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Summary

Why do people wish to migrate? It is well established that migration can increase and be sustained by way of one’s involvement in migrant networks. Would-be migrants receive financing, accommodation, and other forms of assistance which substantially increases the chances of migration. But does access to migrant networks influence aspirations to migrate and not merely the ability to do so? In this thesis, I examine associations between having current or returned migrants in one’s wider social network and one’s expressed aspiration to migrate. I analyze survey data from the international research project Examining Europe from the Outside (EUMAGINE), collected in four areas of Senegal, and expand established theories of migrant networks to interpret the findings. I also incorporate insights from migration scholars who emphasize that a “culture of migration” may exist in regions in developing countries which have experienced high rates of emigration. When many people in an area participate in international migration, awareness of opportunities and lifestyles abroad increases, which can have a profound influence on identity formation, norms and behavior in sending communities. If migration becomes associated with social and material success in the public mind in these areas, migration can grow to become the norm rather than the exception.

Previously, scholars who have studied data on people’s migration aspirations have understood these as proxies or determinants of future migration. Here an opposing argument is offered. Aspirations should be understood as social phenomena which is separate from migration ability. A person with an aspiration to migrate but no ability to do so is seen as living in a state of involuntary immobility.

I perform logistic regression analyses on two different measures of migration aspirations. While one survey question asks whether the respondent would move to Europe if provided the necessary papers, the other asks if the respondent intends to move to Europe within the next five years. These are used as measures of aspiration where respondents include different degrees of ability in their answering.

EUMAGINE data analysis shows that migrant networks are important factors shaping migration aspirations. People who know returned migrants have a significantly higher chance of aspiring to migrate than people without such networks. Also, those who know both current and returned migrants are more likely to want to move to Europe. Migrant networks are less important in areas where a strong culture of migration has been established, and where many others have such networks. Knowing only current migrants does not seem to have the same
impact on aspirations, indicating that it is people who are geographically close who are most influential when such aspirations are formed. When respondents also have to reflect on their migration ability, only those who know both current and returned migrants have significantly higher chances of wanting to move.

The findings contribute to our understanding of factors and forces which shape migration aspirations in situations of involuntary immobility. The applicability of migrant networks theory is expanded, offering insight into the ways migrant networks may influence migration aspirations. The thesis raises and answers important questions about migration decision-making.
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1 Introduction

International migration is not only the story of those who leave, it is also the story of those who stay behind. With the extensive focus given to those who actually migrate, it is sometimes easy to forget that only three percent of the world population currently lives in a country different from the one where they were born (Castles and Miller 2003). Attention to international migration is however justified if we also take into account that the few who migrate also shape the lives of those who remain. Many developing countries are dependent on migrant remittances, migrants build houses for family members, and by keeping in contact with “home”, migrants spread ideas and thoughts about a new world abroad. In many so-called sending countries the migrant is considered to be someone who succeeded. Migration is perceived to be a valuable life project, and in some countries, it is considered as one of few possible strategies of upward social mobility (De Haas 2010). Once a select few have made it abroad, the ambition to repeat the successful endeavor spreads among those who remain. This thesis is about the ones who have not yet migrated. It is an investigation into the transnational and local migrant networks that shape desires to migrate from Senegal to Europe.

A recent world-spanning Gallup poll revealed that one-quarter of the world population wants to move to a different country (Torres and Pelham 2008). The proportion of aspiring migrants is markedly higher in many developing countries when compared with advanced, industrialized societies. Senegal is a country where many want to move, and in this thesis, I analyze survey material from four Senegalese areas where people have been asked whether or
not they aspire to move to Europe. Migration aspirations are phenomena that have not been extensively researched, but the media and European policymakers have to some extent collected such data and used them to predict migration flows (Van Dalen and Henkens 2008). Policymakers have used information on aspirations to argue for increased border control and tighter migration restrictions, using expressed aspirations as proxies for future migration. Lacking reliable data on actual migration, some scholars have also used data on aspirations to develop models of migration where the individual decision-maker is given emphasis over structural determinants (De Jong and Fawcett 1981, De Jong et al. 1983). These journalists, policymakers and scholars share the assumption that a wish to migrate will ultimately manifest itself in actual migration.

But there is a different way to consider the relationship between migration aspirations and actual outcomes. Studies have shown that aspirations are poor measures of behavior in situations where freedom to act is restricted (Kupiszewski 2002). The few studies with access to data on both aspirations and actions regarding international migration have found that most of those who say that they want to move in actual fact end up remaining in their native society (Gardner et al. 1985, Van Dalen and Henkens 2008). Carling (2002) has coined the term involuntory immobility to describe this situation – persons aspire to migrate, but they do not have the ability to do so. Involuntary immobility is a reflection of global inequality; the political and economical state we are in where certain groups of people enjoy close to unlimited international mobility while others are subject to strict policies restricting their movement. Rather than interpreting migration aspirations only as potential or future migration, Carling argues that we can study migration aspirations as social phenomena. Many people have a desire to move to Europe, and this may manifest itself in attempts to move there, but may also impact the degree to which they invest in their resident country, for instance by affecting educational rates and life-perceptions (Kandel and Massey 2002). Carling (2012) argues that involuntary immobility shapes the lives of many people in developing countries today and researchers need to pay close attention to the factors that shape such migration aspirations. This thesis aims to contribute to the call for closer investigation of these topics.

In this thesis, I look not at the discrepancy between the desire to migrate and actual migration; rather, I ask what characterizes persons who desire to migrate and which factors determine their aspirations. I argue that one such factor may be whether they have returned or current migrants in their social networks. My focus on both migrant networks at home and
abroad, means that this thesis can be theoretically placed within migrant network theory. Migrant network theory focuses on the role played by others in facilitating, providing for and integrating migrants. In recent decades, migration scholars have found migrant networks to be immensely important in many phases of the migration process (De Haas 2010, Faist 1997, Fawcett 1989, MacDonald and MacDonald 1964, Massey et al. 1987, Massey et al. 2005, Palloni et al. 2001). Knowing someone who has migrated substantially increases the probability of migration and shapes migration destination choices. Networks are known to facilitate integration of migrants in recipient countries and to shape migrant remittance behavior (De Haas 2005). Few have however, looked into how such networks shape aspirations.

Recently, scholars have paid more attention to the transnational potential of migrants, and the ways in which migrants affect the communities they once left (Faist 2000, Glick Schiller 2010, Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992, Mahler 1998, Vertovec 1999). Transnationalism entails that migrants remain in contact with their home countries, and are doubly committed and loyal to more than one country. While migrant network theory has focused on connections between people and on the ways movement is facilitated by networks, studies of migrant transnationalism have looked more broadly at the ways in which the world is becoming increasingly interconnected. However, little has been done to merge migrant network theory, migrant transnationalism and theories on migration decision-making (Faist 1997: 188). This is a contribution to this, by examining how a migrant’s keeping in contact with home affects those on the receiving end and their migration aspirations. A contribution to the field is made by studying whether access to migrant networks is associated with wanting to move to Europe. I argue that migration aspirations are formed within broader social structures; in families, neighborhoods and communities, and through individuals’ engagement in migrant networks. While networks are often said to be important in forming an aspiration to migrate, most of the existing literature does not test this assumption empirically. This thesis is a test of whether or not well-documented theories on migrant networks hold when the dependent variable is no longer the ability to migrate, but different specifications of the aspiration to do so.

Senegal has been selected as a case study to examine the relationships between migrant networks and migration aspirations. West African migration has generally been understudied (Black and King 2004: 76), and Senegal is one of the countries where levels of migration aspirations are, relatively speaking, very high (Van Dalen, Groenewold, and
Schoorl 2005). The fact that many Senegalese citizens aspire to move to Europe is something many qualitatively-oriented researchers have highlighted (Lambert 2002, Poetze 2010, Hernández Carretero 2008, Bjarnesen 2007, Graw 2013), but the point has not been scrutinized in greater detail using quantitative data. The case of Senegal is interesting because we know that Senegalese migrants abroad to a large extent keep in contact with their home country and have strong and lasting migrant networks, mediating contact between Europe and Senegal (Chort 2011, Fall 2004, Grillo and Riccio 2004, Kane 2002, Lambert 2002, Mezger and Beauchemin 2010). Many scholars have referred to Senegalese abroad as a transnational community (Fall 2004, Sinatti 2011, Riccio 2002, Riccio 2008). While establishing new lives for themselves in Europe, Senegalese migrants send remittances and frequently travel back to their native society. There is also a relatively large prevalence of return migration to Senegal (De Haas and Fokkema 2011, Sinatti 2009).

The thesis contributes to the existing literature in three ways: First, I nuance the way migration aspirations have been studied and approached in previous literature, and make the argument that aspirations deserve scholarly attention, regardless of whether they lead to actual migration. I also discuss different ways of understanding migration aspirations, depending on a person’s degree of ability to migrate. Second, I present new empirical data on the prevalence of migrant networks and migration aspirations for inhabitants of four geographical areas of Senegal, where no such surveys have previously been conducted. Third, I combine established theories of migrant networks with the literature on migration aspirations, presenting several ways through which migrant networks might shape migration aspirations. Hopefully, the findings below contribute to a deeper understanding of the motivations behind migration aspirations in developing countries, as well as broadening the application of theories of migrant networks and migration decision-making.
1.1 Research Questions

The main purpose of this study is to understand how migrant networks shape migration aspirations. The research questions are:

1) Is knowing current and/or returned migrants associated with migration aspirations?
2) Are people who live in areas where migrant networks are common, more likely to want to move to Europe?
3) Are personal migrant networks more important in areas where few have such networks?
4) Do migrant networks play a different role for migration aspirations if people need to reflect also on their ability to migrate?

1.2 Research Design

I approach the relationship between migrant networks and migration aspirations quantitatively by analyzing survey data from the European research project *Imagining Europe from the Outside* (EUMAGINE). Four geographic areas in Senegal, Darou Mousty, Lambaye, Golf Sud and Orkadiéré, are included in the study. The areas were selected by EUMAGINE because they were presumed by the research team to have distinctly different histories of migration, and this allows me to study how migrant networks affect aspirations differently depending on the geographic contexts in which they are formed. In each area, 500 households were surveyed, and I have data on every respondent’s current and returned migrant ties as well as several measures of migration aspirations. The EUMAGINE survey poses questions on whether people wish to move abroad, whether they would move abroad if “provided the necessary papers”, whether they intend to move to a specific country, and whether they have taken concrete steps toward migration. The data is representative for people aged 18-39 in the four areas, but not for Senegal as a whole.

The discussion of theory and previous literature is in this thesis a vital part of the research design. Based on the literature on migration aspirations and intentions and a discussion of the four ways the EUMAGINE survey measures migration aspirations, I conclude that the best way of measuring an aspiration to migrate is by comparing results from two questions: Whether the respondent would move to Europe if provided necessary papers, and whether the respondent intends to move to Europe within five years. These two questions shed light on the distinction between migration aspiration and migration ability, and are
therefore chosen as the two dependent variables. There are two independent variables. The first is access to migrant networks, where I distinguish between having no migrant network, knowing only returned migrants, knowing only current migrants and knowing both current and returned migrants. The second is area or emigration environment, where I classify the four areas by degree of migrant networks that exist in them. I control for known determinants of migration aspirations, inspired from the literature on decision-making and the literature on Senegal, and insert controls for area and interaction terms between area and networks to see if the effect of having a migrant network varies with geographic area. Because the dependent variable is dichotomous, the variables are fitted in logistic regression models.

1.3 A Note on Terminology

Since this thesis combines insights from different strains of research, and there is some variation in the usage of terminology, it may be useful to present the most central terms. The first important term used here is “migration aspiration”. I refer to “migration aspiration” to express what other researchers have called migration expectations (Graw and Schielke 2013), migration intentions (De Jong and Fawcett 1981), migration aspiration (Carling 2002) and migration wishes (Torres and Pelham 2008). The variation in the terminology is largely a reflection of the different survey questions which have been used to measure this phenomenon and the degree of ability or concreteness which is thought to lie in a person’s wish. These are issues which will be amply discussed in chapter 4.

In addition to the terminology which denotes aspirations, there is a set of concepts connected to migrant networks applied in this thesis. Having migrant networks is in this thesis defined as knowing either a current migrant or a returned migrant. A returned migrant is someone who has previously been a migrant, but who has now returned to Senegal. I use the term migrant networks, but am referring to having one or many migrants in one’s broader social network. I use the term transnationalism broadly to describe the practices taken by migrants and non-migrants which link them to each other across nation-states. Examples of transnational practices are remittance-sending, visits and extensive contact which crosses national borders. While it is often migrants who are referred to as being or not being transnational in the literature, I follow Åkesson (2004), who argues that transnationalism can also be a useful frame in which to understand the lives of the people who are still in Senegal, or people who were once migrants but who have now returned. In keeping with my understanding of the term, persons in Senegal can be engaging in transnational practices if
they, for instance, keep in contact with friends and family abroad and if their ideas are influenced by these interactions.

I refer to a “culture of migration” to denote an area where the prevalence of current or returned migrants is high, and where many have access to migrant networks. This is a term conceptualized by Kandel and Massey (2002). The reader will be provided with a thorough discussion of the terms and how they have been operationalized to fit the analyses, in the preceding chapters. Aspirations are discussed in chapter 4, while transnationalism and migrant networks are the topic of scrutiny in chapter 5.

1.4 Aims and Structure

This thesis is organized in eight chapters. Chapter 2 gives a short historical background of Senegalese migration and of the peculiarities of Senegal as a context of emigration. In chapter 3, I give a brief overview of the four areas which are subject to analysis in this thesis, and present the EUMAGINE survey data. Chapter 4 is divided into two parts. In the first part, I discuss the concept of an aspiration; and how data similar to mine have been interpreted and understood in the migration literature. Here, I develop the argument that intentions or aspirations should not be treated as proxies of migration, but that aspirations to migrate can be understood in broader terms, incorporating the involuntary immobility faced by many of those who express them. In the second part of this chapter, I present the different questions on aspirations that are available in the EUMAGINE data, and I decide upon two measures of aspirations which are subject to more in-depth analysis in proceeding chapters. Chapter 5 is devoted to theory and literature on migrant networks. I discuss possible theoretical and empirical contributions which mention the role such networks might play in the formation of migration aspirations. The second part of this chapter presents data on respondent’s migrant networks from the EUMAGINE survey and discuss the prevalence of such networks for each of the four areas. Chapter 6 presents and discusses the research design and presents some hypotheses. I integrate the findings from the previous chapters into a model for researching migration networks and aspirations quantitatively, and argue for why the control variables I have included are relevant, and also briefly present logistic regression analysis. In chapter 7, I first present descriptive data, cross-tabulations and logistic regression analyses, analyzing the possible connections between migrant networks, emigration environments and migration aspirations. In chapter 8, I discuss the findings from the analyses in light of theory and previous literature, and conclude.
2 The Case Study: Senegal

When Senegal was chosen as case study for this research, it was because it is a country with a long history of migration of a transnational character. Today an estimated 125,000 Senegalese migrants are living in the EU comprising around 22 percent of all West African migrants on the continent (Hernández Carretero, Fall, and Sarr 2010). Senegalese have been travelling to Europe since the beginning of the 20th century and while many have established lives for themselves in cities like Paris, Rome or Madrid, most are engaging in transnational practices, travelling frequently back and forth, building houses (Sinatti 2009), sending remittances (Jettinger 2005) and many also planning to one day return to Senegal (Riccio 2002, De Haas and Fokkema 2011). Riccio (2002) finds that Senegalese abroad are strongly oriented towards their home country, viewing Senegal as their main source of identification and belonging. Senegalese abroad are often viewed by scholars to be a typical transnational migrant community (Sinatti 2009), and this transnationalism forms the local contexts where migration aspirations in Senegal take place, arguably also inspiring others to want to move abroad.

The first period of out-migration from Senegal was during the First World War, when many Senegalese men were employed as infantrymen in the French army (Jettinger 2005). During the period of French colonization of West Africa, levels of migration to Europe were relatively stable, but the number of movers increased dramatically after Senegal’s independence in 1960, as France needed cheap labor and actively recruited low-skilled workers from its previous colonies. Even after colonialism formally ended, Senegalese held
French citizenship and could travel freely to Europe, a structural affiliation with France which continued into the 1980s (Poetze 2010). While there were approximately 6000 Senegalese in France in 1968, the number had passed 32,000 in 1982 and in 1982 France was the preferred destination for migrants from the Senegal River Valley. In that same year, 42 percent of the households in the region had a member of the family living in France (Chort 2011, Findley 1989).

In the 60s-80s, migration was largely a response to the economic boom in Europe. Many Senegalese were actively recruited by French employers and they left a Senegal where living standards were rapidly deteriorating. The Sahelian drought in the early 1970s increased poverty and unemployment, and was an important push-factor towards migration (Kane 2002: 246, Sinatti 2009). Failed national development policies and adjustment programs deepened the Senegalese crisis, and in 1994, the IMF intervened and devalued the West African CFA currency, halving purchasing power and increasing the price of basic food stuffs by 25 to 30 percent overnight (Fall 2002: 82-83). This, of course, had far-reaching effects on all social classes, and more and more Senegalese from all social strata and ethnic and religious communities, started leaving the country. Whereas cross-continental migration in the 60s and early 70s was mainly from the upper River Valley region and to France, the late 70s and 80s lead people from all over Senegal to migrate. People travelled not only to France, but also to Spain, Italy, Germany and the USA (Jettinger 2005).

While migration from Senegal to Europe peaked in the 1980s, the French free movement politics had officially ended on July 5th 1974 (Poetze 2010), and with the establishment of the European Union, migration became subject to stricter regulations throughout the 1990s. As a response to negative public opinion, Italy, France and several other European states introduced restrictions and border controls, joining their efforts in the Schengen agreement from 1994 (Hernández Carretero 2008). While any Senegalese could travel freely to Europe in the period after French colonization it was now difficult for a Senegalese who was not highly skilled, had a family member in Europe or could apply for asylum, to enter Europe legally (Poetze 2010). Still, the factors driving migrating were as pressing as ever, and Senegalese continued to travel to Europe, many crossing the Sahara desert by car or foot, and crossing the Gibraltar strait from Morocco by boat. The fact that migration continued spurred even stricter restrictions and the zone between northern Africa and Europe became heavily patrolled with semi-military forces at sea. Large fences were put up in Spain’s African enclaves, Ceuta and Melilla, and an early warning radar-system was
installed at the straits of Gibraltar and the Canary Islands, which was the point of entry for most Africans. The new EU external border control agency, Frontex, patrolled the sea routes between West Africa and the Canary Islands, and countries like Morocco signed agreements to patrol their own coast lines, detaining people who attempted to cross (Carrera 2007, Schapendonk 2012).

