

Haverford College

Haverford Scholarship

Faculty Publications

Economics

1983

Social Networks in the Migration Process: Empirical Evidence on Chain Migration in India

Biswajit Banerjee
Haverford College

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.haverford.edu/economics_facpubs

Repository Citation

Banerjee, Biswajit, "Social Networks in the Migration Process: Empirical Evidence on Chain Migration in India" (1983). *Faculty Publications*. Paper 129.

This Journal Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Economics at Haverford Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Haverford Scholarship. For more information, please contact nmedeiro@haverford.edu.



Social Networks in the Migration Process: Empirical Evidence on Chain Migration in India

Author(s): Biswajit Banerjee

Source: *The Journal of Developing Areas*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Jan., 1983), pp. 185-196

Published by: [College of Business, Tennessee State University](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4191118>

Accessed: 12/04/2013 12:46

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



College of Business, Tennessee State University is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Developing Areas*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Social Networks in the Migration Process: Empirical Evidence on Chain Migration in India

BISWAJIT BANERJEE

In both developed and developing countries, considerable evidence indicates that the presence or absence of absorptive social networks strongly influences choice of destination by migrants.¹ Social contacts at destination not only reduce the psychological costs of migration by providing a supportive relationship during the migrant's adjustment period but also reduce monetary costs by providing information on employment opportunities as well as material assistance during the job search. Movements characterized by these interactions between migrants and destination-based contacts are generally designated chain migration.²

Chain migration can be broadly subdivided into delayed family migration and serial migration. The former occurs when family members relocate from origin to destination in lagged stages. Generally one or more of the family migrates first, and other members follow after the initial mover has established himself at the destination. The followers may move as dependents of the initial mover or with the explicit intention of entering the labor force. Delayed family migrants need not be confined to spouse and children but may include brothers, parents, and other patrilineal relatives.³

Serial migration, by contrast, involves interactions between individuals who are not family members. Destination-based contacts are extrafamilial relatives or unrelated persons known to the migrants or their families. The migration stream in serial migration, unlike that in delayed family migration, usually consists entirely of labor migrants.

Economist, International Monetary Fund, Washington DC. At the time this paper was written, the author was Research Officer at the Institute of Economics and Statistics, University of Oxford and Lecturer in Economics at Pembroke College, Oxford. He is grateful to Andre Beteille, Ramkrishna Mukherjee, and Gopal Krishna for helpful discussions, and to three anonymous *JDA* referees for comments on an earlier draft of the paper.

© 1984 by Western Illinois University.

Empirical research on chain migration has focused on identifying and estimating the importance of relationships linking migrants with their contacts and on the pattern of assistance received by migrants. Broad distinctions between relatives and friends are commonly made. Relatives are occasionally subdivided further into "nuclear family members" and "other relatives." This classification scheme clearly does not correspond exactly to the two categories of chain migration identified above. Furthermore, this simple classification does not distinguish in sufficient detail the various kinds of relationships that link migrants and their relatives, nor does it indicate the genealogical distance between them. Social structures may be characterized by institutionally defined and regulated relationships between different kinds of extrafamilial relatives. These relationships stand, *prima facie*, for the customary dyadic relations of special privileges and obligations and the corresponding rights and duties. It is important to check whether migrants adhere to traditional values and social norms during migration.

Empirical studies generally suggest that because migrants receive assistance from relatives more frequently than from friends, kinship ties must be stronger. Nevertheless, it is important to bear in mind that estimates of the frequency of different linkages are sensitive to sample selection. For example, mention of relatives, especially nuclear family members, will be considerably more frequent if the respondents include every household member than if only household heads are interviewed. Also, the simple frequency distribution approach to measuring linkage importance does not indicate if migrants receiving assistance from relatives had present at the destination friends whom they could have approached for assistance.

