

The application of household and network approaches to the study of internal migration:
Case Study in Jawa, Indonesia¹
By
Ekawati S. Wahyuni²

Introduction

The study of the impact of migration in developing countries can be carried out, either, in the destination or origin areas alone or in both areas. However, it can be argued that the study of the impact of migration is better carried out in the villages of origin area since migration decision-making mostly takes place in the villages (Caldwell 1969; Connell *et al.* 1976; Hugo 1988). Moreover, by undertaking rural-based research, one can assess all types of migration, which are commonly occurring in the village, particularly the non-permanent types (Hugo 1978). Non-permanent migrants usually never have a permanent resident in the destination area and they prefer to be considered as village residents. As their travel to urban areas is usually undertaken as a strategy of household economic survival they usually do not intend to move out permanently to the city. Accordingly, their existence would be missed in studies located in the destination areas. Since the decision making process of migration occur in the village, the context of that decision-making can only be studied in origin-based approach. Moreover, there is an opportunity to study the impact upon the family left behind. In the case of non-permanent migrants, the biggest share of their earnings is spent in the village and the permanent migrants also send some of their income back to help their family in the village. Along with these economic impacts, the social impacts are also significant. By leaving their family, the outmigrants give up many of their domestic and social responsibilities to remaining family members at home. Since the aim of this study³ is mainly concerned with the impact of migration on family structure and functioning, this research was conducted predominantly in rural areas, as this is the origin of the majority of migrants.

Although the advantages of a rural-based study on the impact of migration are obvious, it is not without its weaknesses. The main weakness of origin-based research is the loss of information about permanent migrants since they have already moved to the city or other places and is not in the village at the time of the survey, they are missed during the interview process (Connell *et al.* 1976; Bilsborrow 1984a; Hugo 1988). This lack of direct information about outmigrants could possibly be compensated for by "proxy" information from their families or relatives left behind (Hugo 1978), although the information obtained may not be totally reliable (Bilsborrow 1984a). Another method of collecting data from outmigrants in the area of origin is by waiting for their return to the villages (Saefullah 1992). However, as there is no certainty of when migrants will return home makes interviewing them difficult. The other weakness of this approach is the impossibility for the researcher to observe the living conditions of outmigrants in the destination areas, which is very important in assessing their degree of adjustment to and level of well-being. Another method of collecting data from outmigrants is to visit them in the destination areas; this is known as the 'tracing' method (Caldwell 1969; Connell

¹ Paper presented in Session 23: Data and methods in the study of internal migration in IUSSP XXV International Population Conference, Tours, France, July 18-23, 2005.

² The author is lecturer in the Department of Socio-economic Sciences, Faculty of Agriculture, Bogor Agricultural University, Bogor, Indonesia.

³ The 'this study' mentioned here is refer to the study which applied this methodology. The study title is 'The impact of migration upon family structure and functioning: Case study in Jawa, Indonesia'. The study was undertaken to write a PHD thesis in Adelaide University Australia between 1996-2000.

et.al. 1976; Hadi 1981; Bilsborrow 1984a; Hugo 1988; Abustam 1989). In order to get information from the outmigrants directly is important, 'tracing' method in the destination area was also applied in this study. The difficulty to do is to find migrants in the destination areas since their addresses in the cities are often either unclear or unknown, and therefore substantial resources are needed to locate their whereabouts. Nevertheless, we know that inmigrants who come from the same village usually live and work in a similar place in the destination areas (Hugo 1978; Abustam 1989), and therefore a family and community network approach has been applied to trace the location of migrants in the city. To be able to do so, we need to know at least one definite out-migrant's address in the destination area. The address is obtained from the family in the village. This paper will explain this approach.

