PN-AAX-356

IAN-50499

CLASS, HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE, AND MIGRATION: A CASE STUDY FROM RURAL MEXICO

by

María de los Angeles Crummett
Kellogg Institute for International Studies
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Working Paper #92
August 1985

Abstract: Studies of migration in Mexico have proliferated over the years capturing detailed socioeconomic aspects of migrants such as sex, age, education, occupational status, income, place of origin, and destination. These descriptive studies of migration have fallen short, however, in that they fail to explain why men are the migrants in some regions and women in others, or why some migrants choose destinations within Mexico and others head toward the United States. This paper argues that an examination of class and household characteristics offers significant insights into these questions. The household's class position explains not only what groups have the greatest propensity to migrate but also where they tend to migrate. An analysis of household structure, including the sex and age division of labor, sheds lights on who within the household is most likely to migrate.

About the Author: María de los Angeles Crummett received her Ph.D. in Economics from the New School for Social Research and is currently a Faculty Fellow at the Kellogg Institute for International Studies, University of Notre Dame. Her field research in Peru, Chile, and Mexico has resulted in publications on agrarian economic development, peasant differentiation and migration, the role of households in migration, and the political mobilization of women.

CLASS, HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE AND MIGRATION: A CASE STUDY FROM RURAL MEXICO

Studies of migration in Mexico have proliferated over the years capturing important socioeconomic aspects of migrants such as sex, age, education, occupational status, income, place of origin, and destination.[1] These studies have fallen short in some respects, however. For example, they fail to explain why men are the migrants in some regions and women in others, or why some migrants choose destinations within Mexico and others head toward the United States. The aim of this study is to address these questions by examining the characteristics of individual migrants within a more comprehensive analysis, specifically from the perspective of class position and household structure.

This study is based on a sample survey of 59 rural households conducted by the author in 1982 in Calvillo, Mexico,[2] and argues that examining class and household characteristics of rural units greatly enhances our understanding of migration. The household's class position within the agrarian sector in particular explains not only <u>what</u> groups have the greatest propensity to migrate but also <u>where</u> they tend to migrate, that is, whether within Mexico or to the United States. Moreover, an analysis of household structure and composition, including the gender and age division of labor, offers valuable insights into <u>who</u> within the household is most likely to be selected for migration.

Calvillo, located in the southwest corner of the state of Aguascalientes, offers a rich case study for an examination of class stratification, household structure, and migration in the rural sector. Roughly 75% of the region's inhabitants live in rural communities and almost 60% of the labor force earn a living from agricultural activities (Censo General de Poblacion 1980). In addition, the region contains a high percentage of landless agricultural wage workers, and it is the only major agricultural region in the state in which the <u>pequeña propiedad</u> (smallholding) private unit of production dominates the landholding structure. Private owners control 73.4% of the total arable land while <u>ejidos</u>[3] account for the rest (Censo Agricola, Ganadero y Ejidal, Aguascalientes 1970).

Calvillo's agrarian sector is characterized by a highly polarized production structure. Production of the region's commercial crop, guava, completely overshadows the production of staple crops, corn and beans in terms of area cultivated, output, and yield. The production of commercial and staple crops is also divided along land tenure lines. While both large and small private owners (landholding units with greater than five hectares [one hectare equals 2.47 acres] and five or fewer hectares, respectively), concentrate their resources in the production of high value fruit crops, <u>ejidos</u> devote most of their land to basic crops for home consumption.

An examination of expenditures on wage labor and means of production by landholding unit highlights the economically and socially differentiated

character of Calvillo's agrarian sector. In 1970, wage payments represented over half of total farm costs for private units of production. Labor costs for ejidos, on the other hand, amounted to about 7% of total production expenses. Large private holdings are also the most capitalized units in the region accounting for 70% of total expenditures on raw materials and 76% of investments in capital equipment (Censo Agrícola. Ganadero y Ejidal, Aguascalientes 1970).

In addition to the uneven character of agriculture in the region, Calvillo is notable for high rates of out-migration. Temporary cyclical migration to the United States has been particularly acute since the mid-1960s and constitutes the most outstanding migratory trend in the region and the state.

The paper is comprised of three major sections. The first section presents a brief historical overview of the process of capitalist development in agriculture and its effects on Mexico's rural population. Two key processes are highlighted for the region and for the nation as a whole: increasing socioeconomic differentiation within the rural sector; and the emergence of widespread internal and international migration.

The second section offers both a theoretical and an empirical treatment of class structure in the rural sector. The analytical framework goes beyond traditional classifications of the peasantry by attempting to account for the structure of the production process as well as the social relations that emerge from it. Thus, the rural household's ownership of the means of production is considered within the context of the way in which households participate in the relations of production. This theoretical foundation is then employed to develop empirical indicators of social classes. Three particularly salient characteristics of the region's agrarian structure--the buying and selling of household labor, crop and land type, and access to means of production other than land--are used to determine divisions among rural groups.

The third part of the paper uses the analysis of class structure developed in section two to examine major patterns and rates of migration by class. It explores the way in which class characteristics of rural units, in conjunction with the gender and age division of labor and household size and composition, shape and reinforce specific migration patterns. In addition, the impact of migration on the household division of labor is considered.

Agrarian Structure and Migration: A Brief History

Calvillo's agrarian development differed fundamentally from that of the rest of Aguascalientes. The hacienda, an integral part of pre-revolutionary history in the rest of the state, did not play a major role in Calvillo. (In 1910 Calvillo contained three haciendas that occupied less than 15% of the region's land.) Rather, the pequeña propiedad (smallholding) dominated the rural sector since the founding of the community in the early 1700s. Throughout most of the 19th century, these private units of production grew and prospered. By 1925, however, primarily through property sales and

inheritance, the majority of parcels had been reduced to minifundios, landholding units less than a hectare in size (Rojas Nieto 1981).

After the Mexican Revolution, the agrarian reform land distribution program of the 1930s created ejido units from the expropriation of one of the region's three haciendas. The remaining haciendas were either subdivided among estate owners' relatives or sold as ranchos (large units of mixed farming/cattle) to individual buyers to avoid expropriation. Consequently, reform beneficiaries accounted for only a fraction of the landless peasantry. From 1930 to 1945, Calvillo's present agrarian structure began to take shape. The rural population consisted of owners of a few extensive ranchos, numerous pequeños propietarios, a handful of ejidatarios, and a relatively large contingent of landless agricultural wage workers.[4]

The smallholding class of the peasantry cultivated corn, beans, chili peppers, and some fruit trees, principally guava and peach, for personal consumption and sale at the local market. Cattle raising was a viable activity on the larger ranchos. Households without land rented or sharecropped small parcels; the majority, however, survived through a combination of artisan production, petty trading, and wage work, primarily in agriculture.

With the exception of occasional, temporary, seasonal migration to undertake wage work in neighboring areas, out-migration from Calvillo was minimal prior to 1940.[5] From 1942 to the mid-1960s, temporary migration to the United States dominated the region's as well as the nation's migration patterns. The Bracero Program, a contract labor agreement set up between the United States and Mexico at the start of the Second World War, drew thousands of workers from the community to short-term work in agriculture across the border.

