

Aspects of Ethiopian Return Migration

Prepared by: Adamnesh Atnafu

Master Thesis

Advisor: Dr. Tegegn Gebregzaber

**Department of Regional and Local Development Studies
School of Graduate Studies**

July 2006

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies

Aspects of Ethiopian Return Migration

*A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
Addis Ababa University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts
in Regional and Local development Studies*

By: Adamnesh Atnafu

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

SIGNATURE

1. Chairman of Graduate Committee

Tegegne Chizziablor

2. Advisor

Ferefe Degefa

3. Examiner

4. *Wendimu Abeje*
Examiner



Tegegne Chizziablor

Wendimu Abeje

Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Adamnesh Atnafu

Signature:

Dr. Tegegn Gebregzaber

Signature:

Place and Date of submission:

Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

June 2006

To my parents, Atnafu Bogale and Hirut Mulugeta

Acknowledgement

I am indebted to all those who provided their support for the completion of this thesis. I am deeply grateful to my advisor Dr. Tegegn Gebre-Egzaber for his absolute advice to the research work.

My deepest gratitude goes to Ato Yemane Mekonnen with out whom the data collection would not have been possible. I would also like to thank Ato Samson Kassa who assisted a lot in the data collection.

My appreciation also extends to W/t Mishisala Beyene and W/t Ayne Habtamu who have been very helpful in organizing the data.

As the list will be long, I will not attempt to articulate the names of those who contributed for the compilation of this thesis.

Thank you all for your support.

Abstract

Return migration has different dimensions worth considering. Despite the fact that this issue is an important factor having an impact on the country's socio-economic growth, not much is known on the dynamics of the phenomenon. Lack of research and information regarding return migration is an important reason for the less emphasis given to the issue. This study is therefore concerned with an assessment of return migration of Ethiopian migrants, in particular those who have migrated to the western countries.

Accordingly, as per the study, most went abroad mainly to improve their living standards through education and to support their families back home, and due to the insecurity they had regarding political stability. On the other hand, aspirations to live and work back in Ethiopia and family ties were the main reasons for many to actually return home. Regarding re-integration, most have managed to re-integrate well back in their home country both in the working system and in the community with some exceptions. The problem may be attributed to change in structural value of the return migrants and the resistant nature of the community itself. In addition, as they have accumulated savings from working abroad, most have been able to transfer financial capital and also human capital as most of them have acquired skills and experience through the tertiary trainings they obtained. Finally, as the government's initiative including incentives and privileges is appreciated, still support is required.

By and large, this study attempted to fill the information gap due to lack of research by generating information useful to identify important policy concerns.

Table of Contents

	Pages
Acknowledgement	
Abstract	
Chapter one	
Introduction	7
1.1 Background	7
1.2 Statement of the problem	8
1.3 Research objectives	11
1.4 Research questions	12
1.5 Methods	13
1.6 Limitation of the study	14
1.7 Scope of the Study	15
Chapter two	
Literature review	
General concepts of International migration and return	16
2.1 International migration	16
2.1.1 Concept, pattern and process	16
2.1.2 Reasons for migration	25
2.1.3 Consequences of migration	32
2.2 Return migration	37
2.2.1 Motives for return	39
2.2.2 Re-integration and re-assimilation of returnees	43
2.2.3 Returnees' potential contribution for the home country's development	45

Chapter three	
Results and discussion	50
3.1 An overview of Returnees' profile	50
3.1.1 Age and gender composition	50
3.1.2 Marital status and children	52
3.1.3 Educational background	52
3.1.4 Number of years lived abroad and after return	54
3.2 Reasons for on-ward and Return migration	57
3.3 Re-integration and Assimilation of returnees	63
3.4 Developmental dimensions of Return migrants	70
3.4.1 Development implications of different forms of capital transfer by returnees	73
1. Financial Capital and Engagement in Investment	73
2. Human Capital	76
3.4.2 Suggestions: By return migrants	79
 Chapter four	
Institutional and Legal support	82
4.1 Institutional Support	82
4.2 Legal framework	86
 Chapter five	
Conclusion and Policy implications	92
5.1 Conclusion	92
5.2 Policy implications	94
 List of References	98
 Annexes	
Annex 1	105
Annex 2	107

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Background

Migration is a multi faceted and complex global issue which today involves every country in the world. All 190 or so sovereign states of the world are now either points, origins, transits or destinations for migrants; or all at once. The UN's current official estimate remains at 175 million migrants globally. By basing the growth of the known migrants stocks for the period 1990-2000, the UN population Division predicted a total of between 185 million and 192 million migrants by early 2005 (IOM, 2005). Hence, it can be said that movement has increasingly become an integral part of human existence.

