

Reintegration Strategies

Introduction

The reintegration strategies offer a new method of inquiry for assessing different levels of reintegration. The conceptualization of the reintegration strategies approach is rooted in an in-depth literature review across multiple fields of research including refugee studies, integration, transnationalism, social network theory, social change, and the wider migration literature. This chapter provides a brief overview of the key topics such as transnationalism, social networks, and social change that form the basis of the reintegration strategies approach. The social network and social change literature are essential to the discussion as they provide cornerstones for understanding how people reintegrate and how to assess the impact of reintegration on communities. Although the empirical element of this book cannot examine the impact of returnees upon their communities of return, this is a central piece of the reintegration literature that is therefore included in this section. Key questions will also be addressed such as What is the role of social networks in return and reintegration? How can the relationship between return migration, reintegration, and social change be characterized?

The first section of this chapter will discuss transnationalism theory and the relationship between reintegration and transnationalism. The third section will move to discuss the theory of social networks and the application of network theory in migration studies and return migration. Next, this chapter will examine the topic of social change and how social change concepts have also been applied in migration studies and return migration. Finally, this chapter will conclude with the framework of the reintegration strategies. Integral to this model are the concepts of cultural maintenance, social networks, and individual's self-identification, which will be discussed in sections throughout this chapter.

Transnationalism

As discussed in the brief section on integration in the introduction chapter, transnationalism is a critical concept in migration studies. Limited research exists on the impact of transnationalism on reintegration. Incorporating learning from research on integration and transnationalism, it can be argued that transnationalism may reinforce processes of reintegration. This will be further explored in later chapters, and this section will provide a brief overview of transnationalism theory and its relevance for return and reintegration.

The theory of migrant transnationalism emerged in the 1990s and since has gained increasing popularity. The central premise of the theory is that migrants are involved in dual lives with activities in both the country of migration and the country of origin/return. Portes et al. (1999) delimit the concept of transnationalism to "occupations and activities that require regular and sustained social contacts over time across national borders" (219). Not all migrants are transnational, only those that have significant and sustained cross-border connections with the country of origin/return. The basis of the theory is in the maintenance of cross-border social networks; however, transnationalism goes beyond social network theory to argue that the connections create new transnational social fields and transnational communities impacting communities at home and abroad.

Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004) define social fields as “A set of multiple interlocking networks of social relationships through which ideas, practices, and resources are unequally exchanged, organized, and transformed” (9). They further distinguish between ways of being versus ways of belonging. Ways of being refer to social relations and practices individuals engage in whereas ways of belonging refers to practices that signal an identity that demonstrates a connection to a particular group. Therefore,

If individuals engage in social relations and practices that cross borders as a regular frame of everyday life, then they exhibit a transnational way of being. When people explicitly recognize this and highlight the transnational elements of who they are, then they are also expressing a transnational way of belonging. Clearly, these two experiences do not always go hand in hand. (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004: 12)

Notions of identity and belonging are thus central to the field of transnationalism.

Transnational social spaces can exist at the kinship level, as circuits, or as transnational communities (Faist 2008). These interactions are based on notions of reciprocity, exchange, and solidarity. Transnational communities are rooted in solitary ties that reach beyond kinship and through reciprocity and solidarity create a “high degree of social cohesion and a common repertoires of symbolic and collective representations” (Faist 2008). Transnational communities may or may not have a diaspora identity. A diaspora can be defined as a population “which has originated in a land other than which it currently resides, and whose social, economic and political networks cross the borders of nation-states or, indeed, span the globe” (Vertovec 1999). Only diasporas that have a strong connection to the country of origin can be considered transnational (Faist 2008).

Initial research on transnationalism saw the process as opposing to integration. Recent research has indicated, however, that the processes are not mutually exclusive and can be intertwined (Vertovec 2001). It has also been further argued that not only may the processes be

intertwined, they may be mutually reinforcing so that greater transnational engagement leads to higher levels of integration (Oeppen 2009).

This leads to emerging discussions of the area of “post-return transnationalism” and a debate as to if and how engagement in transnational activities upon return may or may not assist in the reintegration process. The examination of transnationalism from a return perspective is an emerging area that is currently being developed. The next section returns to a central component of integration theory and the basis of transnationalism theory, that is social networks.

Social Networks

Engaging with concepts of social networks is important in this book as networks are essential for understanding concepts of integration and transnationalism and therefore also reintegration. Key concepts of social networks including resources, social structure, and social capital will be addressed in this section. All of these concepts are essential to understand how people are positioned upon their return in terms of access to resources and capital. The section will then discuss the application of network theory to migration studies and return migration.

A network can be defined as “a specific type of relation linking a defined set of persons, objects, or events” (Knoke and Kuklinski 1982: 12 from Mitchell 1969). Network analysis bridges the micro- and macro-level of analysis that is the structural and cultural environment and the individual and household. It moves beyond looking at attributes of individuals to looking at the relationships and connections between individuals.