In 2006, irregular Senegalese migration came to the forefront of the European debate. Tightened and increased border controls between Morocco and the Canary Islands had lead migrants to pursue new routes and rather than travelling through the Sahara and via Morocco, West-Africans were attempting to reach Europe directly by boat, a journey which from the Senegalese capital Dakar is estimated to take approximately seven days (Hernández Carretero 2008: 26). A total of 31,863 people reached the Canary Islands in 2006, an increase from 4790 in 2005 (Carrera 2007), and most of these came by so-called “pirogue migration” named after the fishing boats used for the trip, who took up to 150 persons. The intense media attention was caused primarily by the she drive increase in numbers, but also by the intense risks these migrants were taking to reach Europe. Gammeltoft-Hansen (2008) estimates that in 2006 alone, around 6000 migrants died in their attempt to reach the islands. Many Europeans were appalled by the visibility and numbers of people who were landing on beaches and docks in Spain and her neighboring countries. In an attempt to understand the sudden involvement in a phenomenon which had been going on for decades, Christopher Caldwell (2006) states: “It is partly that we pity people driven to such lengths by poverty and misery. It is partly that we fear they are in deadly, desperate earnest, and are staking their claim to a continent inhabited by people who are not”.¹

2.1 Why do People Want to Leave?

The data material that will be analyzed in this thesis shows that a majority want to leave Senegal and move to Europe.² When trying to explain the reasons for the large numbers of Senegalese who want to come to Europe, very many researchers point to the structural or economic inequality these people face and how the inequality has become manifested as ideas. Senegal-born sociologist Papa Sow tells Caldwell (2006):

¹ Also quoted in Hernández Carretero (2008).
² These percentages are not representative for all of Senegal, but for the four areas surveyed by EUMAGINE.
“They are not coming to Europe because they do not have bread […] they’re coming because they do
not have hope. They're battling for a life more meaningful than the half-employed, underutilized
dependency and mediocrity that stretches out before them”.

In his *Longing for Exile*, Lambert (2002: xxi) claims that “frustration is the most common
Senegalese experience of transnationalism”, and many other scholars who have studied
Senegalese migration to Europe reach the same conclusion. Migration has immersed the
entire Senegalese society, they claim, and “transnationalism has penetrated the collective
imagination of West Africans” (Lambert 2002: xx). In the only previous quantitative analysis
of intentions data from Senegal, Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl (2005: 772) conclude:
“If we had to sum up what dominated the pressure to emigrate out of Africa, it would be just
two words: great expectations”.

Certainly, Senegalese aspirations are formed by the local contexts they are in and by
the extreme contrasts to a world abroad, from which they are constantly fed with information.
In a country where 75 percent of the working-age population is underemployed and where
nearly two-thirds (60.3 percent) live under $2 a day, the contrast between migrant and non-
migrant is immense (Hernández Carretero, Fall, and Sarr 2010: 8, 10). Many Senegalese
claim that they can distinguish a migrant from a non-migrant easily through attire and
attitude, and can easily point out a migrant’s house and how it differs from one inhabited by a
non-migrant. Migrants contribute greatly both to Senegal’s overall economy and to individual
households. In 2001, the World Bank estimated that the total remittances to Senegal were
CFA 127 billion, a number which according to expert should be tripled to include informal
remittances (Jettinger 2005). In the survey analyzed in this paper, over 10 percent of the
respondents say that remittances is their household’s number one source of income.

The fact that Senegal has a long history of migration, and that those who have
succeeded in gaining residency in Europe frequently travel back to visit, has lead the migrant
to achieve a special role in Senegalese society, commonly denoted to be a symbol of success,
frequenting in popular culture, literature and art. Riccio (2011) shows how Senegalese
discourse celebrates migrants as symbols of contemporary society, and emphasizes their
solidarity and efforts in coping with being far from home for the well-being of their families
(Riccio 2011: 101).

Those who have studied migration aspirations in Senegal specifically, all point to the
connection between views of the migrant on the one hand, and the economic situation in
Senegal on the other as reasons for why many want to move (Graw 2013, Hernández
Migration is often seen as synonymous with success in life and upward social mobility. Hernández Carretero, Fall, and Sarr (2010: 32) point to this when reflecting on youth slang in large Senegalese cities: “They speak of migration as climbing or yéeg, which is synonymous with tekki, whose first meaning is associated with social recognition or success”. The aspirations of Hernández Carretero (2008)’s informants are shaped by migrant success stories, as well as emigration-related blogs and television images about the West. Carretero also emphasizes the negative portrayals of migration that might affect her respondents, such as international information campaigns and stories of restrictive immigration policies in Europe, but underlines that among her respondents she did not meet a single person who did not want to come to Europe. Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl (2005) find that 38 percent of Senegalese intend to migrate abroad, and speculate as to whether the situation may perhaps be the result of region-specific migration culture where migrating is considered the only possible thing to do in order to succeed.

2.2 What Keeps Senegalese from Migrating?

If migration has become such an integrated part of Senegalese society, and it is the source of upward social mobility, why do not more people leave the country in search of greener pastures? The main hindrance is definitely money. To get to Europe, legally or illegally, is a very expensive endeavor (Hernández Carretero 2008). Illegal visas to all European countries can be purchased on the streets of Dakar, but the price is substantially higher than a yearly middle-class income (Poetze 2010). As mentioned already, it is almost impossible for any Senegalese today to get a work- or even a legal tourist visa to visit Europe.

Another thing that hinders migration from Senegal is family commitment, and expectations that come with upholding traditional family values. It is mainly young men who leave Senegal to go to Europe, and scholars have pointed to the fact that Senegal is predominantly a Muslim country with traditional gender roles and strong emphasis on family values, when they want to explain the reasons why (Toma and Vause 2012). The women who migrate from Senegal do so mainly for family reunification, and very few women migrate alone, also compared to other countries in West Africa (Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl 2005: 753). In addition to upholding social control over women, family values are important in Senegal, and it is only in a situation where ones family would benefit from ones migration,
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3 There is a distinction between surveys asking about migration intentions and about migration aspirations. This will become clearer in chapter 4.
or could cope without one’s presence, that it is considered appropriate to leave the country. Senegalese live in large collective households, polygamy is widespread and it is common to take in orphans or children of relatives who are living in other regions or areas. Family oriented theories of migration are often employed when migration from Senegal is explained, and strong family values are also emphasized as a reason for why most Senegalese abroad aim at temporary migration rather than permanent settlement (Sinatti 2009).

2.3 Senegalese Networks – Local and Global

Tight family bonds are also manifested in tightly knit networks, and Senegal is a place where family and friendship ties are very important, and have been shown to play a particularly important role in migration. People who have migrant networks more often move abroad (Toma and Vause 2011, 2012, Liu 2011) and researchers have paid extra close attention to the transnational Mouride Brotherhood networks. Many of the Senegalese migrants who are members of this particular brotherhood are known to engage in trade, and the community has developed a complex commercial system which connects Senegal to global markets (Jettinger 2005). Migrant networks have also proven important in migration from Senegal, and such networks have been shown to act as determinants of migration. Four recent, but yet unpublished studies based on data from the MAFE project (Toma and Vause 2011, Liu 2011, Toma and Vause 2012) and national survey data (Chort 2011), show that migrant networks are important factors deciding Senegalese migration, and that the effects of these migrant networks are gendered. Toma and Vause (2012) find that for men’s migration, close family ties matter just as much as friends and extended family ties, but that it is only their male networks that matter. Senegalese women, however, who largely migrate for family reunification, depends exclusively on close family members abroad (other than the partner). Chort (2011) finds household networks to be more important for Senegalese migration than community networks.

In this brief overview of Senegalese migration, I have presented some background information, focusing on the ways migrant networks and transnationalism has been researched, and on the context in which migration aspirations are formed. I show that Senegal’s history of migration has strong ties to French colonial involvement in the West-African region, that trajectories have now spread, and that migration aspirations in Senegal have been interpreted by many scholars as a strategy of upward mobility in a country where few see possibilities of success. What this review of the literature on Senegalese migration
shows, is that Senegalese abroad are actively involved in transnational practices, and that the presence and idea of the migrant has manifested itself in Senegalese discourse and contemporary society. Migration aspirations in Senegal are formed in specific geographical, economic and family contexts, and there is reason to believe that the strong transnational ties many Senegalese have, may also shape their aspirations to migrate. Many qualitative researchers find links between transnationalism and migration aspirations, stating like Hernández Carretero (2008: 8) that aspiration “[is] conditioned by transnational connections between Senegal and countries of the West as much as by local realities”. This short overview creates the backdrop for posing the questions I do in this thesis. We know now that many Senegalese want to move to Europe. We also know that many are tied to migrants and returned migrants through closely knit networks, and that such networks have been shown to act as determinants of migration. The question raised in this thesis, is whether also aspirations to migrate may is associated with memberships in such networks.
3 EUMAGINE Data

To examine the relations between migrant networks and migration aspirations in Senegal, I analyze survey data from the European research project *Imagining Europe from the Outside* (EUMAGINE). In this chapter, I present the data material, sampling procedure and weights that have been used and also give a brief introduction to the four geographic areas of Senegal that are studied in this thesis.

EUMAGINE is an international research project involving researchers in seven countries, and the project aims at gaining a broader understanding of the connections between ideas of democracy and human rights and migration aspirations, in four key sending countries of migration to Europe. Surveys were conduction in a total of sixteen areas in Ukraine, Morocco, Turkey and Senegal. The project was funded by the European Commission through the FP7 program and coordinated by the University of Antwerp. This thesis employs survey data from the Senegalese areas, and looks particularly at the questions concerning migration aspirations, and those related to migrant networks. Surveys were conducted in 2011 using local and international researchers. The Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) and Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar were responsible for the Senegalese data collection. I was granted access to the data through PRIO. While the most important aspects of the methodology used in the project will be described here, a more detailed description and a copy of the questionnaire can be found in Ersanilli, Carling, and De Haas (2011).
3.1 Four Emigration Environments

The previous chapter’s overview of Senegalese migration history emphasized the overall national situation, thereby neglecting important regional and local aspects of a proper understanding of what an emigration environment constitutes. In the EUMAGINE project, and also in this study, a clear premise is that one needs to look at local communities in order to understand how migration aspirations are shaped. The ideas and thoughts about Europe found in Senegal’s capital Dakar clearly differ from those one might observe in the rural areas around the Senegalese River Valley. Aspirations may also vary with an area’s migration history and with many other factors specific to local communities.

To capture as much of the existing local differences as possible within the possible fiscal and structural framework of a two-year research project, EUMAGINE data was collected in four specific geographic locations which, after pilot studies in 2010, were considered to vary largely in regards to their migration histories. Wishing to examine differing categories of emigration environments, researchers selected Darou Mousty, Lambaye, Golf Sud and Orkadiéré, shown on the map in figure 3.1. These areas have not been subject to extensive quantitative inquiry previously; throughout this thesis, I will therefore be presenting descriptive statistics for each area separately, as a way of introducing the reader to differences and similarities between the areas.

Figure 3.1 Map of Senegal: Four Emigration Environments

1. Darou Mousty in the region Louga
2. Lambaye in the region Diourbel
3. Orkadiéré in the region Matam
4. Golf Sud in the region Dakar
Darou Mousty is a place where the Islamic Mouride Brotherhood has its stronghold, and migration is considered to be a central part of social life. The area consists of a mix of rural and urban communities. Lambaye is an agricultural area in the center of the Peanut Basin in central Senegal, amongst the poorest in the country. This is an area where out-migration has not been as prevalent as in Darou Mousty, despite the presence of the Mouride Brotherhood also here. Golf Sud is a middle-class suburb in the outskirts of the capital, Dakar, which for a long time was a population-internal migration destination, and which is also used by people who want to move as a first stop before migrating overseas. Orkadiéré is a remote rural area on the border of Mauritania, where migration has long historical roots. The area is located in a region of the Senegalese River Valley, which was the first site of Senegalese migration to Europe (Findley 1989, Hernández Carretero, Fall, and Sarr 2010).

Methodologically, the choice to select four very different areas for survey means that the EUMAGINE data is not representative for Senegal in its entirety. The data is, however, representative for these particular areas. This is common when sampling survey data, especially in developing countries or when projects have limited funding. An important implication of this is that we cannot state that the findings are representative for Senegal, or speak about “Senegalese migration aspirations” using the data. The selection of four separate areas also raises the question of whether to conduct separate analyses for every area (N=500), or to carry out a single analysis and control for area (N=2000). Because models estimated on low numbers of respondents tend to suffer from large confidence intervals, I have chosen to take advantage of accessing a larger sample and controlling for geographic areas.

### 3.2 Sampling

EUMAGINE researchers aimed at interviewing a representative sample of the population aged 18-39 in each of the four areas. In each area, 500 households were selected and one randomly selected respondent in each household was interviewed. The sampling procedure consisted of the teams first drawing village or neighborhood clusters, then households, and finally individuals within households, a strategy referred to as a random walk stratified cluster sample (Ersanilli 2012).

The team began by dividing each area into clusters, consisting of villages or neighborhoods, and with no more than 5000 households in each cluster. With help from local authorities and village chiefs, they collected updated information on the population size of each cluster, not older than two years. Within each area they did urban-rural stratification, to
secure that urban or rural communities were not overrepresented when clusters were selected. If an area consisted of both rural and urban communities, such as in the case in Darou Mousty, the team calculated the share of urban households, and divided the interviews accordingly. If for example 40 percent of the area consisted of urban households, it was decided that 40 percent of the interviews were to be conducted in urban areas (Ersanilli, Carling, and De Haas 2011, Ersanilli 2012).

The clusters for the interviews were drawn proportional to size, meaning that clusters with a larger population had a higher chance of being selected. (Ersanilli, Carling, and De Haas 2011). In Golf Sud, Orkadiéré and the urban parts of Darou Mousty, households in each cluster were selected via random walk method. To minimize bias, the random walk was not conducted by the interviewer, but by a supervisor who wrote down a detailed description of the houses that were randomly selected, for the interviewers to find at a later point of time (Ersanilli, Carling, and De Haas 2011).

In Lambaye and rural Darou Mousty, the random walk strategy proved difficult to implement because of the large distances between households, and the EUMAGINE team instead developed their own method, the “all compounds method”, to obtain a random sample. This method is essentially a bottom-up way of defining an area, and using Google Earth images the teams made coverage plans of the villages and neighborhoods that were to be surveyed. The coverage plan consisted of zones of layers in semicircles, spreading from the central town and extending zone by zone until 500 interviews had been completed. Covering an area often meant travelling along a main road and visiting all the villages along the way, systematically and in a predefined order. In each zone, the sampling method involved visiting every compound and randomly sampling one household in each compound (Ersanilli 2012).

In all areas, the within-household selection was the same. In every household visited, the head of the household filled out a household survey with information about all household members’ personal details and migration history. When this was done, a randomly selected household member in the target group between the age of 18 and 39 years was selected for interview using the random number stickers method (Ersanilli 2012). This person was asked questions by a trained interviewer who followed the EUMAGINE questionnaire, printed in French, Pulaar or Wolof (Ersanilli 2012). The respondent was asked questions regarding his or her thoughts and ideas about Europe, about migration aspirations, and a number of demographic questions (N=2000). The person was also asked to list all friends and relatives
who were currently abroad that they could rely on for material support or had been in contact with within the past 12 months.

3.3 Data Cleaning and Weights

When the surveys had been conducted, they were sent to the International Migration Institute in Oxford, which was responsible for verification, data entry and cleaning. Several consistency checks were performed, for example by comparing data with pictures of the households taken by the interviewers (Ersanilli 2012: 25). Most of the inconsistencies found were reported in questions that are not directly relevant here. For example, the surveys had trouble capturing the complex polygamous household structures in Senegal. Because the data was collected in a total of 16 areas in four countries and the team aimed at securing a sample which could be accurately compared across national cases, they had to develop a sampling strategy which could be implemented in the same way in all areas. This resulted in compromising on some aspects of the survey design. Household structure is one such compromise; age range is another. Interviewing only respondents between the age of 18-39 years means that the data is only representative of the population aged 18-39, and only for households with members in this age group (Ersanilli, Carling, and De Haas 2011).

Response rates in the EUMAGINE survey are very high, a fact common to much survey collection in Senegal (Ersanilli 2012: 20). In Golf Sud, 10 percent of the visited households refused to participate in the survey, while in the other three areas, close to 100 percent participated (Ersanilli 2012: 19). The reason for this is probably that surveys in the non-capital areas are uncommon, and that the EUMAGINE teams were in close contact with local community leaders and village chiefs. In many areas, village chiefs announced the arrival of survey teams, and people often stayed at home and waited for the interviewers to visit. Large households and widespread agricultural work also increased the chance that someone would be home when the interviewers came (Ersanilli 2012). Not only have few households refrained from participating in the survey, but most respondents have answered all questions, leading to very few missing values in the data set. There were a total of 10 respondents who had missing values on one of the two dependent variables, and these have been removed from the data set in order to create a comparable sample. Because the number of respondents with missing values is remarkably low for the other questions, no other steps
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4 In chapter 5, I describe some further filtering done with the data set used for the logistic regression analyses.
have been taken regarding missing values as they are not thought to alter the findings presented in this thesis.

Since EUMAGINE is not based on a simple random sample, it was decided that some weights were necessary to account for differences in selection probability. It is generally recommended that selection weights are calculated for each step of the sampling procedure, which in this case would mean households within villages or neighborhoods (clusters) and people within households (Ersanilli, Carling, and De Haas 2011). However, reliable data both on the number of households with members belonging to the target group within each village or neighborhood and data on the exact number of households in each area proved impossible to attain for these areas (Ersanilli 2012). It was therefore decided only to calculate a selection probability weight for the within-household selection, and to not add post-stratification weights. Lacking reliable information on the composition and numbers of households in the areas, the introduction of such weights were deemed to possibly create more harm than good (Ersanilli 2012: 26). The adding of weights to the within household sampling however, implies that the data is set as survey data when using STATA. I have used svy-commands for all the analyses.
When studying a phenomenon as complex, and possibly vague, as a person’s aspirations, it is important to discuss what aspirations might express, and to use terminology which is as close as possible to those held by our respondents when they give their answers. In the EUMAGINE survey, respondents are asked questions like, “Do you want to move to Europe?” and this chapter discusses what answering yes to that question entails. In the first part of this chapter, I situate the current study in the broader scholarly field of intentions and aspirations literature, many of whom have used the kind of data we have as proxies of migration or determinants of future migration flows. I argue that we should think more openly about aspirations, and treat them as a broad social phenomenon. Migration aspirations can be linked to actual migration, but they may just as well shape local communities, for example causing lack of investment in education (Kandel and Massey 2002). An intention or aspiration to migrate is not the same as future migration. To understand the complexity that lies in this phenomenon, I argue that an important distinction lies between migration aspirations and the ability to migrate.

