The Role of Social Networks on Youth Migration, Settlement and Entrepreneurship in Malawi

Tony Mwenda Kamninga[1], Winford H. Masanjala[2], Bertha Chipo Bangara[3], and Martin Limbikani Mwale[4]

Abstract

This study examines the influence of social networks on the settlement and integration of young internal migrants in Malawi. By employing probit models on a unique dataset collected from 1500 urban migrant youths aged between 15 to 35. The results reveal that social networks positively relate to migrant youths settlement in their first migration destination. The relationship is driven by religious grouping membership. Further, social networks of religious groupings and home associations positively relate to migrant youth integration, observed from their increased business ownership. Membership to workers' unions relates negatively to entrepreneurship. The social networks do not relate to wage job employment. These findings suggest that policy that supports establishment of social networks or leverages their availability could be are key in improving migrant youth welfare through supporting settlement and integration. However, if the goal is enhance migrant youth's formal employment, alternative interventions such as vocation training should be considered.

Keywords: *Social Networks; Internal Migration; Settlement; Integration; Youth; Malawi*

Introduction

Migration separates individuals from their traditional social networks into new environments that are hostile and lack sufficient support for their welfare (Azmat, 2013; Heering et al., 2004; Whitaker, 2017; Zimmerman & Kiss, 2017). During this process individuals must access new support systems that can enable them to obtain psychological, mental, and economic support. The success to integrate into these new systems determine whether one settles at a destination or continues moving until they find an environment that is relatively better to survive and flourish (Kyeremeh et al., 2021).

Economists have long been studying factors that enable people to settle and integrate in new destinations and find that individual level attributes such as having critical employment skills and high level of education facilitates are key (Ivanova et al., 2015; Kamninga et al., 2020). Nevertheless, social networks in the destination area are another potential factor that could facilitate migrant settlement and integration. People find job referrals and business ideas and opportunities from social networks groups (Durlauf & Marcel, 2005). The resultant increased economic opportunities and the psychological support that group members provide to each

---

[1] African Institute for Development Policy (AFIDEP), Research and Policy, Box 31024, Lilongwe 3, Malawi.
E-mail: kamningatonymwenda@gmail.com.
[2] University of Malawi, Chancellor College, Economics Department, P.O Box 280 Zomba, Malawi.
E-mail: whmasanjala@gmail.com.
[3] Malawi University of Science and Technology, Applied Studies Department, P.O Box 5196, Limbe, Malawi.
E-mail: berthabangara@gmail.com.
[4] Stellenbosch University, Department of Economics, Cape town, South Africa, 7602 Bosman Street, Stellenbosch Central.
E-mail: martinresearch4@gmail.com.

other could, therefore, make a migrant less willing to leave for another destination. Nevertheless, migration literature on the effects of social networks has not given adequate attention to settlement and integration. Many efforts are dedicated to establishing the relationship between social networks, in the areas of origin, and the decision to migrate (Kwon et al., 2013; Manchin & Orazbayev, 2018; Thomas & Inkpen, 2013).

In rural economies experiencing demographic dividends, the decision to migrate is mainly characteristic of the youth between the ages of 15 to 35 (Bell & Charles-Edwards, 2014). The youth move to urban areas in search for job opportunities and following markets to create business enterprises (Manda, 2013; Mussa, 2016; Todd et al., 2017). Unfortunately, this age group has less experience in the labour market that makes it difficult to obtain jobs upon migration (Lauer et al., 2012). Neither do they have capital to startup businesses in the urban areas. Social networks, particularly joining religious and social groups could provide the much needed social and economic capital to the youth migrants that necessitates settlement and integration.

In this paper we take advantage of a cross-sectional dataset collected from 1500 internal migrant youth to examine the relationship between social networks and settlement-measured by whether individuals live in their first migration destination. We then examine the relationship between social networks and integration-measured by ownership of a business and participation in a paid job. The paper uses probit models to account for the binary nature of our dependent variable. We hypothesize that social networks allow youths to settle and integrate in their destination areas. Particularly, the youth obtain social capital and establish businesses that are supported by their network members. Unlike establishing business, obtaining a job does not only rely on the social network but also individual's abilities, skills and qualification. Therefore, social networks should easily facilitate business relative to employment.