The central importance of networks is the access to resources that they provide. Resources can be defined as “material or symbolic goods” (Lin 1982). Lin argues that there are three principles regarding how individuals assign meaning to resources. The first principle is “differential values are assigned by consensus or influence to resources to signal their relative significance” (Lin 1982). This relates to supply and demand of the resource available, but also the value of the resource

can change due to events or over time. The second assumption is “all actors will take actions to promote their self-interests by maintaining and gaining valued resources if such opportunities are available”. Generally, those with more valued resources will work to protect their resources, and those with less valued resources will try to gain more valued resources or change the values assigned to resources. Appropriation of resources can occur in legitimate ways such as education, or in illegitimate deviant behaviours such as stealing. The third principle regarding resources is that “maintaining and gaining valued resources are the two primary motives for action, with the former outweighing the latter” (Lin 1999).

The acquisition of resources is embedded within a social structure. Here, there is a distinction between resources that are attached to an individual versus resources that are attached to a position. Power, hierarchy, authority, and rules all become embedded in the social structure and regulate the access to resources of individuals depending on their position and network connections within the social structure. Individuals have limited resources themselves and thus use social ties and connections within the structure to access resources. Social capital is thus a critical component of the network approach.

Social capital according to a network perspective is the resources accessible and embedded through social connections or social networks (Lin 2001; Burt 2002). This contrasts the theories of social capital put forth by Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam in that social capital exists on a group level and can be examined through solidarity and reproduction of the group (Lin 2001). Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam argue that a requirement for social capital is the density or closure of social networks (Lin 2001). Dense networks are those that consist of strong ties wherein “members know one another, interact on a routine basis, and are privy to the same information regarding the social environment, including job opportunities” (Wilson 1998: 397).

Network theorists approach to social capital argues that weak ties in networks can be more beneficial for accessing new resources not currently possessed, such as information regarding new job opportunities. Granovetter (1973) has illustrated that information regarding job opportunities is often best found outside of dense networks ties through

weak ties that thus act as an information bridge from structural holes (absence of ties). Building on Granovetter, Burt argues “Dense networks tend to convey redundant information, while weaker ties can be sources of new knowledge and resources” (from Portes 1998: 6). In terms of maintaining resources, denser networks have an advantage as they prevent entry for others, such as occurs with the privileged class (Lin 2001). For those looking to obtain new resources, such as a job, weak ties and extending bridges can be more helpful.

Putnam (2000) termed the differences between weak ties and dense ties access to social capital as bridging and bonding social capital. Bridging social capital is defined as networks that are “outward looking and encompass people across diverse cleavages” and bonding social capital as “inward looking [networks that] tend to reinforce exclusive identities and homogenous groups” (Putnam 2000: 22). Nannested and Svendsen (2008) further the explanation to equate with trust where bridging social capital is based on general trust and refers to trust in strangers and bonding social capital is based on concrete trust and refers to trust in people you already know. Bonding social capital can also turn negative when it becomes excessive in groups that form units such as al-Qaida and the mafia (negative social capital is explored further below).

Upon accessing social capital, Lin (2001) argues that social capital can lead to two types of returns: instrumental returns and expressive returns. Instrumental returns are based on instrumental action, which is taken to obtain resources not already possessed by the actor. Instrumental returns include economic, political, and social returns. Economic and political returns are self-explanatory. Social returns can include reputation, that is the unfavourable or favourable opinion regarding an individual in a collective. Expressive action refers to a method to consolidate resources and defend against resource losses. Expressive returns include physical health, mental health, and life satisfaction. Expressive returns reflect the theory of homophily, also known as the “like-me hypothesis”, which states that people with similar characteristics, attitudes, and lifestyles tend to congregate.

Through social networks, individuals can mobilize resources and gain social capital that offers the individual different types of returns. In general, it is assumed that returns acquired through networks and social

capital are positive and can lead to economic, political, and social gain, or improvements in health, happiness, and life satisfaction. There can be, however, negative elements to social capital and network membership.

Portes (1998) highlights four negative aspects of social capital: exclusion of outsiders, excess claims on group members, restrictions on individual freedoms, and downward levelling norms. Portes states “Social ties can bring about greater control over wayward behaviour and provide privileged access to resources; they can also restrict individual freedoms and bar outsiders from gaining access to the same resources through particularistic preferences” (Portes 1998: 21). Downward levelling norms refer to groups where solidarity is created and maintained based on opposition to mainstream society. When one individual is able to create success in mainstream society, this undermines group cohesion as the group is rooted in the impossibility of such successes. Therefore, that member generally exits the group and the remaining group members focus on downward levelling norms that maintain their group dynamics.

The negative aspects of social capital highlight an important component of the network debate as network membership may have negative influences on its members. Therefore, simply being a member of a network is not enough; it is the characteristics and dynamics within the network, and the access to resources that the network provides that is important. Finally, it is essential to note that networks are not static entities that are constantly changing and adapting (Cassarino 2004).

Migration Networks

It is essential to note that network theory has only been partially applied in migration studies. A network approach to migration studies gained increasing popularity in the 1980s. Prior to this research conducted in the 1960s and 1970s also focused on the importance of social networks in theories of chain migration (MacDonald and MacDonald 1964; Boyd 1989). Current migration research emphasizes social networks in various stages of the migration process including (1) decisions to migrate, (2) direction and persistence of migration flows,

(3) transnational links, and (4) settlement patterns and incorporation (Hagan 1998).

