VITA

Human migration: concepts and approaches

Sinha, B.R.K.[1]

Concepts and approaches are the basic aspects of any study as the entire contents of a subject depend largely on its concepts and approaches. Concept is an idea of a particular theme and approach is a way of dealing with it. Both are crucial and set a new direction in the study of a particular subject. In the context of human migration concepts and approaches form a complex interconnections to our understanding of the process of spatial organization because migration is an important and multidimensional element of population processes. Newell, Colin (1988, 82 p.) considered migration as one of the important components of population change. Similarly, in the words of Kammeyer, K.C.W.–Ginn, H. L. (1988, 108 p.) migration is one of the three processes of population change.

According to Demko, G. J.–Ross, H.M–Schnell, G.A. (1970, pp. 286–287) migration is the most complex component of population change. It provides an important network for the diffusion of ideas and information and indicates symptoms of social and economic change, and can be regarded as a human adjustment to economic, environmental, and social problems. In addition, migration is the component of change most difficult to project because of the uncertainty associated with the decision to change one's place of residence. Dudley, Krik (1970, 300 p.) described population migration as an expression of interaction over space but differs in certain essential characteristics from other channels of interaction, mainly in terms of commodity, which is being transported. Migration is viewed as a form of individual or group adaptation to perceived changes in environment. Chapman, Keith (1979, pp. 140–142) considered migration as a good example of relocation diffusion since no body can literally be in two places at once.

However, to regard migration as an example of relocation diffusion does not explain the forces underlying the individual decisions to move. In the words of Zelinsky, W. (1966, pp. 43–44) migration is a cultural phenomena and a dynamic element, probably more than fertility and mortality, in population. Migration is a result of over-all design of a society within which economic, social, demographic and other types of behaviour are enfolded. According to Trewartha, G.T. (1969, 135 p.) migration is an indicator of racial, linguistic and nationalistic mixing of earth's population. Shrivastava, O.S. (1983, 157 p.) opined that migration is an instrument of cultural diffusion and social integration of it may create 'communities within the community'. Similarly, migration can be considered as a means of spatial interaction too. Ogden, P.E. (1984, preface) interpreted migration as a part of the wider study of population geography and as an important element in the understanding of the geographical organization of human society.

[1] Professor of Geography, Visva-Bharati University, Shantiniketan – 731235, W.B., India. E-mail: sinha_brk@yahoo.com

In brief, migration of population, in space and time with aid, advice and consent of nature and earth of opportunities, is a special and an important topic of study in a human branch of geography. It creates a particular niche especially in the fields of population geography. It is very complicated and problematic global issue and draws attention of scientists of various specialties. Especially for population geographers, it is very interesting topic of research because of its inherently spatial character.

Concepts and meaning of migration

As mentioned above that migration is a very complicated global issue, no one has yet provided any such concept or basis which can be universally, in all circumstances or in all situation or in all sense accepted as standard criteria applicable at all spatial units or scales (such as local, regional, national and international) and can really make a perfect definition of migration that can be free from any sort of question.

The views of the following scholars provide us a clearer picture of the concepts and approaches of defining human migration.

CLARKE, J.I. (1965, 123 p.) said, 'there is no unanimity over the meaning of migration' though many consider it as movement involving a change of residence of substantial duration. On the basis of this definition one should exclude the constant movement of pastoral nomads, the temporary movement of tourists and the daily movement of commuters, but there is little justification for their exclusion merely because we have no satisfactory term, which encompasses the numerous spatial movements of populations. Clarke was of the opinion that migration cannot be defined perfectly as it involves a wider range of elements. Therefore, definition of human migration remains inconclusive.

TREWARTHA, G.T. (1969, 136 p.) placed emphasis on distance, human will and change in permanent residence in migration. He described that the term 'migration' has various shades of meaning. Most commonly migration involves a movement of some distance, which results in a change in permanent residence. But, according to him, this restrictive definition would exclude other types of human mobility, including the daily trek of commuters between a city center and its peripheral areas, the seasonal shifts of migrant workers, the temporary and irregular movements of tourists, and the wanderings of pastoral nomads. Hence the usual definition of migration is stretched so that it may include a wide range of population mobility, even though space may not permit a meaningful discussion of all forms.