Our results indicate that social networks positively associate with migrant youth settlement; members of religious groupings settle in their first migration destination. The social networks positively associate with migrant youth integration. Particularly, migrant youths that are members of religious groups and home associations own businesses. However, those that belong to workers' union associations relate negatively to business ownership. Further, participation in paid jobs is non-responsive to social networks of any nature. These results highlight that social networks are an important factor in facilitating migrant youth settlement and integration through entrepreneurship, but with limited results on formal employment.

The main contribution of this paper is to understand the role of social networks in migrant youth settlement and integration, unlike the previous literature (Amuakwa-Mensah et al., 2016; Buller et al., 2015; Ivanova et al., 2015; Kamninga et al., 2020; Manchin & Orazbayev, 2018; Thomas & Inkpen, 2013) which ends at estimating their effects on the decision to migrate

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews relevant literature. Section 3 discusses the data and methods adopted to establish our findings. Section 4 presents the results of the paper. Section 5 discusses the results and provides policy recommendations. Section 6 concludes the paper. An appendix is added in the final section to provide detailed descriptive information and estimates.

Migrant youth's settlement and integration

There is plethora of literature that discussed factors that affect migrant's youth settlement and integration in a new destination. Among many factors, sports and recreation are key in successful immigrants settlement in Canada (Doherty & Taylor, 2007). Migrant youths in the country, consider sports and recreation to be enjoyable, healthy, and supportive in the development of dialectal skills and in providing alignment to the mainstream culture of the host destination (Doherty & Taylor, 2007). Such groups also provide mental support that is required to maintain individual happiness and increase chances that and individual settles in a particular area (Myroniuk & Anglewicz, 2015; Rock et al., 2016).

These findings, receive support from other studies[5]. Nevertheless, they contrast Seat (2000) who show that participation in sport may lead to feelings of social exclusion amongst the youths who are novices, because of language difficulties, unfamiliarity with mainstream sports, and prejudice from peers. Additional studies reveal that those social groupings tend to closely monitor members inhibiting individual's ability to socialize. For example, Hungwe (2015) found social networks, through peer monitoring, hinder integration amongst migrant youths in Zimbabwe. Even though participation in social groups associates with better physical health, it predicts deteriorated mental health status amongst Malawian youths (Myroniuk & Anglewicz, 2015).

Besides, generic groups, social networks that are linked to family, kin or religion acquaintances facilitate integration and settlement in most African countries (Shimeles, 2010). Because of speaking similar languages, identifying with common tribal routes and following same religion values, migrant youths easily settle and integrate in many neighbouring countries in Africa. For instance, the strong ethic, religious and linguistic ties shared by migrants along the borders of Somalia, Djibouti, Ethiopia and Eritrea facilitate their settlement and integration (Shimeles, 2010), while language and historical ties matter amongst immigrants from Burundi and Rwanda when integrating into the populations of Uganda and Tanzania. In southern Africa migrants from Lesotho, Swaziland, Mozambique, and Botswana easily blend into societies in South Africa for similar reasons, making mobility and settlement reasonably easy for would-be migrants (Shimeles, 2010).

Therefore, migrant settlement and integration are largely influenced by unprecedented individual connections and ties that are galvanized by social networks. Moreover, migration within Africa is higher relative to oversees movements (Achieng et al, 2020). Social networks could be the reason the inter-Africa migration is high. Arguably, the influence of these social networks is stronger within countries and leads to increased internal migration. This is because network ties are more homogenous within countries relative to between countries. Nevertheless, evidence on the role of social networks on internal migration is sparse. Moreover, the influence of social networks on migrant youth's settlement and integration remains an empirical question that this paper answers.

---

[5] See for example (Kilbride et al., 2000; Tirone & Pedlar, 2000)

Data and methodology

Youth migration in Malawi

The study uses Malawi as a case study to examine the relationship between social networks, migrant youth settlement and integration. Malawi is a country in Southern Africa with a total population of 17.6 million and largely a youthful population that has median age of 17 years (NSO, 2019). Youth is a crucial stage in life as many people start to realize their aspirations, assume economic independence and find their place in the society (Mussa, 2016) . Most Malawians make decisions about where to live and what occupation to venture into at a young age (Kamninga et al, 2020). As such it is mostly the youth that migrate in search for employment, business enterprise and other occupational opportunities that could improve their livelihood in the country (Manda, 2013). The general migration patterns in Malawi involve movement from one rural are to another (NSO, 2017). This pattern accounts for about 50% of the movements while rural to urban migration comprises close to 27% of the migration patterns. Malawian youths participate in various forms of social interaction and these include religious communities, sports, and community organizations, home village associations and business groups (Rock et al., 2016). Involvement in these kinds of social networks could provide opportunities for interacting with people of diverse experiences and social standing and allow young men and women of different origins to easily settle and integrate in new societies.