Empirical Data

The purpose of this paper is to examine evidence on chain migration in India. The empirical base of this paper is my survey, conducted from October 1975 to April 1976, of migrant heads of households in Delhi.⁴ At the first stage of the survey, I enumerated 10,000 heads of households in 76 census blocks—representing 1.14 percent of the total number of census blocks into which the city was divided—that were selected by weighted stratified random sampling. At the second stage no sampling was involved, and all heads of households who satisfied the following criteria were interviewed in detail: male, born outside Delhi, age at arrival in Delhi being 14 years or more, came to Delhi in 1965 or later, and came after securing employment or in search of employment. The last criterion eliminates migrants who were transferred to Delhi by their employers and those who had come as dependents and students. A total of 1,615 migrant heads of households, of whom 1,408 had come from rural areas and 207 from urban areas, were interviewed in the second stage. The focus throughout this paper is on migrants from rural areas.

Source of Assistance to New Migrants on Arrival in the City

About 86 percent of the migrants in the sample indicated that they had relatives or covillagers, or both, living in Delhi at the time of their arrival. As table 1 shows, virtually all these migrants received some form of assistance from their contacts on arrival. The table, primarily in column 2, brings out the overwhelming importance of relatives as the source of help to new migrants. Of the migrants who had both relatives and covillagers living in the city, slightly less

TABLE I
SOURCE OF HELP RECEIVED BY MIGRANTS ON ARRIVAL IN DELHI
BY TYPE OF CONTACTS PRESENT
(Percentages)

SOURCE OF HELP	CONTACTS PRESENT				ENTIRE SAMPLE
	Relatives Only	Relatives and Covillagers	Covillagers Only	Neither Relatives nor Covillagers	
Relatives only	96.3	64.3			52.4
Relatives and covillagers		24.4			4.5
Covillagers only		7.4	93.2		24.7
No help received from relatives or covillagers	3.7	3.9	6.8	100.0	18.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Entire sample	42.2	18.3	25.0	14.5	
N	594	258	352	204	1,408

than two-thirds received help *exclusively* from relatives and only about one-third from covillagers. A vast majority of those receiving help from covillagers were also assisted by their relatives. This phenomenon was not the result of covillagers' refusal to help, however. Migrants were explicitly asked if they had contacted covillagers for assistance, and of the migrants who had both covillagers and relatives, only 45 percent said that they had approached their covillagers (see table 2, column 3). (This figure is likely to be an overestimate because during the first few weeks of the fieldwork some of the investigators failed to distinguish between contacting covillagers for help and contacting them as a part of social interaction in the urban network.) The respondents were also questioned on their own behavior towards helping new arrivals, and their responses indicate that it is not customary for urban contacts to refuse help when approached by new migrants. Only 9 persons in the sample said that they had refused to help, whereas about 90 percent of those who had never given help to anyone since their arrival in Delhi said that no one had approached them for help. Thus it can be claimed that new migrants have a tendency not to seek help from covillagers when relatives are present.

One possible explanation why migrants do not seek help from covillagers when relatives are present could be the caste structure of rural society in India. Because individuals in rural areas are conscious of the caste they belong to, they intermingle socially only with those who belong to the same caste or to castes of equal status. Whatever may be the impact of the urban environment on caste consciousness, newly arrived migrants are likely to adhere to their traditional values and behavior during their adjustment process. They will tend to seek help mainly from those covillagers who earlier were a part of their rural social network. Thus it is possible that migrants who had both relatives and covillagers available for help did not approach the latter for assistance because they belonged to castes of different status. The evidence in table 2 does not support this hypothesis, however. Three-quarters of the migrants under consideration had covillagers who belonged to the same caste as they themselves did. Even among those who had caste members present, only 46 percent approached covillagers. Furthermore, there was no statistically significant difference in the sources ap-

TABLE 2
SOURCES APPROACHED FOR HELP ON ARRIVAL BY MIGRANTS HAVING
RELATIVES AND COVILLAGERS IN DELHI, ACCORDING TO CASTE
AFFILIATION OF COVILLAGERS
(Percentages)

Sources Approached for Help	Had Covillagers of the Same Caste in Delhi	Did Not Have Covillagers of the Same Caste	All Categories
Relatives only	51.5	54.7	52.3
Relatives and covillagers	37.6	32.8	36.4
Covillagers only	8.8	7.8	8.5
Neither relatives nor covillagers	2.1	4.7	2.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
All sources	75.2	24.8	100.0
N	194	64	258

$X^2=1.67$, d.f. = 3, $P=0.64$.

proached for help between migrants who had covillagers of the same caste in Delhi and those who did not.

