

Reciprocal Relationships and Competing Commitments:

The Impact of Non-familial Ties in Urban Kenya on Migrants' Remittances to the Origin

Nancy Luke
Assistant Professor
Department of Sociology and
Population Studies and Training Center
Brown University
Box 1916
Providence, RI 02912
nluke@brown.edu

March 2007

DRAFT PAPER – DO NOT CITE WITHOUT AUTHOR'S PERMISSION

Paper to be presented at the Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America,
New York, March 29-31.

Acknowledgements: This paper is based on data from a project directed by Kaivan Munshi and Nancy Luke, Population Studies and Training Center, Brown University. We gratefully acknowledge support from the World Bank; the National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Aging, Grant number AG12836 through the Population Aging Research Center at the University of Pennsylvania; and the Mellon Foundation, the Center for AIDS Research, and the University Research Foundation at the University of Pennsylvania. We would like to thank Francis Ayuka and Survey Research Team, Nairobi, for their superb work collecting the data.

Introduction

Social networks comprised of family and community members in the origin are important sources of social and economic support during the migration process. Research on international and internal migration experiences across the globe has documented how migrants receive employment information, relocation assistance, and emotional encouragement from social ties in the origin. Apart from current forms of support, migrants also anticipate future benefits from these networks, such as family inheritance and enhancement of their status and prestige within the home community. Once migrants reach the destination, research continues to focus on assistance provided by connections from the origin, including accommodation and job referrals. Remarkably absent from the migration literature is the study of *non-familial* ties that migrants forge in the destination and the nature and significance of support provided by these new relationships.

It has long been recognized that migration is not merely an individual decision motivated by the receipt of social and economic support. Particularly in developing countries, migration is often undertaken as a household strategy that generates streams of benefits and costs for both migrants and their families and home communities. In this context of reciprocal exchange, financial and material remittances are a major obligation for migrants. Indeed, large proportions of migrants' incomes are devoted to remittances, frequently amounting to 10 to 30 percent of earnings (Findley 1997, Stark and Lucas 1988), and these resources are often critical to reducing economic vulnerability of the family. Given the attention to social networks as sources of support for migrants, the accompanying literature has naturally focused on migrants' continuing ties to the origin as determinants of remittance flows. This research commonly concludes that stronger social ties to families and home communities increase migrants' propensity to remit and the level of pecuniary assistance they provide. This work has neglected to recognize, however, that migrants simultaneously build new reciprocal relationships in the destination whose benefits could substitute for familial and community support. As a result, remittances should depend not only on migrants' social networks in the origin but also on the strength of new ties in the destination.

The conflicting notions of familial and non-familial ties are particularly relevant to the internal migration experience in sub-Saharan Africa. On the one hand, African migrants have been described as living in a "dual system": embedded in the new urban environment while maintaining close relationships with their rural households and kinship groups (Gugler 1991). Historically, the migration literature has depicted how Africans continue to identify with their rural origins and expect to return there to retire, even after a lifetime of urban residence. Consequently, most migrants send remittances to a wide range of rural relations, including the extended family and throughout the home community (Cliggett 2003, Gugler 2002, Smith 2001). On the other hand, a parallel body of health research has investigated a new form of social tie prevalent in urban Africa—married and single men's nonmarital sexual relationships—and has documented the pivotal role these partnerships have played in the spread HIV/AIDS through the migration process (Dyson 2003, Brockerhoff and Biddlecom 1999). Our past work has shown that these diverse relationships also embody reciprocal exchange; commercial sex, casual, and longer-term partnerships require a substantial financial component on the part of migrant men, and provide them with various types of social and emotional support in return (Luke 2006,

2005b). If this particular form of non-familial tie substitutes for the benefits of social networks in the origin, then money and gifts given to sexual partners could greatly impact the amount of remittances migrants send to their families and home communities. We argue that a comprehensive understanding of remittance behavior must not only consider migrants' ties to the origin but also the nature and strength of competing non-familial connections in the city, particularly nonmarital sexual relationships in the African context. This paper provides a first step toward the integration of these distinct strands of research on migration and health in sub-Saharan Africa to develop theoretical insights into familial and non-familial ties, reciprocal exchange, and remittances.

Our empirical investigation relies on quantitative and qualitative data that we collected from male Luo migrants in Kisumu, Kenya, the capital of Nyanza Province and third largest city in the country. Kisumu represents one of a multitude of smaller African cities that serve as important interim or final destinations for large streams of internal migrants (White and Lindstrom 2004, Findley 1997). Our survey gathered information on migrants' remittances not only to their families but also separate estimates of remittances to their home communities. Ours is also among the first to elicit details of men's relationships with nonmarital sexual partners and the financial transfers given to them. These unique data on migrants' multiple resource flows allow us to study the impact of transfers to sexual partners on two types of remittances to the origin. Further, our theoretical framework of reciprocal exchange will also make clear that benefits and obligations vary by the type of sexual partner with whom a migrant is involved, and therefore money and gifts to various sexual partners should differentially affect remittances to the family and home community.

Kisumu is the epicenter of a mature HIV/AIDS epidemic in Western Kenya, with HIV prevalence rates reaching 25 percent or more over the last decade (NAS COP 2005, Glynn et al. 2001). Recent health research has implicated migration patterns in the rapid spread of the disease in this area of the country and among the Luo in particular (Voeten et al. 2004, Buvé et al. 2001). In addition, our own work has found that financial transfers to sexual partners in Kisumu are often exchanged for unsafe sexual activities (Luke 2006, 2005a). Thus, men's involvement in sexual exchange relationships increases their risk of contracting HIV and joining the reverse stream of urban African migrants who return home to be cared for and ultimately die of AIDS (Clark et al. 2007). These new non-familial ties may have short-term repercussions for those dependent on migrant remittances as well as a lasting impact on the migration strategies and stability of rural families and communities throughout sub-Saharan Africa.

Theoretical framework

Our theoretical framework situates migrants' resource flows in a context of reciprocal exchange with social networks in the origin and non-familial ties in the destination. Migrants' primary responsibility within all of these relationships is to provide material and monetary assistance, and in return, they receive numerous social, emotional, and economic benefits depending on the nature of the exchange relationship. In this section, we discuss the three major types of exchange relationships that migrants maintain in the city—with the rural family, the home community, and nonmarital sexual partners—and the various benefits these relationships bring to urban migrants.

Finally, we conclude by theorizing how migrants choose between these competing financial commitments and how transfers to non-familial ties may differentially affect remittances to the family and home community.

Remittances to the Origin Household

Most of the theoretical work on remittance behavior conceives of migration as a household strategy characterized by reciprocal or contractual arrangements between migrants and their families of origin¹ (Azam and Gubert 2006, Piotrowski 2006, Sana 2005, van Dalen et al. 2005, Vanwey 2004, Stark and Lucas 1988). The two main forms of contractual arrangements discussed in the literature are coinsurance and investment strategies, both of which have been found to be relevant to the migration experience in sub-Saharan Africa. Several of the major determinants of remittance behavior under these arrangements are discussed below.

The *coinsurance* strategy is aimed at diversifying risk for migrants and their rural households in the shorter-term (Azam and Gubert 2006, de la Brière et al. 2002, Lucas and Stark 1985). Because insurance and capital markets are incomplete in many developing country settings, migrants and rural households rely on each other for support in times of unforeseen “shocks” or hardships, such as periodic drought or crop failures in the origin and bouts of unemployment or temporary illness for migrants in the destination. While most of the resources exchanged take the form of short-term economic transfers, migrants also benefit from social and emotional support from families, which is particularly helpful to new migrants as they establish themselves in the city (Hoddinott 1994, Stark and Lucas 1988). Several studies in Africa have found evidence of coinsurance arrangements. In a Kenyan study, Knowles and Anker (1981) found that remittances decrease as migrants become more established in the destination, measured by the length of time they have resided away from home, as they are less likely to need the family’s temporary support. In addition, Lucas and Stark (1985) detected a positive relationship between the occurrence of periodic droughts and remittances in Botswana.

