LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO 1870 AD · MAJOREM · DEI · GLORIAM
eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Master's Theses | Theses and Dissertations

1972

The Black Migrant: An Analysis of Family Dependency Within the Migration Process

Edward J. Peklo
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses

Recommended Citation

Peklo, Edward J., "The Black Migrant: An Analysis of Family Dependency Within the Migration Process" (1972). *Master's Theses*. 2707.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/2707

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 1972 Edward J. Peklo

THE BLACK MIGRANT
AN ANALYSIS OF FAMILY DEPENDENCY
WITHIN THE MIGRATION PROCESS

by

Edward J. Peklo, S.V.D.

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

May, 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER II. URBANISM, MIGRATION, AND FAMILY COHESION. . . 2

Theory and Research 1887-1943 (2)--Theory and Research 1943-1970 (8)

CHAPTER III. THE DEVELOPEMENT OF A MOBILE, URBAN, BLACK COMMUNITY. 15

Introduction (15)--Urbanization of Blacks (16)--Outmigration of Blacks from the South (18)--Future Trends (28)

CHAPTER IV. FAMILY SUPPORT AND SPONSORSHIP IN MIGRATION . 30

Introduction (30)--Sponsors (30)--Support During Migration (34)--Relations with family after Migration (36) Hypotheses (39)

CHAPTER V. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS. 42

Sponsors of Migration to Chicago (43)--Support and Aid During Migration (51)--Post-migration Adaptation (56)

CHAPTER VI. CONCLUSIONS 59

APPENDIX 62

BIBLIOGRAPHY 66

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Net Migration to and from the United States South By Color and Decade, 1870-1970	19
2.	Negro Population and estimated Net Out-Migration of Negroes from South, 1940-1970	26
3.	Percentage of Black Population Urban, 1890-1960. . .	27
4.	Migration Patterns of Heads of Households by Age and Marital Status	44
5.	Social Status Position of Migrant By Sponsor	46
6.	Personal Sponsorship vs. Impersonal Sponsorship by Rural-Urban Origins	48
7.	Personal Sponsorship vs. Impersonal Sponsorship by Age at time of Migration.	49
8.	Sources of Aid and Information at Migration by Origin and Social Status Rankings.	51
9.	Prime Source of Aid and Information by Sponsorship .	52
10.	Prime Source of Aid and Information.	53
11.	Family as the Prime Source of Aid and Information By Age	54
12.	Indicators of Adaptation to Urban Life by Sponsorship	57
13.	Median Organizational Participation Score by Rank and Sponsorship	58

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to study the role of the family among black migrants in terms of the sponsorship and support offered by the family to the migrant before, during, and after migration. Sociological literature is filled with anti-urban bias and the assumption that family and kinship cohesion within urban society is impossible. If this be the case, the migrating individual will receive little and inconsequential aid and support from his already urbane kin.

The following study intends to show, that, on the contrary, vigorous and strong relations within kinship and family networks do exist among deeply urbane populations and that this, in turn, has implications for the crisis-prone situation of migration.

To begin, I will review some of the related literature on urbanism, migration, and family cohesion.

CHAPTER II

URBANISM, MIGRATION, AND FAMILY COHESION

Theory and Research 1887-1943

The sociological literature on urbanism and the urban way of life is firmly based on an intellectual and conceptual tradition which runs from Durkheim, Toennies and Simmel through Park and Burgess to Wirth, Thrasher, Zorbaugh, Faris and Dunham, Mowrer and McKenzie. The fact that living in the city makes a difference in one's way of life has long been noted. Durkheim, in 1897, succinctly stated the relationship of the nature of physical conditions of living and population agglomerations to "social life:"

> Social life rests on a substratum whose size as well as its form is determined. This substratum is constituted by the mass of individuals who make up society, the way in which they are distributed on the soil, and the nature and configuration of all sorts of things that affect collective relationships.[1]

Durkheim differentiated between social orders whose cohesion was derived from "mechanical solidarity" and those whose cohesion was "organic" arising from the division of labor.[2] He envisaged these differentiations as consecutive developements in keeping

---

[1]Emile Durkheim, L'Annee Sociologique, Vol. II, 1897, as quoted in Philip M. Hauser, "On the Impact of Urbanism on Social Organization, Human Nature and the Political Order," Confluence, (Spring, 1958), p. 59.

[2]Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labor in Society (New York: Free Press, 1964), pp. 70-132.

with his historical and evolutionist approach. "Organic solidarity was typical of the more recent and more complex social orders. Toennies produced a similar distinction between "community" and "society" as existing simultaneously.[3] Redfield and Wirth climaxed this developement of "ideal type" constructs in amplifying the distinction between "folk society"[4] on the one hand and "urbanism as a way of life"[5] on the other.

The urban social order is the opposite of the folk society which Redfield described as small, isolated, homogeneous, with simple technology, with simple division of labor, largely independent economically, characterized by a strong organization of conventional understanding with no systematic knowledge in books and with no market complex. Wirth, in describing the urban mode of life, emphasized the way in which the physical mechanism of the city, including patterns of land use, land values, transport and communication facilities influenced urban living. He emphasized the dominance of the city over its hinterland. He pointed to the way in which the essential abstract characteristics of the city--"size," "density," and "heterogeneity"--resulted in the "substitution of secondary for primary contacts, the weakening in the bonds of kinship and the declining social significance of the family, the disappearance of the neighborhood, and the undermining

---

[3]Ferdinand Toennies, Community and Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), pp. 33-102.

[4]Robert Redfield, "The Folk Society," American Journal of Sociology, (January, 1947), pp. 293-308.

[5]Louis Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," American Journal of Sociology, (July, 1938), pp. 1-24.

of the traditional basis of social solidarity."[6]

In terms of urbanism, what has been described so far relates to broad and general aspects of social order and social reality. More important and relevant to this thesis is the effect urbanism has on social institutions, and specifically its influence on the family which has been traditionally recognized as the primary social unit.

Even this most solidly rooted of our social institutions has not been able to withstand the impact of urbanization. The colonial family in early America, for example, was the keystone of social organization. It was a basic and largely self-sufficient economic unit; it provided the security and protection of its members; and it was the center for their affectional and recreational life. Compared to the colonial family, the modern urban family is smaller; it is more often childless or has fewer or no children. The urban family, both as a group and as individuals, is much more mobile; it possesses comparatively little economic or social unity; is more frequently broken by separation or divorce; and has long since lost many of its various historic functions, or shared them with new, specialized, urban institutions. The relationships of husband and wife, parents and children, children to each other, and of the nuclear to the extended family have been redefined in the urban setting. The relationships between family members compete in depth, range, influence and satisfaction with extra-familial relationships.

---

[6]Ibid., p. 21.

As old institutions were modified, including the family, new institutions emerged in response to new needs. These have given rise to specialized types of agencies and services such as police departments, public health services, insurance, workmen's compensation laws, unemployment compensation, labor unions, etc. The urban environment has forced modification of our inherited institutions and has precipitated the need for the formation and developement of new institutions.

One of the most important differences between the urban and the "folk" environment, as it affects the conduct of the individual, is found in the extent to which one is faced with the necessity of exercising choice, and of substituting rational for traditional ways of doing things. In the "folk" setting, there is generally a prescribed way of dealing with most situations--certainly the most important recurring situations in life. In the city there are almost always alternatives--and the individual is forced to choose.

These basic changes in the nature of life, in an urban setting, are expressed in changes in modes of thought and action and in personality types. Max Weber recognized this in his construction of "ideal types" of social behavior: the "traditional," "the purposive-rational," "the valuational," and "the emotional"[7]--types which Riesman has adapted and popularized in his categories of "directedness," "traditional-direction," "inner-direction," and

[7]Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations (New York: Free Press, 1969), pp. 115-118.

"other-direction."[8]

Thus, enforced rationalism and urbanization, together with rapid social change, provide the matrix for personal and social disorganization. This social process, in turn, has been the catalyst for much of the research done on urbanism and family structure. Outstanding for its efforts in laying the groundwork in this area is the Chicago School of Sociology. The students of Park and Burgess, with the possible exception of McKenzie, see the urban community as largely pathological. Their analysis of the family tends to stress the general decline in the significance of the family for the individual.[9] It is argued that while family and kinship networks are still a part of the individual's social environment, they have been replaced by secondary associations and relations so that the family and kinship are of declining importance in modern urban society.[10] This change is seen as a result of the urban setting being dysfunctional for familial relationships which are basically rural or small town in community origin.

It is the work of Robert Ezra Park that speaks very forcefully to the issue. Turn to his study of urban spatial arrangements: there is his idea that city landscape records the pattern

---

[8]David Riesman, Nathan Glazer, and R. Denny, The Lonely Crowd (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), Chapter I.

[9]cf., Ernest W. Burgess and Harvey J. Locke, The Family (New York: American Book Company, 1953), p. 121.

[10]Ibid., p. 10.

of social mobility;[11] turn to the writings on ethnic relations: there is his metaphor of social distance;[12] turn to the analysis of migration: there is his theory of the marginal man.[13] The essence of this latter theory, which is relevant to this study, is as follows: migration detaches individuals and groups from traditional restraints and supports, casts them into a marginal position full of personal turmoil and potential social disorganization, and eventually leads to their simultaneous socialization and reintegration into the receiving population--the pace of the reintegration depending on the cultural gaps between newcomers and the receiving population.

> Disorganization of attitudes and conduct is almost invariably the lot of the newcomer to the city; and the discarding of the habitual and of what has been called the moral is not infrequently accompanied by sharp mental conflict and a sense of personal loss.[14]

This theory seems most plausible and it has passed into sociological writing as an explanatory principle, however with little elaboration and precious little testing. It gains much of its credibility from its excellent fit to what I discussed earlier: the fundamental conception of the city as an impersonal mechanism

---

[11]Robert E. Park, "The Urban Community as a Spatial Pattern and Moral Order," On Social Control and Collective Behavior ed. by Ralph H. Turner, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), pp. 55-68.

[12]Robert E. Park, "The Concept of Social Distance: As Applied To the Study of Racial Attitudes and Relations," Journal of Applied Sociology, (July, 1924), pp. 339-44.

[13]Robert E. Park, "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," American Journal of Sociology, (May, 1928), pp. 881-93.

[14]Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, The City (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925), p. 54.

and its near corollary--the conception of a more traditional form of social integration based on a small scale, and like-minded and intense communication. The city presumably draws its newcomers from this kind of setting. Hence, the strength of the conclusion that migration to the city ordinarily disorganizes the individual and his society by destroying, at once, his restraints and emotional supports.