According to DEMKO, G. J.–ROSS, H.M–SCHNELL, G.A. (1970, 286 p.) definition of migration or typology is generally based on change in residence, journey to work, types of boundaries crossed, and many others. LEE, E.S. (1970, 290 p.) in his theory of migration made an attempt to provide a theoretical background for the spatial movement of populations. In his words 'migration is defined broadly as a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence'. In his opinion, no restriction is placed upon the distance of the move or upon the voluntary or involuntary nature of the act and no distinction is made between external and internal migration. According to him, not all kinds of spatial mobility are included in migration. For example, a move from one apartment to another, continual movements of nomads and migratory workers, a move from plain to mountain are not migration.

EISENSTADT, S.N. (1953, pp. 167–180) defined migration as the physical transition of an individual or a group from one society to another. This transition normally involves abandoning one social setting and entering another, and different one. His emphasis is mainly on leaving a whole set of social life of a person's previous residential region and establishing a new set of social life in a latter or new region where he migrated and decided to live.

Zᴇʟɪɴꜱᴋʏ, W. (1971, pp. 219–225) defined 'migration as the perceptible and simultaneous shifts in both spatial and social locus …'. He put stress on territorial movements and stated that not all form of spatial mobility may be regarded as migration. Migration implies a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence and therefore excludes, e.g. commuters, holidaymakers and students moving temporary between family home and college. These from of mobility are often designated as circulation. According to him a true definition of migration requires several dimensions or criteria.

Mɪꜱʜʀᴀ, S.K. (1981, pp. 227–228) defines migration as an inflow or outflow of population from a defined region to another region for a permanent or semi-permanent settlement. His approach of defining migration does not cover other relevant criteria and seems unsound.

According to Rᴏꜱꜱ, J.A. (1982, pp. 448–449) migration is a geographic mobility that involves a change of usual residence between defined political or statistical areas, or between residence areas of different types. The meaning of 'change in residence' here is for relatively permanent. The words 'defined political or statistical or geographic areas' are meant for certain areas surrounded by a definite political or statistical or geographic boundary or line. Migration also entails the length of stay in terms of time span and purpose.

The United Nations (1970, No. 47) recommended an intended duration of stay of more than one year with a purpose of job for a permanent migration and one year or less than one year for temporary migrant provided he/she receives pay from sources within the country he/she enters. Similarly, if a person remains in another country with no legal identity for a period of one year or less is called refugee, or displaced person or transferred person. This approach of classification does not provide us clear picture of the type of job obtained and the mode of payment followed. Secondly, this is mainly applicable for international migration. For internal migration most countries follow 'place of birth' at the time of enumeration in destination region as a criteria in measuring migration.

In the words of Sʜʀɪᴠᴀꜱᴛᴀᴠᴀ, O.S. (1983, pp. 137 and 144) migration means a permanent, or at least for a considerable period of time, departure for a place which is not just nearby. According to him, if a person is residing at a place but was not born in that place he/she is regarded as migrant. This definition may be logical particularly at the time of census enumeration.

Nᴇᴡᴍᴀɴ, J.L.–Mᴀᴛᴢᴋᴇ, G.E. (1984, pp. 159–162) have critically analyzed the concepts of migration. According to them, "most definitions focus on the notion of a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence in order to distinguish migration from circulation. The latter does not involve a change of residence and includes such daily movement as commuting to and from work, shopping trips, and vacations. Both migration and circulation are included under the broader heading of population mobility".

In order to make the concept of definition more clear they have raised some questions relating to span of time applicable to permanent or semi-permanent change in residence, intention of a mover, length of distance a migrant (mover) covers, an enumeration unit boundary a migrant crosses, etc. Regarding time span of over one-year (often taken as the accepted duration for either permanent or semi-permanent change in residence) they pointed out, "some highly migratory groups (street people in the United States and Gypsies in Eastern Europe, for example) do not settle for as long as one year in a given place and so would be excluded under this definitional restriction".

About an intention or motive of a mover they pointed out the methodological problem of the availability of data. On distance issue they stressed-whether a person moving from one apartment to another covering some distance within the same city / community or a person moving from one place to another within the same defined geographical or political unit or within district would be considered a migrant? In other words, how far must one move to be considered a migrant? In their opinion, the length of distance between two points in space must be related to political boundary that exists between the two spatial or enumeration units (e.g. place of origin and destination place). They developed and used a good cartographic model of origin, destination, and non-movers (Figures 7.1, 162 p.) to solve the boundary problem in the definition of migration. This model explains that a person mov-

ing within the same administrative unit, no matter the distance between his origin and destination points is greater, is not considered as a migrant. It is only because of not crossing a political boundary. Opposite to this, a person who crosses a political boundary between his origin and destination place (no matter the length of distance between origin and destination points is shorter) is considered a migrant. Those not moving anywhere are called non-movers or stayers.