The *investment* strategy aims to smooth longer-term consumption patterns through intertemporal, intergenerational arrangements, mainly between migrants and their parents. The resources exchanged are typically economic, and the direction of their flow depends on the migrants’ stage in the life cycle. Migrants send remittances during their productive years in the city to re-pay parents for investing in their education and to secure a portion of their inheritance, which will support the migrants in old age (van Dalen et al. 2005, de la Brière et al. 2002, Hoddinott 1994, Lucas and Stark 1985). This strategy is most likely employed in contexts where migrants expect to return home and therefore have incentives to remain connected to their rural households. Such is the situation among the Luo, where most migrants hold claim to and maintain a portion of the family farm and expect to return to their rural homes to retire and to be buried (Hoddinott 1994, Hoddinott and Francis 1993, Parkin 1978, Ocholla-Ayayo 1976). Investment strategies are evidenced by a positive correlation between remittances and the wealth of the rural household,

¹ Most studies on remittance behavior measure remittances as resource flows to *households* of origin, although the theoretical literature commonly refers to migrants’ relationships with *families* of origin as well. Although we recognize that families and households are not synonymous within the social science literature, we use these terms interchangeably in this paper and define how remittances were reported in our survey in the methods section below.

which signifies the extent of potential bequests (van Dalen et al. 2005, Vanwey 2004). Hoddinott's (1994) study supports this hypothesis, where household wealth is measured by land, the main form of inheritable asset in western Kenya,² as well as Lucas and Stark's (1985) study in Botswana, with wealth measured by ownership of cattle. Furthermore, Hoddinott (1994) finds that remittances increase with migrants' education and income, which signal earlier parental investment in sons' human capital, as well as the number of sons (brothers of a migrant), as they are the competitors for a share of the parents' inheritance (de le Briere et al. 2002, Hoddinott 1994).

We believe that African migrants have new incentives to maintain strong ties with their rural families in contexts of ongoing HIV/AIDS epidemics. Without access to life-sustaining anti-retroviral therapy or quality health care, many urban African residents in the later stages of AIDS return to their rural homes to be cared for until death (Chimwaza and Watkins 2004, Clark et al. 2007). The extended family also assumes the primary support functions for widows and orphaned children migrants leave behind (Drimie 2003, Nyambedha et al. 2003a, 2003b, Luke 2002). Under these emerging circumstances, migrants have additional motivations to enter into investment arrangements with their rural households to secure lasting social and emotional assistance in the event of premature illness, death, and a legacy of dependents. We would expect migrants who have a greater number of dependents, including wives and children, to remit larger amounts, and that remittances should not decrease over time or distance, as the future expectation of inheritance and caretaking persists.

In addition to contractual arrangements, an alternative motivation theorized to affect remittance behavior is altruism. Migrants send remittances to their rural households because they are concerned for the welfare of their family members, without an expectation of reciprocal support. In this case, the presence of people whom migrants care about in the origin household, such as parents, wives, and children, encourage them to send larger remittances (van Dalen et al. 2005, Vanwey 2004, Menjivar et al. 1998). Further expectations are that migrants' resources (including their education and income) increase remittances, while the rural household's wealth should be negatively associated with remittances (Vanwey 2004). Some scholars argue that pure altruism cannot be the sole explanation for rationally-minded migrants to remit, however (Lucas and Stark 1985). Nevertheless, they recognize that "mutual altruism" between family members serves to reinforce contractual relationships and therefore makes the family an ideal institution in which to situate such reciprocal arrangements (Hoddinott 1994, Lucas and Stark 1985).

Remittances to the Home Community

The theoretical work on remittance behavior lacks a comprehensive framework for explaining migrants' strategies for remitting to the home community beyond the household of origin. In the existing research, these ties have only been considered as determinants of resource flows to the household and have not been studied as an explicit target of migrant remittances (Piotrowski 2006, Sana 2005, Mooney 2003). Although migrants in many developing countries spend their

² Remittances may not be contractual if migrants could purchase their own land. Hoddinott (1994) finds that there are difficulties with new purchases in Western Kenya, however, and that migrants may wish to farm their own family's land because they have "specific experience" on it.

resources in their origin communities, the normative nature and the extent of this spending may be unique to sub-Saharan Africa (Cliggett 2003, Gugler 2002, Findley 1997). Therefore, a theoretical framework is needed specific to Africa, and we base ours on the contractual and altruistic arrangements that occur with the rural family.

Compared to other societies, scholars have noted that Africans maintain an enduring identification with and allegiance to their kinship groups and ancestral communities beyond the family of origin (Smith 2003, Geischiere and Gugler 1998, Gugler 1991). These strong ties are often based on lineal descent, such as the patrilineal system of clan membership among the Luo that traces inheritance through the male line. These kinship ties also include an important spatial dimension. For example, Luo clans are bound to a geographically distinct “rural home” where the ancestors historically migrated and settled (Luke and Munshi 2006, Parkin 1978, for a detailed Luo clan settlement history, see Ogot 1967). Thus, Luo males are eternal members of rural clan communities and are expected to be buried in the rural location regardless of their birthplace, residence, or place of death (Ocholla-Ayayo 1976).

This strong kinship identity is accompanied by a high degree of loyalty and affection for other village and clan members (Smith 2003, Ocholla-Ayayo 1976), which we believe supplies altruistic motivations for African migrants to remit to their rural home communities. Accordingly, we expect that more educated and more financially successful migrants would be able to remit larger amounts. We also expect that the enduring nature of clan membership and rural identity ensures a sustained level of remitting by migrants to their communities regardless of their time spent in the destination or its distance from their rural home.

Beyond migrants’ altruistic attachments, the instrumental nature of kinship ties in contemporary Africa cannot be ignored, particularly for migrants (Luke and Munshi 2006, Smith 2003). The literature often describes how migrants become “big men” in the city as a consequence of access to valuable resources and information (Gugler 2002), and this new-found power can turn previous egalitarian kinship relationships more clientelistic (Smith 2003, 2001). Within this structure of patron-clientism, migrants distribute remittances within the wider community and gain economic, social, and political status from their kinship groups in return (Azam and Gubert 2006, Smith 2003). For example, successful migrants often become respected members of the rural community, who are sought after for their experienced counsel, and they use their kinship clientele as a political base of support within the system of tribal politics (Gugler 2002, 1991, Smith 2001). This power is often displayed and strengthened by migrants through membership in formal ethnic or clan associations in urban areas, which are created to support kinship group members in the city and keep them abreast of and involved in the affairs of the home community (Gugler 2002, Smith 2001, for the Luo see Parkin 1978 and for Mexico see Mooney 2003). These clan associations also facilitate reciprocal arrangements with the home community, particularly the distribution of resources and mobilization of political support (Parkin 1978).

Within such a context of patron-clientism, we form several hypotheses about the motivations for urban African migrants to contribute to the home community. We would expect that older migrants, who are approaching retirement and expect to take a regular position in the rural home, would expend greater amounts on remittances (Gugler 2002). In addition, migrants with higher levels of education and income would likely reap greater benefits from these kinship relations

and would consequently send larger remittances. Participation in clan association activities would serve as an additional route to tendering favor with the rural kinship group and increase remittances. Finally, we also hypothesize that the benefits of close connections to the home community would not diminish over time and distance, and therefore would not reduce remittances.

Transfers to Nonmarital Sexual Partners

As we have outlined, past theory and evidence focuses on migrants' familial ties in the origin as the major determinants of remittance behavior. Little attention has been paid to non-familial ties that migrants form in urban destinations³ and the associated costs and benefits of these new reciprocal exchange relationships. In contrast, a great deal of health research has been focused on nonmarital sexual partners as a specific form of non-familial tie that African men have access to in the city, where traditional constraints on sexual behavior are reduced and opportunities for sexual activities increased (Lagarde et al. 2003, Brockerhoff and Biddlecom 1999). While men may engage in nonmarital sexual relationships in rural communities as well, cities provide opportunities for expanding sexual networks with more and more diverse types of partners (Dyson 2003, Zulu et al. 2003). This sexual networking has been associated with increased transmission of sexually transmitted diseases historically and is likely to have formed the basis of present HIV/AIDS epidemics in Africa that originated in urban areas and among migrants (Voeten et al. 2004, Lagarde et al. 2003).

An emerging line of health research has focused on the role of “transactional sex”—or the exchange of money and gifts for sexual activity—in the continuing spread of HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa. Numerous scholars have noted that premarital and extramarital encounters increasingly involve the transfer of material resources from men to their female partners (Dinan 1983, Vos 1994). This development has been labeled as the “commodization” of sexual relations, where financial transfers have become an accepted and expected feature of nonmarital sexual relationships throughout Africa (Luke 2003). Much of the recent literature on sexual exchange in the era of HIV/AIDS assumes that transfers have similar purposes in most nonmarital sexual relationships and that they are consistently associated with unsafe or unwanted sexual practices. We argue, however, that not all sexual exchange relationships are homogeneous, and that transfers may have various motivations and meanings in different types of partnerships (Luke 2005b, Luke 2003, Kaufman and Stavrou 2004). For a more comprehensive understanding of these exchange relationships, we follow Carrier (1991), who uses a Maussian perspective to differentiate between two main types of exchange in social relationships: gift and commodity exchange. We review these concepts and apply them to nonmarital sexual relationships in particular.⁴

³ While research has not measured new ties in the origin directly, Menjivar et al. (1998) view more years spent in the United States as a proxy for immigrants' new ties in the host country, although this variable does not show a significant association with the level of remittances in their models.