The demand aspects of the program often overshadow the complex economic and political changes occurring in the region and in Mexico as a whole, fostering increased levels of documented and undocumented migration.[6] The height of the nation's modernization drive in agriculture coincided with the program. Agriculture was to provide Mexico with the foreign exchange and cheap food needed to spur the industrialization process (Arizpe 1981). Land redistribution was at its peak under the Cárdenas administration (1934-1940) and came to a near halt after 1940.[7] Between 1950 and 1960 agricultural policy shifted away from land distribution and development of rainfed smallholding plots to public investment in large scale irrigated agriculture and livestock raising (Dinerman 1982). The emphasis on irrigated agriculture discouraged the production of basic foodstuffs in favor of more profitable export crops.

By 1960 the polarization of Mexican agriculture into large scale agribusiness and small rainfed units was complete. Fifty percent of the landholding units had less than five hectares of land. These smallholders controlled about 14% of the total arable land and produced 4% of agricultural output. On the other hand, 0.5% of the land units accounted for 28.3% of the arable land and 32.3% of agricultural production (Arizpe 1981:167).

One of the manifestations of this new model of development was an increase in the number of landless agricultural wage workers. Between 1950 and 1960 rural laborers increased by 50%, making up almost half of the agricultural work force. By 1970 they represented 54% of the labor force in agriculture (Paré 1979). In short, the "modernization" process had seriously eroded the economic viability of smallholding rainfed agriculture and produced an increase in the number of landless agricultural wage workers. A major consequence of this process was an outflow of rural people to the cities and across the northern border in search of work.

The development of commercial agriculture in the region had similar effects. In the 1950s and 1960s, a group of capitalist farmers in Calvillo was able to consolidate landholdings and undertake commercial guava production.[8] Private and public bank credit financed the construction of dams and other irrigation systems; improved strains of guava, insecticides, herbicides, chemical fertilizers and other high technology inputs became essential ingredients in the production process.

Calvillo's entrepreneurs came mainly from the small proprietor class. By the early 1970s, they had brought guava production into full swing. Calvillo became the most important producer of guava in Mexico, accounting for two-thirds of national output and 30% of the state's agricultural income (INIA 1980). In contrast, basic crop cultivation dropped sharply for two major reasons: 1) government regulated corn prices eroded producer incentives to the point where land was sold, leased or abandoned altogether;[9] and 2) many producers, attracted by the lucrative nature of guava, began planting guava trees in place of basic food crops.

As the number of hectares planted to guava increased throughout the 1970s, strategic portions of the production process became concentrated in the hands of a few producers. Packing and storage, processing, distribution to national and international markets, and sales were controlled by the minority of growers who had access to financial and commercial networks. More and more, capital accumulation in guava controlled the productive activities of the majority of direct producers. Increased capital accumulation further differentiated producers, thus reinforcing the capitalist character of small private producers (Esteva 1980).

The process of capitalist development not only increased socioeconomic differentiation in Calvillo but also created a relative surplus population comprised of marginalized subsistence producers and a growing sector of landless laborers.[10] For this population, migratory wage labor became the primary means of survival.

Although migration is a widespread phenomenon in the region, households have not been affected equally. The next section turns from a discussion of the macroeconomic causes and consequences of the agrarian crisis to an analysis of rural class structure. We contend that an examination of the development of the rural productive structure as presented here provides only a partial explanation of differential migration rates and patterns. A fuller

understanding of migration involves relating the overall process of macroeconomic change to the household's specific role in the productive structure, i.e., class position.

Determinants of Rural Class Structure in Calvillo

Traditional economic studies of the peasantry tend to select a single index of ownership over the means of production as the major determinant of class; the most common indicator is size of landholding.[11] In a number of studies, land quality or the value of agricultural output complements the analysis.[12] The consideration of property relations in isolation does not, however, adequately capture class divisions in the agrarian sector. First, simple land-size categories do not reflect differences in the quality of land. Second, and more important, land-size categories do not capture the organization of production on the landholding.

To better understand class stratification within the peasantry, the nature of the productive process as well as the social and economic relations that emerge from such a process must be considered. Unlike the standard criterion, this approach to class status enables us to view households' unequal access to land and other means of production as part of broader structural mechanisms, the process of production, accumulation, and exploitation, in operation in the countryside.[13]

At the empirical level, the task is to identify indicators of the household's access to the means of production and the associated set of relations in which it participates. The incidence of commercialized agriculture and the extent of proletarianization in Calvillo give rise to three major interrelated indicators that serve as approximate measures of class structure.

The first and most important measure of class status is the household's participation in the labor market. By examining the buying and selling of household labor, this first indicator attempts to account for the household's level and form of integration into rural relations of production. We then introduce two variables that reflect important facets of the household's access to productive resources and, thus, of its form of participation in the production process; these are the type of land in use and the kind of crop produced. The final class indicator is the household's ownership of means of production other than land, i.e., tools, work animals, and other farm animals. This indicator, an additional measure of the household's economic standing, complements and reinforces the class structure given by the first two measures.

Using the data from the Calvillo survey, the following subsections analyze each of the three indicators to arrive at a multivariate picture of class in the study region.

1. Participation in the Labor Market. In the literature concerned with class status within the peasantry on the empirical level, the methodology

developed by the Indian economist, Utsa Patnaik (1976), represents a groundbreaking contribution to the field. In her analysis of Indian agriculture, she argues that using the size of the landholding unit to measure the concentration of means of production is not a sufficient foundation upon which to indicate class status. While examining the resource position of the household may indicate that the peasantry is segregated into more or less distinct land-size divisions, it fails to capture qualitative differences in land type and in the ways in which production is organized.[14] Stressing that no one index can fully measure class status, Patnaik proposes that the labor exploitation criterion or "the use of outside labor relative to the use of family labor would be the most reliable single index for categorizing the peasantry" (1976:84, Patnaik's emphasis).

Patnaik's index defines class position in the rural sector through two related criteria: the possession of the means of production and the exploitation of labor arising directly from the production process itself. The uneven distribution of the means of production in the rural sector reflects a process in which certain households accumulate most productive resources and thus require more labor than can be provided by family members, while other households have so few resources as to necessitate selling their labor power. Additionally, the total amount of labor used and, thus, its division between family and hired labor reflects the intensity of cultivation as well as the level of technology. At a general level, then, households can be classified by the extent of their participation in the labor market.

Patnaik presents the following "E" index or labor exploitation criterion[15] to categorize "mutually exclusive economic classes":

$$E = (X_1 - X_0)/Y$$

where X_1 equals total labor days hired in by the household; X_0 equals total labor days hired out by the household; and Y represents family (household) labor days on the operational holding.[16]

The numerator of the E index determines whether a household is a net seller or net buyer of labor power. The relationship between net labor (X_1-X_0) and family labor (Y) thus indicates the household's relative dependence on wage labor for subsistence. For example, a fully proletarianized household--lacking land and other means of production--neither hires in labor (X_1=0) nor performs family labor (Y=0). In this case the E ratio tends toward negative infinity, since the household participates in the labor market only as a seller of labor power (X_0>0). At the other extreme, a pure capitalist household depends exclusively on the labor of others (X_1>0, X_0=0, Y=0) for production; E therefore approaches positive infinity.

For those classes not identified as exclusively capitalist or proletarian, the sign and size of E determine whether a peasant household is a net appropriator of labor or whether it is exploited on the whole. In the middle peasantry, self-employment (Y) by definition is of primary importance for household subsistence and therefore exceeds net labor. The numerator will be

positive and E positive if the household on balance hires in more labor than it hires out. If no outside labor is involved on the operational holding ($X_1=0$) or if the household is more dependent on wage labor for subsistence ($X_0 > X_1$), then E is 0 or negative (and small). Poor peasants or the semi-proletarians are poorly equipped with land and other productive resources; off-farm labor thus provides the greater part of households' subsistence so that E tends to be large and negative.