Theory and Research 1943-1970

The purpose of this thesis is to suggest a modification of the analysis presented above. The position taken is that family and kinship are very important for some population elements, and, that the rural-to-urban adjustment analysis presented above is over generalized.

There is a growing body of empirical evidence to support this position. Following a path forged by Whyte's Street Corner Society,[15] researchers on urban life have found ostensibly disorganized areas with high levels of internal organization, and everyday urban contacts rich with kinship, friendship, and neighborliness. It is noted by Michelson that "disorganization is a loaded concept."[16] He points out that there is notquestion of many "rundown" areas poorly organized on a social level. However, some of them are organized, and the precise basis of the organization frequently appears to be kinship. For example, such were the findings through-

---

[15]William F. Whyte, Street Corner Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943).

[16]William Michelson, Man and His Environment: A Sociological Approach (Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley, 1970), p. 67.

out the variety of reports arising from the West End Study in Boston in the 1950's and 1960's.[17] The West End Study utilized the tools of psychiatry, psychology, anthropology and sociology to study, over a period of time, the impact of urban renewal on the residents of the area. One consistent finding running throughout all the various reports isthe devotion of energy and attention paid to frequent gatherings with like-age relatives. Young and Willmott, in their study of London's East End,[18] likewise found interaction with relatives to be highly valued. The daily flow of life centered around the family, just as it did for the West Enders'. Axelrod,[19] Greer,[20] and Litwak,[21] in three independent studies of middle-class groups in large urban centers (Buffalo, Detroit, and Los Angeles), found that almost 50 percent of their samples saw relatives at least once a week or more. In still another study by Bell and Boat,[22] on San Francisco, close to 90 percent of the

---

[17]Herbert Gans, The Urban Villagers (New York: Free Press, 1962); Edward Ryan, "Personal Identification in an Urban Slum," The Urban Condition ed. by Leonard J. Duhl, (New York: Basic Books, 1963), pp. 135-150; Chester W. Hartman, "Social Values and Housing Orientation," The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 19, (No. 2, 1963), pp. 113-131.

[18]Michael Young and Peter Willmott, Family Kinship in East London (Glencoe: Free Press, 1957).

[19]Morris Axelrod, "Urban Structure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, (February, 1956), pp. 13-19.

[20]Scott Greer, "Urbanism Reconsidered," American Sociological Review, (February, 1956), pp. 19-25.

[21]Eugene Litwak, "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion," American Sociological Review, (June, 1960), pp. 385-94.

[22]Wendell Bell and Marion Boat, "Urban Neighborhoods and Informal Social Relations," American Journal of Sociology, (January, 1957), pp. 391-98.

respondents reported that an extended family member was also one of their closest friends.

The rediscovery of personal relationships also makes a difference in the analysis of mobility's consequences. If we suppose that personal relationships are common and that such relationships often ease the pain of abrupt shifts in social position and environment, then the sequence going from migration to personal disorganization to social disorganization does not necessarily follow. We can expect the maintenance of social networks already in existence to cushion the shock of transfer for some individuals, and the rapid establishment of new personal relationships to do the same for others. A growing body of evidence supports this position.

The role of the family in migration became evident with industrialization in Europe. LePlay showed how the "stem family" encouraged the migration of some of its members as a means of extending the opportunity of the family or kinship group.[23] Migration in this case in viewed as a temporary condition, or, if permanent, one in which the migrant sends money back to the family and assists other family members in becoming established, thereby contributing to the enhancement of the status and security of the extended family.

The function of the "stem family" in migration is found also in the Polish peasant family,[24] in mountaineer families in the

---

[23]Frederick LePlay, Les ouvriers europeens, 2nd ed., 6 Volumes, (Paris: Tours A Mame et fils, 1878).

[24]W.I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, The Polish Peasant in Europe and America (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1918), p. 192.

United States,[25] and in the Irish country family.[26] Thomas and Znaniecki state that "when the peasant emigrates, it is usually with the desire to earn ready money and return home to buy land."[27] As a result, most of the early Polish immigrants to the U.S. did not take up farming but instead sought work in the mines, on railroads, and in steel mills, where they could earn the most cash with the least preparation and investment. Polish migrants who moved to urban centers in their own country returned every year to their native village with money and stories of their experiences.

Litwak argues convincingly that the classical extended family acted as a barrier to geographic mobility when and only when they felt that such mobility was not legitimate or would lead to a break in contact. Nuclear families who had a good reason to move were actually better able to do so if they had an extended family to help them than if they stood alone. The extended family, by cooperation, could raise capital to send one of its nuclear families to the urban center. This family, with its superior earning power, could then help other families to follow after it. The existence of the extended family tie between the migrating nuclear family and those left behind also enhanced the mobility of related nuclear families by providing reliable information on jobs,

---

[25] James S. Brown, Harry K. Schwarzweller, and Joseph Mangalam, "Kentucky Mountain Migration and Stem Family: An American Variation on a Theme by LePlay," Rural Sociology, (March, 1963), pp.48-69.

[26] Conrad Arensberg and Solon T. Kimball, Family and Community in Ireland (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940), pp. 143-157.

[27] Thomas and Znaniecki, The Polish Peasant, pp. 101-102.

housing, local social norms, language, and generally aiding the new migrant at the most difficult point of migration.[28]

The maintenance of strong family ties with migration was also found among Italian immigrants to London.[29] The London families were a kind of extension of the home families based in Italy. This was strongest among the higher status families. Kinship among the Italian families of London carried with it a set of rights and obligations and was not only an instrument of social expression as it was among the English. All families interviewed had been asked to help some of their kin migrants at some time or other. This ranged from hospitality to providing jobs, money, and legal protection.

It has also been noted that kinship ties among Appalachian migrants endure despite their movement into urban centers of the U.S.[30] In fact, the greater the difference in the environment to which the family moves, the greater the tendency to maintain family ties. Families going from Tennessee to Detroit maintained closer family ties than those going to Nashville or other nearby locations.[31]

In the face of an unfamiliar or unfriendly environment, kinship ties are maintained between local and migrant family members.

---

[28]Eugene Litwak, "Geographic Mobility," pp. 385-394.

[29]Raymond Firth, ed., Two Studies of Kinship in London (Athlone Press, 1957).

[30]Brown, Schwarzweller, Mangalam, "Kentucky Mountain," pp. 48-69.

[31]Elmora Matthews, Neighbors and Kin (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1965), pp. 58-59.

On the one hand, higher status families continue interaction with the home families when opportunities are closed to them for becoming fully integrated into the receiving society, as was the case with the Italian immigrants to London, and on the other hand, lower status migrants continue such interaction because of their inability to become assimilated into the new environment due to a lack of skills and resources necessary for such integration.

Another study of 109 migrant families in Kentucky, by Schwarzweller and Brown, gives further support to the role of the extended family in migration.[32] Level of living, income, and occupational levels were maintained throughout the process of migration; this stability of the families would not have likely occurred without the support of the family structure.

Studies of urbanization in Latin America have likewise indicated the importance of family and kin ties. Family reasons were found to play an important role in the choice of Buenos Aires as a place to live.[33] Relatives are the nucleus of the contacts of the head of the household in the city, and contact is also maintained with relatives more than friends in the place from which the migrant came. Pearse observes that the family continued to be the most important basis of social contact and material aid in the favelas of Rio de Janeiro for migrants to the city. Mutual assist-

---

[32]Harry K. Schwarzweller and James S. Brown, "Social Class Origins, Rural-Urban Migration and Economic Life Chances: A Case Study," Rural Sociology, (March, 1967), pp. 5-19.

[33]Gino Germani, "Inquiry into the Social Effects of Urbanization in a Working Class Sector of Greator Buenos Aires," in Philip M. Hauser, Urbanization in Latin America (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), pp. 206-233.

ance is provided in the form of temporary housing or acquiring a favela house, making contacts for employment, and in some cases, financial assistance.[34]

These are just a few of the many reformulations challenging the idea that urban society and family and kinship networks are incompatible. They have uncovered vigorous relationships among kinship groups in deeply urbane populations, and they have implications for the crisis-prone situation of migration. Thus, in the light of these empirical studies, I will suggest a modification of the rural-to-urban adjustment analysis in terms of family sponsorship and support.

But since this study deals primarily with black migrants, it is necessary to, first of all, take a brief look at the historical development of a mobile, urban, black community in the U.S.

---

[34]Andrew Pearse, "Some Characteristics of Urbanization in the City of Rio de Janeiro," in Hauser, Urbanization in Latin America, pp. 188-206.

CHAPTER III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MOBILE URBAN BLACK COMMUNITY

Introduction

Blacks were originally brought to the States to work in the cities as house servants or laborers. During the second half of the seventeenth century and the next, their numbers in the emerging cities grew as more laborers were needed and immigrants from Europe became difficult to obtain.

During the eighteenth century, agricultural growth created a new economic slot for blacks and many more slaves entered the Southern colonies. After the Revolution the need for slaves was increased with the invention of the cotton gin and the opening up of the Gulf Coast States, and by the time of the Civil War, the black population was concentrated in rural Southern areas.

Immediately following the War, many blacks moved to Southern cities. However, because of the lack of prosperity and industrialization, only a small proportion of blacks could support themselves in an urban setting. Thus, at the turn of this century, blacks were still as concentrated in the rural South as forty or one hundred years earlier.

It was in this period, the post Civil War years, that the outmigration of blacks from the South began--a pattern which became substantial after 1900. The cities of the North and West were the

destination of practically all the blacks leaving the South. Economic changes have encouraged blacks to leave the South since early in this century. Agricultural advancement practically eliminated the small and marginal farmer--typified by the rural, Southern black. The boll weevil destroyed farms lessening the need for agricultural workers and encouraging blacks to leave the South. World War I spurred a greater industrial production, and at the same time cut off the supply of European immigrant labor. Industries began to recruit Southern blacks, thus precipitating further urbanization of blacks. The migration of both blacks and whites was cut off by the Depression, but, again, World War II and the prosperity of the post War years meant a resumption of pre-Depression migration trends.

Today, blacks are more urbanized than the white population, and the 1970 Census indicates a continuing movement of blacks away from rural areas to cities. And since the Southern black, rural population is still large and rapidly growing, these trends will most likely continue in the foreseeable future.

