Return Migration and the Problem of Reintegration

Oladele O. Arowolo*

ABSTRACT

This article proposes a programme approach for achieving the social and economic reintegration of all categories of return migrants.

As former exiles who have returned to their country of origin are no longer refugees, some government agencies need to organize the reception of, and provide assistance to, returnees. But without long-term planning, ad hoc committees are unable to be effective facilitators of the reintegration process.

The article suggests a list of major elements necessary for an effective reintegration programme, and argues that governments should focus on the institutional mechanism of programme management, including the creation of a responsible agency or agencies. The management structure should be based in the National Planning Ministry of government.

Establishment of an effective mechanism would be likely to inspire donor confidence; and "homecoming" would no longer be a nightmare for potential returnees trying to reintegrate.

INTRODUCTION

This article presents a regional perspective on return migration and the complex problem of re-integration. The focus is on refugees and internally displaced persons in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). It has been argued that future patterns of migration in SSA will most probably be dominated by refugee and clandestine workers, and the political and economic situations giving rise to such migrations are likely to remain unstable. The changing political, economic and environmental situations that propel such migratory movements are also potent factors

* Consultant in Population and Development, Windhoek, Namibia.

in return migration. Following wars of independence and cessation of civil conflicts, many countries in the region have been facing the problem of reintegrating the returnees back into civil society (Arowolo, 1998).

In 1991, some 16 SSA countries were harbouring over 5.4 million refugees, originating mainly from Mozambique, Ethiopia, Sudan, Angola and Somalia. Although concrete data are not available, civil wars in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea have added hundreds of thousands of refugees and internally displaced persons to the 1991 estimates. To these should also be added thousands of internal and international voluntary migrants, all over subcontinent, who find it convenient to return home at different points in time, and who also require assistance in one form or another in their social and economic reintegration.

Largely because return migration is a neglected area in migration research, the development of a viable framework for addressing the complex issue of reintegration is still at infancy. Most organized schemes for rehabilitation of return migrants tend to be a spontaneous response to emergency situations and are largely donor driven. The focus of such schemes, invariably spearheaded by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), is on the repatriation process, and success is measured in terms of timely provision of physical transportation and relocation of exiles rather than the subsequent process of reintegrating them into civil society.

This explains in part why many projects of refugee resettlement and rehabilitation have recorded limited positive impact, and why many countries continue to adopt ad hoc measures to address this growing problem. Even then, most countries do not have any provision for voluntary migrants who make private arrangements to return home and fend for themselves. The purpose of this article is to raise the issue of return migration and reintegration to high on the migration research agenda in SSA countries. The review on methodology, conceptual clarification and programming strategy, however, goes beyond the African continent, and is appropriate for a programme approach to national strategies for socio, economic and political reintegration of returnees.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

Return migration

When conceptualized as a series of behavioural phases, seven distinct migratory movements in the mobility process have been identified and defined by Standing (1984) as:

- migration not ever considered;
- migration considered but rejected (for definite future, or temporarily, on a contingency basis);

- migration intended/planned, but timing and/or destination uncertain;
- migration in process;
- migration completed;
- migration made, and repeated;
- migration made, returned to area of origin or place of previous residence.

The last phase defines return migration (see also Vanderkamp, 1972; Da Vanzo, 1976; Da Vanzo and Morrison, 1981). Peek (1981) has argued with reference to rural-urban migration that a person who, after living in an urban area returns to a different village rather than to his village of origin, should not be regarded as a return migrant. However, this is a rather narrow view and its application is bound to exclude some categories of return migrants.

A variant of return migrants, for example, may be those who return to a rehabilitation centre or newly created settlements, their area of origin or previous residence having been destroyed by war, or natural disaster, or have fallen victim of gerrymandering. In other cases, the original home or place of residence before migration may be unknown for a variety of reasons, especially in situations of war exiles returning to their country of origin after 20 or more years away from home following cessation of hostilities. Depending on their duration of stay away from home, returning migrants, sometimes referred to as "returnees", may also include children who were born abroad and whose place of origin is technically not the place to which they now find themselves as *derivative return migrants*. The UNHCR has estimated that by June 1990, when its repatriation programme in Namibia officially ended, 43,454 exiles had returned. Simon and Preston (1991) show that many of the returnees had been outside Namibia for a very long time; some for up to 30 years and the majority had left the country as children or were born in exile.

Many general typologies of migration omit return migration and focus on methodological approaches (Eichenbaum, 1975); or analytical issues of personal and other relationships, social forces and types of migration (Petersen, 1958). Hugo's migration classification schema (1978) is focused narrowly on rural-urban population mobility and only on the so-called "spontaneous movers". However, it is useful for analysing migrant assimilation to urban areas and the links between population mobility, community involvement and social networks, all of which are relevant to the study of return migration and reintegration. Because of its relevance to this article, Hugo's schema of rural-to-urban population mobility in a Third World context is presented in Figure 1 (pages 76-77).

Reintegration

There are conceptual problems regarding *reintegration*, sometimes used interchangeably with *integration,* of return migrants. The Oxford Dictionary

defines integration as the intermixing of persons previously segregated; and reintegration as the process of integrating back into society. When applied to return migrants, the two words do not relate to the same process.