In the second part of this chapter (4.3), I present the first findings from the EUMAGINE data, and discuss different ways we can understand migration aspirations, using answers from four questions in the survey. These findings shed light on the existing models of migration decision-making and strengthen the argument that a person’s wish to migrate should be interpreted as a phenomenon in itself rather than as a necessary determinant or
proxy of actual migration. In chapter 5, I will discuss theory, previous literature and the chosen operationalization of migrant networks, and connect these two strains of literature together.

4.1 Aspirations as Determinants of Actual Migration

There are a number of studies in the field of migration research who study migration aspirations, and most of these refer to the phenomenon as migration *intentions*. Some of these ask about internal migration (e.g., De Jong et al. 1983, De Jong and Steinmetz 2006, Gubhaju and De Jong 2009, Harbison 1981, Hughes and McCormick 1985, Root and De Jong 1991, Sandu and Jong 1996) and some about international migration (Agadjanian, Nedoluzhko, and Kumskov 2008, Abrams, Hinkle, and Tomlins 1999, Becerra 2012, Becerra et al. 2010, Burda et al. 1998, Drinkwater 2003, Papapanagos and Sanfey 2001, Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Fokkema 2005, Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl 2005, Van Dalen and Henkens 2008). The studies on internal migration preceded those on international migration historically, and some used this data to develop models of migration where the individual decision-maker is the main unit of analysis. Such studies of migration are often referred to as micro-level migration approaches because they emphasize an agent who takes informed decisions about migrating, rather than looking at macro- or structural factors driving migration processes. In the simplest of such micro-level models, a potential migrant is an individual calculating economic risk, inspired by neo-classical economics. It is assumed that the decisive benefits for the individual are the differences between income in origin and destination, and that the only cost involved is that of transportation (see Faist 2000: 35). More sophisticated models include a wide range of considerations when individuals calculate risk (Courgeau 1995, Malmberg 1997, Wolpert 1965).

The most commonly cited model of migration decision-making today is the basic value-expectancy model (De Jong and Fawcett 1981). It was developed for analysis of intentions data, and predicts that in choosing between moving or staying, a person will chose the alternative from which he can maximize value, while taking into account his or her subjective probabilities (De Jong and Gardner 1981: 7). An intention to migrate is defined as the sum of expected utilities, categorized on dimensions of wealth, status, comfort, suggestion, autonomy, affiliation and morality (Haug 2008: 587, De Jong and Fawcett 1981). The model works under the assumption that the actor makes rational decisions on the basis of an ordering of preferences, and acts in accordance with his stated intentions, much like classic
economic theory. The connection between intentions and behavior which is implied in the model, builds on the popular social psychological theory of reasoned action (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980, Fishbein and Ajzen 1975) and the closely related theory of planned behavior (Ajzen 1991). These theories see intentions as products of social norms and of the expectation that one will meet a certain goal as a consequence of the behavior. This is a framework that sees a person envisioning the costs and benefits linked to migrating, and this person decides to migrate once benefits exceed costs. The theory of reasoned action assumes that most behaviors of social relevance are under volitional control and therefore the behavioral intention is seen both as the immediate determinant and as the single best predictor of behavior. The model was developed for the study of internal migration behavior, but has been used to analyze intentions data on international migration, for example from Albania (Papapanagos and Sanfey 2001), South Africa (De Jong and Steinmetz 2006) and the Philippines (De Jong et al. 1983).

The basic value-expectancy model rests on the idea that migrant intentions are in essence predictors of actual migration, and so the same factors are assumed to affect both wishes and behavior. As argued both by Haug (2008) and Kupiszewski (2002) however, this is not necessarily the case. When the migration we are discussing is not internal, but involves people crossing international borders, there are more complex physical, structural and legal hindrances in the way. Thus, some factors might affect aspirations or intentions, while others affect actions. When social psychologists study intentions and behavior data, they find that intentions are generally good predictors of behavior if they concern specific action within a restricted time span, where individuals have great freedom of choice (Van Dalen and Henkens 2008). International migration from developing to developed countries, which is the aspect researched in this thesis, does not meet such criteria.

In addition to studies explicitly citing the value-expectancy model and the social psychological theories of Fishbein and Ajzen (1975), there are a number of studies using intentions data who simply state that they use intentions data because they lack data on actual migration (Burda et al. 1998), 5 or who refrain from entering the discussion of differences between intentions and behavior at all (Becerra et al. 2010). 6 Some of these use intentions data to directly forecast migration, referring to the outcome from such studies as a country or
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5 Burda et al. (1998) point out that intentions data may be problematic to use as proxies of migration, but conclude to “simply take the position that 'intentions' are a monotonic function of the underlying driving variables which motivate migration”.

6 Drinkwater (2003) argues that while it is difficult to know whether those who state willingness to move will actually move, we can say with more certainty that those unwilling to move are less likely to do so.
areas *migration potential* (see Kupiszewski 2002 for a review and criticism of such approaches). Their argument is that we need some kind of data to understand when and how migration comes into place, and intentions data is as good as we get.

There is little empirical evidence to state that intentions to migrate are by necessity followed by actual migration, or that the wish to migrate and actual migration are affected by the same factors, and few studies in the realm of international migration, have data on both intentions and actual behavior. Gardner et al. (1985) look at the discrepancies between migration intentions and behavior in a rural area of the Philippines. They find that only a small minority of those who state that they want to move actually end up doing so. The respondents commonly referred to visa problems as the main reason for them deviating from their plans. Gardner et. al.’s (1985) study is restricted to cross tabulations, but Van Dalen and Henkens (2008) use a more complex analytical strategy to look at migration intentions and behavior in the Netherlands. They find that 24 percent of those who had stated intentions of migrating from the Netherlands did so within two years, but they do not have panel data over the course of several years. 24 percent is a high number, and the authors themselves state that “to expect that all respondents would have followed up their intentions would be asking too much of individual rationality and self control” (Van Dalen and Henkens 2008: 19). Their findings are interesting, but do not imply that we should treat intentions data from Senegal in the same manner. One important difference is that Dutch citizens are not subject to the same restrictions on their movement as Senegalese respondents are, and they do not face the same economic gains of migrating, nor lack the means of moving in the first place.

To summarize, much of the micro-level research treats migrant intentions as a predictor of actual migration and claim that the same factors influence both intentions and migration behavior, but there are few studies done which indicate that this is the best way of interpreting intentions data. When reviewing the use of intentions data in other fields of research, Manski (1990) argues that “even if individuals have rational expectations and stated intentions are best predictors of future behavior, intentions and behavior need not coincide”, and Constant and Massey (2002) claim that “intentions are notoriously unreliable as guides to eventual behavior”. After reviewing existing literature on migration forecasting from Poland to Europe, Kupiszewski states:
“There is no scientific justification to use replies to questions on migration plans for forecasting future migration flows. Constructing forecasts of future migration flows without being able to demonstrate what percentage of those who had declared an intention to migrate actually migrated makes no sense whatsoever” (Kupiszewski 2002: 636).

The studies done comparing intentions and behavior give little reason to believe that action will necessarily lead from an intention, and no evidence that the same factors influence both intentions and action. How then shall one treat the statement “26 percent of the world’s population want to migrate?” (Torres and Pelham 2008), or understand the high levels of migration aspirations that researchers have found in countries like Senegal?

4.2 Aspiration and Ability – Different Aspects of Migration Decision-making

The previous section shows that the model of individual migration decision-making developed using research on internal migration does not necessarily prove sufficient for the researcher faced with information about people who want to move abroad. Aspirations cannot simply be treated as proxies of behavior, and one cannot presume that the same factors will influence both the wish to migrate and actual migration. A different approach can, however be found amongst some qualitative researchers who study the same phenomena. It has been argued that rather than entering the discussion of whether or not aspirations lead to action, such aspirations can be treated as phenomena separate from action (Carling 2002). Scholars studying aspirations can pay closer attention to the social contexts in which such aspirations are formed, and acknowledge that aspirations to migrate may be consequences of globalization and global inequality. Graw and Schielke (2013: 8) state that “in much of the world, it has become very difficult to think about a better future without thinking about migrating to a place where one can make money needed to realize that better future”. In chapter 2, I showed that this exact discrepancy between the lack of possibilities of success in Senegal and the stories of successful migrants abroad is part of what might shapes Senegalese thoughts of Europe. In a situation where more and more information, commercial products and ideas are being spread across continents, migration is manifesting itself as a way of escape and the migrant has become a symbol of success. I believe that migration aspirations should be studied in light of such processes, rather than as a necessary determinant of actual migration.
The one place in West Africa where migration aspirations has been studied most extensively is in Cape Verde. Studies there have found that migrant aspirations have taken on a central role in social life (Carling 2001, Carling 2002, Carling and Åkesson 2009). As in Senegal, the sudden decrease in European demand for labor was not reflected in a similar decrease in supply of labor migrants or a decrease in levels of migration aspirations, which had built up over years while people were free to leave the islands. In Cape Verde, migration is viewed as one of the few strategies of upward social mobility available to youth, and for this national state of unfulfilled aspirations, Carling (2012) coined the term *involuntary immobility*. Based on his research on the islands, he makes the point that the characteristics of those aspiring to migrate are often the same as those who in turn restrict them from migrating: They are poor and uneducated. He uses this point to argue that aspirations and ability are two phenomena which should be studied separately, and he forges a theoretical model separating aspirations from ability.

In the aspiration/ability model developed on the basis of data from Cape Verde, an aspiration to migrate is defined as the belief that migration is preferable to non-migration, and aspirations can vary in degree and in the balance between choice and coercion (Carling 2002: 12). Aspirations are viewed not necessarily as determinants of migration, but with dubious links that must be empirically found. According to the aspiration/ability model, an understanding of migration aspirations must incorporate both macro-level factors of the specific emigration environment in which aspirations are formed, and the individual-level influences aspirations are subject to on the micro level. The aspiration/ability model distinguishes between three types of people in sending-communities. Those with both aspiration and ability become international migrants, while those who lack aspiration to migrate are voluntary non-migrants. Those who aspire to migrate but lack the ability, are involuntary non-migrants according to the model (Carling 2001: 12). One could add a fourth type of individual to the model, namely the one who does not aspire to migrate but who would do so anyway if they had the ability. According to the model, both aspirations and ability are formed when individual characteristics and contexts of emigration or immigration interplay, but they should be analyzed as separate steps in the migratory process. This understanding of aspirations allows for an approach to study such data which does not presuppose a link to actual migration, and it makes it an empirical question whether or not aspirations and ability are affected by the same factors.
To summarize, the models of individual decision-making have tended to overestimate the degree to which an expressed aspiration to migrate can be taken as a true predictor of migration, and assumed that the same factors affect both aspirations and migration behavior. Mainly, this has to do with the fact that the models are built on internal migration flows. Also, the value-dependency model has not incorporated the fact that most migration aspirations never manifest themselves in actual migration, but perhaps rather in frustration which affects other aspects of life, such as investment in education. Qualitative research emphasizes that migration aspirations can be viewed irrespective of whether it leads to actual migration. Expressing a wish to migrate can be an expression of wishing to succeed in life in general and chapter 2 showed aspects of this in the Senegalese context.

4.3 Measuring Aspirations with EUMAGINE Data

It has now been established that different factors may affect a person’s aspiration to migrate and his or her ability to do so. In this section, I will discuss how migration aspirations can be measured, if we wish to hold ability to migrate separate from people’s aspirations. Here, I discuss the way questions of aspirations are posed in the EUMAGINE survey, and look at how respondents answer the various questions. I use this section to begin to approach the distinction between aspiration and ability to migrate empirically, but I also select two ways of asking about migration aspirations which become subject to more in-depth analysis in chapter seven. In separate sections, I show how the sample is filtered to allow for appropriate comparisons between people’s answers, and finally, I cross-tabulate the responses to various aspiration-questions to provide further confirmation that this approach to aspirations- and intentions data is more suitable than those attempted in previous studies.

4.3.1 The Questions on Migration Aspirations

The EUMAGINE survey asks a number of different questions about migration aspirations. These are presented in table 4.1, listed in the order that they appear in the survey. The questions can be interpreted as different scenarios laid out to the respondent; some may also argue that they capture different stages of the migration process (see Gardner et al. 1985). They are all good questions in the sense that they are open, clear and easy to interpret for the respondent, and none of them ask directly about migration, a word which may have different meaning depending on the context it is asked in.
Table 4.1 EUMAGINE Survey Questions on Aspirations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspirations conceptualized</th>
<th>Survey questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wish to migrate</td>
<td>“Ideally, if you had the opportunity, would you like to go abroad to live or work some time during the next five years, or would you prefer to stay in Senegal?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred destination and intention to migrate</td>
<td>“Which country would you like to go to? Will you try to go to that country within the next five years?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Taken steps towards migration to Europe | “Have you applied for or obtained a visa for going to Europe during the past five years?”  
“Have you applied for a place at a university or other educational or exchange program in Europe?”  
“During the past five years, have you contacted an agent, office, or website to help you find work in Europe?” |
| Would leave for Europe if provided necessary papers | “If someone were to give you the necessary papers to go to Europe, what would you do? Would you stay here or go to Europe?” |

Source: EUMAGINE survey (Ersanilli, Carling, and De Haas 2011).

The first question about aspirations asked in the EUMAGINE survey is the most open in its form of all four questions, asking whether the respondent would like to go abroad or prefer to stay in Senegal, ideally and if given the opportunity. It does not specify any location and opens for respondents to think about other places than Europe, which is the main focus of this study. The question gives a time frame of five years. One could say that the framing “if you had the opportunity” is somewhat vague, and different respondents will arguably understand an opportunity to migrate differently. Some respondents may include their perceived ability of migrating when answering this question, while others may interpret the question as a question of what they want, regardless of the possibilities they have of achieving that goal.

If the respondent answers yes to the first question, and confirm that they want to go abroad to live or work some time within the next five years, they are asked to list a preferred destination country and whether or not they will try to go there within the next five years. The latter is a typical way of framing what is in the literature often referred to as an intention-question (Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl 2005). When asked this question, respondents not only have to relate to what they want given some vague formulation of opportunities, but are to a larger extent forced to take into account their own ability to migrate as well as their aspiration. Persons to do not consider themselves to be possible migrants might answer yes to the first question in table 4.1, but no to the second one. For example, the Senegalese context of traditional gender roles might mean that a woman answers yes to the first question – she wants to go abroad – but no to the second. She will not try to go to for example France within
the next five years, because she knows that as a woman, she has restricted ability to do so. The same is probably valid for people with much household responsibility or who are for other reasons tied to staying in Senegal. Also, those who lacks funds or do not see themselves as being in any position of obtaining a visa or passport, might also be inclined to answer no to this particular question. Arguably, the question of intention implies some aspect of a plan, but respondents might interpret this differently. Either way, this question is clearer than the previous one. There is no doubt that respondents will incorporate some aspects of their ability of migrating when answering the question. Thus, this question is clearly blurring the division between aspiration and ability, but most respondent will arguably consider both their aspirations and their perceived abilities to migrate, when answering.

The third way of measuring migration aspirations presented in table 4.1 is a type of index created by the EUMAGINE team, which combines a number of different questions concerning whether the respondents have taken particular steps towards migration. There is no question in the data set asking “have you taken steps?”, but the EUMAGINE team have constructed this measurement based on several questions from the data set. The way it is presented here is as a dummy variable, where the respondents score one if they answer yes to one or more of the questions indicated. There are questions on whether a person has applied for or obtained a visa for going to Europe, applied for a university or exchange program to Europe or contacted an agent, office, or website to help find work in Europe. These questions are the best indicators available in the data measuring whether or not respondents have made concrete plans to migrate, and this measure arguably incorporates even more ability into the answer. However, the index might not be the best way of measuring migration plans in the Senegalese context. As was mentioned in chapter 3, the EUMAGINE survey was developed to be used in four different countries, and in some of the other countries, contacting an agent and applying for a visa at an embassy, are steps people take in the process towards migration. For many Senegalese, however, visas to Europe are not necessarily applied for. Many of those who travel to Europe do so without visas, and others purchase tourist visas illegally on the street. Poetze’s (2010) respondents claim that illegal visas can be purchased to any European country, and at least in Dakar, they are easily available as long as one can afford them. The illegality of obtaining visas in Senegal makes such questions sensitive, and respondents may be reluctant to answering truthfully, fearing the consequences. All in all, this index seems to be composed of questions which are irrelevant measures of migration planning in a country where a majority of the population has none or only basic levels of education, very few have
access to the internet\textsuperscript{7} and migration agents are not common.\textsuperscript{8} It is also probable that a person who has acquired a visa to Europe or a place at a university has already used his possibility to leave the country, and he would therefore not be included in the survey. A straightforward question asking if the respondent had taken steps, started planning the trip, or asked around about ways of getting to Europe, would have been a better measure in the Senegalese case. While taking into account that the question is not the best measurement of having taken steps, it is clear that in the discussion of aspirations and ability, this question captures ability more than necessarily aspiration. If the respondent has applied for a visa or a place at a university in Europe, he or she is closer to having an ability to migrate, than someone who only aspires to leave.

The fourth measurement of wishing to migrate found in the EUMAGINE survey is more suitable and relevant for the Senegalese context. It asks whether respondents would go to Europe if someone provided them the necessary papers. Lack of papers such as passports, plane tickets and visas is a key hindrance to migration from Senegal, and with this question the ability to migrate is partially given and we are arguably left with a measure of aspiration. Whether or not the respondents \textit{want} to go is what drives the answers, and not whether or not they \textit{can}, as one important hindrance to migration is removed. While the question “will try to go to your preferred destination country within the next five years” places the respondent in a situation where he must reflect on his possibilities of migrating, this last question provides the respondent with the utopian scenario that he has the necessary papers, and asks what he would do. Within the aspiration/ability model, the latter question can be said to be a measure of aspiration, where an aspect of ability can be taken for granted by the respondent.