Urbanization of Blacks

Most blacks stayed in the South after the Civil War. During this period, the South was far behind the North in industrialization, and the main industry of both blacks and whites was agriculture. From 1860 to 1900, the percentage of the nation's population in the South held steady at one-third, but the South's share of manufacturing output was not proportional.[1] Consequently, urbanization

[1]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1960 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office), PC(1)-1A, Table 20.

in the latter nineteenth century progressed much slower in the South than in other regions of the country. As recently as 1950, the majority of Southerners still lived in rural areas, whereas the Northeast became predominantly urban in the 1870's, and the North Central and Western regions during World War I. This slow growth of urban centers in the South meant that most blacks lived in rural areas. The Census of 1890, which was the first to give a rural-urban breakdown of the black population, found 80 percent of all blacks and 85 percent of Southern blacks in rural areas.[2] (See Table 3).

However, in spite of the Southern, rural concentration of blacks, a substantial number of them did move to cities immediately following the Civil War. With emancipation, many blacks left their farms and headed for the cities--especially cities with Union Army camps. This freedom of movement was a guarantee of emancipation for some; others, on the assumption that the end of slavery meant they would no longer have to struggle for a living, expected the Federal Government to support them.[3] However, the War had severly devastated most Southern towns. It had destroyed rail lines, and many of the factories were either wrecked or dependent upon the highly disrupted agricultural sector.[4] Thus, attempts at reconstruction were only complicated by the presence of unskilled and

---

[2]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Negro Population, 1790-1915 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1918), p. 91.

[3]Vernon L. Wharton, The Negro in Mississippi, 1865-1890 (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 106.

[4]Robert S. Henry, The Story of Reconstruction (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1938), pp. 68-112.

destitute blacks in the cities. Certain federally held lands were turned over to the Freedman's Bureau to be distributed among blacks in the hope of resettling them in the rural areas. However, most of these turned out to be marginal lands and poor for farming, and apparently, few blacks benefitted.[5] In another effort to encourage blacks to leave the cities, the Freedman's Bureau arranged and acted as overseer in a contract labor system, and paid transportation costs as well.[6]

Efforts on the part of the Freedman's Bureau may have been partly successful in resettling blacks, but the black population of most Southern cities jumped sharply following the Civil War. To give just two examples: in the decade 1860 to 1870, the percentage of the population black in Atlanta jumped from 20 percent to 46 percent, and in Memphis, it grew from 17 percent to 38 percent.[7]

In most cities, blacks filled whatever need there was for unskilled or semi-skilled labor and for house servants. The Census of 1890 shows that practically all blacks, who held nonagricultural jobs, worked as laborers, porters, or house servants.[8]

Outmigration of Blacks from the South

Although most blacks stayed in the South after the Civil War,

---

[5]John Hope Franklin, Reconstruction After the Civil War (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 37.

[6]Wharton, The Negro in Mississippi, 1865-1890, p. 75.

[7]Richard C. Wade, Slavery in Cities (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), Appendix.

[8]U.S. Census Office, Eleventh Census of the United States: 1890 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office), II Table 82.

outmigration also occurred. Since 1895, the Census has included a question about state or country of birth.[9] By comparing state of birth information and making appropriate allowances for mortality, it is possible to estimate the volume of outmigration for decennial periods. Such estimates of net migration for the South are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

NET MIGRATION TO AND FROM THE UNITED STATES SOUTH BY COLOR AND DECADE 1870-1970 (IN THOUSANDS)

Decade	Total	White	Nonwhite
1870-1880	11	82	-71
1880-1890	-411	-328	-83
1890-1900	-143	52	-195
1900-1910	-274	-77	-197
1910-1920	-1,088	-566	-522
1920-1930	-1,576	-704	-872
1930-1940	-756	-349	-407
1940-1950	-2,135	-538	-1,599
1950-1960	-1,403	53	-1,456
1960-1970	400	1,800	-1,400
Totals	-7,377	-575	-6,802

Sources: [a]1870-1960, C. Horace Hamilton, "The Negro Leaves the South," Demography, 1: (1, 1964), Table 3a.

[b]1960-1970, Philip M. Hauser, "The Census of 1970," Scientific American, (July, 1971), pp. 17-25.

For the last one hundred years, there has been a continual and generally increasing migration of blacks from the South. Immediately after the Civil War, migrants out of the South were few in number. Some did move to the plains states, especially Kansas,

[9]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population: 1960, PC(2)-2A, p. viii.

in the hope of receiving free land.[10] The late 1880's saw a shift, both in direction and volume: the movement from the South turned toward Northern cities, and since 1880, blacks have consistently migrated to cities. In 1890, the first date for which the necessary information is available, three-fifths of all non-Southern blacks lived in towns and by 1910 this figure approached four-fifths.[11]

There are many reasons why blacks migrated--reasons typically called push and pull factors. In terms of the South, there were poor economic activities and opportunities for blacks. Wharton states that the employment of blacks in agriculture, in either a wage, share crop, or tenancy basis was unsatisfactory to both blacks and white landowners.[12] The depression of the 1890's, the gradual spread of the boll weevil from the Southwest across cotton lands to the Southeast, the droughts of 1916 and 1917--all these only worsened the economic status of blacks and encouraged many to leave.[13] In fact, the peak year for the amount of farm land worked by blacks was reached back in 1910, and despite the growth of the black population in the South, the number of black farmers has declined steadily since 1920.[14] As mechanization and

---

[10]Wharton, The Negro in Mississippi, pp. 113-116.

[11]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Negro Population, 1790-1915, p. 90.

[12]Wharton, The Negro in Mississippi, pp. 70-71.

[13]Louise Venable Kennedy, The Negro Peasant Turns Cityward, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930), p. 48.

[14]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Agriculture: 1959 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office), II, Chap. X, Table 5.

modernization of agriculture occurred, the black farm population has continued to drop. From 1960 to 1965 alone, the black farm population declined 41 percent while the white farm population fell 17 percent.[15]

Another push factor was the abuse blacks had to suffer in the South. Vann Woodward argues that Southern states instituted or reinstated Jim Crow practices and laws toward the end of the nineteenth century.[16] It began with Mississippi in 1875 and ended with Virginia in 1902: one state after another came up with some way of excluding blacks from voting or politics, of limiting their civil rights and restricting their activities.[17] As a result, many more blacks left the South. Kennedy claims that areas in which attacks on blacks, such as lynching, were most commonplace, lost black population through migration most rapidly.[18]

In terms of the North, the major attraction or pull factor was the hope of economic prosperity. However, this factor wasn't operative until the World War I era. Blacks had been used by certain Northern industries as strikebreakers.[19] Yet, descriptions of black workers before 1917 suggest little threat to the white

---

[15]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Farm Population of the United States: 1965 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office), Current Population Reports, Series P-27, No. 36.

[16]C. Vann Woodward, The Strange Career of Jim Crow (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 7.

[17]cf. Wharton, The Negro in Mississippi, p. 199.

[18]Kennedy, The Negro Peasant Turns Cityward, p. 49.

[19]Seth M. Scheiner, Negro Mecca (New York: New York University Press, 1965), p. 68.

labor force. Certain jobs--domestic service, pullman car porters, and some construction and slaughterhouse jobs--were particularly all black; other jobs were typically closed to blacks. Myrdal writes that there was a hesitancy on the part of Northern industry "to mix the machine and the Negro."[20]

World War I had a tremendous influence on the volume of black migration from the South. During 1910-1914, an average of over 900,000 Europeans entered the United States annually. In the following five years, the years of World War I, the average fell to 100,000 per year. This opened up a vast labor market in Northern industry, and Southern blacks became the focal point for many labor recruitors. Firms sent such recruitors to Southern areas and paid the transportation of blacks willing to move to New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, etc.[21] Thus, from 1910 to 1920, over half a million blacks left the South for Northern cities. (See Table 1).

In this stage of black migration, there is evidence that the black press was also an active propaganda agent among Southern blacks. It kept all grievances clearly before the eyes of the black man and pointed out the way of escape. Perhaps the most outspoken of these campaigns was carried on by the Chicago Defender, a paper with a large circulation in the South. It exhorted blacks to leave the repression of the South for the freedom of the North.[22] From all over the South, blacks wrote to its editor, Robert S. Abbott,

---

[20]Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), Vol. I, p. 194.

[21]Kennedy, The Negro Peasant Turns Cityward, p. 53.

[22]Ibid., p. 53.

asking for help and advice. From the black belt of Mississippi came this letter, dated 1917, showing the hopes that moved many of the migrants:

> This letter is a letter of information of which you will find stampt envelope for reply. I want to come North sometime soon but I don not want to leave here looking for a job where I would be in dorse all winter. Now the work I am doing here is running a guage edger in a saw mill. I know all about the grading of lumber. I have been working in lumber about 25 or 27 years. My wadges here is $3.00 a day, 11 hours a day. I want to come North where I can educate my three little children, also my wife. Now, if you cannot fit me up at what I am doing here I can learn anything anyone else can. also there is a great deal of good woman cooks here could leave anytime, all they want is to know where to go. Please write me at once just how I can get my people where they can get something for their work. There are women here cooking for a $1.50 and $2.00 a week. I would like to live in Chicago or Ohio or Philadelphia. Tell Mr. Abbott that our people are tole that they cannotnot get anything to do up there and they are being snatched off the trains here in Greenville and arrested but in spite of all this they are leaving everyday and everynight 100 more is specting to leave this week. Let me hear from you at once.[23]

A further factor influencing blacks to move North was personal communication and contact, by way of visits and letter, between relatives and friends. The following two letters are illustrative of the propaganda style news forwarded from North to South:

> Mike, old boy, I was promoted on the first of the month. I was made first assistant to the head carpenter. When he is out of the place I take everything in charge and was raised to $95 per month. You know, I know my stuff. What's the news generally around H'burg? I should have been here 20 years ago. I just begin to feel like a man. It's a great deal of pleasure in knowing that you have got some priveleges. My children are going to the same school with the whites and I don't have to humble to no one. I have registered. Will vote the next election and there isn't any yes sir and no sir. It's all yes and no, Sam and Bill.[24]

---

[23] John G. Van Deusen, Black Man in White America (Washington, D.C.: Associated Publishers, 1944), p. 38.

[24] Ibid., p. 38.

> I often think so much of the conversation we used to have concerning this part of the world. I wish many times you could see our people up here, as they are entirely in a different light. I witnessed decoration day on May 30, the line of march was four miles, eight brass bands. All business houses were closed. I tell you the people here are patriotic. The chief of police dropped dead Friday. Buried him today, the procession about three miles long. People are coming here everyday and find employment. Nothing here but money and its not hard to get. Oh, I have children in school everyday with the white children.[25]

How many blacks who went North and made good must have started other migrants on their way by just such letters, holding out the promise of greater social tolerance and "nothing but money?"