⁴ A related discussion of the exchange of gifts within intimate sexual relationships is presented in van de Rijt and Macy (2006). Their work concerns marital relationships in the United States, however, and perhaps therefore does not incorporate commodity exchange (or “economic exchange” as they term it) in sexual relationships (see also Sprecher 1998). We believe commodity exchange is prevalent and particularly relevant to nonmarital sexual relationships in sub-Saharan Africa, and therefore place emphasis on theorizing about these partnerships in Kisumu.

Carrier (1991) describes the three main elements of gift exchange relationships as the *obligatory* transfer of *inalienable* objects or services between *related* transactors. Relationships that reflect gift exchange occur between people who are tied together in a social relationship, and in this sense they are related. Gifts between partners signify that the relationship is reaffirmed and extended, and are thus obligatory for the relationship to continue. Nevertheless, gifts are not given on a one-to-one basis or because the giver expects an equivalent or immediate return gift. Therefore, gifts do not operate coercively, and gift exchange does not involve bargaining between individuals over reciprocal expectations. Gifts are not merely presents, but encompass a range of objects and services, such as cooking, job advice, or sexual intercourse. The gifts exchanged are inalienable; in other words, they have meaning for the two partners but may not have utility or meaning for individuals outside the relationship.

Numerous types of nonmarital sexual relationships embody gift exchange. For example, gifting is represented in dating relationships, where a meal or tickets to the cinema may serve as symbols of interest and the giver demands nothing sexual in return. In more serious relationships, gifts may signify love, affection, trust, or continuing commitment. In urban Africa, money and material goods are often the main form of gifts given to female partners and bring multiple benefits to women, ranging from status and attention to support for their families (Luke 2005b, Kaufman and Stavrou 2004). Migrant men, who may suffer from alienation and the stress of a new city environment, benefit from the emotional attachment, social support, and status offered by such gift exchange partners (Clark 2007, Silberschmidt and Rasch 2001, Brouckerhoff and Biddlecom 1999, Dinan 1983).

In contrast, commodity exchange involves the *inobligatory* transfer of *alienable* objects or services between *unrelated* transactors, and thus the three main elements of gift exchange are reversed (Carrier 1991). Commodity exchange is evident in nonmarital relationships when sexual activity and sexual gratification—the main benefits for male partners—are traded for a monetary equivalent on the sexual market. Formal prostitution is often considered to best embody the concept of commodity exchange. In its strictest form, the two people in a commercial sexual relationship do not know one another, the sexual activity could similarly be provided by any number of sex workers, and the parties separate after the exchange is completed. More informal means of commodity exchange have been shown to exist in sub-Saharan Africa, such as in casual sexual relationships, where exchange activity is not part of a woman's profession, the items exchanged are not restricted to money, and the transfer may not be predetermined or explicitly stated (Hunter 2002; Wojcicki 2002). Notably, however, there is a direct association between transfers and sexual activities performed in all of these commodity exchange relationships.

Gift and commodity exchange sexual relationships are a common occurrence in urban Africa, and they require the transfer of financial resources on the part of migrant men. At the same time, most migrants are involved in reciprocal relationships with their rural families and communities, which entail financial obligations of their own. Armed with limited resources, migrants must choose between these competing commitments to familial and non-familial ties. We now turn to our hypotheses about migrants' decision-making regarding distribution of resources and the possible ways in which transfers to sexual partners may affect remittances.

In the simplest sense, we can view sexual partners as a form of men's personal consumption in the city, and thus increased spending on transfers to these partners will "crowd out" or reduce spending on remittances. This would be the case no matter what type of personal consumption migrants engage in, whether nonmarital sexual relationships, gambling, or drinking. In this case, spending on transfers should have a similar negative effect on both types of remittances that we measure.

Hypothesis 1: Transfers to nonmarital sexual partners should be negatively associated with remittances to families and communities in the origin.

However, we have presented a theoretical framework that characterizes diverse types of sexual relationships. Notably, we believe that both gift and commodity exchange sexual relationships offer different forms of support for migrant men in the city, and these benefits are likely to be important substitutes for the social and emotional support derived from arrangements with rural families and kinship groups. Therefore, we argue that transfers to different types of sexual partners should have a differential effect on remittances to rural households and communities. This leads to two specific hypotheses. First, we believe that sexual partners in gift exchange sexual relationships supply migrants with emotional encouragement in the city that migrants would otherwise gain from the rural family, while casual and commercial sex partners provide no forms of support that substitute for the family. Therefore, we expect that transfers to gift exchange sexual partners should reduce remittances to the rural family and transfers to casual and commercial sex partners would have no effect on these remittances. Second, gift exchange sexual partners may similarly substitute for social status generally derived from the home community, and thus transfers to gift exchange partners should show a negative relationship with remittances to the rural home, while transfers to casual and commercial sex partners would again show no correlation with remittances.

Hypothesis 2: Gift exchange partnerships substitute for emotional support from the family, and therefore transfers to gift exchange partners should be negatively associated with remittances to the family. Transfers to commercial sex and casual partners should have no effect on family remittances.

Hypothesis 3: Gift exchange partnerships substitute for social status conferred by the kinship group, and therefore transfers to gift exchange partners should be negatively associated with remittances to the home community. Transfers to commercial sex and casual partners should have no effect on home community remittances.

In the next section, we describe the data and the methods we use to test these hypotheses as well as examine the evidence for the presence of altruistic and reciprocal exchange relationships between migrants and their familial ties in the origin.

Data and Methods

The Kisumu Survey and Qualitative Data

The survey and qualitative data used in our analyses were collected as part of a larger project co-directed by the author in Kisumu. We chose Kisumu as the site for a study of the effects of social organization on sexual behavior and labor market outcomes among a population of migrant men in an urban, high HIV/AIDS environment (see Luke and Munshi 2006). Although Kisumu attracts migrants of both sexes (Lyons 2003), our project was particularly interested in examining the role of male sexual behavior in the spread of the epidemic in Western Kenya. In addition, among the patrilineal Luo, sons are particularly important sources of social and economic support for rural families and communities (Hoddinott 1994), and thus a study of men's labor market opportunities and resource expenditures in the city were important issues for the project.

The survey data derive from a random sample of 2700 Luo males ages 21-45. For this paper, we restrict our analysis to the sub-sample of 2200 men who are migrants, which we define as moving to Kisumu after birth. Kenyan Census Bureau enumeration areas were used as primary sampling units within Kisumu town. Of these, 121 were randomly chosen for the survey, and all households in each enumeration area were selected. In each household, all males of eligible age were interviewed by trained field-workers.

Our project was designed to gather specific information on the social organization of the Luo and migrants' connections to their rural families, communities, and traditions. The survey asked each respondent to identify the name of his rural home. In its translation into the Luo language, "rural home" is understood to mean the rural clan or community of origin. For this paper, we use the Euclidian distance from the center of the home community to Kisumu as a measure of direct distance moved by the migrant (White and Lindstrom 2004). We also used this information in other work to connect migrants to clan settlement patterns and other socioeconomic characteristics of their rural origins (Luke and Munshi 2006).

The survey instrument also gathered demographic information on the respondent and his rural household of origin as well as on his migration experience, remittance behavior, and sexual behavior. In the section on remittance behavior, each respondent was first asked to estimate the total value of money and gifts that he gave or sent to his rural home in the last year, referring once again to his rural clan community. Each respondent was then asked to estimate the total value of money and gifts that he gave or sent to his family, which refers to his household or compound of origin, in the last year. In rural villages, Luos live in extended family compounds that consist of a father, his male offspring, and their families. Upon marriage, sons continue to live in their fathers' compounds, building a new house for each of their wives and their children. On the survey, remittances to the rural home community and family were understood to be mutually exclusive and reported separately. Respondents estimated the monetary value of these two forms of remittances; the survey did not discern the particular individuals or purposes for which these resources were sent.

