or distance of move accounts for the overlapping character of the categories. It illustrates the challenges faced in developing concepts that can be used to clarify the ambiguities inherent in the study of movement behavior while also retaining the "flavor" of movement as seen by the native nonmovers and movers.

Although recognizing the value of the typology used, especially in an exploratory study such as Singhanetra-Renard's, I believe that for more general purposes the considerable overlap in time and even distance that characterizes the three basic movement categories places an undue burden on the researcher, if not on the mover himself, to identify the particular category in which the mover best fits. It creates par-

ticularly difficult problems with respect to comparative analyses over time and space and among different societies. The complexity of the data that would be needed would seem to relegate the collection of information to very intensive surveys of the kind that Singhanetra-Renard was able to conduct but which larger-scale studies would find difficult to execute. Simplification of the concepts and the related questions needed to obtain appropriate information should therefore take high priority in such studies in the future. This is particularly essential if comparability among different surveys is to be enhanced.

What has already emerged as noteworthy in Singhanetra-Renard's studies, regardless of the problems noted, is the high degree of mobility characterizing Mae Sa and the existence of all three types of movement simultaneously for the past 100 years. In what is labeled as the traditional era (before 1940), almost all members of the village commuted or circulated. In the second generation, 1940–60, cash crops were developed and caravan trade lessened, with the result that daily commuting became more common. Since 1960, the contemporary period, land shortages due to population increase and new desires and aspirations have in combination led to further increases in commuting, made easier by the availability of improved transportation. The earlier circulation to *miang* villages declined, but was replaced by a new form of circulation to factories in Bangkok. Migration persisted in this period as in the previous one, tied in large part to the traditional forms of marriage.

Indicative of the nature of movement encompassed by this study is Singhanetra-Renard's observation that it is not a question of who moves but rather of when the move is made. Virtually everyone at one time or another goes to the city for work, education, shopping, or some other activity. In sum, Singhanetra-Renard's study has broken new ground in the analysis of population movement in Thailand and in Southeast Asia generally. Although the full significance of this study must await the completion of the analysis, it is already clear that a considerable part of the movement characterizing rural life in Thailand is masked by the reliance on official statistics and definitions. The insistence on "permanence" as a key concept in defining movement fails to take account of short-term movement, including both circulation and commuting. A study using such statistics thereby misses the key role of mobility in the lives of the individual villagers as well as in the life of the community as an entity; and it overlooks the importance of such mobility in the maintenance of social ties and the raising of levels of living. Both aspects are important factors in the relation between

movement and social and economic development, not only because of the impact of movers on the village but also because of their effects on the place of destination. To the extent that employers in urban centers and in rural areas rely upon commuters or circular movers for a substantial part of their labor force needs, these employment centers do not have to provide the housing, sanitation, education, and other facilities that would be required by permanent residents.

A final word of caution is needed about the definitions used in this study. If an individual moves to an urban location and lives there for 20, 30, or 40 years, is it reasonable, as Singhanetra-Renard suggests, to regard that person as a temporary resident simply because he intends, or is even likely, to return to his village upon retirement? There is certainly a need to distinguish such a person from the migrant who has made a permanent commitment to living in the urban location and who has therefore made a more definite break. The same concern can be raised with respect to the distinction between commuters and circulars, once the former category is allowed to encompass people who are absent for long periods from the community. How more effective distinctions can be made cannot be answered in the abstract but requires more data on the nature of the interaction between the mover and his or her place of origin as well as on the nature and degree of integration in the place of destination. One cannot assume that the African or Melanesian patterns hold for Southeast Asia. As more research of this kind is undertaken in Southeast Asia it should become easier to address some of these concerns and to develop a more standardized and more widely accepted set of categories whose meaning will not be subject to the same criticisms as can now be lodged against the concept of migration itself.

The Philippines

Migration has been the subject of a number of comprehensive studies undertaken in the Philippines. In these, both census and survey materials have been used (e.g., Hendershot, 1971; Pernia, 1975), but most of the studies have used the "standard" definitions and measures of migration associated with censuses and do not, therefore, provide insights on the extent and patterns of circulation. One recent study drawing on census materials does, however, have some relevance to the present concern with circulation. Using the 1970 census, del Rosario, Lourdes, and Kim (1977) have constructed a typology of mover-stayer migration patterns in order to assess differences in the social,

demographic, and labor force characteristics among nonmigrants and migrants by migration types.

From questions in the 1970 census, residence of household heads at four different times was obtained: at birth and in February 1960, February 1965, and May 1970. From this information, 15 mover-stayer migration patterns were identified. These were reclassified into six major migration types: nonmigrants and primary, secondary, tertiary, return, and circular migrants—a set of types elaborated from that initially developed with U.S. data by Hope Eldridge (1965). A primary migrant experienced a single change of residence from place of birth, which was recorded either in 1960, 1965, or 1970. Secondary migrants experienced two changes of residence, and tertiary migrants three changes. The fourth category, return migrants, includes those who migrated from their birthplace but had returned to it by 1970. Finally, circular migrants had changed residence from birthplace at each reference period (1960, 1965, and 1970) and had by 1970 returned to any of the previous residences except the birthplace at a succeeding move. The results suggest that 59 percent of all the heads of households qualified as nonmigrants and an additional 21 percent as primary migrants. Therefore, only a minority of the total heads of household, 20 percent, had made more than one move, as judged by the four reference points. Of those who made more than one move, just under half had ever returned to their place of birth or to a previous place of residence.

By restricting the analysis to the population that had actually moved, the authors give a better indication of the importance of return and circular migration. From this perspective, 23 percent of all migrants belong to these categories, with the circular migrants outnumbering the return migrants by a ratio of four to one. Clearly, then, even at the gross provincial level there is evidence of a considerable amount of return and circular migration in the Philippines. Presumably, if data were available on more reference points and if the geographic or political units of analysis were more refined, circular and return migration would constitute an even greater proportion of total movement. These census data obviously do not fully serve the needs of an analysis of circulation in the Philippines. They do, however, go beyond the standard census type of analysis, and in so doing document the opportunities that exist even in census data for exploring return and circular movement.

That circular migration in the Philippines is more extensive than census data indicate is strongly suggested by research on population

movement in Central Luzon undertaken by Otto D. van den Muijzenberg (1973, 1975) during 1968–69.⁴ He stresses the need to give consideration to temporary migration to urban places even though this type of movement is difficult to quantify. Referring to such return movers as “circcommuters,” he assesses their role both in the city and in their village of origin (which is a village of tenants). Because of the low levels of land ownership in the particular village studied, identified by a pseudonym only, a number take jobs in Manila as a way both of meeting their personal needs for a source of livelihood and of expanding the local resources of the village population.

The circcommuters, mostly adolescent and adult males, work in Manila part of the year, but return to their village for planting and harvesting, as well as for weekends once or twice a month. Thus strong links are maintained with the village, links that may have been strengthened by the effects of the Green Revolution, which has led to increased demands for rural labor (van den Muijzenberg, 1975). Van den Muijzenberg suggests, however, that as the number of migrants coming to Manila from other areas increases, and as the greater distances between place of origin and Manila for many such migrants make return movement more difficult, the competition for the circcommuters from nearer areas will grow.

Yet he predicts that the number of circcommuters to Manila will continue to increase, if for no other reason than that the high cost of living in the capital will force migrants to leave their families in the village, preventing them from taking up permanent residence in Manila even if they wished to do so. Given the rising costs of living in many cities in less developed countries, increases in circulation may well become more common elsewhere for the same reasons.

As found in studies for other countries, circcommuting in the Philippines is said to benefit the urban areas by not requiring investment in education or most of the other forms of logistic support needed by permanent migrants. By also serving as a safety device for the village by bringing employment within its resource field, it proves mutually beneficial to both the place of origin and the place of destination.

Van den Muijzenberg also indicates that the interaction between village and city is a two-way process. By focusing on the role of education as an integrating mechanism, he suggests that teachers sent to the village represent the national center and, in so doing, serve to

4 This review of van den Muijzenberg's study is based partially on an English summary of his larger monograph, *Horizontale Mobiliteit in Centraal Luzon* (1973:431–36), written in Dutch.

achieve certain national goals in the village itself. Far too little attention has yet been given to this form of circular migration.

Some further insights into circulation in the Philippines are provided by Vinson Sutlive's (1977) comparative study of urban migration in Sarawak and the Philippines. The Philippine segment, conducted in 1975, focused on Cagayan de Oro, the principal city in northern Mindanao. Its growth from 68,000 in 1960 to an estimated 164,000 in 1975 attests to its attractiveness to migrants. Relying on interviews with captains of 24 of the 40 rural *barangay* (neighborhoods) that encircle the city, Sutlive ascertained that desire for a regular income was one of the most commonly cited reasons for movement, growing out of problems of landlessness, diminished soil fertility, deforestation, and difficulties in obtaining clear title to land. But unlike both the Sarawak population he studied and van den Muijzenberg's village group, Cebuanos appear to have little possibility of moving back to rural areas. As Sutlive (1977:368) phrases it, "once 'in' they find there is no 'out'." Clearly, the extent to which circulation provides a viable alternative to permanent out-migration varies considerably, depending on opportunities not only in the place of destination but also in the place of origin itself.

Malaysia

Despite its long history of censuses, dating back to 1881, Malaysia, like a number of other Southeast Asian countries, has had few census data on migration. In her assessment of the situation, Nagata (1974) points out that, at best, all that was ascertained was place of birth of the population and current residence. Problems of analysis are compounded by changes in definitions of urban, in urban boundaries, and in ethnic identification.

The 1970 Malaysian census offers more promising data for analysis of migration patterns and some opportunity to assess return migration, although I have no evidence that this has yet been done. Among the questions asked was the traditional one on country of birth; distinguished within the same question were Sabah and Sarawak, for which data on number of years of residence were obtained. In addition, number of years lived in the present locality was obtained, as was information on place of previous residence, including its specific name (Cho, 1976).

The first serious attempt to obtain information on population movements in West Malaysia actually came in the form of an intercensal survey in 1967-68. Like the census, it obtained information on place

of residence and place of birth, but only for all those born before 1957. An additional survey of population movements elicited information on current residence and place of residence in 1957. Regrettably, however, the ten-year migration data could not be related to the information collected on place of birth in order to get place of residence at three different times, which would have provided some insights into the extent of repeat and circular movement.