The preference for relatives when both relatives and covillagers were present may also indicate that new migrants considered kinship bonds to be stronger than village and caste ties, although this does not explain why covillagers were not approached for help. It would be in the interest of migrants to cast their nets for contacts as wide as possible, so as to obtain the maximum amount of information about the labor market. This behavior can be explained partly in terms of the source and nature of premigration information. Of those who had both relatives and covillagers in Delhi, 35 percent had received suggestions that they migrate from relatives and only 4 percent from covillagers. The survey data indicate that migrants tend to confine their request for help to those who suggested that they migrate. This fact is not surprising because urban-based contacts usually make suggestions after they have lined up specific jobs for prospective migrants or are sure of doing so, and the expectations of these migrants are formed on the basis of information received from contacts.⁵ Those who had not received a suggestion from anyone had a greater tendency to approach both relatives and covillagers for assistance. About one-quarter (26 percent) of those who received suggestions from relatives approached covillagers for help, compared to over one-half (55 percent) of those who had not received suggestions from their urban contacts.

The survey data also suggest that covillagers are contacted by migrants if relatives fail to secure a job for them within a reasonable time. Migrants who received help from both relatives and covillagers experienced a longer period of unemployment on arrival in Delhi. Nearly 30 percent of these migrants had to wait 1 month or more for their first urban job. In contrast, only 16 percent and 6 percent of those who received help exclusively from relatives and covillagers respectively had not found employment within 1 month of arrival in the city.

To determine if traditional values and social norms were adhered to while taking help from relatives, it would be useful to classify relatives into four groups: male agnates (for example, father, brother, father's brother); female agnates and kin affinally linked through these women (for example, sister, daughter, father's sister, sister's husband, father's sister's son); maternal kin—persons related through mother (for example, mother's brother, mother's brother's son, father's mother's brother); and affines—persons related through wife (for example, wife's brother, brother's wife's brother). A characteristic feature of the kinship system in north India is its patrilineal emphasis. Men are expected to form their most intimate and lasting ties with male agnates, and certain formal and symbolic relationships are maintained between male agnates even after partition of the extended family. The primary obligations of women are to their conjugal family, and they are expected to interact most frequently and intensively with male agnates of their husbands. The kinship system allows women to retain ties with their own paternal kin, but it makes these secondary and confines their expression to limited and specified contexts. Moreover, these relationships are not reciprocal. Gore has argued that it is acceptable for an individual to help his sister's children and his sister's husband, since the well-being of his sister depends on the position of her husband, but that it is degrading for him to receive help from them. Conversely, as Gore notes, "the relatives of the wife have no institutional basis

for seeking or accepting any assistance. They belong to a different family, and have no blood ties as in the case of the sister or sister's children."⁶

In rural areas of north India, interactions of individuals with relatives who are not male agnates is further limited by the prevalence of village exogamy. Not only is it common practice to marry persons not belonging to the village, but also marriages are often prohibited between persons in contiguous villages. It has been estimated that the average distance of marriage is about 12 miles in Uttar Pradesh and about 8 miles in Punjab.⁷ Such distances prevent the development of ties that grow out of living in close proximity to one another.

New migrants, therefore, would be violating the traditional norms if they received assistance from female agnates and kin affinally linked through these women. As table 3 shows, this was the case for 13 percent of the migrants in the sample. This phenomenon reflects the willingness of individuals to relax the norms of the traditional system when exploiting opportunities for economic

