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Family and Personal Networks In International Migration: Recent Developments And New Agendas

Monica Boyd
Carleton University, Ottawa

Family, friendship and community networks underlie much of the recent migration to industrial nations. Current interest in these networks accompany the development of a migration system perspective and the growing awareness of the macro and micro determinants of migration. This article presents an overview of research findings on the determinants and consequences of personal networks. In addition, it calls for greater specification of the role of networks in migration research and for the inclusion of women in future research.

Twenty-five years ago, labor migration was a major component of immigration flows to industrial nations. Australia, Canada and the United States admitted a substantial proportion of migrants based on their economic contributions. Many Northern European countries encouraged and received labor migrants admitted ostensibly for short periods of time. These labor based migrations offered apparent confirmation of Ravenstein's law that males predominated in long distance migration. Such movement also was consistent with the prevailing theoretical approaches which stressed the movements of people as responses to push and pull forces in places of origin and destination.

Labor migration and the migration of young unaccompanied males still characterize migration into areas such as Singapore, parts of Latin America and the oil rich Middle Eastern nations. Elsewhere such characterizations are less accurate. In major settlement countries, family based migration predominates, and women are as prevalent as men in legal migration flows. Similarly in Europe, the migration of family members, the majority being women and children, augments the earlier flows of male "guestworkers".

The changing composition of migrant flows to industrialized nations accompanied the economic downturns of the 1970s and 1980s in many
countries. However, attributing such shifts solely to depressed labor demand is facile. The trends also reflect the maturation of migration streams, stimulated by social networks based on family/household, friendship and community ties and relationships.⁴ Existing across time and space, social networks are highly relevant for studies of international migration. By binding migrants and nonmigrants together in a complex web of social roles and interpersonal relationships (Massey et al., 1987:138), these personal networks are conduits of information and social and financial assistance. They also shape migration outcomes, ranging from no migration, immigration, return migration or the continuation of migration flows.

By the late 1980s, a growing body of research existed regarding the role of social networks in the etiology, composition, direction and persistence of migration flows, and in the settlement and integration of migrant populations in receiving societies. There now exist many ways of conceptualizing and studying family, friendship and community ties as key ingredients in international migration. Not surprisingly, there is no one orthodox treatment of personal networks, and not surprisingly a number of empirical and theoretical challenges remain. The remainder of this article examines more thoroughly these characterizations of the field. First the current interest in social networks is linked to other developments in international migration. Research areas which consider and/or emphasize the role of personal networks, particularly those based on family ties, in explaining the origin, composition, adjustment and dynamics of migration are then reviewed. Finally, two types of agenda which would enhance the explanatory powers of social network related research in the 1990s are discussed.

CONCEPTUALIZING MIGRATION: THE EVOLVING CENTRALITY OF NETWORKS AND FAMILY

Despite its current popularity, the subject of social networks is not new in international migration research. Analysts in the 1960s and 1970s studied the process of chain migration and the role played by kin and friends in providing information and facilitating migration (e.g., Anderson, 1974; MacDonald and MacDonald, 1964; Ritchey, 1976; See, also, Hugo, 1981:195-205). However, current migration patterns and new conceptualizations of migration underlie more recent interest in the role of family,

² Immigration networks exist through family and friendship, community practices such as festivals, membership in associations and as "intermediaries" such as labor recruiters, immigration consultants, travel agents, smugglers and other forms (Gilliespie and Browning, 1979:513; Lim, 1987b:4). To date, considerable attention is focused on the operation and implications of networks based on family, friendship and community ties. These networks may be considered "personal" networks to distinguish them from networks based on social ties based on distant or organizationally defined social relations (such as those associated with "intermediaries"). However, sociologists and anthropologists generally use the term social networks to refer to networks of personal relations. In this paper I use "social" networks and "personal" networks interchangeably.
friendship and community based networks.

Today, contemporary treatments of migration theory often begin with the almost de rigueur reference to the demise of push-pull theory. According to this theory, people moved either because social and economic forces in the place of destination impelled them to do so or because they were attracted to places of destination by one or more social and economic factors there. Reviews of push-pull theory note its implicit assumption of immobility, its limited ability to predict the origin of flows and changes therein, and the emphasis on the movement of people as a result of rational calculations performed by individual actors (Fernandez-Kelly, 1983b:205; Pedraza-Bailey, 1985:5; Portes and Bach, 1985:4-5).

The origins and legitimacy of these criticisms lie in the vastly changing nature of migration from the 1960s on. Four migration trends augmented pre-existing legal settlement flows to countries such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United States: 1) temporary labor migration to Europe, characterized by eventual settlement (Castles, 1984); 2) clandestine or irregular migration to traditional settlement areas as well as to European countries; 3) the migration of workers from Third World areas such as Korean and Pakistan to countries such as Saudi Arabia and Kuwait where industrialization programs were underway; and 4) the movement of workers to newly industrializing areas of the Third World countries (Castles, 1986:776-777). These trends revealed a heretofore unacknowledged dynamic character to migration. The origins of these flows, their regularization, their reversals and cessation were not always well understood and, in the European guestworker migration, certainly underestimated.

Immigration research in the 1970s and 1980s was stimulated by these changing migration flows in Europe and the Middle East, as well as by the movement of capital from core industrialized economies to the less developed nation, and by issues of race, class and labor market segmentation in receiving societies. Such research increasingly viewed international migration as conditioned by structural factors. Important structural factors included bilateral agreements regarding labor migration, foreign investment patterns, devolution and change in local economies — particularly agrarian economies — and the distinction between policies of migrant settlement and those of immigrant integration.

The migration trends of the 1970s and 1980s also challenged existing explanatory frameworks, and they stimulated the development of alternative theories to account for origins, stability, uses of immigrant labor and immigrant social and economic adaptation (Papademetriou, 1988a; Portes and Bach, 1985: Chapters 1 and 10). Influenced by marxist theory (Burawoy, 1976; Castles and Kosack, 1973), dependency and world systems schools (Petras, 1981; Portes and Walton, 1981) and labor market segmen-
tation theory (Piore, 1975; 1979), these theoretical developments interpreted migration phenomena from a structural perspective with an emphasis on understanding labor migration (Portes, 1987; Portes and Bach, 1985: Chapters 1 and 10). Such approaches permitted the understanding of international labor migration within the context of a global economic system which not only linked less developed countries to industrial ones, but also restructured domestic economies (Castles, 1986; Sassen-Koob, 1980; 1981; 1984; 1988).