Preston (1993a: 2-4) has argued that within migratory cycles, the process of integration is one of adaptation; a process of give and take on either side as people learn to live together. At destinations, this adaptation takes place between the host community and their guests, while at places of origin it is between those who have returned and those who remained at home during their absence. The extent of integration, she argues, will depend upon a series of constantly changing contextual factors, ranging from contingencies of the physical environment, climate and pestilence, as well as social and economic circumstances.

The point is that integration is applied to the return migrant as if there was no integration experience at the point of origin prior to migration. Preston's argument that the term reintegration may be taken to imply that the social and economic environment to which people return has not changed since they left is unrealistic. There is nothing about the process of reintegration to suggest that such a process is only feasible under conditions of graveyard social and economic stability and quiet. Integration or reintegration can take place in the face of changes in the economy, society and the environment.

If it can be assumed that a potential migrant is a fully integrated member of his place of origin, the decision to migrate and his actual departure from the home environment should not rob him of the status as a formerly integrated member of his home base. Upon return from a chosen place of destination, he needs to be *reintegrated* into the original society to which he was already acculturated. This process applies to returnees from voluntary migration and to those returning from various forms of forced movements, including persons moving out of their countries and in exile, or living in "in exile" as a result of internal displacement.

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

A return migrant is a person who moved back to the area where he formerly resided (Shryock and Siegel, 1973: 618). It is difficult to capture all return migration in the usual sources of migration data; information is required from individual migrants on origin and destination for at least two migration periods. This type of information can be obtained from special surveys which partly explains why most studies of migration have ignored return migrants (Oberai, 1984: 165). Indeed, Molho (1986) has argued that the importance of separately identifying return migrants from other migrant streams must depend on the relative prevalence of such migration in observed flows.

A reference period since return should be established to avoid grouping all returning migrants in a study of reintegration. In addition, a minimum period of absence away from the usual residence should be considered. In both cases, determination of the reference period is arbitrary and may vary from one study to another, depending on research objectives. Since information has to be obtained directly from each return migrant, there is the additional problem of location in the field. That is why it may be easier to investigate return migrants as part of a larger migration survey carried out in (at least) origin areas. If migrants are rare, return migrants will be even rarer (Bilsborrow et al., 1984: 63). This raises sampling problems associated with locating relatively "rare elements" of the population (Kish, 1965).

The velocity of circulation, that is, changes in residential stability of a population, has implications for social and economic planning as well as reintegration of returning migrants. It also provides a measure of the extent of circulation and is useful in identifying trends, as well as comparing circulation in two or more areas (Standing, 1984: 51). As a phenomenon, return migration has been observed to vary pro-cyclically, implying that in times of high national unemployment, return migrants tend to go home whilst the remainder of the population stay home. In essence, the balance and composition of migration flows may adjust during national downswings in favour of return migrants (Vanderkamp, 1972).

The study of reintegration per se relies on answers provided by return migrants in a survey, and analysis of relevant environment and community level variables associated with place of final destination. The longer the period since return, the less likely the information supplied will be accurate and reliable. This is why a reference period of five years (those who have returned within five years prior to the survey) is suggested in the literature as a guide to selecting return migrants in a survey. Again, there is need to determine the minimum period of absence away from the usual residence in order to define return migrants. It is suggested that three months may be used as the minimum period (Oberai, 1984: 165). In both cases, the choice of reference period is arbitrary and may vary from one research to another, depending on objectives. This, of course, sets a limit on comparability of findings on the subject in different historical and environmental settings.

CHARACTERISTICS OF RETURN MIGRANTS

The fact that migration flow is not always uni-directional means that some out-migrants or emigrants return to their place or country of origin. This applies to returning rural-urban migrants (in Hugo's scheme), internally displaced persons, and returning exiles. The reasons for return vary widely but are intimately related to the objectives set for migrating in the first place. While some

migrants return after achieving their objectives, others return out of frustration and failure to realize their dreams at destination. Some find it most fulfilling to return home after retirement from work; others prefer to return home and work after acquiring necessary skills abroad.

Based on a study of the determinants and consequences of internal migration in India (Oberai et al., 1989), migrants may return to their place of origin if they fail to achieve the objectives with which they out-migrated, or because they cannot reconcile themselves to the social environment and way of life at destination. They may also return if they went for a fixed contract period or after completing service tenure. Some successful out-migrants are reported to find it more worthwhile to return to their native home and make use of the skill/wealth acquired during their stay away. The tabulated results of their investigation of reasons for return migration in three states of India are shown in Table 1 (page 78).

In her study of selected towns in Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe, Margaret Peil (1995) reported a variety of factors accounting for return migration especially among elderly and retired persons. Based on her analysis, Africans generally prefer to return to their place of origin on retirement, or before, rather than leaving for good and settling permanently in the host location. This preference has to do with economic and social factors; returning home may mean retaining or regaining land rights and as such an opportunity to support themselves by farming.