After the first World War, many of the same influences continued and blacks kept up their migration Northwards: the Immigration Laws of 1921 and 1924 effectively limited immigration from abroad; cotton production in the South Atlantic and East South Central states was still in the doldrums; and, more importantly, a pattern of migration had been established.

In the 1930's, lightning struck in the form of a nationwide and worldwide economic depression. There was still plenty of surplus rural black population in the South, but there was very little economic opportunity in the North and West. In November, 1937, for example, 39 percent of the male, nonwhite labor force for the Northern states outside the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coast areas was unemployed.[26] As a result, net migration of both blacks and whites from the South dropped about 50 percent under the previous decade.

In terms of net migration from the South by decades, the peak

---

[25] Ibid., p. 39.

[26] Myrdal, An American Dilemma, Vol. 1, p. 196.

movement was reached in the 1940's: the decade of World War II and the early postwar period. This was a time of economic growth and prosperity. During the forties, black migrants to the West became numerous, apparently a response to military and industrial growth along the Western seaboard. The total net movement out of the South during this decade amounted to 2,135,000, of which over three-fourths were black. This was the first decade, since 1910, in which the black movement out of the South greatly exceeded the outmigration of whites.

And so the pattern has remained, contrary to speculation, up to the present moment: the early figures from the 19th count of the U.S. population show that the large migration of blacks out of the South is continuing in full force.[27] Population experts had expected a decline in the number of blacks moving North to the cities. The supposition had been that the tide began to abate in the 1960's. Mrs. Sylvia Small, a senior economist in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, who has a major part in compiling the data for the 1970 Census, wrties:

> We had thought there was a great slowdown. But apparently the earlier figures weren't complete. The final ones show little slowdown if any. It's continuing to be a real population shift--as important as any mass migration in history. The whole mechanization of farms in the South has been so dramatic, and it's still happening. There's still a tremendous movement of people--not only from the cotton fields to the Northern cities, but from the urban South to the urban North as well. They're moving from the textile mills in the South to the automobile plants of Detroit.[28]

---

[27]Since the final results of the 1970 Census are not in print yet, my figures are based on Philip M. Hauser, "The Census of 1970," Scientific American, (July, 1971), pp. 17-25.

[28]Sylvia Small, "Black Migration from South Appears Unabated," St. Louis Post Dispatch, (July, 27, 1971), Sec. 1, p. 1.

The figures show that from 1960 to 1970, roughly 147,000 blacks moved out of the South every year--a rate virtually identical with the rate for the 1950 to 1960 decade.

TABLE 2

NEGRO POPULATION AND ESTIMATED NET OUT-MIGRATION OF NEGROES FROM SOUTH 1940-1970 (IN THOUSANDS)

Subject	1940	1950	1960	1970
Negro Population in South	9,950	10,222	11,312	11,970
Average Annual Net Outmigration from South of Negro Population	1940-50	1950-60	1960-70	
	159.9	147.3	147.4	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, The Social and Economic Status of Negroes in the United States, 1970 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office), Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 38.

Thus, for more than sixty years, these push factors in the South and pull factors in the North have affected the distribution of the black population.[29] In conclusion, three facts may be noted:

First, the black population is now less concentrated in the South and more evenly distributed nationally. For the first 120 years of our country's history, nine-tenths of all blacks lived in

[29]To explain migration only in terms of pushes and pulls and a difference in opportunities is not to lay a completely accurate picture. The real causes of migration were as numerous as the blacks who migrated and as complex as the entire life experience of these blacks. The real causes were not simply a series of conditions or factors impinging on the individual, but they were complexes of factors actively interpreted, weighed, and integrated in the conscious and unconscious minds of the individuals. The situation was different for each black who migrated and it involved a conscious consideration of all the personal elements in the situation that the individual could think of and judged as important.

the South. In the next 50 year span the proportion in the South fell to slightly more than one-half--53.2 percent according to the 1970 Census.[30] If this tendency continues, in the year 2000, the four regions of the U.S. will have approximately similar compositions of blacks and whites. C. Horace Hamilton predicts the following distribution of the nonwhite population of the states:[31] Northeast--21.0 percent; North Central--25.0 percent; South--28.0 percent; and West--26.0 percent.

Second, the black population has become primarily an urban population, both within and outside the South. Table 3 presents the percentages of the black population that were urban from 1890 to 1960 (information not available yet for 1970).

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF BLACK POPULATION URBAN 1890-1960

	Total USA	South	North and West
1890	19.8	15.3	61.5
1900	22.7	17.2	70.4
1910	27.4	21.2	77.5
1920	34.0	25.3	84.5
1930	43.7	31.7	88.1
1940	48.6	36.5	89.1
1950	62.4	47.6	95.2
1960	73.2	58.4	95.2

Adapted from: Hamilton, The Negro Leaves the South, Tables 2(a) and 2(b).

From an early date, blacks in the North and the West lived in the cities. Urbanization of blacks occurred more recently in

[30]Hauser, "The Census of 1970," p. 20.

[31]Hamilton, The Negro Leaves the South, p. 286.

the South, but there is no doubt that Southern blacks are also becoming increasingly concentrated in cities.

Third, the racial composition of Northern and Western cities changed, due to the immigration of blacks. The proportion of blacks in these cities climbed in the past and will continue to do so in the foreseeable future. Within Southern cities there has been much less change in racial composition.

The 1970 Census figures continue to document the fact that black migration is mainly to central cities in the large metropolitan areas. In four cities, blacks now constitute a majority of the population. In Washington, D.C., the percentage of blacks rose during the decade from 53.9 to 71.1; in Newark, N.J., from 34.1 to 54.2; in Gary, Indiana, from 38.3 to 51.3; and in Atlanta, Georgia, from 38.8 to 52.8. In seven other cities, the population is more than 40 percent black: Detroit, St. Louis, Baltimore, New Orleans, Wilmington, Birmingham, and Richmond. The rising ratio of blacks in some cities was due, in part, to the exodus of whites. In Chicago, for example, the white population declined by more than half a million, or 18.6 percent, in the 1960's. Several other cities showed even larger percentage losses of whites: 29.2 percent in Detroit, 31.3 percent in St. Louis, and 36.7 percent in Newark.[32]

Future Trends

The black population of the South is still large and growing. Despite sixty years of outmigration, the number of blacks in the South has grown from about 8 million at the turn of the century to

---

[32]Hauser, "The Census of 1970," pp. 20, 21.

slightly over 12 million in 1970.[33] The loss in migration has failed to equal the gains due to natural increase, and the high fertility of Southern black women seems to insure rapid future growth.

Though there has been a long history of blacks leaving the South, it is difficult to predict the volume or direction of such migration in the future. If the outmigration rates of the 1960's persist into the 1970's, the number of outmigrants will be larger. One might argue that social and economic systems would lead to a continued migration to the cities of the North and West. However, increased economic opportunities in some regions of the South, such as Florida and Texas, may combine with decreasing economic opportunities in Northern cities to diminish the outmigration of blacks from the South. The 1970 Census already provided hints in this direction: the South was the second fastest growing region of the country in terms of population growth (14.2 percent increase), and for the first time since 1880, it had a net gain by migration. In fact, in terms of urbanization, the South actually had the largest increase in proportion of population urban: 10 percentage points.[34]

---

[33] Ibid., p. 18.

[34] Ibid., p. 19.

CHAPTER IV

FAMILY SUPPORT AND SPONSORSHIP IN MIGRATION

Introduction

The family does play a role in migration among Americans. This role varies depending upon the cultural, social, economic, and demographic characteristics of the participants. However, clarification is needed indetermining: a) exactly how that role is fulfilled throughout the entire migration process, and b) whether there is any change, at each stage of the migration process, in the correlation between the role the family plays and the various determining characteristics. Anyone who tries to answer these questions for all types of migrants and all types of migration will soon find himself reduced to useless platitudes or utter frustration. I will limit myself in this thesis to the migration of American blacks. Here are the three basic questions:

> First, what part does the family play among the major sponsors of migration among American blacks?
>
> Second, what form does interaction with the family take during the migration process itself?
>
> Third, what happens to relationships with the family during the assimilation process of the migrant to the new community?

I will now explain the basic concepts.

Sponsors

By sponsors of migration, are meant the social structures which establish relationships between the migrant and the receiving

community, before he moves, i.e. an individual migrates under the sponsorship of the family when his principal connections with the city of destination are through family members, even if he comes desperately seeking a job; likewise, one migrates under the sponsorship of work when the labor market or a particular firm provides the main relationship to the new community, even if the individual has family there. Of course, one may migrate under several sponsors at once, or under none at all--by being totally independent and self-sufficient.

Although they have not approached it in this particular way, other researchers have found family structure playing a powerful part among the sponsors of American migration, both white and black. In a 1957 study of recent black migrants to Philadelphia, Blumberg found that 56 percent of the respondents reported having close relatives in Philadelphia, (close relatives were defined as adult children, brothers and, or sisters, parents or grandparents); 12 percent of the respondents said they had no relatives in the city at all. And, perhaps what is most significant in their findings, is that 65 percent of the respondents said they came to Philadelphia because relatives or friends were already there.[1] These facts suggest that primary group relationships are important in recruiting migrants into the urban area, traditionally seen as characterized by secondary group relationships.

The significance of relatives and friends as a positive influence for rural migrants into east coast cities was brought out by

---

[1]Leonard Blumberg, A Pilot Study of Recent Negro Migrants into Philadelphia (Philadelphia: The Urban League, 1958).

Kiser in his classic study of migration of blacks from the island of St. Helena.[2] In a more recent study on the migration of blacks from Mississippi to Beloit, Wisc., Omari constructed a socio-economic index and a community index as measures of adjustment. These indexes included such items as type of residential housing, standard of living, job stability, participation in formally organized voluntary associations and other community efforts. One of the findings was that the presence or absence of relatives did not seem to be associated with either index. Relatives provided aid, but, apparently, did not facilitate adjustment. However, Omari further comments that the importance of relatives may be concealed since nearly all of the migrants had relatives in Beloit.[3] Rubin, in a similar study of blacks from a rural northeastern Mississippi community, concluded his study with the statement:

> . . . migrations are for reasons of work and wages, and destination communities are selected on the assumption that they will fulfill this wish. . . . however, close kin tend to be present in these destination communities.[4]

Perhaps the most classical demographic term expressing this tendency is chain migration:

> . . . that movement in which prospective migrants learn of opportunities, are provided with transportation, and have

---

[2]Claude V. Kiser, Sea Island to City: A Study of St. Helena Islanders in Harlem and Other Urban Centers (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952).