\textsuperscript{7} 17 percent of the respondents in the EUMAGINE survey have accessed the Internet at one point during the last 12 months.

\textsuperscript{8} Papa Demba Fall (Personal communication, December 2012).
Table 4.2 shows the prevalence of migration aspirations in the four areas covered by our data material. Leaving the differences between the areas aside for the time being, the table shows that the way questions about migration aspirations are asked, to a large extent affects people’s answers. While an average of 74 percent would like to move abroad to live or work, 41 percent intend to do so and 8 percent have taken concrete steps towards migration. 80 percent of the respondents would move to Europe if given the necessary papers. In their article of migration aspirations among Mexican youth, Kandel and Massey (2002) conclude that they believe that their respondent’s responses would not have changed dramatically if questions were worded away from aspirations and closer towards future plans. However, table 4.2 shows that the way the question is worded means a great deal in the Senegalese case. There is little reason to believe that this would not be the case other places. There are obviously variations in how wishes of migration are expressed, depending on the degree of ability respondents have to reflect upon, and rather than being measures of the same phenomena, they can be seen as measures of migration aspirations capturing varying degrees of ability.

In light of the discussion of the variables provided here, and the results from table 4.2, it seems appropriate to argue that the second and last questions in table 4.1 capture two very different aspects of migration aspirations, and that these are the most interesting to pay attention to in more in-depth analyses. These questions are the ones asking whether respondents will move to a preferred destination country in Europe within the next five years, and what they would do if given the necessary papers to go to Europe. While the question on
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Table 4.2 Prevalence of Migration Aspirations by Area (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration aspirations</th>
<th>Darou Mousty</th>
<th>Lambaye</th>
<th>Golf Sud</th>
<th>Orkadiéré</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would like to go abroad to live or work</td>
<td>64,4</td>
<td>76,1</td>
<td>73,6</td>
<td>81,6</td>
<td>73,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will try to go to preferred country within next five years</td>
<td>38,7</td>
<td>34,4</td>
<td>46,7</td>
<td>43,2</td>
<td>41,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has taken steps towards migration to Europe</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>21,3</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would leave for Europe if given the necessary papers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74,7</td>
<td>87,1</td>
<td>86,3</td>
<td>79,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EUMAGINE survey data, version 20121001. Weighted results.

Note: 10 respondents have been removed from the data set because of missing values.

---

9 Table 4.2 may indicate that the areas do not differ much as regards the levels of aspirations, although very many more have taken steps towards migration in Golf Sud. These findings will be commented on in more detail in the preceding chapters.
steps is not adapted to the context of Senegalese migration decision-making, the question on whether the respondent wishes to go to Europe can be said to not be clear enough in whether respondents are asked to incorporate ability in their answering or not. Looking at the answers presented in table 4.2, it is also evident that the two chosen questions pick up different aspects of the decision-making process, and of degree of ability incorporated into people’s aspirations. Because these are the two questions of the four where degrees of aspiration and ability are the easiest to interpret, they have been chosen as the dependent variables for the logistic regression analyses in chapter 7. However, the other questions will be discussed in some of the descriptive tables.

4.3.2 Filtering

In the previous section, I chose two questions on migration aspirations which will be analyzed in separate logistic regression models in chapter 7. The intentions-question incorporates ability, and is the question used by most existing research, while the question of what the respondent would do if provided the necessary papers is new to the EUMAGINE survey, and can be said to measure the respondent’s aspiration leaving an aspect of ability out.

In order to provide a meaningful analysis of the differences between the answers given to the two questions, it is important to take into consideration that not only do these questions differ on the degree of ability incorporated in the question, but they also specify different destinations. The question on intentions asks about the respondents’ own preferred destination country, which can be anywhere in the world. The question on whether respondents would leave if provided necessary papers specifies Europe as destination. This means that the differences observed in table 4.2 may be reflections not of the degree of ability incorporated in the questions of aspirations, which is what I am interested in examining, but of the differences between wanting to go to Europe and wanting to go somewhere else. As pointed out by Findley (1989), wanting to move to Europe and wanting to move to other African countries are two very different processes and mind sets, that should be examined separately.

In order to secure that the results presented here are not reflections of differences in preferred destinations, I have filtered the sample, excluding respondents who say that they want to go to places outside of Europe. ¹⁰ This means that I reduce the sample size from 2000 respondents to 1698 respondents, leaving a sample with 442 respondents from Darou Mousty,

¹⁰ As mentioned briefly in chapter 2, I have also excluded the ten respondents who have missing answers on one of the two dependent variables.
430 from Lambaye, 402 from Golf Sud and 424 from Orkadiéré. Table 4.2 shows some important characteristics in the original sample and the remaining sample. We see from the table that the filtered sample is reasonable similar to the original sample, with respect to some key characteristics.

Table 4.2 Comparison between Original and Filtered Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original sample</th>
<th>Filtered sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (percent)</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean)</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling (mean)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EUMAGINE survey data, version 20121001. Weighted results.

While filtering the sample may be considered a bold move, it is a consequence of the construction of the EUMAGINE survey questions, and necessary in order to secure that differences in preferred destinations are excluded as possible explanatory factors.

One could argue that filtering alters the degree to which the sample can be said to be representative for the population defined by EUMAGINE, as the respondents are not randomly excluded. However, as there do not seem to be substantial differences between the original and filtered sample on key variables, some of which are included in table 4.2, I will continue to refer to the representativity of the data. The fact that logistic analyses run on both original and filtered sample yield similar results is taken as confirmation that the findings are robust.

4.3.3 Comparing Different Aspects of Decision-making

The answers from the EUMAGINE survey questions on aspirations are interesting not only because they give us an indication of the scope and variation of aspirations between the four areas, but also because they can be used to see if respondents answer differently questions of aspirations are posed to them. As discussed in the first part of this chapter, the value-dependency model postulates that migration begins with a wish, is manifested as an intention if the person believes that possible constraints can be overcome, and finally, the person takes concrete steps towards migration and becomes a migrant (Gardner et al. 1985). While the value-dependency model would indicate that respondents are consistent in their answering
creating a staircase of answers where those who have taken steps also have an intention and a wish to migrate, a broader approach can be justified if people take steps even if they do not want to migrate, or if they say that they would stay if given the necessary papers, while also saying that they want to move to Europe. The latter would be more in accordance with the aspiration/ability model.

Table 4.3 Cross Tabulations of Aspirations-questions, Intends vs. Would (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration intention</th>
<th>Would leave if provided papers</th>
<th>Total (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stay (0)</td>
<td>Leave (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (0)</td>
<td>33,20</td>
<td>66,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
<td>3,60</td>
<td>96,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EUMAGINE survey data, version 20121001. Weighted results.

Table 4.4 Cross Tabulations of Aspirations-questions, Would vs. Intends (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration intention</th>
<th>Would leave if provided papers</th>
<th>Total (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (0)</td>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay (0)</td>
<td>94,00</td>
<td>6,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave (1)</td>
<td>54,00</td>
<td>45,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EUMAGINE survey data, version 20121001. Weighted results.

Table 4.3 and table 4.4 present simple cross tabulations of the aspiration questions from the EUMAGINE survey. They both show that the respondents answer in a way which indicates that a broad approach to interpreting aspirations is in order. As shown in table 4.3, 67 percent of those who answer that they have no intention of moving to Europe, would do so if provided the necessary papers. Table 4.4 shows that 6 percent of those who have an intention of moving within the next five years, say that they would stay if given the necessary papers. Although only brief indicators, these findings are in line with approaching migration aspirations more broadly, and not beginning with the assumption that steps are preceded by intentions which in turn are preceded by a wish. It also indicates that the distinction between ability and aspiration is fruitful, but that there are obviously also other important hindrances to migration than being provided with the necessary papers. We could assume that for example family obligations might be one such hindrance.

To summarize, I have discussed different ways of thinking about migration aspirations, and I have settled on a way of studying aspirations based on insights from the
qualitative literature and the aspiration/ability model. I have also discussed different possible ways of operationalizing migration aspirations and decided upon two questions which will be further analyzed in the chapters to come. The first is a measure of aspirations where an important aspect of ability, namely necessary papers, are given to the respondent and the second is migration intentions, which allows the respondent to incorporate both aspiration and ability. One important point made in this chapter is that I will not be viewing migration aspirations as proxies of migration, but interpret the findings viewing aspirations as a social phenomenon which may or may not lead to actual migration. Persons may have aspirations to migrate, but may or may not end up migrating. Outcomes are only one problematic to be studied; the actual aspirations in and of themselves are worthy objects of social scientific analysis because they speak volumes about the Senegalese society, culture and social networks. The justification for such an approach is two-fold. First, the theoretical premises underlying much existing interpretation of intentions data is flawed, and, second, respondents in the EUMAGINE survey do not answer questions about migration aspirations in a way which makes a clear-cut link between aspirations and actual migration probable. The next chapter attempts to analyze which factors lead migration aspirations and concentrates on the role played by migrant networks.
5 Migrant Networks and Transnationalism

Do migrant networks shape migration aspirations? The underlying premise of this question is the idea of transnationalism; the fact that Senegal’s population is increasingly linked to migrant communities may be what is causing so many people to want to move. To sort out different aspects of transnationalism, perspectives of migrant networks and of a ”culture of migration” are relevant (Kandel and Massey 2002, Massey et al. 2005) Both these perspectives are outlined in the first part of this chapter, after the discussion of what transnationalism entails. I also outline the few theoretical and empirical contributions which have tried to combine migrant networks approaches with data on migration aspirations or intentions. In the second part of this chapter, I present data from the EUMAGINE project, both on the prevalence of migrant networks on an individual level, and on the histories of migration in the four emigration areas surveyed by EUMAGINE. The data on the various networks is thought to measure some aspects of the degree of a culture of migration in that specific area.
5.1 Transnational Migration

Traditionally, scholars of migration have believed that once persons successfully migrated and integrated into new countries and communities, they lost ties to their home countries. For the last two decades, however, migration scholars have increasingly acknowledged the transnational practices of migrants, pointing to the fact that individuals remain oriented toward their home communities long after they have moved, and that many stay in contact with the sending countries they once left (Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992, Levitt and Jaworsky 2007, Mahler 1998, Vertovec 1999). Scholars have studied the practice of remittance sending, expatriate voting, dual citizenship, and housing investments, aiming at gaining a better understanding of the ways in which migrants live transnational lives (Carling 2008, Portes, Guarnizo, and Landolt 1999).

Not all migrants are transnational according to these definitions, as it is a term restricted only to those who are connected to non-migrants and to their home country, fostering what De Haas and Fokkema (2011: 758) call “multiple belongings and double loyalties”. Transnational communities are built on a foundation of economic, political and cultural globalization, and the growth in such practices is linked to technical advances in transport and communication, which has enabled migrants to call or Skype home, to travel more frequently back and forth, or to watch television channels from their home societies. One important aspect of transnationalism is the degree to which migrants remit, or send money back to their countries of origin. Much research has been conducted in recent years on the role played by remittances in forming and shaping non-migrants lives, especially on the role remittances play in development of sending countries (De Haas 2005, Groenewold and Fokkema 2003, Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Fokkema 2005). As was shown by the brief review of Senegalese migration studies in chapter 2, remittances are a key contributor to Senegalese economy and personal households, and many scholars have argued that Senegalese abroad constitute a transnational community (Grillo and Riccio 2004, Kane 2002, Riccio 2011, 2002, Riccio 2008, Sinatti 2008, Fall 1998, Fall 2002).

When scholars discuss transnationalism, they are often concerned with the lives and practices of migrants. However, as Åkesson (2004) points out, when migrants are living transnational lives, they also influence the lives of those who never migrated and those who are in the process of preparing for migration. Peggy Levitt argues that one of the most important aspects of transnationalism lies in the dissemination of ideas between countries (Levitt 1998, Levitt and Lamba-Nieves 2011, Levitt and Sørenson 2004). Not only money and
capital are transferred between countries, she claims, but also ideas and beliefs, so-called social remittances. Levitt (1998) studies the Miraflores community and defines them as being transnational because of the strong, geographically-focused ties that almost two-thirds of the households there share with family members in Boston. Both members of the Miraflores community and their friends and family members in Boston express belonging to a group that spans two settings, and form organizations to attest to this, and Levitt shows how ideas and thoughts travel rapidly back and forth, shaping also the non-migrant community. Arguably, it is possible to understand non-migrants as transnational to the degree that they are oriented towards other nation states that the one they are currently living in.

5.2 The Dissemination of Ideas: Migrant Networks and Cultures of Migration

Globalization entails that the world becomes smaller and more interconnected. Today, thoughts and ideas about Europe can spread to Senegal via new media, TV and modern technology – aspects of transnationalism which migration scholars have paid a great deal of attention. No doubt, Senegal’s population receives its share of global impulses through modern technological channels. However, the EUMAGINE survey shows that a majority of the respondents do not have access to satellite television, the Internet or telephones in their households. Although not by any means technologically isolated, globalization and ideas about Europe on the African continent are still spreading largely by word of mouth. We can employ different but sometimes overlapping theories of cultures of migration and migrant networks to understand how migration aspirations are formed in context of globalization.

Migrant transnationalism is a concept linked to, but also separate from the stream of literature within migration studies known as migrant network theory. The latter is the idea that migrants can make use of resources in their networks before, during and after migration. Migrant network theory stems from sociological theories of social capital (De Haas 2010: 1589), and was first defined as “that movement in which prospective migrants learn of opportunities, are provided with transportation, and have initial accommodation and employment arranged by means of primary social relationships with returned migrants” (MacDonald and MacDonald 1964: 82). The idea that kinship or community ties facilitate migration, was previously referred to as chain migration (Tilly and Brown 1967). Gradually, the term has been replaced by that of migrant networks (Poetze 2010).
Douglas Massey and his colleagues (2005: 43) define migrant networks as “sets of interpersonal ties that connect migrants, returned migrants and non-migrants in origin and destination areas through ties of kinship, friendship, and shared origin”. They argue and provide ample evidence that access to such networks increase the likelihood of international movement, lowering the costs and risks of movement and increasing the expected net returns. Massey was the first to properly acknowledge migrant networks as a specific form of social capital, in the Bourdieusian understanding of the term. Bourdieu specifically distinguishes between the networks themselves and the resources that can be mobilized through them. The volume of the social capital possessed by the individual depends both on the size of that network, and on the volume of the cultural, economic and symbolic capital possessed by each of the members of one’s network (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). However, when appropriated by migration scholars, Bourdieu’s distinction is often overlooked, and knowing someone who is, or has been a migrant, has become the most common operationalization of migrant networks in the literature (De Haas 2010). Some scholars distinguish between weak and strong ties (Granovetter 1973, 1985, 1983). Although Granovetter’s understanding was more complex, the distinction is often operationalized in migration studies as a separation between family or household ties, on the one hand, and ties to friends, on the other hand. Family networks have been much more extensively researched than friendship ties (Garip 2008, Palloni et al. 2001, Wilson 1998).

Based on extensive mapping of Mexican migration to the United States, Massey et al. found that once someone in one’s network has migrated, ties to this person are transformed to a resource which can be used to gain access to economic capital and foreign employment, in turn affecting chances of migration (Massey et al. 1993). An overwhelming majority of the studies done on migrant networks and on the probabilities of succeeding in migration have later shown that adding prior migrants as a regressor in aggregate models of immigration flows strongly predicts migration rates. Studies on individual-level data produce a similar picture (see Massey et al. 2005 for an overview). Access to migrants in your social network greatly increases access to relevant information, prospective jobs, and perhaps also provides economically, for example through remittances. Migration research has established that social networks are an important determinant of migration plans and choice of destination (Faist 1997, Boyd 1989, Fawcett 1989), and possessing such a network makes it increasingly likely that you become a migrant.
Massey has extended the theoretical concept of migrant networks to also encompass what he calls a culture of migration, and it is here that we find the “idea-aspect” of the networks in Massey’s framework. Migration influences awareness of opportunities and lifestyles abroad, which may have profound influence on identity formation, norms and behavior in sending countries, he claims. If migration becomes associated with social and material success, migration may become a norm rather than an exception. According to Massey (et al. 1993) this can even give rise to a culture of migration, which may increase migration aspirations or even lead to what he calls “obsessions” over migration.

“The essence of the culture-of-migration argument is that nonmigrants observe migrants to whom they are socially connected and seek to emulate their migratory behavior. Seeing friends, relatives, and neighbors dramatically improve their socioeconomic circumstances through U.S labor, and hearing returned migrants selectively relay stories of thrilling adventures and cosmopolitan experiences north of the border, young Mexicans acquire aspirations that lead them psychologically to invest less in Mexico and more in the prospect of life and work north of the border” (Kandel and Massey 2002: 983).

The argument that migrant networks might also spread ideas is closely related to Levitt (1998)’s concept of social remittances, although she does not explicitly state that such social remittances lead to increased migration aspirations. De Haas (2010), however, discusses ways cultural impacts of migration might encourage increased migration. The exposure to the wealth and lifestyles of returned migrants can for example contribute to changing rural tastes, which may manifest themselves in the different areas where people live, he argues. These concepts seem to fit well with the Senegalese case.

5.3 Theoretical and Empirical Links between Migrant Networks and Aspirations

As indicated in the previous section, many scholars have researched aspects of migrant transnationalism and migrant networks, but few have developed good theoretical frameworks or explanations of how or why people with access to networks might have greater migration aspirations, even though Kandel and Massey (2002) come close in their culture of migration theory. Several scholars have explicitly called for more empirical and theoretical studies linking these two strains of literature and investigating the role of networks in migration decision-making (see Faist 1997, 2000). A few scholars have so far answered the call.
One framework for understanding the ways migrant networks might shape migration aspirations can be found in Haug (2008). Inspired by both economic and sociological theory, she argues that there are mainly three ways migrant networks can influence migration decision-making. Having seen someone migrate introduces others for the possibility, and arguably increases the chances that they too will see migration as a valuable life project, she claims, which in turn may increase people’s aspirations to migrate. In addition to the information and ideas spread through networks, the transaction and adaptation costs of migrating can potentially be lowered by getting help from friends and family, and that this may make it easier for an individual to perceive of migration as a project worthwhile. Last, friends and family who have migrated might also actively encourage people at home to join them.