Sometimes it also happens that a person has his multiple residence in different administrative units, say in two or three district or states. In this case, it would be very difficult to define him a migrant. Therefore, merely crossing a political boundary does not seem a standard criterion in defining migration.

Lastly, Newman, J.L.–Matzke, G.E. (1984 76 p.) too accepted that 'migration' is not an analytically sharp concept. Definitions are largely situational depending on the investigator's particular need and objectives.

Goldscheider, C. (1971, 64 p.) defines migration as any permanent change in residence. It involves the detachments from the organization of activities at one place and the movement of the total round of activities to another. Similar is the opinion of Week, J.R. (1989, pp. 186 & 214) also. According to him migration is the process of changing residence and moving your whole round of social activities form one place to another. He laid emphasis on crossing political boundaries (for example, country line, state line, international border). The U.S. census Bureau classifies those persons as migrants who cross any political boundary. If a person changed his residence but stayed within the same county, then the Census Bureau would call him a mover not migrant. In other words, all migrants are movers but not all movers are migrants. Every migrant has his origin place (the place he left behind) and destination (the place he reached). Their definitions are mainly based on the residential mobility form an origin place to a destination place. In between these two places, a certain kind of political boundary lies, which is to be crossed by a migrant. They have not mentioned anything about-how long time does a permanent change in residence require?

Ghosh, B.N. (1989, 34 p.) considers migration as a change of place of living for almost a long, stable period. It implies giving up of some political boundaries. When people leave one place and go to a new place for a temporary span of time it is no migration from the demographic point of view. He also considers migration as a process of shifting home not the house. This definition focuses on change of place of living, long or stable period of item and crossing of political boundary, but does not clearly state the number of years a long or stable period of time should include to define a permanent or temporary migration.

Chandna, R.C. (1998, 86 p.) defines migration as a movement that involves a permanent or semi-permanent change in residence from one settlement to another migration in other words, is a physical and social transaction and hence difficult to conceptualize. His definition deals mainly with the residential change and physical distance. It does not explain the criteria upon which the status of permanent or semi-permanent change in residence can be precisely defined.

Kammeyer, K.C.W.–Ginn, H. L. (1988, pp. 108–109) define migration as the movement of individuals or groups from one place of residence to another when they have the intention of remaining in the new place for some substantial period of time. This definition seems straightforward, yet several questions arise:

– Would a change in permanent residence include an individual who moves from one apartment to another or perhaps into a townhouse only one block away?

– Would a person have to move across a political boundary in order to be a migrant?

– How long is the substantial period of time that one must intend to remain in his or her new residence before it is considered as migration?

– How long is a person classified as a migrant after a move?

The answers of all these questions lie in operational definition, which relates to political boundaries and time period. Political boundary acts as a divider between a migrant and non-migrant or

mover. When a person changes his/her residence and crosses a political boundary, called as 'migrant' and when a person moves and changes his/her residence but remains within the same community, city or district, called as 'mover'. For example, a person moving from one apartment to another or from one locality to another in the same town or in the same political unit is called a mover not migrant, while a person moving from Bihar to Punjab with the intention to settle down there is called a migrant.

Regarding time frame, there is no internationally accepted concept or standard time scale. However, the U.S. Census Bureau frequently uses a five-year migration interval. All people who are residing in different county or state for the last five-years from the date of census count are considered as migrant. If people move more than one time during the five-year interval, only the last move is recorded. It is possible for some one to have moved from one county to another and back to the original county (district) during that time. It is the case of return migrant.

Therefore, the actual migration interval used depends upon the issue being explored. In some cases the interval may be quite short and in some other cases it may be quite long. In Indian context, Census of India considers those also as migrants who have changed the place of residence even during less than one year.

Darsky, L.Y. (1978, 49 p.) considered migration as a mechanical movement of population. In broader sense, it is territorial shifting of people, either permanent linked with a change of domicile or temporary. This definition focuses mainly on the movement of people from one territorial unit to another. It does not explain other criteria that are involved in defining migration.

Rubenstein, J.M.–Bacon, R.S. (1990, 75 p.) defines migration as a permanent move to a new location. It must be distinguished from the more general term 'mobility', which refers to all types of movements by people. For example all journeys to work, shops and school would be forms of mobility. These are examples of periodic or cyclical movement. Migration implies a permanent change in residence, the location where one sleeps and stores possessions. The new location to which people move may be either another county or another place within the same country.