Structural approaches to migration emphasize linkages between societies as fundamental for the understanding of migration flows, their size, direction and persistence. These emphases call attention to existence of migration systems, in which places are linked by the flows and counterflow of people, as well as by economic and political relations between countries or areas. Approaching migration from a systems perspective offers several advantages. First, it departs from a static conceptualization of migration as a one time event from place A to place B. Second, it emphasizes interdependence and reciprocity (Papademetriou, 1988a). For these two reasons, systems approaches offer three advances in the conceptualization of migration. Such approaches force attention on stability and movement in both sending and receiving areas, examine flows within the context of other flows, and emphasize that flows of people are part of, and often influenced by, flows of goods, services and information (Fawcett and Arnold, 1987:456).

In sum, by the 1980s, researchers increasingly considered migration as representing and evolving from linkages between sending and receiving countries (Lim, 1987a; 1987b; Salt, 1987). Social networks represented one such link in these migration systems. Networks connect migrants and nonmigrants across time and space. Once begun, migration flows often become self-sustaining, reflecting the establishment of networks of information, assistance and obligations which develop between migrants in the host society and friends and relatives in the sending area. These networks link populations in origin and receiving countries and ensure that movements are not necessarily limited in time, unidirectional or permanent.

A migration system approach also illuminates the connections between macro and micro approaches to the study of migration. This connection is another reason for examining social networks in migration. Researchers increasingly invoked structural explanations for migration while measuring migration as the movement of individuals or groups of individuals. A real danger also was the replacement of an undersocialized view of migration in which all action reflected individual wishes and preferences with an oversocialized view in which people were passive agents in the migratory process, projected through time and space by social forces. Introducing social networks in migration partly alleviated these dilemmas in migration research.
Social relations both transmit and shape the effect of social and economic structures on individuals, families and households. Additionally, social ties transmit information about places of destination (including places of return migration) and sources of settlement assistance. Thus, studying networks, particularly those linked to family and households, permits understanding migration as a social product — not as the sole result of individual decisions made by individual actors, not as the sole result of economic or political parameters, but rather as an outcome of all these factors in interaction. This approach also permits conceptualizing migration as a contingency. Whether migration occurs or not, and what shapes its direction, composition and persistence is conditioned by historically generated social, political and economic structures of both sending and receiving societies. These structures are channeled through social relationships and social roles which impact on individuals and groups.

The domestic unit is an important component in social network based migration. Households and families are common representations of this domestic unit. The importance of this unit in migration research is four-fold. First, domestic units are sustenance units. As sustenance units, they have their own structural characteristics which condition the propensity to migrate and the pattern of migration. A number of studies show that the motivation and ability to migrate as well as the pattern of migration are influenced by the resource levels of households, the age and sex structure of the family/household and the stages of the family life cycle (Harbison, 1981; Schmink, 1984). Households with middling levels of financial resources may be more likely to sponsor migration of one or more members than households with few resources (Dinerman, 1978; Pessar, 1982). Households with few adults or conversely many dependent children may be less likely to participate in migration in part because no household members are likely candidates (Harbison, 1981; Root and De Jong, 1986) and because the income generating capacity is low for household members left behind (Escobar et al., 1987). However, studies of select Mexican communities find that men with young children are more likely than recently married men to migrate to the United States, because of increased economic needs of the family (Massey et al., 1987; See, also, Escobar et al., 1987). These studies indicate that migration is not a haphazard movement of poor people. Instead, it is a calculated movement, designed to relieve economic pressures at various stages of the life cycle. Also, the type of migration (settlement, temporary and recurrent) varies with the stage of the life cycle (Escobar et al., 1987; Massey et al., 1987:207-215).

In addition to acting as sustenance units, domestic units are socializing

---

3 Households may contain nonfamily members. Families usually include only those members related by blood, marriage or adoption and even here definitions may include or exclude multiple generation or may vary according to political considerations (Hune, 1985; 1987:124).
agents and are the foundation for family and household based networks (Harbison, 1981). As socializing agents, families transmit cultural values and norms which influence who migrates and why. Families also transmit norms about the meaning of migration and the maintenance of familial based obligations over time and space.

Equally important, families represent a social group geographically dispersed. They create kinship networks which exist across space and are the conduits for information and assistance which in turn influence migration decisions (Harbison, 1981). Shadow households in the place of destination consist of persons whose commitments and obligations are to households in the sending area. Such persons may be especially likely to assist in the migration of other household or family members or to remit funds to the family members remaining behind (Caces et al., 1985).

Finally, families are migratory units. Families may migrate together or individuals can be sent out with the clear expectation that other members will be sent for (Boutang and Garson, 1984:586; Harbison, 1981; MacDonald and MacDonald, 1964). Both types characterize migration to North America, Europe and Oceania, and family migration in toto represents a large share of migration flows to these regions.

RESEARCH AGENDAS AND FINDINGS

Numerous diagrams emphasize the family migration and social networks as central ingredients of systems approaches involving both macro and micro variables (Fawcett and Arnold, 1987: Figure 19.1; Salt, this volume: Figures 1-4). Such diagrams also capture various research agendas. To date, most research that examines family migration and the role of social networks falls within the following topics: 1) economic, political and social structural factors in sending and receiving countries; 2) bilateral treaties between countries regarding labor migration; 3) government policies governing the admission of international migrants; 4) linkages to sending areas, often analyzed through remittances and returns; and 5) the settlement and/or integration of migrant populations. Although this classification of research indicates major research findings and initiatives, the classification is admittedly heuristic and oversimplistic. Many of these areas overlap substantively. A migration system perspective also conceptually links many areas of research.