Research Location Selection in Origin Area

The impact of migration depends upon the local socio-economic conditions and the types of migration (Hugo 1988). A key issue is the selection of the location in which to undertake the study. Two provinces in Java were chosen to represent the origin and destination areas of migration. Based on the analysis of migration using Population Censuses data, Jawa Tengah (Central Jawa) was chosen as the province of origin, because it has sent out the largest number of outmigrants of all provinces in Indonesia and village has been chosen as the area for micro study. The province of destination was decided later, after the primary survey had located the destination areas of migration for the 'tracing' survey. Based on the data on migrant's addresses in the destination areas and the degree of difficulties to trace the addresses, Bandung the Capital of Jawa Barat (West Jawa) province has been selected as research location in the destination area.

The village selection process in Jawa Tengah was carried out in several stages passing through all government administration levels, from the province until village level. One village in Jawa Tengah has been chosen as the research location, that is Hutankita⁴ village in Kebumen regency. A small river divide Hutankita village into two settlement area, one in the northern side of the river or Utara and the other one in the southern side of the river or Selatan. One could easily catch the difference between the two sub-villages. Selatan is far better off economically than Utara. Administratively, Hutankita village consists of five hamlets, two in Utara and three in Selatan.

Data Collection Methods in Origin Area

Following the decision to select Hutankita as the research location, the pre-survey was carried out to obtain more insights into the village. The main objective of the pre-survey was to develop the questionnaire that suitable with the village condition. Among other things, the most important information collected during pre-survey is the village people understanding about the migration term. For them migration is understood as *merantau* for non-permanent migration and *pindah* for permanent migration. Other qualitative information collected during the pre-survey was related with the socio-economic life of the village, the incidence of migration and family life. Another objective of pre-survey activity was to get a sampling frame, that is a list of household with one or more member migrated in non-permanent basis elsewhere, from which research sample will be selected. This *merantau* household list was produced with the help of village officials who know quite well which household that have non-permanent migrant members. When the first draft of the questionnaire has been developed and sample households had been selected, a questionnaire testing activity was taken. Following questionnaire testing activity was reviewing the questionnaire and the sampling frame.

⁴ This is a pseudo name.

Many new information on migration incidence, family relation, and social and economic condition of household had been collected during the questionnaire testing. Based on these information the questionnaire revised and the sampling frame adjusted.

The adjustment of sampling frame was a must because there were variations in migration activity. As mentioned before, the household sample was to be drawn from the *merantau* household list, but after several household visits, it was found that permanent outmigrants and return migrants are also influencing the family structure and functioning. Therefore, to cover all kinds of migration, the *merantau* household list was extended. The new list included permanent outmigrants, return migrants, and married children who left their parents' household to set up their own household. Non-migrant households were also included in the sampling frame as a control group. The new list, therefore, covered all households in the village. By undertaking a full community sample, there was more opportunity to study the family networking among households and to examine the dynamics of the family in the decision making process.

As has been mentioned above, Hutankita village consist of five hamlets, two in Utara and and three Selatan. One hamlet in Utara and two hamlets in Selatan were chosen as the community samples. Every household in the selected hamlets were interviewed in the survey. To get more information on non-permanent migration incidence, all households in the village with non-permanent migrants was also included in the survey. The distribution of the household sample is shown in Table 1. Following the completion of sample selection and the revision of questionnaire the survey was started.

Table 1. Distribution of Household Sample

No	Hamlet	Migrant Household	Non-Migrant Household	Total
1.	Hamlet A (Selatan)	15 (7.2 %)	1 (1.6 %)	16 (5.9 %)
2.	Hamlet B (C, Selatan)	52 (25.0 %)	14 (21.6 %)	66 (24.4 %)
3.	Hamlet C (C, Selatan)	57 (27.4 %)	23 (37.1 %)	80 (29.6 %)
4.	Hamlet D (C, Utara)	61 (29.3 %)	24 (38.7 %)	85 (31.5 %)
5.	Hamlet (Utara)	23 (11.1 %)	-	23 (8.5 %)
Total		208 (100.0 %)	62 (100.0 %)	270 (100.0 %)

Note: C = community sample

Source: Field Survey 1995/1996

Based on the survey data, 12 households out of 270 had been chosen as case studies and to be visited again to obtain more qualitative information on migration history, marriage history, family history and working experience using in-depth interview method. The twelve selected households had the following characteristics:

- One household with a return migrant.
- Four households with, both, return and non-permanent migrants.
- Three single person households.
- Three households with permanent migrants.
- One household with no migrant and had limited migration experience.