However, under normal circumstances, returning migrants often want to be sure of their personal safety, accommodation and social recognition at place of origin. For example, with the hope of returning home eventually, a typical pioneer Nigerian migrant within Nigeria, or outside, would like to "invest" at home, or "register" his/her presence at home while away. This objective is best achieved by owning a modern house back home, regardless of the economic justification for such an investment. In Hugo's rural-urban migration scheme (Figure 1), this is referred to as evidence of commitment to the village of origin by rural-urban migrants.

In many cases, retired out-migrants invest a substantial proportion of their lump sum pension benefits to achieve this cherished objective. Indeed, out-migrants who are yet to make their presence felt in this manner while away can hardly lay any claim to success in their venture away from home. Such a migrant, in local parlance, is "yet to arrive"! That is why a traveller through Nigeria may come across the anomaly of a few ultra-modern houses in the midst of rural-type dwellings in a remote rural location. For most of the time such houses are unoccupied, except for security person(s) and occasionally at festive seasons by their owners once in a while, if at all. However, such modern houses seem to offer hope; hope that in future the migrant family may move in and fulfil the initial pre-migration expectation to be together again.

However, there are exceptions such as Hausa migrants in northern Nigeria who often sell their land when they leave and thus have no reason to return (Hill, 1972). Also, it is reported that in Tanzania, persons who are not members of the village cooperative under the land collectivization system will have nothing to return to and thus plan a permanent stay away from the home village (Peil, 1995).

Return migration may also be precipitated by certain circumstances related to retirement, as with the majority of southern Nigerians and Ghanaians in the past (Caldwell, 1969). As Peil puts it, many people consider themselves old when they go home, or they retire from an urban job when conditions seem ripe for return. In addition, becoming a widow may precipitate a woman's return home in middle or old age, but they are more likely than men to prefer remaining in a town away from home.

For those who have been forced to live in exile or are otherwise displaced as a result of struggle for independence or autonomy, the issue changes from return migration to voluntary (or, forced) repatriation. On the basis of numbers of persons involved and the complexity of problems created in the process of reintegration, repatriation is perhaps the most challenging problem faced by many African countries that have been plagued by civil wars, ethnic hostilities or secessionist struggles during the past three decades or so.

In almost all cases of repatriation, the reason for returning to place or country of origin is because peace has, or is perceived to have, returned and conditions are conducive to reintegration. And for those who are forced to return, they have no option, particularly if the host country can no longer retain them. It is estimated that by 1991, some 16 sub-Saharan African countries harboured over 5.4 million refugees and asylum-seekers in need of protection and/or assistance. Their distribution is shown in Table 2 (page 79).

According to the report of the US Committee for Refugees (1991), 1.4 million refugees originated from Mozambique, 1.1 million from Ethiopia, and close to half a million each from Angola, Sudan and Somalia (Table 3, page 80). The statistics exclude thousands of refugees from Namibia (estimated at 50,000 in 1991, of which 43,454 had returned by 30 June 1990, soon after independence), South Africa, and other African countries for which there are no hard data. Adepoju (1995) reports that among countries in the world with the highest proportion of refugees to local population in 1992, 8 were in sub-Saharan Africa (Swaziland, Malawi, Somalia, Sudan, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Burundi and Ethiopia). These figures indicate the magnitude of the potential problem of reintegration faced by the countries from which the millions of refugees originated.

When the unknown but large number of regular internal and international return migrants are added to those being repatriated, hardly any country in

Africa can afford to ignore the seriousness of the potential problem of reintegration. Failure to achieve reintegration soon after return may lead again to internal strife, political agitation and civil war, with its predictable negative consequences on the economy and society.

The recent war between NATO and Yugoslavia over ethnic cleansing of Kosovo Albanians, fought in the glare of CNN and watched literally by the whole world, presents a formidable challenge to research in the field of return migration. While the war raged, the whole world was kept informed about almost every shell fired at the front. The process of displacement of ethnic Albanians from Kosovo was monitored meticulously and numbers were calculated to facilitate the resettlement of refugees at their organized and well-supervised points of destination. When the war ended, the whole world knew who had won and how the challenge had moved from war to resettlement of refugees. Later, only brief attention was focused by the media on internally displaced people. And since the war ended, media attention moved away from the process of return of refugees. Their reintegration into the different home communities is not a subject of interest to the media. Only future research can uncover the social, economic and political obstacles faced by returning refugees, and the success of various strategies employed in their reintegration.

Now that the formerly displaced Albanians are being assisted to return home, little is known about the strategies for resettlement and reintegration. In Africa, where such conflicts do not enjoy the privilege of CNN and Western media coverage, it is not surprising that there is practically no information at the country level on returnees. Yet their return and effective integration into the original society can go a long way in resolving internal political crisis, restoring peace and stability, and rejuvenating the economy. In the Africa subcontinent, return migration and the issue of reintegration is a virgin area of research enterprise.

INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS

Largely because of political sensitivity, the focus of the international community has been almost exclusively on international refugees, asylum-seekers and other categories of cross border migrants who need assistance to return home. When the stream of returning international migrants (or refugees) is potentially large, media attention excites the international community even more.