Structural Conditions in Sending and Receiving Areas

Classic push-pull approaches sought to understand migration as the result of social, economic and political factors in sending and receiving areas. However, two more recent approaches use social psychological and political economy frameworks to link migration to structural conditions.
One development rests on a social psychological approach to understanding migration. Here, researchers link macrolevel influences to the migration decisionmaking process of individuals using a variety of conceptual and analytical models (De Jong and Gardner, 1981; Fawcett, 1985-1986a). A major premise of the value expectancy model is that some motivations for migration have counterparts in environmental and structural factors. The model emphasizes the processes through which such macro stimuli convert into individual decisionmaking processes (De Jong and Fawcett, 1981; Gardner, 1981). Background and personal aspects are linked conceptually and analytically to migration intentions/behaviors by their impact on the individual/family expectancy that migration will be followed by a given consequence and by the value of that consequence (De Jong and Fawcett, 1981). Such perceptions in turn affect migration intentions and actual migratory behavior (De Jong et al., 1983; Simmons, 1985-1986). Social contacts with relatives and friends are central to this model. Social contacts represent networks of information and social and economic assistance between areas, and they are important influences in international migration decisionmaking processes (De Jong, Root and Abad, 1986; De Jong, et al., 1985-1986; Fuller et al., 1985-1986).

In addition to social psychological frameworks, the gradual incorporation of marxist and world systems approaches into migration research also emphasize links between the family unit, personal networks and structural features of sending and receiving areas (Eades, 1987). The marxist and world systems approaches call attention to demand in receiving industrial nations for the reproduction of cheap labor, the subsequent movement of capital to less developed regions with cheap labor, the bifurcation of industrialized economies into skilled and unskilled sectors, and the intensification of export oriented production instead of import substitution activities in less developed countries.

Governments often develop economic, social and political policies alongside these developments. For example, the recruitment of guestworkers by European countries and the development of the United States bracero program represent formal agreements which ensured a supply of cheap labor (Burawoy, 1976; Sassen-Koob, 1980). After the mid 1960s, changes in United States tariff laws stimulated the movement of textile and electronics work to less developed countries, coinciding with the development of free trade zones, the establishment of run-away shops of which the Mexican maquiladora are a form, and the general reliance on export diversification as opposed to import substitution in small countries (Safa, 1986). At the same time, the inability of services to be exported meant a growing demand for cheap (immigrant) labor in core economies (Sassen-Koob, 1980; 1981; 1983; 1984; 1988).
The development of a world economic system links national economies and governments, changes domestic economies and alters the employment structures of receiving and sending countries. Other dimensions of economic and political interrelationships also exist between countries including agreements of economic and technical assistance, political alliances and trade and tariff agreements (See, Fawcett and Arnold, 1987; Weintraub and Stolp, 1987). These all are preconditions for economic and refugee migration. However, two mechanisms connect these interrelationships to migration: social networks and household survival strategies.

A starting point for research on social networks is that structural factors provide the context within which migration decisions are made by individuals or groups. However, at this microlevel analysis, the decision to migrate is influenced by the existence and participation in social networks, which connect people across space. As noted previously, networks provide resources in the form of information and assistance. Once these networks develop, they support and encourage additional migration. Thus they explain the persistence of migration long after changes in the original migration inducing structural conditions (Massey et al., 1987; Portes, 1985; 1987; Yücel, 1987). Various Mexican communities (Escobar et al., 1987; Massey et al., 1987) and the post-guestworker migration to European countries (Buechler and Buechler, 1987) are based on the institutionalization of migration through social networks.

Because households are units which mediate between individuals and the larger structural setting, they are an important component in the relationship between structural conditions and migration (Crummett, 1987: 247-248; Pedraza-Bailey, 1985). Much migration research which incorporates household/family strategies emphasizes the reorganization of local and national economies within the context of a world economy. The household unit is a co-resident group which ensures its maintenance and reproduction by generating and allocating a common pool of resources including labor and monetary income (Schmink, 1984; 1986; Wood, 1981; 1982). Household strategies are actions directed at balancing the household resources, the consumption needs and the alternatives for productive activity (Pessar, 1982). Migration of individual members or the entire household unit represents a strategy at the household level to achieve a fit between resources such as land or capital, the consumption needs of its members and the alternatives for generating monetary and nonmonetary income (Pessar, 1982:348; Wood, 1982:313). Migration can be an important strategy for generating income in the form of remittances.

Households survival mechanisms also show why migration does not always occur, the existence of linkages between households at origin and destination, and the consequences of outmigration for nonmigrant mem-
bers (Briody, 1987; Pessar, 1982). In her analysis of Mexican illegal migration, Dinerman (1978) argues that migration as a household strategy is conditioned by social ties at the community level as well as by the local economy. Under certain circumstances migration can be an economic alternative to producing cash by selling household production goods in the local market. Further, generation of cash through migration ensures household economic viability and the meeting of social obligations. However, migration also requires cash for transportation, food and documents as well as clothing and possibly the need to replace the lost free labor. As a result, most immigrants come from extended households with secure income (Dinerman, 1978). Pessar's (1982) analysis of Dominican migration to the United States also illuminates the use of migration as a strategy for reducing the process of land fragmentation and downward mobility which occurs as a result of economic transformations. Such migration reduces the operating capacity of family farms, thereby creating additional incentives for the migration of more household members to the United States. The ensuing kin based chain migration of employable household members means the creation of new households in the United States and in the Dominican Republic. Marked differences exist in the structure of such households with dependents remaining in the Dominican Republic and connected to those in the United States through remittances.

**Bilateral Treaties and Labor Recruitment**

Agreements between governments regarding labor migration represent specific examples of economic based policies which stimulate migration flows. The emergence of labor brokers also represents a mechanism, often officially sanctioned, for the recruitment of labor. Well known examples of both are those of the United States-Mexican Bracero Accord (1942-1962), the role of government visa granting agencies in the flow of guestworkers to European EEC countries; and more recently the contract recruitment of Asian workers to the oil rich areas of the Middle East. The perception of migration as temporary and a one time event is basic to such agreements. In reality, these agreements establish a bridgehead of migrants who represent one end of a migratory chain. Kinship and personal ties across space are created with the potential for inducing more migration and/or for creating dynamic processes of migration, emigration and remigration.

Temporal trends as well as indepth studies provide evidence for these generalizations. In Europe, declining guestworker recruitment after the early 1970s did not stop migration. Clandestine migration has increased alongside the legal admittance immigration of women and children (OECD, 1988). These changes also exist elsewhere. In two of the four Mexican communities studied by Massey et al. (1987), the bracero years not only
created an history of legal and clandestine migration but also established contacts in the United States. Over time networks based on family, friendship and community ties developed and expanded. Their availability shaped household survival strategies, thereby stimulating more migration and legitimating and regularizing its occurrence.