Some Methodological Considerations

The enumeration of outmigrants as a part of household survey in the origin village should be carried out on the basis of the following considerations:

Firstly, in enumeration of outmigrants, the house is the spatial boundary to define migration. This means that all members of a particular household, who had already

moved to a different house, including those who just moved to the main household's backyard, should be included as outmigrants. This method was applied to avoid overlooking some people who used to be household members, especially the children. However, the use of household as the boundary can cause double enumeration for particular people. An example of this situation is as follows: a man has been recorded as an outmigrant from his parents' home as he moved-out to live in his own home next door, but he does not live in his home for most of the year because he is working in Bandung as a temporary migrant, so in his own household he will again be recorded as an outmigrant. To avoid the confusion that may arise, probing questions had been used to identify whether the particular people still live in the same hamlet or village at the time of survey or not. If they are still living in the same hamlet or village of study, they will be coded as 'Moved out to their own house' instead of 'Temporary Migrant' or 'Permanent Migrant'. The man, in the above example, therefore was coded as 'Moved out to their own house' in his parents' questionnaire and recorded as a 'Temporary Migrants' in his household's questionnaire.

Secondly, to be consistent with the lifetime migration definition applied in this study, people who had migrated permanently were not including as an outmigrant unless they were village-born. For easier listing, those people were also included in the enumeration and coded "Not village-born" although they are excluded from the data processing and analysis.

Thirdly, is a consideration in defining household. The household in this research is a family-household, meaning that the household members were related by blood, marriage or adoption, although it might also include non-family members, such as maid or distant relatives. A family-household has a long history. Following the end of family life cycle, the household head changed. Commonly, elderly widowed men or women gave up their headship to their sons or sons-in-law as they got older and do not want to be troubled with various matters related to household affairs. He or she has changed their status in the household from head to become a member. On the other hand, a son or son-in-law has been promoted to become a household head. This study, therefore, used the current household heads as the basis to define its members' migration status. This means that only members who left the house under the current household head are considered as outmigrants, meaning that other family members left the house with different household heads were not included. This definition was applied to be in accordance with the family-household analysis and as the main reference point of family-household is the household head. Therefore, the number of outmigrants is more related to households than the village, because not everyone who used to live in the village had migrated permanently to other places is counted. The common people who are missing from the enumeration are siblings or in-laws of current household heads who used to live in the same home but left it, permanently, when it was headed by their parents or parents-in-law. These people might still have a strong influence on the household, especially when the mother or father is still alive. The analysis of outmigration therefore will be based on those who were coded as 'Temporary Outmigrants' and 'Permanent Outmigrants' and live outside the village boundary only.

Another set of definitions has been taken to classify a migrant as temporary or permanent. Migrants who had been said to be *merantau* by the respondents in the village were classified as temporary migrants, while those who were said to be *pindah* were permanent migrants. There will be two questions addressed to identify the migration status of outmigrants, the current status and the initial status. Generally, respondents will more accurately answer about current migration type rather than the status on initial movement, because it is difficult to recall the migration status of every outmigrant at the time of their initial movement as it sometimes happened decades ago. Therefore, in

classifying migration type in their initial movement a definition has been used that is, except for marriage and transmigration, other initial migrations will be classified as temporary migrants or *merantau*. This is because marriage and transmigration were considered as permanent actions, which often meant the separation from parents' households to build their own households. On the other hand, migration with other objectives, such as go to school, look for work or for work, was largely considered as *merantau*, because these single migrants generally still regarded their parents' households as their homes. A change of migration status frequently happened when the migrant got married and set up home elsewhere. If the outmigrant bought land or built a house in the village, they were considered as temporary migrants. Commonly, these migrants intend to return to the village in their old age to enjoy the fruits of a long time of hard work. Those migrants could have lived and worked in the city for more than six months, but as long as they put their saving in the village, they were considered as temporary migrants.