Massey et al. define migrant networks as “sets of interpersonal ties that connect migrants, former migrants, and non-migrants in origin and destination areas through ties of kinship, friendship, and shared community origin” (1993: 448). Migrant networks are theorized to increase migration because they lower the risks and costs of migration and increase the returns from migration (Massey et al. 1993). Migrant networks can aid the migrant at the destination in multiple ways, such as “the provision of food and housing for a temporary period, assistance in finding housing and work, orienting the migrant to life in the receiving community, and often constituting the primary source of continuing social relationships and moral support once the migrant has established himself/herself in their destination” (Wilson 2010: 13). Once established, migrants can send back remittances and information to members of their networks to assist them in facilitating migration. This creates what has also been termed *chain migration*. MacDonald and MacDonald (1964) defined chain migration as “that movement in which prospective migrants learn of opportunities, are provided transportation, and have initial accommodation and employment arranged by means of primary social relationships with previous migrants” (82).

Network theory in migration studies has primarily focused on the facilitating role of migrant networks (de Haas 2010). The approach has assumed a dense network that provides privileged access to information on how to migrate and then self-perpetuates migration. Migrant network theory has largely ignored three important aspects of network theory (de Haas 2010). First, the importance of access to resources remains largely unaddressed in migration theory which assumes that networks’ simple existence will lead to migration, while only the resources provided from the network ties can facilitate access to migration. Second, the forms of social capital are not assessed in the migration network approach, which assumes dense networks and does not examine the potential to migrate through bridging social capital or weak ties. Third, the negative aspects of social capital are generally excluded from the migration network approach, which is significant as it is highly probable that outsiders (based on kin or class) are excluded from migration

opportunities due to lack of membership (de Haas 2010). de Haas (2010) argues that building on Portes (1998) argument, the fifth downside of social capital is that strong bonding and weak bridging social capital lead to the exclusion of individuals from new information and ideas that may be critical for migration. In summarizing the network effects on migration and accounting for previous shortages in the theory, de Haas states:

Large-scale migration diffusion through network effects seems most likely to occur among relatively poor, low-skilled migrant groups with a 'moderate' level of group identity, cohesion and 'strong ties', which should be strong enough to guarantee clustering and prevent rapid assimilation, but also loose enough so that group norms do not prevent the establishment of 'weak ties'. This seems to apply to many rural communities in relatively poor but rapidly modernizing and transforming societies. (de Haas 2010: 1610)

This highlights the continued importance of the social structure (hierarchy, power, authority) in the access to resources that the network can provide. Building on these arguments, this book will utilize the full application of social network theory to migration studies, moving beyond the limited application of the "network approach" commonly utilized in migration studies.

Finally, Epstein (2008) puts forth that a distinction must be made between migration network effects and migration herd effects. Network effects account for the individual receiving personal information regarding the migration, whereas herd effects account for individuals who make their migration decisions based on observations of others. In the herd model, emigrants "may have some private information, but are imperfectly informed about the attributes of alternative foreign locations, and pay attention to previous emigrants' decisions" (Epstein 2008: 568). Individuals may discount private information to follow the herd model, and the result can be a negative migration experience, due to the discounting of private information that was accurate. This model differs from network effects where migrants have a connection at the destination that will assist them in their initial settlement.

Social Networks and Return Migration

The application of the social network approach to return migration is less well studied than in the migration literature. From a return migration perspective, it is anticipated that the migrant will acquire social capital while abroad that can be transferred upon return. Cassarino (2004) states “social network theory views returnees as migrants who maintain strong linkages with their former places of settlement in other countries” (265). Thus, successful returnees would have generally expanded their social network due to migration, thus granting them further access to resources and providing positions of power upon returns from their expanded social capital.

In addition to expanding the network through migration, social networks are vital in the process of return migration and the individual’s resource mobilization and preparedness for return (Cassarino 2004). Resource mobilization refers to the tangible (i.e. financial resources) and intangible (contacts, relationships, skills, and acquaintances) resources that have been mobilized while abroad. Preparedness refers to “not only the willingness of migrants to return home, but also their readiness to return home” (Cassarino 2004: 271). A high level of preparedness refers to an individual who has strong incentives and opportunities in the origin country to encourage return, has acquired savings and new acquaintances, maintained contacts in the origin country, and has knowledge, skills, and expertise mobilized for return. Their reintegration is thus a process of adaptation and negotiation and the rediscovery of the true characteristics of the origin country (Cassarino 2004). Cassarino’s preparedness theory highlights that networks and resource mobilization are not the only central component in return migration, as the willingness and readiness of the migrant to return is also central to their ability to reintegrate.

Both preparedness and resource mobilization for return can be supported through social networks in the host and origin country. Temporary visits allow the individual to see the country of return and preliminarily assess the conditions of return. Networks in the country of return can assist in providing access to valuable resources of

information, housing, employment and business opportunities, and social support in the reintegration process. Networks abroad can also continue to provide information on opportunities and access to potentially broader networks in the country of return, as well as providing social support in the reintegration process.

Social networks are a vital component to successful return and reintegration. Networks provide access to resources and social capital that can play essential roles in the process of reintegration. This includes leading to instrumental returns in the reintegration process such as access to employment, information for business development, or political positions. Networks and social capital can also lead to expressive returns such as mental health and life satisfaction in the return experience. The establishment of return migrant networks that perpetuate further return from networks in the country of migration is also a possibility that has yet to be explored. Finally, the social structure impacts the capacities of the return migrants' network in return and the migrant's agency is paramount in determining their preparedness for return. All of these factors combine to impact the ability of the return migrant to affect social change in their communities of return.