[3]Thompson Peter Omari, "Factors Associated with Urban Adjustment of Rural Southern Migrants," Social Forces, (October, 1965), pp. 47-53.

[4]Morton Rubin, "Migration Patterns of Negroes from a Rural Northeastern Mississippi Community," Social Forces, (March, 1960), p. 65.

initial accomodation and employment arranged by means of primary relationships with previous migrants.[5]

Black migrants, especially from rural areas, tend to go to cities where their family is already established.[6] In fact, migration under family sponsorship seems to be most common among groups which have the least skill in dealing with adjustment and assimilation to impersonal urban institutions, i.e. markets, bureaucracies, communication systems, etc. The support and protection of the family balances their weakness in these aspects.

If this is generally true, then I would expect the tendency to migrate under the sponsorship of the family to rise with lower status, decreasing urban experience, and less previous mobility, and, likewise, to be greater for those migrants at the extremes in age, and for those migrating nuclear families with an incomplete

---

[5]John S. and L. McDonald, "Chain Migration, Ethnic Neighborhood Formation, and Social Networks," Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, (January, 1964), p. 82; see also, M. Lune and E. Rayjack, "Racial Differences in Migration and Job Search: A Case Study," Southern Economic Journal, (July, 1966), pp. 81-95.

[6]On a demographic level, following the gradual distribution of the black population throughout the country leads to an interesting patterns and reciprocal relationship between three pairs of regions, one member of each pair in the South and the other outside the South. The percentage of blacks in each region has remained surprisingly constant, but the share of the region in the South has declined as the share of the non-Southern region has grown, Since 1890, for instance, approximately 47 percent of the nation's blacks have lived in the combined Northeastern and South Atlantic states, and the relative increase of the black population of the Northeast has exactly balanced the relative decrease in the South Atlantic states. The East North Central states have a similar relationship with the East South Central states, and the Pacific states with the West South Central states. Thus interstate migration is highly selective regionally among blacks: that is, a large percentage of the migrants from each region select the same region of destination. There are three great streams of black migration within the United States. Examination of black population trends by regions indicate that these streams have existed for at least half a century.

LEWIS TOWERS LOYOLA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

family structure. A corollary to this is that individuals who are of lower status, with less urban experience, etc., who do not have familial support, will more commonly suffer personal disruption when they do move.

Support During Migration

The general designation of sponsorship does not tell us exactly how the family aids in the process of migration. The recent explorations of urban life reveal a rich undergrowth of kinship in what had once been seen as an urban desert. The vigor of family relationships prevails in both lower-class and middle-class populations. If this is true, it ought to be all the truer during the crisis of migration. Among a number of groups that have been studied, family structure does offer a wide range of aid and encouragement during migration and immediately afterwards. In a further development of Blumberg's 1957 study, Blumberg and Bell found that contact with relatives continued after the subjects moved into the city. Forty-six percent of the respondents reported visiting their close relatives at least once a week; 64 percent of the respondents said they saw their close relatives once a month or more often. The family was also an important source of information, as well as providing social support. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents said that relatives had served as first sources of information about housing. Many of the respondents had moved several times between immigration and the time of the interview, and relatives continued to be an important source of information about housing for 18 percent of the sample.[7]

---

[7]Leonard Blumberg and Robert Bell, "Urban Migration and Kinship Ties," Social Problems, (Spring, 1959), pp. 328-33.

A study by Smith in 1953 reports on 157 migrants, some of whom are black. Thirty-four percent reported they had anticipated receiving help from relatives or friends when they moved to Indianapolis. About one-third of the respondents reported they had received general orientation from relatives on arrival, and about 15 percent reported that relatives or friends had been the sole means for finding a job. However, since there was no significant difference in the median amount of time required to find the first urban job for those who had assistance from friends and relatives and those who did not, Smith's data seems to support the idea that relatives and close friends are psychologically supportive rather than functionally effective in this area. But friends and relatives were very important with respect to housing: 70 percent of the black migrants and 80 percent of the Southern whites reported help from friends or relatives in acquiring housing. In contrast, Northern whites, most of whom came from the surrounding counties, tended to rely much less on relatives and friends.[8]

However, there will be some differences among groups, and on the whole, the groups that I have tagged as likely to migrate under family sponsorship should rely, in turn, more heavily and more exclusively on the family structure for everyday aid and moral support. Lower-ranking migrants, those with little urban experience, those with little prior mobility, those at the extremes in age, and those with an incomplete or denuded nuclear family structure, might, therefore, be expected to receive a wider variety of

---

[8]Eldon Dee Smith, Migration and Adjustment Experiences of Rural Migrant Workers in Indianapolis (Unpublished PhD Dissertation: University of Wisconsin, 1953).

aid and more of it from kinsmen during migration. Having migrated under family sponsorship should only accentuate this tendency.

Thus, family groups specialize in certain kinds of aid. They rarely have jobs "in their gift." They can more often offer housing, at least temporarily. They vary greatly in how much information and how much skill in dealing with major urban institutions they can lend to a newcomer. Their primary speciality lies in the internal operation of the household rather than in its external relations. So, we might expect to find the family most regularly offering domestic forms of aid at migration--housing, personal care, food, emotional support, short-term cash, etc.

Relations With Family After Migration

The next phase, relations with family after migration, brings us into a much longer span of time and faces us with the very important problem of assimilation. Relations with and dependency on family structure provide functional alternatives to personal skill and knowledge in dealing with the receiving community. This is certainly true of formal relationships within the community, like entering the labor market: some groups commonly find work through impersonal channels as newspapers and employment agencies. However, it is also true in a subtler way of informal relationships. Most urbanites spend part of their leisure in the company of people from outside their households, but members of some groups spend it almost exclusively with family members and individuals first met through family members, while, still others spend it almost exclusively with individuals first met in formal settings.

Let us assume that all groups of migrants face the same general problems in the receiving community--assuring a source of income, finding shelter, acquiring commodities, establishing supplies of advice, informational and emotional support, etc. Those individuals outside family structure at migration presumably undergo a much greater change in their ways of facing these problems than those who stay within the family structure, and they often show the cost of the change in personal discontent and disorganization. For instance, it does look as though American long-distance migrants have a disproportionally high rate of detected major mental disorders.[9] The cost, the consequent upset, the time and energy required to establish new means of meeting these problems are greatest for those who bring with them the least transferable skill, knowledge and power. When migration does cut family ties, we might therefore expect it to cause a greater disruption among lower-ranking migrants, those with little urban experience or little prior mobility, those at extremes in age, and those nuclear families with an incomplete family structure.

Among those who do maintain or establish bonds with family members in the receiving community at migration, we should expect to find a continuation of intensive contact with them well beyond the first throes of adjustment. But as experience with the community accumulates, we should also expect to find migrants developing individual skill and alternative sources of aid in meeting

---

[9]H.B.M. Murphy, "Migration and Major Mental Disorders," in Mildred B. Kantor, Mobility and Mental Health (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1965), pp. 5-29.

problems. The shift should be fastest among those who transfer the most experience from the previous community.

Actually, the relationship between individual skill and dependency on family is two-way. Those who become skilled in dealing with the community's institutions make themselves independent. But those who have no family at hand to rely on surely have a strong incentive to acquire skills and alternative sources of aid, and more energy to spend in others forms of social relationships. Let us assume again, that there is a basic level of skill, style, and social relationships which most members of a community eventually possess. Then, migrants actively involved with family in the community will be slower to gain that standard base than others will. To state it more narrowly and manageably: migrants who come under family sponsorship will increase their direct, formal participation in the city's impersonal institutions more slowly and over a longer period of time than others. Rose and Warshay found evidence that migrants with already existing primary group contacts in their new community are more likely to remain isolated from the rest of the community and to remain isolated longer than migrants without such contacts.[10] Thus,

> In most urban circumstances family aid generally should help in making urban adjustments such as becoming acquainted with shopping areas and service facilities, developing new acquaintances, becoming familiar with recreational facilities and generally becoming familiar with the city. But continuous and near exclusive interaction with relatives, especially under conditions of insulated community

---

[10] Arnold Rose and Leon Warshay, "The Adjustment of Migrants to Cities," Social Forces, (36, 1957), pp. 63-76.

life, can only accentuate inferior social status and probably retard the assimilation of migrants.[11]

Hypotheses

From very general questions dealing with the effects of mobility on social integration, I have arrived at four specific hypotheses, which have guided this research thesis on the role of family dependency in the migration process.

1. Black Americans who migrate under family sponsorship are, a) typically of a lower social status, and b) with less prior mobility experience than migrants who are either self-reliant or reliant on non-family structures in migration.

Therefore:

H_{1A}: The lower the social status of the black migrant at the time of migration, the more likely that he will be sponsored by family members.

H_{1B}: The less frequent the number of prior moves made by a black migrant, the more likely that he will be sponsored by family members.

The independent variable, "migration under family sponsorship," is defined as: a) movement into Chicago from outside its SMSA boundaries, b) where the migrant's principal connections with Chicago are through family members residing there already, i.e. parents, children, siblings, grandparents, grandchildren, and in-laws. The qualification is, that if family members were not in Chicago, the migrant would not have moved there.

The dependent variables are defined as:

a) "Social Status:" a composite of occupation, source of in-

---

[11] Lee G. Burchinal and Ward W. Bauder, "Adjustments to the New Institutional Environment," in Kenneth C. Kammeyer, ed., Population Studies, Selected Essays and Research (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1970), pp. 211-231.

come, house type and dwelling area. On the basis of these four indexes, each respondent has been given one summed score determined by the Revised Index of Status Characteristics as developed by Warner, Meeker and Eels.[12]

b) "Prior mobility:" the number of moves across county lines made by the migrant before coming to Chicago.

2. A greater proportion of those who migrate under family sponsorship will, a) have less urban experience, b) be at the extremes in age, and c) in the case of a family migrating, be an incomplete nuclear family.

The dependent variables for the second hypothesis are defined as:

a) "Urban experience:" residential history of the migrant in terms of rural-urban background.

b) "Extremes in age:" under 21 years of age or over 40.

c) "Incomplete Nuclear Family:" the head's spouse is absent--deceased, divorced, separated or otherwise.

3. The dependency of the black migrant upon family members as the prime source of aid and information is positively related to the role the family played in sponsoring the migrant.

The dependent variable, "Dependency upon family members as the prime source of aid and information," is defined in terms of the family or individual family members being the first to whom the migrant turns to for housing--temporary or permanent, money in case of need, domestic items such as food, clothes, furniture, etc., information about housing--general or specific, and information about employment--general or specific.