Given these limitations, Nagata's analysis of the survey data, not surprisingly, showed that an overwhelming majority of the Malaysian population experienced no change of residence among the various zones established for the country. As of 1967, at least 92 percent of the population in four of the five zones were still living in the same zone in which they had been born, and 87 percent of the population in the fifth zone was doing so. As Nagata suggests, migration probably remained localized within limited areas and was therefore not detected by the types of questions asked. This expectation is confirmed by the ten-year data, which indicate that most migration took place within the same zone. Overall, these materials, like those for other countries discussed earlier, are severely limited because the geographic or political units used for analyzing migration are so large; and the time references used in determining whether a person has changed residence are so broad that a considerable number of moves may have been made in the interval. As a net result, the assessment of population movements is far from comprehensive and considerably biased in the direction of more permanent moves and longer-distance moves.

Nagata's analysis goes beyond the data available from the survey and draws upon observations made during field work. For many migrants she found no clear unidirectional pattern in population movements—that is, toward either rural or urban places. Rather, an alternating pattern emerges of movement back and forth between city and country and often also between zones, which Nagata terms oscillation (Nagata, 1974:317). This pattern reflects a number of factors typical of Malay life, but in many respects it is in response to the same underlying forces that account for circulation in Africa, Melanesia, and other Asian countries. To the extent that education is a key mechanism for mobility and that quality education is only available in urban areas, many rural residents and sometimes entire rural families will move into the cities to obtain an education for themselves or for their children. Evidently this practice is becoming increasingly common as Malaysia makes a concerted effort to develop and modernize itself. Education also contributes to circular migration because many persons

who are teachers in rural areas continue to maintain residences in urban locations and return there frequently. This entire process illustrates Nagata's contention that the distinction between urban and rural is not very clear. Movers perceive their rural homes as security against the crises and failures confronted in the city. To the extent that it is possible to retain ownership of land or at least a homestead to which to return, it is easier to make the decision to move to the city in an effort to improve one's economic lot. In fact, many migrants may make such a move in the hope that rural conditions will improve during their absence; they plan to return home once such improvement occurs.

Nagata also cites inheritance as playing a key role in oscillation, particularly since, according to Moslem custom, all children inherit some property. Various practices are followed once property is inherited, but most of them, in one way or another, result in circulation. At one extreme are people who return to rural areas to settle on the land and work it. Intermediary are those who return only seasonally to supervise the harvest. At the other end of the continuum are those who maintain their residence in rural areas but do so as absentee landlords; their major involvement in the rural areas is through their investment to improve the property. Although not strictly qualifying as circulation in the absence of physical movement back to rural places, the exchange of money, ideas, and goods resulting from absentee ownership is significant and may help explain why, as Nagata (1974:319) puts it, "socially, economically, and ideologically, as well as demographically, the rural-urban distinction for Malays is somewhat blurred."

Closely related to these patterns is the practice, common among many Malays who have moved to urban places, of retiring in old age back in their *kampung* for both social and financial reasons. This is still another aspect of the value placed on land as a form of security.

Still another factor contributing to circulation in Malaysia is one already observed for Thailand: the government policy of transferring civil servants from one location to another and the fact that a significant proportion of the nonagricultural labor force is engaged in government service. Doctors, teachers, and government officials are repeatedly moved about between urban and rural locations. Many of these persons compile a record of repeated moves. The pattern is obviously not unique to less developed countries, since even in the United States many civil servants and employees of firms with several branches are transferred repeatedly.

In Malaysia, as elsewhere, circulation is also inflated by crisis situa-

tions associated with life-cycle events and by other social and religious norms operating in the country. As in India, many women evidently prefer to have their babies at the parental home. Others return in time of sickness or for religious festivities. Again, the lack of a clear notion of what constitutes home blurs the line between urban and rural identities and rural and urban styles of life. Nagata (1974:323) suggests that oscillation between rural and urban areas may entail little change in life styles or in basic values and attitudes. But considerably more research is needed, preferably longitudinal in character, to ascertain the extent to which both individuals and communities are actually affected by the high volume of movement between rural and urban places.

Nagata's observations about circulation in Malaysia are supplemented by the work done by Judith Strauch (1977), who also argues that using western models that give particular emphasis to permanent migration seems inappropriate for much of the less developed world. In particular, she calls for recognition of the fact that migrants are not only leaving rural places, but also returning to them, requiring adaptation on the part of both the migrants and the communities. In contrast to Nagata, Strauch is convinced that circulating labor migration can have profound effects, both socially and politically, on the home community. Focusing her attention primarily on the labor migration of the Chinese in Hong Kong and Malaysia, Strauch (1977:2) points out that "Chinese migration, both traditionally and today, occurs typically in two distinct forms: 1) the back and forth shuttle migration within a relatively bounded regional system, showing considerable internal variation, and 2) the long-distance and long-term overseas migration. . . . In both types, the intentions of the migrants are typically those of the sojourner, whether short or long term. The goal is to return home successful, to retire with honor in the bosom of the native place." (See also Watson, 1974.)

Evidently, the circulation of Chinese within a regional system has received comparatively little attention. Some studies have acknowledged the existence of a certain percentage of absentee workers but concentrate their attention on the more permanent migrants. In her work on a Chinese-Malaysian village in 1971-72, Strauch found comparatively high levels of circulation. Although only 38 percent of the working population were identified as shuttle or temporary migrants, over 40 percent of the households included one such migrant, and 25 percent of the households included a migrant worker whose spouse resided permanently in the village. Most migrants were engaged in logging, construction, or tin mining. They varied in frequency of re-

turn visits, ranging from once weekly to once yearly. Similarly the distances involved ranged from a few miles to a few hundred miles within Malaysia, and some of the shuttle migrants were at work or studying in other countries.

Strauch's conclusion about the positive impact of circulation is based on evidence that through their years of moving about throughout Malaysia, the circular movers gained personal self-confidence as well as a broadened outlook on national issues and the role of Chinese in Malaysia. Because of these changes, concurrent with the maintenance of strong ties to their home community, many of these migrants provided leadership among the younger members of the community in supporting fairly radical action that could lead to permanent change and a greater incorporation of the village into the national political scene (Strauch, 1977:3). It is encouraging to note that Strauch is proposing to undertake a comparative study of circulation in Hong Kong. She plans to test the general hypothesis that "greater strain will be placed on primary family and community ties by temporary migration in Hong Kong than in Malaysia, and that in Malaysia more migrants will return, and once returned, play a greater role in integrating the community into a national political and cultural framework" (Strauch, 1977:4). The very nature of Hong Kong makes it a unique situation, but having an intensive study of circulation in Hong Kong should provide an interesting body of data for comparison with other Asian situations as well as with those in Africa and the Pacific.

As noted in the discussion of circulation in the Philippines, Sutlive's (1977) research focused comparatively on the Philippines and Sarawak. The Malaysian segment of the study involved the analysis of movements of Iban into Sibul, a city of 70,000 in the Rejang Valley of Sarawak. The Iban group comprises about 3,500 of Sibul's population. Their movement from the agricultural sector to nonagricultural activities in Sibul reflects, according to Sutlive, a complex of natural and cultural factors including generally poor soil conditions, swidden cultivation as a way of life, an opportunistic ethic, and generally a desire to advance economically.

Sutlive's interviews with a random sample of 200 Iban in Sibul showed considerable variation in the intended permanency of the move, depending on the degree of job security achieved and the fringe benefits, such as housing, associated with employment. He found that few government or church employees, for whom housing was often provided, actually returned, despite statements to the effect that they wanted to do so. In contrast, service workers and day laborers gener-

ally averaged only one or two years in the town. As Sutlive (1977: 360) put it, "After they have saved enough money and bought enough goods to demonstrate their success . . . they return in triumph to their longhouses." Thus, unlike the Cebuanos, for whom return migration was a remote possibility, the Iban, according to Sutlive, maintain real and viable options to go back to their longhouse communities.

Even for those not eventually returning, frequent contacts and exchanges were maintained with rural kin. More than three-fourths of the sample indicated that they regularly helped their parents with money, food, clothing, or work and that they, in turn, were supplied with rice or other foodstuffs from rural areas. This finding suggests, as does the evidence for other Southeast Asian countries, that close links persist between the rural and urban members of a kinship unit, with significant implications both for the adjustment of the migrants in the town or city and for the ability of the rural nonmigrants to share in the benefits of the migration process.

One other interesting study, still in preliminary form, touches on circulation in Malaysia. "Village Paths and City Routes" by Heather Strange (1976) bases its analysis on women in a Malaysian coastal village. Three categories of women are identified. Village-oriented women live in the village and hold local wage-paying jobs or claim to be only housewives. Town-oriented women were originally from the coastal village but now live in east coast towns 100 to 450 miles north or south of the village. These women are also engaged in a variety of economic activities ranging from holding wage-paying or salaried positions to being housewives. The third category comprises dual-oriented women, those who live in the village and work in a town or, alternatively, live in a town and work in the village. Factors accounting for dual orientation are generally the same as those already cited. For women drawn to the towns they include the impact of education, kinship ties, and shopping; for women who are pulled to the villages, important factors are kin and social ties, life-cycle crises, and festivities.

Strange, like Nagata, observes that in recent years an increasing number of women have been going to town, and that, as a result, there has been more feedback to the village about the urban way of life, which in turn makes it easier for others to visit the town. It becomes quite obvious to women that education and work opportunities exist outside the village context. Exposure to outside work in turn creates impatience with the village and contributes to the view of it as a dull and restricting location in which to live. Overall, in recent years, more people, females as well as males, have held wage-paying jobs outside

the village. Strange believes that urban alternatives are a reality, and part of that urban reality is moving slowly and steadily into the village (Strange, 1976: 12). In contrast to Nagata, Strange concludes that, while rural and urban distinctions are blurred by circulation, the potential for social change in the village as a result of that blurring makes circulation a potentially important force in social change and the development process.