Social Change

Migration can be both a form of change and a cause of change that has different effects on the sending and the receiving societies. Social change is discussed in this section as it is important to note the potential impacts of return migrants on their communities of return. The short-term effects of migration on the sending society include remittances and investments, and the development potential depends on the country's governance. Long-term effects include the possible depopulation of sending regions and transnationalization of local culture; economic remittances alleviate poverty and potential political transformations via mass voting from abroad. Short-term effects on the receiving society include surface-level social and political adaptations and the meeting of labour market needs. The long-term effects on receiving societies include the emergence of working class settlements and

enclaves, increasing ethnic diversity in working class, some social and political transformations to accommodate diversity, and the emergence of specialized institutions to handle marginalized groups (Portes 2010).

Return Migration and Social Change

In terms of return migration, it is possible to conceptualize that all of the changes mentioned above for both the sending and receiving societies become feasible in the country of return. The key impacts for the country of return can be categorized as economic impacts and social, cultural, and political impacts. In terms of economic impacts, the primary economic impact of migration generally discussed is the impact of remittances. Upon return, the migrant is of course no longer able to send remittances; however, decided returnees often return with financial resources acquired abroad. These resources may be invested into the local economy. This can be on a small scale such as purchasing a house or items for the return migrant and their family, or a larger scale such as investing in a new business or large project.

The impact of new business creation from return migrants can be significant in countries of return. A prime example of this is the case of India, wherein highly skilled migrants from the USA began to return to India and re-vitalize the information technology (IT) sector in India (Hunger 2004). According to Hunger (2004: 102), in 2000, ten of the twenty most successful software companies in India were set up and/or managed by return migrants from the USA. The software boom in India has led to development gains and increased the economic position of the country.

In terms of social, cultural, and political impacts, return migrants that have themselves undergone a process of cultural change and adaptation to the country of migration may return with new values, cognitive frameworks, and knowledge. These new cultural elements interact with the local culture and may create clashes or over the long term the increased diversity and social and political transformations to accommodate the new diversity. In particular when those that return are the elite

who hold the power in the country, the processes of social change may occur more rapidly.

Finally, Ammassari (2009) argues that development through return migration can occur at the micro-, meso-, and macro- level. At the micro-level, social change includes the individual themselves and their immediate family. Social change can occur through human and financial capital accumulation, thus including an increase in knowledge or wealth for the individual and/or family unit. Social change occurs at the meso-level through the return migrants' behaviours and the spreading of new ideas within their social environment and workplace. Finally, macro-level social change occurs through the development of new businesses and entrepreneurial activity and through community development, the mobilization of civil society, and public advocacy. This section has illustrated that there is a gap in the evidence on the relationship between return migration and social change, which will be explored in this research, however, requires further attention beyond the scope of this book.

Return Migrants' Potential to Affect Social Change

A distinction can be highlighted between diffusion effects caused by return migration (such as through business creation) and direct social changes initiated by individual return migrants. Several factors contribute to the ability of return migrants to affect social change including their skill sets, the duration of time abroad, skill acquisition in the country of migration, and their networks and preparedness for return. Portes (2010) argues that the power of migration to affect change depends on three factors: the size of the movement, the duration of the movement, and its class composition. Thomas Hope (1999) states that return migrants must have not only the skills, but also the experiences and attitudes to impact the country of return. This also relates back to Bovenkerk (1974) in that large numbers of returnees will have the critical mass to create reforms whereas small numbers have limited capacity for influence (Gmelch 1980). It is argued that circular migrants

who move for a short period with intended return are unlikely to affect change as compared to highly skilled migrants who have been abroad for a longer duration (Portes 2010).

Furthermore, having the potential to elicit social change does not mean that one will lead change to occur. Gmelch (1980) found that the innovation influence of return migrants often does not occur and cited the example of Ireland where returnees felt that in order to gain acceptance with locals they could not force their ideas or foreign experiences on local people. This highlights the importance of the conditions in the country of origin as noted by Thomas Hope (1999).

Levitt and Merry (2009) argue that diffusing practices (the basis of social change) do not occur through merely the existence of social networks and linkages, but that linkages, practices, and identities are inherently cultural. They term the process of appropriation of international ideas into a local context for local adaptation *vernacularization*. According to Levitt and Merry (2009) “Vernacularizers take the ideas and practices of one group and present them in terms that another group will accept” (446). Levitt and Merry (2009) apply this model to the international human rights and women’s movement regime to see how international human rights ideas are translated on the ground.

Bridging the above theories, in order to create social change, return migrants can affect culture by bringing with them new values, cognitive frameworks, and knowledge. In order to have these new values become adopted by the local population, the return migrants must be vernacularizers who have the capacity to translate the new values and knowledge into terms that the local population will accept. When this occurs, provided the country has constructive structural factors, the return migrant as an individual has the capacity to affect social change.