In short, two fundamental tenets in migration research are that 1) social relationships across distances create social ties which in turn are the basis for the continuation of migration over time as well as for its changed composition; and 2) through these networks, labor migration has the strong potentiality for changing into family migration. To be sure, these tenets do not have universal applicability. But the existing exceptions offer the opportunity to further specify the roles of social networks. For example, in Asian migration to the Middle East, contract migration dominates, labor rotation appears high and accommodation is in segregated compounds. These arrangements appear to have circumvented the establishment of a "bridgehead" migratory population, at least among unskilled laborers. Whether such arrangements are the necessary and sufficient conditions to prevent the maturation of migration streams through the development of social networks and family reunification remains a topic for future study.

Immigration Policies

In addition to or as part of bilateral treaties and agreements, major receiving countries in the industrial world have rules and procedures regarding the border crossing of persons who are not foreign born and/or who are not citizens of the designated country, but who seek employment and/or residence in that country. These selection criteria can be viewed from macro and micro perspectives. Following Jasso and Rosenzweig (1987:1215), at a macro level, criteria for admission are determinants of the size and characteristics of legal immigrant flows. But, from a micro perspective, the selection criteria provide the foundation for the process by which a person or group of persons become resident in a given country. And the criteria may play a part in the strategies devised by potential migrants, leading to no migration, immigration or illegal entry. Such strategies, shaped by immigration rules and regulations, show how immigration laws can illicit unintended consequences and in turn create new laws. These strategies exist within the broader context of the social, economic and political conditions in the sending and receiving countries, and they involve the decisions of both individuals and families or households.

Where immigration policies include provisions for family reunification and permit admission on the basis of family relationships, chain migration

---

4 For example, the perception that laws permitting migrants to sponsor new brides or grooms are abused is the basis for regulations which grant permanent residency to newly wed sponsored spouses only after a period of time (before the two year anniversary in the United States and up to two years in Sweden).
of family members often results. In many European countries, migration of spouses and children now is permitted (OECD, 1987; Papademetriou, 1988b). Family migration currently predominates in the United States. The requirement of U.S. citizenship to sponsor relatives stimulates its acquisition by resident family members and in turn fosters family migration (Jasso and Rosenzweig, 1986; 1987). The time lag between entry and subsequent sponsorship may be even less in countries such as Canada where citizenship is not a requirement for most categories of family migration and the level of sponsorship may be higher (Samuel, 1988).

Two overlapping approaches at present dominate research on the role of personal networks in meeting or circumventing immigration policy. The first emphasizes the decisionmaking process of potential migrants as informed and guided by existing immigration law. For example, research into the migration intentions of persons residing in the Ilocas Norte area of the Philippines shows that close family ties between potential migrants and United States residences are associated with intentions to migrate, with U.S. relatives acting as petitioners and with the timing of other events such as receiving a passport. From the immigrants’ perspective, family migration provisions in United States immigration law are important explanations for legal immigration (De Jong, Root and Abad, 1986). The second area of research quantifies the stimulative effect of family ties on immigration flows. The groundbreaking work by Jasso and Rosenzweig (1986; 1987) permits estimating the rates at which naturalized citizens of the United States sponsor the immigration of various relatives. Such work reveals a decay curve whereby depletion occurs over time in the stock of relatives abroad who are eligible to migrate. Their study of naturalization pattern by the foreign born also shows that migrants are very responsive to immigration regulations and to changes therein (Jasso and Rosenzweig, 1987).

These two research perspectives generate at least three future research agenda. One challenge is to specify further the process of chain migration in relation to immigration law. Definitions of family adopted in immigration policies influence what family members migrate and over what phase of the chain migration. These definitions vary considerably by receiving country (Hune, 1987), but tend to emphasize eligibility based on nuclear families formed by legal marriage. This definition of family may not fully reflect the kin group that is the unit of adaptive strategies. This discrepancy is likely in areas where extended family structures and consensual marriages exist (Garrison and Weiss, 1979). What is the relationship of such discrepancies to legal versus illegal migration? If personal networks provide information and resources to legal migrants along with fulfilling formal requirements, such information and resources may be similarly available to others in the household.
In fact, family networks are central features of illegal migration. In the United States, legal migration is associated with the illegal migration of Mexicans. Reichert and Massey (1980) observe that when a majority of family members possess the U.S. resident visa, the family often migrates as a unit. If they are old enough to work, family and household members who lack proper documentation frequently accompany other members. Similar observations characterize migration into European countries, Australia (Boutang and Garson, 1984) and Canada, where a study of the 1983-1985 Illegal Migrant program found that over 80 percent of the applicants for permanent resident status had close relatives (spouses, brothers and sisters) in Canada. Once in a host country, illegal migrants can develop social and economic connections which assist in regularizing their status (Massey, 1987).

Further research also is needed on the structure of family induced chain migration. When labor migration occurs, spouses, usually wives, and children immigrate later. If regulations permit, adult offspring, siblings and parents are later participants in the migration process. Do these linkages occur sequentially or is the pattern one of mass family migration. If return migration occurs, does it disrupt the pattern, and under what conditions? These are useful questions, for the pattern of family chain migration affects the tempo of the multiplier effect. It may also influence the decisionmaking process of potential migrants.

The nature of sponsorship and its effects are two additional areas of research for the 1990s. In North America, the term "sponsor" refers to the person or group who desires the presence of the would-be migrant and who undertakes various actions to substantiate the application. The procedures differ slightly in the United States and in Canada (Canada Employment and Immigration, 1986; Jasso and Rosenzweig, 1988). However, petitioners can be persons, groups of persons, the federal government in the case of refugees, or businesses. Most research today emphasizes sponsorship by persons who are connected to the applicants by family ties. In such research, being sponsored is synonymous with the evoking of family networks for the purpose of migration. However, other types of sponsorship may evoke different types of networks.