In applying the E criterion to the Calvillo survey data, several salient trends emerge (see Table 1). First, the class divisions given by the E ratio show that only a small percentage of the landed, i.e., the capitalist/rich peasantry[17] control the demand for labor in each region. Second, the data show evidence of a self-sustaining middle peasantry that on balance neither exploits labor nor is itself exploited ($X_1=0$, $X_0=0$, and $E=0$). And finally, the greatest percentage of households are located within the lower two strata of the rural class structure, the poor and full-time laboring groups. Significantly, proletarianization is pervasive among poor peasants. Indeed, the average number of labor days hired out by the poor peasantry is greater than that of the landless or full-time laborer class.

2. Land Type and Crop Type. an examination of the type of land in use and the kind of crop produced by the household strengthens the analysis by focusing on the highly differentiated character of agricultural production in the region. In Calvillo, basic crops, corn and beans, are largely cultivated on rainfed land while the commercial cropping of guava is done on irrigated land. Table 2, based on 1970 Census data,[18] provides an insight into the uneven distribution of land by type and crop in the region.[19]

The most outstanding division within rural groups appears with respect to crop type. While ejidos devote a minimum amount of land (2.5%) to commercial crops, private units of production devote between 32% (for holdings greater than 5 hectares) and 53% (for holdings of 5 or fewer hectares) of their land to commercial crops. Among rural groups, the distribution of land by crop type is equally skewed. Private units control 97% of the land under commercial agriculture and 63% of basic crop land whereas ejidos cultivate 3% and 37% of commercial and basic crop land, respectively. In terms of land type, the census data show that both irrigated and rainfed land are concentrated in large private units of production.

The marked differences across peasant households in the type of land owned and the kind of crop cultivated translate into severe inequalities in households' expenditure and revenue structures and, consequently, in class position. From the point of view of household expenditures, the production of guava--a commercial crop cultivated on irrigated land--requires large investments in fertilizers, pesticides, wage labor, transportation, and year-round upkeep and packaging; thus, it is a viable enterprise only for those households with a sufficiently strong economic base, namely the upper strata of the peasantry. Corn and bean production, on the other hand, requires neither irrigated land nor large capital outlays in the form of wage labor and means of production and is, therefore, an option open to all landed households.

From the perspective of household revenues, land and crop type are also indicative of the household's socioeconomic position in the region's agrarian structure. In comparing (gross) revenues derived from subsistence and commercial output, we find that on average each hectare devoted to the cultivation of guava generated $467,647 as opposed to $1,534 pesos[20] for corn and beans. Similarly, a hectare of irrigated land generated an average of $372,511 in contrast to 1,411 pesos for rainfed land. Clearly, then, these two variables, crop type and land type, significantly define and distinguish rural households in Calvillo.

Those producers cultivating guava and having irrigated land thus provide an initial juxtaposition between the upper (capitalist/rich and middle peasants) and lower strata (poor peasants and full-time laborers). Given the large capital outlays necessary for the cultivation of commercial crops, the capitalist/rich sector of the peasantry can be identified by the possession of irrigated land and the production of guava. Middle peasants, although possessing irrigated land, are more likely to engage in the cultivation of basic crops, an activity that does not require large capital investments. The poor peasantry lack irrigated land, thereby impending the production of more profitable crops. The class structure shown in Table 3 is based on the analysis of the type of land in use and the kind of crop produced by the household.

In contrast to the census data given in Table 2, the sample survey data capture more precise patterns of land distribution by type and crop across classes. According to Table 3, the capitalist/rich stratum owns a smaller percentage of the total arable land in the sample than either middle or poor peasants, yet it dominates the production of the most profitable crop in the region, guava, and accounts for a significant portion of the corn and bean output. For the area under study, then, absolute land size is secondary to an analysis of land quality and the kind of crop produced on the operational holding.

Furthermore, these two indicators provide a clearer picture of the polarization of classes than can be gleaned from a consideration of household participation in the labor market. In particular, the middle peasantry, a group that lacks a precise classification on the basis of the buying and selling of labor power, acquires a more specific character. In contrast to the capitalist/rich class, the participation of middle peasants in commercial agriculture is minor; however, by holding irrigated land they are able to produce both absolutely and relatively larger amounts of staple crops than poor peasants with larger holdings.

3. Access to Nonland Means of Production. The third class indicator examines access to productive resources other than land. The two previous indicators supported the existence of distinct classes. A large group of fully proletarianized households stands out in contrast to a small capitalist/rich peasant sector controlling commercial agriculture in the region. The polarization of economic groups denotes a level of capitalist development in which the means of production are concentrated in the hands of

a few, while the vast majority of rural inhabitants must resort to the sale of labor power to subsist. It is expected that an analysis of the household's access to nonland means of production will further clarify the pattern of concentration of resources in the hands of an economically superior class.

The marked difference in the types of production prevalent in Calvillo makes it necessary to distinguish between mechanized (tractors, trucks, and pick-ups) and nonmechanized (tools and draft animals) instruments of production. As indicated earlier, commercial crops require a relatively high degree of mechanization in contrast to basic crop cultivation which can be undertaken with draft animals (horses, mules, and donkeys) and a few basic implements (shovels, hoes, and axes).

The ownership versus rental of means of production, in particular mechanized instruments, must also be considered in examining rural class structure. For example, the ownership of a truck or a tractor represents not only an instrument of production on the operational holding but also an instrument that can be rented-out to generate a monetary income. Ownership of mechanized instruments thus implies relative independence in production and an additional income source that complements agricultural production. On the contrary, renting-in of means of production may imply a greater dependence on usury capital and a monetary outflow from the household.

In classifying Calvillo's households with this third indicator, it is hypothesized that ownership of mechanized means of production is associated with a capitalist/rich peasant class, whereas renting-in mechanized instruments characterizes poor and middle peasants. The use of draft animals in production establishes the opposite situation; poor and middle peasant households favor draft animals because of their scant hold on mechanized instruments.

Ownership of other nonwork farm animals (cows, pigs, and chickens) provides a further insight into the socioeconomic status of the household. The animal stock represents both an additional source of farm income and a means to meet basic subsistence requirements. For poor peasants in particular, animals are a "reserve fund" to be drawn from in times of economic difficulty and emergencies. On the other hand, for capitalist/rich households financially able to amass large animal stocks, they represent an expansion of farm investments. These differing uses of farm animals suggest that the possession of animals also represents a useful complement of class status.

Table 4 presents the class distribution of households based on access to mechanized and nonmechanized means of production. The most important phenomenon seen in Table 4 is the highly uneven distribution of the means of production in Calvillo. Capitalist/rich households (7% of the total number of rural units) control the totality of owned mechanized instruments, over a third of the tools used in production, and the vast majority of nondraft animals. Significantly, the middle peasantry (22.8% of households) rents in approximately two-thirds of all (rented) mechanized instruments. In contrast, poor households (24.6% of the total) depend heavily upon animal power to

undertake production, own 15% of nonwork animals, and, to the extent that they use mechanized instruments of production, rent them in. As expected, the bottom 45.6% of households, the full-time laborers, have little or no access to means of production.