The different implications of the complementarity noted by both Nagata and Strange call for more attention to the influence of local characteristics. Strauch (in verbal communication) has pointed out that Penang, the site of Nagata's field work, is one of Malaysia's largest and most industrialized urban concentrations. By contrast, Strange's research involved the east coast of Malaysia which is still highly underdeveloped, judged even by Malaysian standards. Thus, the changes that were observed as now occurring in Kelantan have probably taken place more gradually over the last two centuries in Penang. This points to the need, in any assessment of the impact of circulation on social change, for due attention to the levels of urbanization and development already achieved and to the prior rates of circulation in relation to the development process.

Indonesia

To date, the most comprehensive assessment of circulation undertaken in Southeast Asia is for Indonesia. The work of Graeme Hugo (1975) on population mobility in West Java constitutes a milestone in research on the topic, both because of its innovative character for the region and because of the many insights it provides on the role of circulation and commuting in total population movement. It will undoubtedly serve as a model for a number of similar studies both within and outside the region. Partly stimulated by Hugo's work, Mantra's (1978) study on Indonesia also promises to add considerably to our knowledge of circulation.

These investigations on Indonesia, as those for other areas and regions, are concerned that Western ideas and values color the assessment and measurement of population mobility. A key goal is the need to distinguish between migration and circulation, using the criterion of the permanence of the move. As a number of scholars working with Indonesian material, including Hugo, have pointed out, in Indonesia the distinction between a permanent and a temporary move is of long standing and is embodied in the very language of population movement. *Pindah* is regarded as permanent migration, but *merantu* implies

that the mover uses the destination not as a goal in itself but rather as a means to improve or stabilize his position in the place of origin. Even though the move may end up being permanent, the orientation and behavioral patterns of the migrant are temporary, reflecting the intent to return.

Mantra (1978) suggests that the language distinctions among types of movement go well beyond the broad dichotomy suggested by *pin-dah* and *merantu*. In Javanese, he points out, *merantu* is used to refer only to those who go to another island for a relatively long period but eventually return to the community of origin. As distinct from this long-term return movement, the Javanese use *nglaju* for those who travel to a place but return from it the same day, *nginep* for those who remain away from the home community for several days before returning, and *mondok* for those who remain in their community of destination for several months or years. The very existence of such language distinctions lends strong support to the need for research on population movement to take account of the various types of moves that do in fact occur.

Comparison of the 1961 and 1971 Indonesian censuses' information on place of birth shows a decline in lifetime migration to the capital, Jakarta, which had been the destination of a considerable amount of internal movement in the country. Hugo, in assessing these data, correctly charges that this change reflects nothing more than the superficial assessment of population movement resulting from the arbitrary criteria employed by the census in identifying movement; it fails to detect either the total level of movement or the possible substitution of one form of movement for another (Hugo, 1978a:3-4).

As in Thailand, the 1971 Indonesian census identified a comparatively low level of migration: only 6.4 percent of the country's total population was living outside the province of birth by 1971 (Hugo, 1978b). This image of a high degree of population stability is partly a function of the census's use of provincial boundaries and its identification of only relatively permanent moves. Anyone living away from the usual residence six months or more was regarded as a migrant. If an individual was away from the usual residence for less than six months, he or she was reassigned to it for purposes of census enumeration unless there was clear evidence of an intentional move to change place of residence. However, anyone who had visited home within six months was classified as a nonmigrant. These criteria obviously operate against identification of circular migrants, since a considerable proportion of such migrants will have been away from their usual place of

residence for less than six months. Inclusion in the 1971 census of an additional question on place of last residence did allow a limited amount of attention to repeated movement and return movement because it provided an opportunity to compare place of residence in 1971 with birthplace and with an intermediary move. These data revealed that 1.53 million persons had returned to their province of birth, accounting for a rise in the percentage of lifetime migrants from the 6.4 percent based on place of birth data alone, to the 7.7 percent based on the combined place of birth and duration of residence data.

The census data point to two other interesting patterns: the highest levels of return migration characterize the provinces with the highest rates of initial out-migration; and metropolitan Jakarta is one of the major origins of return migration to provinces of birth. Despite their limitations, these data do point to a high degree of circular movement in Indonesia. This hypothesis is confirmed by Hugo's use of survey data to analyze the levels of both commuting and circulation among the populations of the villages he studied.

Hugo's research is particularly effective in bringing together evidence that forms of movement other than permanent migration have characterized a long period of Indonesian history. Hugo's own field work, undertaken in 1973, focused on West Java, which constitutes the western third of the island of Java and contains one-fourth of the entire Indonesian population, although it accounts for a minute portion of the total land area of the country. West Java is a key area because it constitutes a major source of migration to two of Indonesia's largest cities, Jakarta and Bandung. Hugo's data sources include documentary materials, field work in the urban areas, and surveys in 14 villages chosen because they were major sources of movers to Jakarta and Bandung. In a careful assessment of these data sources, Hugo stresses that the villages do not constitute a representative sample of West Java. For this reason, Hugo frequently analyzes the data for the 14 villages individually; this practice, in turn, makes it difficult to cite summary statistics that reflect the various kinds of population movement in West Java.

Registration data are used to ascertain the numbers of persons leaving the villages either permanently or temporarily. Using them for measurement of circulation and even permanent migration presents a number of problems that further illustrate the limitations of register records for the assessment of movement. Persons leaving the village for periods of less than a week to make social calls, to work, or to go shopping rarely register their absence. Moreover, even persons who

leave for longer periods to visit relatives evidently rarely register their departures. Within this uneven coverage of moves, the registration data document the predominance of short-term migration. In the 14 villages, the proportion of residents who were temporary out-migrants during the period July 1972 to June 1973 ranges between a low of 2.6 and a high of 19.5 percent. This finding contrasts sharply with the comparatively low percentage of residents who qualified as permanent out-migrants, between 0.02 and 1.8 for the 14 villages.

In the survey phase of his investigation Hugo attempted to gauge mobility patterns of households over a ten-year period. He achieved this by obtaining information on the mobility experience of all persons residing within the households at the time of the survey and by relying upon a form of "family reconstitution" of all persons who had resided within that household during the previous ten years. For all such individuals, migration histories were obtained together with information concerning circular migration and commuting.

Commuters were defined as persons who regularly, though not necessarily daily, went to a place outside their village to work or to attend an educational institution but who returned to the village on most nights. Hugo found that the majority of rural commuters moved to destinations less than ten kilometers from their village, whereas urban commuters traveled up to 50 kilometers. Substantial differences characterize the rural and urban commuters with respect to the dominant modes of transport used. Whereas more than 80 percent of the urban commuters relied upon modern sector buses, *oplet* (microbuses), or railways, by contrast, rural commuters placed heavy reliance upon personal and nonmechanized forms of transport. The great majority of respondents who commuted did so on most working days. Hugo interprets this to mean that their major occupation was at their commuting destination. At the same time, most commuters also reported working in the village when possible, especially in the planting and harvesting seasons. They did this either on weekends or by refraining from commuting for a few days. This pattern of foregoing commuting in favor of work within the village was also noted in the research on Thailand.

Although commuting among urban residents is heavily tied to modern modes of transportation, Hugo notes that daily travel out of the village to work is a long established practice in much of West Java. Helping in the planting and harvesting in neighboring villages has evidently been practiced by villagers for many years, as has local inter-village movement of traders. What have changed are the increased op-

portunities for commuting, enhanced by the development of urban centers and through easier modes of transportation. Commuting continues to be limited by space and time considerations, however, and where these become restrictive, greater reliance is placed on circulation. The patterns noted are markedly similar to those observed by Singhanetra-Renard for Thailand.

Conceptually, Hugo regards circular migration as a temporary move in which the mover intends to return to his birthplace within a consciously planned period. Hugo fully recognizes the difficulty of measuring circulation in these terms, and for his operational definition of circulation adopted a six month upper limit as the period of absence from the village during which an individual qualifies as a circular migrant. This definition coincided both with how the register inscribed persons as temporary or permanent departures and with the census criteria. Nonetheless, many individuals were absent from the village for much longer periods but qualified as circular migrants because of their intention to return. Adoption of an absolute time standard therefore proved to be a source of frustration for Hugo and pointed to the problems inherent in developing a clear operational definition of circulation.

The pervasiveness of circular migration is evidenced in the finding that in nine of the 14 surveyed villages it was the most commonly practiced rural-urban mobility strategy of the movers composing the re-constituted "mover" households. Within the 14 villages studied, between 5 and 67 percent of adult males were circular migrants and between 7 and 85 percent of all the movers were circular migrants. Moreover, two-thirds of all circular migrants moved to urban destinations, Jakarta itself being preferred by the majority of movers. In two of the 14 villages, commuting was a major form of movement; as one would expect, both these villages were nearer to Jakarta or Bandung than the others. In only three of the 14 villages was permanent migration the prevalent form of movement.

Although circular migration is not a new form of population movement in Indonesia, it expanded considerably following Independence. This development stemmed partly from improvements in public transportation, from the growing pressures on agricultural resources, and from the substantial unemployment in these areas during much of the year as a result of seasonal slack in labor demand in rice growing areas. Another important factor was the desire of the villagers to supplement their incomes and raise their standard of living; they proceeded to do so by working in urban locations. Circulation was not entirely re-

stricted to urban places. Hugo also notes that differences in seasons and growing periods enable individuals to move to adjoining agricultural areas for work during harvest times. Still others sought nonfarm work in other rural areas.

Nevertheless, large-scale circular migration involving short periods of time is a relatively recent phenomenon. Particularly relevant to the heavy reliance upon circulation is the strong value placed on continued residence in the village and the recognition of the high costs of settling permanently in the city. Both circulation and commuting are strategies, therefore, whereby movers are able to take maximum advantage of employment opportunities in the cities while maintaining residence in the villages.

Hugo's analysis is particularly valuable because it attempts to document how the various forms of population movement operate for the migrant and the impact they have on the village. The analysis clearly shows that former links are especially important in providing channels for getting jobs, arranging housing, and providing a sense of ecological security in a new environment. Moving into the city is made easier through the various subcommunities in the city that are characterized by village-based relationships. This results not only in residential clustering, but in occupational clustering as well, and contributes substantially to the economies that are essential if either commuting or circulation are to be financially rewarding: it allows a considerable portion of the income to be used in the village rather than for maintenance in the city.