To what extent do personal networks, represented not just by family but also by friendship and community of origin ties, play a role in corporate sponsorship in which immigration requires arranged and government approved employment? Are persons who enter as refugees or as economic migrants under occupational demand based criteria devoid of personal networks? Or, do such networks influence the migration process but elude capture by bureaucratically defined categories of admission? And to what extent do these migrants embody social ties which stimulate subsequent migration?
Finally, attention should be given to the consequences of sponsorship ties. United States research assumes the value and usefulness of sponsorship, and little information exists on the functions of sponsorship (Yu and Liu, 1986). At least for refugees where sponsorship can be undertaken by individuals or by groups, the type of sponsorship appears to matter for economic adjustment. Bach and Carroll-Sequin (1986) observe a lower labor force participation for refugee women who are sponsored by their relatives rather than by other American families or church groups. Such rates appear to reflect the greater incorporation of these women into ethnic communities where women are either under greater constraints to remain in the home or else lack the connections necessary for locating employment. Other examples show negative as well as positive consequences of sponsorship. In Canada, the family sponsored migrants are ineligible for training allowances associated with language training programs. This feature may depress the participation of sponsored migrants, many of whom are women (See, Boyd, 1987). In many European countries where residence permits are distinct from work permits, the admission of spouses and children is not always synonymous with legal permission to enter the labor force.

Return Migration and Remittances: Maintaining Networks

In part because of the distinctions embedded in host country's regulations, family migration is often labeled as "noneconomic". It also usually is equated with residential permanency. But such characterizations are facile if not inaccurate. In North America, migrant women often have labor participation rates which are as high or higher than native born women. Their economic participation contrasts with perceptions of migrant women as accompaniments — if not dependents — of their male sponsors. For migrants in Europe, family related migration often represents a household strategy of accumulating as much money in as short a period possible through the wage earning activities of multiple household members. Return to the sending area is one desired outcome of this family migration.

Return migration involves the movement back to the country or area of origin, either temporarily or for long periods. Because return migrants embody information and resources about receiving areas, such migration links sending and receiving areas and preserves the use of social networks in the migratory process. Social networks also are maintained in three other ways: 1) by the visits of migrants who have settled in the receiving country; 2) by the reliance on activities such as sports associations or village fetes which link the sending and receiving areas (Hily and Poinard, 1987; Massey et al., 1987; and 3) by marriages which sustain kinship obligations across time and space (Ballard, 1987) and which encourage capital mobilization and success in the receiving country (Rex and Josephides, 1987).
Household migration strategies often include remittances, or the sending of money from the receiving area to the sending area. These remittances can take the form of money transfers to families in the sending areas, payments to schools in the home country where children are educated, and investments in the land, and businesses of the sending areas (H.C. Buechler, 1987: 3). Remittances are noteworthy for four reasons: 1) they indicate the existence of social networks across space (Caces et al., 1985); 2) they have economic effects in the sending area; 3) they may maintain the use of migration as a household strategy; and 4) they send back important messages about comparative opportunities and standards of living, thereby stimulating future migration flows (Fawcett and Arnold, 1987).

Much has been written about the economic impact of such flows to Mexico and Europe. Most remittances are used for the purchase of consumer goods or family support rather than productive investment. However, such spending patterns must be analyzed within the context of the larger socioeconomic setting of the sending community, including employment and investment opportunities, national development trends and policies and the interest of national governments in the foreign exchange value of such remittances (Ballard, 1987). As well, immigration induced income also can increase dependency on migration wage labor, particularly under conditions of agricultural restructuring and export oriented industrialization in Third World areas (Ballard, 1987; Gonzalez, 1979; Pessar, 1982). Such dependency ensures the persistence of migration flows and the continued utilization of social networks.

Adjustment in the Receiving Country

Family migration and networks are part of immigrant settlement and integration in the receiving countries. Settlement refers to the intention and decision to settle in receiving countries. It does not preclude an eventual return to the sending areas or subsequent migration elsewhere. Integration involves the adaptation, acculturation and assimilation of individuals and groups in the receiving society (Kritz and Keely, 1981: xxvii), and it connotes (but does not guarantee) greater residential permanency in the host society.

Settlement and integration processes are influenced by kin and friendship ties, village based networks and customs (such as festivals), membership in ethnic associations and shared cultural and ethnic origins. These personal networks provide money to finance moves. They also provide food, shelter, job information and contacts, information on health care and social services, recreation and emotional support (See, Cornelius, 1982: 392; DaVanzo, 1981: 110; Massey et al., 1987: Chapters 6 and 9; Tienda, 1980; Yücel, 1987). These network resources change with length of residency. As the period of settlement grows, family reunification is more
likely, increasing the existence of family based networks in the receiving society. The volume and amount of remittances may decline, and membership in ethnic and non-ethnic based voluntary associations may increase (Portes and Bach, 1985: Chapter 9; Massey et al., 1987). These "period" effects in turn affect subsequent cohorts of migrants. Recent migrants also enter an area with many more relatives, friends and contacts than did earlier migrants (Massey et al., 1987). They also may find social and economic situations substantially modified by their predecessors (J.M. Buechler, 1987: 258).

To be sure, the operation of networks and their temporal developments are shaped by policies of receiving countries regarding integration and settlement. A distinction can be made between countries which stress immigration and immigrant settlement and those which do not (OECD, 1987). The preceding generalizations are relevant for countries which conceptualize migration as permanent and immigrant integration as a desired outcome. In countries which view migrants as marginal and temporary, other characterizations regarding the content and development of networks may exist. For example, as a correlate of Germany's alien policy, the achievements of Turkish workers in Germany depend very much on their personal relationships (Yücel, 1987). The intense utilization of networks based on kin and ethnicity results in the "colonization" of certain factories and towns or villages by Turks related through kinship or village origins.

Legal and illegal status also conditions the use and development of networks and the incidence of family migration. Illegals from Mexico frequently migrate without their wives and children. They also have fewer family and friendship ties than do legal migrants from Mexico (Massey et al., 1987). Again, such patterns vary according to the migration and settlement policies of the receiving countries. In Germany (FRG) where legal labor recruitment was organized initially through authorized institutions in Germany and in several major sending countries (Yugoslavia, Turkey), family and village networks alone did not ensure that relatives and fellow villagers would be in close proximity in terms of work or residence. In fact, during the first year, many workers were isolated from previous networks and forced to rebuild social relationships in new environments. In contrast, for the illegal migrants there was almost no severance of social networks, for the operation of networks was crucial for all aspects of the migratory process, ranging from the decision to migrate to the obtaining of employment (Yücel, 1987).