This skewed distribution of production instruments by class is directly in line with the class structure that emerged from the consideration of the buying and selling of labor power and land/crop type. In fact, the distribution of households is not altered in moving from the second to the third class indicator. This strongly indicates a cohesive interaction among the household's extent of participation in the labor market, the type of land/crop under cultivation, and access to nonland productive resources.[21]

Class, Household Structure, and Migration

Using the Calvillo survey data, this section examines how differential migration rates by class affect and are affected by households' internal structure, composition, and the sex and age division of labor. This framework, which introduces particular aspects of the household unit into the study of migration, is adopted on the assumption that household organization and structure are dynamic components of class. As a social unit, the household responds to and acts upon changes occurring in the wider economy. In this respect, we are in agreement with Pessar in defining the household as "an evolving nexus of social relations which originates within a larger field of social relations and institutions through which it is transformed and which it may in turn modify" (1982:3).

The first part of this section outlines migration patterns and rates by class and addresses the importance of migration for each class. The second part links differential migration rates to household structure and composition characteristics. In particular, women's roles in production and in the household are highlighted as key components shaping and defining the migration trajectory of the household. Additionally, the impact of migration on the household division of labor is considered.

1. Migration Patterns by Class. Table 5 presents data on rural out-migration by class in Calvillo for the survey period 1981-1982. The table shows that migration is inversely related to class. The number of households engaged in migration increases as class status decreases. Almost one-half (46.1%) of full-time laborer households had members who migrated during the study period whereas no households within the capitalist/rich sector reported anyone migrating. The size of household income and the importance of remittances for household reproduction provide key measures of the role class plays in migration. For example, among completely proletarianized households--numerically the most important group in Calvillo's rural sector--migration to the United States represents an important means to supplement household income and allows many households to secure reproduction requirements substantially above a bare subsistence level.

Table 6 shows that over 90% of migrants from the proletarianized class sent remittances and that remittances constituted a significant percentage of total household monetary income, 28.5%. In almost half (48%) of full-time laborer households, the cash influx was directed toward the purchase of consumer goods such as television sets, radios, bicycles, and household appliances. Health and educational expenses were also taken care of through remittances. A smaller percentage (28%) were able to invest migration income in "home improvements" such as, painting the house, constructing a new room or house, or installing indoor plumbing. For another group of households (20%), however, remittances went solely toward the repayment of debts, some incurred to finance previous migration expenses.

Among the poor peasantry, on the other hand, the relatively high percentage of households engaged in migratory wage labor (42.8%) reflects this sector's extreme state of impoverishment. For poor households, the marginalization of rainfed production of staple crops has meant that wage labor rather than production on the land satisfies immediate consumption needs. These households thus have more in common with full-time laborers than with their landed counterparts. An examination of the data, however, shows this class to be economically worse off than landless or completely proletarianized households and casts doubt on whether minimum subsistence requirements are being met.

Table 7 presents data on household incomes for all strata. The poor peasantry have both the lowest average annual cash income and average total income.[22] A comparison of poor and landless households, the most proletarianized groups, shows that the poor have an average cash income 30% less than full-time proletarian households; average total income only slightly decreases the income gap between the two groups.[23]

A second factor, related to total income formation, is also suggestive of this sector's impoverished condition. With the exception of a single household, agricultural production of corn, the main staple, was held for personal consumption. Yet in no instance were corn output levels sufficient to supplement, much less cover, dietary needs throughout the year. On average, food crop production lasted about three months, although in several cases the poor quality of the crop made it suitable only for animal feed.

In poor peasant households, then, migratory wage labor represents an important means to meet basic consumption needs. Indeed, Table 6 shows that this class derives almost one-third of its total monetary income from migration remittances. Through the permanent and cyclical migration of some household members, these units acquire resources that contribute to household survival. In contrast to landless households, nearly 70% of households from the poor peasantry receiving remittances used these remittances to purchase such basic necessities as food and clothing rather than provide for an improved standard of living.

Direct producers classified as middle peasants account for 22.8% of the households in the survey. Within this stratum, approximately one-quarter of

all households had members engaged in migratory wage labor. All migrants from the middle peasantry sent remittances; remittances, however, constituted less than 15% of the total cash income of these households. In contrast to the lower strata of rural households, remittances in this class were invested in the purchase of land and other means of production rather than being used to purchase basic needs or consumer goods.

In the majority of middle peasant households receiving remittances from migrants (64.9%), farm equipment and livestock were the two principle purchases. Migration by members of this class thus appears to be motivated by the need to maintain a competitive balance in the region's productive structure. For a significant group of middle peasant producers, resources gained from international migration appeared to keep households afloat as producers of staple food crops. For a minority of middle peasants looking to expand production, remittances provided a critical means to finance capital outlays in the production of the region's most profitable crop, guava.

The capitalist/rich units of production, which account for 7% of the households in the survey, dominate the agrarian productive structure in Calvillo. Their superior position in production is linked to the underlying process of capital accumulation in agriculture. These households are involved in the production of the most profitable crop in the region, guava. The use of wage labor accompanied by a high degree of inputs and mechanization characterize the production process. It is primarily for these reasons that labor migration in this class is not a characteristic feature. A number of factors relating to household reproduction support this hypothesis.

In capitalist/rich households, agricultural commodity production constitutes the primary source of income. Nearly the whole of their income (93%) is derived from the sale of agricultural goods. The type of income earning activity engaged in by these units produces marked disparities in income levels. Because commercial agriculture is very profitable, the upper stratum of the peasantry has an average gross total household income more than ten times greater than that of the middle peasantry (see Table 7). Financial stability within this class, then, appears to account for the absence of migration in this stratum. In a region where wage labor migration represents an important means to secure a variety of reproduction requirements, we would not expect this type of migration to characterize the upper class.

The destination of migrants also appears to relate to the household's position within the agrarian class structure. Table 8 shows the percentage of migrants that sought work within Mexico or in the United States. Migration to the United States constitutes the outstanding trend among the proletarianized stratum. Migration to the U.S. also predominates among the middle peasantry. Among poor peasant units, however, internal migration is the most pronounced trend. The prevarious economic base of poor peasant units appear to restrict international migration. Instead, internal migration and the general proletarianization of households members constitute the primary income-generating option.

2. Household Structure and Migration. The migration index presented in Table 9 gives a view of the extent of migration by sex across classes. Male migration dominates in all class strata, but there are significant differences among classes.

Full-time laborer households have the highest rate of male out-migration as evidenced by the migration ratio, 0.47. In this class, nearly half of all males between the ages of 15 and 59 migrated on a temporary or permanent basis during the survey period.[24] Furthermore, this is the only class with a relatively strong incidence of female migration.[25] Although the poor and middle sectors of the peasantry lag behind the migration rates established for the landless, the middle sector exhibits a higher incidence of male out-migration than the poor.

Among landless and poor peasant households, male migration relates strongly to the existing gender and age division of labor within the region and in the household. There are two key factors: the lack of permanent, steady employment for men in the region and women's dual roles in productive and reproductive activities.[26] In Calvillo, the majority of completely proletarianized households depend on wage work to meet consumption needs. Wage income is primarily obtained from work in the guava fields or through maquila doméstica, the home assembly of women's blouses, lingerie, and infants' clothing. Within this strata, 65% of households engage in agricultural wage labor and 57% take in piece work. Overall, more than 75% of households depend on either guava or maquila for employment.