---

[12]LLoyd W. Warner, Marchia Meeker and Kenneth Eels, Social Class in America (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), pp. 121-159. See also, John L. Haer, "Predictive Utility of Five Indices of Social Stratification," American Sociological Review, (October, 1957), pp. 541-547; Edwin D. Lawson and Edwin E. Bock, "Correlations of Indexes of Families' Socio-Economic Status," Social Forces, (December, 1960), pp. 149-152.

4. Those who migrate under family sponsorship will adapt more slowly to urban life than those migrants who are either self-reliant or reliant on non-family structures.

The dependent variable, "Adaptation to urban life," is a very broad and value-laden term. In the context of this thesis, it refers primarily to integration into the secondary organizations of urban life, and thus, it will be measured in terms of three indexes:

a) participation and voting in the last Chicago aldermanic election;

b) organizational participation in, for example, block clubs, Urban Progress Centers, home-school associations, PTA, Breadbasket, etc. (The individual's score on this particular index will be scored by Chapin's Social Participation Scale, 1952 edition.)[13]

c) informational awareness about issues specifically involving the Chicago black community, i.e. Judge Austin's freezing of federal funds for the Chicago Housing Authority, the existence of and type of programs at Malcolm X College, and finally, a number of articles on sickle-cell anemia that have appeared recently in the major Chicago newspapers, including the Defender.

For hypothesis four, each respondent has been given one score which is the sum of his scores on all three indexes, as a measurement of his adaptation to urban life.

---

[13]Stuart F. Chapin, Experimental Designs in Sociological Research (New York: Harper, 1955), pp. 275-278.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Using a standard questionnaire which dealt mainly with residential history, conditions of migration to Chicago, and present social participation, information was collected from the heads of 95 families with children in two of the city's parochial elementary schools. Both schools contain within their boundaries dwelling units ranging from public housing to expensive private dwellings. The sample consists of adults heavily concentrated in their thirties and forties. Almost 90 percent of the heads of the sample households are married with spouses present, and 75 percent of the households consist of a man, his wife and their children, and no one else. Thus, there is a relative homogeneity among all the respondents in terms of family structure at the time of the questionnaire. However, this was not the case at the time of migration. The size of the groups with which the respondents migrated to Chicago, for example, was larger for rural than for urban blacks, larger for higher status than for lower status blacks--the essential contrast being between individuals migrating alone and nuclear families coming together.

Altogether, 36 of the respondents migrated to Chicago alone, and 56 came with their nuclear families. The remaining three respondents came under other arrangements, such as in a group of non-

nuclear relatives. The number of migrants who were unmarried and alone declined regularly, as expected, with the age of the migrant, at least up to 40 years of age. (See Table 4.)

Sponsors of Migration to Chicago

Determining which social structures linked the migrant to Chicago--the city of destination--is not that easy, especially in light of recalling an event that took place, for most of the respondents, on the average of 10 years ago. The migrant's report of his sources of aid, information and help in making the move provides some of the essential information in, perhaps, the most reliable form possible now. (Looking back at this point, a desirable adjunct to the questionnaire would have been an analysis of available letters and correspondence dating from the time of migration.)

The respondents in Chicago reported on their sources of information about jobs, housing, etc., in the city. They also answered a series of questions, such as the following:

18. Did anyone in Chicago help you, or encourage you, or try to talk you into coming here?

19. If YES, what relationship were they to you?

20. Would you have come to Chicago if that particular group or individual had not lived here?

A number of respondents named more than one source of encouragement or aid. I have simplified the classification of sponsors by combining the responses to all these questions and sorting all migrants naming more than one type of source (except for the combination of "Family and Friends" which was very common) into the category "Other." This category does not include anyone who named

TABLE 4

MIGRATION PATTERNS OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS
BY AGE AND MARITAL STATUS

age at migration	unmarried migrated alone	unmarried migrated with others	married migrated alone	married migrated with nuclear family	married migrated with others	totals
21 or less	9	1	-	4	-	14
22 to 28	8	2	4	14	-	28
29 to 34	3	-	6	18	-	27
35 to 39	1	-	1	13	-	15
40 and over	2	-	2	7	-	11
Totals	23	3	13	56	-	95

"Family" as one source of aid or sponsorship among others. In addition to these combinations, "Other" also includes 17 respondents who were jointly sponsored by the church they attended in the South and a real-estate developing company located in Chicago. This sorting produced the following breakdown of the sample:

Sponsors	Number
Family	26
Friends	11
Family and Friends	7
Work	9
Other	26
None	16

In terms of group differences, my first two hypotheses lead me to expect that respondents who name family as sponsors will: a) have a lower social status at the time of migration; b) have had less experience in mobility at that time; c) be migrants with rural backgrounds; d) be the youngest and the oldest migrants; and e), in the case of family migration, more often be an incomplete nuclear family. In the present sample, the hypotheses for social status and age come out as expected, rural-urban differences are also in the expected direction, but less strong, and differences in terms of nuclear family structure and prior mobility are untestable. Tables 5-7 present the data.

Table 5 shows where each respondent, classified according to sponsor, fell in a ranking of the social status scores of the whole sample. The migrants who had been sponsored by the family had overwhelmingly lower social status scores at the time of migration, especially in relationship to those migrants who were clas-

TABLE 5

SOCIAL STATUS POSITION OF MIGRANT BY SPONSOR

Family	Family and Friends	Friend	Work	Other	None
1.5	5	5	12.5	36.5	45
1.5	7.5	7.5	42	40.5	47.5
3	18.5	16	44	47.5	53.5
5	22	20	47.5	50	55
10	33	29.5	59.5	51.5	56
10	33	29.5	65	53.5	57.5
10	40.5	43	73.5	61.5	61.5
12.5		47.5	77	68	68
14		57.5	78	68.5	68
15		63.5		71.5	68
17		63.5		71.5	75
18.5				73.5	76
22				80	79
22				81.5	84
25				81.5	86
25				84	87
25				84	
29.5				89.5	
29.5				89.5	
33				91	
36.5				92	
36.5				94	
36.5				94	
39				94	
51.5				95	
59.5				95	
Median Status Score:					
22	22	29.5	59.5	80.7	68

a=.05, H(6 d.f.)=399.5, P .001

sified under the "Work," "Other," and "None" categories. The higher status migrants more frequently claimed no aid at all or fell into the "Other" category. The reason for this is that 17 out of the 26 respondents classified under "Other" had come to Chicago under the joint sponsorship of the Southern Baptist Church and a real-estate development corporation. They had been recruited

for residence in condominiums that were in a middle to upper income price bracket. In their social status scores, all in this group fell within the 70-95 rank category.

The group that presents the most problems are the 16 respondents who listed "No One" as sponsor. Although this response indicates a deficiency or lack of clarity in the questionnaire--in that it did not seek out those subtler generalized relations between the respondent and Chicago as the city of destination, which the respondent may not have thought of--it did indicate one link between the respondents and Chicago, namely, distance. The migrants in this category were those respondents who had lived closest to Chicago: 6 were from Memphis, Tenn., 5 were from St. Louis, 2 were from Evansville, Ind., and one each from Peoria, Ill,, Rockford, Ill., and South Bend, Ind. This deficiency in the questionnaire could have been corrected by asking 2 further questions: "Why Chicago was preferred over, for example, Detroit?" and "Whether the migrant had relatives or friends living in Chicago already?" The interpretation I would suggest, is, that while lower status blacks are more likely to be linked with the city of destination primarily through family structure, higher status blacks more often have multiple links with the city of destination, often including family. With this suggestion, the data supports my hypothesis: respondents in the sample who were lower in social status at the time of migration, were sponsored more often by family members than higher status blacks.

Turning to the comparison of migrants by rural-urban background, the differences are not large enough to reach statistical

significance, and therefore it leaves this segment of the first hypothesis doubtful. However, in line with the interpretation I have just suggested, I think a combination of the 6 categories of sponsors into 2 basic ones is theoretically feasible. If, as Smith suggests, relatives and close friends are psychologically supportive rather than functionally effective,[14] and if this is one of the values that a migrant holds in being dependent on the family, then this naturally assumes a contact on a personal level. Using personalism as a kind of thread running through all 6 categories of sponsors, I have combined them into 2 basic groups: personal sponsors, i.e. family members, friends, and family and friends, and impersonal sponsors, i.e. work, others and no sponsors. Broken down in this fashion, rural-urban background by sponsorship takes on great significance.

TABLE 6

PERSONAL SPONSORSHIP VS. IMPERSONAL SPONSORSHIP BY RURAL-URBAN ORIGINS

	Personal	Impersonal
Rural	27	24
Urban	17	27

a=.05, Chi-Square (1 d.f.)=140
P. .001

The two hypotheses dealing with previous mobility and incomplete nuclear family structure are untestable because of a lack of variation in the sample in these two areas. In terms of mobility,

[14]Smith, Migration and Adjustment

98 percent of the respondents had moved across county lines only once, and that was in their move to Chicago; and for those cases involving families moving, only 3 involved an incomplete nuclear family structure--mother and children--and in all three cases, the move was sponsored by an older sister already living in Chicago.

The breakdown of the sample, percentagewise, by age and sponsor is shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7

PERSONAL SPONSORSHIP VS. IMPERSONAL SPONSORSHIP BY AGE AT TIME OF MIGRATION

Age at Migration	Percent Sponsored Personally	Percent Sponsored Impersonally
21 or less	55	45
22 to 28	58	42
29 to 34	43	57
35 to 39	19	81
40 and over	50	50
Total (N = 95)	46.3	53.7

One outstanding feature in this table is the 81 percent of the 35 to 39 year old age bracket who came under impersonal sponsorship. But the explanation is simple: the fact that the percentage for this group is so high is due specifically to the influence of the group of respondents who were co-sponsored in their move by the Southern Baptist Church and the housing development corporation.

In terms of the basic hypothesis: as was expected, the proportion of migrants coming to Chicago under personal forms of sponsorship declines with age up to 40 and then rises again.

The data also turned up an interesting relationship between age, social status and rural-urban background at the time of migration. At least up to 40 years of age, the older the migrant, the greater probability that he ranks among the upper 50 percent in the sample in social status and likewise in urban background. This pattern was further reflected in the respondents' answers to Question 17, "Why did you leave _____ and move to Chicago?" The proportion of migrants who said they were looking for work when they came varied remarkably by age:

Age at migration	Percent looking for work
21 or less	87
22 to 28	41
29 to 34	34
35 to 39	12
40 and over	52

As shown here, the youngest and the oldest migrants tend to have the most uncertain connections with the labor market in the city of destination. This is reflected in their lower social status and rural backgrounds.