Our analysis includes independent variables pertaining to the migrants' individual characteristics, including age, years of education, and the respondent's self-reported income in the last year recorded in Kenyan shillings.⁵ We include a quadratic term for income to test for the possibility that the relationship between income and remittances may be curvilinear. Because we are interested in not only the respondent's current marital status but also whether he cohabitated with his wife (wives) in Kisumu, we construct three dummy variables for marital status designating men as currently unmarried (single, divorced, separated, or widowed), currently married and cohabitated with a spouse 10 or more months of the last year; and currently married and cohabitated with a spouse less than 10 months in the last year. The great majority of married men cohabitated at least part of the year with a spouse in Kisumu⁶; therefore, we attempted to distinguish between those whose cohabitation experience was essentially continuous from those who cohabitated intermittently.

We also include a measure of the number of children ever born to the respondent. Our survey did not collect information on the ages of these children, and therefore we are unable to calculate the number of dependents who are under age 18, for example. Nevertheless, due to the young age range of our sample, we believe that most men have children at or under the age of dependency. Furthermore, children of any age are eligible for inheritance and land rights, which are important to potential investment arrangements with the rural household. We also include a variable indicating the number of months since the respondent migrated to Kisumu. Eighty-eight percent of the men in our sample lived in Kisumu continuously since first migrating (not shown), and therefore this measure provides a good approximation of migrants' cumulative urban experience.

Our survey collected information on important characteristics of the migrant's rural household, which we include as independent variables. We use information on the household's land as a measure of wealth as well as potential bequests. In the patrilineal system of the Luo, inheritance is passed down from fathers to sons. Therefore, in order to determine competition for bequests, we include a variable for the respondent's number of brothers. The survey also asked respondents to report the survival status of their parents.

A potential drawback to our data is that the survey recorded the location of residence of migrants' spouses but not of other family members, including children and parents. For the purposes of our study, we assume that these members remain in the rural household. This assumption is nevertheless quite credible for the Luo in this area of Kenya. As noted above, attachment to the rural village is strong, and most individuals return there to retire (and wives to their husbands' home villages) if not already in residence. Children, particularly the young, often remain in the rural home to be cared for by extended family (Nyambedha et al. 2003a).

Another specific aim of the survey instrument was to gather information on male nonmarital sexual behavior and financial transfers to nonmarital sexual partners. Before constructing the survey, we conducted in-depth interviews with 21 male residents of Kisumu to assist in the

⁵ 70 Kenyan shillings was the equivalent of US\$ 1 at the time of the survey.

⁶ Of the married men, 6.1 percent are polygynous, and therefore may have one wife living in Kisumu and another in the rural household. These men were asked to report the number of months in the last year they cohabited with any of their wives.

formulation of detailed questions on the number, types, and characteristics of men's nonmarital sexual partnerships. The in-depth interviews revealed the importance of sexual partners called *jadiya* in men's lives. *Jadiya* is a slang term derived from the English phrase "my dear" and refers to serious girlfriends or lovers. Respondents also described the circumstances of men's relationships with casual partners and commercial sex workers (CSWs). These interviews were tape recorded and simultaneously translated and transcribed into English. We coded the interview data using NVivo to categorize the various meanings, benefits, and commitments across these nonmarital relationship types.

Based on the information gleaned from the in-depth interviews, the survey instrument asked respondents the number of nonmarital sexual partners they had in the last year, and to report information on the five most recent partners.⁷ Partnership information included the type of partnership, the duration of the relationship in months, condom use at last sexual intercourse (yes/no), and material transfers respondents gave to each nonmarital partner in the last month. We create dummy variables that designate men's involvement with at least one *jadiya*, at least one casual partner, and at least one CSW.⁸

Our survey is one of the first to gather detailed information on the type and value of transfers that men give to their nonmarital sexual partners. Previous surveys face several limitations, including problems with the validity and scope of the questions on transfers,⁹ and we aimed to improve on these weaknesses. Our survey question read: "It is common for men to give women gifts or other assistance when they are in a relationship. What have you given your partner(s) in the last month?" Response categories included the major types of transfers that were uncovered during pre-testing, including money; gifts; meals, drinks, and food; rent; and an open category, where respondents could designate other items given. For each category of transfer, the respondent was asked to estimate the amount of money or value of the items given in Kenyan shillings. In order to ensure accurate recall about the specific type of assistance given and the value of those transfers, the question was limited to transfers that were given in the last month.

In this paper, we use several measures of transfers. For the purpose of describing the characteristics of partnership types, we use the partnership as the unit of analysis and pool all of men's recent nonmarital partnerships into a separate sample. Recent partnerships include those whose last act of sexual intercourse occurred in the last month (as opposed to the last year), which therefore coincides with the reference period of the last month used for the transfers questions. We create a dichotomous variable for any transfer given in the last month within a partnership (yes/no), and a continuous variable designating the total value of transfers given within the partnership. This variable was calculated by totaling the value of each category of assistance reported by the respondent specific to each partnership.

⁷ Of the men reporting nonmarital sexual partners in the last year, 95 percent had 5 partners or fewer.

⁸ Most men were involved with none or only one of each of these types of partners in the last year: 98.8 percent were involved with none or 1 CSW, 87.7 percent with none or 1 casual partner, and 87.9 percent with none or 1 *jadiya*. We experimented with including continuous variables for the number of relationships men had with each of these partner types, but none were significant in our analyses, indicating that the existence of a relationship with each of these partner types is an important determinant of remittances, not the number of relationships.

⁹ See Luke (2005b) for a more detailed discussion of previous work on transfers.

For the purposes of describing men’s characteristics and the determinants of remittances in the regression analyses, the individual migrant is the unit of analysis. For these transfers variables, we first create a dichotomous variable indicating if a migrant gave a transfers to *any* of his nonmarital partners in the last month (yes/no; those with no nonmarital sexual partners were coded “0” for not giving transfers). We also include a continuous variable for the total amount of transfers a respondent gave to *all* of his nonmarital sexual partners in the last year. As remittances to the family and community as well as income are measured in the last year, we must convert the monthly amount of transfers to a yearly amount. To construct this variable, we sum the amount of transfers given within all of a respondent’s partnerships in the last month and multiply by 12. While there may be some seasonality to transfers that men give to their nonmarital sexual partners, which could potentially over- or under-estimate our measure of yearly transfers, we believe this is not a significant problem.¹⁰

Gathering data on sensitive issues, such as nonmarital sexual behavior and transfers, is difficult in survey settings because respondents tend to underreport behaviors that may be considered socially inappropriate (Catania et al. 1990, Gregson et al. 2002). In addition, respondents may exaggerate their reports of material assistance given to female sexual partners or as remittances, as they may have wanted to appear overly generous on the survey. Although our data and observations indicate that nonmarital sexual relationships involving material assistance are widespread and socially acceptable in Kisumu, data quality was of paramount importance to the project. The research team took several steps to ensure the validity and reliability of reporting, including developing a culturally sensitive survey instrument and carrying out numerous reliability checks in the field.¹¹ In addition to these data quality procedures, our interviewers were trained to develop significant rapport with the respondents in order to ensure accurate reporting. The interviewers were all Luo secondary school (or higher) graduates who were from the local area. Many had worked on other demographic and reproductive health surveys in Kisumu, where a great deal of research has been carried out due to the high prevalence of HIV in the area. Our interviewers were quick to point out that our survey elicited much more positive reactions from respondents than other research studies, particularly because our study also dealt with topics and traditions that are of great interest and concern to the Luo community. We believe that the popular interest in our survey and the careful attention we placed on training and data quality resulted in a high response rate (96 percent) and accurate reporting. Nevertheless, we drop the 0.5 percent of transfers and family and home community remittances from the sample as extreme outliers.

Analytic Methods

Our analysis is divided into several parts. First, we provide summary statistics on the individual and rural household characteristics for the urban migrants in our sample. We also show descriptive statistics on the prevalence and level of remittances to the family and home community as well as the prevalence and level of transfers to nonmarital sexual partners. Second, we examine the associations between transfers to sexual partners and other individual and rural household characteristics and the two types of remittances using ordinary least squares

¹⁰ See Luke (2005a) for more discussion of seasonality of transfers.

¹¹ See Luke (2005a) for further description of data quality checks.

regression analysis. Third, in order to tease out further the relationship between transfers and remittances, we examine the types of sexual partnerships migrants are involved in using descriptive statistics. Finally, we include transfers to these different types of partners in our previous regression models to see if the nature of migrants' sexual exchange relationships differentially affects family and home community remittances.