These two activities reveal the rigid sexual division of labor prevalent in the region and in the household. Guava, for example, employs a male work force.[27] Maquila, on the other hand, employs women exclusively and uses female children from the age of 7 or 8 as unpaid family workers.[28]

The limited range of permanent, salaried work available to male household members shapes the pattern and intensity of migration. Employment in guava is seasonal, the harvest extending from late September through early February. Few jobs are available in guava during the off-season and other employment opportunities--in construction (bricklaying), petty commerce or odd jobs in the community (carpentry, plumbing)--are sporadic. During the off-season, temporary migration is at its highest with migrants leaving after the harvest and returning in the fall.

Women's roles in productive and reproductive activities are equally important contributory factors in shaping the composition of the migrant labor force. Women's work in maquila provides the household with a dependable source of income throughout the year. Even though maquila earnings constitute less than 25% of total income among rural proletarians, the availability of steady, albeit poorly remunerated, work[29] allows the male head of household to migrate knowing the basic needs are being met in the interim before his remittances arrive. The availability of maquila may also account for women's overall lack of participation in migration.

Significantly, the nature of maquila work--paid work in the home--means that the day-to-day responsibilities of household maintenance and child care can be performed simultaneously with wage work. In short, women's combined and interdependent roles in productive and reproductive activities ensure the ongoing economic as well as social reproduction of the domestic unit.

The sexual division of labor both defines the household's relationship to the labor market among the poor peasantry as well as contributing to the tenuous economic status of this class. In fact, low household income in this class emerges in part from the social relations embedded in the gender division of labor. First, this sector's extensive involvement in wage labor as evidenced by the relatively large contingent of household wage earners is due to women's greater participation in salaried work. That is, insofar as wage employment accounts for the household's primary income source, the burden of paid work falls on women. Slightly over half (52%) of all wage earners in the poor peasant class are women as opposed to 38% of the landless category.

Second, the sexual division of labor assigns to women the most poorly remunerated work in the region, maquila doméstica. Indeed, low household cash income for this sector directly arises from the fact that a high percentage of these households, in contrast to the full-time laborer class, derive a major portion of their cash earnings from maquila. Nearly 60% of households receive between 40 and 100% of their income from home manufacture activities.

The consequences for migration, particularly international migration, are clear. The meager income obtained from maquila restricts the household's capacity to cover migration costs. Despite the attraction of higher wages in the United States, this sector does not have the economic stability to send a migrant across the border. Migration patterns are decidedly regional and national in character.

A number of factors relating to households' internal structures further distinguishes these internal migrants from the international migrants of the landless group. For example, who in the household leaves varies across these two strata. Both sectors are dominated by male migration yet, as Table 10 indicates, male head of households largely comprise the international migrant labor force among the full-time worker group while sons account for half of the internal migrant stream among the poor.

The tendency for sons to migrant in the poor peasant class relates in part to our earlier discussion of regional labor demand and the sexual division of labor. In this class, however, increasing demographic pressure on the land in the face of fixed or decreasing resources compounds the effects of a restricted labor market and a rigid sexual division of labor in production (Young 1978). In ejidatario households, for example, only one son, usually the oldest, will inherit his father's plot. (With the exception of widows, women are generally excluded from inheriting land). Sons of sharecroppers have no guarantee of future access to land or other productive resources. The extent of the problem can be gleaned from an examination of household size and composition.

Table 11 shows average household size and composition according to social strata. Although households are large in all strata, the poor peasantry have on average significantly larger units than either full-time laborers or middle peasants. Furthermore, the poor peasantry is the class with the largest percentage of extended family units, 36%.

Other studies in Mexico have argued that the extended family structure is most characteristic of landholding units with greater resources (e.g., Arizpe 1980; Dinerman 1982). In Calvillo, however, the extended family household appears to occur among the landed poor for reasons of basic survival. Where wage work is absolutely essential to meet consumption needs, it is in the economic interests of households to have as many potential laborers as possible (Young 1978).

The large and extended household structure has been particularly supportive of migrant households. Over 80% of migrants from the poor peasantry come from either large or extended households. If land rights depend on annual cultivation of the soil, as in the case of ejidatario units, the household can sponsor a single migrant, usually a son, while other family members remain to do agricultural work. Large and extended families, while crucial to overall household viability for the poor peasantry, have had differential effects on particular household members. In an area where access to land and employment are both limited and circumscribed by the sexual division of labor, sons have the highest tendency to out-migrate.

Male out-migration is also the dominant pattern within the middle peasant sector. Three quarters of all male migrants from this class are dependent sons involved in international migration. The drive toward acquisition of means of production by these households and the high rates of participation in migration by sons suggest that, to a certain extent, land resources represent a viable employment option. In this class, land inheritance is not restricted to a single male child--90% of these units are private owners or pequeños propietarios; sons in these households may be investing in farming to secure and maintain at least a portion of future subsistence requirements. Nonetheless, the relatively small size of middle peasant plots, 3.7 hectares on average, suggests that this may be an option available to one son only. The higher median age of male migrants from this class (see Table 10) suggests that older sons are vying for land resources.

The strong tendency to expel male household members and retain women has in turn provoked changes in the economic and social organization of peasant households (Margolis 1979). Among the poor peasantry in particular, a greater tendency for men to migrate has altered the traditional sexual division of labor. Women and children (12 years and younger) from this sector constitute a significant proportion of the labor force on the family holding, comprising 43.7% of family farm workers. Additionally, in 60% of poor households women assume major responsibility for agricultural production. In addition to their tasks of weeding, spreading fertilizers, cutting beans, and husking corn, women are involved in tasks traditionally performed by men--plowing, sowing and cultivation.

In both poor and landless households, women's participation in wage work has increased in response to the high incidence of male migration. As noted earlier, women's incorporation into wage work is an integral part of the poor and landless household strategy for subsisting and reproducing itself. During periods of male migration, women supplement household income in a variety of ways. In addition to doing maquila work, women take in laundry and ironing and daughters work in domestic service, primarily in Calvillo City.

In contrast to the lower strata of rural households, the middle peasantry does not appear to have altered the traditional gender and age division of labor in response to migration by male household members. In this class (as in the case of the capitalist/rich sector) women are not involved in paid labor either within or outside of the home. Women of the middle peasantry contribute to household income formation through other income earning activities. In almost half of these households, women work for pay as self-employed seamstresses, but their earnings account for less than 12% of total household income. Women's work in agricultural production in the landed upper classes largely consists of preparing and taking a mid-day meal to husbands and sons in the fields.

In sum, household structure and organization, in concert with the household's class position, is both responsive to and the result of migration. Economic pressures provoke multiple strategies of survival and reproduction among different rural groups, affecting both the household's productive base and the sexual and age division of labor.

Conclusions

This study has shown that the factors shaping migration processes must be analyzed within a framework that locates larger economic, political, and social issues within a concrete study of the regional structure of production, class position, and household structure and organization. The particularly strong interaction evidenced between household class position and migration patterns in Calvillo underscores the importance of differentiating social groups in the rural sector on the basis of their place in the relations of production.

For the four classes identified in the region--full-time laborer, poor peasantry, middle peasantry, and capitalist/rich peasantry--decisions to migrate are uniquely grounded in the household's productive base. The least commercialized units--completely proletarianized and poor peasant households--have the highest propensity to migrate at the household level. For landless households, migration to the United States appears to substantially improve the household's standard of living. In contrast, internal migration among the poor peasantry is less an "option" than a vital means to secure consumption requirements that contribute toward the very survival of the domestic unit. Among the middle peasantry, migration is primarily a means to enhance the household's productive base. The absence of migration among the capitalist/rich peasant stratum suggests that its economic dominance within the agrarian productive structure makes migratory wage labor unnecessary.