Faist (1997, 2000) has called for more empirical works that incorporate migrant networks perspectives and aspects of migration decision-making. As stated previously, very few have devoted entire studies to understanding these mechanisms, but some have included network variables as one of several possible determinants of aspirations. Kandel and Massey (2002) make one such empirical contribution. Using data from the Mexican Migration Project, they ask whether students who have family members who have migrated to the US have greater migration aspirations and lower aspirations to continue education in Mexico. They also test the effects of residing in areas characterized by long-standing, high rates of international migration - what they define as areas with a culture of migration. The authors find both of these factors to be strong predictors of migration aspirations. The greater involvement of both communities and families in foreign wage labor, the more motivated they are to move abroad and the less motivated they are to continue schooling. The authors argue that this is the first statistical evidence for the “culture of migration” argument.

Epstein and Gang (2006) take a somewhat different approach when they look at the social influences on migration plans, investigating whether it is so-called “herd-effects” or migrant networks that are the most important factor. Epstein and Gang use theories of migrant networks and Epstein’s (2002, 2008) concept of herd effects to explain why migrants from the same area tend to want to travel to the same destinations. Networks and herds reflect different types of information, they argue, while people chose the same locations as their friends and family because they know that they can benefit from the network externalities that are there,
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11 Haug also includes two hypotheses on the relations between migration decision-making and social networks not related to migration. These are not presented here.
herd behavior is when migrants chose a location on the supposition that returned migrants had information that the decision-maker does not have. While network externalities imply that people go where people in their personal networks already are, herd behavior indicates that people go where they have observed that others want to go, believing that others have information that they don’t have access to (Epstein 2008: 568). Epstein and Gang (2006) use data from the Hungarian Household Panel survey, and they find that Hungarians who have kin or friends who are abroad are more likely to be willing to go abroad and to plan to go abroad. The influence of returnees is twice as large as that of current migrant ties. Most surprisingly, they find that it is not the current or the returned migrants who have the highest influence on migration decision-making, but rather friends and family who are themselves planning to go abroad. Epstein and Gang argue that this is an argument for the herd-effect, and that what affects migration plans the most is not actual information and a flow of ideas, but rather that people follow the crowd. Epstein and Gang find large gender differences in aspirations; men much more often want to move abroad than women. They also emphasize that aspirations to migrate do not seem to vary between employed and unemployed individuals.

A third empirical contribution comes from Agadjanian, Nedoluzhko, and Kumskov (2008), who focus on the role of ethnicity in migration aspirations amongst young people in Kyrgyzstan. Their study can arguably be placed among the works focusing on migrant networks and aspirations, even if this is not the main concern of the paper. Looking at how aspirations to move varies between members of the Kyrgyz majority group, Asians, and the minority group, Europeans, they argue that the latter will be more dependent on migrant networks in their migration decision making, they are more disadvantaged and socially vulnerable. They find that migration-related social capital, both at potential destination and in current place of residence, strengthens migration intentions.

The aforementioned studies all relate situations which are contextually very different from Senegal, and their findings and focus vary slightly from that taken in this study. Although there are not necessarily clearer contextual patterns between African countries, it is interesting to see that at least two studies have incorporated the role of migrant networks when studying migration aspirations using data from African countries. Carling’s (2001) study of aspirations in Cape Verde has already been mentioned, and he also finds links between migrant networks and migration aspirations. The other findings which are clear and direct in his study contend that young, unemployed and uneducated Cape Verdeans are very
likely to wish to emigrate. Aspirations to migrate strongly decreased with age and educational attainment. Unemployed Cape Verdeans have a much higher probability of aspiring to migrate than those who are employed (Carling 2002: 24-25).

As far as has been possible to ascertain, there is only one study which examines networks and migration aspirations in Senegal using survey data. Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl (2005) study intentions to migrate in Ghana, Morocco, Egypt and Senegal\(^\text{12}\) and they indicate that Senegal is an especially interesting country to study since stated intentions to migrate are particularly high in this country. The authors are concerned with both push and pull factors as determinants of migration intentions, and their approach is similar and different from that taken in this study, when they argue that intentions can be treated as predictors of future migration flows, but that they also represent a vote of no-confidence in the future of their home country vis-à-vis other countries (Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl 2005: 742). They find that individual optimism about the benefits of migration is the primary driving force behind such migration intentions in all the countries they survey. The authors are surprised to find that network effects are not present in the Moroccan or Senegalese case, and list a number of possible explanations, including the factor that a culture of migration might exist in these areas, where everyone would move if given the chance. They find that stated intentions are higher in areas with a long history of migration, and based on that argue that ties with local population might be more important than migrant ties. Concerning other determinants of migration intentions in the Senegalese case, Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl (2005) found that men were more likely to want to move abroad than women, although the gender differences were not as high in Senegal as in the other countries surveyed. They are surprised to find that self-defined poverty does not seem to be a driving force behind migration intentions in Senegal.

This review of the literature combining migrant networks and aspirations has shown several interesting things. First, not very many have attempted to theoretically or empirically combine aspirations with migrant network theory. Even fewer have done so using data from African countries and only one with data from Senegal. Second, while the emphases in the various studies that have been undertaken vary greatly, migrant networks seem to matter in migration decision-making and in forming aspirations. Although the only study done on Senegalese migration aspirations does not find any connection between networks and aspirations, there seems to be good reason to investigate the connections further. Not only is

\(^{12}\) The question they ask is “Do you intend to migrate abroad?”
the material they rest on slightly outdated, but they also state themselves that they had few possibilities of operationalizing migration networks in a meaningful way. In the next section, I will discuss possibilities of mapping migrant networks using the EUMAGINE data from Senegal, and look at the degree to which people in these four areas have such networks. In chapter 7, I will combine the insights from this and the previous chapter, forming some hypotheses and a model for studying these relations further.

5.4 Migrant Networks and Cultures of Migration in Four Senegalese Areas

The discussion of the literature on migrant networks and cultures of migration theory reveals that we have good reason to believe that there is a link between migration aspirations, and knowing people who are previous or current migrants, even if this connection was not found in the one study previously done on data from Senegal. In this subchapter, I will look at the prevalence of such networks in the areas surveyed by EUMAGINE, and also look at the differences between the four areas.

In the EUMAGINE data, there is information about three different aspects of a person’s migrant network. First, the household roster provides information on the migration history of all household members, and on all family members currently living outside the household who have a history of international migration. This gives information about all returned migrants in our respondent’s household or close family. Second, each individual respondent was asked to list all family members currently living in another country, who have been in contact with the respondent at least once over the past year. Third, the individual respondent was asked to list everyone they know outside their family who is currently living abroad, and whose help the person could count on if he or she needed it. Compiled, these people are what will here be referred to as our respondents’ total migrant network. The extent to which respondents in the four areas have such networks is presented in figure 5.4. Because most of our respondents know few migrants or persons with migration experience, the variables are coded as dummies, meaning that if a respondent knows one or more in each category, he is scores 1 on the variable, and knowing none gives score 0.\textsuperscript{13} The category any

\textsuperscript{13} Limitations in the data do not allows us to go as far in investigating networks effects as would have been possible with a more complex data structure, and perhaps more importantly, a larger sample. With only 500 respondents in each area, many of the variables have high confidence intervals, and it is difficult to get significant results on analyses with smaller subsamples.
migrant network is coded so that a person with one or more of the migrant network categories scores one on this variable, while a person with no networks at all scores 0.

Table 5.1. Frequency of Migrant Networks, by Area. Percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migrant networks</th>
<th>Darou Mousty</th>
<th>Lambaye</th>
<th>Golf Sud</th>
<th>Orkadiéré</th>
<th>All areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family member abroad</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend abroad</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows returned migrant</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any migrant network</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EUMAGINE survey data, version 20121001. Weighted results.
Note: 10 respondents have been removed from the data set because of missing values.

Table 5.1 confirms the findings in the qualitative literature, which indicated that Senegalese have many connections abroad and that they know many returned migrants. Still, it is not the case that all Senegalese know people abroad. 62 percent of our respondents have a migrant network. The category of migrants that fewest of our respondents report of having is friends abroad, which may be somewhat surprising. One reason for this may be that there was a criterion that this was someone they knew they could count on for help if they needed it, and not a list of absolutely all contacts. It may also be the case that because these networks are self-reported, people are less likely to remember all their contacts abroad, while family members are easier to report and list. Either way, only 15 percent of the respondents report of having a friend abroad, while 41 percent know a returned migrant and 41 percent have a family member abroad.

We see from this table that the prevalence of networks seems to vary between the four areas. Half of the respondents in Lambaye report of having any migrant networks, 54 percent in Darou Mousty 67 percent in Golf Sud and 75 percent in Orkadiéré. While the distribution of migrant networks is rather similar in Darou Mousty and Lambaye, Orkadiéré differs quite substantially from the other areas, having much higher shares of people with migrant networks. The difference between Orkadiéré and the other areas seems particularly

---

14 Whether these findings are also statistically significant will be examined in the logistic regression analyses in chapter 7.
large in the returned migrant category. We know from EUMAGINE pilot studies that Orkadiéré is also the area with the longest history of migration out of the four areas.

Table 5.1 shows that Orkadiéré seems to be the area where access to and prevalence of migrant networks is the largest. Based on this, and the indications from the EUMAGINE report, it is a probable assumption that Orkadiéré is that of the four areas where a culture of migration is the most prevalent. In their analysis of migration aspirations in Zacatecas, Mexico, Kandel and Massey (2002) develop a theoretical framework for determining whether an area can be quantitatively defined as having a culture of migration. In order to do so, they create an index which measures ratio of returned migrants, dividing areas into categories of low prevalence of migration (under 3 percent returned migrants in the population), moderate prevalence (3-6 percent) and high prevalence (6+ percent). Although we only have data on representative of the population in the age range 18-39, we can make a similar estimation to the one Kandel and Massey conduct. A table showing the percentage of our respondents who have personal history of international migration can be found in table 5.2. According to their definitions, Orkadiéré would be an area of high prevalence, Golf Sud and Darou Mousty moderate prevalence and Lambaye would be considered to have low prevalence of migration.

Table 5.2 Prevalence of Respondents with Personal History of Migration, by Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Darou Mousty</th>
<th>Lambaye</th>
<th>Golf Sud</th>
<th>Orkadiéré</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has personal history of migration (percent)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EUMAGINE survey data, version 20121001. Weighted results

To conclude this subsection, we have seen that the prevalence of migrant networks in all areas is high, and that it is especially in Orkadiéré that we find high prevalence, both of respondents with migration experience and of people with migrant networks. An astonishing 75 percent of the respondents have one or more returned migrants in their family. On the other end of the scale, Lambaye has a low prevalence of migration according to Kandel and Massey’s definition of a culture of migration. Still, half of the respondents in Lambaye has some type of migrant network. Hypotheses concerning the possible connections between networks and aspirations can be found in the next chapter, which presents and discusses the research design.
6 Research Design

In this chapter, I build on the discussions from all previous chapters when I present the research design employed in this thesis, and provide motivations for inclusion of the control variables. I briefly describe logistic regression analysis, which is the most common statistical method used when faced with a dichotomous dependent variable. Most importantly, I discuss the strengths and limitations of my choice of design and how it allows me to answer the proposed research questions. It may be important to state from the very beginning that this is an exploratory study which looks for patterns or associations in the data material, rather than aiming at performing causal analysis. The question this design is made to answer is whether migrant networks might be one amongst many factors that are associated with having aspirations to migrate.

6.1 Hypotheses

From the literature review in chapter 5, it is possible to deduce several hypotheses regarding the ways migrant networks might influence migration aspirations. First, I assume that people with access to migrant networks will in general express higher levels of migration aspirations than those without access to such networks. This is the underlying assumption in all theories of migrant networks, and it is also what the literature on Senegal postulates.\textsuperscript{15} If a person has

\textsuperscript{15} With the exception of the study done by Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl (2005).
a migrant network, he or she is more likely to have been exposed to the idea of Europe, to the modern desire for individualism and to the possibility of upward social mobility that lies in migration (Poetze 2010). When a person is not a member of such networks, he is less likely both to be pressured and inspired to leave.

**H1**: People with access to migrant networks will generally express higher levels of migration aspirations.

Building on the culture of migration theory, the second assumption or hypothesis of this thesis is that living in an area with high levels of out-migration and where it is common and viewed as natural to migrate, will increase aspirations. Based on Kandel and Massey’s (2002) theory, people living in an area with high levels of out-migration will be more exposed to ideas about migration in Europe, and see migration as a natural out-strategy and as a valuable life project. Applied to the areas we are examining here, it is a probable assumption that people living in Orkadiéré are more likely to want to migrate, than respondents in Lambaye or Darou Mousty, and also when we control for other relevant determinants of migration aspirations.

**H2**: Inhabitants of Orkadiéré will generally express higher levels of migration aspirations, than people in areas where a culture of migration is not as prevalent.

The third hypothesis is that personal migrant networks are less important for aspirations in areas where an established culture of migration exists. While Kandel and Massey (2002) assume that both personal networks and living in an area where there exists a culture of migration will increase a person’s aspirations to migrate, it is my assumption that whether or not such networks are important for aspirations, will vary with area. Arguably, people who live in an established culture of migration already have access to much of the information and ideas that are communicated through migrant networks. If this hypothesis holds, it is therefore likely that personal migrant networks increase migration aspirations more in Lambaye and Darou Mousty, than they will in Orkadiéré or Golf Sud.

**H3**: Access to personal migrant networks are more important for aspirations in areas where a culture of migration is less established.

Finally, I build on the distinction between aspiration and ability from chapter 3 and hypothesize that living in a culture of migration is more important for migration aspirations, while personal migrant networks are more important when people have to reflect also on their
ability to migrate. This is an assumption based on both the theory of a culture of migration and migrant network theory. While culture of migrations theory largely emphasizes the spread of ideas of migration to people, migrant network theory to a larger extent focuses on the concrete possibilities of help and support in the migratory process. If this assumption is correct, we are likely to see strong effects of the areas with high prevalence of networks on migration aspirations, and stronger effects of personal networks on the intention question, which also incorporates ability.

**H₄**: Living in a culture of migration is more important for migration aspirations, while personal migrant networks are more important when people have to reflect also on their ability to migrate.

### 6.2 Migrant Networks and Aspirations: A Model

The model developed to study the associations between migrant networks and migration aspirations builds on the “add-a-regressor” approach, which aims at securing a comparison of individuals which are as equal as possible on theoretically relevant variables (Skog 2004). After a discussion of the pros and cons of different measures of aspirations in chapter 4, I decided to measure aspirations to migrate using two dichotomous variables indicating whether the respondent intends to move to Europe within a five year period and whether the respondent would move to Europe if provided the necessary papers. These are my two dependent variables. The degree of involvement in migrant networks is one central independent variable, measured using a variable with four categories, indicating whether the respondent has no migrant network, knows only current migrant(s), knows only returned migrant(s), or knows both returned and current migrants. Accordingly, I use three dummy variables in my models, leaving the fourth category, no migrant networks as point of reference. I also include variables for each of the four areas; Darou Mousty, Lambaye, Golf Sud and Orkadiéré. In chapter 5, I showed that Lambaye was the area amongst the four with the lowest degree of migrant networks, and also with the lowest levels of returned migrants among the respondents. Arguably, this is the area where a culture of migration is least prevalent, and it has therefore been chosen as a reference category. Emigration environment or area is the second independent variable employed in the model.

From the literature on migration aspirations, we know that there are certain factors that are common determinants of migration aspirations. These are included in the design as control
variables, held constant to see if there are associations between migrant networks and aspirations regardless of these factors. My model adapts the literature on migration decision-making to the Senegalese context, and I account for these as best as I can with the data that is available to me, by including them in the analysis as control variables.

6.2.1 Control Variables

Gender, Age, Marital Status and Children

Gender is one of the variables known to distinguish those who wish to migrate from those who do not. In Senegal, males have often taken the lead in migration, and culturally conservative gender roles imply that it is generally less accepted for women to choose to migrate alone (Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl 2005: 770). In this study, I assume that women will be more reticent about expressing intentions to emigrate, even when provided the relevant paperwork needed to migrate. Gender is included as a control variable where the reference category is males.

Young people are known to migrate more often than older people, and youth are also known in the literature to be most likely to want to migrate (Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl 2005: 760). Young people are generally less bound by family commitments and are often singled out as the candidates most suitable for migration in families. Because age is assumed to affect expressed migration aspirations, it is included in the model, measured as a continuous variable running from 18 to 39. Because the EUMAGINE project was primarily concerned with the aspirations of young adults, people over 39 were not interviewed. A few respondents have reported to be either younger than 18 or over 39, and these have been set as “missing”. To control for a curvilinear effect of age, the variable age squared has been computed. As it did not prove significant, it was removed from the final analyses.

Both being married and having children are generally thought to affect a person’s wish to migrate negatively, a phenomenon referred to in the literature as the “affinity-hypothesis” (Haug 2008). The affinity hypothesis predicts that people who have primary care responsibilities or have strong ties in their home communities are less likely to migrate, mainly because they are less mobile. Rather than migrate, these individuals may encourage others in the family to take responsibility for providing for the family economically, through migration. In the analyses that follow, living with ones own children in the household, is included as a control variable. I have also included the control variable “ever been married”. Although the two often appear simultaneously and there may be a problem of colinearity, this
is not considered to be a large problem, given that the variables only serve as controls. It is more important that they are both included than that they necessarily turn out to be significant. The *ever married* variable refers to people who have ever been married, and includes divorced and widowed individuals.

**Educational Attainment**

The literature shows that those with little or no education and the very highly educated are more likely to want to migrate than those with mid-level educations. This finding is strong in Carling’s study of Cape Verdean migrants, and also in the previous study on migration aspirations in Senegal conducted by Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl (2005). The EUMAGINE survey included questions on the number of years respondents had gone to school and separate codes were used if the respondent had only attended Quran schools. However, years spent in Quran school were by some interviewers added to regular education in addition to being coded separately. This means that respondents who have attended both regular schooling and Quran school may have a higher score on the education variable. To limit the impact of this, I have decided to compute a variable for years of schooling and recoded only Quran school as having one year of schooling. Because previous literature indicates that the effect of education is not necessarily linear, the variable schooling squared has also been computed and included.