The impact of circulation and commuting on the village takes many forms. Hugo found that all temporary movers remitted money to their villages, and four out of every five brought back goods. As much as 60 percent of the family income of commuters was derived from the commuting, and about half of the income of the households of circular migrants was supplied by the migrants. These substantial contributions to village income by circular migrants and commuters are important for day-to-day consumption as well as for long-term plans for education and the purchase of material items.

The importance of these income contributions to the village is evidenced in the finding that three-fourths or more of the movers and stayers reported that money income was the biggest positive contribution of migration to the village. A majority in both groups thought the urban experience gained by the movers to be beneficial, and a considerable number also placed a positive value on the new ideas that migrants brought back with them. Nevertheless, respondents expressed

some concerns about the breakdown of traditional values, changes in style of dress, and changes in behavioral patterns. Interestingly, the flow of remittances between village and city is not always unidirectional. Villagers often subsidize the travel costs and initial expenses in the city for both circular migrants and permanent migrants; and the flow of foodstuffs, particularly after visits, is a common practice. Overall, strong rural-urban ties are retained in both directions, but an outstanding finding emanating from Hugo's research is that for all 14 villages the flow of remittances generated by circular migration and commuting is essential if the village economies are not to be damaged.

Beyond the insights it provides into the heavy reliance upon circulation and the significance of this movement for the individual and the community, Hugo's investigation has both policy and theoretical relevance. Confronted with the massive flow of rural people to cities and especially to big cities such as Jakarta, the Indonesian government has made efforts to discourage such moves, in effect closing the cities to migrants through requiring registration and the deposit of sufficient money to cover return fares. As Hugo points out, this process has the effect of encouraging circular migration and commuting rather than permanent migration since temporary movers can obtain permits in the village and avoid registering in the city.

Hugo's study points to other, broad policy concerns. Given the importance of remittances from migrants to their villages, and the fact that it is in the cities where the number of jobs is still expanding, migration can be seen as providing a mechanism by which to redistribute the wealth generated in the city. At the same time, reliance upon circular migration instead of permanent migration places less demand on the services, housing, and resources of the city. This form of movement thus may not compound the problems of the city to the same extent as does permanent migration. This view is consistent with Elkan's (1967:589) earlier assessment of the African situation, wherein he argued that circular migration, while it lasts, should be seen not as an evil, but as a process that lowers the cost of development. Although the evidence is not yet clear, one can argue that circular migration, even more than permanent migration, has the potential for spreading to rural areas knowledge, ideas, and new attitudes that could contribute to faster development and modernization. On this basis, Hugo offers the suggestion that perhaps, as a matter of policy, circular migration and commuting should be encouraged in lieu of permanent migration.

On a theoretical level, Hugo's investigation provides an excellent

test of Zelinsky's mobility hypothesis. Hugo found little evidence that mobility patterns in Indonesia conform to the evolutionary sequence posited by Zelinsky. In West Java, colonialism rather than modernization had a major impact on population mobility. A history of forced labor on government plantations, seasonal movement, and coolie labor all contributed to a tradition that was receptive to seeking part-time occupations outside the village. In Java, colonial policy deliberately kept industry decentralized to create employment in rural areas. As a result, the mobility experience of Java has little similarity to that of the West. Even after Independence, Indonesia coped with rural population pressure through such mechanisms as deliberate confinement of industry, intensification of agriculture, and continuing if not increased circulation both between rural areas and to the cities. The end of the colonial period led to increased urbanization, but much of the social and economic structure of the colonial era remained to hamper the industrialization and urbanization processes. *In situ* adaptation continued and, with improved transportation, both circular migration and commuting became easier. Overall, therefore, Hugo's conclusion that the experience of the West differs from that of the less developed countries in the pace at which particular stages of the mobility transition are reached seems justified, as does his advice that "one should be wary of claiming universality for a formulation which is based predominantly on experience which is fundamentally time and culture bound" (Hugo, 1978b:59).

Mantra's (1977, 1978) study of population movement in two wet rice communities in Indonesia was inspired by the same frustrations as was Hugo's work, namely, that all too much of the prior research on Indonesia has focused on permanent migration, making it easy to conclude that Indonesians, in general, and Javans in particular, are highly stable. At the same time, however, Mantra points out that the large geographic area encompassed by Hugo's study—that is, West Java—made it difficult to undertake an intensive evaluation of the processes underlying mobility behavior. In a sense, this particular criticism points to a major dilemma confronting a researcher concerned with population movement when adequate data on circulation and commuting are not provided by censuses and national surveys. To obtain such data in adequate depth, with appropriate information on motivation and impact, necessarily restricts the researcher to a few communities. This limitation, in turn, inevitably raises the question of the extent to which those communities are typical of the more general patterns characterizing a region or country as a whole, given

the unique ecological, economic, and social conditions that probably typify most villages. What is ideally required, therefore, is a combination of approaches. From this point of view, much is to be said for Hugo's general design, although it would be preferable to choose villages in such a way as to allow the results to be combined in order to facilitate more thorough assessment of the overall relations among various forms of movement and social and economic factors.

To overcome the limitations inherent in the traditional kinds of data sources, as well as the limitations of Hugo's broadly designed study, Mantra (1978) undertook an in-depth case study of two *dukuh* (hamlets) representing wet rice communities in the Yogyakarta special region of Indonesia. By focusing on the mobility behavior of the inhabitants of these hamlets and the processes whereby they gathered information and made decisions about movement, the analysis is designed to encompass the full range of mobility and provide insights into the conditions under which differing forms of movement are undertaken. Reflecting this broad approach, a minimum period of six hours is specified as the time unit for analysis, which means that movement is regarded as having occurred whenever a person crosses the *dukuh* boundary in either direction and stays inside or outside the *dukuh* for a minimum period of six hours. Given this minimum time measure and since the *dukuh* constitutes one unit within a village consisting of several hamlets, Mantra's study provides for identification of the maximum amount of movement without reducing the time or geographic units to the point of absurdity.

The research challenges faced in such an effort to inventory all moves is evidenced in Mantra's (1978:65) observation that "the identification of all moves at or close to the time they occurred was made more difficult by the surprisingly large number of *dukuh* people who were involved. . . . People find such moves hard to remember, because often they happen spontaneously, but it is very rare to find people who are absent from their village for longer than one month." How much more serious would this problem be if such data were to be obtained retrospectively after a longer interval?

Relying upon Zelinsky's distinction between migration and circulation, which is based on whether the move is intended to be permanent or not, Mantra defines permanent migration as an intentional shift of residence across the *dukuh* boundary for a period of at least one year, and circulation as any population movement in which the *dukuh* boundary is crossed for an absence of more than one day but less than one year. Commuting consists of absences from the *dukuh* of more

than six hours but less than one day. Within this general classification, both circulation and commuting are further divided into regular, non-regular, and seasonal. In contrast to the framework suggested by Gould and Prothero (1975:42–43), Mantra does not define return movement after an absence of one year as circulation. This procedure differs from that followed by Singhanetra-Renard in Thailand, where individuals who have been away for 20 to 40 years can still be regarded as circular migrants because of their intention to return to their home village. The differences between Mantra's and Singhanetra-Renard's operational definitions with respect to boundaries, minimum time units for classifying moves, and distinctions between commuting, circulation, and migration illustrate the failure among researchers working on circular movement to standardize their concepts. In turn, it makes any effort at comparing the results of the different studies difficult except at a very general level.

Mantra's field research monitored the mobility of all people aged 15–54 and all heads of household in the two study *dukuh* over nine months beginning in mid-May 1975, a period that encompassed the wet and dry seasons as well as the major events of the agricultural cycle. The research was thus designed to overcome the difficulties people have in remembering short-term movements in the past. Persons were also asked about past movements involving a minimum absence of one month over the previous three years; but the information gained was used only for illustrative purposes to complement the prospective data. The points that Mantra makes about the comparative advantages of prospective and retrospective data illustrate the difficulty that would be encountered in an attempt to include questions on circulation and commuting in any census or large-scale survey that would necessarily have to be retrospective in character. They also have particular relevance for the type of information collected by Lauro (1977b) in Thailand. Despite the advantages to be gained by the life-cycle matrix approach which he suggests, it seems highly unlikely that that approach will yield longitudinal data of high quality on short-term movement.

Altogether, during the survey period Mantra recorded a total of 17,407 moves among the 440 people he studied in Kadirojo and Piring. Of these, 92 percent constituted commuting moves, 8 percent circulation, and well below 1 percent permanent migration. Moreover, the permanent migrants maintained strong ties to the village, and many planned to return at a later date. The extent to which the character of the village affects patterns is evidenced in the ratio of 7.8 commuters

to every circulator in Piring in contrast to the ratio of 1.6 to 1.0 for Kadirojo. The difference reflects in part the fact that in Piring people cannot cultivate rice during the dry season.

These data also point to one other problem in measuring migration, circulation, and commuting. If a move qualifies as migration, the number of moves and the number of migrants will be identical. By definition, however, the number of moves per commuter and per circulator is far greater than the number of commuters and circulators; therefore, counting moves rather than movers inevitably inflates the results in favor of commuting and circulation since a permanent out-migration counts only once. This problem also occurs frequently when data on population movement are based on registration statistics (Goldstein, 1964). It argues strongly for presenting such data for both moves and movers.

Recognizing this problem, Mantra (1978) also classifies his study population by movement status. In Kadirojo, 66 percent were commuters compared with 84 percent of those in Piring. By contrast, 63 percent of those in Kadirojo but only 31 percent of those in Piring were circular migrants. In both communities, however, a considerable proportion (46 and 26 percent, respectively) experienced both commuting and circular migration during the nine-month survey interval. The fact that only 16 and 12 percent of the populations in Kadirojo and Piring, respectively, never commuted or circulated during this period attests to the extent to which some form of population movement is part of the experience of the rural population. On the other hand, citing his finding that the average number of movements per month in these two *dukuh* was only 4.7 and 4.1, respectively, Mantra argues that in these *dukuh* people are generally quite immobile. One can note, however, that without knowing how many different people were actually involved in these moves, such a conclusion seems premature, although suggestive of comparatively low mobility.