The focus on class status also shows how the internal structure of different rural households affects and is affected by migration. The sexual division of labor--specifically women's roles in production and reproduction--and household size and composition vary widely across classes and have a decisive effect on households' migration patterns. This analysis also sheds light on why men and not women are the migrants in Calvillo.

The sexual composition of the migrant pool also reinforces key components of class. Among landless and poor peasant households in particular, male migration has important consequences for the household division of labor. Women increase their participation in agricultural production and wage work while retaining their traditional responsibilties for child care and family welfare. Thus, the intensification of women's labor in paid and unpaid work and productive and reproductive activities sharpens the analysis of class structure and migration. It reveals how and which household members are most vulnerable to and marginalized by changes in the household's productive base. In summary, the consideration of class and household characteristics in this study help not only to clarify why migration occurs but also to discern the uneven effects of migration on rural households.

NOTES

1. See C. Vásquez and R. Chiapetto (1981) for a recent detailed examination of the Mexican migrant population.

2. Calvillo, the second largest of nine municipios or counties in the state of Aguascalientes, has approximately 37,000 inhabitants. A stratified random sample of rural communities in the region was taken by the author in 1982. Eight communities and 59 households were selected for analysis. The Calvillo study forms part of a larger comparative project undertaken by the author, analyzing the relationships among class, household structure, and migration in the three most important agricultural regions in Aguascalientes--El Valle, El Llano, and Calvillo. Unless otherwise noted, all data in this paper refer to the author's 1982 survey of Calvillo. Funding for the project was generously provided by the Social Science Research Council and the Inter-American Foundation.

3. An ejido is a landholding unit in which ownership and administration is legally vested in a community responsible for allocating cropland to individual ejido members, ejidatarios. Ejido land may not be sold, rented or transferred to nonmembers of the ejido (World Bank 1978).

4. According to the 1930 Agrarian Census of Aguascalientes, 75% of Calvillo's landholding units were held by small property owners. There were no ejidatarios. In 1944 the Delegación Agraria reported 216 ejidatarios in the municipio of Calvillo, about 1.4% of the total number of ejidatarios in the state of Aguascalientes. In terms of land size, 47% of the landholding units over one hectare in 1930 had an average size of 4.5 hectares.

5. Prior to 1940, the principal migrations occurred after the introduction of the railroad (1900) and during the turmoil of the civil war (1910-1917). In both cases migration was primarily to the United States and northern border areas (Rojas Nieto 1981).

6. According to Bustamante (1975) undocumented migration to the United States first emerged as a wide-scale phenomena during the years of bracerismo. Internal migration was largely toward Mexico's major urban centers, Mexico City, Guadalajara, and Monterrey.

7. By 1940, 22% of all farmland, including 47% of the cropland, had been distributed to over half of the country's rural population (World Bank 1978).

8. Guava production accelerated in the 1950s. In this period, only 52 hectares of guava were cultivated as opposed to 3,068 hectares of corn and beans. At this time, the production of guava was exclusively controlled by private units. By 1960 nearly ten times more land had been taken into cultivation of guava while areas sown for basic crops less than doubled.

During this period, private producers controlled all but a single hectare of the land used for guava. In the 1970 Agrarian Census, land for guava was reported to be 1,666 hectares, that is, an increase of 227% over 1960. Furthermore, for the first time, the amount of land devoted to guava was greater than that devoted to corn and beans. While private producers maintained their dominance over guava production, ejido units now accounted for 3% of the land devoted to guava. (Censo Agrícola, Ganadero y Ejidal 1950, 1960, and 1970).

9. From 1957 to 1973, the government regulated the price of corn (Arizpe 1981). The idea behind the price controls was to ensure rural income levels as well as to control the price of the nation's primary staple. In practice, however, government-guaranteed prices meant the displacement of corn production, because producers could buy corn on the market cheaper than they could produce it for themselves and their families. A 1982 ECLA study states that 33% of the smallholding peasantry are net buyers of corn (CEPAL).

10. In my 1982 Agrarian Survey of Calvillo, 53.8% of landless households reported having had land previously.

11. Most agrarian censuses of Latin America divide rural groups on the basis of landholding size. Governments and international financial institutions, e.g., the World Bank, typically rely on this kind of division for their analyses of the rural sector.

12. In the Latin American context, researchers associated with the Centro de Investigaciones Agrarias (CDIA) and the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) have used this approach. See Reyes Osorio, et al. 1974 and Domike and Baraclough 1972.

13. In her analysis of the Mexican rural proletariat, Pare (1979:42) addresses this issue in her critique of Stavenhagen's (1968) classification of rural classes. She writes, "Though Stavenhagen's conception has the merit of revealing the proletarian character of the landless peasant ... it emphasizes income levels and standard of living and leaves aside the problem of accumulation and exploitation."

14. See Lenin (1972) for an equally powerful argument against classifying the peasantry on the basis of the size of the peasant holding.

15. Patnaik's E, as a quantified measure of exploitation, does not correspond to the rate of exploitation or S/V defined by Marx (1975) as the ratio of the surplus value to the variable capital.

16. Patnaik's original equation specifies an additional type of (indirect) labor relations: renting-in/-out of land where labor is indirectly appropriated through rent payments. In this study we do not consider Patnaik's land renting concept in classifying rural households for two reasons. First, leasing-in and -out of land was difficult to document in

the Calvillo survey because of ejidatarios' reluctance to reveal land renting practices. Second, a rigorous empirical application of the theory of rent has not been employed by Patnaik.

17. In my agrarian survey of Calvillo, the capitalist and rich peasantry comprise a single class. This seems an appropriate conflation because the upper strata of the cultivating population evidence a homogeneous social and economic structure vis-à-vis other classes. Additionally, the capitalist units of production surveyed in the three regions have not reached a level in which the division of labor can be characterized by an absolute separation between manual labor and supervisory tasks; thus the concept of a pure capitalist as defined by Patnaik does not hold.

18. At the time of this study, the 1980 census data for the state of Aguascalientes were not available.

19. In Table 2 the census category "private unit of production" refers to a single production unit or household, whereas the "ejido" category refers to a group of landholding households. Thus, the four ejidos that are reported to exist in Calvillo do not accurately reflect the distribution of land among ejidatario households.

20. Before the devaluation of the peso in February 1982, one U.S. dollar was equivalent to approximately 26 Mexican pesos. Between February and August 1982, one U.S. dollar was equivalent to 49 pesos.

21. The simple correlation coefficient between the E ratio and irrigated land is 0.49. The correlation coefficient between work animals and rainfed land is 0.79.

22. In Table 7, the category "total income" includes all income sources--from marketed and nonmarketed agricultural output, wage labor, income generated from self-employed activities, sharecropping revenues, rents, government subsidies, migration remittances, etc. It does not include goods or services received from family, friends, and formal institutions. The category "money income" is total income minus the value of nonmarketed agricultural output.

23. In considering the poor peasantry's low income level, it is interesting to note their extensive involvement and dependence on wage work. For example, wage income accounts for about 80 to 90% of total income earned by poor and completely proletarianized households, respectively. The average number of wage earners in poor households, however, is greater than among the landless strata, 3.4 as opposed to 2.6.

24. In this study, a temporary migrant is someone who left the community for at least one month for work purposes and returned within the study period. A permanent migrant is someone who was living and had lived more than half a year out of the community when the survey was taken. The tables on migration refer to both temporary and permanent migrants.