In addition to kin networks, ethnic associations and ethnic enclaves have multiple roles in the migratory/settlement/integrative process. Ethnic based associations which focus around some activity such as sports, religion or recreation act as conduits for information and help. To the extent their
activities involve contact with the origin community, they also may link 
migrant members to the communities of origin and facilitate reintegration 
upon return to the origin community (Massey et al., 1987). However, the 
role they play in the integration of their members in the receiving society 
is deserving of more research. In her study of German associations, Schoen-
berg (1985) shows that it is over simplistic to see participation in ethnic 
organizations as an indication of ethnic cohesion and social segregation 
vis-à-vis the larger society. An equally simplistic assumption is that such 
associations integrate members in the host society by providing networks 
of contacts and information. Much depends on the activities and the goals 
of the ethnic association (Schoenberg, 1985; Sassen-Koob, 1979). Such goals 
and objectives are shaped by the structural differences between the origin 
and destination societies, which influence the mediating role of associations 
(Sassen-Koob, 1979). Other factors are national policies of integration and 
settlement and the class composition of migrants.

Much is written about the impact of ethnic enclaves on the economic 
status of individuals, families and migrant communities. Ethnic enclaves can 
be defined in several ways, but generally the term refers to small enterprises 
that are owned by (self-employed) members of an ethnic community. Here, 
the labor force is drawn extensively from the same ethnic community using 
kin, friendship and ethnic ties. Networks are an integral part of such 
enclaves. They provide essential information on the setting up of businesses, 
the economic inputs required, the problems encountered and the labor 
requirements (Werbner, 1987: 220). They also link employers and potential 
employees through personal ties. Ethnic businesses extensively use family 
ties, often relying on the participation of women in the operation of family 
businesses (Model, 1985; Kim and Hurh, 1985; Rex and Josephides, 1987; 
Werbner, 1987).

In the United States, participation in an ethnic enclave depends on the 
interaction of ethnicity, entry status and family ties. Mexicans and Haitians 
who lack ethnically defined economic enclaves do not do as well as Cubans 
who are in ethnic enclaves. The economic disadvantage arises in part 
because of the absence of family ties (Haitian refugees) and because previous 
migration experience as illegals (Mexicans) allocates them into the secon-
dary labor market (Portes and Bach, 1980; 1985; Portes and Stepick, 1985; 
Stepick and Portes, 1986). Employment in the primary labor market is more 
likely for other migrants (particularly those from Asia) who do not enter the 
United States on the basis of family ties (Portes, 1981). However, they tend 
to be in subordinate positions within that sector (Portes and Bach, 1985: 
Chapter 10).

Considerable debate exists about the consequences of participation in an 
enclave economy for recent migrants (See, Portes and Bach, 1985; Portes
and Jensen, 1988; Model, 1985). One view holds that ethnic enclaves help economic adjustment because ethnic ties provide networks of social support and facilitate the learning of new skills (Perez, 1986; Portes and Bach, 1985; Yücel, 1987). The positive implications of the ethnic enclave result from the reciprocal relations embedded in ethnically based social networks. If employers profit from the hiring of fellow immigrants, they also are obligated to train them, hold open supervisory positions and support their movement into self-employment (Portes and Bach, 1985:343; See, also, Model, 1985). This view contrasts with the argument that ethnic firms exploit the more recently arrived migrants by paying low wages and hiring migrants for jobs which are menial, dead end and have poor working conditions. From this perspective, employment in an ethnic enclave shares considerable similarity with employment in the secondary labor market.

Additional research is needed to refine and further this debate. A recent FRG study (Yücel, 1987) shows that impact of enclave employment depends on the life cycle of the business enterprise and the legal status of migrant workers. If ethnic entrepreneurs attempt to break into self-employment through the establishment of small industrial workshops, they may employ illegal migrants if available. Such employment minimizes costs to employers and provides contacts, jobs and some job training to such migrants. However, as such enterprises become more successful and as state policing of hiring illegals increases, entrepreneurs shift their employment to legal migrants. Such practices both support and maintain illegal migrants as an underclass in an ethnic enclave (Yücel, 1987).

ISSUES FOR THE 1990s

Although it provides insights in the character and continuation of migration flows, current research on family and personal networks also generate questions requiring future consideration. Some of these questions evolve from specific research topics, discussed in the preceding sections. However, two general issues shape research agenda for the 1990s. These issues are 1) greater specification of the role of networks in migration; and 2) the inclusion of women in models which currently are gender blind.

Development Regarding Networks in Migration

Three types of research agenda exist for migration networks. One centers on greater refinement of the concept “network”. Most migration studies which examine networks do not incorporate the distinctions provided from the sociological field of network analysis. As a result, some potential refinements in the study of networks and their role in migration are absent. For example, Granovetter’s (1973) pioneering research showed that under certain conditions, weak ties — those involving relationships between ac-
quaintances — as opposed to strong ties — those reflecting relationships between close friends and relatives — can maximize information flows and social mobility opportunities, in part because they provide bridges between two or more cliques. The distinction between weak and strong ties appears useful in studies of ethnic enclaves (See, Werbner, 1987) and may be relevant in other areas of migration research.

The second agenda calls for a more comprehensive look at the dynamics of networks. Most studies of personal networks in international migration emphasize their existence, operation and persistence across time and space. In addition, most studies examine networks within the context of movement from less developed areas to more developed areas, and most studies focus on networks which are associated with or derive from labor migration, as opposed to refugee or “forced” migrations.

These foci are understandable given the fixation of researchers and policymakers on the persistent and almost uncontrollable nature of current migration to industrialized countries. To better understand the dynamics of migration networks, two questions require answers: 1) why and when do personal networks fail to emerge; and 2) under what conditions do networks weaken and/or disappear.

To answer these questions, the conditioning effects of micro and macro variables across time and space must be considered. Thus, the study of the dynamics of personal networks in migration is closely associated with a third research agenda which calls for further empirical and conceptual refinements in the study of migration systems. These refinements require continued, new and sustained efforts at linking together the component parts and understanding changes in such linkages. The specific questions to be addressed in this exercise are numerous (Fawcett and Arnold, 1987; Lim 1987a, 1987b; Salt, 1987). Personal networks, or ties between people, represent only one out of many kinds of networks, such as political (military, foreign relations) or economic (trade, foreign investment) ties between sending and receiving nations. However, refinements in the conceptualization of migration systems will provide a broad generalized framework from which to study the origins, persistence and decline of networks, and to compare the dynamics of personal networks vis-à-vis other networks.