However, little or no attention is given to internally displaced persons yearning to return home as soon as the circumstances that caused their displacement change for the better. Ironically, it is usually for political reasons that governments discourage focus of media attention on the problem of internally displaced persons in their country. And for the same reason, hard data are

difficult to find from government official sources, except in planned resettlement schemes following official acquisition of land, or for political reasons. Even then, such planned resettlement schemes, as illustrated with the case of Ethiopia, are known better for their poor performance in the Africa region (Rahmato, 1989).

For example, it still remains a mystery, except for media speculations, how many people were displaced internally in Kenya between 1991 and 1993 when ethnic conflicts in the Rift Valley and neighbouring districts were most pronounced. The phenomenal growth of the population of Nairobi and peri-urban areas, enhanced by the influx of hundreds of thousands of displaced persons, is a classic example of internal displacement of population. A large population of rural origin became suddenly displaced and immediately "urbanized", or rather "urban placed". When will they return? Or are they ever expected to return to their confiscated rural homes and landed property? Yet, if the Government is willing to solve the chronic problem of urban congestion, crime and ravaging poverty, the return of millions of displaced rural people from Nairobi Metropolis to the Rift Valley and other rural areas of origin may be the answer.

Elsewhere in the subcontinent, the situation is even worse. Civil wars in Somalia, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, Angola and the Democratic Republic of Congo have together generated millions of internally displaced persons whose fate is unknown. To the extent that these wars have continued for about two decades in Sudan and Angola, and that there is evidence of skirmishes in almost all the other countries, the generation of internally displaced populations in SSA is now a growing phenomenon. It is possible that the numbers involved may even be much larger than the estimated 5.4 million refugees/asylum-seekers for SSA in 1991 (Table 2). Oucho (1996) reviewed the complex social, economic and political factors inducing the outflow of refugees from Sudan and displacement of population in the country and concluded that the end of the refugee crisis and the related problem of population displacement in the country was not in sight in the foreseeable future.

REINTEGRATION STRATEGIES

Within the context of studies on voluntary migration, return migration has long remained invisible. This is largely because return migration tends to be a private, individual or family affair. However, over the past three decades, the increased scale of international return migration has made it conspicuous, and the growing problems of reintegration have in many cases led governments and agencies to intervene (Preston, 1993b: 2-5).

Intervention strategies include pre-return or on-arrival orientation to prepare for changes and difficulties to be encountered; provision of financial and

investment advice for those hoping to start business or acquire property (Athukorala, 1986); provision of information about qualification and skill recognition for labour market entry; language training for children born abroad and their preparation for entering the school system at "home" (Dumon, 1976).

Despite such support strategies, many return migrants still face acute problems of reintegration, ranging from joblessness and social maladjustment to boredom and frustration. In cases of accompanying foreign dependants, they tend to encounter, on the one hand, the problem of adaptation between themselves and their relations and, on the other hand, between themselves and the community. In such situations, both foreign wives and children are reported to have experienced loss of identity and trauma (Gmelch, 1980).

Both the host country and country of origin often jointly plan the return of refugees to their home country, invariably with the assistance of international agencies. However, reintegration of returning refugees is even more challenging because their return, although often planned and orchestrated, tends to be dramatic and chaotic. Unlike voluntary migration, construction of frameworks for analysing the integration of refugees into their country of origin is recent and poorly developed. Part of the problem is that while the numbers involved tend to be large, those who return independently are far in excess of those who take part in organized schemes (Rogge, 1991).

 Some governments have utilized policy and legal instruments as a strategy for achieving the integration of returning migrants, particularly refugees. For example, Zimbabwe enacted several Acts of Parliament in support of the country's scheme to reintegrate an estimated 300,000 persons who had left the country to seek refuge abroad during the prolonged war of independence which ended in 1980. But implementation of these Acts met with many different problems, including resistance from the civil service establishment, poor inform-ation and inadequate commitment of the Government to ensure compliance by the public (Makanya, 1992).

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF REINTEGRATION

For any programme of economic reintegration of returnees to be successful, it must be based on a careful analysis of their background characteristics: age, sex, education/skills acquired, reasons for leaving, host country or place of residence, type of work done while away, family characteristics, amount of money repatriated, access to property at home, etc. These determine the individual/personal needs for economic integration or reintegration. In addition, the absorptive capacity of the local economy must be placed against the potential demand by returnees for employment. If information is lacking, or of

poor quality, on either the returnees or the local economic environment, planning for smooth reintegration could be rendered difficult.

For most returnees, "homecoming" tends to generate rising expectations, more so if the repatriation programme coincides with long awaited political independence in the country of origin. In the case of Namibia, problems were compounded by the resettlement strategy adopted; large numbers of returnees were repatriated to their rural homes thereby generating pressure on the fragile economic and environmental resource base. Given their location in scattered rural settlements throughout the region, returnees were effectively isolated from major towns and from potential job markets (Tapscott and Mulongeni, 1990). In addition, most returnees came back from exile with insufficient funds to acquire seeds and tools to start farming (Tamas, 1992). Lack of development activity at place of destination can pose a major constraint to the economic reintegration of return migrants.