In this study, it is not possible to measure the impact of return migrants to affect social change, or to assess whether locals have embraced the messages of return migrants. For these reasons, the study will focus on the potential of return migrants to vernacularize. As illustrated above, vernacularizers can be powerful agents of change upon their return. This study will thus examine the potential of return migrants to vernacularize upon their return.

The Reintegration Strategies: A Framework for Analysis

Following from the definition of reintegration presented in the Introduction: *“the process in which return migrants are supported in maintaining their cultural and social identities by the host society and the whole population acquires equal civil, social, political, human, and cultural rights”*, return migrants’ reintegration will be assessed in two parts: the structural and cultural environment of return, and the returnees’ reintegration strategy. The structural and cultural environment of return refers to the first half of this definition in that *“migrants are **supported** in maintaining their cultural and social identities **by the host society**”*. The structural and cultural environment in this study characterizes the host societies’ attitudes towards the returnees, and their level of welcomeness to the cultural diversity returnees may bring with them upon return. The structural and cultural environment of return is therefore based on the three elements such as government policies, the number of returnees, and locals perspectives towards returnees.

The second part of the definition refers to the returnees’ reintegration strategies—that is how, in fact, they reintegrate. The approach recognizes the critical importance of integration and culture in the life cycle of the return migrant. Having had the opportunity for integration abroad, migrants may change their cultural orientation and bring this with them in return. Reintegration is therefore not only an insertion back into the culture and life of the country of origin, but it is a process. Much like integration, return migrants must go through a process of reintegration, and how they reintegrate will be dependent upon their experiences and choices. Agency and the life cycle of the migrant are critical elements in determining the returnees’ reintegration strategy. Networks have a critical role in this process as they provide access to resources and information regarding return and reintegration. The returnees’ reintegration strategy is thus based on the four categories such as: cultural maintenance, social networks, self-identification, and access to rights, institutions, and labour markets.

Taken together, these two parts, such as the structural and cultural environment and the reintegration strategies, comprise the four categories of integration classified by Heckmann (2001). However, as structural factors are outside the realm of the individual return migrants' control, I have addressed them separately. The return migrants' reintegration strategies and the conditions of the structural and cultural environment are then combined to assess the potential of return migrants to act as vernacularizers.

Structural and Cultural Conditions

Structural and cultural conditions of the return environment include government policies towards return migrants, the attitudes of locals towards return migrants, the approach of the private sector to return migrants, and return migrant flows. It is important to note that as return migrants are heterogeneous, the structural and cultural conditions at any one time may differ for different categories of return migrants. For instance, the government may have a pro-return stance for highly skilled migrants and an anti-return stance for low-skilled migrants, or locals may be welcoming towards highly skilled migrants and negative towards deportees.

The structural and cultural environment of return can thus be categorized as favourable, adverse, or neutral as illustrated in Table 1. Favourable return environments include an official government position welcoming and encouraging return, conducive government policies towards returnee business creation, positive attitudes of locals and the private sector towards returnees, and a medium number of returnees that does not overwhelm the local environment.

An adverse return environment would be characterized by government policies that do not encourage return or provide support to returnees, negative attitudes of locals and the private sector towards returnees and return that is in large numbers that overwhelms the local population. The conditions of the structural and cultural return environment can have a significant impact on the reintegration experience of the return migrant.

Table 1 Structural and cultural environment for return

	Favourable	Adverse	Neutral
Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage return migration • Implement policies to support returnees reintegration/ participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discourage return migration • No policies to support returnees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ambivalent towards returnees
Local population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusive attitude towards returnees • Open towards cultural diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclusive attitude towards returnees • Closed towards cultural diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ambivalent towards returnees
Private sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusive attitude towards returnees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclusive attitude towards returnees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ambivalent towards returnees
Return migrant flows	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium flow of return migrant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flow is too large and overwhelms local population • Flow is too small to be noticed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small to medium flow of returnees (does not affect local populations daily lives)

The Reintegration Strategies

The reintegration strategies represent a multidimensional approach to the process of reintegration based on the four dimensions such as cultural maintenance, social networks, self-identification, and access to rights, institutions, and the labour market in the country of return. Cultural maintenance reflects the value systems of the return migrant and their orientation towards the values of the country of migration or the values of the country of origin/return. The choice of cultural orientation reflects the desire or not for cultural maintenance of the values adopted from the country of migration (Berry 1997). Social networks reflect the type of network of the return migrant: if it is comprised of returnees, locals, cross-border networks, or a combination of the three groups.

The network of the return migrant will determine the access to resources and social capital that the network can provide. Self-identification is the returnees' subjective view and self-definition of their own identity. Return migrants can identify themselves as one of

the following: unidirectional orientation towards the country of origin/return, unidirectional orientation towards the country of migration, or a transnational bidirectional orientation towards both the country of migration and origin/return. Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004) term the last option a *transnational way of belonging*. The final component is the access to rights and institutions in the country of return that is available to the return migrant. This includes the position and statuses that the return migrant can achieve in institutions such as the labour market, citizenship rights, political institutions, housing rights, and within the education system (Heckmann 2001). All of these factors are not absolutes and can be envisioned as different degrees along a spectrum.