Findings

Male Migrants, Transfers, and Remittances

We begin by describing our sample of Luo migrants in Kisumu and the flows of financial resources they provide their familial and non-familial ties. Overall, the summary statistics in [Table 1](#) describe a young and relatively educated male migrant population that is likely to be found in many urban settings across sub-Saharan Africa. In Kisumu, the mean income in the last year was approximately US\$847 (59,000 Kenyan shillings), and only five percent of the sample was unemployed for the entire year, many of whom are students (not shown). The majority of migrant men are married, and, in contrast to the traditional pattern of male-only migration in Africa (Brockerhoff and Biddlecom 1999, Gugler 1991, Parkin 1978), many lived with a spouse in Kisumu for most of the last year. These migrants came to the city by and large as young adults, having resided in Kisumu 8.4 years on average. Most of their rural households include surviving parents and numerous brothers. These rural homes are located about 30 miles from the city on average, which can entail a lengthy journey over very poor roads in this area of the country.

Statistics on migrants' resource flows are presented in [Table 2](#). In our sample of migrants, 88 percent remitted to their families in the last year, suggesting that remitting is indeed normative behavior in Kisumu. Hodinott's study (1994) from two rural Luo locations in Nyanza Province recorded a similar prevalence of remitting in 1988. Of those who remitted in the last year, the average amount was approximately US\$ 213, totaling one-quarter of migrants' yearly income among those who remitted. Sending remittances to the home community was also quite common (66 percent of migrants) but not as prevalent as remitting to the family. The average amount remitted was also much lower, with home community remittances making up only five percent of migrants' yearly income.

With respect to sexual behavior, we find that 60 percent of the migrants in our sample had at least one nonmarital sexual partner in the last year. Of these men, almost three-quarters gave a transfer to at least one of their partners in the last month. Like remittances, these figures indicate that giving to sexual partners is customary in exchange relationships in Kisumu. The mean amount given over the last year almost matched the amount given to the family (approximately US\$ 163) and greatly exceeded the total sent to the home community. Transfers to sexual partners comprised 21 percent of men's yearly income on average.¹²

¹² The figures on resource flows as a percent of yearly income in Table 2 are calculated for those who have given remittances or transfers in the denominator. If all migrants serve as the denominator, the percentage of yearly income given to family remittances decreases to 22.1 percent, to the rural home decreases to 3.7 percent, and to

In light of the view that African migrants maintain close ties with the origin, the comparable figures on the amount of resources given to sexual partners and sent to the rural family suggest that the benefits migrants receive from sexual partners are quite valuable to them. Moreover, the large proportions of migrants' incomes that are devoted to families, communities, and sexual partners suggest that competition over migrants' resources could be quite severe. We now turn to our regression analyses of the relationship between transfers to sexual partner and remittances.

Transfers to Sexual Partners and Remittances

Table 3 presents our first set of regression results of the correlates of remittances to the rural family and home community. The migrant sample size decreases slightly in the regressions for home community remittances, as several respondents did not report this information.

The results confirm a negative association between transfers to sexual partners and remittances to the rural family. Controlling for various individual migrant and rural household characteristics, we find that every Ksh 1000 given in transfers to sexual partners reduces family remittances by Ksh 60. Although the magnitude of this effect is not large, it might nevertheless represent nontrivial amounts of financial support appropriated from poorer households.

We find several interesting and significant results with respect to migrants' individual characteristics and remittances to the family. The coefficients on migrants' yearly income are significant; income displays a positive association with remittances and the quadratic term is negative. These results indicate that at lower levels of income migrants remit smaller amounts, which is likely to occur as they adjust to urban life and find employment (Cliggett 2003). However, the positive effect of income on remittances evens out and perhaps declines at higher levels of income. Hoddinott (1994) explains that a negative quadratic term for migrants' income signifies an investment arrangement, where migrants with higher earnings gain less from parental rewards.

Currently single men send significantly less in remittances to rural families than married men who cohabitated continuously in the last year, the reference category; however there is no significant difference between the effect for married men cohabitating intermittently and continuously. A separate analysis shows that single men send significantly less in remittances than married men cohabitating intermittently, indicating that cohabitation has no relationship to the level of remittances (not shown). Thus, it is not the residence of the spouse that matters for family remittances, but the marriage institution more broadly. These findings support our earlier work, which conceptualized the traditional system of exogamous marriage in sub-Saharan Africa as another type of contractual arrangement between individuals and their kinship groups (Luke and Munshi 2006). This traditional marriage institution has evolved to bring new types of benefits to individuals in urban Africa, including assistance finding employment in the city, while also creating new kinds of obligations, including remittances to the family.

sexual partners decreases to 8.2 percent. Although these figures are lower, they still represent substantial resource outlays on average.

We also find that remittances to the rural family increase significantly with each additional child.¹³ It is important to note that there is no relationship between the years since an individual migrated to Kisumu and clan association participation and remittances.

With respect to the rural household's characteristics, the amount of land owned by the household is positively and significantly associated with remittances. The distance the rural household lies from Kisumu has a negative and significant relationship with remittances. The coefficients on other family members in the origin, including parents and brothers, are not significant.

Overall, these findings provide evidence that both contractual and altruistic arrangements are in place between urban migrants in Kisumu and their rural households. In particular, the hypothesized relationships for an investment strategy hold up most consistently, including migrants' new motivations to remit in light of the ongoing HIV/AIDS epidemic in the region. Other studies have also uncovered multiple concurrent strategies for remitting among international and internal migrants (van Dalen 2005, Vanwey 2004).

The second half of Table 3 presents results for predicting remittances to the home community. Interestingly, we find that transfers to sexual partners display a positive and significant relationship with remittances: every Ksh 1000 given in transfers to sexual partners increases remittances by Ksh 20. It may be that those who remit to the home community are more generous in their offerings and also give more to their sexual partners.

With respect to migrants' individual and rural household characteristics, we find similar relationships for income and marriage as we did for family remittances; married migrants send more in remittances to the home community and income increases remittances, eventually leveling off. In addition, age and education are positively and significantly associated with home community remittances. For the rural household variables, having a surviving father shows a positive and significant relationship with remittances. In the patriarchal, patrilineal society of the Luo, kinship ties are hierarchical and senior members, particularly men, wield more power than younger members (Ocholla-Ayayo 1976). In this case, fathers (and not mothers) may engender stronger commitments on the part of migrant sons. As expected, attendance at clan association meetings also positively affects remittances, but this relationship is only significant at the 10 percent level. We also note that both years since migrating to Kisumu and distance from the home community display no significant relationship to remittances. On the whole, these results support both contractual and altruistic strategies for remitting to the home community, supporting the notions that the home community forms a particular identity for migrants and that migrants use remittances as a route to gain status and power within the kinship group.

Our regression results reveal several noteworthy conclusions. We find that migrants maintain reciprocal arrangements with familial and non-familial ties concurrently in Kisumu, demonstrating migrants' position in the "dual system" in urban Africa. Most importantly, our results do not support hypothesis 1, which stated that transfers to nonmarital sexual partners should be negatively associated with remittances to both rural families and communities.

¹³ We also substituted a variable designating the number of children that are not residing with the migrant in Kisumu for the number of children ever born variable. The coefficient was not as large; however, it was also precisely estimated.

Transfers showed a negative relationship with remittances to the family and a positive relationship with remittances to the rural community. In order to explain these diverging effects, we examine men's relationships with non-familial ties more rigorously.

Types of Sexual Exchange Partnerships and Their Impact on Remittances

In this section, we use our survey and qualitative in-depth interview data to describe the three main sexual partnership types in Kisumu and the motivations for men's involvement with these partners and the meaning of transfers within them. Overall, the data show that *jadiya* relationships embody gift exchange and both commercial sex and casual partnerships are more closely aligned with commodity exchange. This distinction is reflected in the characteristics of these relationships and men's description of them.

We begin with the quantitative data in [Table 4](#), which compares the characteristics of the *jadiya*, casual, and commercial sex partnerships. We find that involvement in these relationships is widespread among migrant men in Kisumu. Approximately one-half of the migrant men in our sample were involved with at least one *jadiya* in the last year, over one-third were involved with at least one casual partner, and only four percent were engaged with at least one CSW. *Jadiya* and casual partnerships are also common among both married and single men.¹⁴ Thus, it appears that migrant men seek out nonmarital partners in the city, and *jadiya* girlfriends in particular.