Therefore, the data from Chicago shows the variations in sponsorship from one group to another: fairly emphatically in the case of social status and age, questionably in the case of rural-urban background, and unknown in the case of mobility and nuclear family structure.

If sponsorship really matters, two things should result: 1) there should be a relationship between sponsorship and aid and help during migration, and 2), the initial differences should affect

the form and degree of integration into urban life. This takes us to the remaining 2 hypotheses.

Support and Aid During Migration

Table 8 shows the major sources of aid that people named, by their rank in social status and rural-urban background. The

TABLE 8

SOURCES OF AID AND INFORMATION AT MIGRATION BY ORIGIN AND SOCIAL STATUS RANKINGS

Percent who received aid from:	Status Ranking 1-45		46-95	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Family	38	51	28	21
Friends and Neighbors	33	35	26	21
Social Agencies and Religious Officials	12	04	35	29
Welfare	12	14		
Work	19	14	28	38
No One	17	09	22	27

Note: Percents do not total to 100.0, since more than one source of aid or information could be mentioned.

data shows the higher status migrants relying more heavily on work and religious officials, and social agencies (in this case, the real-estate development corporation), and the lower status migrants relying on friends and very heavily on family members. Among upper status migrants there are relatively little differences between urban and rural residents, but this is an important factor among the lower status migrants. Over half of the rural, low status migrants got help primarily from family members--the largest proportion for any group. Other tabulations also show family mem-

bers particularly important for the youngest and oldest migrants.

The hypothesis for this section deals with the relationship between the migrant's sponsor and his prime source of aid and information: the dependency of the black migrant upon family members as the prime source of aid and information is positively related to the role the family played in sponsoring the migrant. Relating sponsorship to prime source of aid gives the following breakdown:

TABLE 9

PRIME SOURCE OF AID AND INFORMATION BY SPONSORSHIP

Sponsors	Sources of Aid: Family and Friends	Non-family
Family and Friends	40	22
Non-family	4	29

a=.05, P .001

What kinds of help does the family provide? There were 3 areas which the respondents could list: housing, jobs, and domestic items. Although they are not all equally important, it is safe to assume that a respondent who named a particular source 3 or 4 times got more help from that source than a respondent naming the source only once. Tabulating responses in this fashion presents results substantially the same as those already presented: lower status blacks, those rural in background, and those who were the youngest and the oldest at the time of migration tended to rely more on the family. The pattern is already familiar.

The responses to the separate questions concerning sources of aid, housing, jobs, etc., touch the specialized forms of aid suggested as particular to family members, i.e. domestic forms of help and possible housing. In each case, the respondent not only enumerated his sources of information, but also identified the most important source for each area. According to my theory, the family should play a larger part in helping out with housing and domestic forms of aid rather than with jobs. In fact, the data on sources of aid and information does not confirm this theory. Table 10 summarizes the findings in terms of the percentage of all migrants naming the particular source most helpful in each area.

TABLE 10

PRIME SOURCE OF AID AND INFORMATION

Source of aid	Area of aid		
	Housing	Domestic	Job
Family	24	18	21
Friends and Neighbors	12	10	16
Social Agencies and Religious Officials	18	04	04
Welfare	03	07	
Work	07	03	16
No One	30	51	33
Other	06	07	10
Total (N = 95)	100%	100%	100%

Considering the variation in the proportion naming any source at all, the proportion naming family remains relatively constant. In all three respects, including jobs, family is the most commonly named source. If we calculate the proportion of those who name

family as one among a number of sources of aid and information, though not necessarily the most important, the progression looks like this: housing--40 percent, domestic aid--42 percent, jobs--27 percent.

The patterns of variation by social status and rural-urban background follow already familiar lines; they likewise do not support the suggestion of specialization. The differentials are essentially those we have already discussed, with variation by age a bit more irregular than in previous comparisons. The following figures summarize the percentage naming family as the prime source of aid and information by age.

TABLE 11

FAMILY AS THE PRIME SOURCE OF AID AND INFORMATION BY AGE

Age at migration	Area of aid		
	Housing	Domestic	Job
21 or less	24%	28%	27%
22 to 28	29	16	39
29 to 34	19	17	17
35 to 39	23	19	03
40 and over	28	23	18

None of the three areas constitute a monopoly on the types of aid and information given by family members. The suggestion of specialization gains very little support from this data.

Why? Perhaps it is just the peculiarity of the sample or the crudity of the measurement. But if the specialization expected doesn't exist, that raises two possibilities: 1) the social status

differentials in relationship to family found in previous research largely reflect the availability of family, rather than substantial variations;[15] 2) because of relative homogeneity of status within family groups, the skills and influence available within family groups vary sufficiently with the migrant's status, and the claims for aid the migrant can make on them are strong enough that they are usually among the most effective intermediaries between the migrant and the new community.

If the first is true, it would cast a new light on the whole analysis. For it would bring a quite different problem than we have been considering into prominence: it is then a question of why the availability of family differs from one status to another. There are a number of possible contributing factors: the size of a particular family group, the extent to which the presence or absence of family members, either at a particular point of destination or in the home locality, affects direction and selectivity or even departure.

If the second alternative--systematic variation by status in the ways in which the family groups mediate between new arrivals and the community--is the valid one, it would not raise as serious questions about the general line of argument as the first alternative would. Finer classifications than the ones used in this thesis ought to disclose the nature of these variations.

---

[15] cf. Alan F. Blum, "Social Structure, Social Class, and Participation in Primary Relationships," in Arthur B. Shostak and William Gomberg, ed., Blue-Collar World (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964), pp. 195-207.

However, this does not affect the general conclusions that the sponsors of migration vary systematically with the status of the migrant.

Post-Migration Adaptation

Any information concerning systematic changes over a long period of time, other than a time series study itself, must come from one of 2 sources: 1) the comparison of segments of the sample at different stages in a continuous process; b) the retrospective accounts of the respondents. The first requires very careful control of the variables which may be correlated with each stage. The second becomes suspect on changes in involvement with different groups in the community, changes in skill, changes in attitudes, etc. On the basis of the data from this sample, I can do little more than suggest some possible lasting consequences of coming to the city under various forms of sponsorship.

Table 12 presents some characteristics of the migrants at the time of the interview. The characteristics are indicators of assimilation into different aspects of life in the city. All the indicators rise to some extent with length of residence in the city, and all vary systematically with status. The table categorizes them by the sponsors under which the respondents originally migrated to Chicago.

As is evident, in most of these respects the span of variation among the sponsor groups is very small, except in terms of organizational participation, where those who migrated under the sponsorship of "Other" or were self-sufficient participate more actively

in such groups, especially in home-school type associations and neighborhood block-club type groups.

TABLE 12

INDICATORS OF ADAPTATION TO URBAN LIFE BY SPONSORSHIP

Sponsor	Median Awareness Score	Number Voting in Last Election	Number Involved in Last Election	Median Organizational Participation
Family	3.0	72	0	7.5
Friends	2.5	67	0	8.5
Family & Friends	2.0	67	0	4.0
Work	3.0	80	0	9.0
Other	3.5	77	0	12.4
None	3.0	65	0	10.6

Theoretically, many of these variations could result from differences in length of residence in the city. However, the length of time in the city did not vary that much among the various sponsorship groups. The variations could also result from differences in social status, which has been shown to be highly correlated with the sponsors of migration. Let us look at the one indicator, of those presented here, which has been most used in other sociological studies--participation in voluntary associations. Table 13 tells us, at least, how controlling for social status affects the figures in table 12.

The main discrepancies deal with the two categories of migrants who were either self-sufficient in the migration process or sponsored by work affiliated groups or individuals. The median participation score of 9.0 for the lower ranked, work-sponsored

TABLE 13

MEDIAN ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION SCORE BY RANK AND SPONSORSHIP

Sponsor	Social Rank 1-45	46-95	Median
Family	6.5	15.1	7.5
Friends	8.2	15.8	8.5
Family & Friends	4.0		4.0
Work	9.0	10.0	9.0
Other	4.0	26.1	12.4
None	4.2	13.0	10.6

migrants is very inconclusive because it's based on only 3 cases; however, the over-all low median scores of the upper ranked migrants who were either self-sufficient or sponsored by work affiliates are notable enough to urge caution. And yet, we can say, with a fair amount of certainty, that variation is due primarily to status rather than to sponsorship group.

Therefore, we may continue to speculate that sponsorship affects long-run integration into the life of the city, but both Tables 12 and 13 show, that in terms of awareness, voting, and organizational participation, this speculation, certainly, cannot be established as a fact.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

The four hypotheses in this study concerning the role of the family among black migrants have emerged partly untested, partly shaken, and partly verified. The data supports most fully the hypotheses dealing with varying sponsorship according to social status and age at migration, and the speculation about the types of aid given by family members or family related groups at migration, although less so in the latter case. In fact, the data does not show any strong specialization of family members in particular forms of aid. But it does show the considerable amount of aid that family members give at migration, and it suggests that more of the variation by social status in this area, than is ordinarily realized, may be due to variations in the availability of family members.

The data dealing with variation in sponsorship by status is the most conclusive: it produces a consistent picture of strong differences by rank and age at migration and weak differences by rural-urban background. In retrospect, future study needs to be done using much finer and narrower classifications of sponsorship. One cannot assume that any of the various forms of sponsorship will be more or less exclusive.

In terms of where such a study as this can lead, there are

two possibilities that interest me. First of all, if family related groups and individuals do play such a large part in sponsoring and receiving newcomers into the city, this raises questions about the extent of personal and social disorganization among migrants. Again, looking back, this would have been an excellent area of investigation possible under my fourth hypothesis dealing with assimilation and integration into city life. Such variables as juvenile delinquency, arrest records, job stability, mental and physical health should all correlate and vary with type of sponsorship. This is one area that I hope to do more research in.

The second possibility deals more with a practical point--the possibility of some type of group or organization to help prepare and sponsor individuals or families who desire to migrate. For instance, I am acquainted with a number of families who have moved to Chicago from the same city in the South, and in fact from the same Catholic parish. They all moved to Chicago independently of one another and they all had family members here to receive them. The possibility exists of a group of individuals joining forces, here at the point of destination--it could be on a parish level, or more ideally, a number of cross-denominational churches joined together--whom an individual, thinking of moving, could contact and use as a resource. It would amount to a link between an inter-denominational group in Greenville, Miss., for example, and the corresponding group here in Chicago: one acting as a referral agency at the point of departure, and the other acting as a resource agency at the point of destination. The possibility exists, the question is, is it desirable?