From these four dimensions, the reintegration framework puts forth four reintegration strategies as illustrated in Table 2. The first strategy is termed “reintegrated”. The reintegrated returnee has been abroad for a longer duration (more than 5 years), has a high preparedness for return, and possesses skills or a comfortable level of wealth. In this strategy, the return migrant has maintained aspects of the culture from the country of migration, but has also adjusted to the culture of the local context. The return migrant has a vast social network that includes locals, other returnees, and the maintenance of their cross-border network from the country of migration. The vast social network allows the return migrant access to both bridging and bonding social capital, thus being able to access a wide array of resources. The return migrant identifies himself or herself as being transnational or belonging simultaneously to two cultures and country contexts. From this reintegration strategy, the return migrant is able to acquire limited rights in the country of return. The ability to acquire rights will be largely dependent on the country of return's citizenship policies. For instance, if the country of return allows for dual citizenship, then the return migrant will have the same rights as citizens.

If the country of return does not allow for dual citizenship and the return migrant opts to maintain their citizenship from the country of migration, although being a resident of the country of return, their rights in the country of return will be limited. In terms of access to the labour market, the reintegrated should have strong access due to their skills and adaptability. Finally, their access to the core institutions of the

Table 2 Reintegration strategies

	Reintegrated	Enclaves	Traditionalists	Vulnerable
Return migrant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abroad for longer duration • Decided return • High return preparedness • Economic success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abroad for longer duration • Decided return • High return preparedness • Economic success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abroad for shorter duration • Decided return • Medium preparedness • Economic stability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abroad for shorter duration • Forced return (deportees) • No return preparedness • Economically vulnerable
Cultural orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value both the culture of the country of migration and country of origin/return 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value the culture of the country of migration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value the culture of the country of origin/return 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rejection of culture of country of migration • Rejection from dominant society in country of origin/return
Social network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locals, returnees and cross-border ties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Returnees and cross-border ties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ties to kin and other vulnerable groups
Self identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transnational 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transnational 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unidirectional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unidirectional
Access to rights, institutions, and the labour market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited or full access to rights in country of return (depends on citizenship choices) • Limited access to key institutions in country of return 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited access to rights in country of return • Limited access to key institutions in country of return 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full access to rights in country of return • Full access to key institutions in country of return 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full access to rights in country of return • Limited access to institutions in country of return

country will also be dependent upon their citizenship choices, and thus may be limited.

The second strategy is termed the “enclave” strategy. Return migrants in the enclave strategy are similar to those in the reintegrated strategy in that they have been abroad for a longer duration (more than 5 years), have a high preparedness for return, and possess skills or a comfortable level of wealth. The enclavists, however, maintain the culture of the country of migration and do not adapt to the local culture. The enclavists are most likely to have cultural clashes with the local population. The social network of the enclavists is primarily comprised of other returnees and the maintenance of their cross-border network with limited ties to the local community. The enclavists thus have strong bonding social capital, but weak bridging social capital. They maintain an exclusive network that is difficult to gain access to for outsiders. The enclavists define themselves as transnational. Similarly to the reintegrated, the enclavists would have limited rights in the country of return if the country does not allow for dual citizenship. Unlike the reintegrated who may opt to give up their citizenship from the country of migration, the enclavists would not give up their citizenship from the country of migration as they identify with the country of migration and ensure the maintenance of the connection with the country of migration. Thus, their rights would be limited in a country of return that does not allow for dual citizenship. Therefore, the enclavists would also have limited access to key institutions in the country of return, such as political membership (if this is not allowed for non-citizens); however, they should have access to the labour market, educational institutions, and housing.

The third strategy is the “traditionalist”. The traditionalist typically has been abroad for a shorter amount of time (3–5 years), has a medium level of preparedness for return, and had less social status than the enclavists or reintegrated, but enough status that they can acquire positions of medium power upon return. The traditionalist has fully adapted to the local culture and rejects the culture of the country of migration. Either the traditionalist does not maintain the cultural changes that they adopted from the country of migration and rejects these changes in the return migration strategy, or the traditionalist

adopted a segregated integration approach in the country or migration wherein they had limited contact with locals and did not venture beyond their cultural environment, thus not adopting new cultural capital in the country of migration. The traditionalists' social network is primarily comprised of locals with minimal to no interaction with other return migrants and the cross-border networks from the country of migration. The network thus has limited access to resources, and the traditionalist has weak bridging social capital due to the lack of maintenance of transnational ties. The traditionalist defines himself or herself as entirely oriented towards the country of return. The traditionalist has typically maintained the country of origin/return citizenship and would have full access to rights and institutions in the country of return.

The final reintegration strategy is the "vulnerable". The vulnerable have been abroad for a shorter duration (less than 2 years), have a low preparedness for return, and often are low skilled with low social status. The vulnerable generally have had an unsuccessful migration experience and may have been forcibly returned as a deportee. The vulnerable do not associate with the culture of the country of migration. Simultaneously, the vulnerable are often rejected by the dominant culture in the country of origin/return. This is due to the lack of social acceptance of deportees in the country of origin/return. The low social position of the vulnerable places them on the periphery of society and leads to social exclusion. This places them in a position of vulnerability where they have low access to local institutions for employment and low rights within the country of origin/return, although they are full citizens of the country of origin/return. The vulnerable have limited social networks that are comprised of locals or other returnees and do not maintain cross-border networks developed during migration, as they generally do not have a network in the country of migration to maintain. The vulnerable are at risk of experiencing the negative aspects of social capital, such as "downward levelling norms" as their network is comprised of other vulnerable people. The vulnerable identify themselves with a unidirectional orientation towards the country of origin.