Youth Employment and Migration in Eastern and Southern Africa project

The data used in this study was collected by the department of Economics at the University of Malawi, under the Youth Employment and Migration in Eastern and Southern Africa (YEMESA) project. YEMESA gathered information on youth migration, migrant's settlement, social networks such home village associations, religious based social groups, credit and savings credit cooperatives, funeral groups and games or music clubs. The project survey gathered data on youth entrepreneurship (business and enterprise ownership), migrant demographics, education and training, income expenditures, and migrant youth employment. YEMESA captures information on a representative sample of 1500 migrant youths in urban Malawi, between the ages of 15 and 35[6]. After excluding all observations with missing information on the variables of interest we remained with 1335 youths for analysis. Amongst them, 536 were in social networks while 799 did not belong to a social network. We use the sample to estimate the relationship between social networks and migrant youth settlement and the relationship between the networks and migrant youth integration measured by business ownership and participation in wage employment.

Sample characteristics

For the settlement outcome we use a dummy variable of whether an individual is living in their first migration destination captured by 1 and 0 otherwise. Integration is captured by 2 outcomes. The first is a dummy of whether one owns a business or not. The second integration outcome is a dummy of whether they are on a paid job. We capture social networks by a dummy variable where 1 entail that a migrant youth belongs to at least one group or an organization or association and 0 otherwise. To unbundle the heterogeneity in the social

---

[6] This is in line with definition of a youth and migrant as observed in Kamninga (2019)

network parameter we disaggregate it by 4 subgroups provided in the survey: religious group, home association savings and credit cooperative and workers' union (The definition of settlement and integration covariates used in the paper is included in table A2 of the appendix).

Table 1: Mean sample characteristics

	Full sample	Social networks	No networks	T-stats
Settlement	0.599	0.677	0.547	-0.130***
Business	0.423	0.473	0.390	-0.083**
Paid job	0.184	0.161	0.199	0.037
Age	26.547	27.073	26.194	-0.879***
Male	0.772	0.709	0.814	0.105***
Married	0.364	0.417	0.328	-0.089***
Children	1.179	1.354	1.063	-0.290***
Below secondary Education	0.417	0.323	0.480	0.157***
Time	4.557	4.969	4.280	-0.689**
Head	0.739	0.706	0.761	0.056*
Catholic	0.179	0.199	0.165	-0.034
Anglican	0.039	0.057	0.027	-0.030**
Muslim	0.144	0.142	0.146	0.004
Pentecost	0.211	0.242	0.190	-0.052*
Presbytery	0.174	0.148	0.191	0.043*
Chewa	0.155	0.161	0.150	-0.010
Yawo	0.149	0.139	0.156	0.017
Lomwe	0.305	0.318	0.297	-0.021
Ngoni	0.150	0.155	0.147	-0.009
Tumbuka	0.112	0.096	0.123	0.026
Manganja	0.044	0.046	0.042	-0.005
Tonga	0.019	0.018	0.019	0.001
Sena	0.040	0.046	0.036	-0.011
Observations	1335	536	799	1335

Notes: *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table 1 presents characteristics of the variables used in the analysis. The first column presents full sample means. We then split the sample by membership to social networks in column 2 and 3. Column 4 presents the t-statistics for the mean differences by the membership to social networks. The proportion of the youth migrants that settled in their first destination is 60 percent. Amongst those is social networks, 68 percent settled while amongst those who are not in social networks 55 percent settled. The difference in settlement by social networks is statistically significant. Concerning integration 42 percent of the sample owns a business. Social network members have a 47percent representation in business while 39 percent of non-members own a business. The difference between the two groups is statistically significant. In the sample, 18 percent of the migrant youths are in a paid job. There is no statistical difference in paid job participation by social network membership. The summary of the outcomes provides preliminary indication that social networks are important for settlement and only essential for integration measured by participation in business but not job acquisition.