Several interesting observations emerge from Mantra's assessment of the purposes for commuting and circulation and the destination of the moves. In Kadirojo, only half of all commuting moves were for wage work; another 28 percent were for trade. Of the balance, education accounted for by far the most, 14 percent of all moves. By contrast, in Piring wage work was cited for only 39 percent of the commuting moves and trade for another 15 percent. Travel to school accounted for over one-fourth of all moves. Similar sharp differences characterized the destination of the moves. Whereas 24 percent of those from Kadirojo were to an urban destination, this was true of 32 percent of

those from Piring, and especially true of moves from Piring involving trade and school. Clearly, differences in opportunities in the villages and in ease of access to other rural and to urban locations affect the purposes and nature of commuting. The same is true of circular migration.

In both Kadirojo and Piring, four-fifths or more of the return moves occurred within one week of their initiation and all but 2 to 3 percent of all circular moves were completed within one month from time of departure. In contrast to commuting, visiting accounted for the most circular moves in both hamlets, just over one-third. Wage work was second most important (30 percent in Kadirojo and 26 percent in Piring); for the former, trade accounted for another 14 percent of all moves, but it does not seem to explain any of the circular migration for Piring, where traders were able to commute to the local market. On the other hand, moves related to schooling were more important for Piring (30 percent compared with 10 percent). Again because of the limited access to a major city and the lesser opportunities for wage work in smaller urban places, a majority of the circular migrants from both Kadirojo and Piring (56 and 51 percent, respectively) circulated between the hamlets and other rural places. This finding, and the even more striking percentage of rural destinations for commuting moves, give further emphasis to the need to take account of rural-to-rural movement in any overall assessment of rural movement patterns.

Mantra's study, as well as others undertaken in Thailand, Indonesia, and elsewhere, indicate that both economic and social factors operate to explain movement away from the village as well as return to it. The underlying rationale accounting for the high proportion of movement that is circular, including commuting, is that it allows the individual mover to adopt an alternative strategy that is a compromise between migrating and staying. In that way, the advantages to be gained by maintaining close social ties, the chance to continue to work the land, and the low cost of living in the village are complemented by the advantages of taking work in the town or city or in other rural locations or by going there to advance educationally.

In accordance with some of the observations made for Thailand, Mantra suggests that most people who work outside the *dukuh* eventually return to it upon retirement. This pattern again reflects both economic and social considerations. Lower living costs in the village make it attractive compared with the city especially after income has been reduced or eliminated in retirement. Moreover, the close social ties in the village and the great value placed on living and dying in the an-

cestral home exercise a strong return pull on those who have been away. Both these motivations are reinforced by ties to relatives, friends, and the village as a whole, which have usually been maintained.

Like Hugo, Mantra tries to use his data to assess Zelinsky's formulation of the mobility transition. He points out that innovation in the agricultural sector decreases employment opportunities there and also diminishes the chance that landless people or small holders can work as share croppers during the harvest season. Rising educational aspirations mean that a larger number of children go into towns to obtain an education and are influenced there by the city way of life. Concurrently, the improved transportation system facilitates movement between rural and urban areas and between rural places themselves. All of these changes have resulted in a dramatic increase in the volume and distance of commuting and have probably increased the number of individuals who aspire to move more permanently to towns and cities. The evidence indicates, however, that despite the rising level of movement, the ties individuals have to their home villages remain strong, suggesting that the relation between modernization and types of movement is complex and does not necessarily follow the pattern characterizing western countries. Thus Mantra's findings suggest that commuting and circulation occur quite commonly in Indonesia at fairly early stages of development, in contrast to what Zelinsky posits. Mantra's (1978) summary of his own findings highlights the findings emanating from the other studies conducted in Indonesia and other Southeast Asian countries.

Economic needs underlie population movement, but do not fully explain it. Social and kinship ties, the desire for more education, and the perceptions of opportunities at other destinations are often an integral part of the decision making process. When economic conditions do lead to a move, it is usually to a nearby place so that continued contacts, if not actual residence, can be maintained in the village. A high premium continues to be placed on social ties as well as on the opportunity in many instances to continue concurrently to earn income in the village. For the Indonesian hamlets and villages, as for the other rural locations in Southeast Asia, Africa, and Melanesia for which population movement has been assessed, a major characteristic of the populations observed appears to be their bi-local or even multi-local residence patterns. As Chapman (1977a) noted, the villages remain relatively stable in their demographic composition, but consist disproportionately of individuals in fairly constant motion between the village and other rural places as well as urban locations.

A noteworthy number of villagers prefer to remain in their villages. This attitude may help account for the comparatively low level of mobility observed, even when the definition of movement is enlarged to include commuting and circulation. Given the strong ties to the village, it becomes understandable that permanent migration, in the comparatively rare instances when it occurs, does not result from a single decision. Rather, such migration stems from a series of decisions; the person who leaves initially for a temporary period may be gradually "absorbed" in his or her place of destination through work and new social ties, which may in turn weaken the ties to the village.

It is clear, however, that to fully assess these relations and particularly the transitions from temporary to permanent migration requires prospective studies of a much longer duration than those undertaken by Mantra and others (e.g., Conroy, 1977). Similar in-depth observation is essential to observe the process by which some moves initially intended to be permanent become temporary through the decision to return to the village or to move elsewhere. Only through such on-going assessments will the necessary data become available to develop more fully concepts of circulation and commuting in Southeast Asia and, in so doing, allow more meaningful comparisons for the less developed countries as well as with the experience of the more developed areas.

Some comparisons with South Asia

The situation as described in the foregoing review of Southeast Asian patterns of movement is by no means unique to this subregion of Asia. Although hampered by the same kinds of data limitations, research has produced considerable evidence that Asia generally is characterized by a high degree of commuting and circular movement. In a review of Asian migration patterns at the 1967 meetings of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP) in Sydney, Zachariah (1969) observed that return migration is widespread in many countries of Asia and that unless specific efforts are made to study it, knowledge about migration will remain incomplete. Like other experts working on the topic, he found it necessary to point out that the main obstacle to such a study is the lack of data with which to estimate the extent of return migration.

In his own research on Bombay, Zachariah estimated that 29 percent of the male migrants left Bombay before 1961 after having moved into the city during the preceding five years, and that the level of return migration rose sharply with increasing age to as high as 70

percent of those aged 60 and over. Other research on India (Prabhu, 1956) found as early as 1955 that an extensive amount of return migration characterized migrants to Bombay; they worked there during the dry season and returned to their villages with enough money to buy seeds and support their families during the rainy months. Like Zachariah, Prabhu observes that mobility between these two cultures means that the transmission of values, outlooks, and ways of behavior can be carried to the village and therefore serves as an important means of spreading urban culture. The "casual" character of Bombay's industrial labor force, as a result of the periodic movement of workers to their villages, leads to heavy turnover. Mitra (1969) notes that this large floating population points to the lack of a true urban-industrial proletariat who have staked their lives in the city and severed rural ties. As he put it, this suggests the precariousness, vulnerability, and instability of the industrial experience of the workers in metropolitan areas, a fair proportion of whom have to keep continuously on the move in search of opportunities and better employment (Mitra, 1969:611).

In another study of India, Zachariah (1966) noted that improved transportation made the use of commuting much more popular and a substitute for migration, and that this in turn could help account for a decline in migration to Bombay and the other metropolises of India. Given the evidence of high rates of return migration and of commuting, Zachariah raises the possibility that enhanced contacts between urban and rural populations will introduce urban ideas, work discipline, better health, and a wide range of modern patterns. At the same time, because so many of these migrants maintain close contacts with their villages, they may retain rural ways of life longer and to a higher degree than permanent migrants and so may have less than the expected effect on their place of origin when they return.

Strong evidence of commuting also emerges from Dias's (1977) research on Sri Lanka, where it has been observed that as much as 45 percent of Colombo's work force commutes to the city. In fact, Dias notes that such heavy reliance on commuting relieves the city of the need to provide facilities for twice as many persons as would have to be accommodated if the temporary movers became permanent migrants. Sri Lanka seems to have a well developed, low-cost transportation network that is highly conducive to commuting and can, in turn, not only relieve the problems of cities but contribute to the development of villages through the substantial amounts of income returned there by commuters and others who temporarily migrate to the city. This finding points to the important policy implications that heavy

commuting may have for relieving pressures on cities and contributing to rural development. But because greater reliance is placed on migration as travel costs rise, the future impact of increases in transportation costs on the relative prevalence of commuting, circulation, and migration must be considered.

In contrast to a number of the optimistic assessments of the role of circulation in mitigating individual poverty and fostering rural development, as well as in relieving the pressures on urban places, Mukherji takes the view that the answer to both rural and urban poverty lies not in fostering other forms of circulation; it lies rather in changing conditions in both the village and the city by reducing rural-urban disparities, rural indebtedness, and conditions generally conducive to stagnation (Mukherji, 1977a:5; 1977c). This view is consistent with Prabhu's contention that circulation compounds the poverty of the city because the circular mover starts with a large family in the village and has not only to meet his own needs in the city but also to provide for other family members' day-to-day needs and debts. Overall, however, as Mukherji (1977a, 1977c) stresses, the detailed empirical and conceptual studies needed to provide definitive answers to the many questions raised about circulation and commuting in Asia are not yet available, precluding testing the extent to which patterns observed for Africa or Melanesia also characterize Asia.

OVERVIEW

In recent years, several efforts have been made to provide overall assessments of what is known about migration in Southeast Asia, sometimes as a part of the comparative assessment of the situation in less developed countries generally and sometimes focusing exclusively on the region itself. Regardless of which approach has been used, there is a consensus that return migration and cyclical migration are among the processes ignored by Asian analysts (Simmons, Diaz-Briquets, and Laquian, 1977:58). As Pryor (n.d.:9-10) put it,

Circular mobility is a subject requiring major research efforts, not only to measure its patterns and frequency but [also] to elucidate its social and economic role in urban and rural communities, and specifically its role in the flows of remittances and information which are hypothesized as contributing to the demographic as well as the mobility transition. Temporary movements undoubtedly create a familiarity with the urban environment and may well pave the way for later . . . more permanent locations. But the degree to which present migration fields, as tapped by censuses, are homologous with the catchment areas for 'oscillation' between town and country is not yet entirely clear.