**Bringing in Gender**

In addition to the empirical and theoretical challenges associated with studying networks from a migration systems perspective, another challenge is that of understanding the relationship between gender and networks in migration. To date much of the recent research on networks is indifferent to gender. Some studies emphasize the experiences of male migrants or all migrants undifferentiated by sex, while others emphasize group behavior
as represented in household decisionmaking strategies. Such emphasis is consistent with a general research orientation which assumes that women migrate as part of family migration (Morokvasic, 1983; 1984; Ranney and Koussoudji, 1984). As a consequence, little systematic attention is paid to gender in the development and persistence of networks across time and space.

Does a complete understanding of the role of personal networks in international migration require specific attention to gender? Answering this question requires some reflection on the meaning of the term "a complete understanding". A methodological approach would be to show that the pattern and strength of relationships between "independent" and "dependent" variables are the same or are different for females and males with respect to a given model. For example, this could be done in the value-expectancy decisionmaking research or in research on the multiplier effects of family migration. However, such approaches risk assuming a priori the basic parameters of the model against which to undertake female-male comparisons. A conceptual approach asks if existing models can be enriched or extended by explicit analyses of women in network and family migration research. Using this standard requires ascertaining that the inclusion of women requires additional conceptualization or adds new research topics.

The impetus for the latter approach arises from feminist perspectives on the relations between gender and social and economic institutions (for examples, See, Jaggar, 1983; Sokoloff, 1980). Although unresolved debates and differences exist among feminist schools (Jaggar, 1983; Sargent, 1981), a major tenet is that the gender division of labor must be included in any account of the social relations of production in a society. That is to say, the division of labor — the structured activities in a society — are gendered. Further, not only do men and women undertake different tasks, but women are responsible for activities in the domestic sphere. These different tasks are the basis for the social construction of gender in which women are excluded from some activities, confined to others, dependent on males, docile, subservient and assigned secondary status in the labor market (Arizpe and Aranda, 1986; Elson and Pearson, 1981; Lim, 1983).

Feminist perspectives call for analyses which conceptually include a gender division of labor as a key ingredient of theoretical paradigms. Although the field of migration research has not been immune to such calls, such inclusions are limited largely to research on women and development (Beneria, 1985; Fernandez-Kelly, 1983a; 1983b; 1986; Leacock and Safa, 1986; Nash and Fernandez-Kelly, 1983; Nash and Safa, 1986) and to migration research which emphasizes the female migration within the context of the new international division of labor (Sassen-Koob, 1984) or capitalist modes of production (Phizacklea, 1983a).
Does the inclusion of women or the issue of a gender division of labor require additional conceptualization efforts or add new research topics to the field of migration? Selected areas of research on family migration and personal networks indicate an affirmative answer. Review of material presented previously in this article shows that gender differences in social and economic roles influence migration decisionmaking processes, modify the conceptualization of household strategies, influence the sex composition of labor migration, are often incorporated into immigration policies and are embedded in the organization of ethnic enclaves.

In models of migration decisionmaking, the sex of the person exerting pressure or serving as a source of aid or information may influence the effect of such pressure or information. In a male dominated society, for example, female approval for migration may carry little weight in decisionmaking processes (Trager, 1984:1274; Young, 1985:167). Where social norms demand attachment of women to a family structure, resulting family pressures may prevent any migration of unattached women (Shah, 1983; Thandi and Todaro, 1979; 1984). In other circumstances, gender differences in the division of labor may favor migration of women more than men. For example, not only is the migration of young women from rural to urban areas in the Philippines, and particularly to Manila, substantial, but also it represents a family strategy for obtaining short term remittances (Lauby and Stark, 1988; Trager, 1984). However, family strategies regarding remittances are linked to gender roles and cultural values. Families expect daughters to be obedient, less likely to spend money on themselves and more likely to remit money to the family unit (Trager, 1984). Offers of assistance by female friends and relatives to prospective female migrants may evoke powerful images of protection and chaperoning, thereby facilitating migration intention or behavior (Huang, 1984:253). In short, migration decisionmaking processes are shaped by sex-specific family and friendship sources of approval, disapproval, assistance and information.

In addition, male hierarchies of power and authority which exist in households call for refining approaches which treat the household as a monolithic unit, focus on total income and emphasize the pursuit of rational economic behavior (Bach and Schraml, 1982; Schmink, 1986:143, 149-150). In discussing household strategies, the same question asked of family strategies can be posed: whose strategies are we observing (Hareven, 1987: xvi)? Families and households are not always harmonious decisionmaking units and collective strategies are not always identical to those of individuals (Fawcett and Arnold, 1987; Hareven, 1987; Schmink, 1986:150). Do household/family units develop strategies on the basis of rational economic behavior (Schmink, 1986)? In patriarchal societies, household strategies which involve males but not females migrating may not be predicated on
the basis of economic rationality (Schmink, 1986:150). Also, who benefits or pays the costs for these collective strategies in which individual needs or interests may be suppressed (Crummett, 1987; Fernandez-Kelly, 1983a)? Mexican women employed in maquiladora work are there because of a dependency of the family on their wages, a dependency often elicited by high male unemployment. Faced with low wages and the need to reconcile domestic responsibilities with employment requirements, these migrant women and their families have not experienced improvements, and they must rely on the informal sector for meeting additional living requirements (Fernandez-Kelly, 1983a).

Recognizing the gender division of labor also refines analyses which emphasize the structural conditions of sending countries as powerful stimulants of migration streams. The existing gender division of labor is predicted on the subordinate position of women to men. It influences whether males or females become a "surplus" population and hence more subject to outmigration during periods of economic transformation. For example, female rather than male migration is likely to occur under the following circumstances: 1) where men control agricultural ownership and production; 2) where reorganization of agriculture polarizes the peasants into large land holdings versus smaller or landless holdings; and 3) where nonagricultural domestic manufacturing, undertaken by women, is destroyed by the introduction of externally manufactured goods (Beneria and Sen, 1986; Sassen-Koob, 1984; Young, 1985). Thus, in Latin America, the internal and international migration of women is considerable, in contrast to areas of Africa where the involvement of women in agriculture fosters the migration of males.