In the sample the average, is 27 years old. Those in social networks are older than those in non-social network. 77 percent of the sample is male. Social network members are 71 percent male while non-members are 81 percent male. Thus, social networks are significantly dominated by males. The sample is 36 percent married. More social network members are

married (42 percent) than non-members (33 percent). The difference is statistically significant. On average the sample has 1.2 biological children. Members have a higher average number of biological children (1.4) than non-members (1.1). Forty-two percent of the sample has less than secondary education. Network members have significantly high education (32percent with less than secondary education) relative to non-network members (48 percent with less than secondary education). On average the same lived 5 years in their current location with networks members spending significantly more years (5 years) comparing to non-members (4 years). Seventy-four percent of the youths in the sample are household heads. Social network members have fewer household heads (71percent) relative to non-network members (76 percent). The rest of table 1 shows the distribution of the sample by religion and ethnicity.

Estimation strategy

We build econometric models that specify migrant settlement, business ownership and participation in wage employment (wage job) as a function of membership to social networks presented in the following form.

$$Y_i = \delta Social\ networks_i + \gamma_i covariates_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

Where Y_i denotes the outcome of interest for person i. We start by estimating **Social networks** as a dummy for an individual who is a member of any social network, then estimate another model that disaggregates the treatment into specific social networks of religious, home based groups, savings and credit cooperatives and workers union. **Covariates** denotes attributes of the individual that affect the outcomes and could relate to the treatment; social networks. These include age of the respondent, gender, marital status, religion, tribe, level of education, whether one in household head or not, number of biological children that one has, education and time since arrival in the current destination. We capture errors in estimation by the parameter ε.

Considering that all our outcome variables are binary, we employ probit models to obtain the results. The relationship between social networks and any of the outcomes is captured by δ while that between the **Covariates** and outcomes is denoted by a vector of parameters γ_i. A positive and significant δ entails that social networks enhance settlement or business or wage employment, while a negative δ means social networks reduce the outcomes. To allow interpretation of these coefficients as probabilities we derive their marginal effects.

Results

We now present results from the probit estimations of equation 1. The coefficients are marginal effects. For the interest of brevity, we only describe estimates of interest (social networks); a full presentation of covariate coefficients is included in table A3 of the appendix.

Table 3: The marginal effects of social networks on migrant youth settlement and integration

Dep. Var.	(1) Settlement	(2) Settlement	(3) Business	(4) Business	(5) Paid Job	(6) Paid Job
Social networks	0.387***		0.103**		-0.140	
	(0.142)		(0.047)		(0.231)	
Religious		0.101***		0.180**		0.028
		(0.017)		(0.088)		(0.093)
Home		-0.091		0.303***		-0.228
		(0.271)		(0.109)		(0.324)
Cooperatives		0.610		0.137		-0.260
		(0.381)		(0.224)		(0.393)
Workers Union		0.126		-0.422*		-0.099
		(0.083)		(0.224)		(0.314)
Constant	1.737***	1.788***	-1.802***	-1.805***	0.407	0.378
	(0.644)	(0.646)	(0.131)	(0.126)	(0.551)	(0.511)
Observations	1,335	1,335	1,335	1,335	1,335	1,335

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$ The results control for age of the respondent, gender, marital status, religion, tribe, level of education, where one in household head or not, number of biological children that one has, education and time since arrival in the current destination.

Table 3 shows the relationship between social networks and migrant youth settlement, business, and paid job participation. Columns 1, 3 and 5 show the results from the binary social networks treatment while columns 2, 4 and 6 display results from the disaggregated social networks. We observe, in column 1, that membership to a social network increases the likelihood of settlement. Specifically, participation increases the chance that one will remain at their first migration destination by 39 percent. The results for individual networks reveal that this relationship between social networks and settlement is entirely driven by religious groupings. Column 3 shows that social networks increase the probability of establishing a business by 10 percent. A disaggregation of the networks reveals that religious groups home associations drive this result; membership to a religious group increases chances of owning a business by 18 percent while membership to a home association increases chances of owning a business by 30 percent. Membership to a worker's union reduces the probability of owning a business. Column 5 and 6 show that social networks do not relate to paid job employment. Across all the specifications, membership to savings and credit cooperatives does not relate to migrant youths' settlement, business ownership and participation in paid job.