After a bold beginning, many qualifications have been made. It will take much more investigation to answer our general questions about the role of the family in migration. However, one thing stands out as certain: the basic direction of the findings of this thesis corroborate research done in the last 10 to 15 years on family cohesion in an urban setting, and chain migration through the influence of family support and sponsorship.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What year did you move to Chicago? _____

2. How old were you when you moved here? _____

3. Where did you move from (town, state)? _____

4. Where were you born (town, state)? _____

5. Where else have you lived besides your home town and Chicago? Indicate how long you lived in each place.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. What was your job at the time you moved to Chicago?

_____

7. What was your main source of income at the time you moved to Chicago? (Check one.)

_____ Inherited Wealth
_____ Earned Wealth
_____ Profits and Fees
_____ Salary
_____ Wages
_____ Relief (Private)
_____ Relief (Public)
_____ Other

8. How would you rate the dwelling you lived in right before your move to Chicago?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
best			average			worst

9. How many people were living in that dwelling? _____

10. How many rooms were in that dwelling? _____

11. How many people live in your present home? _____

12. How many rooms are in your present home? _____

13. Would you say that your present home is better or worse than the home you lived in just before moving to Chicago?

_____

14. How would you rate the neighborhood in which you lived just before moving to Chicago?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
best			average			worst

15. Would you say that your present neighborhood is better or worse than the neighborhood you lived in just before moving to Chicago?

_____

16. How many years of schooling had you completed at the time you moved to Chicago? _____

17. Why did you leave _____ and move to Chicago?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

18. Did anyone help you, or encourage you, or try to talk you into coming here? _____

19. If YES, who or what relationship were they to you? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

20. Would you have come to Chicago if that particular group or individual had not lived here? _____

_____

21. Were you married at the time you moved to Chicago? _____

22. Did you have any children? _____

23. Was there anyone else besides your own children who was dependent upon you for care and support? _____

_____

24. When you arrived in Chicago, did anyone help you with housing?

_____

_____

25. Who helped you most in terms of housing? _____

_____

26. When you arrived in Chicago, did you have a job waiting for you? _____

27. Who helped you most in terms of finding or getting a job?

_____

_____

28. Who did you turn to, if and when you needed money, furniture, information about stores, and so forth? _____

_____

_____

29. In general, who would you say helped you the most when you moved to Chicago? _____

_____

_____

30. Have you encouraged anyone to move to Chicago? _____

_____

31. Have you helped them in any way? _____

_____

32. Did you vote in the election for alderman last November? ___

33. Were you actively involved in the election in any way:

_____ Work for a candidate?

_____ Attend meetings?

_____ Contribute money?

34. List the organizations or groups to which you belong (such as, block club, PTA, Breadbasket, union, Church groups, Welfare Rights Org., etc.)

Organization	Member	Attend	Contribute	Committees	Officer

35. Do you know anything about:

Malcolm X College? _____

CHA Freeze Suit? _____

Sickle Cell Anemia? _____

36. Have you made any effort to seek further information about any of these topics, either by further reading or talking with others:

Malcolm X College? _____

CHA Freeze Suit? _____

Sickle Cell Anemia? _____

37. Is there any one particular newspaper in Chicago that you like best? _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arensberg, Conrad, and Kimball, Solon T. Family and Community in Ireland. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940.

Axelrod, Morris. "Urban Structure and Social Participation." American Sociological Review, (February, 1956), 13-19.

Bell, Wendell, and Boat, Marion. "Urban Neighborhoods and Informal Social Relations." American Journal of Sociology, (January, 1957), 391-98.

Blum, Alan F. "Social Structure, Social Class, and Participation in Primary Relationships." Blue-Collar World. Edited by Arthur B. Shostak and William Gomberg. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Blumberg, Leonard. A Pilot Study of Recent Negro Migrants to Philadelphia. Philadelphia: The Urban League, 1958.

_____, and Bell Robert. "Urban Migration and Kinship Ties." Social Problems, (Spring, 1959), 328-33.

Brown, James S.; Schwarzweller, Harry K.; and Mangalam, Joseph. "Kentucky Mountain Migration and Stem Family: An American Variation on a Theme by LePlay." Rural Sociology, (March, 1963), 48-69.

Bruchinal, Lee G., and Bauder, Ward W. "Adjustments to the New Institutional Environment." Population Studies, Selected Essays and Research. Edited by Kenneth C. Kammeyer. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1970.

Burgess, Ernest W., and Locke, Harvey J. The Family. New York: American Book Company, 1953.

Chapin, Stuart F. Experimental Designs in Sociological Research. New York: Harper Book Company, 1955.

Durkheim, Emile. The Division of Labor in Society. Glencoe: Free Press, 1964.

_____, L'Annee Sociologique, (Vol. II, 1897), quoted in Philip M. Hauser. "On the Impact of Urbanism on Social Organization, Human Nature and the Political Order." Confluence, (Spring, 1958), 57-69.

Firth, Raymond. Two Studies of Kinship in London. London: Athlone Press, 1957.

Franklin, John Hope. Reconstruction After the Civil War. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Gans, Herbert. The Urban Villagers. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Germani, Gino. "Inquiry into the Social Effects of Urbanization in a Working Class Sector of Greater Buenos Aires." Urbanization in Latin America. Edited by Philip M. Hauser. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Greer, Scott. "Urbanism Reconsidered." American Sociological Review, (February, 1956), 19-25.

Haer, John L. "Predictive Utility of Five Indices of Social Stratification." American Sociological Review, (October, 1957), 541-47.

Hamilton, C. Horace. "The Negro Leaves the South." Demography, (1: 1, 1964), 273-95.

Hartman, Chester W. "Social Values and Housing Orientation." The Journal of Social Issues, (Vol. 19, No. 2, 1963), 113-31.

Hauser, Philip M. "The Census of 1970." Scientific American, (July, 1971), 17-25.

Henry, Robert S. The Story of Reconstruction. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1938.

Kennedy, Louise Venable. The Negro Peasant Turns Cityward. New York: Columbia University Press, 1930.

Kiser, Claude V. Sea Island to City: A Study of St. Helena Islanders in Harlem and Other Urban Centers. New York: Columbia Press, 1952.

Lawson, Edwin D., and Bock, Edwin E. "Correlations of Indexes of Families' Socio-Economic Status." Social Forces, (December, 1960), 149-52.

LePlay, Frederick. Les ouvriers europeens. Paris: Tours A Mame et fils, 1878.

Litwak, Eugene. "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion." American Sociological Review, (June, 1960), 385-94.

Lune, M., and Rayjack, E. "Racial Differences in Migration and Job Search: A Case Study." Southern Economic Journal, (July, 1966), 81-95.

Matthews, Elmora. Neighbors and Kin. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1965.

McDonald, John S., and L. "Chain Migration, Ethnic Neighborhood Formation, and Social Networks." Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, (January, 1964), 82-97.

Michelson, William. Man and His Environment: A Sociological Approach. Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

Murphy, H.B.M. "Migration and the Major Mental Disorders." Mobility and Mental Health. Edited by Mildred B. Kantor. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1965.

Myrdal, Gunnar V. An American Dilemma. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Omari, Peter Thompson. "Factors Associated With Urban Adjustment of Rural Southern Migrants." Social Forces, (October, 1965), 47-53.

Park, Robert E. "The Concept of Social Distance: As Applied to the Study of Racial Attitudes and Relations." Journal of Applied Sociology, (July, 1924), 339-44.

_____. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." American Journal of Sociology, (May, 1928), 881-93.

_____. "The Urban Community as a Spatial Pattern and Moral Order." On Social Control and Collective Behavior. Edited by Ralph B. Turner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

_____, and Burgess, Ernest W. The City. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.

Pearse, Andrew. "Some Characteristics of Urbanization in the City of Rio de Jameiro." Urbanization in Latin America. Edited by Philip M. Hauser. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Redfield, Robert. "The Folk Society." American Journal of Sociology, (January, 1947), 293-308.

Riesman, David; Glazer, Nathan; and Denny, R. The Lonely Crowd. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Rose, Arnold, and Warshay, Leon. "The Adjustment of Migrants to Cities." Social Forces, 36 (1957), 63-76.

Rubin, Morton. "Migration Patterns of Negroes from a Rural Northeastern Mississippi Community." Social Forces, (March, 1960), 59-66.

Ryan, Edward. "Personal Identification in an Urban Slum." The Urban Condition. Edited by Leonard J. Duhl. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Scheiner, Seth. Negro Mecca. New York: University Press, 1963.

Schwarzweller, Harry K., and Brown, James S. "Social Class Origins, Rural-Urban Migration and Economic Life Chances: A Case Study." Rural Sociology, (March, 1967), 5-19.

Small, Sylvia. "Black Migration From South Appears Unabated." St. Louis Post Dispatch, (July, 27, 1971), 1

Smith, Eldon Dee. Migration and Adjustment Experiences of Rural Migrant Workers in Indianapolis. Unpublished PhD dissertation: University of Wisconsin, 1953.

Thomas W.I., and Znaniecki, Florian. The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1918.

Toennies, Ferdinand. Community and Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Negro Population, 1790-1915. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1918.

_____. Census of Agriculture: 1959. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

_____. Census of Population: 1960. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.

_____. Farm Population of the United States: 1965. Current Population Reports. Series P-27, No. 36. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

_____. The Social and Economic Status of Negroes in the United States: 1970. Current Population Reports. Series P-23, No. 38. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971.

United States Census Office. Eleventh Census of the United States: 1890. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893.

Van Deusen, John G. Black Man in White America. Washington: Associated Publishers, 1944.

Wade, Richard C. Slavery in Cities. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Warner, Lloyd, W.; Meeker, Marchia; and Eels, Kenneth. Social Class in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Free Press, 1969.

Wharton, Vernon L. The Negro in Mississippi, 1865-1890. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Whyte, William F. Streetcorner Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

Wirth, Louis. "Urbanism as a Way of Life." American Journal of Sociology, (July, 1938), 1-24.

Woodward, C. Vann. The Strange Career of Jim Crow. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Young, Michael, and Willmott, Peter. Family Kinship in East London. Glencoe: Free Press, 1957.

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Fr. Edward J. Peklo, SVD, has been read and approved by members of the Department of Sociology.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that an necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Sept 19, 1972
Date

Signature of Advisor