There seems to be general agreement in the literature that both the nature and meaning of cityward migration varies greatly from country to country. Latin America is frequently pointed to as a region in which the great majority of migrants leave the countryside permanently. Whereas some may return for visits, few return to resume residence. In contrast, Africa is regarded as a region in which much of the movement is temporary, either for a few years or for the period of the mover's working life. Close ties are maintained to the village of origin and a high proportion of the migrants eventually return there. As this review has indicated, for many countries of Asia, stability of the rural population has often been cited; but whether it reflects the actual behavior of the population or is largely an artifact of the data available for analysis has justifiably begun to be questioned. Where relevant data have been obtained, the evidence seems strong for Asia generally and for Southeast Asia in particular that the general patterns of movement on the part of the rural population closely follow those in Africa and Melanesia. That is, a considerable part of the total movement is hidden by the failure to ask the right questions or to use more appropriate political or geographic units of measurement and to establish the correct overall research designs. Quite consistently, measured levels of mobility rise as the size of the units under analysis is reduced, and the extent of movement identified increases as the opportunity to record or to observe short-term movements is enhanced. The extent of circulation or return migration is far greater than censuses reveal.

Recent studies have been undertaken using residential histories or research designs that allow prospective observation. These allow better assessment of the temporary or permanent character of a move. They have their own limitations—in coverage, appropriateness of the particular questions asked, the time dimension used, or the overall design followed. Yet, their findings lend strong support to the conclusion that, "throughout the world a stream of migrants covers a spectrum from the seasonal or sporadic short-term movers seeking to supplement a meager rural income to the permanent migrant attempting to substitute one set of lifetime prospects for another" (Nelson, 1977: 20). What evidently varies from country to country and region to region is not the variety of forms of movement relied upon, but rather the particular mix of alternatives and the exact conditions under which one or another is relied upon more heavily. These conditions argue for high priority in research to factors that explain the variation in patterns that seem to exist and will undoubtedly be more fully documented as research on circulation proceeds.

In this review, attention has focused almost exclusively on voluntary migration, as stimulated by the wide range of push and pull factors operating in the multivariate complex of local situations. But involuntary rural-to-urban migration has also been of some importance in Southeast Asia, as in other parts of the less developed world (Hugo, 1978b). One might add that, partly as a result of such "forced" moves to urban places, some Asian nations now seem to have adopted policies of forced return migration designed to relieve the pressures on urban places or to increase agricultural production.

Hugo (1978b) points out that studies of refugee migration have almost always dealt with international flows, overlooking the considerable intranational rural-to-urban streams of refugees, some of them massive, that have occurred in such countries as Malaysia, the Philippines, Indonesia, and more recently Vietnam and Cambodia. To the extent that these moves were stimulated by crises arising out of wars or scarcity problems, many of the migrants presumably planned to return to the places they were forced to leave. To what extent they have, who returned and who remained, what contacts the nonreturnees have maintained with place of origin, and how government policies have affected the return rate or possibly movement to still other locations are all questions that require extensive and intensive research when the opportunities for conducting it arise.

Beyond this, as the various studies in Southeast Asia have strongly suggested, pressing need also exists for more attention to the theoretical concerns related to the conditions under which given populations resort to commuting, circulation, and migration. Zelinsky's hypothesis of the mobility transition gives inadequate attention to the wide diversity of patterns that seem to exist within a single region, such as Southeast Asia, and indeed within the same country. Pryor (n.d.: 22-23) offers a succinct criticism of the current situation when he says:

Western researchers tend to assume that "traditional" values and patterns of behavior will . . . become "modern". Evidence here and elsewhere indicates to the contrary that traditional patterns are persistent and interdependent with modern ones. . . . Nowhere is this better demonstrated than in the development of temporary mobility between rural and urban areas. . . . Circular migration is a form of rural-urban linkage which . . . paves the way for the urbanization transition by developing an individual's familiarity with different residential and work environments, contributing to the modernization of values and migration motives and providing the opportunity for chain migration.

Research priorities

The evidence already available from the studies done in Thailand and Indonesia documents the need to include attention to commuting and circulation in all forthcoming efforts to assess population movement and redistribution in the region. At a minimum, it argues for inclusion of a sufficient number of questions in censuses to allow some detection of the volume and character of return migration. This should be done not just at the provincial level but also for smaller units, such as districts, and certainly for rural and urban areas. Even if the resulting data cannot be tabulated or published, their availability on tape, if only for a sample of the total census population, would represent a major forward step toward allowing comprehensive assessment of all forms of population movement and the way in which they relate to both urbanization and the rural situation.

In national sample surveys and particularly in community surveys, the opportunity to obtain more comprehensive data on population movement is greater. Here, whenever possible, complete residential histories encompassing both temporary and permanent migration should be obtained, with concurrent attention to work histories so that assessment of commuting can be undertaken. In the process, the limitations inherent in retrospective questions must be recognized and every effort made to take advantage of innovative research techniques, including the life-cycle matrix, as a way of enhancing the quality of the data. Given the concerns with retrospective data, particularly as they relate to short-term movement, prospective studies will have to be designed and conducted in such a way as to insure maximum opportunities for follow-up so that the losses resulting from migration do not bias the data obtained in succeeding survey rounds.

Many of the Southeast Asian countries have already conducted national demographic surveys and are planning others. Even more numerous are the individual community studies being undertaken. Frequent opportunities therefore arise for obtaining a rich body of data on commuting and circulation, provided that the need for such data can be impressed upon the appropriate authorities and scholars and care is taken in execution of the study design.

The data collection must be guided both by appropriate theoretical concerns and by appropriate questions and measures. The inadequacies of Zelinsky's hypothesis of mobility transition for the less developed countries has already been cited. Building on the insights provided by the studies completed to date in Southeast Asia, as well as in Africa

and the Pacific, it is necessary to specify more clearly the historical and contemporary conditions under which commuting and circulation occur in traditional societies, and to elaborate their links to the modernization process both as cause and as effect. Above all, as Hugo (1978b:31) put it, there is a pressing need to conceptualize rural-urban mobility so that all movers, and not selective subsets only, can be distinguished from stayers and meaningful distinctions can be made between types of movers judged particularly by degree of commitment to their home place and to the place to which they move.⁵ Within this context, Hugo suggests appropriate measures of commitment, including (1) whether or not the family accompanies the mover; (2) whether land or a house or some other property continues to be owned in the village; (3) whether remittances in money or in goods are sent, and what proportion of total income these constitute; (4) what political and social role the mover plays in the village; and (5) how frequently he or she returns to it (Hugo, 1978a:37). If the distinction between temporary and permanent migrants is to be meaningful and to have standard significance for comparative research purposes, questions such as these require major attention, as do the time and space dimensions of movement. These concerns argue, too, against restricting investigations to a small number of communities whose typicality is subject to doubt, and argues for inclusion of questions in censuses and national surveys to provide the context for in-depth community studies. Such measures will serve, too, to create maximum opportunity in comparative analyses of migration and circulation to assess the effects of differences in population scale and socioeconomic conditions both within Southeast Asia and between this region and others.

Making use of registers for analysis of population movement must not be overlooked, particularly in those Southeast Asian countries where some form of register already exists. Here again, particularly for purposes of comparative analysis, care must be exercised with respect to the types of moves that are legally covered by the register and the extent to which individuals adhere to the law in reporting moves. Particular problems affecting completeness of coverage may be encountered if a registry system is viewed by some segments of the population as an effort to control rather than to assess the population. As opportunities arise to introduce register systems on a national or sample basis as part of the growing efforts to assess population dynamics,

5 For a suggested typology of rural-to-urban population mobility in a third world context, see Hugo (1978b:33).

every effort should be made to insure that they give as much attention to population movement as to births and deaths.

Through such combined efforts, and with adequate attention to the individual movers, and to the characteristics and conditions of their places of origin and destination, it should be possible to ascertain the conditions leading to the decision on the part of residents of particular locations to stay or to move. If the decision is to move, it should be possible to ascertain what factors, both individual and environmental, account for the choice, for the type of move—commuting, circulating, or migrating—and how the specific destination of the move was chosen in lieu of alternative destinations. Beyond these questions, research should inquire, especially through prospective-type studies, into the adjustment to the move, later decisions to change from one form of movement to another (for example, from commuting to circulation, or from circulation to permanent migration), alterations in intentions with respect to the temporary or permanent character of the move, and the decision on whether to return to place of origin or to move on to a new destination. For all types of moves, it is necessary to assess fully the nature of the interaction with place of origin and the effect of the interaction on the stayers. Again, some solid steps in the direction of answering these questions have already been taken in the studies done on Southeast Asia, and they provide valuable models on which to build in the future.

Policy concerns

Interest in the levels and patterns of commuting, circular movement, and migration stems from concern with the quality of life in rural and urban places. Because of the high rates of population growth in most of the countries of Southeast Asia and interest in reducing urban and rural poverty, growing attention is being focused in various countries of the region on the relation between population movement and development; on the ways in which migration contributes to the exacerbation of urban problems and the reduction of rural poverty; and on the ways in which efforts at rural development are affected by migration and in turn may contribute to migration. In view of the projected increases in rural and urban population and the anticipated continued growth of big cities in the region, these concerns take on special significance. Of particular concern is the growing rural population reservoir, which will have to be provided with adequate sources of livelihood in rural areas if massive rural-to-urban migration is not to compound the problems of cities.

Many efforts to assess the relation between population movement and the problems of cities and rural areas are hampered, however, by the lack of data on the various forms of population movement, how they have changed over time, and what functions they perform for the individual and the communities of origin and destination. A large number of questions can be raised: To what extent does one or the other form of movement in itself or in combination relieve rural pressures? To what extent does temporary migration in the form of commuting or circular movement relieve the problems that cities such as Bangkok, Manila, and Jakarta would otherwise face if all these movers were to become permanent migrants? To what extent does the interchange between urban and rural places, and particularly the interchange resulting from return movement by commuters and circular migrants, contribute to the development and modernization of rural areas through the introduction of new ideas and behavior and through the remittances of money and goods? How crucial, in fact, are such remittances for meeting the basic needs of rural locations, thereby contributing to the more equitable distribution of income generated in the cities? Does the circulation of elites, such as teachers and government officials, play a particular role in enhancing the spread of urban values or creating a disdain for rural ways, thereby encouraging in some instances the modernization of rural populations and in others the exodus of persons from villages into cities or into the jungles to join the dissidents? Should Southeast Asian governments, as Elkan (1967) and Hugo (1978a) have suggested, perhaps encourage commuting and circular movement in lieu of migration because of the lower demands such movers place on urban services and the greater contribution they make to the development of their home places? Would encouragement of even greater reliance upon commuting and circular movement continue to provide, both for the movers and for their respective communities, the advantages of continuing strong social ties associated with traditional societies and the gains from participation in the economic opportunities available in towns and cities? How do development efforts, such as improved transportation and educational systems, affect the levels of migration and circulation and what impact do these changes, in turn, have on the development process? Should governments, in fact, go beyond the "naturally evolved" patterns of urban growth and population movement and adopt policies designed to create growth centers in other parts of the Southeast Asian countries? By their very presence, and by the opportunities they provide for diverting migrants from the big cities and encouraging additional commuting

and circular movement, such centers may both alleviate the pressures on existing cities and rural areas and create further opportunities for rural and urban interchange, with whatever beneficial effects this interchange can produce.