**Employment and Economy**

A person’s labor market situation and whether or not he is in a state to provide economically for himself and his family, are important factors that may affect migration aspirations. EUMAGINE data allows us to control for this using information on a person’s “principal activity”. Work sector is in the EUMAGINE data measured as a variable with a large range of different categories, which proved difficult to re-categorize meaningfully. The data does not allow for construction of any type of class-variables. Based on the data available, and following De Haas and Fokkema (2011)’s operationalization of employment, I created four categories of work: employed, in school/student, not economically active and unemployed, with employed as reference category. Unemployment is here a self-reported status which may differ from official definitions. Unfortunately, there is no measurement of underemployment in the data, which is the factor most likely to influence migration aspirations in Senegal, according to the literature.
Economic factors are likely to affect both aspiration and ability to go abroad. On the one hand, people who are well off can afford the costs of migration, but having a secure basis of wealth or income might also be a good reason to stay in Senegal (Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl 2005: 761). It may be the case that people do not want to migrate because they know they can’t afford the costs of visa and transportation, but it is also the poorest that have the most to gain from the potential economical opportunities that lie in migration. As was argued in the literature review, the same factors that affect migration ability negatively, might affect aspirations positively (Carling 2002), and it is therefore important that we hold income level stable when examining network effects. There is no income data in the EUMAGINE survey, but using principle component analysis, the EUMAGINE team has constructed a wealth index, which is calculated based on the household’s access to electricity, flush toilet, running hot water, shower, radio, television, satellite dish and receiver, video or DVD player, telephone (landline or mobile), computer, internet connection, refrigerator, gas or electric stove, dishwasher, washing machine, bicycle, moped or motorcycle, and car, truck or van.\footnote{Confirmed by Papa Demba Fall (Personal communication, December 2012).} This way of measuring wealth is common in household surveys in low-income countries. The underlying assumption of this method is that there is a latent, unobservable household wealth variable that manifests itself through ownership of the different assets. A computed wealth index is generally viewed as the most reliable measurement of economic standing in developing countries, as income is subject to high variations in areas like Senegal, and barter is prominent (De Haas and Jolivet 2012). A wealth index also gives a long-term measurement of the financial situation within a household. An thorough explanation of the EUMAGINE wealth index construction can be found in De Haas and Jolivet (2012: 17-19), and the procedure they follow in Moser and Felton (2007). The wealth index has been weighted by area, which gives a more intuitive measurement, and I have broken down the index into deciles. The wealth variable which is included in both regression models is therefore a measurement indicating economic standing in ones local community, relative to others, and it is continuous variable which goes from 1-10. The variable \textit{wealth squared} did not prove significant in any models, and was therefore excluded from the final analyses.
Religion and Ethnicity

As shown in chapter 2, Senegal is an ethnically diverse nation. People who want to migrate can seek out information and advice in their personal social networks, amongst families and friends, but they can also receive such knowledge from their religious networks, or local religious leaders. This especially holds for members of the Mouride Brotherhood, which is a widespread transnational network of Senegalese engaged in cross-border trade (Glover 2007). The Mouride Brotherhood is known to have facilitated migration for many Senegalese. As there is not sufficient data on the respondent’s participation in transnational religious networks in the EUMAGINE data, I have decided not to include such membership as an independent variable, or as a way of measuring access migrant network participation. However, I have included Mouride membership as a dummy variable and control, and will pay extra close attention to this factor in the regression analyses.

Personal History of International Migration

Kandel and Massey (2002) argue that people who have already experienced international migration have a distinctly different way of relating to migration decision-making than their peers without such experience. Their aspirations to migrate will be formed more by their own experiences than those related to them by others in their networks. The prevalence of migrant networks is probably also large among this group. I have therefore chosen to control for international personal history of international migration, using a dummy variable.

6.3 On Logistic Regression Analysis

The fact that the dependent variables analyzed in this study are dichotomous means that several of the assumptions of linear regression are not met. The most common statistical approach when analyzing data with a dichotomous dependent variable is to use a logistic regression model and this is also the approach chosen in this study. The reason why logistic regression analysis is preferable to regular regression analysis in these types of cases, is that the linearity assumption of linear regression analysis is not met. Said simply, we cannot assume that the relationship between the independent and dependent variable can be represented as a straight line (Skog 2004: 353). Because it is impossible for the dependent variable to attain values lower than zero or higher than one, the logistic regression curve is S-shaped. However, it can be linear-transformed by logit-transliteration, which implies estimating the probability of an event happening as opposed to it not happening, so-called
odds estimation. Estimated odds are again logarithmically transformed, meaning that we are dealing with relative rather than absolute differences. The logit-transliteration allows the dependent variable to take any value, and therefore a sense of linearity is restored (Skog 2004). The logit is expressed in the following equation:

$$\text{Logit}(\hat{Y}) = \ln\left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \ldots + \beta_k X_k + \epsilon$$

where $\beta_0$ is an expression of the logit-value for those who have the value 0 for all variables in the model and $\beta_1$ denotes the expressed logit increase for every unit increase in $X_1$. $\epsilon$ is the error term, which is an expression of all the unobservable factors, which are not included in the model. A logit model is estimated using a maximum likelihood estimator (MLE), rather than an ordinary least sum of squares estimator (OLS), which is the estimator used in linear regression. Because the logit parameter is estimated based on logarithmically transformed odds, taking the antilogarithm of the logit gives us the odds ratio. It is the odds ratios which are expressed in the following models, as these are the most intuitive expressions of this kind of statistical model.

Although it is the most common approach to a dichotomous dependent variable, the extensive usage of logistic models in sociology, has been extensively criticized in recent years, culminating in a famous article by Carina Mood (2010). Mood claims that odds ratios cannot be straightforwardly interpreted as effect measures, because these coefficients also incorporate the degree of unobserved heterogeneity which exists in the model. Therefore, she argues, odds ratios are not comparable for similar models across groups, samples or time points. While aware of Mood’s critique, I have chosen to conduct logistic regression models, but have also followed Mood’s recommendation and conducted separate linear regression models. This analysis produced largely the same results.

### 6.4 Significance Testing

It is common in statistical analysis to report test statistics for each individual parameter in the model. The test statistics are what enables me to say that the associations I find are valid not only for the persons who have answered the EUMAGINE survey, but for all people between 18-39, in the particular Senegalese area where the sample was drawn (Skog 2004). I report z-test statistics based on the wald test, which are estimated by STATA based on the following formula:
In the logistic regression models, significance levels are indicated with stars for various levels of significance. The significance stars in the tables denote 5 percent, 1 percent and 0.1 percent significance levels. The models also include standard errors, which have been corrected for clustering and stratification, seeing as I use STATA svy-commands.

I have chosen not to add tests for goodness of fit to the models presented here, as ordinary likelihood-ratio-tests are not applicable when using weighted survey data (Archer and Lemeshow 2009). The inclusion of an appropriate test for survey data, such as the F-adjusted mean residual test, is not deemed necessary as there is good reason to believe that the theoretical basis that grounds that the model used is the preferred one. The variables that have been included in the model are entered based on previous research and theory, and the model has been checked for consistency by entering several other control variables. This does not alter the overall findings of the study. As it is not an explicit aim to compare the fit of the various models, such tests have been deemed superfluous.

6.5 Limitations of the Research Design

The research design employed in this thesis has its strength in it being theoretically grounded, and built on similar analyses conducted by others (Kandel and Massey 2002, Van Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl 2005). The design enables me to test the four hypotheses laid out in the previous subchapter. However, there are certain limitations, and in this subsection, I will briefly discuss two of them. Possible pitfalls concerning operationalization of the variables and issues of representativity due to filtering have already been discussed elsewhere.

The first limitation regards causality. It is important to state that the research design presented in this chapter is not one that proves causality, and one cannot based on these findings say that knowing a current or returned migrant is what causes a persons to have higher migration aspirations. Neither is this the ambition of the study to prove causality, but rather to investigate possible associations between the two, and to discuss some of the links between them. Should one aim at providing a causal explanation, an entirely different type of data would have to be utilized. Such an interpretation clearly lies beyond what is attempted here.
7 Results

This study examines the associations between migrant networks and migration aspirations, and asks whether people who know migrants abroad or who have returned migrants in their social networks are more likely to want to move to Europe. In order to systematically identify associations between migrant networks and migration aspirations, I first present cross-tabulations between the main variables, and then conduct two logistic regression analyses, one for each dependent variable. In the logistic regressions, I control for other known determinants of migration aspirations. In this chapter, I present results to answer the research questions proposed in this study. The research questions are:

1) Is knowing current or returned migrants associated with migration aspirations?
2) Are people who live in areas where migrant networks are common, more likely to want to move to Europe?
3) Are personal migrant networks more important in areas where few have such networks?
4) Do migrant networks play a different role for migration aspirations if people need to reflect also on their ability to migrate?
7.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 7.1: Descriptive Statistics of the Variables, by Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration aspirations (dependent variables)</th>
<th>Darou</th>
<th>Mousty</th>
<th>Lambaye</th>
<th>Golf Sud</th>
<th>Orkadiéré</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would leave for Europe if given the necessary papers (percent)</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to go to Europe to live or work (percent)</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will try to go to preferred country in Europe within next five years (percent)</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has taken steps towards migration to Europe (percent)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration networks (independent variable)</th>
<th>Darou</th>
<th>Mousty</th>
<th>Lambaye</th>
<th>Golf Sud</th>
<th>Orkadiéré</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No migrant network (percent)</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows returned migrant(s) (percent)</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows current migrant(s) (percent)</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows both return and current migrants (percent)</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinants of migration aspirations (control)</th>
<th>Darou</th>
<th>Mousty</th>
<th>Lambaye</th>
<th>Golf Sud</th>
<th>Orkadiéré</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male (percent)</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (18-39) (mean)</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married (percent)</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in household</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling (mean)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/ in school</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework/ Inactivity</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Mouride Brotherhood</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has personal history of international migration</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N                                            | 442   | 430    | 402     | 424      | 1698       |

Source: EUMAGINE survey data, version 20121001. Weighted results.

Note: Respondents whose preferred destination country is non-European have been removed from the data set.
Table 7.1 presents descriptive statistics for all variables included in the logistic regression models, with one column for each area and one column for all areas combined. The table is included both because it gives an overall picture of all the variables, and because it shows how respondents are distributed on the key variables, after those who preferred non-European destinations have been filtered out of the sample. When compared to the tables presented in previous chapters, table 7.1 confirms that filtering the sample does not create systematic bias on the observed variables. It is important to note that the descriptive statistics presented in table 7.1 presents distributions only within the sample. The table will not be commented on extensively here, but the results from it will be incorporated into the analyses that follow.

7.2 Linking Migrant Networks and Migration Aspiration

Table 7.2 presents the percentages of respondents answering “yes” to the four measures of migration aspiration, classified by their degree of involvement in migrant networks. The table combines the results from all areas. Table 7.2 indicates that respondents with migrant networks seem to more likely to desire to migrate, for most measures of aspiration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to migrant networks</th>
<th>No migrant network</th>
<th>Knows returned migrant(s)</th>
<th>Knows current migrant(s)</th>
<th>Knows both return and current migrant(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would move to Europe if provided necessary papers</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants to move to Europe</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intends to move to Europe within the next five years</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has taken steps towards moving to Europe</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 630 285 406 377

Source: EUMAGINE survey data, version 20121001. Weighted results
Note: Respondents whose preferred destination country is non-European have been removed from the data set

17 The wealth variable is not included in table 7.1, as it was weighted by area.
18 See comment on how and why the sample has been filtered in chapter 4.3.2.
19 Although it was decided in the previous chapter to conduct regression analyses only on two measures, all four indicators of migration aspiration have been included in tables 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3.
Beginning with the measure of whether one has taken steps towards moving to Europe, in the last row in table 7.2, we see that the percentage of respondents who say that they have taken such steps, rises across the four categories of involvement. Among those who know both returned and current migrants, 11 percent have taken steps to migrate, as opposed to only 4 percent of those without such networks. Knowing only current migrants seems to be more important than knowing only returned migrants for whether a person has taken steps to migrate to Europe. As was discussed in chapter 6, it is difficult to say whether having taken steps towards migration is a measure of aspiration or ability, and arguably, it blurs the distinction between the two.

For the other three measures of migration aspiration, the pattern we observe in table 7.2 is not a steady increase across the four categories of networks. While it seems that respondents who know returned and current migrants are more likely to want to move to Europe than those without any networks, there are variations as to whether knowing only current migrants or only returned migrants seems to be the most important. The prevalence of aspirations is slightly higher amongst those who know returned migrants than current migrants on the questions of whether the respondent wishes to move to Europe, and whether the respondent would move there if provided the necessary papers. Somewhat surprisingly, the percentage of respondents who want to go to Europe seems to be somewhat lower amongst those who have current migrants in their networks than amongst those who have no migrant network, but the differences here are small. On the question of migration intention, the prevalence is slightly higher amongst those who know current migrants than those who know returned migrants. While remembering that these are only cross-tabulations, table 7.2 may be an indication that knowing returned migrants are more important for person’s aspiration, while knowing current migrants is more important for a person’s ability to migrate, seeing as both intentions and steps seem to be more prevalent amongst those who know current migrants. It remains to be seen whether this holds when also controlling for other variables affecting migration aspiration and ability.

Summarized, table 7.2 indicates that respondents with both current and returned migrants in their networks may be more likely to aspire to migrate than respondents without such networks. Whether knowing only current migrants or knowing only returned migrants is the most important, seems to depend on the way the question of aspiration is posed to the respondent. In the logistic regression analyses, these questions will be explored in more detail, and we will also control for known determinants of migration aspirations, to see if the
associations found here, might be caused by other factors, such as the selection into having networks. The logistic regression analysis will also allow us to see whether the results from the sample hold for the entire population.

In table 7.3, I present the degree of migration aspirations by area, and have also listed the frequencies of return- and current migrant networks among the respondents in these areas. The reader should note that these measures of network prevalence are not the same as those used in table 7.2 and in the logistic regression models, but indicates whether respondents have said that they know current or returned migrants. Respondents can fall into both categories, which are included to indicate the levels of migrant networks in the four areas. It is important to bear in mind that the areas vary by a large number of factors other than their emigration history, and that differences observed between the four areas may be caused other factors. Table 7.3 merely indicates a possible pattern in the drawn sample.

Table 7.3: Migration Aspirations by Emigration Environment, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emigration environment</th>
<th>Darou Moustic</th>
<th>Lambaye</th>
<th>Golf Sud</th>
<th>Orkadiéré</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows current migrants</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows returned migrants</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would move to Europe if provided necessary papers</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants to move to Europe</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intends to move to Europe within the next five years</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has taken steps towards moving to Europe</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EUMAGINE survey data, version 20121001. Weighted results
Note: Respondents whose preferred destination country is non-European have been removed from the data set

Table 7.3 indicates that respondents in Orkadiéré have the highest levels of migration experience amongst these four communities, where 59 percent know current migrants and 75 percent have returned migrants in their family or amongst their relatives. Respondents in Darou Moustic and Lambaye have the lowest levels of migration experience, and Golf Sud respondents relatively moderate levels. What distinguishes Golf Sud from Lambaye and Darou Moustic seems to be the somewhat higher prevalence of current migrant ties amongst
the respondents. While approximately 30 percent of the respondents in all these three areas have ties to returned migrants, 56 percent of the Golf Sud respondents know current migrants, as opposed to approximately 40 percent in Lambaye and Darou Mousty.

If we focus on Lambaye, the area with the lowest prevalence of out-migration out of the four areas, we observe that while aspirations levels there are generally very high, the levels of intentions and steps taken are the lowest among all areas. If we can speak of degrees of involuntary immobility, one could argue that Lambaye is especially struck by this phenomenon, as the discrepancy between aspiration and ability seems to be high. It is especially the discrepancy in percentages between the question of whether respondents would move if provided necessary papers and the question of whether they intend to move or have taken steps that indicates that levels of involuntary immobility are especially high in Lambaye.

The fact that 18 percent of the respondents in Golf Sud have taken steps towards migration could point to levels of migration ability there to be quite high, but this indicator should be interpreted with caution. It is not surprising that we higher percentages of steps taken towards migration for among respondents in Golf Sud, as the possibilities of applying for a visa or a study abroad program is arguably higher in the capital than in the other areas. People in Golf Sud have easier access to universities, government offices, embassies, migration offices and the internet, and table 7.1 showed that Golf Sud also seems to differ from the other areas on a number variables. Fewer in Golf Sud are married and live with their children, and while the average years of schooling in the other areas is around 1.5, the average in Golf Sud is 9.5. We see from table 7.1 that while around 40 percent of the respondents in Darou Mousty and Golf Sud state that they are employed, only around 20 percent of the respondents in Lambaye and Orkadiéré say the same. The demographic composition in capital cities is often different from that found in smaller communities, be they rural or urban, so these findings are not surprising in themselves. The more thorough comparison which is to follow in the logistic regression models – between respondents who would move to Europe if provided the necessary papers and those who intend to move to Europe – may incorporate more of the differences between aspiration and ability that is indicated here for Golf Sud.

Table 7.3 shows that migration aspirations are high in all four areas, and that these levels to some extent vary with prevalence of migration experience from them. Overall, respondents in Orkadiéré and Golf Sud have the highest levels of both aspirations and migrant networks, while the levels in Darou Mousty and Lambaye are lower. The differences between
the areas are however not striking, and looking for example at the question of whether respondents want to migrate, levels are higher in Lambaye (72 percent) than in both Darou Mousty (59 percent) and Golf Sud (68 percent). Based only on this table, we cannot say that differences observed here, are statistically significant.

7.3 Logistic Regression A: Investigating Aspirations

In this section, I present the results from the logistic regression models on migration aspirations. In this section, an aspiration to move to Europe is measured using the question of whether the respondent would move to Europe if provided necessary papers. As discussed in previous chapters, this is a measure of aspiration which provides the respondent with an ability to migrate.

In table 7.4, I fit three binary logit models. Model one includes the independent variables denoting access to migrant networks, and controls for several known determinants of migration aspirations. Model two includes the four emigration environments; Darou Mousty, Lambaye, Golf Sud, Orkadiéré. Model three includes interactions between areas and migrant networks. Lambaye, which based on the descriptive statistics is assumed to be the area with the lowest level of migrant network prevalence, has been chosen as reference category in all models. I will comment on the control variables towards the end of the section.