The characteristics of *jadiya* relationships coincide with expectations for committed gift exchange relationships, and casual partners appear to embody commodity exchange. In the in-depth interviews, men were asked to describe the difference between casual partners and *jadiya*. Casual relationships were described as short-term "hit-and-run" encounters, whose main purpose is for sex. We also assume that the main purpose of the partnerships with CSWs is sexual gratification. Men described having "no relationship" with or little commitment to female casual partners. In contrast, *jadiya* relationships involve more than sexual intercourse; they are serious, longer-term relationships. Indeed, we see in [Table 4](#) that *jadiya* relationships are longer than other types of partnerships, almost one and one-half years on average.

Jadiya relationships were also characterized by their intimacy, closeness, and trust, and men spoke of the emotional link they formed with these girlfriends, which appears to be a major benefit for urban men. Indeed, many men said they eventually marry these partners or continue to be involved with them as "outside wives" once they do marry, not able to break the emotional bond that has formed (Fennell and Luke 2007). Following are several respondents' explanations of the differences between *jadiya* and casual partners (with the interview number and respondent information in parentheses).

Interviewer: Why are some women known as "*jadiya*" while others are [casual] girlfriends, yet one can have sex with both?

¹⁴ 28.1 percent of married men had at least 1 *jadiya* partnership in the last year, 23.4 percent had at least one casual, and 3.9 percent had at least one commercial sex partnership. The corresponding figures for single men are 78.2 percent, 45.7 percent and 5.3 percent.

Respondent: They both provide sex alright... but a *jadiya* is one who is much closer. (511, married, 22 years old)

Interviewer: Why are some women called *jadiya* and others casual partners?

Respondent: Well... It depends on the intimacy.

Interviewer: Yes?

Respondent: There's what you call "hit-and-run" casual. But there's somebody where the relationship continues for a longer period, and this intimate relationship is what they call "*jadiya*." But a casual partner is just a day-to-day hit-and-run and there's no relationship. Your interest is just to have sex and go away. (501, married, 39 years old)

There is one to trust [a *jadiya*], one who is close and knows you well and knows how you feel about her. (510, unmarried, 20 years old)

The mutual trust between partners in *jadiya* relationships is reflected in the low condom use within them (Kaufman and Stavrou 2004, Harrison et al. 2002), as we see in Table 4. Condoms were used at last sexual intercourse in only 38 percent of *jadiya* relationships, and condom use was substantially higher in casual and commercial partnerships.

Numerous men remarked that *jadiya* relationships are "expensive" and that they give *jadiya* more money and gifts. Men feel *jadiya* need them—and often their gifts—and these transfers signify men's ongoing commitment.

Interviewer: Why are some women called "*jadiya*" and others "casual partners"?

Respondent: I think casual partners are those who cover weekends or one-night stands with a man but are never to be seen again. Others get more involved and are more regular and are depended on by their partners.

Interviewer: So are these the ones you call *jadiya*?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Is a *jadiya* treated differently from casual partners or even wives?

Respondent: I believe so.

Interviewer: What would the situation be? Like would the *jadiya* be given more gifts?

Respondent: I think *jadiya* would be given gifts because most of the time they are not there [not living with the man], but it's in the man's head that she exists [he thinks of her often]. [So] he drops by and gives her presents once in a while. (515, married, 33 years old)

Interviewer: Between a *jadiya* and a [casual] girlfriend, is there any difference?

Respondent: Yes, there is.

Interviewer: Where is the difference?

Respondent: A *jadiya* is somebody who is very close and you can help in times of a problem. She is a lover.

Interviewer: *Jadiya* is whom you now refer to as a lover?

- Respondent: Yes, and a [causal] girlfriend is just somebody I am close to and see once in a while. She has a steady boyfriend elsewhere.
- Interviewer: Do you treat *jadiya* differently?
- Respondent: Yes.
- Interviewer: Where is the difference?
- Respondent: What you give your lover is different than what you give your girlfriend.
- Interviewer: So you value your lover more?
- Respondent: Yes, because when she asks for anything, then you listen. But a [causal] girlfriend has other services were she could get help. (505, unmarried, 22 years old)

We see that transfers within these partnerships have diverse meanings: gifts to *jadiya* signify ongoing, committed relationships, while transfers to casual partners are impersonal payments that these partners could easily obtain from other men. These differences are echoed by the descriptive statistics on transfers in Table 4. *Jadiya* relationships usually involve transfers and *jadiya* receive larger amounts than casual and commercial sex partners. Over three-quarters of *jadiya* received a transfer in the last month, averaging US\$ 89 (Ksh 6200) in the last year. Casual partners, in contrast, receive transfers less often and in roughly half the amount as *jadiya*. CSWs are very likely to receive a transfer, as the relationship is transactional by definition, however they receive less than *jadiya* on average. In sum, these figures reveal that *jadiya* partnerships are gift exchange investments for migrant men.

In the in-depth interviews, men were also asked about the status that comes with having a *jadiya*. Interestingly, the consensus among respondents was that *jadiya* are not a means to gain status within the community, and indeed, most of these relationships are hidden, particularly from wives but also from the general public. Thus, while *jadiya* do appear to offer benefits to urban migrants that the family would otherwise provide, they do not substitute for the status afforded by the home community.

We now turn to the results in [Table 5](#) to examine the relationship between transfers to *jadiya* and commercial sex/casual partners and remittances. Because of the small number of men involved in commercial sex partnerships in the last year, we pool transfers to commercial sex and casual partners, which both represent commodity exchange relationships, for the analysis. The other independent variables are the same as in Table 3.

We find that transfers to *jadiya* are negatively and significantly associated with remittances to the family. Every Ksh 1000 in transfers to *jadiya* decreases remittances by Ksh 90. Transfers to the other types of partners have no effect on family remittances. These results provide support for hypothesis 2, which states that transfers to gift exchange partners will decrease family remittances while transfers to commodity exchange partners will have no effect. The relationships between the other variables and family remittances remain largely unchanged or weakened only slightly from the previous results in Table 3.

It appears that the negative effect of transfers to all sexual partners that we uncovered in Table 3 is mainly explained by relationships with *jadiya*. The support received in *jadiya* relationships is

not a complete substitute for all of the benefits of the family, however, as the coefficient on transfers to *jadiya* is less than 1.

We would also like to point out an alternative interpretation for the small coefficient on transfers to *jadiya*. We noted above that migrants in high HIV/AIDS environments may remit more to their rural families as an investment strategy to ensure that they and their dependents are cared for in the event of HIV infection. Accordingly, we would expect that migrants who have the greatest perception of HIV risk or display unsafe sexual behaviors would remit the most to rural households. We saw in Table 4 that *jadiya* partnerships have the lowest levels of condom use, and therefore men in these relationships are at elevated risk of HIV infection. In this case, men in relationships with *jadiya* should remit *more* to their families as part of an investment strategy. This effect works in the opposite direction to the substitution effect we have described, where *jadiya* substitute for the benefits of the family and therefore migrants remit less to the rural household. This might help to explain why the coefficient on transfers to *jadiya* is so small, as these two opposing effects serve to dampen the substitution effect we are interested in.

With respect to home community remittances examined in Table 5, the effect of transfers to *jadiya* is small but positive and marginally significant, and the effect of transfers to commercial sex/casual partners displays no significant relationship with remittances. The relationships between the other independent variables and home community remittances remain largely unchanged or weakened only slightly from the analysis in Table 3. Thus, we can reject hypothesis 3, which predicted a negative effect of transfers from gift exchange partners on remittances to the home community. Indeed, the positive relationship between transfers to sexual partners and home remittances is likely due to selection effect: that the types of men who give more transfers are also those who give more to their communities.

Taken as a whole, our results support the conclusion that *jadiya* partnerships operate as a substitute for some of the support that urban migrant men reap from the rural family but are not substitute for the benefits received from the home community. The family continues to serve important insurance and investment functions for migrants in Kisumu, those which *jadiya* cannot provide, and therefore migrants do not abandon ties to the rural household entirely. Moreover, new non-familial ties with sexual partners in the city do little to sever men's enduring attachments to their wider kinship groups.

Conclusion

This paper contributes to the theory and evidence on migration and remittances in sub-Saharan Africa. We use both quantitative and qualitative data from a study of male Luo migrants in Kisumu, Western Kenya. We find evidence of contractual arrangements and altruistic motives for migrants to remit to their families of origin, including new incentives to maintain longer-term relations with rural households in contexts of ongoing HIV/AIDS epidemics. We are among the first to examine remittances to rural households and communities separately. Our results find that the determinants of these resource flows differ and support the view that urban African migrants remit to the home community due to their identify with the kinship group and as part of a strategy to enhance their status within the wider community.