The introduction or expansion of export oriented manufacturing often requires a labor force characterized by cheapness, docility, obedience and ease of control. While such characteristics are not innately female as opposed to male, they are implicit in most systems of gender differentiation (See, Elson and Pearson, 1981; Hancock, 1983; Lim 1983). As a result, women represent labor for micro-electronic, toy making, textile and component assembling industries. In combination with the structural changes in local economies, such employment opportunities condition and encourage female migration (Arizpe and Aranda, 1986; Fernandez-Kelly, 1983a, 1983b; Safa, 1986; Sassen-Koob, 1984). Much of this migration is rural to urban migration within Latin American and Asian countries (Khoo, Smith and Fawcett, 1984). However, from an international migration perspective, such migration is noteworthy for two reasons.

First, some international migration of women also exists between Asian countries and between Latin American countries (Fong and Lim, 1982; Hancock, 1983; Marshall, 1979). International migration flows among Third
World countries most likely will increase in the decades ahead (Salt, 1987). If immigration rises, the patterns may be more readily interpreted by a framework which recognizes the role of gender differentiation in conditioning migration from sending areas and in establishing desired labor pools.

Second, from the perspective of the new international division of labor, the movement of capital to peripheral areas coincides with the increasing demand for low wage labor in the core (Sassen-Koob, 1984; 1988). Economic transformation in core does not innately require female labor, but it creates a low skill, low wage service economy which is consistent with the perceived characteristics of female labor. The growth in Third World immigration, particularly under family reunification policies, is associated with a female immigrant supply for such jobs and the growing demand for this type of labor (Castles, 1987; Sassen-Koob, 1984). According to this perspective, the use of family networks and increased family migration does not indicate the demise of labor migration as much as its transformation. Yet this transformation has not been central to much research on networks.

Government agreements are integral to the creations of free trade zones, where intensive female employment exists in certain types of industries. Governments also may use gender related criteria in the implementation of gender blind international agreements. For example, during the early stages of the European guestworker movement, would-be migrant Portuguese women faced hurdles in obtaining visas from Portuguese officials for official emigration. This appears to have been a deliberate policy, based on a gender division of labor in which women remained, literally and figuratively, in the home. Such location, and the resulting economic dependency, ensured remittances and from the government’s viewpoint, the continued flow of foreign exchange to Portugal (See, Leeds, 1987).

The gender division of labor also influences the formulation and implementation of immigration policy and regulations. The presumption of males as breadwinners and females as dependent spouses can be built explicitly into immigration policy. Thus it can shape the use of family networks in migration. In the early 1980s, women without British citizenship in Britain faced greater difficulty in sponsoring the immigration of their fiancés than did their male counterparts (WING, 1985). Even when gender is not used as an explicit criteria, outcomes associated with a gender division of labor may dampen the use of family networks which connect to women migrants. For example, lower wages is one well known correlate of the secondary status of women in the labor force. But in Canada, when family income is below the low income cutoffs, immigrants may be ineligible to sponsor the migration of family members. This ruling is gender blind. However, female earnings are approximately 60 percent those of men. Thus women who are single or single parents may be less eligible to sponsor relatives.
An important tenet in the feminist literature on women and capitalism is that changing modes of production do not do away with a gender division of labor and a subordinate status of women. Rather, changing modes of production often intensify as well as decompose old forms and recreate new expressions. Examining the use of family ties in the operation of ethnic enclaves indicates that the persistence of a gender division of labor and its new expressions are crucial for the success of enclave businesses. But the success is built on a paradox, not yet incorporated fully in the existing research on ethnic enclaves.

The paradox arises because the involvement of women in ethnic enclaves has the appearance of growing equality. Actually it may reflect no change or new expressions of sexual inequality. On the one hand, ethnic enclaves appear to facilitate the employment of ethnic women through the existence of particularistic hiring criteria and family firms as well as through child care arrangements resulting from social arrangements within the enclave and often the presence of elderly relatives. Women often view such employment as furthering the family’s economic status and thus achieving family objectives (Anthias, 1983; Perez; 1986; Prieto, 1986).

But, in fact, these patterns of female employment can simply recast patriarchal gender relations in a new setting. Two separate studies of Greek-Cypriot women in London and Cuban women in the United States note that women view their economic role as subservient to that of males in their families, work with the permission of their husbands, and maintain full responsibility for child care and domestic work (Anthias, 1983; Fernandez Kelly and Garcia, quoted in Portes and Jensen, 1988).

Female employment in enclaves also generates two issues for future research. First, in the enclave economy women represent a flexible cheap source of labor in unwaged or low paid work and personalistic settings, all of which increase the viability of entrepreneurs (Anthias, 1983; Kim and Hurh, 1985; Model, 1985; Perez, 1986). Phizacklea (1983:110) argues that much of the literature on ethnic economies ignores the fact that the petit bourgeois class position, represented by self-employment and small factory ownership, can only be achieved through the labor of other migrants particularly female relatives (See, also, Anthias, 1983; Portes and Jensen, 1988). Second, most studies which document the positive effects of enclave employment examine the experiences of males. Women’s employment calls for refining ethnic enclave research to include female specific segmentation, quite possibly approximating secondary labor markets as traditionally defined (Piore, 1975).

**CONCLUSION**

To date, the study of networks has stimulated considerable research and
developed new insights into international migration flows and settlements. Social networks based on kinship, friendship and community ties are central components in migration systems analysis. They mediate between individual actors and larger structural forces. They link sending and receiving countries. And they explain the continuation of migration long after the original impetus for migration has ended.

Because kinship ties are a major source of personal networks in migration, the interest in personal networks also directs attention to the role of families and households in migration and in family migration per se. The study of personal networks and family related migration includes many perspectives and emphasizes many areas. This article reviews five domains of research. Economic and social conditions in the place of origin as well as in the place of destination influence the activation of personal networks in mobilizing migration and the way in which such networks are utilized. Immigration policies and the legacy of bilateral treaties regarding labor recruitment also structure the settings within which individuals make migration decisions, and they stimulate family migration through kinship ties. Personal networks and their stimulative effects on migration also are maintained and transformed through remittances, return migration and by the settlement and integration of migrants.

The study of personal networks in migration reveals the importance of social relations in migratory behavior. It provides insight into the origins, composition, direction and persistence of migration flows. At the same time, a large research agenda remains. In addition to the specific issues raised in various parts of the overview section, greater attention could be given to the nondevelopment and cessation of personal networks and to the incorporation of personal networks in a broader migration systems approach. The near absence of women in many studies also indicates an insensitivity to the ways in which the gender division of labor shapes the determinants and consequences of personal networks in migration. Responding to these gaps are the research challenges for the 1990s.
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