The single most important impediment to the full reintegration of returnees is perhaps their inability to secure wage employment. Unable or unwilling to work on farms, many rely on education and experience acquired while away to obtain appropriate wage employment. But most of them are often disappointed by the negative impulses from the labour market. The reasons for this are many and may be summarized as follows:

- Where unemployment is already high and problematic, returning migrants in search of jobs exacerbate the problem.
- With poorly developed labour market information systems in most African countries, and lack of experience in looking for jobs, many returning migrants, particularly repatriated refugees, do not know how or where to get a job.
- Returning migrants have to submit their qualifications to the scrutiny of professional bodies or official institutions and in many cases the process serves to reinforce prejudices and biases of potential employers in different sectors of the economy.
- Depending on the host country while in exile, many returnees may find language to be a serious impediment to re-entry into wage employment as inability to communicate effectively with prospective employers could be a justification for rejection.
- For some returnees, their acquired skills may not match existing job opportunities at their home location.

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF REINTEGRATION

Even if a returning migrant effectively overcomes the problem of economic reintegration, the social dimension of the process is equally critical to full

reintegration. Apart from their background characteristics and the community level variables referred to above, social reintegration calls for understanding of the cultural environment, both at their points of destination as migrants and their home base.

Adjustment to life at the migrants' place of destination invariably calls for change in lifestyles and living conditions. In cases of voluntary migration, inability to achieve full acculturation at the place of destination may have led to frustration and eventual return. But having acquired a new lifestyle, as in the case of rural-to-urban migrants who become "urbanized", return migration means that the old or traditional way of life must now be relearned.

The process can be smooth or rough depending on a combination of factors: duration of stay away from home, age at the time of departure, extent of assimilation of foreign culture and nature and intensity of links with home while away (Figure 1). In addition, the reception by family and friends who stayed behind and the personal disposition of the returnee could be vital to social reintegration.

The demographic situation of returnees may also present a barrier to social reintegration. In the case of Namibia in the wake of independence in 1990, many returnee families were too large to be absorbed into the households of their parents or relations. In such situations, reintegration was impeded because families were either broken up and members distributed among the extended family or, alternatively, they were isolated and compelled to start up with whatever resources they had (Tapscott and Mulongeni, 1990).

Some returnees also face an identity crisis which often leads to personality disorders or trauma. For example, post-traumatic stress has been found among numerous returnees, as well as those who stayed behind, following Namibia's protracted war of independence. Among returnees, the effects of this stress are manifested in a number of ways including depression, alcoholism, suicide and various other misdemeanours or anti-social behaviour. Social integration of returning migrants may also be constrained by disability conditions, particularly if official strategy makes no provision for the special cases of disabled persons. In the absence of counselling services, it is even more problematic for family members and relations at home to relate to one of them who had been away and is now back but blind, deaf, mentally handicapped, or sick.

POLITICAL ASPECT OF REINTEGRATION

The politics of return and the reintegration of returnees into civil society can be confounding. At the political level, the issue may boil down to who may return? Even if those who want to return are known, the process of actual return

(logistics of transportation, receipt of grants and benefits, etc.) may be a roll call of those who have connections in political circles. Tamas (1992) cited examples of criticism from some persons in Namibia about returnees receiving too much attention at the expense of other needy groups.

Much may also depend upon the socio-political climate in the local environment hosting returnees. As Rogge (1991) noted,

> …the receptiveness of the local population also affects the nature of responses returnees encounter. If local chiefs, for example, are supportive of the returnees, then an array of response strategies will be available from within the community. If there is no support, or if local people are hostile to the returnees, then the re-integration process will be seriously impeded.

Refugees and asylum-seekers tend to be politically active and their potential for political activism upon return can be a cause for concern in political circles. There is a sharp division between those who were in exile and those who "compromised" and remained at home, such as in the liberation struggle in South Africa and Namibia. Equipped with political experience, returnees tend to make a significant input into the political system.

CONCLUSION

A programme approach is proposed as a viable strategy for achieving the social and economic reintegration of all categories of return migrants (returning refugees, displaced persons, or voluntary migrants) into civil society. Most organized schemes for rehabilitation of return migrants tend to be a spontaneous response to emergency situations and are largely donor driven. The focus of most of such schemes is on the repatriation process, and success is measured in terms of timely provision of physical transportation, and relocation of exiles, rather than the subsequent process of their reintegration into civil society.

As noted by Tamas (1992), former exiles who have returned to their country of origin are no longer refugees, and thus no longer the formal responsibility of UNHCR. Shortly after relocation, some Government agencies or special disaster committees may be established to organize the reception of returnees as well as provide assistance with basic accommodation, food rations, agricultural kits, tracing of relatives and provision of educational and medical services. But without long-term planning, such ad hoc committees may wind up before most of the returnees begin their reintegration process.

In the programme approach proposed here, reintegration should begin with a comprehensive study of the social, economic and demographic conditions of returnees and the environment to which they returned. Bilsborrow et al. (1984)

provide guidelines for such studies, including sampling, questionnaire design and analysis. The report of such an investigation should form the basis for design of the reintegration programme.