Discussion

Our results reveal important considerations when examining the relationship between social networks and post-migration welfare that previous scholarship (Kwon et al., 2013; Manchin & Orazbayev, 2018; Thomas & Inkpen, 2013; Yotebieng, 2017) did not give adequate attention. We show that social networks in a destination area facilitate migrant youth settlement. Particularly religious groups unlike home associations, cooperatives, and worker's union, drive the positive association between social networks and remaining in a first migration destination. These results are robust to controlling for the length of time that an individual lived in the destination and many other sociodemographic and economic covariates.

The findings support the notion that the networks enable migrants obtain social capital (Matchaya, 2009; Peters, 2010). Individuals who belong to groups have easy access to peer information that assist them to adapt to the new living conditions and develop their economic capital (Durlauf & Marcel, 2005). The economic capital assists them to develop resilience to vulnerability, hence, reduce the need to seek greener pastures in new destination. Further, religious groups facilitate this process better than alternative networks, arguably, due to strong values and norms which religion embeds in its members, that are common across space, (Rock et al., 2016); a migrant of a particular religion does not necessarily need to learn completely new beliefs in the destination. This is unlike alternative networks such as cooperatives and worker's union that have localised norms. These norms demand relatively more time for a migrant to adapt to and integrate.

Migrant integration is one of the important mechanisms through which settlement could develop (Grzymala-Kazlowska & Phillimore, 2018); people who integrate earlier in their stay at the first destination are less likely to move to another area. We show that social networks are key in facilitating migrant youth integration. While religious groups emerge an important social network for establishment of business, home association provide the highest catalysts for the entrepreneurship. Home associations membership is mostly amongst neighbouring people. The proximity provide trust that could also involve access to credit between family and friends without stringent demands such as collateral. Previous evidence (Fiamohe et al., 2021; Zidana, 2015) support this by showing that most credit in rural economies is obtained from family and friends. The financing becomes key in establishment of businesses. Not only, do the home association increase capital, but they, together with religious groups, provide a market for the businesses.

Besides, we find workers union negatively related to business ownership. Workers union comprise skilled individuals with high levels of education whose main livelihood is wage employment. Union members have less incentives to assist each other in developing business. Moreover, most of these are non-migrants since education deters migration in rural economies (Kamninga, 2019). Probably workers' union members do not encourage each other in investing in entrepreneurship. This leads to the observed reduction in business ownership amongst youth migrants that belong to the unions. These workers' union youths alternatively develop employment skills to increase their wage job benefits.

The potential for workers' union social networks is, however, limited to those who already have jobs. We confirm this with the findings that membership to the union does not relate to finding a paid job. Previous evidence (Durlauf & Marcel, 2005; Nordman & Pasquier-Doumer, 2014) show that social networks lead to access to information about job adverts and referrals. Our results further reveal that amongst the migrant youths, no social network including religious groups, cooperatives and home associations leads to formal employment participation. Arguably, skills and education experience matter more than social networks for migrant youths to obtain the employment.

These findings have implications for policy. Governments in rural economies like Malawi can leverage on the available positive relationship between social networks and migrant youth settlement and integration through providing less stringent credit. The credit would facilitate business establishment with the overall effects of improved welfare. Policy should, however, be aware that the social networks may not be used in the same way to facilitate wage job employment participation. Alternative measures to allow increased access to the jobs for the

migrant youths could include, on the labour supply side, providing vocation training that embed skills targeting specific jobs localised in the migrant destinations (Kamninga et al., 2020). From the labour demand perspective, government could provide incentives, such as tax cuts for firms that demand migrant youth skills. This could facilitate migrant youth settlement, integration and improve their welfare from both ends.

Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between social networks in the urban destination areas on migrant youth settlement and integration using data from Malawi, a country experiencing demographic dividends while having limited opportunities for the youths in the rural areas. It employed probit models to account for the binary nature of the settlement and integration outcomes and find that social networks positively and significantly associate with migrant youth settlement. Further, the networks particularly those of religious groups and home associations positively relate to migrant youth integration measured by business ownership, while workers' unions negatively relate to the entrepreneurship behaviour. Further, social networks do not relate with acquisition of paid jobs. The findings from this paper alert policy that social networks can be relied upon to enhance migrant youth settlement and integration particularly through entrepreneurship. If job creation acquisition should be an additional goal of migration welfare policy, then alternative channels beyond social networks should be considered.