According to Johnston, R.J. and Smith David (1994, 380 p.) migration is permanent or semi-permanent change of residence of an individual or group of people. Another aspect of migration is boundary of some sort to have been crossed and a certain length of time to have been spent over that boundary in new area of residence. This definition is mainly based on the concept of residential change, boundary to be crossed and the length of time to be spent in new area, but does not explain specifically about any agreed length time (in terms of year) that is always applicable.

From the above it is found that different scholars have adopted different approaches and defined migration differently but the common elements as involved in their definitions are: residential change (preferably permanent), distance travelled, place of birth, kind of boundary crossed, intention of stay and length of time spent in the new place or residence area. However, these elements are noticed having some sort of questions and limitations in defining a perfect definition. Thus, despite all the above scholarly definitions one finds that no universally accepted standard criteria for defining migration have yet been evolved, hence the concepts of migration remain inconclusive.

Since we have some sort of methodological problems in providing a commonly accepted definition, author attempts to present a definition, which may reduce some question marks from it. Migration is ubiquitous process of movement of individual or a group of people from one spatial unit or place of residence (known as origin place) to another (called as destination place) defined by any kind of commonly agreed geographical or political or administrative boundary in space and time. The movement between the defined origin and destination place is termed as spatial or territorial movement. Through such spatial or territorial movement a mover finds change in his or her residence, which may be either permanent or semi-permanent or temporary. Such movers are usually found residing in a house (no matter it is owned or hired), and engaged in some sort of source (economic activities) of their livelihood (in case of the working persons) and sharing or consuming the resources of the area they entered (in context of working and non-working persons) at particular point of time of enumeration.

Now, the question of – who is migrant or who is not migrant?, and who is permanent or who is temporary migrant?, can be solved by evolving an internationally or universally accepted standard scale with reference to migration criteria. Therefore, with a view to classify a mover as migrant or non-migrant one must obtain data (at particular point of time) from the movers about the purpose or intention of their move (such as education, service/job, settlement, marriage, tour, visit, refuge, etc) the boundary/borders crossed, distance travelled, the length of time they already spent in the destination area at the time of enumeration. For permanent migration a mover must cross any kind of boundary or border (such as political, administrative or geographical) no matter the distance between origin and destination place is longer or shorter. They must spend either more than a year time (to be called permanent) or one year or less than this (to be called temporary) as suggested by the U.S. Census Bureau and the United Nations and agreed by all. If this is not accepted, geographers at global level must formulate and fix a certain period of time as standard scale to be applicable for both the permanent and temporary migration. Hand in hand movers must also declare their intention of continuing in the new place of residence for quite a substantial period of time, no matter their intention would change after the time of enumeration.

Regarding migrant or non-migrant, one should make distinction among the terms 'mobility', 'migration', and 'circulation'. Mobility is a rather more general term than migr-ation, covering all kinds of spatial or territorial movements of whatever distance, duration or degree of permanence. Circulation is a short-term, repetitive or cyclic movement, and has in common the lack of any declared intention of a permanent or long lasting change in residence as apposed to migration. Therefore, those having no any declared intention of a permanent or long-lasting change in residence in new place or destination area are known as non-migrant. This includes students, tourists, visitors, commuters, holidaymakers or vacationers, refugees (illegal entry) and some other persons of such categories. They are generally non-residents intending to remain for one year or less without engaging in an occupation within the country (CLARKE, J.I. 1965, 124 p.).

The question of possession of multiple residence of a migrant does not seem so significant and valid once a migrant occupies a new residence in destination area and shares and consumes the resources of that for their livelihood. The same migrant cannot use at the same time one residence in the origin and another in the destination place. For example, such person cooks, eats, sleeps, and spends time only in the residence of destination area not in previous area. Similarly, the problem of counting of the same migrant several times at the time of censuses can be solved by making the range of period of time of migration, e.g. migrants of the last one year, of the last five years, of the last ten years or so on, or as per the purpose of investigation.

Concepts and approaches of classifying migration

Concepts and approaches of classifying migrations are another important aspect of migration study. Any typological or classificatory scheme of migration involves very complicated and multidimensional criteria. TREWARTHA, G.T. (1969, 141 p.) and UYANGA, J. (1981, 35 p.) also advocated that any classification of migrations is difficult to formulate and understand because it takes into consideration numerous criteria or stimulating factors of varying nature.