From 270 sample households, 719 people had been recorded as having left the households, excluding the 'Not village origin' people. Twenty-two people left the households to live elsewhere within the same hamlet and 88 people moved to other hamlets within the village. Therefore, the number of people who had migrated to other places outside the village are 609 consisting of 346 males (56.7 per cent) and 263 females (42.3 per cent). Among them, 38.4 per cent (N=233) are temporary outmigrants and 61.6 per cent (N=376) are permanent outmigrants. Some 58.4 per cent (N=356) used to live on the Selatan and 41.6 per cent (N=253) are from Utara. The 609 outmigrants are related to 208 households, meaning that 22.9 per cent (N=62) of sample households do not have a member who lives elsewhere and classified as 'Non-migrant households' (see Table 2).

Table 2. Distribution of Outmigrants from Hutankita

Type of Movement	N	per cent
Moving within hamlets	22	3.1
Moving within the village	88	12.2
Moving to outside the village or outmigrants	609	84.7
Total Movers	719	100.0
Distribution of outmigrants: (N=609)		
<u>By Sex:</u>		
-Male	346 (56.7 %)	
-Female	263 (42.3 %)	
<u>By Migration Status:</u>		
- temporary outmigrants	233 (38.4 %)	
- permanent outmigrants	376 (61.6 %)	
<u>By Location:</u>		
- Selatan	356 (58.4 %)	
- Utara	253 (41.6 %)	
<u>By Household: (N=270)</u>		
- With Outmigrants	208 (87.1 %)	
- Without Outmigrants	62 (22.9 %)	

Source: Field Survey, 1995/1996

Selection of the Research location in the Destination Area

The destination areas considered for the tracing survey were Jakarta and BOTABEK (Bogor, Tangerang and Bekasi), because most outmigrants from Hutankita went to those areas. Unfortunately, at that time a heavy flood hit Jakarta and it was very

difficult to travel within the city, and many migrants had been moved to different addresses as their former residents flooded. Since there was no sign of the flood diminishing in the short term, and there was no other definite address of any outmigrant in Jakarta or Botabek, another destination area had to be chosen to undertake this research. The second option of a destination area was Bandung. If the province is used as a spatial boundary for defining migration, there would be 477 people defined as outmigrants. Among them, 57 per cent (N=274) went to Jakarta and BOTABEK, while 26 per cent (N=124) moved to Bandung and the remainder (17 per cent) were distributed to other provinces in Indonesia or went abroad. However, one should remember that this number consists of both types of migration, permanent and non-permanent. Based on these data, Bandung is the second most popular destination area and therefore, was chosen as an alternative to Jakarta as the location of the tracing survey. Accordingly, Jawa Barat province, of which Bandung is the Capital, was chosen as the research area for macro-scale research. The micro research location in Bandung was concentrated in Pasawahan village in Dayeuh Kolot sub-district. Dayeuh Kolot sub-district is the main area of textile and garment industries in Jawa Barat and even in Indonesia.

The first step to be carried-out was to go to Bandung and try to meet a migrant from Hutankita village there. Even though I already had one definite address of a migrant in Bandung, no one could guarantee that it would help. Before going to Bandung a list of all immigrants from Hutankita was produced. The list contained such information as their names, sex, age, parents' name, hamlet, address and job. This list was taken to Bandung to assist in locating the migrants. An address of male migrant from Hutankita village in Bandung eventually can be located and able to meet him and got his approval to contact other migrants from Hutankita. This migrant (C1)⁵ is a textile factory worker whose wife in the village has given me his work address in Bandung.

After a brief conversation in the factory he invited me to his boarding house, located in the back yard of the factory, during his day-off for a longer interview. It was rather difficult to find his home, since it was in the very dense urban settlement of Pasawahan village in Southern Bandung. His boarding house was actually a factory *bedeng*⁶ located outside the factory compound. The factory had bought the land and several houses the villagers to be used as a factory *bedeng*. The factory does not need to build new houses and only provides facilities for the workers, such as clean water and toilets. Although C1 had lived there for more than two years he is a migrant, and therefore was unknown to the local people in private. He gave me the name of a prominent local person who could help me find his house.