Conflict of Interest

All authors declare no conflict of interest

Acknowledgement and Funding

References

Achieng, M., El-Fadil, A., & Righa, E. (2020). What is Wrong with the Narrrative on African Migration? In A. Adepoju, C. Fumagalli, & N. Nyabola (Eds.), *African Migration Report: Challenging the Narrative* (pp. 1–13). International Organization for Migration.

Amuakwa-Mensah, F., Boakye-Yiadom, L., & Baah-Boateng, W. (2016). Effect of education on migration decisions in Ghana: a rural-urban perspective. *Journal of Economic Studies*, *43*(2), 336–356. https://doi.org/10.1108/JES-09-2013-0138

Azmat, F. (2013). Opportunities or obstacles? *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, *5*(2), 198–215.

Bell, M., & Charles-Edwards, E. (2014). *Measuring internal migration around the globe: A comparative analysis* (No. 3; Global Knowledge Partnership on Migration and Development).

Buller, A., Vaca, V., Stoklosa, H., Borland, R., & Zimmerman, C. (2015). *Labor exploitation, trafficking and migrant health: Multi-country findings on the health risks and consequences of migrant and trafficked workers.* https://publications.iom.int/books/labour-exploitation-trafficking-and-migrant-health-multi-country-findings-health-risks-and

Doherty, A., & Taylor, T. (2007). Sport and physical recreation in the settlement of immigrant youth. *Leisure/ Loisir*, *31*(1), 27–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/14927713.2007.9651372

Durlauf, S., & Marcel, F. (2005). Social Capital. In P. Aghion & D. Steven (Eds.), *Handbook of Economic Growth* (p. 16391699).

Fiamohe, R., Dedehouanou, S. F. A., Djo, A. E. F., Bouraima, N., Djidonou, A. W. C., Honore, N., & Hounton, D. (2021). *Access to Financing for Productive Employment Opportunities for Women in Rural Benin* (No. 2021–10; PEP Working Paper Series).

Grzymala-Kazlowska, A., & Phillimore, J. (2018). Introduction: rethinking integration. New perspectives on adaptation and settlement in the era of super-diversity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *44*(2), 179–196. https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1341706

Heering, L., van der Erf, R., & van Wissen, L. (2004). The Role of Family Networks and Migration Culture in the Continuation of Moroccan Emigration: a Gender Perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *30*(2), 323–337.

Hungwe, C. (2015). The uses of social capital among Zimbabwean migrants in Johannesburg. *Africa Review*, *7*(2), 121–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/09744053.2015.1030868

Ivanova, V., Ushchev, P., & Vakhitova, H. (2015). Occupational choice of migrants: does NEG tell something new? *55th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "World Renaissance: Changing Roles for People and Places."* http://hdl.handle.net/10419/124738%0D

Kamninga, T. M. (2019). Spillover effects of education on internal migration in Malawi. *Migration and Development*, *9*(2), 238–252. https://doi.org/10.1080/21632324.2019.1601831

Kamninga, T. M., Phangaphanga, M., & Masanjala, W. (2020). The Impact of Skill Acquistion on Choice of Occupation and Destination for Migrant Youths in Malawi. *Migration and Development*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/21632324.2020.1808366

Kilbride, K. ., Anisef, P., Baichman-Anisef, E., & Khattar, R. (2000). *Between two worlds: The experiences and concerns of immigrant youths in Ontario.*

Kwon, S.-W., Heflin, C., & Ruef, M. (2013). Community Social Capital and Entrepreneurship. *American Sociological Review*, *78*(6), 980–1008.

Kyeremeh, E., Arku, G., Mkandawire, P., Cleave, E., & Yusuf, I. (2021). What is success? Examining the concept of successful integration among African immigrants in Canada. *Journal of Ethinic and Migration Studies*, *47*(3), 649–667.

Lauer, S., Wilkinson, L., Yan, M. C., Sin, R., & Tsang, A. K. T. (2012). Immigrant Youth and Employment: Lessons Learned from the Analysis of LSIC and 82 Lived Stories. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *13*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-011-0189-1

Manchin, M., & Orazbayev, S. (2018). *Social Networks and the Intention to Migrtae* (Working Paper No. 90).