We also are the first to conceptualize and measure non-familial ties that migrants forge in the city and how these compete for a share of migrants' resources. We investigated migrant men's involvement with nonmarital sexual relationships and the transfers given to them. We found that transfers to sexual partners are associated with decreases in remittances to the rural household, and that this effect is largely explained by partnerships with longer-term, serious girlfriends known as *jadiya*. We argue that these non-familial ties—particularly *jadiya* partnerships—serve as substitutes for the emotional support that migrants would otherwise derive from their rural families. Transfers to sexual partners do not reduce remittances to the home community, however, signifying that new non-familial ties in the city do not substitute for the benefits urban migrants receive from patron-client relationships with their kinship groups.

References

- Azam, Jean-Paul and Flore Gubert. 2006. Migrants' remittances and the household in Africa: A review of evidence. *Journal of African Economies* 15 (Suppl. 2):426-462.
- Brockerhoff, Martin and Ann E. Biddlecom. Migration, sexual behavior and the risk of HIV in Kenya. *International Migration Review* 33(4):833-856.
- Buvé A, Lagarde E, Carael M, Rutenberg N, Ferry B, Glynn JR, Laourou M, Akam E, Chege J, and Sukwa T for the Study Group on Heterogeneity of HIV Epidemics in African Cities. 2001d. The Epidemiology of Gonorrhoea, Chlamydial Infection and Syphilis in Four African Cities. *AIDS* 15(Suppl. 4):S117-S126.
- Carrier, James. 1991. "Gifts, Commodities, and Social Relations: A Maussian View of Exchange." *Sociological Forum* 6(1):119-136.
- Catania JA, Gibson DR, Chitwood DD, and Coates TJ. 1990. Methodological Problems in AIDS Behavioral Research: Influences on Measurement Error and Participation Bias in Studies of Sexual Behavior. *Psychological Bulletin* 108(3): 339-362.
- Chimwaza, A.F. and S.C. Watkins. 2004. Giving care to people with symptoms of AIDS in rural sub-Saharan Africa. *AIDS Care* 16(7):795-807.
- Clark, Samuel J., Mark A. Collinson, Kathleen Kahn, Kyle Drullinger, and Stephen M. Tollman. 2007. Returning home to die: Circular labor migration and mortality in Northeast South Africa. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America. New York.
- Cliggett, Lisa. 2003. Gift remitting and alliance building in Zambian modernity: Old answers to modern problems. *American Anthropologist* 105(3):1-10.
- de la Brière, Bénédicte, Elisabeth Sadoulet, Alain de Janvry, and Sylvie Lambert. 2002. The roles of destination, gender, and household composition in explaining remittances: An analysis for the Dominican Sierra. *Journal of Development Economics* 68:309-328.
- Dinan, Carmel. 1983. Sugar daddies and gold-diggers: The white-collar single women in Accra. In Christine Opong, ed. *Female and male in West Africa*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Drimie, Scott. 2003. HIV/AIDS and land: Case studies from Kenya, Lesotho and South Africa. *Development Southern Africa* 20(5):647-658.
- Dyson, Tim. 2003. HIV/AIDS and urbanization. *Population and Development Review* 29(3):427-442.

- Fennell, Julie and Nancy Luke. 2007. Wives and “jadiya” lovers: Parallel unions in post-polygynous Kenya. Brown University, mimeo.
- Findley, Sally E. 1997. Migration and family interactions in Africa. In Aderanti Adepaju (ed.), *Family, Population and Development in Africa*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Francis, Elizabeth and John Hoddinott. 1993. Migration and differentiation in Western Kenya: A tale of two sub-locations. *The Journal of Development Studies* 30(1):115-145.
- Geschiere, Peter and Joseph Gugler. 1998. The Urban-rural connection: Changing issues of belonging and identification. *Africa* 68(3):309-319.
- Glynn, J.R., M. Caraël, B. Auvert, M. Kahindo, J. Chege, R. Musonda, F. Kaona, A. Buve, and the Study Group on the Heterogeneity of HIV Epidemics in African Cities. 2001. “Why Do Young Women have a Much Higher Prevalence of HIV than Young Men? A Study in Kisumu, Kenya and Ndola, Zambia.” *AIDS* 15(suppl. 4):S51-S60.
- Gregson S, Zhuwau T, Ndlovu J, and Nyambukapa C. 2002. Methods to Reduce Social Desirability Bias in Sex Surveys in Low-Development Settings: Experience in Zimbabwe. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 29(10): 568-575.
- Gugler, Joesph. 1991. Life in a dual system revisited: Urban-rural ties in Enugu, Nigeria, 1961-87.” *World Development* 19(5):399-409.
- Gugler, Joesph. 2002. The son of a hawk does not remain abroad: The urban-rural connection in Africa. *African Studies Review* 45(1):21-41.
- Harrison, Abigail, Nonhlanhla Xaba, and Pinky Kunene. 2002. Understanding safe sex: Gender narratives of HIV and pregnancy prevention by rural South African school-going youth. *Reproductive Health Matters* 9(17):63-71.
- Hoddinott, John. 1994. A model of migration and remittances applied to Western Kenya. *Oxford Economic Papers* 46:459-476.
- Hoddinott, John and Elizabeth Francis. 1993. Migration and differentiation in Western Kenya: A tale of two sub-locations. *Journal of Development Studies* 30(1):115-145.
- Hunter, Mark. 2002. The materiality of everyday sex: Thinking beyond ‘prostitution’. *African Studies* 61(1): 99-120.
- Kaufman, Carol E. and Stavros E. Stavrou. 2004. “‘Bus fare please’: The Economics of Sex and Gifts Among Young People in Urban South Africa.” *Cultural, Health and Sexuality* 6(5):377-391.
- Knowles, James C. and Richard Anker. 1981. An analysis of income transfers in a developing country: The case of Kenya. *Journal of Development Economics* 8:205-226.

- Lagarde, E., M. Schim van der Loeff, C. Enel, B. Holmgren, R. Dray-Spira, G. Pison, J.P. Piau, V. Delaunay, S. M'Boup, I. Ndoeye, M. Coeuret-Pellicer, H. Whittle, P. Aaby, for the MECORA Group. 2003. Mobility and the spread of human immunodeficiency virus into rural areas of West Africa. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 32:744-752.
- Lucas, Robert E.B. and Oded Stark. 1985. Motivations to remit: Evidence from Botswana. *Journal of Political Economy* 93(51):901-918.
- Luke, Nancy. 2006. Exchange and Condom Use in Informal Sexual Relationships in Urban Kenya. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 54(2):319-348.
- Luke, Nancy. 2005a. Confronting the 'Sugar Daddy' Stereotype: Age and Economic Asymmetries and Risky Sexual Behavior in Urban Kenya. *International Family Planning Perspectives* 31(1).
- Luke, Nancy. 2005b. Investigating Exchange in Sexual Relationships in Sub-Saharan African using Survey Data. In Shireen Jejeebhoy and Deepkia Ganju, eds. *Non-consensual Sex and Young People: Perspectives from the Developing World*. London: Zed Books.
- Luke, Nancy. 2003. Age and Economic Asymmetries in the Sexual Relationships of Adolescent Girls in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Studies in Family Planning* 34(2):67-86.
- Luke, Nancy. 2002. Widows and 'Professional Inheritors': Understanding AIDS Risk Perceptions in Kenya. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America, May 9-11, Atlanta.
- Luke, Nancy and Kaivan Munshi. 2006. New Roles for Marriage in Urban Africa: Kinship Networks and the Labor Market in Kenya. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 88(2):264-282.
- Lyons, Maryinez. 2003. Mobile populations and HIV/AIDS in East Africa. In Ezekiel Kalipeni, Susan Craddock, Joseph R. Oppong, and Jayati Ghosh, *HIV and AIDS in Africa: Beyond Epidemiology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Menjivan, Cecilia, Julie DaVanzo, Lisa Greenwell, and R. Burciaga Valdez. 1998. Remittance behavior among Salvadoran and Filipino immigrants in Los Angeles. *International Migration Review* 32(1):97-126.
- Mooney, Margarita. 2003. Migrants' social ties in the U.S. and investment in Mexico. *Social Forces* 81(3):1147-1170.
- National AIDS and STI Control Programme (NASCOP). 2005. *AIDS in Kenya: Trends, Interventions, Impact*, 7th Edition. Nairobi: Ministry of Health.