He shared the house with seven other workers. When I showed a list of immigrants from Hutankita village I wished to visit, he told me that half of them live in this hamlet named Citepus, but he did not know them very well. However he agreed to introduce me to one immigrant who did know them well. In the afternoon he accompanied me to her house. Fortunately, she already knew of my activity from her family in the village and she agreed to help me find the other people. Later, the young female worker, C12, and her family became important informants.

⁵ Cn is a code number given to traced-outmigrants in Bandung, which will be used throughout the report. C1 is the code for this particular male outmigrants.

⁶The literary meaning of *bedeng* is 'shed' or 'hut' (Echols and Shadily 1994). A building made of very simple materials, such as bamboo or plywood to be temporary accommodation for temporary workers that could be easily dismantled to be moved to other location. The *bedeng* was usually built by employers to provide free accommodation for their workers.

Data Collection Methods in Destination Area

With the help of one female and one male worker, I visited as many of the names on the list as possible. Among the 124 people who migrated to Bandung from Hutankita, 42.9 per cent (54 people) lived in this *kampung* and worked as factory workers, in the textile or garment industries. The rest of them lived scattered around Bandung, either in the regency area or in the city. Most immigrants, who lived in the city, worked as street vendors or had a job in a restaurant. Although I could not visit all of them, I tried to choose the prospective respondents with regard to the following considerations:

1. It is preferable to choose immigrants who came from case-study households in the village.
2. Immigrants who came from the same family (brothers or sisters) should be visited.
3. The respondents should represent the variation, which exists in terms of sex, marital status, migration status, and work types among the total group of migrants.

In the process of sample selection I found that job variations were a reflection of the hamlet's location in the village of origin. Most immigrants from the northern hamlets worked as street vendors, while the majority of those who came from southern hamlets work as factory workers. This phenomenon called the occupational clustering of migrants from a particular origin (Hugo 1978, p.230).

It was easy to meet the factory workers because they live in the same *kampung* and most of them knew each other very well. From C12 I obtained information about who would be available to interview that day and when would be the best time to visit. She always accompanied me during the visits, because without her it would take longer to find each house. She was not formally interviewed, although she was an important respondent. The information about her was collected informally at any time I was alone with her. I asked her questions on the way to the respondent's houses or while we were having a meal together. To find immigrants who lived in the city of Bandung was a rather different experience. The female informant knew some of them, but she did not know where they lived. Therefore she introduced me to her friend, a male factory worker who came from the northern hamlet. C7 knew many of his hamlet fellows, where they lived and what they did. Moreover, he agreed to accompany me to visit them and became an important informant.

A great deal of effort was needed to meet immigrants who lived in the city of Bandung. Based on the considerations on selecting prospective respondents, I had tried to locate several migrants taken from the village of origin outmigrants' list with the help of factory worker migrants in Pasawahan village. Fortunately, C7 knew two of them. He assured me that they would help us to locate the other immigrants in the city. The first person visited was C6 who lived in a rented house 'with his family in a *kampung* in the City of Bandung. Later Mrs. C6 told us how to get to the other prospective respondents. The other prospective immigrants that knew my informant quite well were C2 and his brother C3. C2 has a *martabak*' stall, while C3 helps him to serve the customers. One evening, we visited them at his stall. After some conversation, I told C2 of my intention to visit his house to interview him about his migration experience. He agreed with the idea and gave me a map of how to get to his house. I only visited him once at his house, but visited him more frequently at his stall. The difference between the immigrants who lived in Pasawahan and those in the city is that the immigrants in the city did not know much about the whereabouts of their fellow villagers. The main reason for this was that they lived in different places, which were quite distant from one another. Another reason was that they worked in the informal sector as own-account workers or labourers, which is not located in the same areas. This meant outmigrants in the city seldom made social visit to each other.