Migration is usually categorized depending upon the type of *political boundaries* such as county line, state line, and international border and also according to the point of origin and destination. The major distinction however, is simply between internal and international migration (WEEKS, J.R. 1989, 186 p.). NEWMAN, J.L.–MATZKE, G.E. (1984, p. 160), GHOSH, B.N. (1987, 37 p.), CHANDNA, R.C. (1998, 88 p.), and RAJ, H. (1981, 210 p.) also took into consideration the political boundaries such as village boundary, Community Development Block boundary, district boundary,

state boundary, for national or internal migrations and national boundary or international border for international or external migration. When a migration takes place within a country by crossing either village or district or state boundary, it is known as national or internal migration and the persons associated with it are called in-migrants and out-migrants. When migrants cross international boundary, it becomes international migration. Such migrants are known as immigrants and emigrants too. Thus, depending upon the kinds of *political or administrative boundaries crossed* migration can be known as village to village, Block to Block, district to district, state to state (within the nation under the category of national migration), and from country to country and from continent to continent under the category of international migration. Such classification is based on the concepts and approach of political units and boundaries crossed.

Depending upon *length of time* migration may be classified as short-term and long-term migration as well as temporary or permanent migration. CHANDNA, R.C. (1998, 88 p.) is also of the opinion that migration can be classified as short-terms migration and long-term migration as well as permanent, semi-permanent and temporary migration on the basis of time, though he does not mention anything about any well framed time range for such classification. CLARKE, J.I. (1965, 124 p.) however, took into consideration a period of more than one year for permanent and one year and less for temporary migration provided the departure from or entry into a state would be for the purpose of changing residence. This time period is basically meant for emigration and immigration though the same can be applicable for in(ward)-migration and out(ward)-migration. In fact, this time frame can be applicable in case of both the internal and external (international) migration.

Depending upon *length of distance* migration may be classified as short-distance and long-distance migration. JOHNSTON, R.J. (1994, 381 p.) also mentioned the same categories but did not mention any calculated distance. CHANDNA R.C. (1998, 88 p.) says, distance is most commonly used criterion to classify migration, but this classification ignores cultural or social distance travelled by the migrant. However, NEWMAN, J.L.–MATZKE, G.E. (1984, 162 p.) as referred earlier, clearly state that moves of even greater distance can not be taken as a criterion for classifying migration unless the moves cross a boundary.

Similarly, a move having even a short distance is considered to be migration because the move crosses a boundary or boundaries. Therefore, distance, here, is not the sole criterion of defining migration. Therefore, boundary, time, distance and a declared intention for change in residence, causes (physical, demographic, social, cultural, economic, political and environmental), numbers, etc. are necessary for making classification of migration.

KOSINSKY, L.–PROTHERO, M. (1975, pp. 6–10) also considered time for temporary or permanent migration; distance for long and short distance migration; boundary crossed (for internal and external / international migration); members involved (individual or mass migration); decision making (for voluntary impelled and forced migration); social organization (for family, class and individual migration); political organization (for sponsored and free migration); causes (economic and non-economic); and aims (conservative ad innovative) as the basis for migration classification. CLARKE, J.I. (1987, 130 p.) stated that obviously no typology satisfactorily incorporates all types of human migration, and the problem is exacerbated by the lack of uniformity in terminology.

Spatial approach is another important way of classifying migration. This is also treated as spatial scale and the migrations classified on this basis are known s local level (such as rural to rural, rural to urban and commuting population), regional level, national level and international level migration. For local level migration the village or community development block boundary; for regional level migration the boundary of geographical regions such as plain region, plateau region, mountainous region, coastal region, the Ganga Plain region or of any other region is taken into consideration. For national level the boundaries of states and for international level the boundaries of nations are taken into consideration. The other common criteria as mentioned in the concepts and definition of migration remain applicable.

Depending upon *rural-urban nature of the area* migration becomes: rural to rural, rural to urban, urban to rural and urban to urban. According to Coffey, W.J. (1981, pp. 57–62) rural-urban migration is formulated as a spatial process whose dynamics and special impacts must form part of any comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon. Migration movement normally tends to be toward cities of large population and that the volume of movement decreases with distance between the source (origin place) and the centre can be of absorption (destination place). Such classification of migration has been of great use.

Depending upon *decision-making approach* migration is known as voluntary migration or free migration (usually small in number), instigated or forced migration (when the migrants have no choice in whether they go or stay), and impelled migration (when they retain some power of decision).

Forced migration is due to political cause such as war, displacement decision and physical causes such as flood, drought, earth quake, epidemic etc. Fernie, J.–Pitkethly A.S. (1985, 17 p.) rightly pointed out that unacceptable regime, wars, and droughts have engendered a mass movement of refuges suffering from poverty, malnutrition and ill health. Voluntary migration is caused by objective based self-decision such as higher aspirations.