On the basis of available evidence, major elements of a reintegration programme should include:

- employment creation and the promotion of employment opportunities;
- awareness creation on political development and social change;
- provision of education, vocational training, health services and welfare support;
- counselling and career guidance;
- provision of pension and other welfare support; and
- rehabilitation of disabled persons.

These elements appear to address the major social, political and economic problems of reintegration in most situations. The dimensions of the problems may vary, depending on the peculiarity of the situation being addressed, but this should in no way affect the feasibility of the framework proposed in this article.

Following identification of the major elements of the programme, attention should then focus on the institutional mechanism for programme management; creation of responsible agency or agencies of the Government and development of clear and comprehensive terms of reference for their operation. The issue of returnees should not be confined to the mass movement of returning refugees, a phenomenon that tends to be rather episodic. Rather, the concept should be broadened to include the less visible streams of returning voluntary migrants who also require assistance to achieve reintegration. Given such an understanding, the organizational structure being proposed here is not an ad hoc affair, but rather an institutionalized mechanism for addressing problems of reintegration as they occur.

Based on the six programme elements identified above, the management structure should be based in the National Planning Ministry of government, supported by a number of Standing Committees corresponding to the number of major programme issues identified. By implication, each Standing Committee is a specialized body comprising experts and administrators with a professional orientation in the assigned problem area.

The successful operation of the programme, or indeed any programme of government, calls for commitment and political will. Resources for operational aspects of the programme should be provided adequately and in time. In order to justify any further input, management should have built-in mechanisms for continuous programme monitoring and periodic evaluation. Through such a

process, the government can, at any point in time, determine the extent to which the various investments in the programme are together yielding the desired results.

Such a process will most likely inspire donor confidence and, with government commitment, programme activities should be sustainable. The ultimate impact of a fully reintegrated stream of returnees into the society is that homecoming would no longer be a nightmare for potential returnees, and their reintegration would boost the economy through their contributions to economic activities. The social, economic and political gains of such an achievement are too obvious to warrant further elaboration.

Return migration has been poorly researched for too long. In the past, such neglect was probably justified because return migration was largely an individual or family affair, and where large numbers of people were displaced as part of an official planning process, resettlement programmes, even if inadequate, were designed to provide solutions to the problem of integration.

Migration research can no longer continue to ignore the refugee phenomenon. The numbers involved are large, and continue to grow almost at the increasing pace of economic migration. To the issue of refugees must be added the problems of internally displaced persons. The numbers involved are invariably obscured, but the magnitude is almost the same as refugees who are distinguished only because of international official recognition. Unless we understand the phenomenon of internally displaced persons, the problem of their integration is unlikely to be resolved.

REFERENCES

Adepoju, A.
  1995   "Emigration dynamics in developing countries", *International Migration,* 33(3/4).
Arowolo, O.O.
  1998   "Return migration and economic and social aspects of reintegration", a paper presented at the Regional Meeting on International Migration in Africa at the Threshold of the XXI Century, organized by UNESCO, Dakar and the Central Statistics Office, Botswana, 2-5 June 1998, Botswana.
Athukorala, P.
  1986   S*ri Lanka's Experience with International Contract Migration and Reintegration of Return Migrants,* ILO, Geneva.
Bilsborrow, R.E., A.S. Oberai, and G. Standing
  1984   *Migration Surveys in Low-Income Countries,* published for the ILO Geneva, by Croom Helm, London and Sydney.

Caldwell, J.C.
   1969   *African Rural-Urban Migration: the Movement to Ghana's Towns,* Australian
           National University, Canberra.
Da Vanzo, J.
   1976   "Differences between return and non-return migration: an econometric
           analysis", *International Migration Review,* 10: 13-27.
Da Vanzo, J., and P. Morrison
   1981   "Return and other sequences of migration in the United States", *Demography,*
           10: 85-101.
Dumon, W.A.
   1976   "The situation of children of migrants and their adaptation and integration
           in the host society and their situation in the country of origin", *International
           Migration,* 17(1/2): 59-75.
Eichenbaum, J.
   1975   "A matrix of human movement", *International Migration,* 13(1/2): 21-41.
Gmelch, G.
   1980   "Return migration", *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 9: 135-159.
Hugo, G.J.
   1978   "New conceptual approaches to migration in the context of urbanization",
           paper presented at the Conference of IUSSP Committee on Urbanization
           and Population Redistribution, Bellagio, Italy.
Kish, L.
   1965   *Survey Sampling*, Wiley, New York.
Makanya, S.T.
   1992   "Lessons from elsewhere: integration strategies in independent Zimbabwe",
           in R. Preston (Ed.), *The Integration of Returned Exiles, Former Combatants
           and War Affected Namibians,* University of Namibia, Windhoek: 3-1 and
           3-19.
Molho, I.
   1986   "Theories of migration: a review", *Scottish Journal of Political Economy,*
           33(4): 396-419.
Oberai, A.S., P.H. Prasad, and M.G. Sardana
   1984   "Identification of migrants and collection of demographic and social
           information in migration surveys", in R.E. Bilsborrow, A.S. Oberai, and
           G. Standing, *Migration Surveys in Low-Income Countries,* published for
           the ILO Geneva by Croom Helm, London and Sydney: 130-185.
   1989   *Determinants and Consequences of Internal Migration in India,* Oxford
           University Press, Delhi.
Oucho, J.O.
   1996   "Refugees and displacements in sub-Saharan Africa: instability due to
           ethnic and political conflicts and ecological causes", in A. Adepoju and
           T. Hammar (Eds), *International Migration in and from Africa: Dimensions,
           Challenges and Prospects,* Dakar, Senegal: 161-187.
Peek, P.
   1981   "A typology of migrants: some methodological aspects", ILO, World
           Employment Programme research working paper, Geneva.
Peil, M.
   1965   "Ghanaians abroad", *African Affairs,* 94(376): 345-367.