Within three months of beginning the tracing survey, I was able to compile a set of qualitative information gathered by means of in-depth-interviews and participation observation. The method used in participation observation was slightly different to that applied in the village. Since the respondents do not involve themselves in the local community, I did not use the community approach. Instead, I involved myself in their everyday life; I visited each of them in their house, I ate with them, went to shopping together, went to Bandung city with them on their day off, watched Indian movies on television and made conversation with them. The range of information collected from the respondents in the destination area covered such topics as: migration history, work history, marriage history, living arrangements, the relationship with the village of origin, childcare, the adjustment process and domestic arrangements. A total of 16 migrant were interviewed in depth.

Definitions and Concepts

Temporary and Permanent Migration

There are many types of population mobility based on their time and space characteristics. Gould and Prothero (1975) created a typology of population mobility based on their experience in Africa using different time and space criteria. In Indonesia, some scholars had applied the typology with modifications (Hugo 1978; Mantra 1981). In the Gould and Prothero typology, the space dimension could be defined as distance or direction; while in Indonesia it is an administrative boundary. Based on that sequence, one can define the spatial dimension of migration, such as Hugo (1978) in his study in West Java applied village boundary as the spatial boundary and in Yogyakarta Mantra (1981) applied hamlet, while for national census province is taken as the migration defining boundary. This means that one is considered as a migrant if one moved out from one village to another village in the Hugo definition, while in the national census people can be categorised as migrants only if they moved out from one province to the other.

The time dimension, on the other hand, was differentiated as non-permanent and permanent migration. According to Zelinsky (1971) the difference between the two is whether a migrant has the intention to change residence permanently or not. In Indonesia the definition of the non-permanent migration includes all types of short period of movement. A commuter refers to a migrant who leaves their village for another place on a daily basis, without an intention to stay overnight in the destination area (Hugo *et al.* 1987). Various terminologies have been found in Indonesia to define particular types of mobility. In Yogyakarta, Mantra (1981) came across local terminology designating a commuter as *nglaju* and *mondok* or *nginep* for circulation, while *pindah* stands for permanent migration. In West Java, Hugo (1981) uses *merantau* for non-permanent migration and *pindah* for permanent movement. Similar to that of Hugo's, the people in this study area use *merantau* to indicate a form of non-permanent migration, while a person who has already migrated permanently was considered as *pindah*. People who are *merantau* elsewhere were considered as village residents and their names still registered on the Family Card (*Ind. Kartu Keluarga*) whereas people who are already migrated permanently were removed from the card. To decide if someone intends to move permanently or not is not an easy job, therefore in the national census a strict period of time was applied to categorize people's migration status. The Central Bureau of Statistics Indonesia defines people as permanent migrants if they had moved to another province for at least six months.

In this study, the spatial boundary used to define migration is the household. Therefore, one will be recorded as an outmigrant if one moved to another house even if it

is in the same hamlet. It is important to analyze household formation. The household formation is very much influenced by the onset of the children leaving the family, which is not only caused by migration, but is in fact associated often with marriage. However, in the analysis of migration, geographically, only those who moved to other villages will be analyzed. On the other hand, the time dimension was not limited to a certain length of time to define the permanency of migration, but it was decided by the outmigrants themselves, whether they were already *pindah* or still *merantau*.

Family and Household

The distinction between family and household can be recognised through ‘the essential features that define membership’ in each of them (Bender 1967). The membership of a family is kinship, whereas the membership of a household is propinquity of residence or co-residence. Demographers, such as Burch (1978) mentioned that because of the need of covering the entire population it is necessary to combine the sociological definition of family, namely a group of kin, with the methodology of modern population censuses and surveys, which place the unit of census enumeration in a central position. Therefore in a demographic sense:

“*Family* refers only to those kin with whom one co-resides. Persons living in the same dwelling unit comprise a household, whether they all are related or not. ... kin with whom one does not share the same dwelling unit are not part of one’s *family* even though they may live close by, and even though there may be considerable social and economic integration among them” (Burch 1978 p.174).