25. In the full-time laborer class, four of the five women migrants migrated to the United States with their husbands. In general, however, the small size of the female migrant pool does not permit an adequate treatment of the phenomenon of female migration in this study.

26. The term reproduction has meaning on several different but interrelated levels: biological reproduction; the daily maintenance of the labor force; and social reproduction, or the reproduction of the whole society.

27. Although the widespread practice of paying workers according to the number of kilos of guava picked and boxed (a destajo) often encourages entire families to engage in agriculture wage work, adult men and male children above the age of 13 generally constitute the contracted work force.

28. In contrast to the guava industry, the maquila industry has no local base. Textile and clothing manufacturers from the state capital, Aguascalientes City, account for some of the distribution of materials among rural households in Calvillo. For the most part, though, large national firms from Mexico City and Guadalajara, Jalisco, have set up elaborate networks of intermediaries in charge of distribution, collection of the finished product, and payment.

29. Wages vary widely within the maquila industry. Elaborately hand-stitched blouses (deshilados), for example, take a single highly skilled woman 4 to 5 days to complete, working an average of 8 hours a day. For each blouse, women receive $150 pesos. Even with many family members involved, few households can finish more than 4 blouses a week. Machine sewn designs on children's blankets are remunerated at 6 pesos per blanket. Between 60 and 80 blankets can be assembled in eight hours. Women machine-embroidering designs on women's lingerie are paid between 5 cents and 1 peso per garment. It takes approximately 3 hours to earn 20 pesos!

    In addition to receiving extraordinarily low wages, women doing maquila work face harsh working conditions. Long hours of closely detailed work with poor or no illumination has many women complaining of severe headaches and loss of eyesight after several years. If sewing machines are used (usually rented-in), overhead costs such as electricity and maintenance are borne by the household. Thread and needles must also be provided by the worker.

TABLE 1

CLASS STRUCTURE I. THE BUYING AND SELLING OF LABOR POWER[a]

Household Classification	Number of Households	Average Family Days worked (Y)	Average Labor Days Hired in (X_1)	Average Labor Days Hired out (X_0)	Average Net Labor Days (X_1-X_0)	E Ratio $\frac{X_1-X_0}{Y}$
Capitalist/ Rich Peasant	3 (5.1)	338.0	501.0	5.0	496.0	1.46
Middle Peasant	17 (28.8)	356.0	30.0	30.0	0.0	0.00
Poor Peasant	13 (22.0)	158.0	0.5	795.0	-794.5	-5.02
Full-Time Laborer	26 (44.1)	0.0	0.0	502.0	-502.0	- ∞
Total	59 (100.0)					

Source: 1982 Agrarian Survey of Calvillo

[a]Labor days (family, hired in and hired out) are calculated on a per person per day basis. Hired in labor accounts for wage workers employed on the operational holding only; hired out labor refers to wage labor performed in or outside of the household. In households where petty commercial activities are involved (such as fruit and vegetable street vending) or self-employment exists within the home (such as working as a seamstress or owning a small store) and no land is held, the households have been classified as full-time laborer. Numbers in parentheses indicate percentage of total households sampled.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF ARABLE LAND BY CROP AND TYPE (HECTARES)[a]

Census Category	Number of Units	Land Devoted to Commercial Crops (Guava)		Land Devoted to Basic Crops (Corn and Beans)		Total
		Rainfed	Irrigated	Rainfed	Irrigated	
Ejidos	4	7	48	1,399	662	2,116
Private Units <5 ha.	342	39	281	237	48	605
Private Units ≥5 ha.	514	94	1,356	2,945	208	4,603
Total	856	140	1,685	4,581	918	7,324

Source: Censo Agrícola, Ganadero y Ejidal, 1970.

[a]One hectare equals approximately 2.5 acres.

TABLE 3

CLASS STRUCTURE II: LAND TYPE AND CROP TYPE

Household Class Type	Number Of Households	Land Owned (%)	Land Type		Crop Type Output	
			Irrigated (%)	Rainfed (%)	Guava (%)	Corn/Beans (%)
Capitalist/ Rich	4 (7.0)	22.9	67.9	13.2	98.0	11.9
Middle	13 (22.8)	33.8	30.9	34.5	1.9	48.1
Poor	14 (24.6)	43.1	0.0	52.3	0.0	48.0
Full-Time Laborer	26 (45.6)	0.2	1.2[b]	0.0	0.1	0.0
Total	57 (100.0)[a]	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: 1982 Agrarian Survey of Calvillo

[a]Two missing values. Numbers in parentheses indicate percentage of total households sampled.

[b]Constitutes a family garden.

TABLE 4

CLASS STRUCTURE III: NONLAND MEANS OF PRODUCTION

Household Class Type	Number of Households	Instruments of Production[a] (%)				
		Mechanized		Nonmechanized		
		Own	Rent	Tools	Animals	
					Work	Other[b]
Capitalist/ Rich	4 (7.0)	100.0	14.3	34.1	5.8	66.2
Middle	13 (22.8)	0.0	64.3	26.1	31.9	16.0
Poor	14 (24.6)	0.0	21.4	29.1	58.0	15.0
Full-Time Laborer	26 (45.6)	0.0	0.0	10.7	8.3	2.8
Total	57[c] (100.0)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: 1982 Agrarian Survey of Calvillo

[a]An index was constructed for each category.

[b]Percentages based on an index of 1981 market prices of cows, pigs, and chickens.

[c]Two missing values.

TABLE 5

WAGE LABOR MIGRATION BY CLASS, 1981-1982[a]

Class Type	Number of Households	Number of Households with Migrants
Capitalist/Rich	4 (7.0)	0 (0.0)
Middle	13 (22.8)	4 (30.7)
Poor	14 (24.6)	6 (42.8)
Full-Time Laborer	26 (45.6)	12 (46.1)

Source: 1982 Agrarian Survey of Calvillo

[a]Class type in this and subsequent tables refers to the classification of households given in Tables 3 and 4.

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF MIGRATION REMITTANCES BY CLASS, 1981-1982

Class Type	Number of Households	Households w/Migrants	Households Sending Remittances	Remittances as a % of Total Monetary Income
Capitalist/Rich Rich	7.0	0.0	--	--
Middle	22.8	30.7	100.0	14.1
Poor	24.6	42.8	66.6	31.7
Full-Time Laborer	45.6	46.1	91.6	28.5

Source: 1982 Agrarian Survey of Calvillo

TABLE 7

AVERAGE ANNUAL GROSS MONEY INCOME AND AVERAGE ANNUAL TOTAL INCOME
1981-1982
(HUNDREDS OF PESOS)

Class Type	Average Annual Gross Money Income	Average Annual Gross Total Income
Capitalist/Rich	11,911	11,942
Middle	865	1,338
Poor	800	828
Full-Time Laborer	1,136	1,136

Source: 1982 Agrarian Survey of Calvillo

TABLE 8

DESTINATION OF MIGRANTS BY CLASS, 1981-1982[a]
(%)

Class Type	DESTINATION		
	Aguascalientes	Mexico	United States
Capitalist/Rich	--	--	--
Middle	--	17.6	82.4
Poor	--	67.1	32.9
Full-Time Laborer	--	22.2	77.9

Source: 1982 Agrarian Survey of Calvillo

[a]Destination refers to whether migrants sought work within the state of Aguascalientes (outside of Calvillo), elsewhere in Mexico, or in the United States.