While talking about trans-border migration, the concept of migration can be divided in to three broad parts: 1) life before migration and the causes of migration; 2) migrants situation in the host country; and 3) coming back to the country of origin which includes reasons for their return, their situation in their country of origin and their contribution to their country's development (Seferagic, 1977)

The first two concepts have been the subject of numerous studies. However, the concept related to returnees is hardly investigated even if it seeks due attention. It is therefore the main concern of this study.

Return migration is the coming back of migrants to their country of origin of habitual residence to live after spending some time in another country.

Migrants decide to return for many reasons. They may be motivated to return because of encouraging and positive environment in their country of origin or they may also be forced to return back home for other obligatory factors. Returning back may involve the construction of a new home as part of a wider community or nation building process (Black and Koser, 1999). In this case, settlement to a new area of home may expose returnees to an imbalance with the local community who have been there before.

Overall, the issue of returnees should be dealt with thoroughly for the fact that, studying the grounds of returning, the re-integration and re-assimilation process, and the areas of challenges and problems in their investments and also other means of living, has a very significant policy implication thereby having an impact on the development of the country. In this view, the purpose of this study is to examine Ethiopian return migration.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Ethiopia is one of the poorest countries in the world undergoing constant poverty. The causes for this poverty may include social, political, economic and environmental factors. Thus, people opt to migrate to more developed countries in search of better

opportunities to get education and employment, and access to better living facilities. During the derg period, many Ethiopians left their country mainly due to absence of democracy and unrelenting political disruptions while those who were already abroad chose to stay away (Getachew and Maignet, 1991). Even after the fall of the derg regime, people continued to migrate for different reasons: to pursue higher quality education, in search of employment and escaping unfavorable conditions in the country including political instability.

Limited information is available regarding the migration pattern of Ethiopian migrants. Most migration studies in Ethiopia are concerned about internal migration and not much is done on international migration. Some of the studies available on international Ethiopian migration, among the few, include: An assessment of International Labor Migration by Emebet Kebede (2003), which concerns only female labor migrants who migrate to the Gulf States; Ethiopian Migration: Challenging Traditional Explanatory Theories by Abye Tasse (2003), examining the causes of Ethiopian migration in terms of the universal theories; Reversing the trend of Brain Drain: the Case of Ethiopian Diasporas by Yohannes Gebresellase (2006), which is restricted to the brain drain aspect of migration.

Correspondingly, no exact statistical data are available on the number of Ethiopian migrants who migrate to other countries. Yet, sources indicate that the numbers of those migrating to the western countries are high and most likely increasing (Emebet, 2003). In this regard, a study by Yohannes (2006) reveals that, more than 500,000 of

these Ethiopian Diasporas live and work in North America representing a significant proportion of the immigrant community. These migrants live there and are engaged in different kinds of jobs that would most likely enable them survive. According to information on migrants who left the country in the years 1997 and 1998 the most common occupation for male migrants is “driver” (Emebet, 2003). Some are also engaged as factory workers, mechanics, laborers, guards, waiters and, in very few cases, in such professional posts as drafters, engineers and accountants. On the other hand, most women migrants are employed as housemaids or nannies while in some cases they work as waitresses.

It appears that there are very little or no studies on return migration in Ethiopia. No scientific work is known to this Author on the subject. Nonetheless, it is very important to examine the case of returnees in order to realize their contribution to the country’s development. Most of the migrants abroad acquire economic strength while others may achieve educational and professional backgrounds developing new skills and experiences (Yohannes, 2006). Thus, considering their number and potential, the Ethiopian Diaspora can do much more by returning back to their home and engage in different activities that would help the country’s development.

In order to realize their developmental potential, however, information is needed on motivating factors for their return, their re-integration and assimilation in Ethiopia after they return, the problems and challenges they face, the achievements they gained after migration and the overall impact of the above on the development of the

country. It will also be important to understand the strength and weaknesses of the existing institutional support for returnees. In the absence of such information, it will be difficult to design policies and institutions not only to maximize the returnees' developmental contribution, but also to facilitate their re-settlement and re-integration in their home country. This study attempts to fill this gap by generating information on reasons of return migration and the existing situation regarding their assimilation and contribution.