Depending upon *number* migrations can be classified as individual or group of people and mass migration. In mass migration collective behaviour of people becomes important. Similarly, on the basis of volume of flow migration can be called as large scale, medium scale and small-scale migration. Depending upon qualitative approach migration can be classified as qualitatively high level, as well as skilled migration, semi-skilled migration and unskilled migration.

Like this migration can also be classified on the basis of *occupational mobility*. Persons especially workers generally move from one occupation to another. For example, migration may be from agricultural to non-agricultural occupation. This approach of classification is known as *occupational approach.*

Other concepts and approaches as stated by Kammeyer, K.C.W.–Ginn, H. L. (1988, 112 p.) and Trewartha, G.T. (1969, pp. 141–142) are also important and are in common practice of migration classification. According to them migration may also be classified as conservative and innovative migrations depending upon conservative and innovative ideas. Conservative migration occurs when individuals move form one place to another in order to retain their existing way of life. The move of such individuals is necessitated by some changes that have occurred or are occurring in their current place of residence.

If the residents were to stay, they would have to change their way of living. In this case migration is, therefore, an effort to conserve important parts of the existing way of life. For example, if the individuals have to evacuate the area in which they reside due to construction of dam and choose to settle at new place with the same occupation, they are conservative migrants.

Innovative migration, on the other hand, is the movement of people in order to obtain a new way of life. If the individuals have to evacuate their origin place and choose to settle at new place with new occupation / activities which they think better than former, they are innovative migrants. Thus the conservative or innovative migration depends on the thinking, perception, decision etc.

Primitive migration is another type that refers to a movement resulting from an *ecological force*. In this case people become unable to cope with the natural conditions of his environment and as a result they move in order to survive. Some migrations take place in successive time intervals and known as seasonal or periodic. These are related to seasonal rhythms.

Migration is sometimes also known as *secular* depending upon ideological concept.

All types of migration involve the persons of different age, gender, social class, religion, education and marital status. Therefore, migration is also known as age, sex, caste, religion, marriage and education specific.

Concepts relating to factors of migration

Factor is generally considered as an agent or a force of anything that affects, determines and influences something in space and time. Such force may be favourable or unfavourable or neutral in conception of some one. So far as the matter of concepts of factors of migration is concerned, one finds that all types of factors that determine a move or migration of a person are apparently related to the Origin (the place of residence before migration or the place from where migration takes place or place of last residence) and Destination (the place of residence after migration or the place where migration completes or also the place of new residence).

Both the origin and destination place are characterized by favourable (encouraging), unfavourable (discouraging) and neutral or indifferent (not taking part either in supporting (helping) or protesting a move in the process of migration) factors. In fact, the origin and destination have positive, negative, and neutral characteristics, which are directly or indirectly related to the process of migration of a person.

The positive or favourable or encouraging attributes or characteristics of a place are called as pull factors working on the individual or in attracting the person from the place where push factors exist. Similarly, the negative or unfavourable or discouraging attributes or forces found operating at a place are called push factors which force or repel a person to move some where or in other words to the place where the pull factors for such person do exist. But the truth is that both the pull and push factors do exist or operate simultaneously at both the origin and destination place of a migrant. The neutral factors do not make any contributions to the decision making process of an individual but sometimes act in making balance in the move of some one. For example, the school running in Visva-Bharati campus has purely Bengali language as its medium of instruction. This language as a medium of instruction acts as a negative factor for those who wish to have English or Hindi medium for their children and hence have tendency to move from Shantiniketan, whereas the Bengali language as a medium of instruction acts as a positive factor for those who belong to Shantiniketan region and put their wards gladly in this school. For some others (who are even form other states) this language acts as neutral factor as they put or have put their children in this school after thinking a lot or comparing the advantages and disadvantages of existing condition or in other words, such persons have to adjust or have already adjusted depending upon present situation in their life. Therefore, the negative factor of a person may be positive for another person depending upon choice in life.

Another concept relating to the origin and destination is also important. In between the origin and destination there exist a different situation that includes such factors that act as obstacles and impede the movement of a person. The major intervening obstacles are: distance between the origin and destination, attachment to the native place, travelling costs, maintenance of double establishments, social condemnation, migration laws, discouragement by the recipient countries, religion, culture and social customs etc. Such factors are also known as barriers in the way of taking decision to migrate.