Above all, the heavy reliance by Southeast Asian rural populations upon commuting and circular movement and the potential high levels of interaction between urban and rural places that this reliance signifies for the present and the future indicate a need for integrated development planning—integrated in the sense that it attempts to take account of the needs of the rural and the urban populations concurrently. In developing a planning strategy, it is important to stress linkages rather than the differences between rural and urban populations. This can perhaps be done best by recognizing that there are many people in Southeast Asia and elsewhere who are neither exclusively rural nor exclusively urban but partly-both, because of their bi-local or even multi-local residence patterns. The interests of these individual movers as well as of the rural and urban communities of which they are a part and toward which they make important contributions can best be met by policies that take account of the needs of the rural population, the needs of the urban population, and the needs in both locations of those persons who move between them for shorter or longer periods.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnold, Fred, and Supani Boonpratuang

- 1976 *1970 Population and Housing Census: Migration*. Subject Report no. 2. Bangkok: National Statistical Office.

Bedford, Richard D.

- 1973a *New Hebridean Mobility: A Study of Circular Migration*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- 1973b A transition in circular mobility: population movement in the New Hebrides, 1800–1970. In H. Brookfield, ed., *The Pacific in Transition: Geographical Perspectives on Adaptation and Change*, pp. 187–227. London: Arnold Publishers.

Bedford, Richard D., and A.F. Mamak

- 1976 Bougainvilleans in urban wage employment: aspects of migrant flows and adaptive strategies. *Oceania* 46:169–87.

Bose, Ashish

- 1975 Basic data needed for the study of urbanization: a case study of the Indian census. In Sidney Goldstein and David Sly, eds., *Basic Data Needed for the Study of Urbanization*, pp. 71–100. Liège: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population.

Chapman, Murray

- 1974 Mobility in a non-literate society: method and analysis for two Guadalcanal communities. In Leszek A. Kosinski and R. Mansell Prothero, eds., *People on the Move: Studies on Internal Migration*, pp. 129–45. London: Methuen & Co.
- 1976 Tribal mobility as circulation: a Solomon Islands example of micro/macro linkages. In Leszek A. Kosinski and John W. Webb, eds., *Population at Microscale*, pp. 127–42. Christchurch: New Zealand Geographical Society.
- 1977a Circulation studies at the East-West Population Institute. *Indonesian Journal of Geography* 7:1–4.
- 1977b International seminar on the cross-cultural study of circulation. National Science Foundation conference proposal (mimeographed), East-West Population Institute, Honolulu.

Chapman, Murray, and R. Mansell Prothero

- 1977 Circulation between home places and towns: a village approach to urbanization. Paper presented at Working Session on Urbanization in the Pacific, Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania, Monterey, California, March.

Cho, Lee-Jay, ed.

- 1976 *Introduction to Censuses of Asia and the Pacific, 1970-74*. Honolulu: East-West Population Institute, East-West Center.

Conroy, J.D.

- 1977 A longitudinal study of school leaver migration. In R.J. May, ed., *Change and Movement*, pp. 96-115. Canberra: Australian University Press.

del Rosario, Juan, Maria Lourdes, and Yun Kim

- 1977 Migration differentials by migration types in the Philippines: a study of migration typology and differentials, 1970. Paper presented at IUSSP General Conference, Mexico City, August.

Dias, Hiran D.

- 1977 Dispersal of human settlements: a study of the Sri Lanka experience. Paper prepared for ESCAP Expert Group Meeting on Migration and Human Settlements, Bangkok, June.

East-West Population Institute

- 1978 *Summary Report of the 8th Summer Seminar in Population, 13 June-15 July 1977*. Honolulu: East-West Population Institute, East-West Center.

Eldridge, Hope T.

- 1965 Primary, secondary, and return migration in the United States, 1955-1960. *Demography* 2:445-55.

Elkan, Walter

- 1967 Circular migration and the growth of towns in East Africa. *International Labour Review* 96:581-89.

Findley, Sally

- 1977 *Planning for Internal Migration*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Goldstein, Sidney

- 1964 The extent of repeated migration: an analysis based on the Danish population register. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 59:1121-32.
- 1975 Urbanization and migration in Southeast Asia. In Yunshik Chang and Peter Donaldson, eds., *Population Change in the Pacific Region*, pp. 69-92. Vancouver: Thirteenth Pacific Science Congress.
- 1976 Facets of redistribution: research challenges and opportunities. *Demography* 13:423-34.

- 1977 Urbanization, migration, and fertility in Thailand. Report prepared for Center for Population Research, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Washington, D.C.
- Goldstein, Sidney, Pichit Pitaktpsombati, and Alice Goldstein
- 1976 Migration and urban growth in Thailand. In Anthony H. Richmond and Daniel Kubit, eds., *Internal Migration: The New World and the Third World*, pp. 116-47. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Goldstein, Sidney, and David F. Sly, eds.
- 1975 *Basic Data Needed for the Study of Urbanization*. Liège: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population.
- Gould, W.T.S., and R. Mansell Prothero
- 1975 Space and time in African population. In Leszek Kosinski and R. Mansell Prothero, eds., *People on the Move*, pp. 39-49. London: Methuen & Co.
- Hendershot, Gerry E.
- 1971 Cityward migration and urban fertility in the Philippines. *Philippine Sociological Review* 19:183-91.
- Hugo, Graeme
- 1975 Population mobility in West Java. Ph.D. dissertation, Research School of Social Science, Australian National University, Canberra.
- 1977a Commuting, circulation, and migration in West Java: policy implications. Paper prepared for Workshop on Circular Mobility and Policy, East-West Center, Honolulu, June.
- 1977b An investigation into population mobility in South Sulawesi, Indonesia. Mimeographed research proposal, Department of Anthropology, Flinders University of South Australia, Bedford Park.
- 1978a Circulation in West Java, Indonesia. In R. Mansell Prothero and Murray Chapman, eds., *Circulation: Population Movement in Developing Countries*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul (in press).
- 1978b New conceptual approaches to migration in the context of urbanization: a discussion based on Indonesian experience. Paper prepared for the seminar New Conceptual Approaches to Migration in the Context of Urbanization, IUSSP Committee on Urbanization and Population Redistribution, Bellagio, Italy, June 1978.
- Keeny, S.M.
- 1973 East Asia review, 1972. *Studies in Family Planning* 4:101-31.

Kunstadter, Peter, et al.

- 1977 Migration, urbanization, and development: current studies at the East-West Population Institute and suggestions for future research. Paper prepared for ESCAP Expert Group Meeting on Migration and Human Settlement, Bangkok, June.

Lauro, Donald

- 1975 Reconstructing village demographic history from genealogical data. Mimeographed report, Department of Demography, Australian National University, Canberra.
- 1977a Continuities and discontinuities in Thai villager mobility: an approach to mobility research. Mimeographed draft report, East-West Population Institute, Honolulu.
- 1977b Life history matrix analysis: progress report. Report prepared for East-West Population Institute, Honolulu, October.

Lipton, Michael

- 1977 *Why Poor People Stay Poor*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Liu, Paul K.C., and Alden Speare, Jr.

- 1973 Urbanization and labor mobility in Taiwan. Paper presented at International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP) International Population Conference, Liège.

McGee, T.G.

- 1975 Rural-urban mobility in South and Southeast Asia. Different populations . . . different answers? Paper presented at Seminar on Human Migration: Patterns, Implications, and Policies, Department of Human Geography, Australian National University, Canberra, April.

Mantra, Ida Bagoes

- 1977 Commuting, circulation, and migration in Yogyakarta special region: a case study of two *dukuh*, Kadirojo and Piring. Paper presented at Workshop on Circular Mobility and Policy, East-West Center, Honolulu, June.
- 1978 Population movement in wet-rice communities: a case study of two *dukuh* in Yogyakarta special region. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

Meinkoth, Marian Richards

- 1962 Migration in Thailand with particular reference to the Northeast. *Economics and Business Bulletin* 14:2-45.

Mitchell, J. Clyde

- 1961 The causes of labour migration. In *Migrant Labour in Africa South of the Sahara*. Publication no. 79, pp. 259–86. London: Commission for Technical Cooperation in Africa South of the Sahara.

Mitra, A.

- 1969 Internal migration and urbanization in India, 1961. In W.D. Borrie and Monag Cameron, eds., *Population Change: Asia and Oceania*, pp. 607–14. Canberra: Department of Demography, Australian National University.

Mukherji, Shekar

- 1977a Circular mobility, wage labour displacements, and policy: a cross-cultural comparison of circulation in Hawaii and India. Mimeographed research proposal, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.
- 1977b A note on circulation. Mimeographed report, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.
- 1977c Spatial disorganization and internal migration in India: alternative strategies for restructuring the space economy and development. Paper presented to the Expert Group Meeting on Population Growth and Economic Development in Subnational Areas, ESCAP, Bangkok.

Nagata, Judith A.

- 1974 Urban interlude: some aspects of internal migration in West Malaysia. *International Migration Review* 8:301–24.

Naim, Mochtar

- 1976 Voluntary migration in Indonesia. In Anthony H. Richmond and Daniel Kubat, eds., *Internal Migration: The New World and the Third World*, pp. 148–83. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Nelson, Joan M.