Manda, M. (2013). *Situation of Urbanization in Malawi.*

Matchaya, G. (2009). Land ownership security in Malawi. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, *4*(1), 1–013. http://www.academicjournals.org/AJAR

Mussa, R. (2016). *Labour market transitions of young women and men in Malawi:results of the 2014 school-to-work transition survey* (Issue 35).

Myroniuk, T. W., & Anglewicz, P. (2015). Does Social Participation Predict Better Health? A Longitudinal Study in Rural Malawi. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *56*(4), 552–573. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146515613416

Nordman, C. J., & Pasquier-Doumer, L. (2014). Transitions in a West African labour market: The role of family networks. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, *54*, 74–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2014.11.008

NSO. (2017). *The Intergrated Household Survey 2016-2017.*

NSO. (2019). *2018 Malawi Population and Housing Census Main Report* (Issue May).

Peters, P. E. (2010). " Our daughters inherit our land , but our sons use their wives ' fields ": matrilineal-matrilocal land tenure and the New Land Policy in Malawi. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, *10*(55), 1753–1063. https://doi.org/10.1080/17531050903556717

Rock, A., Barrington, C., Abdoulayi, S., Tsoka, M., Mvula, P., & Handa, S. (2016). *Social networks, social participation, and health among youth living in extreme poverty in rural Malawi.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.10.005

Seat, R. (2000). *Factors Affecting the Settlement and Adaptation Process of Canadian Adolescent Newcomers 16-19 Years of Age.*

Shimeles, A. (2010). *Migration Patterns, Trends and Policy Issues in Africa.* www.afdb.org/

Thomas, K., & Inkpen, C. (2013). Migration Dynamics, Entrepreneurship, and African Development: Lessons from Malawi. *The International Migration Review*, *47*(4), 844–873.

Tirone, S., & Pedlar, A. (2000). Understanding the leisure experinces of a minority ethic group: South Asians teens and young adults in Canada. *Sport, Education and Society*, *23*(1), 145–169.

Todd, G. J. N., Clark, B., Marston, M., Urassa, M., & Todd, J. (2017). Gender and youth migration for empowerment: migration trends from Tanzania. *Migration Letters*, *14*(2), 300–317.

Whitaker, B. E. (2017). Migration within Africa and Beyond. *African Studies Review*, *60*(2), 209–220.

Yotebieng, K. A. (2017). Health, well-being, and urban refugees and asylum seekers: an agenda paper. *Migration Letters*, *14*(3), 343–354.

Zidana, R. (2015). Exploring Alternative Sources of Financing Small and Medium Enterprises (SMES) In Malawi: Lessons from Elsewhere. *Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, *4*(4), 2229–5313.

Zimmerman, C., & Kiss, L. (2017). Human trafficking and exploitation: A global health concern. *PLoS Medicine*, *14*(11), e1002437–e1002437. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002437

Appendix

Table A2: Definition of variables used in the paper.

Variable	Description
Dependent Variables	
Settlement	Binary variable =1 if respondents' first destination is the same as the current destination and = 0 otherwise
Integration	Binary variable = 1 if respondent own any business or has a job and = 0 otherwise.
Treatment variables	
Social networks	Dummy variable=1 if a respondent belongs to any social network and 0= otherwise
Religious group	Dummy variable=1 if a respondent is a member and 0= otherwise
Home association	Dummy variable=1 if a respondent is a member and 0= otherwise
Credit and savings cooperative	Dummy variable=1 if a respondent is a member and 0= otherwise
Workers union	Dummy variable=1 if a respondent is a member and 0= otherwise
Independent Variables	
Age	Continuous, at least 15 years old
Male	Binary variable = 1 if respondent is male; = 0 if respondent is male
Marital status	Binary variable= 1 if respondents say they are married; 0= if they responded otherwise
Children	Count variable beginning from zero to the maximum number of children in the sample
Employed	Binary variable = 1 if respondent is employed; = 0 if respondent is not employed
Education	Dummy variable =1 if the respondent has less than secondary education; =0 otherwise
Time	The number of months that an individual has stayed in the current destination.
Head	Binary variable= 1 if is the head of household and 0=Otherwise
Catholic	Binary variable= 1 if respondents say they are of catholic religion, and 0=Otherwise
Anglican	Binary variable=1 if respondents say they expected better job opportunity, and 0= Otherwise
Muslim	Binary variable=1 if respondents say they are a Muslim, and 0= Otherwise
Tribe	Binary variable = 1 if respondent say that they are of chewa, tumbuka, yawo,sena, mang'anja, lomwe or tonga tribe; 0= otherwise