Petersen, W.
  1958   "A general typology of migration", *American Sociological Review,* 23(2): 256-265.
Preston, R. (Ed.)
  1993a   *The Integration of Returned Exiles, Former Combatants and Other War-Affected Namibians,* Namibian Institute for Social and Economic Research, Windhoek, Namibia.
  1993b   "Studying integration", in R. Preston (Ed.), *The Integration of Returned Exiles, Former Combatants and Other War-Affected Namibians,* Namibian Institute for Social and Economic Research, Windhoek, Namibia: 2-1 and 2-14.
Rahmato, D.
  1989   "Rural resettlement in post-revolutionary Ethiopia – problems and prospects", in ONCCP, *Conference on Population Issues in Ethiopia's National Development: Report of Conference Proceedings*, 2: 668-747.
Rogge, J.R.
  1991   "Repatriation of refugees: a not-so-simple optimum solution", UNRISD, paper presented at the Symposium on Social and Economic Aspects of Mass Voluntary Return Migration, 12-14 March, Harare, Zimbabwe: 28-29.
Shryock, H.S., and J.S. Siegel
  1973   *The Methods and Materials of Demography,* US Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC.
Simon, D., and R. Preston
  1993   "Return to the promised land: the repatriation and resettlement of Namibian refugees 1989-1990", in R. Black and V. Robinson (Eds), *Geography and Refugees: Patterns and Processes of Change,* Belhaven Press.
Standing, G.
  1984   "Conceptualising territorial mobility", in R.E. Bilsborrow, A.S. Oberai, and G. Standing, *Migration Surveys in Low-Income Countries,* published for the ILO Geneva by Croom Helm, London and Sydney: 31-59.
Stein, B.N.
  1992   *Policy Changes Regarding Repatriation in the 1990s: Is 1992 the Year for Voluntary Repatriation?,* Michigan State University, Michigan.
Tamas, K.
  1992   "After return; repatriated exiles in independent Namibia", NISER discussion paper no. 15, Windhoek.
Tapscott, C., and B. Mulongeni
  1990   *An Evaluation of the Welfare and Future Prospects of Repatriated Namibians in Northern Namibia,* NISER Research Report 3, Windhoek.
US Committee for Refugees
  1991   *Immigration and Refugee Service of America,* Washington, DC.
Vanderkamp, J.
  1972   "Return migration: its significance and behaviour", *Western Economic Journal,* December, 10(4): 460-465.

FIGURE 1a

RURAL-TO-URBAN POPULATION MOBILITY IN A THIRD WORLD CONTEXT

Type of spontaneous mover	Characteristics of move	Commitment to city	Commitment to village
Short-term visitor	Adventitious shoppers, tourists, visitors	None	None
Seasonal or shuttle migrant	Search for work to augment meagre agricultural income	Very little financial or social investment in city. Sleep in open, group-rented room or employer-provided barracks. Social interaction almost entirely with other migrants from village. Employment in sectors.	Family of procreation remains in village. Retain all political and social roles in village. Remit bulk of income (after living expenses) to village. Traditional or day labouring. Retain village citizenship. Almost total orientation to village.
Target migrant	Come to city for limited period (though longer than a season) to accomplish a specific purpose (e.g., reach a particular education level).	Moderate. May bring family of procreation. Seek more permanent accommodation. e.g., individually rented room. Have more interactions with settled urban population but retain close contact with fellow city. Usually employed in traditional villages in sector.	Strong links maintained with family in village through visits and letters, although some roles may be temporarily given up. Remittances remain regular and high. Usually retain village citizenship.
Short-term life cycle sojourner stage migrant	Migrants who move to the city at one or more specific stages of life cycle.		

Source: Hugo, 1978.

FIGURE 1b

RURAL-TO-URBAN POPULATION MOBILITY IN A THIRD WORLD CONTEXT

Type of spontaneous mover	Characteristics of move	Commitment to city	Commitment to village
Working life migrant	Migrants who spend their entire working life in the city but intend to eventually retire to their home village.	High. Family of procreation always accompanies. Purchase or build individual housing, occupy employer-supplied (e.g. government) housing, or rent housing on long-term basis. Often in formal sector occupations. High level of interaction with settled urban population but retain contact with fellow migrants through associations, etc. Always transfer citizenship to city. Assist new arrivals to city from home village.	Sufficient links maintained with village to ensure acceptance on eventual return. Investments in housing and land although unable to maintain most social and political roles. Periodic remittances to family. Return visits made at end of fasting months and for important life cycle ceremonies.
Permanent migrant	Migrants committed totally to exchanging a rural for an urban way of life.	Total	None
Undecided migrant	Migrants who have no clear intention of either staying in the city or returning to the village.	Unknown	Unknown

Source: Hugo, 1978.