TABLE 3
DETAILED CLASSIFICATION OF SOURCE OF HELP EXPLOITED
BY MIGRANTS ON THEIR ARRIVAL IN DELHI

Source of Help*	Percentage Frequency
Male agnates, of which	28.6
F	2.6
B	13.4
S	0.8
FB	4.8
FBS	6.0
FF, FFB, FFBS, FFBSS, FBSS, BS	1.0
Female agnates and kin affinally linked through them, of which	13.0
ZH, ZS	6.7
FZH, FZS	3.7
BDH, ZDH, ZHF	1.3
FBDH, FZDH, ZSWF, ZDHF, ZHZH, FFZSS	1.3
Material kin, of which	7.2
MB	3.6
MBS	1.3
MZS, MZH	1.3
MFZS, MBDH, MBWB, MZDH, FMBS, FMZS, FMZH	1.0
Affine, of which	8.1
WF	2.4
WB	3.0
WFB, WMB, WZH, BWF, BWB	2.1
WFBS, WMBS, WBWB, FBWB, BSWF, BWZH, FBWBS, FBWZS	0.6
Subtotal: Relatives	56.9
Covillagers	29.2
Neither relatives nor covillagers	18.4
Total	104.5**
N	1,408

NOTES: *F=father, M=mother, B=brother, Z=sister, S=son, D=daughter, H=husband, W=wife. All relationships can be represented by a combination of these primary relationships. For example, ZH=sister's husband; MBS=mother's brother's son; WMBS-wife's mother's brother's son.

** Adds to more than 100 because some migrants received help from both relatives and covillagers.

advancement. Gore also observed such behavior in his study of an immigrant community in Delhi.⁸ In her study on kinship and urbanization in Uttar Pradesh, Vatuk has noted that there is a general tendency for traditional norms to be relaxed in an urban setting.⁹ In the context of chain migration, however, it is particularly notable that prospective migrants decide whether to take assistance from noncustomary sources while still in their traditional rural setting.

Table 3 also indicates that for 28 percent of the sample, representing those cases where migrants received assistance from relatives who were not male agnates, the field of operation of chain migration extended beyond the migrants' village of origin. This factor follows from the prevalence of village exogamy in north India and is also confirmed by a separate question on the place of origin of the urban-based contact. This evidence goes against some researchers' implicit assumption that urban-based contacts involved in chain migration originate from the same village as the migrants.¹⁰

From the preceding discussion and given that family composition in north India is determined by the patrilineal mode of descent, it is clear that moves of those who received assistance from kin affinally linked through female agnates, maternal kin, or affines are appropriately classified under serial migration. Nevertheless, receiving assistance from male agnates does not necessarily imply delayed family migration. Because sociologists conventionally define family as a coresident and commensal kin group, it is necessary, in order to classify the move under delayed family migration, that the urban-based relative belonged at the time of his migration to the same rural *household* from which the migrant originated. Unfortunately, our estimate of delayed family migration may be somewhat inaccurate. In the survey, migrants were not directly asked if their urban-based agnates had originated from the same rural household as themselves. Elsewhere in the questionnaire, however, they were questioned on the occurrence of previous migration from the family, and the relationship of these persons was noted. A cross-tabulation of relationships with previous migrants from the family and relationships with contacts from whom migrants received assistance indicates that 94 percent of the primary male agnates (father, brother, and son only) and only 8 percent of the other male agnates belonged at the time of their migration to the same rural household as the migrant. This fact implies that the moves of only 16.7 percent of the sample could be classified under delayed family migration. The rest of the sample who received assistance from relatives and covillagers were involved in serial migration.

The type of relative present in Delhi might be important in explaining who received assistance from both relatives and covillagers: perhaps migrants who violated traditional norms by receiving assistance from kin affinally linked through female agnates would be more likely to approach covillagers for assistance. The survey data, however, do not support this hypothesis. The proportion who approached covillagers for assistance did not differ significantly between migrants helped by different kin groups.

Pattern of Assistance Received from Urban-Based Contacts

Assistance from relatives and covillagers may take many forms, such as room, food, money, and job search. Table 4 shows the pattern of help received from relatives and covillagers separately. Help usually came as a package. The most common combination for both sources was "room, food, and job search," followed by "room, food, money, and job search." Although monetary help was

TABLE 4
 PATTERN OF HELP RECEIVED BY NEW MIGRANTS
 FROM URBAN-BASED RELATIVES AND COVILLAGERS
 (Percentages)

		PATTERN OF HELP RECEIVED FROM RELATIVES				TOTAL	N	
PANEL	SOURCE OF HELP	Room and Food	Room, Food, and Job Search	Room, Food, Money, and Job Search	Other Combinations			
A	Primary male agnates	13.1	36.0	46.2	4.7	100	236	
	Other male agnates	15.1	54.8	26.5	3.6	100	166	
	Kin affinally linked through female agnates	16.9	53.6	24.6	4.9	100	183	
	Maternal kin	16.7	55.9	22.5	4.9	100	102	
	Affines	22.1	49.6	23.9	4.4	100	113	
	Entire sample	16.1	48.4	30.9	4.6	100	800	
	N	129	387	248	36			
X ² =40.82; d.f.=12; P=.0001.								
		PATTERN OF HELP RECEIVED FROM RELATIVES				TOTAL	N	
PANEL	SOURCE OF HELP	Room and Food	Room, Food, and Job Search	Room, Food, Money, and Job Search	Other Combinations			
B	Relatives only	14.9	49.7	30.9	4.5	100	737	
	Relatives and covillagers	30.2	33.3	30.2	6.3	100	63	
	All recipients from relatives	16.1	48.4	30.9	4.6	100	800	
	N	129	387	248	36	800		
	X ² =12.00; d.f.=3; P=0.01.							
		PATTERN OF HELP RECEIVED FROM COVILLAGERS				TOTAL	N	
PANEL	SOURCE OF HELP	Room and Food	Room, Food, and Job Search	Room, Food, Money, and Job Search	Aid in Job Search Only			Other Combinations
C	Relatives and covillagers	6.7	8.3	0.0	70.0	15.0	100	60
	Covillagers only	13.2	46.3	28.2	5.2	7.2	100	348
	All recipients from covillagers	12.3	40.7	24.0	14.7	8.3	100	408
	N	50	166	98	60	34	408	
X ² =186.79; d.f.=4; P=0.00								

the least common of the four types of assistance under consideration, contacts were not necessarily unwilling to lend money to new migrants. Rather, the data reflect the tendency of migrants not to ask monetary help from their contacts. This hypothesis can be checked for migrants who had relatives in Delhi. These migrants were asked for each of the four categories of help to indicate if they received, were refused, or did not seek help. Only 4.8 percent reported that they were refused money. A similar exercise on refusal from covillagers cannot be

carried out because questions on help from covillagers were framed in a different way.

In his study on rural-urban migration in Ghana, Caldwell found that many urban households did not feel the same responsibilities towards fellow villagers as towards relatives, and this difference was reflected in the pattern of help given to the two groups: "Far more frequently than with relatives, townsmen feel that their only obligation towards fellow villagers is to devote some time and use their superior knowledge of the town in searching for jobs, contacting others (often of the same ethnic group) and generally advising. It is far less common to give or lend money to fellow villagers than to relatives."¹¹ Table 4 shows quite clearly that this disparity was not the experience of migrants in Delhi. When approached, covillagers helped new migrants as adequately as relatives did. The pattern of help received by migrants who relied exclusively on relatives (row 1 in panel B) was quite similar to that received by those who relied on covillagers only (row 2 in panel C). In particular, the difference in the proportion who received monetary help was small.

This finding can probably be accounted for by the widespread tendency among rural Indians and those from a rural background to attribute fictive kinship to fellow villagers. Typically, rural Indians do not make a sharp distinction between "relatives" and "unrelated covillagers." Rather, these individuals consider fellow villagers as a particular kind of relative, although not related genealogically, and commonly refer to them as "brother," "uncle," and so on. Given this attitude, urban-based contacts can be expected to give fictive kin from their village the same kind of help that they would give to closer genealogical kin, though the degree of help may differ.¹² In the survey on which this paper is based, investigators were instructed to ascertain whether the specified relationship between the respondent and the urban contact was genealogical or fictive. All fictive kin were classified as covillagers. This rigorous distinction between genealogical kin and unrelated covillagers was made to ensure clarity.

For migrants who received help from both relatives and covillagers, the pattern of help from the two sources differed considerably. The assistance from covillagers was confined mainly to aid in job search (row 1 in panel C) while relatives provided all four categories of help in varying proportions (row 2 in panel B). The selectivity in assistance was exercised by the help seekers and not by the helpers. It was noted earlier that migrants with both relatives and covillagers in the city tend not to approach covillagers for help. The evidence on the pattern of help received further indicates that if covillagers are contacted it is for limited help. New migrants prefer to obtain board and lodging from relatives if they are present.

There was a statistically significant difference in the pattern of help received from relatives between those who relied entirely on relatives and those who also received help from covillagers. The latter group was twice as likely as the former to receive only room and food from relatives (see panel B). It need hardly be stressed again that refusal is not one of the causes. It is possible that these migrants did not think that their relatives had knowledge of the market and influence to locate the jobs they desired or that they did not want to inflict further burden on the relatives.

In his study of an immigrant community in Delhi, Gore observed that assistance to migrants from relatives who did not constitute a customary source was largely confined to job search.¹³ The evidence in panel A in table 4 is in

sharp contrast to that finding. Virtually all migrants who were assisted by kin affinally linked through female agnates received room and food, and four-fifths were helped in job search. While this fact could be an indication of relaxation in cultural codes of conduct over time, it is more likely that differences in sample characteristics of the two studies have a bearing on accounting for the contradictory finding. Gore's sample consisted of members of a relatively well-off business community who had the ability to finance the period of job search out of their own resources. In contrast, the present study is based on a representative sample of migrants in Delhi from rural areas. The sample included a large number of migrants whose ability to finance job search out of personal resources was limited.

Panel A in table 4 also shows that the pattern of assistance received from different types of relatives differed significantly at the 1 percent level. One of the differences involved the receipt of monetary assistance. Migrants assisted by primary male agnates were nearly twice as likely to receive money as those who were helped by other types of relatives. The most common package among the former group was "room, food, money, and job search," while among the rest it was "room, food, and job search." However, an interesting feature is that when migrants sought monetary help, the proportion who met with refusals was greater among those helped by male agnates and kin affinally linked through female agnates (6 percent in each group) than among those helped by matrilin and affines (3 percent in each group).

A second noticeable difference, that the proportion who received only room and food was greater among those assisted by affines, is accounted for by the fact that a larger proportion of these migrants had obtained information and arranged for employment through formal channels. In general, migrants who received only room and food and were helped exclusively by either relatives or covillagers had prearranged jobs through formal channels and were staying with their contacts until suitable accommodation was found.

Summary and Conclusions

This paper was concerned with interactions between labor migrants and their urban-based contacts in the migration process in India. An overwhelming majority of the migrants were assisted by their contacts on arrival in Delhi. There was a tendency among new arrivals to rely exclusively on relatives even though covillagers were also present. I explained this behavior in terms of transmission of information by urban-based relatives and interpreted it as an indication of kinship bonds being stronger than village ties. However, there did not appear to be any discrimination between kin and covillagers on the part of urban-based contacts when helping new migrants. The pattern of help received by migrants who relied exclusively on relatives was quite similar to that received by those who relied exclusively on covillagers. Migrants who received assistance from both relatives and covillagers, however, preferred to approach the latter mainly for aid in job search and to rely on the former for board and lodging.

Not all urban-based relatives could be termed family members of the migrants. Only 29 percent of those who were assisted by relatives were involved in delayed family migration. Indeed, in about one-half of the cases that involved assistance from relatives, the places of origin of migrants and their urban-based relatives were different, and in the traditional rural setting it would not be customary for migrants to have interactions with many of these relatives.

The occurrence of chain migration is a reflection of the lack of assimilation of migrants into the urban environment. Urban-based migrants are likely to take the initiative in migration of relatives and covillagers when they want to build in the town a social network similar to that in the rural area. Further, owing to the lack of assimilation, the social network of migrants also includes the rural area, and most of them plan to return to their place of origin on retirement.¹⁴ These ties make urban-based migrants vulnerable to pressures to honor the customary obligations to network members and make them more wary of refusing to help when approached. Therefore, as long as migrants have a tendency to retain ties with their place of origin, chain migration is likely to occur.