The reintegration strategies are not permanent, and return migrants may adopt different strategies at different stages of their return. For example, upon initial return, an individual might adopt the enclave

strategy; however, with time as they become accustomed to the culture and country of return, they may change to adopt a reintegration approach. Factors that can impact a change in a reintegration strategy would include a shock to the economic position of the individual, a change in the family situation, a negative or positive experience with the country of origin/return, or a change in the relationship with the country of migration. For instance, the relationship with the country of migration could decrease over time and the returnee may choose to move from a reintegrated strategy to more of a traditionalist strategy as they lose connections with the country of migration. On the other hand, the connection with the country of migration may strengthen and a returnee that was initially a traditionalist may re-engage with the country of migration and move to the reintegrated strategy. The returnee may even choose to re-migrate, thus no longer maintaining return status. Finally, the reintegration strategies are conceptualized to provide overall categorizations and it is possible that individuals may portray aspects representing different categories; thus, the categorizations may not be mutually exclusive.

Reintegration Strategies and the Potential to Vernacularize

The potential of return migrants to vernacularize depends, among others, upon their reintegration strategy. The reintegration strategies presented in this study define the process of how people reintegrate across the four dimensions such as cultural orientation, social networks, self-identification, and access to rights, institutions, and the labour market. In order to act as a vernacularizer, one must first have gained new ideas and values that they bring with them in return, and second, be able to gain the trust of locals and frame issues in a way that is socially acceptable. Therefore, the reintegrated have the highest potential to vernacularize as they are comfortable within both cultures and are networked between locals, returnees, and transnational ties. Enclavists have the second highest potential as they meet the first condition of bringing with them new ideas and values in return. Their limited networks with locals

upon return limit their potential to vernacularize. Both traditionalists and vulnerable have no potential to vernacularize as by rejecting the culture of the country of migration they do not bring with them new ideas and values in return. Table 3 depicts this relationship illustrating the potential to vernacularize among the different reintegration strategies.

Structural and Cultural Environment, Reintegration Strategies and Potential to Vernacularize

A return migrants' reintegration strategy is essential in their potential to vernacularize; however, the structural and cultural environment will also significantly determine the ability of the return migrant to vernacularize. Table 4 combines the potential to vernacularize the return migrant according to their reintegration strategy in a favourable versus adverse structural and cultural environment.

In situations of a favourable structural and cultural environment for return migration, individuals who are reintegrated have a high potential to vernacularize. Locals are open to return migrants and are thus willing to learn new ideas and accept cultural diversity. In addition, reintegrated returnees can engage in social structure positions that are supported by the government and can share new ideas through developing businesses, joining political organizations or advocacy movements. Reintegrated returnees possess both the power positions and cultural orientations to be highly effective change agents in the favourable environment.

Table 3 Reintegration strategies and potential to vernacularize

	Reintegrated	Enclaves	Traditionalists	Vulnerable
Potential to vernacularize	High	Medium	None	None

Table 4 Potential to vernacularize based on the reintegration strategy and conditions of the structural and cultural environment

Structural and cultural environment	Reintegrated	Enclaves	Traditionalists	Vulnerable
Favourable	High	Medium	None	None
Adverse	Medium	Low	None	None

In an adverse structural and cultural environment for return migration, reintegrated returnees still have the greatest potential to vernacularize, but the constraining structural and cultural environment limits their capacity to be effective. Strong vernacularizers will be able to integrate with the local population and still disseminate some new ideas, despite the closed attitudes towards returnees. The adverse environment may also push returnees who would generally opt for a reintegrated strategy towards an enclave strategy due to the clashes with the local population.

In a favourable structural and cultural environment, enclavists would have a medium potential to vernacularize as they return with different cultural values and if they are highly skilled can occupy positions of power that lead to indirect diffusion effects. That is, locals may indirectly learn from their behaviour, emulate their cultural differences, or desire to migrate due to their example. In an adverse structural and cultural environment for return, enclavists would have a low potential to vernacularize due to the cultural clashes between returnees and locals. The enclave strategy may no longer be chosen in an adverse structural and cultural environment, but it may be forced if locals ostracize returnees. The adverse structural and cultural environment may lead to high levels of re-migration if enclavists cannot establish themselves.

In both a favourable and adverse structural and cultural environment, traditionalists and vulnerable have no potential to vernacularize. A favourable structural and cultural environment would, however, be more supportive towards the vulnerable and offer them services for assistance. An adverse structural and cultural environment would ostracize the vulnerable leading to further marginalization from society.

This section has highlighted the importance of both the structural and cultural environment and the return migrants' reintegration strategy in determining the potential of return migrants to vernacularize. Clearly, not all returnees have the capacity to act as vernacularizers and not all return environments are open to return migration.