TABLE 9

WAGE LABOR MIGRATION INDEX BY CLASS AND SEX, 1981-1982[a]

Class	MEN		Index	WOMEN		Index
	Migrant Pool	Actual Migrants		Migrant Pool	Actual Migrants	
Cap./Rich	8	0	--	7	0	--
Middle	15	5	0.33	19	1	0.05
Poor	29	7	0.24	30	2	0.07
Full-Time Laborer	38	18	0.47	40	5	0.12

Source: 1982 Agrarian Survey of Calvillo

[a]The index is calculated by dividing the total number of actual migrants by the migrant pool or potential migrants, i.e., persons between the ages of 15 and 59.

TABLE 10

CHARACTERISTICS OF MALE MIGRANTS
(AGE AND KINSHIP) BY CLASS
1981-1982

Class Type	Median Age (Years)	Kinship (%)		
		Head	Son	Other[d]
Capitalist/Rich	--		--	
Middle	28	25.0	75.0	0.0
Poor	26	33.3	50.0	16.6
Full-Time Laborer	30	84.6	7.6	7.6

Source: 1982 Agrarian Survey of Calvillo

[a]Includes son-in-law, brother, grandson, and brother-in-law.

TABLE 11

HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND COMPOSITION BY CLASS
1981-1982

Class Type	Average Household Size	Household Composition (%)		
		Nuclear	Extended	Single Person
Capitalist/Rich	8.2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Middle	6.1	76.9	15.4	7.6
Poor	8.3	64.2	35.7	0.0
Full-Time Laborer	7.2	88.4	7.7	3.8

Source: 1982 Agrarian Survey of Calvillo

REFERENCES

Archivo General del Estado de Aguascalientes (AGEA)
1945-1964 Government documents on the operation of the bracero program in the state of Aguascalientes.

Arizpe, Lourdes
1980 La migración por relevos y la reproducción social del campesinado. Centro de Estudios Sociológicos. Mexico: El Colegio de Mexico.

1981 The Rural Exodus in Mexico and Mexican Migration to the United States. In: The Border That Joins, ed. by P. Brown and H. Shue. pp. 162-183. New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield.

Bustamante, Jorge
1975 Espaldas mojadas; materia prima para la expansión del capital notreamericano. Centro de Estudios Sociológicos. Mexico: El Colegio de México.

Comisión Económica para América Latina (CEPAL)
1982 Economía campesina y agricultura empresarial. Mexico: Siglo XXI.

Corona Vásquez, R. and C. Ruiz Chiapetto
1981 Migrantes internacionales con y sin antecedentes de migración interna: algunas caracteristicas socioecónomicas. Mexico, CENIET: Mexico.

Deere, Carmen Diana
1978 The Development of Capitalism in Agriculture and the Division of Labor by Sex: A Study of the Northern Peruvian Sierra. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of California: Berkeley.

Dinerman, Ina
1982 Migrants and Stay-at-Homes: A Comparative Study of Rural Migration from Michoacán, Mexico. San Diego: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies.

Dirección General de Estadística, Mexico
Censo Agrícola, Ganadero y Ejidal 1930, 1940, 1950, 1960, and 1970. Mexico: Dirección General de Estadística.

Domike, A.L. and S.L. Baraclough
1972 La estructure agraria en siete paises de américa latina. In: Lecturas sobre desarrollo agrícola, ed. by E. Flores. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Esteva, Gustavo
1980 La batalla en el México rural. Mexico: Siglo XXI.

Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Agrarias (INIA)
1980 Plan regional de investigación agrícola, Aguascalientes México: SARH.

Lenin, V.I.
1972 The Development of Capitalism in Russia. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Margolis, Jane
1979 El papel de la mujer en la agricultura del Bajío. Iztapalapa 1(1):158-169.

Marx, Karl
1975 Capital, Vol. I, New York: International Publishers.

Paré, Luisa
1979 El proletariado agrícola en México: campesinos sin tierra o proletarios agrícolas? Mexico: Siglo XXI.

Patnaik, Utsa
1976 Class Differentiation Within the Peasantry: An Approach to the Analysis of Indian Agriculture. Economic and Political Weekly 2(39):82-101.

Pessar, Patricia
1982 Kinship Relations of Production in the Migration Process: The Case of Dominican Emigration to the United States. Unpublished manuscript. New York University.

Reyes, Osorio, S., et al.
1974 Estructura agraria y desarrollo agrícola en México. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Rojas Nieto, Beatriz
1981 La destrucción de la hacienda en Aguascalientes. Mexico: El Colegio de Michoacán.

Stavenhagen, R.
1968 Neolatifundismo y Explotación. Mexico: Nuestro Tiempo.

Warman, Arturo
1979 El problema del proletariado agrícola. In: Polémica sobre las clases sociales en el campo mexicano, ed. by L. Paré. pp. 85-96. Mexico: Macehual.

World Bank
1978 Land Reform in Latin America. Washington, D.C.

Young, Kate
1978 Modes of Appropriation and the Sexual Division of Labor: A Case study from Oaxaca, Mexico. In: Feminism and Materialism, ed. by A. Kuhn and A. Wolpe. pp. 124-154. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

PUBLICATIONS

OFFICE OF WOMEN IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

The WOMEN IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PUBLICATION SERIES were founded in 1981 to disseminate information rapidly to national and international specialists in universities, government, and private institutions concerned with development issues affecting women. The two series, WORKING PAPERS ON WOMEN IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT and the WID FORUM, publish reports of empirical studies and projects, theoretical analyses, and policy discussions that illuminate the processes of change in the broadest sense and encourage manuscripts that bridge the gap between research, policy, and practice. Publications in the series address women's historical and changing participation in economic, political, and religious spheres, intra- and inter-family role relationships, gender identity, women's health and health care, and the sexual division of labor.

EDITOR: Rita S. Gallin

MANAGING EDITOR: Patricia Hubbard-Garcia

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE: Patricia Whittier

EDITORIAL BOARD: Marilyn Aronoff, Sociology; Anne Ferguson, Anthropology; Ada Finifter, Political Science; Peter Gladhart, Family & Child Ecology; John Hinnant, Anthropology; Susan Irwin, Anthropology; Akbar Mahdi, Sociology; Anne Meyering, History; Ann Millard, Anthropology; Nalini Malhotra Quraeshi, Sociology; Barbara Rylko-Bauer, Anthropology; Judith Stallmann, Agricultural Economics; Paul Strassmann, Economics

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS: To provide an opportunity for the work of those concerned with development issues affecting women to be critiqued and refined, all manuscripts submitted to the series are peer-reviewed. The review process averages two months and accepted manuscripts are published within five to six weeks. Authors receive ten free copies, retain copyrights to their works, and are encouraged to submit them to the journal of their choice.

Manuscripts submitted should be double-spaced, sent in duplicate, and include the following: (1) title page bearing the name, address and institutional affiliation of the author; (2) one-paragraph abstract; (3) text; (4) notes; (5) references cited; and (6) tables and figures. The format of the article may follow any journal of the author's choice. Submit manuscripts to Rita Gallin, Editor, WID Publication Series, Office of WID, 202 International Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1035.

TO ORDER PUBLICATIONS: Publications are available at a nominal cost and cost-equivalent exchange relationships are encouraged. To order publications or receive a listing of them, write to Office of WID, 202 International Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1035, USA.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: The Women in International Development Publication Series are partially funded by a Title XII Strengthening Grant.

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution