Migrant Social Capital and its Influence upon Return Migration: The Case of Rural-to-Urban Migrants in Thailand.

Kim Korinek
Barbara Entwisle
Aree Jampaklay

The Carolina Population Center
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Paper presentation for the Population Association of America Annual Meeting, Boston, MA, April 1, 2004

Introduction

In this paper we investigate the role of social capital as an influence on the migration process, in particular the permanence of settlement and return migration. Return to the household and community of origin has shown to be a pervasive outcome in both internal and international migration processes, with the selective settlement and departure of migrants bearing upon a nation's population, social and economic dynamics. However, the extent of return migration—among both international and domestic migrants—and the features of the migrant experience and migrant community that serve to either consolidate settlement or facilitate return remain elusive (Constant and Massey 2002; Lindstrom 1996). Numerous scholars have asserted and tested the premise that migrant social capital, embodied in social network ties to kin and others, lowers the costs and risks associated with distant and international movements and thereby increases the likelihood of migration (Palloni et al. 2001; Massey et al. 1994; Gurak and Caces 1992; Massey et al. 1987). Fewer analyses of the migration process have delineated the impact of migrant social capital on the nature of settlement and odds of return among individuals who have already migrated from origin communities. We address the question of settlement versus return among a population of urban Thai migrants who originate from Nang Rong, a mostly agrarian, poorly developed district in northeastern Thailand.

The difficulties associated with measuring the prevalence of return migration and the characteristics of return migrants have been duly noted (Kirwan and Harrigan 1986). Indeed, in the case of latter 20th century international migration some scholars have noted that the dichotomous, returned-versus-settled status oversimplifies elaborate, often transnational, patterns of movement (Glick Schiller 1999). In Thailand, the lives of rural-urban migrants traverse time and space in patterns that are often complex, repetitive, and thus difficult to measure. Nonetheless, by amassing longitudinal data and investigating the recent life histories of migrants, it is possible to delineate a meaningful, albeit temporally limited, determination of residential status and changes in residential status over time. Our findings indicate that urban Thai migrants differ markedly in their embeddedness in migrant communities

and their access to social support, and that the decision to return or stay in the destination rests, in part, upon the nature of their ties to persons in the destination who can provide support in times of hardship.

Towards an Understanding of the Factors Facilitating Settlement and Return among Migrants

The experiences and social relations of rural migrants in urban destinations play a decisive part in their decisions to settle or return home, and thus are integral features of the migration process and population dynamics. In the internal migration systems of many developing countries, men and women from rural regions are frequently sojourners, undertaking numerous, brief seasonal trips to urban settings to seek off-farm labor and supplement rural household incomes (Lauby and Stark 1988; Piore 1979). However, all migrations, even those predominated by sojourners, eventuate in urban settlement for some. Many rural youth venturing to urban destinations will settle indefinitely and perhaps permanently, the duration and permanence of their stays depending upon their ability to cope, survive, and earn a livelihood, as well as the formation of social ties that integrate their lives in destination communities. The incorporation of migrants in urban destinations plays a decisive role in maintaining the momentum of a migration system, and thus contributes to the expansion and evolution of migrant networks that provide social capital for subsequent waves of migrants (Gurak and Caces 1992:165). Furthermore, the settlement of rural sojourners-turned-urban dwellers has been a vital component in the dramatic urbanization occurring in developing countries such as Thailand at the turn of the 21st century (Singelmann 1993:79). Thus, we may make steps toward understanding how migration impacts upon population processes by clarifying the features of migrants and their communities that facilitate return to rural origins and those that consolidate settlement in urban centers.

Myriad elements of migrants' social and economic positions vis-à-vis the rural origin and urban destination contribute to decisions to stay for lengthy periods or eventually settle in the destination. Although their inquiries have mostly focused upon international migrants, several scholars have suggested that economic opportunities—manifested as lucrative, stable job opportunities, novel social roles, and consumer activity, serve to ground migrants in the place of destination, encouraging settlement,

lengthening the duration of their stay, and lessening the odds of return to the place of origin (Reyes and Mameesh 2002; Lindstrom 1996; Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991). Others have emphasized the role of human capital as it shapes the probability of return, suggesting that return migration is a socioeconomic process in which migrants are selected to stay or return based upon their skills, knowledge, expertise, and the degree to which this capital can be utilized in the destination context (Lindstrom and Massey 1994; Ramos 1992). Especially in the growing literature that envisions migration as a gendered process, scholars assert that newly acquired gender equity and status advances in the destination society may invoke migrants', especially women migrants', desires to settle, so as to leave behind relatively patriarchal, inequitable conditions that prevail in origin communities and households (Pessar 2003).

A consensus has emerged in migration research that regards social networks as central to the precipitation and sustenance of migration (Massey 1987; Pessar 2003). Migrant social networks serve as important conduits of information and assistance for migrants (De Jong et al. 1986; Boyd 1989), thus they fulfill many functions in the migration process. Having arrived in the destination, the benefits of movement are likely to be greater and the risks lesser for migrants embedded in a network of others—usually kin and village predecessors, who can aid in finding jobs, provide financial assistance, and help with living expenses (Curran and Rivero-Fuentes 2003; Menjivar 1997; Massey et al. 1987). However, the functions of migrant social networks are diverse and may operate at counter purposes, facilitating migrant settlement and adaptation on the one hand, or, on the other hand, fostering return home by sheltering migrants in tightly-knit, origin-based communities that limit integration into destination contexts. The particular migrant outcomes that emerge are likely to depend upon the nature of migrants' destination communities, the type of individuals who occupy migrant networks, and the extent to which migrant social networks provide access to resources that consolidate or discourage relatively permanent forms of settlement (Gurak and Caces 1992). An empirical question thus looms: what types of migrant community forms and social networks foster settlement, and what types are conducive to short-term, temporary moves?

In several instances, research has demonstrated that embeddedness in migrant networks or enclaves may, in fact, limit adaptation and adjustment in the destination (Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993). Tilly and Brown (1967) suggest, for instance, that migrants who relied heavily upon their kinfolk in the destination were less likely to experience linguistic assimilation than migrants living relatively isolated from kin networks. Kritz and Gurak (1985-86), too, argue that strict reliance on kinship networks inhibits adjustment and mobility by migrants who subsequently fail to form social ties and seek opportunities outside the immediate migrant community. Especially for migrants confined to relatively impoverished, marginalized communities (i.e., "ghettoes" or "slums") that offer few opportunities for socioeconomic advancement, social networks that too strongly tie migrants to other migrants may be ties that "bind," rather than ties that foster mobility and settlement. Migrants who are strictly embedded in social relations to other relatively transient migrants, who occupy mostly impermanent, peripheral status positions in the urban setting, are less likely to experience meaningful adaptation to the destination society. Thus, other factors being equal, those closely and exclusively surrounded by mates and kin from the origin village are more likely to focus their sights on returning home, and will be inhibited in forming social ties external to the migrant community that could facilitate mobility and orientations conducive to settlement. Conversely, the forging of social ties to a farther-reaching array of individuals in the destination is likely to consolidate settlement. Using the terminology of social network frameworks (Granovetter 1983), different migrant settlement outcomes are likely to arise, depending upon whether migrants forge and rely upon weak or strong ties.

Although the functions of migrant networks and communities have been widely theorized, precise measurements of the concepts remain elusive and the mechanisms linking embeddedness in migrant networks to outcomes are not often elaborated with precision (Boyd 1989). In previous research, migrant social capital tends to be operationalized and enumerated through indirect approaches. "Having a tie to someone who has migrated" (Palloni et al. 2001:1264) is taken as a proxy for social capital, but frequently the existence and content of social ties to persons with migration experience are not explicitly measured. Rather, migrant networks, and hence social capital, are often inferred where migration

experience has accrued in the village of origin or where a "community" or "enclave" of migrants has arisen in the destination society. The guiding assumption is that such conditions—simply having other migrants in one's midst or in one's kinship system, generate resources, in the form of information and social contacts in the destination, for potential and new movers. In fact, the field of migrant research possesses limited knowledge about the actual configuration of social relations that constitute migrants' social support systems.

Additionally, a common approach has been to assess the influence of social networks that are confined to the kinship group, as indicated by previous migrations of origin family and household members (e.g., Curran Rivero-Fuentes 2003; Massey and Espinosa 1997), rather than addressing more encompassing social networks that incorporate friends and other community members. While kin are vital to the migration process and perpetuation of migration streams, this approach compromises our understanding of migrant networks and their role in producing social capital, given the common reliance upon support providers who lie outside one's kinship group, such as friends and neighbors (Wellman and Wortley 1989). Scholarly work showing that strength of social ties and access to resources in the migrant community are differentiated by gender and other social categories calls into question the assumption that migrant social capital is widely and equally accessible to all persons living within communities, and even families, where migrants are plentiful and migration experience is extensive (Curran and Rivero-Fuentes 2003; Pessar 1999; Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994). Especially when resources derived through kinship ties are differentiated by gender, generation and other status positions, it is important to incorporate more diverse and extensive social relations in definitions of migrant social networks.

Gurak and Caces (1992:153) point out that generalized migrant social networks (i.e., those most commonly referenced in the literature) may differ from local community support networks due to social and spatial distance, and other constraints upon social ties experienced by migrants. Migrants may experience an expansion of their social networks as a result of their movement (Jampaklay 2003), but it is the form and content of social interaction that takes place among a community of migrants that impinges upon the migration process (Brown 2002). Thus, methods that only tap into the general prevalence of

migration experience or presence of kin and other contacts in the destination fail to indicate directly and decisively whether individual migrants have social ties to supportive individuals and institutions in the destination that do, in fact, provide access to resources.

To adequately capture the operation of migrant social capital that derives from a social network, it is important to delineate social ties and the potential to access information and assistance resources by exercising such ties. Due to structured relations in migrant communities, which are delineated by social, economic and spatial constraints, the mere presence of other migrants in one's midst, even migrants originating from the same village, does not guarantee access to social ties that deliver support. This is particularly the case if other migrants in one's midst lack information, skills, and other resources, or if they are reluctant and partial in sharing said resources. To properly conceive of migrants and the social relationships that shape their behaviors—such as their acts of settlement and return, it is important that we use an approach that closely pinpoints those social relationships. Accordingly, we assess how three distinct measures of migrants' embeddedness in the destination society influence the migration process. Specifically, in addition to the numeric presence of village-mates in the destination context, and sharing a place of residence with other migrants, we assess migrants' perceived ties to persons, migrants and others, in the destination and outside their own household, who can provide support in times of need. In particular, we focus on migrants' perceived ties to persons in the destination from whom they could borrow money or ask for assistance in finding a job. These measures, we believe, tap into the concept of social capital, as distinct from mere embeddedness in a migrant community. By juxtaposing and measuring distinct sources of social support that derive from different social locations, it is possible to estimate which social relations bond migrants to the destination society, and which reinforce their connections to migrant communities and to home.

By distinctly enumerating social ties to support providers, our migrant network measures provide a close approximation to formal definitions of social capital. For example, Loury (1977:pp), early on, suggested that social capital accrues through "social connections… [that contribute to] information about opportunities" (Loury 1977). Bordieu (1985:pp) later stated that it consists of "the aggregate of the actual

or potential resources which are linked to…a durable network of …relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition." A recent statement of the definition emphasizes that social capital depends upon membership in social networks and relationships that provide actors with "the ability …to secure benefits" (Portes 1998:6; Massey 1999). By focusing upon migrants' social ties to supportive persons in the destination community who reside outside of their own households, we highlight those social resources, accessible through an individual's social network, which may protect, improve or maintain their position in society. Stays of longer duration and settlement are more likely, we posit, where migrants are embedded in a social network that conveys resources helpful in weathering difficult times. In addition, long duration stays and settlement will be further enhanced when social ties are forged that link migrants to persons located outside the origin-based migrant community. Lacking these perceived ties to instrumental support, we expect that migrants, other factors being equal, will stay for shorter periods and be more likely to return to origin villages.

Social Context of the Research and Characteristics of the Migrant Population

The migrants featured in our analyses have moved to several prominent urban settings from Nang Rong—a relatively poor district in the historically poor northeastern region of Thailand, also known as Isan. The people of Isan, commonly of Lao, Mon and Khmer descent, have for centuries eked out an existence on the mostly inhospitable land of the Khorat plateau as subsistence-level agrarians and pastoral hunter-gatherers (Myers 2004). Due to their late incorporation into the Thai nation-state, utilization of linguistic dialects that more closely resemble the speech of lowland Lao peoples than the Central Thai, and occupation of the most impoverished and remote region of Thailand, the people of Isan (*khon isaan*) are identified as a distinct, subordinate and marginalized regional and minority group (Mills 2002). As a result of their disadvantaged surroundings and outsider status, the Isan people remain an indigent farmer-class within the larger Thai society, a status that persists despite the rapid economic and technological change has been visited upon rural villages of Northeast Thailand in recent decades. Despite relative geographic proximity to Bangkok (approximately 400 kilometers) and other chief urban destinations, the cultural, social and economic distances breached in the movement from rural villages of Isan are vast, and

pose difficulties of settlement and adaptation that are arguably analogous to those faced by international migrants who feature predominantly in migration theory and empirical research.

The landscape of northeast Thailand has witnessed marked economic change in recent decades, including urbanization of rural places, increased cash cropping, and development of small-scale entrepreneurship in towns and villages (Mills 2002; Singhanetra-Renard 1992). In terms of rural infrastructure, Nang Rong has seen electrification, the extension and improvement of the road network, and improvements to its bus service. The agricultural basis of Nang Rong has also become more modernized, with more widespread use of tractors (mostly "walking tractors") for land preparation, an increase in the number of mechanized rice mills, and improvements in sanitation and water storage. While its agricultural system still relies heavily upon rain-fed paddy rice, cash crops such as sugarcane, kenaf, and cassava have been cultivated in recent decades, and many households practice animal husbandry to supplement subsistence incomes.

Rural economic change notwithstanding, the draw of urban employment among Nang Rong residents is powerful and has been enhanced by advancements in transportation and communication infrastructure in recent decades, as well as the information and remittances sent home by growing streams of migrants. Since the World War II, and especially since the 1970s, Isan villagers have looked toward Bangkok in search of alternative income sources (Singhanetra-Renard 1992). In part because the rural northeast has been mostly neglected in national economic development schemes with distinctly urban biases, a steady stream of young adults has flowed to Bangkok and other urban centers, providing the plentiful cheap and flexible labor that has contributed to the rapid, vast expansion of the nation's export-oriented manufacturing and services sectors (Mills 2002). Rural-to-urban migration is thus an established, pervasive practice among young adult residents of Nang Rong who have long sought economic opportunity outside their home villages. Remitted earnings are an important source of subsistence income and purchasing power in many rural household economies of Isan (Mills 2002). While a large share of young adults engage in streams of circular and seasonal movement, certain

migrants from Nang Rong opt to remain more or less permanently in several target destinations, including Bangkok, Korat, Buriram, and the Eastern Seaboard region.

As an urban, industrial labor class, the migrants of Isan face various difficulties in adapting to urban life and managing the hardships that often attend urban employment (Myers 2004). Ethnographic accounts of Isan migrants' experiences in Bangkok and elsewhere often depict a sense of ambivalence, of seeking to earn cash income and take on modern identities, while enduring alienation, economic difficulty, instances of discrimination, and harsh work conditions (Mills 2002). For Isaners, social relations with other migrants and ties to home, characterized by bonds of trust and commonality, are crucial in providing a supportive environment and sustaining migrants through times of need. In terms of adapting to urban contexts and settling in the destination, however, forging supportive social ties to individuals outside of the migrant community may be even more important than ties to other migrants. This is because, relative to native urbanites and persons outside the origin community, migrants from one's own village may have limited social contacts and resources in the destination, and thus, while providing comfort and aid in times of need, may not facilitate strong orientations toward settlement. These questions, concerning the nature of the migrant community and the social distance traversed in support relations, guide our analyses of migrant return and settlement.

The Data and Analytical Approach

The data we analyze come from a set of social and demographic surveys conducted since 1984 in 51 villages of Nang Rong district, Buriram province, northeast Thailand. The surveys were designed and data collected through a collaborative effort of the Institute for Population and Social Research at Mahidol University and the Carolina Population Center at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The first migrant follow-up survey, a focus of our analyses, was geared toward the members of households in 22 villages of Nang Rong district in 1984 but who had moved, for a duration of at least two months, to one of four urban target destinations at the time of the 1994 data collection. The 22 villages were selected randomly within strata defined by a cross-classification of general location in the district and distance from major roadways in 1984. Persons resident in 1984 but no longer resident in 1994 were

candidates for follow-up if they had gone to one of the following: greater metropolitan Bangkok; the Eastern Seaboard (a focus of rapid growth and development), Korat (a regional city), or Buriram (the provincial capital). Approximately 70% of persons eligible for the migrant follow-up survey in 1994 were successfully located and interviewed. Of these, around 75% had migrated to the Bangkok metropolis. In year 2000, an additional round of the household and migrant follow-up surveys were conducted. The 2000 migrant follow-up identified as migrants those individuals that lived in the 22 selected Nang Rong study villages in 1984 and/or 1994, but who were not living in their origin village when the 2000 household interviews were conducted.

The longitudinal aspect of data collection in the Nang Rong surveys allows us to determine the residential status of migrants in 1994 and again in 2000. Specifically, the year 2000 data collection involved attempts to define the residential status of all persons who had been identified and interviewed as study migrants in the 1994 survey. 1994 study migrants included individuals who were originally members of households in Nang Rong district in 1984 but at the time of the 1994 data collection had migrated to the four major target destinations and resided there for at least two months. 1994 study migrants also included the members of entire households that had moved outside Nang Rong district to one of the target destinations between the 1984 and 1994 survey intervals. In the 2000 round of data collection a household informant provided the residential status of each individual who had been a study migrant in 1994, denoting that they were either deceased, residing in the origin household, had moved to another house in the village, or had moved out of the village two or more months ago. Using this information from origin household informants and data from the 2000 follow-up survey, which specifies the migrant's location when s/he was found in a target destination, we delineate each 1994 study migrant's status in 2000 as follows: returned to origin village, still living in and found in target destination (settled), not found in either the origin village or in a target destination (unknown). We take note that there are limitations to defining the migration process through a comparison of two "snapshots," given that the 1994 migrants defined as "settled" in an urban destination in 2000 may include persons who returned to the origin village one or more times between the surveys.

The longitudinal nature of the Nang Rong migrant follow-up survey and the inclusion of detailed survey network data provide an unparalleled opportunity to address the impact of specific forms of migrant social capital upon the migration process. Because we measure access to social support and residence in a migrant community at a distinct point in time (i.e., one week prior to 1994 interview), and then establish the migrants' return-settlement status at a subsequent point in time (i.e., the date of the year 2000 interview) we establish a prospective point of view on the relationship between migrant social capital and the return-settlement outcome. We maintain that this approach is less prone to errors of recall than approaches that feature retrospective lines of questioning about social relations and circumstances experienced at an earlier point in time.

Given our interest in migrant social capital as it influences the decision to settle in an urban destination or return to one's rural origins, the central variables in our models measure four distinct aspects of migrants' social proximity to and relations with persons in the destination society. We begin with two variables analogous to those commonly used to indicate migrant social capital. Specifically, we denote whether migrants in 1994 were living in a destination community (province) with other migrants from their origin village, and whether migrants in 1994 were sharing living quarters with other migrants, also from Nang Rong, in the destination. These variables, while they indicate spatial proximity of other migrants, and hence the presence of a migrant 'community,' loosely defined, do not indicate whether actual social ties exist between migrants, or between migrants and other urban dwellers. In comparison to knowing and having supportive relations with a more far-reaching set of migrants and non-migrants in other social contexts of the urban setting, we expect that living in close proximity to one's kin and village mates, while it may aid in some aspects of assimilation and settlement, may support an orientation toward returning to one's rural origins. In order to address the question of social capital more directly we incorporate migrants' assessments of perceived connections to persons who can provide social and economic support in the destination.

The specific type of relational content chosen to represent social ties sets boundaries on the measured interpersonal environment of migrants (Marsden 1987). It is beneficial, then, that the Nang

Rong survey asked all study migrants to describe their relations to others in the destination, specifically individuals outside of their own household, who they believe could provide distinct forms of social support. Specifically, each migrant was asked whether they knew someone in the destination who could lend money in a time of need, or someone in the destination who could help them to find work in a time of need. For each distinct dimension of support migrants could designate up to three persons whom they believed could provide such support.[1] We use information derived from migrants' descriptions of their relationship with the designated support contact to characterize the social support tie. Specifically, based on migrants' identification of their primary support provider's place of birth, we develop a variable that indicates whether the migrant has access to social support in the destination and, if so, whether that support derives from a fellow Isan migrant or from a native of the target destination or other province outside the origin province of Buriram. By including multiple measures of community embeddedness and migrant social capital in the destination we are equipped to determine if they have unique or parallel impacts upon migrants' acts of return or settlement.

Our statistical analyses of migrant status in 2000 incorporate several other sets of variables, measured in 1994, which are thought to influence the migration process. Migrants' age and years spent in the destination for the most recent stay capture life course elements that are likely to impact upon migrants' decisions to stay in the destination or return home. Marital status, including a designation of the current residence of the migrant's spouse, captures another life course feature that has shown to impact upon the relative permanence or temporary quality of the migration spell (Jampaklay 2004). It is our assessment that married migrants residing with their spouses in the destination are less inclined to return, given a greater sense of attachment and sense of family in the destination, as compared to single migrants whose kinship ties remain focused upon the origin village.

[1] While given the choice to name multiple support providers, the majority of respondents (75%) who named support providers in the destination only named one individual from whom they could borrow money. 21% named two individual and only 4% named three individual. An even smaller share of respondents named multiple support providers on the question about job search assistance.

Compared to other developing country settings, gender is a somewhat weak line of differentiation for the migration process. Rural households often adopt a relatively fluid division of labor between male and female members, such that migrating to seek wage labor is a strategy commonly adopted by young women and men alike. As such, men and women have come to be almost equally represented in the well-established rural-urban migration streams originating in Isan. Notable gender differences do exist, however, with respect to the economic activities performed by male and female migrants in destination contexts, and the family-based expectations for remitting and otherwise supporting origin households. Specifically, in keeping with gender-specific expectations for merit-making that derive from Thai Buddhist teachings, female migrants are more likely than their male counterparts to remit money and extend support to their parental household (Mills 2002; Van Wey 2001; Curran 1995). While our expectations are not strong, we anticipate that female migrants will exhibit a greater propensity to return to origin villages, due to traditional preferences for matriarchal kinship patterns and gender differentiated social norms that call for young women to repay 'bunkhun,' or debts of merit, by caring for their parents' needs (Chamratrithirong et al. 1988). Thai gender-based socialization tends to favor women's orientation to kin and household-based activities and men's greater independence, mobility and socializing outside the family context. We will explore whether such socialization and activity differences have consequences for men's and women's social tie formation in urban destination contexts.

Because they capture the economic resources and social position of migrants within the destination society, we include two indicators of migrants' socioeconomic status in the models predicting return versus settlement. A variable for educational attainment indicates whether the migrant has received average and sub-average levels of schooling (no schooling-primary school completion) or greater than average levels of education (secondary or post-secondary). Due to national policies that have mandated primary schooling since the 1960s, most migrants in the study have completed four to six years

of schooling[2]. We anticipate that migrants with higher than average levels of education may have access to workforce opportunities in the destination that cannot be found in poorly developed rural origin villages where agriculture predominates. By comparison, migrants with below average levels of education may find it relatively difficult to locate a job and assimilate to urban ways of life. For these reasons we expect that settlement will be positively correlated with migrants' level of schooling. Migrants' current workforce position is measured according to four major occupational categories and a fifth category that indicates a nonworking status in 1994. While we do not have firm predictions for each occupational grouping, we do hypothesize that migrants in higher status workforce positions are more likely to have secure and upwardly mobile positions in the destination, as well as higher wages, and hence are less likely to return to rural origin households. By comparison, migrants concentrated in fields that usually feature temporary and informal positions, such as the construction industry, may have a greater propensity to return.

Results and Discussion

The characteristics of migrants as featured in the 1994 Nang Rong migrant follow-up survey, including their status in migrant communities and networks of social support, are shown in Table One. The overall sample of Nang Rong migrants found residing in the target urban areas in 1994 tend to be young adults in their 20s, resident in their current destination for under five years, and with average levels of education. Women in the 1994 Nang Rong urban migrant sample are present in slightly greater numbers than men, a finding consistent with population statistics for Thailand that indicate women constitute half or slightly more than half of all rural-to-urban migrants (UN Secretariat 1993). The most common occupation undertaken by Nang Rong migrants in urban destinations is factory work, followed by employment in construction and other manual labor, and employment in sales and services professions. Gender differences in the migrant population are few; however, the education and occupational status positions of migrants are structured by gender. Male migrants are more likely than

[2] In Thailand, compulsory schooling was defined as four years in the 1960s and revised to six years in the 1970s. Our variable counts as greater than primary schooling all those migrants who report having completed 7 or more years of schooling.

females to have attained secondary and post-secondary schooling. Male migrants are also more likely than women to be working as professional and managerial workers, or as construction and manual labor workers. On the other hand, greater shares of women than men labor as factory workers and technicians, and a greater share of women compared to men occupy non-working status positions.

[Insert Table One about here]

The bottom panel of figures in Table One reveals that only about one-third of Nang Rong migrants present in target urban destinations in 1994 were still present in those destinations in 2000. The remaining two-thirds of migrants had either returned to an origin village in Nang Rong district or their destination was unknown. While it is not possible to decisively specify the status migrants with unknown status in 2000, they likely had migrated again, beyond the target destinations, or had migrated within the target destinations but were no longer in contact with kin and others in the origin village, and hence were not located by survey staff in follow-up attempts. It is telling that a greater share of male migrants relative to female migrants was of unknown status in 2000. This finding, which parallels earlier findings of gender-based differences in follow-up that emerge in longitudinal migrant surveys, suggests that relative to daughters and other female kin, the members of origin households may maintain less information about their sons' and male family members' whereabouts. Of those migrants who remain 'settled' in the destination in 2000, a greater share are women. We should interpret this slight gender differential with caution, given that male migrants, too, may have remained in the destination, but the greater independence accorded to young men in Thai society may have prevented migrants' family members, and hence survey staff, from specifying their residential location in 2000. We return to the matter of gender-based and other selectivities that surround the migration process, and potentially impact sample selection biases and survey attrition in a latter section of the paper.

As Table One demonstrates, male and female migrants from Nang Rong experience a diverse range of social support relationships in urban destinations. Men and women display diverse degrees of embeddedness in destinations that contain other migrants with shared village origins. Only about 10% of 1994 urban migrants were living in a destination province with no other migrants from their same origin

village. Greater shares of both men and women were residing in destination provinces that contained at least one other migrant from the index migrant's origin village. Greater than 20% of male and female migrants in the urban sample resided in provinces in 1994 that contained greater than 40 migrants with a common origin village. An overview of men's and women's settlement and return status in 2000 by the presence of co-villagers in the destination province in 1994 hints at a positive association between numbers of village mates co-resident in the destination province and settlement as indicated by residence in year 2000. This positive association, which is more marked for men than women, suggests that the overall presence of village-mates in the destination—possibly indicating a migrant community effect, may serve to consolidate migrants' settlement over time. We return to this hypothesized relationship in the multivariate analyses that follow.

The first variable indicating migrants' access to social support suggests that a substantial majority (80%) of migrants in 1994 knew someone in the destination from whom they could ask to borrow money. In identifying their primary support provider, approximately equal shares of women and men indicated that they would seek to borrow money from either another Nang Rong- or Buriram-born individual (46-48%), or from a person born in the target destination or another province distinct from their origin (33-34%). Less pervasive are migrant social ties to individuals in the destination whom they believe they could ask for help in finding a job—a more scarce type of social resource. Only about 37% of 1994 migrants said they knew someone who could help in this way. Interestingly, although Nang Rong migrants tend to occupy peripheral social and economic positions in Bangkok and other urban destinations, about two-thirds of migrants who state they have social ties to someone whom can provide assistance with job-seeking name a person who is also from Nang Rong or Buriram province. In general, the majority of migrants know of at least one person in the destination, outside of their own household, who can provide support in times of need. We take this knowledge and access to resources that can aid in difficult times to be indicative of migrant social capital, and investigate whether it contributes to migrants' eventual decisions to stay on in the destination or return home.

Upon examining the residential status of 1994 urban migrants from Nang Rong in year 2000, we see that migrants who possess social support ties in the destination—to someone outside of their household who can either lend money or provide assistance in locating a job, are more likely to have settled in the destination, whereas a greater share of migrants lacking such support ties have returned to their origin village. While patterns revealed in the bivariate analyses cannot confirm the strength of association, we observe that social support ties linking migrants to natives of the target destination and other persons with social origins distinct from their own have a positive association with settlement, and that these associations are comparable, if not stronger, than the association between settlement and possession of ties to migrants from the origin province. In the multivariate analyses we further explore the role of social support ties in the migration process, and the hypothesis that ties that traverse social distance, in particular, act to encourage settlement in the destination.

Before addressing the influence of migrant community status and migrant access to social support, two factors that we conceptualize as exerting distinct effects upon settlement and return decisions, we sketch the nature of social support relations among Nang Rong migrants in greater detail. Table Two displays information on the social origins, number of contacts, and type of social relations linking migrants to potential providers of social support. The data characterizing social ties to support providers, disaggregated according to migrants' gender, marital status and educational attainment, reveal that the form and context of social support relations diverge by migrants' social status positions.

[Insert Table Two about here]

Several telling patterns are revealed in the bivariate data. First, we see that ever-married male and female migrants are more likely to state that they have no social support contacts outside of their household than their single counterparts. Single migrants, men and women alike, are more likely to have several social support contacts outside of the household, and they are more likely to obtain social support from friends, whereas married migrants, when they do have support providers outside their own household, more often mention acquaintances as their primary support providers. Recalling that the social support questions ask about contacts in the destination, but outside one's own household, it is likely the

case that married migrants rely more heavily upon their spouse and other household members in times of need. As such, married migrants are not necessarily more socially isolated than single migrants, but rather they may focus their social relations within their own household and depend primarily upon their spouses and other kin with whom they live.

Overall, the results in Table Two reveal few distinct gender differences in structures of social support. Women migrants are slightly more likely than men to identify some person in the destination, outside their own household, to whom they could turn for either type of social support. As far as the relationship that underlies the support receiver-support provider tie, men and women both report most frequently that the person to whom they would turn to borrow money or to help find a job is a relative.

Further inspection of Table Two reveals that social support relations are also differentiated by migrants' socioeconomic status, as indicated by educational attainment. Both male and female migrants with secondary and post-secondary schooling have greater access to social support and more numerous social support providers compared to migrants with average and below average schooling. Migrants with higher levels of educational attainment disproportionately choose friends, over relatives and acquaintances, as their primary social support contacts. It is also the case that, if they foresee seeking to borrow money, highly educated migrants, like their counterparts with average and low levels of education, most frequently report that they would turn to someone from their origin province. If needing help locating a job, however, migrants with secondary and post-secondary schooling report that they would seek such aid from a person who was born in the destination or some other place distinct from their own birthplace. Migrants with primary school or fewer years of education, by comparison, tend to mention persons from their own origin village and province as their primary sources of support in seeking jobs. Although support of this kind is relatively rare among Nang Rong migrants, it appears that those with above average levels of education are more inclined to draw on ties rooted in the destination and extending beyond the origin community. This finding of more highly educated migrants' greater reliance on persons "outside" their origin community is suggestive of "strength of weak ties" principles (e.g., Granovetter 1983) which associate greater access to valuable, non-redundant information about jobs and

other social resources to ties that are relationally weak and thereby span greater distances of social systems.

It is instructive to inspect the degree to which migrant's access to social support relates to the presence of a village-based community in the destination. Table Three depicts this relationship. In the bivariate view a clear correlation does not emerge between access to social support and the presence of migrants from one's origin village in the destination. Migrants are about as likely to have a tie to someone who can loan money irrespective of the number of others from their village in the destination. With respect to the job assistance social tie, it appears that this form of social support is more accessible for migrants who reside in a destination with numerous village-mates. It also appears that migrants are more likely to seek help from others who were born in Buriram and Nang Rong, rather than persons who originate in the urban destination or other provinces, if they reside in a destination province where other villagers are numerous. The patterns in Table Three suggest that migrant social support ties are operative irrespective of the larger presence of an origin-based migrant community. Hence, we explore the independent impacts exerted through the overarching origin-based community in the destination and migrants' immediate social support networks upon decisions to settle or return to the origin community.

In order to assess the unique impact of social capital and other elements of the migrant's experience upon the decision to stay in the urban destination or return to the village of origin, we estimate a multinomial logistic regression model that predicts 1994 migrants' status in 2000. Presented in Table Four are regression coefficients and robust standard errors associated with the odds of each outcome: 1) returning to the origin village, or 2) and not being found in either the origin or target destination, relative to having settled in the target destination. In other words, the multinomial logistic regression coefficients convey the likelihood of moving back home or moving away from the target destination, relative to remaining in the destination across the six-year interval between surveys. Migrants in the Nang Rong survey are not distributed independently across space, but rather are clustered within provinces. Hence, the multinomial logistic regression models incorporate clustering at the level of the destination province and we obtain robust variance estimates using the Huber/White/sandwich estimator of variance in place of

traditional calculations. Given the ambiguous status of migrants who are not found in either the target destination or a Nang Rong village in 2000, we focus our discussion upon the first column of results and the question of urban settlement versus return to the origin community.

[Insert Table Four about here]

It is readily apparent, given the pattern of coefficients across the three models, that among Nang Rong migrants who have moved to urban destinations within Thailand, embeddedness in an origin-based community of migrants, and the presence of an immediate social support network in the destination each have significant, independent effects on the likelihood of urban settlement. In the multivariate predictive models we have chosen to represent migrants' social support networks according to their perceived social ties to other persons in the destination who can lend money in times of need. We also ran parallel models that incorporated the migrants' social ties to persons who could provide assistance in seeking a job and these models yielded coefficients that were similar in terms of strength and direction. We have chosen to represent social support according to migrants' having a connection to someone from whom they could borrow money because this type of social tie is more widely accessible to migrants.

The first row of results demonstrates that the presence of relatively large numbers of co-villagers in the province of destination increases the odds that migrants settled in the destination between 1994 and 2000. Migrants who are relatively isolated from persons who share their origins, by comparison, are more likely to have returned to Nang Rong over the six-year period. We interpret these results in accordance with previous research that portrays migrant enclaves and communities as offering viable, familiar social spaces within destinations and generalized ties of social contact, more or less united through their common status as co-ethnics and migrants (e.g., Logan et al. 2002). Where numerous Nang Rong migrants have settled in one urban setting, it is likely that a sense of closeness and community will arise, and this context may increase the chances that any particular migrant also settles in the destination. Especially where migrants' status relative to other urban dwellers is marginalized and their relations are impersonal and even antagonistic, the presence of other villagers could have an insulating effect that is decisive for decisions to settle or return home.

By comparing results across Models One and Two we discern that the existence of an origin-based community and the possession of immediate social support ties have distinct, unique and positive effects on urban settlement. The results for migrant community presence and ties to a social support provider are positive and statistically significant following the inclusion of additional social and demographic characteristics of the migrants that influence return and settlement status. It is telling that the coefficient for embeddedness in a migrant community remains statistically significant the social support ties variable is added to the model. This suggests that two separate processes are at work in shaping the settlement versus return outcome. It is important that migrants have access to social support through their immediate network of social contacts, be they friends, coworkers, neighbors or other acquaintances. These ties of social support provide migrants access to a source of financial aid in times of need. They may also provide information about job opportunities, or other resources that allow the migrant to endure in the urban destination and perceive urban life as favorable and viable. What our models demonstrate is that, above and beyond the presence of co-villagers in the destination, migrants' immediate social support ties are significant for the settlement/return outcome. We take this to indicate that direct access to one or more persons in the destination who can provide instrumental support in times of need reinforces settlement, and that this type of support can be forthcoming through varied types of social relations—among friends, co-workers, friends, and these social relations need not be confined to the relations based in the 'transplanted' origin community. Rather, migrants may come to rely upon urban natives or upon migrants from divergent social origins. As such, direct social support ties can operate irrespective of the migrant's embeddedness in an origin-based migrant community.

The coefficients in Model Three further demonstrate that migrants whose primary support ties are to persons originating in the urban destination or other provinces distinct from their own are more likely to settle in the destination than migrants who seek social support primarily from Nang Rong and Buriram people. This result suggests that settlement is consolidated and return to origins less likely where migrants form social relations that extend beyond their origin-based community in the destination. In forming relations with persons from Bangkok and other areas of Thailand, migrants' social relations are

becoming more embedded in the mainstream destination society. Their orientation widens beyond persons from the northeast, in particular persons who continue to view the rural village as their home and regard their stay in the destination as temporary. These results also reflect upon social networks principles that highlight the distinct role of social ties that "reach" across social distances and thereby link an individual to valuable information and resources that may not be available through interaction with persons relatively close and similar to one self. Migrant social capital, these results suggest, arises not only within, but also beyond the immediate migrant community. It is these ties "beyond" the circle of migrants and mates from one's origin community that may be most instrumental in shaping urban settlement.

Migrants who share living quarters in the destination with one or more additional migrants from Nang Rong are more likely to have returned to their rural origin villages by year 2000 than migrants who either lived alone or lived only with persons having origins distinct from their own. This result suggests that living arrangements may operate similarly to the social support relations when it comes to consolidating settlement. That is, living in close quarters with other migrants (who tend to be sojourners) may foster a short-term, temporary approach to living in the destination. Relatedly, migrants housed with other migrants may be living in special housing quarters intended for short-term stays. By comparison, migrants who share housing with a more diverse group of people (e.g., kin in Bangkok, roommates with different origins) may develop an orientation favorable to settlement. Likewise, migrants living on their own may seek companionship, support, and leisure outside their own household and a closed circle of migrants from the origin community. Thus, in addition to the social relations that migrants form outside their own households, the nature of their living arrangements in the destination are also consequential for settlement outcomes.

Several other variables in the model act as significant predictors in the migration process as observed among Nang Rong migrants in the 1994-2000 interval. Migrants who have resided in the destination for longer periods of time are less likely to return home. This finding is consistent with an attachment to destination perspective, and also resembles the finding, common in other settings where

short-term and circular migration is prevalent, that most migrants return home in the first year following their departure. Concerning socioeconomic status, we find that more highly educated migrants have greater odds of settling in the urban destinations, whereas migrants with only primary schooling or no formal schooling have greater odds of returning home. This finding suggests that migrant settlement is positively selective on human capital characteristics. In terms of occupational positions, migrants who are construction workers and manual laborers are far more likely to have returned home by 2000 than factory workers and professionals, a result that reflects the often temporary status and short-term duration of migrant jobs in the construction industry, as well as the greater financial rewards and opportunities for mobility that accompany particular occupations and thus encourage settlement.

Conclusion

In this paper we demonstrate that social capital, or possession of social ties to persons who can come to one's aid in times of difficulty, has a significant, positive impact upon migrants' acts of settlement in urban destinations of Thailand. Our findings demonstrate that over and above co-residence with other migrants from one's own village, having ties that extend beyond the migrant community and that include a range of urban dwellers and persons from diverse geographic locations reinforce urban settlement. This result mirrors a central tenet of social capital, namely, that social ties to individuals and institutions are important in that they can yield resources that enhance one's well-being or social position. For Nang Rong migrants it is possible, and the results suggest, that maintaining contact with one or more individuals who possess modest economic resources, and who therefore provide aid during difficult times, serves to consolidate settlement and inhibit return. More isolated migrants, or those whose social networks are relatively confined to other newcomers who are relatively social marginalized and lacking in local knowledge, may not be less equipped to withstand challenges in the urban destination and thus more prone to return.

The decision to settle in an urban destination or return to one's rural origin village is pivotal in the life of many migrants. By utilizing longitudinal data that spans a six year period, and by assessing change

in migrants' residential status following their engagement with a particular set of social ties, we are able to assess the direct impact of social support on the migration process. We find that net of socioeconomic status, household composition, duration of stay, and other migrant characteristics, access to social support in the destination consolidates the settlement of rural migrants in urban areas. These findings suggest to us that among those migrants settling in Thailand's vast and growing urban centers, that those who are strongly connected to others through ties of social support are more likely to settle and become long-term and permanent urban dwellers. Such a finding, which is possibly generalizable to other settings and to the situation of international migrants, demonstrates one important channel whereby social capital influences unfolding population processes.

Our approach to the measurement of migrant social capital recognizes that access to valuable resources that shape life in the destination may be channeled not only through embeddedness in an origin-based community, but also through one's immediate personal networks. The influence that community and network bases exert upon migrant settlement are distinct both conceptually and relationally. That is, migrants living in a community filled with individuals from their own village may or may not have the knowledge, ability, or power to request social support from such persons. Additionally, migrants living in such a community of village mates may choose, instead, to form social ties and request social support from persons outside their origin community. Alternatively, migrants living in destinations that lack an origin-based community are not necessarily lacking in social capital; in fact, they may seek out and form social relations with a more diverse set of urban dwellers, including persons born in the city and migrants from other regions of the country. Migrant social capital is not merely the product of embeddedness in or social ties to kin and persons from the origin community. In fact, our analyses suggest that social capital emerges, too, through relations that migrants forge with natives of the urban destination and other regions of Thailand, and that these relations are especially powerful in encouraging urban settlement.

References

Bordieu, Pierre. 1985. "The Forms of Capital," pp. 241-58 in *The Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by J.G. Richardson, New York: Greenwood.

Borjas, G.J. and B,M. Bratsberg. 1994. "Who Leaves? The Outmigration of the Foreign Born," National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, working paper No. 4913.

Boyd, Monica. 1989. "Family and Personal Networks in International Migration: Recent Developments and New Agendas," *International Migration Review* 23(3):638-70.

Brown, David L. 2002. "Migration and Community: Social Networks in a Multi-level world," *Rural Sociology* 67(1): 1-23.

Chamratrithirong, Aphichat, Morgan, S. Philip, Ronald R. Rindfuss. 1988. "Living Arrangements and Family Formation," *Social Forces* 66(4):926-950.

Constant, Amelie and Douglas S. Massey. 2002. "Return Migration by German Guestworkers: Neoclassical versus New Economic Theories," International Migration 40(4):5-36.

Curran, Sara R. 1995. "Intra-Household Exchange Relations: Explanations for Gender Differentials in Education and Migration Outcomes in Thailand," Center For Studies in Demography and Ecology Working Paper, University of Washington, Seattle.

Curran, Sara R. and Estela Rivero-Fuentes. 2003. "Engendering Migrant Networks: The Case of Mexican Migration," *Demography* 40(2):289-307.

Godley, Jenny. 2001. "Kinship Networks and Contraceptive Choice in Nang Rong, Thailand," *International Family Planning Perspectives*, 27(1): 4-11.

Granovetter, Mark. 1983. "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited," *Sociological Theory* 1:201-33.

Grasmuck, Sherri and Patricia R. Pessar. 1991. *Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gurak, Douglas T. and Fe Caces. 1992. "Migration Networks and the Shaping of Migration Systems," pp. 150-167 in *International Migration Systems: A Global Approach*, edited by Mary M. Kritz, Lim, Lin Lean, and Hania Zlotnik. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 1994. *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lauby, Jennifer and Oded Stark. 1988. "Individual Migration as a Family Strategy: Young Women in the Philippines," *Population Studies* 42(3): 473-86.

Lee, Anne S. 1974. "Return Migration in the United States, *International Migration Review* 8(2): 283-300.

Lindstrom, David P. 1996. "Economic Opportunity in Mexico and Return Migration from the United States," *Demography* 33(3):357-4.

Lindstrom, David P. and Douglas S. Massey. 1994. "Selective Emigration, Cohort Quality, and Models of Immigrant Assimilation," *Social Science Research* 23(4): 315.49.

Logan, John R., Zhang, Wenquan, and Richard D. Alba. 2002. "Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles," *American Sociological Review* 67:299-322.

Loury, Glen C. 1977. "A Dynamic Theory of Racial Income Differences," pp. 153-86 in *Women, Minorities, and Employment Discrimination* edited by P.A. Wallace and A.M. La Mond. Lexington, MA: Health.

Marsden, Peter V. 1987. "Core Discussion Networks of Americans," *American Sociological Review* 52:122-131.

Massey, Douglas S. 1999. "Why Does Immigration Occur? A Theoretical Synthesis," pp. 34-52 in *The Handbook of International Migration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Massey, Douglas S., Rafael Alarcon, Jorge Durand, and Humberto Gonzalez. 1987. *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Massey, Douglas S., Luin P. Goldring, and Jorge Durand. 1994. "Continuities in Transnational Migration: An Analysis of 19 Mexican Communities." *American Journal of Sociology* 99:1492-533.

Menjivar, Cecelia. 1997. "Immigrant Kinship Networks: Vietnamese, Salvadoreans and Mexicans in Comparative Perspective," *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 28(1):1-24.

Mills, Mary Beth. 2002. *Thai Women in the Global Labor Force: Consuming Desires, Contested Selves*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Palloni, Alberto, Massey, Douglas S., Ceballos, Miguel, Espinosa, Kristin, and Michael Spittel. 2001. "Social Capital and International Migration: A Test Using Information on Family Networks," *American Journal of Sociology* 106(5): 1262-1299.

Pessar, Patricia R. 2003. "Engendering Migration Studies: The Case of New Immigrants in the United States," pp. 20-42 in *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends,* edited by Pierette Hondagneu-Sotelo. Berkeley, University of California Press.

------. 1999. "The Role of Gender, Households, and Social Networks in the Migration Process: A Review and Appraisal," pp. 53-70 in *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*," edited by Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Portes, Alejandro. 1998. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology," *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 1-24.

Portes, Alejandro and Julia Sensenbrenner. 1993. "Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on the Social Determinants of Economic Action," *American Sociological Review* 98(6):1320-50.

Ramos, F.A. 1992. "Out-migration and Return Migration of Puerto Ricans," in G. Borjas and R. Freeman (eds), *Immigration and the Work Force: Economic Consequences for the United States and Source Areas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Reyes, Belinda I. and Laura Mameesh. 2002. "Why Does Immigrant Trip Duration Vary Across U.S. Destinations?" *Social Science Quarterly* 83(2):580-94.

Singelmann, Joachim. 1993. "Levels and Trends of Female Internal Migration in Developing Countries, 1960-1980," pp. 77-93 in *Internal Migration of Women in Developing Countries*, *Proceedings of the United Nations Expert Meeting on the Feminization of Internal Migration, Aguascalientes, Mexico*. New York: United Nations.

Singhanetra-Renard, Anchalee. 1992. "The Mobilization of Labour Migrants in Thailand: Personal Links and Facilitating Networks," pp. 190-204 in *International Migration Systems: A Global Approach*, edited by Mary M. Kritz, Lim, Lin Lean, and Hania Zlotnik. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wellman, Barry, and S. Wortley. 1989. "Brothers' Keepers: Situating Kinship Relations in Broader Networks of Social Support," *Sociological Perspectives* 32:273-306.

Table One. Descriptive Statistics, Nang Rong Migrants by Residence Status in 2000, 1994 and 2000 Follow-Up Surveys

	Percent of all 1994 Migrants:		Percent of 1994 Migrants-Found in Destination in 2000:		Percent of 1994 Migrants-Returned by 2000:		Percent of 1994 Migrants-Not found in Destination or Origin in 2000:	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Presence of Origin Villagers in Destination Province								
None	11.0%	9.5%	11.1%	10.9%	12.5%	8.9%	9.8%	8.1%
1-9 villagers	25.8%	24.6%	23.0%	23.1%	27.0%	27.0%	27.6%	24.4%
10-20 villagers	21.3%	24.7%	16.3%	24.0%	23.5%	23.0%	24.7%	27.6%
21-40 villagers	20.3%	19.9%	22.2%	19.2%	19.5%	19.5%	18.9%	21.3%
Greater than 40 villagers	21.6%	21.3%	27.4%	22.8%	17.5%	21.7%	18.9%	18.6%
(N)	745	776	270	329	200	226	275	221
Structure of Social Support- Borrowing Money								
No support of this kind	20.9%	18.7%	17.4%	13.4%	22.2%	22.0%	23.4%	23.4%
Support Provider from Nang Rong or Buriram	46.0%	47.5%	49.6%	48.5%	47.0%	50.7%	41.6%	42.7%
Support Provider from target dest./other province	33.2%	33.8%	33.0%	38.1%	30.8%	27.4%	35.0%	33.9%
(N)	742	769	270	328	198	223	274	218
Structure of Social Support- Finding Job								
No support of this kind	62.7%	62.2%	62.8%	58.2%	64.3%	66.4%	61.3%	63.9%
Support Provider from Nang Rong or Buriram	21.7%	23.3%	19.3%	25.9%	25.1%	22.4%	21.5%	20.1%
Support Provider from target dest./other province	15.6%	14.6%	17.8%	15.9%	10.6%	11.2%	17.2%	16.0%
(N)	742	770	269	328	199	223	274	219
Residence in Destination								
Not living with other Nang Rong Migrants	67.3%	63.7%	70.0%	69.6%	63.0%	55.8%	67.6%	63.4%
Living with one or more Nang Rong Migrants	32.7%	36.2%	30.0%	30.4%	37.0%	44.3%	32.4%	36.7%
(N)	745	776	270	329	200	226	275	221
Marital Status								
Single	61.5%	59.9%	60.4%	62.0%	62.0%	57.1%	62.2%	59.7%
Married-Spouse present	30.7%	34.3%	34.1%	34.0%	23.5%	35.0%	32.7%	33.9%
Married-Spouse lives elsewhere	6.6%	2.1%	5.6%	60.0%	11.5%	4.4%	4.0%	1.8%
Separated, Divorced, Widowed	1.2%	3.7%	0.0%	3.3%	3.0%	3.5%	1.1%	4.5%
(N)	745	776	270	329	200	226	275	221
Age in Years								
0-20	31.9%	34.4%	28.5%	35.3%	31.5%	27.4%	35.6%	40.3%
21-30	52.5%	53.0%	57.8%	56.8%	44.5%	53.5%	53.1%	46.6%
31 and older	15.6%	12.6%	13.7%	7.9%	24.0%	19.0%	11.3%	13.1%
(N)	745	776	270	329	200	226	275	221
Years in Destination								
0-1	34.1%	26.5%	30.9%	20.5%	46.1%	39.2%	29.0%	22.7%
2-5	46.9%	49.1%	46.1%	53.1%	45.0%	47.2%	48.9%	44.9%
6 or More	19.1%	24.4%	23.1%	26.4%	8.9%	13.7%	22.2%	32.4%
(N)	702	741	256	322	180	212	266	207
Education Attainment								
Less than primary school	18.7%	19.9%	14.1%	14.6%	30.5%	27.9%	14.6%	19.5%
Completed Primary school	52.9%	62.9%	53.7%	67.2%	51.5%	62.4%	53.1%	57.0%
Secondary schooling	23.6%	13.4%	26.7%	14.3%	16.5%	8.4%	25.8%	17.2%
Post-secondary schooling	4.8%	3.9%	5.6%	4.0%	1.5%	1.3%	6.6%	6.3%
(N)	745	776	270	329	200	226	275	221
Primary Occupation								
Factory Worker, Technician	46.2%	52.9%	51.0%	60.6%	41.9%	50.0%	44.4%	44.8%
Construction, Agriculture, Manual Labor	23.1%	15.6%	18.8%	7.7%	37.0%	29.5%	16.7%	13.2%
Sales, Services	18.4%	19.4%	17.6%	21.5%	16.9%	12.1%	20.5%	23.7%
Professional, Managerial, Clerical	7.4%	2.7%	9.8%	2.2%	2.2%	1.3%	9.0%	5.0%
Not working	5.0%	9.4%	2.9%	8.0%	2.2%	7.6%	9.4%	13.2%
(N)	663	768	245	325	184	224	234	219
Migrant's Status in 2000								
Found in Destination	36.2%	42.4%						
Returned to Origin Village	26.9%	29.1%						
Not found in Destination or Origin	36.9%	28.5%						
(N)	745	776						

Table Two. Social Support among Male and Female Urban Migrants from Nang Rong, 1994 Migrant Follow-up Survey

	--Men--				--Women--			
Social Support Characteristics	Single	Married, Widowed, Divorced	Primary Schooling or Less	Secondary School or Higher	Single	Married, Widowed, Divorced	Primary Schooling or Less	Secondary School or Higher
Social Support-Migrant has someone from whom to borrow money:								
No social support of this kind	18%	30%	24%	19%	14%	28%	20%	18%
Support provider is from origin (Nang Rong or Buriram)	52%	33%	44%	45%	56%	33%	47%	48%
Support provider is from Destination or other Province	30%	37%	32%	35%	30%	39%	33%	34%
(N)	603	226	815	489	669	146	100%	100%
Social Support-Number of Contacts from whom to borrow money:								
None	17%	29%	23%	19%	14%	28%	20%	18%
1	63%	61%	62%	63%	64%	61%	63%	64%
2	16%	9%	12%	15%	16%	10%	14%	11%
3 or more	4%	1%	2%	3%	6%	1%	3%	6%
(N)	499	330	603	226	489	326	669	146
Social Support-Relationship to primary person who can lend money:								
Friend	19%	9%	13%	21%	22%	9%	16%	24%
Acquaintance	24%	29%	28%	22%	22%	28%	27%	15%
Relative	40%	33%	37%	39%	41%	35%	38%	43%
No social support contact/NA	17%	28%	23%	18%	14%	27%	19%	18%
(N)	500	332	605	227	489	327	670	146
Social Support-Migrant has someone to ask to help find a job:								
No social support of this kind	61%	68%	62%	69%	60%	65%	63%	58%
Support provider is from origin (Nang Rong or Buriram)	24%	15%	24%	13%	28%	17%	24%	19%
Support provider is from Destination or other Province	15%	16%	14%	18%	12%	17%	13%	23%
(N)	499	332	603	226	489	327	670	146
Social Support-Number of Contacts whom can help find job:								
None	64%	61%	68%	62%	68%	62%	60%	65%
1	34%	35%	31%	35%	30%	35%	35%	34%
2 or more	3%	4%	2%	3%	2%	3%	4%	1%
(N)	832	500	332	605	227	816	489	327
Social Support-Relationship to primary person who can help find job:								
Friend	9%	10%	7%	9%	8%	8%	9%	5%
Acquaintance	10%	8%	12%	10%	11%	7%	6%	10%
Relative	18%	21%	13%	20%	13%	23%	25%	20%
No social support contact/NA	64%	61%	68%	62%	68%	62%	60%	65%
(N)	832	500	332	605	227	817	490	327

Table Three. Migrant Presence and the Structure of Social Support, Nang Rong Migrant Follow-up Survey, 1994

Migrant Social Support Structure	Number of Co-villagers Located and Residing in Destination Province, 1994				
	None	0-9	10-20	Greater than 20	(N)
Migrant's Access to Social Support: Someone to Lend Money					
No support of this kind	17.7%	26.3%	20.3%	19.2%	346
Support from a fellow Nang Rong/Buriram native	52.0%	40.4%	45.6%	47.4%	752
Support from a native of target destination/other province	30.3%	33.3%	34.1%	33.4%	546
Migrant's Access to Social Support: Someone to Help Find a Job					
No support of this kind	65.5%	67.2%	63.8%	59.3%	1036
Support from a fellow Nang Rong/Buriram native	18.6%	18.3%	23.7%	24.5%	364
Support from a native of target destination/other province	15.8%	14.4%	12.5%	16.3%	245
Relation to person who lends money in destination:					
Friend	19.2%	20.2%	15.4%	13.2%	265
Acquaintance	21.5%	22.8%	26.9%	25.5%	407
Relative	41.8%	30.8%	37.5%	42.2%	630
Company/Cooperative	1.7%	20.0%	0.0%	1.7%	12
N/A--No one to lend money	15.8%	26.0%	20.2%	18.0%	334
(N)	177	409	376	683	1,645

Table Four. Status of 1994 Study Migrants in Year 2000, Nang Rong Migrant Follow-up Survey

	--Model One--				--Model Two--				--Model Three--			
	Migrant Status in 2000, relative to settling in 1994 destination:				Migrant Status in 2000, relative to settling in 1994 destination:				Migrant Status in 2000, relative to settling in 1994 destination:			
Migrant Characteristics in 1994	Migrant Returned to Destination by 2000		Migrant not found in Target Dest or Origin Village in 2000		Migrant Returned to Destination by 2000		Migrant not found in Target Dest or Origin Village in 2000		Migrant Returned to Destination by 2000		Migrant not found in Target Dest or Origin Village in 2000	
	Coeff.	Robust SE	Coeff.	Robust SE	Coeff.	Robust SE	Coeff.	Robust SE	Coeff.	Robust SE	Coeff.	Robust SE
Migrant Community: Number of co-villagers in destination province	-0.01***	0.00	-.010*	0.00	-.01***	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.004*	0.00	-.004*	0.00
Social Support-Migrant has someone to ask to borrow money:												
No social support of this kind (omitted)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Support from person born in origin (Buriram or Nang Rong)	--	--	--	--	-0.36**	0.12	-.57***	0.10	-0.24	0.13	-.49***	0.12
Support from persons born in destination or other province	--	--	--	--	-.52**	0.19	-.43***	0.13	-.35*	0.17	-.41**	0.15
Social Support-Migrant Does not live with other NR migrants	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Social Support-Migrant Lives with other migrants from NR	--	--	--	--	.44***	0.13	.19*	0.08	.29*	0.12	.25***	0.07
Marital Status: Single	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Marital Status: Married-Spouse present	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.40*	0.17	-0.02	0.12
Marital Status: Married-Spouse lives elsewhere	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.54	0.35	0.08	0.33
Marital Status: Separated, Divorced, Widowed	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.02	0.50	0.40	0.65
Gender: Female (omitted=male)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.05	0.11	-.43**	0.16
Age Category: 0-20 (omitted)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Age Category: 21-30	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.12	0.16	-.47***	0.11
Age Category: 31 and older	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.44	0.23	-.63***	0.16
Years in Destination (current trip): 0-1 (omitted)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Years in Destination (current trip):2-5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.33	0.24	-0.04	0.19
Years in Destination (current trip): 6+	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1.06***	0.31	0.13	0.12
Education: Less than Primary (omitted)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Education: Completed Primary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	.53*	0.23	0.32	0.22
Education: Secondary school	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.33	0.17	0.14	0.22
Education: Post-secondary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1.11*	0.45	0.22	0.31
Occupation: Factory Worker, Technician (omitted)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Occupation: Construction, Agriculture, Manual Labor	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	.78***	0.16	.42*	0.19
Occupation: Sales, Services	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.06	0.21	.43***	0.04
Occupation: Professional, Mangerial, Clerical	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.54	0.33	.37**	0.14
Occupation: Not working	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.41	0.40	.88***	0.18
Constant	-.17*	0.09	-0.06	0.11	0.01	0.17	0.28*	0.14	-0.05	0.28	.34*	0.17
N	1,521				1,511				1,348			
Log Likelihood	-1587.24				-1567.35				-1319.11			
BIC	-7450.79				-7372.33				-6396.14			