---

Chi-squared tests could be entered here and in the other cross-tabulations to test whether the differences observed in the data are significant. These have not been included as the answers to the question of population representativity will be addressed when the same variables are entered into the logistic regression models.
Table 7.4. Results from Logistic Regression A: Aspiration (Odds Ratio)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b/se</td>
<td>b/se</td>
<td>b/se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No migrant network</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows returned migrant(s)</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>** 1.653</td>
<td>4.373 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.399)</td>
<td>(0.397)</td>
<td>(1.489)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows current migrant(s)</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>1.302</td>
<td>1.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.359)</td>
<td>(0.339)</td>
<td>(0.844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows both return and current migrants</td>
<td>2.372 ***</td>
<td>2.272 ***</td>
<td>3.602 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.540)</td>
<td>(0.554)</td>
<td>(2.766)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other determinants of migration aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>1.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.217)</td>
<td>(0.238)</td>
<td>(0.241)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.971 **</td>
<td>0.971 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>1.879 ***</td>
<td>1.701 ***</td>
<td>1.733 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.334)</td>
<td>(0.277)</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children living in household</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.150)</td>
<td>(0.155)</td>
<td>(0.153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling</td>
<td>1.150 **</td>
<td>1.099 *</td>
<td>1.091 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling squared</td>
<td>0.989 ***</td>
<td>0.990 ***</td>
<td>0.990 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (employed ref)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/ in school</td>
<td>2.225 ***</td>
<td>2.299 ***</td>
<td>2.278 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.656)</td>
<td>(0.673)</td>
<td>(0.665)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not economically active</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>1.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.330)</td>
<td>(0.337)</td>
<td>(0.324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.249)</td>
<td>(0.221)</td>
<td>(0.229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth index (deciles)</td>
<td>0.929 **</td>
<td>0.936 **</td>
<td>0.936 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Mouride brotherhood</td>
<td>0.668 **</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td>(0.177)</td>
<td>(0.174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has personal history of international migration</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>1.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.486)</td>
<td>(0.490)</td>
<td>(0.492)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (Lambaye ref)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darou Mousty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.195)</td>
<td>(0.314)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Sud</td>
<td>1.757</td>
<td>2.314 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.619)</td>
<td>(0.951)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkadiéré</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>2.795 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.520)</td>
<td>(1.604)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page.
Darou Mousty x Migrant networks (no migrant network ref)
Darou Mousty x Knows returned migrant(s) 0.312 **
(0.171)
Darou Mousty x Knows current migrant(s) 0.859
(0.591)
Darou Mousty x Knows both return and current migrants 0.779
(0.624)

Golf Sud x Migrant networks (no migrant network ref)
Golf Sud x Knows returned migrant(s) 0.470
(0.349)
Golf Sud x Knows current migrant(s) 0.882
(0.689)
Golf Sud x Knows both return and current migrants 0.351
(0.313)

Orkadière x Migrant networks (no migrant network ref)
Orkadieré x Knows returned migrant(s) 0.141 ***
(0.084)
Orkadieré x Knows current migrant(s) 0.863
(0.856)
Orkadieré x Knows both return and current migrants 0.342
(0.291)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.197</td>
<td>5.150</td>
<td>4.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.161)</td>
<td>(2.001)</td>
<td>(1.951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.10. **p<0.05. ***p<0.01. two-tailed tests.
Standard errors are given in brackets. ref. denotes reference category.
Source: EUMAGINE survey data. version 20121001. Weighted results.
Note: Respondents whose preferred destination country is non-European have been removed from the data set

7.3.1 Migrant Network Variables

In chapter 6, I proposed four hypotheses regarding the connections between migrant networks and migration aspirations. My first hypothesis was that people with migrant networks would be more inclined to want to move to Europe. Looking only at the network coefficients in table 7.4, we see that all coefficients measuring networks are positive, and those indicating whether one knows only a returned migrant or both a returned migrant and a current migrant, are positive and significant. This confirms the findings from the descriptive statistics, and shows that having access to migrant networks is important for aspirations even when controlling for other known determinants. Holding other determinants of migration aspirations constant, people who know both current and returned migrants are twice as likely to report that they would move to Europe if provided necessary papers, compared to respondents who do not have any migrant networks. The coefficient only decreases slightly when one controls for area, indicating that this is a finding which is not caused by area-differences. Table 7.4 shows that people who know both current and returned migrants, have distinctly greater chances of wanting to go to Europe than those without any such networks. This is also the case for those
who only know returned migrants. People who know only returned migrants have 1.6 times as high odds of wanting to move to Europe as respondents without such networks, controlled for known determinants of migration aspirations, and for area. The effect is statistically significant, and is thus representative for the entire population.\textsuperscript{21} People who have returned migrants amongst their family members and friends are more likely to want to go to Europe. This finding is consistent with that of Kandel and Massey (2002) for Mexico, and also with Epstein and Gang (2006), who use Hungarian data. Thus, my first hypothesis is so far confirmed.

There is one possible exception to the pattern described above. The coefficient for knowing only current migrants is, like the other network effects positive, but this finding is not statistically significant. Therefore, we cannot say that people who know only current migrants have higher levels of migration aspirations, than those with no migrant networks. This result is not in line with my hypothesis, and there may be several reasons as to why we do not find the same pattern amongst those who know only current migrants. I will discuss three possible reasons here.

First, people are much more likely to be in frequent contact with returned migrants than with current migrants, and thus they are also more likely to be affected by returned migrants’ ideas and opinions about migration and Europe than those of current migrants. Although respondents were asked to list only current migrants who they had been in contact with within the last twelve months, or whose help they could count on if they needed it, it is obvious that contact between our respondents and their migrant networks in Senegal will be of a much higher frequency than the contact they can possibly have with current migrants. Being in close geographic proximity means that access to information is more easily sustained, and it may be this closeness which leads us to see an effect of knowing returned migrants which is not observed for knowing current migrants.

A second reason for why we do not find the same for people who know current migrants as for those who know returned migrants may be that current migrants have a more updated, and thus less idealized, picture of the situation in Europe. The financial crisis and increased hostility against West-African migrants in Europe implies that the situation for Senegalese migrants in Europe is more difficult now than it has been in recent years, and the reality of this situation is one which may be passed on to friends and family members in

\textsuperscript{21} A discussion of the degree to which these results are representative after filtering the sample, was provided in chapter 6 and will not be repeated here.
Senegal though current migrants. Current migrants arguably also have an incentive not to present a too positive picture of Europe, as the pressure on them to remit and visit will arguably increase if they do. While current migrants may have reasons and incentives to give a negative portrayal of the country they are residing, returned migrants have more incentives to present a positive picture of living abroad. Episodes that lie in the past are always more likely to be idealized, and as the literature review on Senegal showed, the returned migrant holds a strong and positive position in Senegalese culture and community which returned migrants are likely to play into rather than counter. Poetze (2010) argues that returned migrants are less likely to provide others with negative stories as they do not fit with the popular picture of migration in Senegal, but one might be inclined to think that also they hold a negative picture of Europe – assuming that there was a reason for their return. Many of the returned migrants in Senegal bear with them stories of dangerous travels, difficult working conditions, and some of deportation or racism in Europe. Because the coefficient for those who know only current migrants is also positive, it is most likely that the lack of significance we observe is caused by the different intensity in contact, rather than by positive and negative portrayals.

A third possible reason for why we do not observe significant effects between knowing current migrants and aspiring to migrate, may lie in the way the migrant variable is operationalized and measured here. On the returned migrants we only have information about household and extended family members, but on current migrants, respondents have reported both friends and family members. Thus, the lack of significance on the current migrant variable may be caused by the fact that people are not as affected by their friends’ ideas about Europe as they are by family members, and that the lack of significance is a caused by effects that go in opposite directions for family members and friends. As stated in the literature review in chapter 5, migrant networks theory has generally focused on family ties, and not included friends or weak ties, as it is the attitudes and ideas of family members that are thought to be of strongest concern in aspects regarding migration decision-making. Although we do not have strong data indication that the distinction between friends and family members is the reason for the lack of significance we observe, it may be one of many reasons.

A fourth way of interpreting these findings is linked to the fourth hypothesis raised by this thesis, namely that knowing returned migrants may be more important for aspirations, while knowing current migrants is more important when those answering also have to reflect on their ability to migrate. The way an aspiration is measured in the analysis conducted in
table 7.4, is through the question of whether one would go to Europe if provided the necessary papers. Arguably, it is precisely things like necessary papers which current migrants' are called upon to assist with, and it is arguably here that we will see the effect of knowing current migrants, and not necessarily in the question of aspirations. We will see in the next logistic regression analysis conducted, whether this fourth hypothesis is valid for migration decision-making in these four areas of Senegal.

To conclude this section, the first hypothesis presented in chapter 6, namely that migrant networks matter for migration aspirations, seems to be confirmed. Migrant networks are important, but we find that there may be substantial differences regarding whether the people in one’s migrant networks are current or returned migrants, and whether they are family members or friends. So far, we have found that it is people who know returned migrants and people who know returned and current migrants who are more likely to want to migrate.

7.3.2 Area variables

The second hypothesis presented in chapter 6 was that levels of migration aspirations would be higher in areas where such networks were prevalent. I based this hypothesis on the culture of migration theory, which implies that in areas where prevalence of out-migration is high, aspiration levels will rise accordingly, as ideas of migration as a valuable life project are diffused throughout the community. The culture of migration theory and migrant networks theory are linked, but they differ on one important point. Cultures of migration are the prevalence of migrant networks in ones local community, while migrant networks are personal and related to individuals knowing other individuals personally. Cross-tabulations of areas and migration aspirations in table 7.3 yielded some support to the culture of migration theory and my second hypothesis, but table 7.3 gives us further indication of whether this is also a valid finding when we control for other determinants of migration aspirations.

The four areas surveyed by EUMAGINE were selected because the team wanted to have different emigration environments to compare, and the degree to which they differ in regards the prevalence of migrant networks and histories of migration was discussed in chapter 5. The descriptive statistics in table 7.1 indicated that there seems to be a relatively low prevalence of migrant networks in Lambaye and a relatively high prevalence of such networks in Orkadiéré. This was also the pattern found when measuring the prevalence of respondents who themselves have a personal history of international migration, presented in
chapter 5. 2.5 percent of the respondents in Lambaye have personal history of international migration, while over 10 percent of the respondents in Orkadiéré report of having lived abroad for a period of time\textsuperscript{22}. According to Kandel and Massey’s (2002) definition of a culture of migration, this places Orkadiéré in the high prevalence category, and Lambaye in the low-prevalance, as was also discussed in chapter 5. So far we have only looked at this descriptively. The observed differences may therefore be caused by coincidence in respondent’s answers, a factor which will be tested in the logistic regression analysis.

In table 7.4, the areas are included only in model two and three. The area-coefficients for both Golf Sud and Orkadiéré are positive and significant, which means that people living in Golf Sud or Orkadiéré, have significantly higher levels of migration aspirations than people living in Lambaye, which is the reference category, controlled for other determinants of migration aspirations. These indications from the descriptive statistics are thus confirmed, and are not only valid for the respondents, but for the population at large. People from Orkadiéré are almost three times as likely to aspire to migrate, compared to respondents from Lambaye. People from Golf Sud are over twice as likely, both controlled for other relevant determinants of migration aspirations. The coefficient for Darou Mousty is negative, but not statistically significant, so we can not say that there is a significant difference between people living in Lambaye and people living in Darou Mousty as regards their levels of migration aspirations. Based on this findings, it is clear that there are differences in the levels of migration aspirations between the areas, and according to Kandel and Massey’s (2002) understanding of the term, this yields support of the culture of migration theory. Areas where prevalence of networks are high are also the areas where migration aspirations are high.

It is important to remember that while these results give reason to believe that there is a stronger, and more established culture of migration in Orkadiéré and Golf Sud than we find in Lambaye, the areas also differ on a number of other factors, on which EUMAGINE has not collected data. The lack of other data on these areas means that we have to interpret the results with caution, and be open for the possibility that there may be other area-specific factors that are causing the observed differences, which have not been possible to control for given the existing data structure and the lack of specific population data on the four areas. These un-observed factors may be causing both high aspiration level, and be what lead many to migrate in the past, which drives the prevalence of migrant networks up. With this reservation in

\textsuperscript{22} Whether or not the areas differ could also be found by performing a chi-test. Such tests have been performed, but are not reported here because the results from the logistic regression models provide the same information.
mind, and knowing that we have controlled for important determinants of migration aspirations in the model, I chose to conclude that the findings we see in table 7.4 are a confirmation of the second hypothesis, and an indication that people who are living in areas with high prevalence of migrant networks, are more likely to aspire to migrate.

The third hypothesis I presented in chapter 6 was that access to personal migrant networks would be less important for aspirations in areas where migrant networks are prevalent in the community, i.e. where a culture of migration is more strongly established. To test this assumption empirically, model three in table 7.4 provides interaction terms between the areas and the migrant network variables. When interpreting the coefficients in model three, it is important to keep in mind that adding interaction terms to a model changes the interpretation of all coefficients included in the interaction. Thus, network coefficients in model three indicate the odds for the reference category, which in this case is people from Lambaye. For example, the coefficient for knowing a returned migrant changes substantially from model two to model three, because in model two it indicated the effect of knowing returned migrants when all other factors were held constant, while in model three, the coefficient for knowing returned migrants only denotes the effect for respondents in Lambaye.

We see in model three in table 7.4, that there are two significant interaction terms, between returned migrants and living in Darou Mousty, and between returned migrants and living in Orkadiéré. Both are negative. The interaction coefficient between knowing a returned migrant and living in Orkadiéré shows the added effect of such networks for people in Orkadiéré, compared to residents living in Lambaye. It proves that there is significant difference between living in Orkadiéré or Darou Mousty and living in Lambaye for the degree to which migrant networks influence migration aspirations. Said simply, knowing returned migrant networks is less important for migration aspirations in Orkadiéré and Darou Mousty than in Lambaye, the area where a culture of migration is the least prevalent. It is important to keep in mind that since the aspiration levels were already substantially higher in Orkadiéré than in Lambaye, people with such networks in Lambaye do not necessarily have higher levels of migration aspirations than people in Orkadiéré without such networks. Rather, what these interaction terms indicate is that having migrant networks is more important for aspirations in Lambaye than it is in Orkadiéré and Golf Sud. This is seems to confirm also the third hypothesis, at least for people who know returned migrants. Knowing returned migrants is more important for aspirations in Lambaye than it is in Golf Sud or Orkadiéré, where such
networks are prevalent. According to the culture of migration theory, this might be because the idea of migration being a positive life project or an established strategy for upward social mobility, is already established in Orkadiéré and Golf Sud, while in Lambaye this is an idea that is more profound amongst those who themselves know people who have migrated and returned. While stories of migration will arguably be more common to hear in communities where many have migration experience, information about the possibilities of migration may be more restricted to the few who have networks, in places like Lambaye. An important thing to remember when considering the differences between these areas, is that we are referring here to degrees of a culture of migration, and the way of measuring the existence of such a culture is by a relative measurement between the areas. If compared to other areas in Senegal than the ones included here, Lambaye may have high prevalence of networks, and the analysis and findings would have to be interpreted accordingly. As pointed out in the literature review on Senegal in chapter 2, aspects of a culture of migration have been found by qualitative researchers in most areas of Senegal, and thus we may here be speaking only of varying degrees of the same phenomenon.

Based on the results from the logistic regression models in table 7.4, we can say that there are significant differences between the degree to which returned migrant networks are important in Lambaye and Orkadiéré and Lambaye and Darou Mousty. However, we do not know based on table 7.4 alone, whether there are differences between Orkadiéré and Darou Mousty or between Golf Sud and the other areas. Changing reference groups does not yield any other significant results, and thus it is only the difference between Lambaye and these other areas which can be said to be documented in this thesis. Returned migrant networks seem to be significantly more important in the one area where such networks are less prevalent, and perhaps in the one area where a culture of migration is the least present, namely in Lambaye. The fact that there are significant interaction terms with returned migrant networks means that we can say that the degree to which knowing migrants who have returned to Senegal is important for levels of migration aspirations, is something that varies with area. Because there are no significant interaction terms between Lambaye and the other measures of networks, we cannot say that there are significant differences between the areas in these regards.

To conclude this section and the discussion of the independent variables presented in chapter 7.4, we see that migrant networks do play a role in whether or not people want to move abroad. All the coefficients reporting migrant networks are positive, and the coefficients
for knowing both returned migrants and return and current migrants are positive and
significant. How much networks matter, depend on the specific emigration environment one
is currently living in, indicated by the negative and significant interaction terms. Thus, the
first, second and third hypothesis are confirmed, which the exception of people who know
only current migrants. The aspects of migrant networks that seem to be important for
migration aspirations for people between 18-39 in these specific areas of Senegal, is whether
one knows either returned migrants or both return and current migrants.

7.3.3 Control Variables

In addition to the variables on migrant networks and areas, several other determinants of
migration aspirations are included in table 7.4. Although included mainly as control variables,
a brief discussion of these can inform the picture of what the factors are that shape and
influence migration aspirations in Darou Mousty, Lambaye, Golf Sud and Orkadiéré. A
presentation of the control variables is also a contribution to the limited scholarly work done
on determinants of migration aspirations, some of which were presented in chapter 4 and 5.

When presenting the control variables in chapter 6, I made some assumptions as to
how these could be thought to affect the model, and the levels of migration aspirations in the
areas surveyed. Previous research on the topic has found that the most important determinants
of migration aspirations seem to be age, gender, marital status and employment situation: it is
the young, single, unemployed men who are the most likely to want to migrate, according to
previous research.

According to the results presented in table 7.4, some of the same important
determinants of migration aspirations are found in these four areas of Senegal. Table 7.4
indicates that the most important determinants of migration aspirations, in addition to migrant
networks and areas, are marital status and being a student; both substantially increase one’s
chance of aspiring to migrate, a finding which is in line with those of Carling (2001) and Van
Dalen, Groenewold, and Schoorl (2005). Students are over twice as likely to want to migrate
as those who are currently employed, controlled for other determinants of migration
aspirations, and having never been married influences aspirations almost as substantially.
None of these coefficients change when the areas are included in model two. These are not
surprising findings, as both students and those who are not married are less bound to Senegal
when they decide on what they want for their future, and fewer of the restrictions that may
apply to migration aspirations, arguably apply to them.
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Age is highly correlated both with being a student and with having never been married, and this may be one of the reasons why the age coefficient does not become significant before controlling for area in model 2. The coefficient for age is negative and lies close to one, indicating that aspirations are only slightly more common amongst young people than older. This is not as surprising if we take into account that EUMAGINE only included people between 18 and 39 years, which is the age range where most of those who migrate chose to do so. We can assume that other studies have found a larger effect of being young on migration aspirations than can be observed in table 7.4, because their age range is broader. Each added year of schooling yields a significant increase in migration aspiration. The fact that the coefficient for schooling squared is also significant indicates that the effect is not the same for all levels of education, which is also in line with existing literature.