Arowolo

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RETURN MIGRANTS
(IN THREE STATES OF INDIA) BY REASON FOR RETURN, 1984-1985

Reason for return	Bihar	Kerala	Uttar Pradesh
Job terminated	21.6	47.7	3.2
Retirement	11.4	0.0	34.1
Job transfer	1.4	27.7	4.9
Strike, etc.	23.2	0.0	0.0
Did not like place/job	19.4	5.5	15.7
Illness	7.1	0.0	4.3
To set up business in place of origin	0.0	19.1	0.0
Needed back in family	11.8	0.0	23.7
Followed family	3.8	0.0	3.8
Others	0.0	0.0	6.4
All	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sample size (N)	(211)	(220)	(185)

Source: Oberai et al., 1989, Table 3.13.

TABLE 2

REFUGEES AND ASYLUM SEEKERS IN NEED OF PROTECTION
AND/OR ASSISTANCE IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES

Country	1988	1989	1991(a)
Angola	95,700	26,500	11,900
Burundi	76,000	90,200	90,700
Djibouti	2,000	4,650	67,400
Ethiopia	700,500	740,000	783,000
Kenya	10,600	15,500	14,400
Malawi	630,000	812,000	909,000
Rwanda	20,600	20,500	21,500
Somalia	365,000	350,000	358,500
South Africa	180,000	201,000	201,000
Sudan	693,600	694,300	726,500
Swaziland	70,700	71,700	47,200
Tanzania	266,200	266,200	266,200
Uganda	125,500	170,500	156,000
Zaire	325,700	338,800	370,900
Zambia	149,000	131,700	133,950
Zimbabwe	171,500	185,500	186,000
Total SSA	4,055,260	4,338,400	4,571,350
Total Africa	4,088,260	4,524,800	5,443,450

(a)   Table refers to countries with 10,000 or more refugees in 1991.

Source: US Committee for Refugees, 1988, 1989, 1991.

TABLE 3

PRINCIPAL SOURCES OF REFUGEES
IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES, 1988-1991

Country	1988	1989	1991
Mozambique	1,147,000*	1,354,000	1,427,500
Ethiopia+	1,101,200*	1,035,900	1,060,300*
Angola	395,700	438,000	435,700
Sudan	355,000	435,100	499,100
Somalia+	350,000	388,600	454,600*
Rwanda	217,800	233,000*	203,900
Burundi	186,600	186,500*	186,200
Western Sahara	165,000	165,000*	165,000*
Chad	41,300		34,400
Zaire	53,200	50,400	50,700

+   Changes in certain populations in early 1991.
*   Indicates that sources vary significantly in number reported.

Source: US Committee for Refugees, 1988, 1989, 1991.

LA MIGRATION DE RETOUR ET LE PROBLEME
DE LA REINTEGRATION

L'article que l'on va lire propose une approche programmatique pour la réintégration sociale et économique de toutes les catégories de migrants retournant dans leurs pays d'origine.

Les anciens exilés cessant d'être des réfugiés à partir du retour dans leurs pays d'origine, c'est aux institutions de ces pays qu'il incombe d'organiser leur accueil et l'aide dont ils ont besoin. Or, sans préparation faite assez longtemps à l'avance, les services chargés de cette tâche ne peuvent contribuer avec une réelle utilité à l'opération de réintégration.

On trouvera dans cet article la liste des principales conditions nécessaires à un programme de réintégration efficace. Il y est également recommandé que les pouvoirs publics donnent toute l'importance voulue à l'aspect institutionnel de ces programmes, notamment en créant un ou des organismes qui en soient responsables dans le cadre du ministère de ces pays qui est chargé de la planification.

La création d'un système institutionnel efficace serait de nature à donner confiance aux donateurs – et le retour cesserait d'être un cauchemar pour les anciens exilés qui tentent de se réintégrer.

MIGRACIÓN DE RETORNO Y EL PROBLEMA
DE LA REINTEGRACIÓN

Este artículo propone una perspectiva programática para conseguir la reintegración social y económica de todas las categorías de migrantes que retornan.

Habida cuenta de que los ex exiliados que retornan a su país de origen ya no son refugiados, algunas instituciones gubernamentales necesitan organizar la acogida de los retornantes y proveerles asistencia. Pero sin una planificación a largo plazo, los comités *ad hoc* no pueden garantizar la eficacia de los procesos de reintegración sean efectivos.

Este artículo propone una lista de importantes elementos necesarios para que un programa de reintegración sea efectivo y arguye que los gobiernos deben concentrarse en el mecanismo institucional de gestión de programas, incluida la creación de una o varias instituciones responsables. La estructura de gestión debe formar parte del Ministerio de Planificación Nacional.

El establecimiento de un mecanismo eficaz inspirará confianza a los donantes y hará que el retorno al hogar ya no sea una pesadilla para los retornantes potenciales que intentan reintegrarse.