- Nyambedha, Erick Otieno, Simiyu Wandibba, and Jens Aagaard-Hansen. 2003a. Changing patterns of orphan care due to the HIV epidemic in western Kenya. *Social Science and Medicine* 57:301-311.
- Nyambedha, Erick Otieno, Simiyu Wandibba, and Jens Aagaard-Hansen. 2003b. 'Retirement lost'—The new role of the elderly as caretakers for orphans in western Kenya. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology* 18:33-52.
- Ocholla-Ayayo, A.B.C. 1976. *Traditional ideology and ethics among the Southern Luo*. Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.
- Ogot, Bethwell A. 1967. *History of the Southern Luo*. Vol. 1. Nairobi: East African Publishing House.
- Parkin, David. 1978. *The cultural definition of political response: Lineal destiny among the Luo*. London: Academic Press.
- Piotrowski, Martin. 2006. The effect of social networks at origin communities on migrant remittances: Evidence from Nang Rong District. *European Journal of Population* 22:670-94.
- Sana, Mariano. 2005. Buying membership in the transnational community: Migrant remittances, social status, and assimilation. *Population Research and Policy Review* 24:231-261.
- Silberschmidt, Margrethe, and Vibeke Rasch. 2001. Adolescent girls, illegal abortions and "sugar daddies" in Dar es Salaam: Vulnerable victim and active social agents. *Social Science and Medicine* 52:1815-1826.
- Smith, Daniel Jordan. 2003. Patronage, per diems, and the 'workshop mentality': The practice of family planning programs in Southeastern Nigeria. *World Development* 31(4):703-715.
- Smith, Daniel Jordan. 2001. Kinship and corruption in contemporary Nigeria. *Ethnos* 66(3):344-364.
- Sprecher, Susan. 1998. Social exchange theories and sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research* 35:32-43.
- Stark, Oded and Robert E. B. Lucas. 1988. Migration, remittances, and the family. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*. :465-481.
- Van Dalen, Hendrik P., George Groenewold, and Tineke Fokkema. 2005. The effect of remittances on emigration intentions in Egypt, Morocco, and Turkey. *Population Studies* 59(3):375-392.
- van de Rijt, Arnout and Michael W. Macy. 2006. Power and dependence in intimate exchange. *Social Forces* 84(3):1455-1470.

- Vanwey, Leah K. 2004. Altruistic and contractual remittances between male and female migrants and households in rural Thailand. *Demography* 41(4):739-756.
- Voeten HACM, Egesha OB, and Habbema JKF. 2004. Sexual Behavior is More Risky in Rural than in Urban Areas among Young Women in Nyanza Province, Kenya. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 31(8):481-487.
- Vos, T. 1994. Attitudes to sex and sexual behavior in rural Matabeleland, Zimbabwe. *AIDS Care* 6(2):193-203.
- White, Michael J. and David P. Lindstrom. 2004. Internal migration. In Poston and Micklin (eds.), *Handbook of Population*.
- Wojcicki, J.M. 2002. Commercial sex work or *Ukuphanda*? Sex-for-money exchange in Soweto and Hammanskraal area, South Africa. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry* 26:339-370.
- Zulu, Eliya Msiyaphazi, F. Nii-Amoo Dodoo, and Alex Chika Ezeh. 2003. Urbanization, poverty, and sex: Roots of risky sexual behaviors in slum settlements in Nairobi, Kenya. In Ezekiel Kalipeni, Susan Craddock, Joseph R. Oppong, and Jayati Ghosh, *HIV and AIDS in Africa: Beyond Epidemiology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Table 1. Summary statistics

	<u>Mean or %</u>
Individual migrant characteristics	
Age (years)	28.7
Education (years)	9.9
Income in the last year (Ksh)	59,261.9
Current marital status (%)	
Married and cohabitated with spouse 10+ months in last year	43.6
Married and cohabitated with spouse <10 months in last year	19.2
Single (never married)	34.8
Divorced, separated, or widowed	2.4
Number of children ever born	1.9
Years since migrating to Kisumu	8.4
Attends clan association meetings in Kisumu	41.2
Rural household characteristics	
Land owned (acres)	7.8
Father surviving (%)	53.6
Mother surviving (%)	75.9
Number of migrant's brothers	4.1
Distance to Kisumu (miles)	28.9
N	2187

Table 2. Migrants' resource flows in last year

	<u>Mean or %</u>
Family	
Remitted to family (%)	87.9
Of those who remitted	
Amount remitted (Ksh)	14,920.6
Family remittances as percent of income	25.2
Home community	
Remitted to home community (%)	66.1
Of those who remitted	
Amount remitted to home community (Ksh)	3340.7
Home community remittances as percent of income	4.9
Non-family	
Had nonmarital sexual partner(s) (%)	59.8
Of those who had nonmarital sexual parnters	
Gave transfer to nonmarital sexual partner(s)† (%)	70.6
Of those who gave transfer	
Amount given to all nonmarital sexual partner(s) (Ksh)	11,434.7
Transfers to sexual partners as percent of income	20.6
N	2187

† in last month

Table 3. Linear regression analysis of the determinants of remittances

	Family remittances		Home community remittances	
	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE
Non-familial ties				
Transfers to sexual partners	-0.06	0.030 *	0.02	0.007 *
Individual migrant characteristics				
Age (years)	-39.91	86.359	41.28	18.875 *
Education (years)	139.16	151.739	86.33	33.118 **
Income	0.15	0.008 ***	0.02	0.002 ***
Income squared (x 10-8)	-4.42	0.036 ***	-0.63	0.079 ***
Current marital status				
Married/cohab. w/ spouse 10+ mo. (ref)				
Married/cohab. w/ spouse <10 mo.	-749.19	1017.888	-4.10	222.248
Single	-4846.76	1018.103 ***	-501.85	222.317 *
Number of children ever born	845.61	253.602 **	46.61	55.299
Years since migrating	20.02	56.993	-11.59	12.507
Attends clan association meetings	299.68	781.570	332.46	170.787 +
Rural household characteristics				
Land owned (acres)	67.81	25.622 **	4.94	5.597
Father surviving	511.74	774.082	402.40	169.014 *
Mother surviving	642.96	876.370	-19.04	191.050
Number of migrant's brothers	-118.56	117.869	-11.29	25.756
Distance from Kisumu (miles)	-70.31	27.949 *	-1.252	6.107
Constant	6312.58	2883.267 *	-1143.67	629.535 +
N	2187		2169	
R2	0.245		0.134	

***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<0.05; +p<=0.10

Table 4. Characteristics of migrants' nonmarital sexual partners by type

	Mean or %		
	Commerical sex workers	Casual	<i>Jadiya</i>
Men who had at least one partner by type in last year (%) (N=2187)	4.4	31.7	46.7
Length of relationship (months)	2.1	6.5	17.3
Received transfer in last month (%)	94.4	63.9	75.9
Amount of transfer in last year (Ksh)	4563.2	2928.0	6231.0
Used condom at last sex (%)	85.9	62.3	38.2
N	72	523	826

Table 5. Linear regression analysis of the determinants of remittances

	Family remittances		Home community remittances	
	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE
Non-familial ties				
Transfers to <i>jadiya</i>	-0.09	0.390 *	0.02	0.009 +
Transfers to casual/CSWs	0.04	0.069	0.01	0.016
Individual migrant characteristics				
Age (years)	-33.48	86.447	40.70	18.912 **
Education (years)	136.53	151.747	86.33	33.118 **
Income	0.14	0.008 ***	0.02	0.002 ***
Income squared (x 10-8)	-4.40	0.036 ***	-0.63	0.079 ***
Current marital status				
Married/cohab. w/ spouse 10+ mo. (ref)				
Married/cohab. w/ spouse <10 mo.	-728.60	1017.949	-4.51	222.353
Single	-4792.13	1019.435 ***	-499.42	222.545 *
Number of children ever born	848.25	253.606 **	47.34	55.331
Years since migrating	19.61	56.988	-11.51	12.512
Attends clan association meetings	284.35	781.449	335.42	170.846 *
Rural household characteristics				
Land owned (acres)	67.88	25.619 **	4.93	5.600
Father surviving	525.84	774.140	401.88	169.088 *
Mother surviving	670.10	876.476	-21.38	191.181
Number of migrant's brothers	-118.05	117.857	-11.19	25.764
Distance from Kisumu (miles)	-71.00	27.953 *	-1.22	6.110
Constant	6146.47	2886.001 *	-1132.20	630.710 +
N	2187		2169	
R2	0.246		0.134	

***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<0.05; +p<=0.10