Another concept relating to pull and push and origin and destination are about the two-way flow and streams and counter-streams in the process of migration. All the regions have two functions. For example, region 'A' may receive or invite persons from region 'B' and at the same time region 'A' drives some persons to region 'B'. Anywhere and at any time in space there are two way process of movement of people. The core concept of movement lies in the attitude, interest, choice and desire of the movers. If some one feels and decides that region 'A' is not hospitable for him so he takes decision and move to region 'B' or 'C' or so on. But it is also possible that region 'A' may be attractive for some other region's people and as a result people take decision to move from region 'B' or 'C' to region 'A'. Thus, the migration is two-way process and develops stream and counter-stream and make population balance among the regions in time. Therefore, a factor sometimes may be positive for some one and the same factor may be negative for another, and neutral for still another person.

All positive (+), negative (-) and neutral (0) factors operating at origin and destination place belong to geographical (Physical / environmental), demographic aspect, social, cultural, religious, economic and political groups and function differently for different persons at different stage of life in the process of migration in space and time.

Migration according to CHAPMAN, K. (1979, 30 p.) is obviously related to differences in economic and social conditions and reflects and accentuates potentially divisive in equalities in living standards and job opportunities. BOGUE, D.J. (1969, 753 p.) stressed that migration generally takes place when positive (encouraging) pull factors at the place of destination are outnumbered by negative (discouraging) push factors at the place of origin. DESHPANDE, C.D.–ARUNCHALAM, B.–BHAT, L.S. (1980, pp. 4–5) were of the opinion that urban area holds such fascination for rural inhabitants that it often leads them to migration. The direction and intensity of this migration is not merely a function of the distance but also of the relative pull of the city through its employment, wage opportunities as well as the push offered by the countryside depending on its slender resources.

It is obvious that migration takes place due to territorial differentiation or regional variation of resource availability in the spatial frame. This causes distribution and redistribution of population. All the regions are not endowed with the same resources and of the same values. This situation causes difference in the levels of development of the regions and as a result different regions are found at different rungs of the ladder of progress. Depending upon such difference in the levels of development regions can be categorised as depressed / disadvantaged / deprived / undeveloped or vulnerable and affluent / advantaged / developed / prosperous or progressive. Such heterogeneous characteristics of regions as well as rural-urban nature (a result of the process of traditionalization and modernization) cause the people on move. Particularly rural and urban nature of the area exerts more on the mobility of human population from one place to another. In developing countries the majority of people, with inferior quality of life, live in rural areas and as a result the dominant flow of migration in most developing countries is from rural to urban.

Consequences of migration

Consequences of migration are multidimensional and important part of the study. Persistent out-migration tends to average the economic problems of under-developed areas as it drains the working population and creates an imbalanced community in which the young and the old are over represented. Migration has both positive and negative effects at the origin and the destination places of migrants. By migration origin place may experience deficit in labour force and its quality. Similarly at destination place a positive effect may be in the form of sufficient labour force, increased production etc. Inversely, there may be positive effect at origin place and negative effects at destination place. At origin place migration may reduce pressure of population, un-employment and allied problems relating to population. Like wise, at destination place migration increases pressure of population, shortens employment opportunities of local people and increases other population-related problems. RAJ, H. (1981, pp. 212–213) also pointed out positive and negative effect of migration. But the common effect of migration is generally seen in the distortion of demographic structure at both the places (origin and destination). BOGUE, D.J. (1969, 753 p.) also suggested that there are positive and negative aspects of migration. According to him positive and negative are related to the 'pull' and 'push' factors respectively operating at the destination and origin places of migrants. Negative effect of migration is seen in the spreads of disease too. LEE, D.R.–ARTHER, B.–KELLEY, W.–ALLEN, C.–RODGER, G.–SRINIVASAN, T.N. (1988, 54 p.); NEWMAN, J.L.–MATZKE, G.E. (1954, 157 p.) also admitted that migration spreads different types of diseases from one place to another.

Human beings by utilising their knowledge, skills, talents, energies and other mental and physical capabilities construct and reconstruct geographical landscape for their own welfare.

In shaping the geographical landscape, the process of migration plays a significant role in the distribution and redistribution of population. Migration at national, regional and local levels together with fertility and mortality becomes a fundamental element in the population process determining growth and population structure of any area.

Migration is not merely a process of shifting people from one place to another. It is a fundamental process of changing the composition of population and contributes a lot for the understanding of the space-content and space-relations of any geographical area (GHOSH, B.N. 1985, pp. 34–35).

In spatial context, in-migration and out-migration make change at both the origin and destination places of migrants and in non-spatial context, in health, education, earnings, life styles, psychological motives, socio-economic profile, demographic as well as environmental aspects of them. In-migration and out-migration are also important agents in diffusion of culture and in changing pattern of opportunities in space. In-migration and out-migration sometimes create favourable conditions and some other times reverse of it. In broader sense, consequences of migration are generally related to ethnic, religious, social, cultural, economic, political and environmental aspects. Migration, thus, is an important topic of analysis for geographers.