Table A 3: Full results for marginal effects of social network on settlement and integration

Dep. Var.	(1) Settlement	(2) Settlement	(3) Business	(4) Business	(5) Paid Job	(6) Paid Job
Social networks	0.387***		0.103**		-0.140	
	(0.142)		(0.047)		(0.231)	
Religious		0.101***		0.180**		0.028
		(0.017)		(0.088)		(0.093)
Home		-0.091		0.303***		-0.228
		(0.271)		(0.109)		(0.324)
Cooperative		0.610		0.137		-0.260
		(0.381)		(0.224)		(0.393)
Workers Union		0.126		-0.422*		-0.099
		(0.083)		(0.224)		(0.314)
Age	-0.060***	-0.059***	0.035***	0.035***	-0.028*	-0.029*
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Male	0.180***	0.215***	0.032	0.062	-0.277*	-0.292**
	(0.056)	(0.059)	(0.147)	(0.137)	(0.142)	(0.114)
Married	-0.074	-0.069	0.380**	0.376**	0.081	0.088
	(0.177)	(0.159)	(0.160)	(0.157)	(0.125)	(0.126)
Children	-0.007	-0.009	0.092***	0.091***	-0.079	-0.074
	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.030)	(0.027)	(0.077)	(0.081)
Below Secondary	0.039	-0.002	-0.123	-0.134	-0.176	-0.161
	(0.071)	(0.070)	(0.084)	(0.083)	(0.110)	(0.124)
Time	0.049***	0.051***	0.036***	0.037***	-0.055***	-0.055***
	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.012)
Head	-0.291***	-0.285***	0.173**	0.172**	-0.025	-0.016
	(0.095)	(0.100)	(0.077)	(0.078)	(0.229)	(0.223)
Anglican	-0.460***	-0.434**	-0.511**	-0.498*	-0.089	-0.107
	(0.177)	(0.221)	(0.260)	(0.259)	(0.200)	(0.182)
Muslim	0.015	0.056	-0.074	-0.082	-0.171	-0.169
	(0.075)	(0.090)	(0.107)	(0.116)	(0.152)	(0.140)
Pentecostal	0.111	0.126	-0.058	-0.067	-0.084	-0.087
	(0.130)	(0.135)	(0.084)	(0.089)	(0.130)	(0.132)
Presbytery	-0.159	-0.183	0.064	0.063	-0.122	-0.104
	(0.183)	(0.174)	(0.131)	(0.122)	(0.090)	(0.085)
Yawo	0.002	-0.026	0.256	0.261*	0.120	0.120
	(0.543)	(0.531)	(0.161)	(0.152)	(0.265)	(0.260)
Lomwe	0.005	-0.011	0.211	0.206	0.213	0.218
	(0.726)	(0.727)	(0.179)	(0.171)	(0.227)	(0.232)
Ngoni	0.139	0.115	0.067	0.059	0.126	0.141
	(0.498)	(0.491)	(0.110)	(0.100)	(0.347)	(0.367)
Tumbuka	-1.310***	-1.299***	0.060	0.040	-0.079	-0.089
	(0.206)	(0.204)	(0.050)	(0.059)	(0.142)	(0.146)
Manganja	0.012	-0.002	0.418***	0.430***	-0.107	-0.108
	(0.557)	(0.558)	(0.133)	(0.130)	(0.235)	(0.239)
Tonga	0.037	0.056	0.144	0.184	0.638	0.634
	(0.288)	(0.315)	(0.377)	(0.341)	(0.455)	(0.454)
Sena	-0.195	-0.164	-0.058	-0.022	0.117***	0.123***
	(0.761)	(0.761)	(0.184)	(0.192)	(0.042)	(0.033)
Constant	1.737***	1.788***	-1.802***	-1.805***	0.407	0.378
	(0.644)	(0.646)	(0.131)	(0.126)	(0.551)	(0.511)
Observations	1,335	1,335	1,335	1,335	1,335	1,335

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1