In other words Glick (1977 p. 389) defines family “as a group of related persons who live together in the same household”. The demographic definition of family and household has been applied widely in population surveys and censuses, which is supported by United Nations (UN 1973).

The UN concept of household is based on “the arrangement made by persons, individually or in groups, for providing themselves with food or other essentials for living (UN 1973 p.4). Therefore a household may be either “... (a) a one-person household, that is, a person who makes provision for his own food or other essentials for living (b) a multi-person household, that is, a group of two or more persons who make common provision for food or essential living. While UN concept about family is “those members of the household can, however, consist of more than one family” (UN, 1973 p.6).

In Indonesia, there are two categories of household in the population censuses, namely ordinary and special households, adopted by Central Bureau of Statistics, which are similar to that of UN. The CBS definition of ordinary household is:

“..... an individual or a group of people living in physical/census building unit or part thereof who make common provision for food and other essentials for living” (BPS 1992, p.xxxiv).

while a special household is:

“ ... a group of people living in a particular institution such as dormitory, military barracks and penitentiary, where food provision is made collectively usually by the institution organization or roomer when they

numbered 10 or more people in a particular rooming house.” (BPS 1992, p.xxxiv).

However, unlike other countries such as Australia or United States, the Indonesian population census does not have a definition of the family and how it can be differentiated from household. Australian Bureau of Statistics, on the other hand, define a family as:

“ ... two or more persons, one of whom is at least 15 years of age, who are related by blood, marriage (registered or de facto), adoption, step or fostering, and who are usually resident in the same household. The basis of a family is formed by identifying the presence of a couple relationship. Some households, therefore, contain more than one family’ (McLennan 1995, p.3).

while using a similar household definition as Indonesia’s. The U.S. Bureau of the Census defined a household as:

“all persons who occupy a housing unit such as a house, apartment, single room, or other space intended to be living quarters. A household may consist of one person who lives alone or several people who share a dwelling”

and a family is:

“ ... two or more persons related by birth, marriage or adoption who reside together. This definition does not measure family ties that extend beyond the immediate housing unit”. (Ahlburg and De Vita, 1992).

There is a similarity in defining the relationship between household and family and all families form households while not all households are families. This means the marriage or blood relations found among members in a household can be used to indicate the existence of a family in household. This kind of relationship is more likely to be found in private households than in special households in Indonesia. Therefore in this study, special households have been excluded from secondary analysis using population census data.

Conclusion

To study the impact of migration on family structure and functioning is at best when conducted in, both, origin and destination area. The advantages of doing migration study in origin area are: (a) we can assess all types of migration, which are commonly occurring in the village, particularly the non-permanent types; (b) we can study the role of the family in migration decision making process; and (c) we can study the economic and social impact of migration on the family left behind. The main weakness of origin-based migration research is the difficulties to get information about the migrants living condition directly as they may be not at the village during research period. By using origin-based in migration study we could not assess the living condition of the migrants in destination areas. Although information about migrants could possibly be collected from their families or relatives in the village, but the information obtained may not be totally reliable. The lack data on migrant living condition and migrant opinion about anything can be compensated by combining origin-based migration research with destination-based

research known as the 'tracing' method. However, this method is also not without problems especially relating to how to find the outmigrants in the destination areas since their addresses in the cities are often either unclear or unknown. Information about migrants' addresses in the city could be collected from the family in the village. The understanding of individual and family networking in the village as well as in the city is very important to be able to conduct a tracing survey in the city.

The main objective of this study was to analyze the impact of migration upon family structure and functioning, and therefore the analysis was based on the household unit. It is very important to decide from which household a migrant has to be related to, as they have been living in several households throughout their lives. In order not to overlooking some of them in the analysis, some methodological adjustment has been applied.

The study was also aimed to investigate the process of networking development among non-permanent migrants in the city to maintain their job security. Since the process to create a networking is a very complex activity, the investigation was conducted by applying a qualitative method, in data collection and analysis.