REFERENCES

BOGUE, D.J. 1969. Principle of Demography. – John Wiley & Sons, New York.
CHANDNA, R.C. 1998. Population, Kayani Publishers. – Ludhiana, New Delhi.
CHAPMAN, K. 1979. People, Pattern and Process: An Introduction to Human Geography. – Arnold Heinemann, Edward Arnold (publishers) Ltd, London.
CLARKE, J.I. 1965. Population Geography. – Pergamon Press, Oxford.
CLARKE, J.I. 1987. Population Geography. – Pergamon Press, Oxford.
COFFEY, W.J. 1981. Geography: Towards a General Spatial Systems Approach. – Methuen & Co. Ltd. London.
DARSKY, L.Y. 1978. Population Reproduction. – In: VALENTEY, D.I. ed.: The Theory of Population: Essays in Marxist Research, Progress Publisher, Moscow.
DEMKO, G. J.–ROSS, H.M–SCHNELL, G.A. 1970. Population Geography: A Reader. – McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.
DESHPANDE, C.D.–ARUNCHALAM, B.–BHAT, L.S. 1980. Impact of Metropolitan City on the Surrounding Region: A case study of South Kolaba, Maharastra. – Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.
DUDLEY, K. 1970. Major Migration since World War II. – In: DEMKO, G. J.–ROSS, H.M–SCHNELL, G.A. eds.: Polulation Geography: A Reader, Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, New York.
EISENSTADT, S.N. 1953. Analysis of Patterns of Migration and Absorption of Immigrants. – In: Population Studies, London School of Economics, London.
FERNIE, J.–PITKETHLY A.S. 1985. Resources: Environment and Policy. – Harper & Row Ltd., London.
GHOSH, B.N. 1987. Fundamentals of Population Geography. – Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.
GOLDSCHEIDER, C. 1971. Population, Modernization and Social Structure. – Little Brown, Boston.
JOHNSTON, R.J. 1994. The Dictionary of Human Geography (3rd. ed.). – Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, U.K.
KAMMEYER, K.C.W.–GINN, H. L. 1988. An Introduction to population. – Archives Books,
KOSINSKY, L.–PROTHERO, M. 1975. Populations on Move: Studies on International Migration. – M. & Co. Ltd. London.
LEE, D.R.–ARTHER, B.–KELLEY, W.–ALLEN, C.–RODGER, G.–SRINIVASAN, T.N. 1988. Population, Food and Rural Development. – Oxford University Press, New York.

LEE, E.S. 1970. A Theory of Migration. – In: DEMKO, G. J.–ROSS, H.M–SCHNELL, G.A. eds.: An Introduction to Population, Archives Books, New Delhi.

MISHRA, S.K. 1981. Factors and Process of Migration in Developing Economy. – In: MANDAL, R.B. ed.: Frontiers in Migration Analysis. – Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.

NEWELL, COLIN 1988. Methods and Models in Demography. – Belhaven Press, London.

NEWMAN, J.L.–MATZKE, G.E. 1984. Population: Pattern, Dynamics, and Prospects. – Prentice-Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

OGDEN, P.E. 1984. Migration and Geographical Change. – Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London.

RAJ, H. 1981. Fundamentals of Demography. – Surjeet Publications, Delhi.

ROSS, J.A. 1982. International Encyclopedia of Population. – The Free Press. A Division of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc, New York.

RUBENSTEIN, J.M.–BACON, R.S. 1990. The Cultural Landscape: An Introduction to Human Geography. – Prentice-Hall of India, Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.

SHRIVASTAVA, O.S. 1983. A Text Book of Demography. – Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.

TREWARTHA, G.T. 1969. A Geography of Population: World Pattern. – John Wiley & Sons, Inc, New York.

United Nations, Department of Economics and Social Affairs (1970. Methods of Measuring Internal Migration, Series A. – Population Studies, No. *47,* New York.

UYANGA, J. 1981. The Nature and Concepts in Migration Studies. – In MANDAL, R.B. ed.: Frontiers in Migration Analysis, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.

WEEKS, J.R. 1989. Population: An Introduction to Concepts and Issues. – Words worth Publishing Company, Belmont, California.

ZELINSKY, W. 1966. A Prologue to Population Geography. – Prentice-Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

ZELINSKY, W. 1971. The Hypothesis of the Mobility Transition. – Geographical Review, Vol. *61*, Worcester.