The wealth index is a measurement of wealth which has been weighted by area. When we observe that the wealth coefficient is negative and significant, this shows that the higher one’s relative level of wealth, the lower one’s aspirations to migrate, controlled for the other determinants of migration aspirations included in the model.

The one determinant of migration aspirations which is not common to include in the literature, but which has been added because of its assumed importance in the Senegalese case, is that of membership in the Mouride brotherhood. This control was included because the Mourides are known to have strong network ties which are of a transnational nature. Model one in table 7.4 shows that members of the Mouride brotherhood have lower levels of migration aspirations than non-members, but after controlling for area in model two, this effect is no longer significant. The main reason why this effect disappears is probably that what is first observed as an effect of Mouride brotherhood, is explained by the difference between the four areas. The descriptive statistics in table 7.1 show that Mouride brotherhood membership is most common in Darou Mousty and Lambaye. 30 percent of the respondents in Golf Sud say that they belong to this specific Sufi order, while almost none of the respondents in Orkadiéré say the same.

The most surprising finding amongst the control variables is probably that there is no significant difference between the migration aspirations of men and women. Most of the literature finds that men are more likely to aspire to migrate than women, and we also know that Senegalese men migrate in remarkably higher numbers than their female counterparts. Although not directly linked to this result, the descriptive statistics presented in table 7.1, indicated that women may be overrepresented in the EUMAGINE data material. This is
especially a factor in Lambaye, where only 27.8 percent of the interviewed respondents are men. To see if the gender differences are due to sampling issues, the EUMAGINE team, lacking updated population data, compared the share of women among respondents of the individual questionnaire with the data on all eligible household members. They found the percentage of women amongst our respondents not to be very different from the percentage of women in the surveyed households overall and concluded that the observed gender differences were similar on a household level (Ersanilli 2012). Knowing that there are large differences both in the levels of actual migration, and in the ability to migrate, the finding of no such gender differences seems to strengthen the argument for studying aspirations as a phenomenon separate from ability or actual migration.

To conclude this section, we see that some of the factors known from other studies to be important determinants of migration aspirations are also important for the four Senegalese areas. As indicated also by Van Dalen and Henkens (2008), scholars have had difficulties pinpointing exactly what factors lie behind such aspirations, and the ones who do seem to vary from context to context, and perhaps also with the ways aspirations are operationalized. The fact that many of the variables included in the model are have values that are close to 1, may be a reflection of the fact that the percentages of respondents who answer that they would go to Europe if provided the relevant papers, i.e. they have migration aspirations, is remarkably high. It may be that we are faced here with a situation where the reasons for why people would chose not to migrate given the situation presented to them in this, are complex and that they are not as systematic. Because almost everyone, man or women, old or young, say that they would move to Europe if provided the relevant papers, it is difficult to find significant and strong effects of for example gender or other things usually find to be important determinants of migration aspirations. In the next section, we will incorporate the insights from the aspiration/ ability model outlined. While levels of migration aspirations are very high in these four areas of Senegal, we know that their ability to migrate is relatively low. Thus, it will be interesting to see whether the same determinants of migrations aspirations are valid when we discuss migration intentions rather than migration aspirations. That is the topic of the next section.
7.4 Logistic Regression B: Incorporating Ability

The previous section examined the associations between migrant networks and migration aspirations, measuring aspirations through the question of whether the respondents would move to Europe if provided the necessary papers. When posed this question, respondents have been given a possibility of reflecting over their aspirations in a situation where some level of ability, namely the access to necessary papers, is given to them. Asking this type of question is arguably one way of separating migration aspirations and ability; aspiration is what is being asked for while ability, at least parts of it, is provided the respondent in the wording of the question. In this section, I will conduct the same logistic regression analysis, but shift the dependent variable to a different measure of aspiration. Here, I use the question which asks whether respondents will try to go to their preferred destination country within the next five years, a so-called intentions-question. This is the most common way of measuring migration aspirations in the existing literature, and it can be seen as a measure of aspirations which incorporates an aspect of the respondent’s ability to migrate rather than seeing ability as a given. Respondents are arguably less likely to report that they will move to a country in Europe within the next five years if they don’t have both the aspiration and also some degree of perceived ability of doing so. I will refer to the dependent variable here as migration intention, to make the distinction to the previous model clearer.

The results from the second logistic regression analysis can be found in table 7.5, which includes three models. Model 1 includes migrant network variables, and other known determinants of migration aspirations. Model 2 adds the variables denoting the four areas and model 3 includes interaction terms between the variables denoting migrant networks and those denoting the various areas. Like in table 7.4, Lambaye has been chosen as the reference category.
Table 7.5 Results from Logistic Regression B, Intentions (Odds Ratio)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b/se</td>
<td>b/se</td>
<td>b/se</td>
<td>b/se</td>
<td>b/se</td>
<td>b/se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migrant networks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No migrant network</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows returned migrant(s)</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>1.327</td>
<td>(0.209)</td>
<td>(0.226)</td>
<td>(0.437)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows current migrant(s)</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>(0.276)</td>
<td>(0.276)</td>
<td>(0.378)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows both return and current migrants</td>
<td>1.751***</td>
<td>1.715**</td>
<td>4.283***</td>
<td>(0.367)</td>
<td>(0.417)</td>
<td>(1.622) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other determinants of migration aspirations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>(0.175)</td>
<td>(0.180)</td>
<td>(0.184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>(0.191)</td>
<td>(0.199)</td>
<td>(0.203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children living in household</td>
<td>0.656**</td>
<td>0.656**</td>
<td>0.663**</td>
<td>(0.131)</td>
<td>(0.129)</td>
<td>(0.125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.046)</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling squared</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (employed ref)</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/ in school</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>(0.230)</td>
<td>(0.245)</td>
<td>(0.251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not economically active</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>(0.257)</td>
<td>(0.278)</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>(0.146)</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth index (deciles)</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Mouride brotherhood</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>(0.210)</td>
<td>(0.174)</td>
<td>(0.176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has personal history of international migration</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>1.252</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>(0.437)</td>
<td>(0.439)</td>
<td>(0.428)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area (Lambaye ref)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darou Mousty</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Sud</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>(0.219)</td>
<td>(0.383)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkadiéré</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>(0.404)</td>
<td>(0.570)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>(0.407)</td>
<td>(1.103)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Continued on next page
Table 7.5 shows that all migrant network coefficients in model one and two are positive, but that only those who know both current and returned migrants have a significantly higher chance of expressing migration intentions than those without any migrant networks. The effect of knowing only returned migrants, which was strong and significant in the analysis on migration aspirations, does not seem to be valid for migration intentions, and neither does the coefficient for knowing only current migrants. This indicates that the first hypothesis, namely that people with migrant networks are more likely to want to move to Europe, holds when we ask about people’s intentions to migrate. However, we see that it is only those who know both migrants abroad and who have returned to Senegal who have significantly higher chances of intending to migrate, and the hypothesis is not confirmed for those who know either returned migrants or current migrants. There may be a number of reasons for why this is the case, and in line with the aspiration/ability model, some possible explanations can be put forward.

Since an intentions-question arguably places respondents in a situation where they have to reflect both on their aspirations and their ability to migrate, it is not surprising that
those who have migrant networks both in Senegal and abroad have a significantly higher chance of expressing such intentions than persons without migrant networks. In line with migrant networks theory, people with access to both types of networks receive information, input and ideas about Europe, and also know that they have people abroad who can facilitate migration, and help them once they have arrived in the new destination country. The data structure is not complex enough to construct a model which allows for comparison between the two dependent variables analyzed here, and so we cannot say whether the effect of knowing both current and returned migrants is larger here than when people are asked only about their aspirations, but this is one possible interpretation of the results. Why we do not find similar effects of knowing either current migrants or returned migrants is difficult to state precisely, but one reason may be that both these kind of networks are important when an intention of migrating is formed, and that they are important only in combination. Another possible explanation is the sheer size of the migrant networks. People who know both current migrants and returned migrants have access to people with different experiences of migration, and perhaps also more migrants. It may be this that causes the effects we observe in table 7.5.

7.4.2 Area Variables

In the second hypothesis raised in this study, I assumed that we would see higher levels of aspirations in areas where migrant networks are prevalent. This was confirmed in the analysis of aspirations, and discussed in light of the culture of migration theory. We see from the results in table 7.5 however, that the same pattern is not to be found for migration intentions. None of the coefficients for area are significant, meaning that we can not say that there are variations between the levels of migration intentions in Lambaye and any of the other areas, and the second hypothesis is not confirmed for intentions.

In model three, I have included interaction terms between areas and migrant networks, to check if the third hypothesis holds. I assumed that migrant networks would be more important for intentions or aspirations in Lambaye than in Orkadiéré, in accordance with the culture of migration theory. From table 7.5, we see that there are negative and significant interaction terms between all other areas and the coefficient for knowing both current and returned migrants. With Lambaye still being the reference category, this indicates that whether one knows current or returned migrants is slightly more important for aspirations if one is living in Lambaye than in any of the other areas. The third hypothesis is thus
confirmed. Knowing both a return and a current migrant is more important for migration intentions in Lambaye than in the other areas.

The results in in table 7.5 confirm the general pattern reported in the discussion in the previous section. Migrant networks are important for migration aspirations, and more so in areas where a culture of migration is not as strong. What is different in this model however is that it is only those who know both current and returned migrants who have significantly higher chances of migration aspirations than those without such networks. It is also only these kinds of networks that are extra important for the aspirations of people living in Lambaye.

7.4.3 Control Variables

In addition to the coefficients for migrant networks and the interaction terms, there are only two significant coefficients in table 7.5. There is a negative effect of having children living in the household and a negative effect of unemployment.

People who have responsibility for children in their household have a significantly lower chance of stating intentions to migrate than people without children, controlled for other determinants of migration aspirations that have been included in the model. The reason for this is probably that people with responsibility for children see migration as a much less probable undertaking than people who do not have children. This is a result that we do not observe when asking about aspirations, where the effect was also negative, but not significant. As indicated in chapter 6, the fact that both children and never married are included in the models may be a reason why we can not get significant results of both, but one might also assume that while respondents who have small children may aspire to migrate, as most of the respondents do, they do not perceive themselves as having the ability to do so.

Table 7.5 also includes a negative and significant effect of unemployment. People who are currently unemployed have a significantly lower chance of aspiring to migrate than those who are currently in the workforce, contrary to what one would assume to be the case. One would think that people who are currently unemployed are more likely to aspire to move to Europe, as they do not have the same possibilities in Senegal nor do they leave a stable work situation or income if they go abroad. When we observe a negative effect of unemployment, this may be caused by the lack of perceived ability to move, as we do not find similar results when looking solely at person’s migration aspirations.

Generally, we see substantially fewer significant results in the logistic regression analysis of intentions as opposed to when analyzing aspirations. Arguably, one reason for the
lack of significant results may be that the question of intentions blurs the distinction between aspirations and ability, and therefore it is more difficult to determine what aspect of migration decision-making is actually measured.

7.4.4 Migrant Networks and the Migration Decision-making Process

The fourth and last hypothesis presented in chapter 6 was that we would assume to see that cultures of migration were more important in the question of migration aspirations, while personal networks, were believed to be the most important for an intention to migrate. The basis for this hypothesis was that while the review of the literature proved that migrant networks have shown to be important in facilitating migration ability, the culture of migration theory has emphasized the spread of ideas in a community, and the affect on such ideas on the aspirations of migrants. Looking at the overall discussion provided here, we see that the last hypothesis is not confirmed. We cannot, based on the results from these two tables, say that personal networks are more important for intentions than for aspirations. We can, however, say that the existence of a culture of migration, or other aspects of area, do not seem to be important for a persons intentions to migrate.

To conclude this chapter, we have seen that three out of four hypotheses stated to be confirmed. Three results seem to particularly stand out. First, migrant networks are important both for migration aspirations and for migration intentions. Second, it is amongst those who know only return migrants or who know both return and current migrants that we find the highest levels of aspirations. Third, we observe differing determinants of migration aspirations and migration intentions, strengthening the argument that an aspiration to migrate and an ability to do so are two different aspects of migration decision-making. While the fourth hypothesis is not confirmed, we do find that both migrant networks and other determinants seem to affect aspirations and intentions differently. It will be up to future research to determine exactly how.
8 Concluding Remarks

In this thesis, I have examined the associations between migrant networks and migration aspirations in four areas of Senegal. I have found that people with access to migrant networks, and people who live in areas where there exists a culture of migration, have significantly higher levels of aspirations. I have also found that the degree to which networks matter for aspirations varies with area. Networks are more important for aspirations in areas where a culture of migration has not been firmly established. This thesis is a significant contribution to our understanding of the factors that shape migration decision-making in developing countries.

Here, I draw some broader implications of the results presented in chapter 7. I briefly summarize the main results, and focus in on what I see as the three most important contributions this thesis provides. I also point to some implications for future research.
8.1 Summarizing Results

Building on insights from scholarly literature on Senegalese migration, and on theories of migrant networks and cultures of migration, I constructed four hypotheses regarding the connections between migrant networks, emigration environments and migration aspirations. I assumed that people who have access to migrant networks and people who live in areas where migrant networks are prevalent, would be more likely to aspire to move to Europe. I also assumed that personal migrant networks would be more important for aspirations in areas where fewer have access to such networks. These three assumptions were, at least partly, confirmed by the results of the logistic regression analyses conducted in chapter 7. The fourth and last question I raised was whether there are differences in the effects of networks when respondents are asked about their intentions to migrate, as opposed to a situation when they are given some ability to move abroad. The hypothesis which stated that area-specific factors would be most important for aspirations, while personal networks would be more important for intentions, was not confirmed, but the results show that different factors influence aspirations and intentions respectively, confirming that the distinction between an one’s aspiration to migrate and one’s ability to do so, is a fruitful one.

8.2 Main Contributions

The contributions this thesis makes to the broader literature can be summarized in three sections. The first is empirical, the second methodological and the third is related to the development of theory.

The empirical contribution of this thesis lies in the novelty of the EUMAGINE data and in the chosen case studies. On a general basis, this is one of few studies of migration aspirations overall. More specifically, migration aspirations in West-Africa is a topic which is much discussed, but the discussions are seldom founded empirically. This is the first time that these areas of Senegal have been subject to quantitative surveys regarding migration aspirations, and by exploring the factors that lie behind such aspirations, I contribute to the understanding of such aspirations in general, and in West-Africa and these Senegalese areas in particular.

Methodologically, this thesis contributes to our understanding of what an aspiration to migrate is, and how it should be operationalized quantitatively. While some previous research has taken lightly on the distinctions between aspirations and ability, the analyses done here
prove that the way you measure and ask about migration aspirations is extremely important, and that the results vary largely depending on one’s definition of aspirations. Not only has the study shown the importance of interpreting aspirations- and intentions data with great caution, but the larger implications are that any study that wants to further investigate migration aspirations, should seek to incorporate the distinction between aspirations and ability into their models.

Theoretically, this thesis broadens our understanding of migration aspirations in several ways. First, I show that migrant network theory – developed and tested largely in the context of Mexico-US migration – is applicable also in the West African context, thus expanding the applicability of such theories beyond the cases where they were first developed. Second, by proving that migrant networks do matter for migration aspirations, I have shown that migrant network theory also holds validity in the realm of migration decision-making. While normally used to explain flows of actual migration, the results of this thesis prove that migrant network theories are also applicable to migration aspirations. Third, and more specifically, I have expanded the Kandel and Massey’s (2002) culture of migration theory. I have shown that not only are such cultures important effects on aspirations, but the degree to which migrant networks are important for aspirations, depends on whether there exists a culture of migration in the area. The results of this thesis show that living in a culture of migration does not only constitute an independent effect on aspirations, but it also influences aspirations in interplay with personal networks.

8.3 Prospects for Future Research

This thesis has offered several interesting paths for further research. Not only does there lie great potential in following up on the points made above, but there are also some specific terrains of study which this thesis sheds light and opens up the possibility for. Mainly, the prospects of future researched proposed here, fall into three categories. There are possibilities within the studies of migration aspirations as a social phenomenon, expansions of perspectives on migrant networks and their effects, and lastly there is potential for developing studies that examine some of the implications of these findings.

Thinking about migration aspirations as a broad social phenomenon implies that scholars can develop studies which examine the links between aspirations and ability, and which ask questions about the factors that determine one but not the other. One such aspect touched upon by in this thesis, is that of gender. My results show no significant difference
between the aspirations or intentions of migration aspirations for women and men, and yet we know that the actual migration patterns vary substantially by gender. This could be one way of approaching the divide between aspiration and ability, and there are many more.

The second set of possible contributions that spring from this thesis lie in expanding the understanding of networks. The operationalization of networks chosen here was rather simple, yet it revealed an interesting distinction between knowing returned migrants and knowing current migrants. Not only can this distinction be broadened further, and the possible differences also between friends and family members effect on aspirations be incorporated, but one can also imagine studies that incorporate more sociological theory than has been common in the migration literature. Studies seeking to investigate the mechanisms through which migrant networks are converted into useful social capital are not abundant in migration studies and would be highly appreciated. Although taken as a premise in this study, membership in a migrant network does not necessarily equal access to relevant social capital. Much potential lies in extending the operationalization of networks, and in exploring different measures of networks than has been possible here.

The third and final set of questions this thesis raises is the possibility of developing studies which seek to investigate the implications raised by this study. One point of entry here would be to investigate further the connections – or lack thereof between migration aspirations and actual migration. Not only do we need to come away from using data on aspirations to predict future migration, but we also need to find new and better ways of measuring actual migration flows. Further studies investigating migration aspirations should also play close attention to the factors other than migration which are influenced by the strong prevalence of aspirations to migrate, and look at how such aspirations shape communities and people in sending countries.

This study has shown that there is no clear-cut link between aspirations and ability, but more research is needed on the mechanisms that link the two, which may fuel discussions of why some aspirations lead to migration and others do not. In order to extensively engage in these questions future research would benefit by collecting data on the connections between the aspirations and ability, and by collecting longitudinal data in both sending and receiving communities. This will give yield a possibility of investigating broader connections between the determinants of migration aspirations and ability, respectively, and to analyze more of the differences between them that is possible with existing data sets.
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