Bibliography

- Abustam, Muhammad Idrus 1989, Gerak Penduduk, Pembangunan Dan Perubahan Sosial: Kasus Tiga Komunitas Padi Sawah di Sulawesi Selatan (Population Mobility, Development and Social Change: Case Study of Three Communities in South Sulawesi), Penerbit Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Ahlburg, Dennis A. and De Vita, Carol J. 1992, New Realities of the American Family, Population Bulletin, Vol. 17, No. 2 (August), pp. 1-42.
- Bender, Donald D. 1967, A Refinement of the Concept of Household: Families, Co-residence, and Domestic Functions, American Anthropologist, Vol. 69, pp. 493-504.
- Bilsborrow, Richard E. 1984a, Survey Design, in Migration Surveys in Low-Income Countries, R.E.Bilsborrow, A.S.Oberoi, and G.Standing, G. (eds.), Croom Helm, London and Sydney.
- Bilsborrow, Richard E. 1984b, Sample Design, in Migration Surveys in Low-Income Countries, R.E.Bilsborrow, A.S.Oberoi and G.Standing (eds), Croom Helm, London and Sydney.
- Bilsborrow, R.E., Oberoi, A.S. and Standing, G. 1984 (eds), Migration Surveys in Low-Income Countries, Croom Helm, London and Sydney.
- Burch, Thomas K., 1979, Household and Family Demography, Population Index, No 43, pp. 173-95.
- Caldwell, John C., 1969, African Rural-Urban Migration, The Movement to Ghana's Town, ANU, Canberra.
- Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) 1992, Population of Indonesia 1990, Central Bureau of Statistics, Jakarta.
- Connell, J., Dasgupta, B., Lashleey, R. and Lipton, M., 1976, Migration from Rural Areas: The Evidence from Village Studies, Oxford University Press, Delhi.
- Echols, John and Shadily, Hassan 1994, Kamus Indonesia-Inggris (An Indonesian-English Dictionary), Gramedia, Jakarta.
- Geertz, Hildred, 1961, The Javanese Family, The Free Press, New York.
- Glick, Paul C., 1978, Dimensions of the Fields of Family Demography, in International Population Conference, Mexico 1977, UIESP, Liege.
- Gould, W.T.S. and Prothero, R.M. 1975, Space and Time in African Population Mobility, in People on the Move, Studies on internal migration, L.A.Kosinski and R.M. Prothero (eds), Methuen & Co Ltd, London.

- Hadi, Abdul Samat 1981, Population Mobility in Negeri Sembilan, Peninsular Malaysia: Evidence From Three Villages in Kuala Pilah, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, School of Social Science, Flinders University of South Australia.
- Hugo, G.J. 1978, Population Mobility in West Java, Gadjah Mada University Press, Yogyakarta.
- Hugo, Graeme 1987a, Demographic and Welfare Implications of Urbanization: Direct and Indirect Effects on Sending and Receiving Areas, in Urbanization and Urban Policies in Pacific Asia, Fuchs, R.J., Jones, G.W. and Pernia, E. (eds), Westview Press, Boulder and London.
- Hugo, G.J., Hull, T.H., Hull, V.J. and Jones, G.W. 1987, The Demographic Dimension in Indonesian Development, Oxford University Press, Kuala Lumpur.
- Hugo, Graeme 1988, Micro-Approaches To The Study Of Population Movement: An Indonesian Case Study, in Micro-Approaches to Demographic Research, Caldwell, Hull and Hull (eds), Kegan Paul Int., London and New York
- Hugo, Graeme 1994, Migration and the Family, Occasional Paper Series for the International Year of the Family, United Nations Department for Policy Co-ordination and Sustainable Development Secretariat for the International of the Family, Vienna.
- Mantra, I.B. 1981, Population Mobility in Wet Rice Community, Gadjah Mada University Press, Yogyakarta.
- Mc.Lennan, W. 1995, Standard For Statistics On The Family, Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS).
- United Nations 1973, Manual VII: Methods of Projecting Households and Families, Population Studies No. 54, UN, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York.