A consequence of chain migration is the concentration of persons from the same village or kinship network in particular occupations or establishments, primarily because contacts are most knowledgeable about vacancies in their own occupations and establishments and because they have most influence with their own employers. The survey on which this paper is based indicated that 36 percent of the wage employees in the sample had relatives and/or covillagers working for the same employer. A survey of squatter settlements in Delhi, carried out in 1973, found that 60 percent of the workers in the sample worked in the same occupational categories as their relatives and covillagers.¹⁵

Chain migration also has implications for the contribution of migration to urban unemployment. In a migration model developed by Todaro, it has been argued that an autonomous expansion of urban employment growth could lead to higher rates of urban unemployment through induced additional migration.¹⁶ Nevertheless, where contacts are important in transmitting information and in lining up jobs for potential candidates, such an increase is unlikely because there is a built-in tendency in such a system for the volume of induced migration to be restricted. First, dissemination of information is uneven. Only those who have contacts in the establishment come to know of vacancies. Second, prospective migrants with urban-based contacts can search for urban jobs from the rural area. If recruitment is through employee referral, prospects are improved little by coming to the city and searching from there unless migrants are able to widen their contacts after arrival. Forty-two percent of the migrants in the sample had come to Delhi after they received suggestions to migrate from urban-based contacts. This figure is a close proxy for the importance of rural-based search through contacts, given the responsibilities that are incurred by making suggestions to prospective migrants. Finally, given the likelihood of concentration of persons from different kinship or social networks in different occupations or industrial categories, the volume of induced migration will be influenced by the sector in which job opportunities are expanding. If jobs are created in sectors dominated by nonmigrants, induced migration will be low. Thus, the prevalence of chain migration implies that the contribution of migration to urban unemployment is likely to be lower than conventionally predicted by economists.

NOTES

¹See, for example, Aderanti Adepoju, "Rural-Urban Socioeconomic Links: The Example of Migrants in Southwest Nigeria," in *Modern Migrations in Western Africa*, ed. Samir Amin (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 127-137; Harvey M. Choldin, "Kinship Networks in the Migration Process," *International Migration Review* 7 (Summer 1973): 163-75; John C. Caldwell, *African Rural-*

Urban Migration (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1969); Bruce H. Herrick, *Urban Migration and Economic Development in Chile* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1965); Charles Tilly and Harold C. Brown, "On Uprooting, Kinship, and the Auspices of Migration," *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 8 (September 1967): 139–64.

²John S. Macdonald and Leatrice D. Macdonald, "Chain Migration, Ethnic Neighbourhood Formation, and Social Networks," *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly* 42 (January 1964): 82–97.

³It is implicitly assumed that family composition is determined by the patrilineal mode of descent.

⁴Results of prior analyses of the survey data are contained in Biswajit Banerjee, "Some Aspects of Rural-Urban Migration in India: A Case Study of Delhi" (D. Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1981).

⁵*Ibid.*, chaps. 2 and 3.

⁶M. S. Gore, *Urbanization and Family Change* (Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1968), p. 101.

⁷McKim Marriott, "Social Structure and Change in an Uttar Pradesh Village," in *India's Villages*, ed. M. N. Srinivas (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1960), pp. 106–21; and Marian W. Smith, "Social Structure in the Punjab," in *ibid.*, pp. 161–79.

⁸Gore, *Urbanization and Family Change*, p. 99.

⁹Sylvia Vatuk, *Kinship and Urbanization: White Collar Migrants in North India* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 140–41.

¹⁰See, for example, Caldwell, *African Rural-Urban Migration*, p. 80.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 133.

¹²I am indebted to one of the referees for bringing this explanation to my attention.

¹³Gore, *Urbanization and Family Change*, p. 101.

¹⁴For a survey of evidence on this issue see Joan M. Nelson, "Sojourners versus New Urbanites: Causes and Consequences of Temporary versus Permanent Cityward Migration in Developing Countries," *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 24 (July 1976): 721–57.

¹⁵Town and Country Planning Organization, "Jhuggi Jhonpri Settlements in Delhi," mimeographed (New Delhi: Government of India, Ministry of Works and Housing, 1975), p. 56.

¹⁶Michael P. Todaro, "A Model of Labor Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries," *American Economic Review* 59 (March 1969): 139–48; and *idem*, "Urban Job Expansion, Induced Migration, and Rising Unemployment," *Journal of Development Economics* 3 (September 1976): 211–25.