- 1976a Sojourners versus new urbanites: causes and consequences of temporary versus permanent cityward migration in developing countries. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 24: 721–57.
- 1976b *Temporary versus Permanent Cityward Migration: Causes and Consequences*. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- 1977 Population redistribution policies and migrants' choices. Mimeographed report, Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, Baltimore.

Pernia, Ernesto M.

- 1975 Philippine migration streams: demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. Research Note no. 51. Manila: Population Institute, University of the Philippines.

Prabhu, P.N.

- 1956 A study of the social effects of urbanization. In *The Social Implications of Industrialization and Urbanization*. Calcutta: UNESCO.

Prachuabmoh, Visid, and Penporn Tirasawat

- 1973 Internal migration in Thailand, 1947–1972. Paper no. 7. Bangkok: Institute of Population Studies, Chulalongkorn University.

Premi, Mahendra K.

- 1976 Out-migration from urban places. In Anthony H. Richmond and Daniel Kubat, eds., *Internal Migration: The New World and the Third World*, pp. 103–15. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Prothero, R. Mansell

- 1977 Typology of population mobility. Paper presented at Population Studies and Training Center, Brown University.

Pryor, Robin

- n.d. Migration and development in South East Asia: a demographic perspective. Unpublished manuscript, Australian National University, Canberra.
- 1975 The migrant to the city in South East Asia—can, and should we generalize? Canberra: Australian National University. (Mimeographed.)

Shryock, Henry, Jacob Siegel, and associates

- 1971 *The Methods and Materials of Demography*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Simkins, Paul

- 1976 Private communication.

Simmons, Alan, Sergio Diaz-Briquets, and Aprodicio A. Laquian

- 1977 *Social Change and Internal Migration*, IDRC-TS6e. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

Singhanetra-Renard, Anchalee

- 1977 Circular mobility of the northern Thai village. Mimeographed report, East-West Population Institute, Honolulu.

Speare, Alden, Jr.

- 1976 *Migration Decisions in Taiwan*. Providence, R.I.: Population Studies and Training Center, Brown University.

Stamper, B. Maxwell

- 1973 Population policy in development planning. *Reports on Population/Family Planning* 13:1-30.

Strange, Heather

- 1976 Village paths and city routes. Paper presented at Conference on Women and Development, Wellesley, Mass., June.

Strauch, Judith

- 1977 Cyclical labor migration among Chinese in Hong Kong and Malaysia. Mimeographed report, Department of Anthropology, Harvard University.

Suharso, Alden Speare, Jr., Han R. Redmana, and Imron Husin

- 1976 *Rural-Urban Migration in Indonesia*. Jakarta: LEKNAS-LIPI.

Sutlive, Vinson H., Jr.

- 1977 A comparison of urban migration in Sarawak and the Philippines. *Urban Anthropology* 6:355-69.

Textor, Robert B.

- 1956 The northeast samlor driver in Bangkok. In *The Social Implications of Industrialization and Urbanization*. Calcutta: UNESCO.

United Nations

- 1967 *Principles and Recommendations for the 1970 Population Censuses*. Series M, no. 44. New York: United Nations.
- 1971 *Manual VI: Methods of Measuring Internal Migration*. ST/SEA/ Series A/47. New York: United Nations.

United Nations Population Division

- 1975a *Trends and Prospects in the Population of Urban Agglomerates, 1950-2000*. ESA/P/WP.58. New York: United Nations.
- 1975b *Trends and Prospects in Urban and Rural Population, 1950-2000, as Assessed in 1973-1974*. ESA/P/WP.54. New York: United Nations.

van den Muijzenberg, Otto D.

- 1973 *Horizontale Mobiliteit in Centraal Luzon* (Horizontal Mobility in Central Luzon). Publication no. 19. Amsterdam: Center for Anthropological and Sociological Studies, University of Amsterdam.

- 1975 Involution or evolution in Central Luzon? In Henry J.M. Classen and Peter Kloos, eds., *Current Anthropology in the Netherlands*, pp. 141-55. The Hague: N.S.A.V./Staatsdrukkerij.
- Watson, James L.
- 1974 *Emigration and the Chinese Lineage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weherman, Glen
- 1977 Population mobility in Jakarta and Yogyakarta. Unpublished honors thesis, Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia.
- Whitney, Vincent H.
- 1976 Population planning in Asia in the 1970s. *Population Studies* 30: 337-51.
- Wilson, Godfrey
- 1941, *An Essay on the Economics of Detribalization in Northern Rhodesia*, Parts 1 and 2. Rhodes-Livingstone Papers nos. 5 and 6.
1942 Livingstone: Rhodes-Livingstone Institute.
- Yin, Chien-Chung
- 1976 Voluntary associations as an adaptive mechanism in the process of rural-urban migration: a Chinese case study. Mimeographed report, Taipei.
- Zachariah, K.D.
- 1966 Bombay migration study. *Demography* 3:378-92.
- 1969 Internal migration and urbanization. In W.D. Boorie and Morag Cameron, eds., *Population Change: Asia and Oceania*, pp. 615-22. Canberra: Department of Demography, Australian National University.
- Zelinsky, Wilbur
- 1971 The hypothesis of the mobility transition. *Geographical Review* 61:219-49.

RECENT AVAILABLE PAPERS OF THE EAST-WEST POPULATION INSTITUTE

No.

- 28 The demographic situation in Indonesia, by Geoffrey McNicoll and Si Gde Made Mamas, December 1973, 59 + vii pp.
- 30 Demographic research in Japan, 1955-70: a survey and selected bibliography, by Y. Scott Matsumoto, April 1974, 78 + v pp.
- 32 The value of children in Asia and the United States: comparative perspectives, by James T. Fawcett et al., July 1974, 69 + vii pp.
- 33 The present and prospective state of policy approaches to fertility, by Ozzie G. Simmons and Lyle Saunders, June 1975, 25 + v pp.
- 34 Female labor force participation in a modernizing society: Malaya and Singapore, 1921-1957, by Monica S. Fong, June 1975, 39 + vii pp.
- 35 Fertility socialization research in the United States: a progress report, by Susan O. Gustavus, July 1975, 19 + v pp.
- 36 Data relevant to socialization in the U.S. national fertility surveys, by Larry L. Bumpass, December 1975, 14 + v pp.
- 37 Some sociological suggestions concerning the reduction of fertility in developing countries, by Norman B. Ryder, January 1976, 14 + v pp.
- 38 Future autobiographies: expectations of marriage, children, and careers, by Nancy E. Williamson, Sandra L. Putnam, and H. Regina Wurthmann, February 1976, 29 + v pp.
- 39 The development of family size and sex composition norms among U.S.-children, by Gerald E. Markle and Robert F. Wait, September 1976, 23 + vii pp.
- 40 Urbanization in the Philippines: historical and comparative perspectives, by Ernesto M. Pernia, November 1976, 38 + v pp.
- 41 A method of decomposing urban population growth and an application to Philippine data, by Ernesto M. Pernia, December 1976, 26 + v pp.
- 42 Methodological difficulties encountered in using own-children data: illustrations from the United States, by Ronald R. Rindfuss, February 1977, 17 + v pp.
- 43 The fertility of migrants to urban places in Thailand, by Sidney Goldstein and Penporn Tirasawat, April 1977, 49 + v pp.
- 44 The demographic situation in the Philippines: an assessment in 1977, by Mercedes B. Concepción and Peter C. Smith, June 1977, 75 + vii pp.
- 45 The demographic situation in Thailand, by Fred Arnold, Robert D. Retherford, and Anuri Wanglee, July 1977, 35 + vii pp.
- 46 The role of migration and population distribution in Japan's demographic transition, by Toshio Kuroda, July 1977, 17 + v pp.
- 47 The recent fertility decline in the Chiang Mai area of Thailand, by Tieng Pardthaisong, February 1978, 36 + vii pp.
- 48 Spatial analysis of family planning program effects in Taiwan, 1966-72, by Albert I. Hermalin, April 1978, 39 + vii pp.
- 49 Gains from population control: results from an econometric model, by Daniel B. Suits and Andrew Mason, April 1978, 22 + v pp.
- 50 The economic value of children in Asia and Africa: comparative perspectives, by Helen Ware, April 1978, 36 + v pp.
- 51 Rural-urban migration and social mobility: studies of three South Korean cities, by Man-Gap Lee and Herbert R. Barringer, May 1978, 44 + vii pp.
- 52 Preliminary estimates of Indonesian fertility based on the 1976 Intercensal Population Survey, by Sam Suharto and Lee-Jay Cho, May 1978, 21 + v pp.

THE EAST-WEST CENTER—officially known as the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West—is a national educational institution established in Hawaii by the U.S. Congress in 1960 to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training, and research. The Center is administered by a public, nonprofit corporation whose international Board of Governors consists of distinguished scholars, business leaders, and public servants.

Each year more than 1,500 men and women from many nations and cultures participate in Center programs that seek cooperative solutions to problems of mutual consequence to East and West. Working with the Center's multidisciplinary and multicultural staff, participants include visiting scholars and researchers; leaders and professionals from the academic, government, and business communities; and graduate degree students, most of whom are enrolled at the University of Hawaii. For each Center participant from the United States, two participants are sought from the Asian and Pacific area.

Center programs are conducted by institutes addressing problems of communication, culture learning, environment and policy, population, and resource systems. A limited number of "open" grants are available to degree scholars and research fellows whose academic interests are not encompassed by institute programs.

The U.S. Congress provides basic funding for Center programs and a variety of awards to participants. Because of the cooperative nature of Center programs, financial support and cost-sharing are also provided by Asian and Pacific governments, regional agencies, private enterprise, and foundations. The Center is on land adjacent to and provided by the University of Hawaii.

THE EAST-WEST POPULATION INSTITUTE, established as a unit of the East-West Center in 1969 with the assistance of a grant from the Agency for International Development, carries out multidisciplinary research, training, and related activities in the field of population, placing emphasis on economic, social, psychological, and environmental aspects of population problems in Asia, the Pacific, and the United States.

East-West Population Institute
East-West Center
1777 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848

Director *Lee-Jay Cho*
Publications Officer *Sandra E. Ward*
Editor *Elizabeth B. Gould*
Production Specialist *Lois M. Bender*
Cartographer *Gregory Chu*