Assumptions of the Model

There are several key assumptions associated with the reintegration strategies. First, it is recognized that return migrants are not always in a

position to make choices regarding their reintegration. Therefore, return migrants may or may not choose their reintegration strategy (as an exercise of their agency). Second, return migrants' reintegration strategies can change over time, that is, over the short and long term, depending, among others, on the type of networks in which return migrants are involved and on the resources they mobilize. Thirdly, the structural and cultural environment can change over time (to or from favourable/adverse) and can differ for different return migrants. Fourth, the potential and ability of return migrants to vernacularize can also change over time with returnees going from a high to low or low to high potential to vernacularize. These assumptions reflect that situations change over time and are never static. In addition, it reflects the agency of the individuals within the process of reintegration.

Summary

This chapter provides the foundation for this book through the presentation of the reintegration strategies' typology. The typology is informed through the multidisciplinary literature review and encompasses elements from the return migration, integration, transnationalism, social networks, and social change literature. The objective is to draw attention to the multiple facets and dimensions influencing return migration and reintegration; the need to widen the definition of reintegration to reflect learning from integration; and the introduction of the reintegration strategies to examine how people reintegrate. The framework recognizes the structure and agency of return migration and how these two factors impact the ability of return migrants to vernacularize.

This chapter forms a substantive base for the remainder of this book. Chapter 3 examines the structural and cultural environment of return migration in Ethiopia, based on the approach to the structural and cultural environment of return addressed in this chapter. Chapter 4 explores the life cycle of return migrants to Ethiopia as the life cycle, opportunities for integration abroad, preparedness, and process of return all have a significant impact on a returnees' resulting reintegration strategy. Chapter 5 provides an in-depth examination of

the dimensions of the reintegration strategies in comparison with the analytical groups of returnees. Chapter 6 then addresses the returnees' reintegration strategies and the relationship between the reintegration strategies and the potential to vernacularize.

References

- Ammassari, S. (2009). *Migration and development: Factoring return into the equation*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46(1), 1–68.
- Bovenkerk, F. (1974). *The sociology of return migration: A bibliographic essay*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Boyd, M. (1989). Family and personal networks in international migration: Recent developments and new agendas. *International Migration Review*, 23(3), 638–670.
- Burt, R. (2002). Bridge decay. *Social Networks*, 24(4), 333–363.
- Cassarino, J. P. (2004). Theorising return migration: The conceptual approach to return migrants revisited. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 6(2), 253–279.
- de Haas, H. (2010). The internal dynamics of migration processes: A theoretical inquiry. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(10), 1587–1617.
- Epstein, G. S. (2008). Herd and network effects in migration decision-making. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(4), 567–583.
- Faist, T. (2008). *Transnationalization in international migration: Implications for the study of citizenship and culture*. (Working Paper 99). Institute for Intercultural and International Studies, University of Bremen.
- Gmech, G. (1980). Return migration. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 9, 135–159.
- Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360–1380.
- Hagan, J. M. (1998). Social networks, gender, and immigrant incorporation: Resources and constraints. *American Sociological Review*, 63, 55–67.
- Heckmann, F. (2001). *Effectiveness of national integration strategies towards second generation migrant youth in a comparative European perspective*. Final report, University of Bamberg.

- Hunger, U. (2004). Indian IT entrepreneurs in the US and in India: An illustration of the "Brain Gain Hypothesis". *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 6(2), 99–109.
- Knoke, D., & Kuklinski, J. (1982). *Network analysis*. London: Sage.
- Levitt, P., & Glick Schiller, N. (2004). Conceptualizing simultaneity: A transnational social field perspective on society. *International Migration Review*, 38(145), 595–629.
- Levitt, P., & Merry, S. (2009). Vernacularization on the ground: Local uses of global women's rights in the Peru, China, India, and the United States. *Global Networks*, 9(4), 441–461.
- Lin, N. (1982). Social resources and instrumental action. In P. Marsden & N. Lin (Eds.), *Social structure and network analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lin, N. (1999). Building a network theory of social capital. *Connections*, 22(1), 28–51.
- Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- MacDonald, J. S., & MacDonald, L. D. (1964). Chain migration, ethnic neighbourhood formation, and social networks. *Millbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 42, 82–97.
- Massey, D., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, E. (1993). Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal. *Population and Development Review*, 19(3), 431–466.
- Nannestad, P., Svendsen, G. L. H., & Svendsen, G. T. (2008). Bridge over troubled water? *Migration and Social Capital Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(4), 607–631.
- Oeppen, C. (2009). *A stranger at home: Integration, transnationalism and the Afghan elite*. D. Phil. thesis, University of Sussex.
- Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1–24.
- Portes, A. (2010). Migration and social change: Some conceptual reflections. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(10), 1537–1563.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L., & Landolt, P. (1999). The study of transnationalism: Pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), 217–237.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

- Thomas-Hope, E. (1999). Return migration to Jamaica and its development potential. *International Migration*, 37(1), 183–207.
- Vertovec, S. (1999). Conceiving and researching transnationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), 447–462.
- Vertovec, S. (2001). Transnationalism and identity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4), 573–582.
- Wilson, D. T. (1998). Weak ties, strong ties: Network principles in Mexican migration. *Human Organisation*, 57(4), 394–403.
- Wilson, D. T. (2010). The culture of Mexican migration. *Critique of Anthropology*, 30, 399–420.

Reintegration Strategies

Conceptualizing How Return Migrants Reintegrate

Kuschminder, K.

2017, XVI, 199 p. 5 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-55740-3