1.3 Research Objectives

This study intends to explore the empirical case of Ethiopian return migrants and to evaluate their re-settlement system back in their country of origin. In this regard the main objectives of the study are:

1. to identify the factors that motivate Ethiopians who migrated to the western countries to return back to Ethiopia;
2. to discuss how the returnees re-integrate, re-adapt and re-assimilate with the society as well as the economic system back in Ethiopia;
3. to identify the problems and challenges the returnees face as they re-integrate with the society and in the working environment;
4. to discuss the success that returnees have gained as a result of their migration;
5. to discuss the developmental dimension of the return migration;

6. to examine what institutional support the returnees receive upon their return and how they perceive it;
7. to suggest policy directions that are believed to encourage both migrants living abroad in order to come back and those who returned to participate in development endeavors;

1.4. Research questions

1. What factors motivate Ethiopian migrants who have moved to the western world to return back to their home country?
2. How well do they re-integrate with the local society, and in the working environment, and what are the problems they face while re-integrating?
3. What achievements did migrants gain as a result of their migration and how do they live after they return?
4. What contributions do returnees make towards the country's overall development?
5. What are institutional and legal supports provided to return migrants?
6. How do returnees perceive the current working environment and the government initiatives as far as their work and activities are covered?
7. What should be improved to sustain returnees while encouraging other migrants to return?

1.5.Methods

This study is designed to make a thorough assessment of Ethiopian return migrants to attain the objectives specified above. Thus, the perception of respondents was obtained from a qualitative investigation on the basis of purposive sampling. Respondents were drawn from returnees who have migrated to the western world, especially to North America (USA), Canada and European countries.

An analytical questionnaire was prepared prior to qualitative data is gathered. The instrument consisted of questions designed to provide information determining the explanations and analysis in relation to return migration and, to gather information on various issues relating to the core matter, Ethiopian return migration, with the purpose of attaining the objectives.

In addition, 5 in-depth interviews were conducted to give added background and substance to issues identified in the questionnaire. Additionally, secondary materials such as books, articles, journals and electronic materials were also reviewed for the compilation of the study.

Sampling Techniques

This qualitative research is not based on statistically representative sample. Since a sampling framework is not available, the study uses a snowball technique to select respondents. Respondents who stayed in Europe and USA for some time and returned

to their home country qualify for this study. About 40 respondents were approached in recreational places and through other contacts, as convenient to the author, and asked to fill in a questionnaire. The study is therefore based on the data from only these 40 respondents as the author couldn't be able to locate more of them. Attempts were made to capture respondents from different occupational mix in order to enrich the insights and minimize the bias that may result from selecting a particular group.

1.6.Limitations of the study

Locating returnees in the community at large is costly and time consuming. In New Zealand, there is a source of information on all New Zealand citizens returning to the country after absence of 12 months or more through the arrival card (Lidgard and Gilson, 2002). However, in Ethiopia there is no such or other efficient means enabling one to locate the returnees without difficulty. Nonetheless, it was managed to find 40 returnees by way of the snow ball method as indicated in the method section. Though most responded to the questions in the survey with concern and have been cooperative, significant number of the selected was skeptical and insecure. Most of these unsure respondents reasoned their insecurity to the political implications the survey may entail that may affect their livelihood including occupation, business, trade etc. Yet, though it was tiresome to convince some, most have been helpful and have completed the survey sufficiently.

The other limitation of this study was shortage of materials regarding return migration in general as most studies of migration focus on out migration. Moreover, there is no literature available regarding Ethiopian return migrants that would help understand

the pattern. It was also impossible to find data on statistics of Ethiopian return migrants. As explained by one of the employees of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, this may be due to the fact that all returnees may not contact the ministry and may proceed their process through the embassies. Hence, as there is no other mechanism of tracking them, the statistics of returnees could not be obtained.

Lastly, Because of the small and less well balanced sample, this study doesn't yield conclusions that could be considered valid for the whole population of returnees in Ethiopia. However, it is useful to highlight the kind of problems confronting returnees from the western countries and their point of view on how to alleviate these problems.

1.7.Scope of the study

The study is mainly restricted to return migrants who migrated to the western countries particularly North America, Europe and Canada. In addition to this, the scope of this study is also restricted to returnees' life after their return. It could have been more complete if data were also obtained about returnees' life before migration. This would have helped in examining their previous life experiences, which is likely to have an influence on their current viewpoints. However, due to time constraint, this was not possible to conduct.

Finally, the selection of respondents was conducted only from those residing in Addis Ababa for the reason the author is convinced that most returnees live in the city as they prefer urban life than rural.

Chapter 2

General concepts of International Migration and Return

2.1 International Migration

2.1.1 Concept, patterns and process

Concept

Migration refers to a change of usual place of dwelling where it can be across city, regional state or international boundary lines (Arsdol et al. 2003). Having this definition in mind, an important aspect of migration worth examining is whether it is voluntary or forced. According to Akokpari, (2000)

'In general voluntary migrants are those who change place within or beyond their country of origin at their own discretion rather than for other uncontrollable factor. Voluntary migrants mostly, though not always, are people seeking better social, economic or environmental conditions in other regions or countries.'

Though there exist many other possibilities, migrants can generally be divided into five key categories: settlers, contract workers, professionals, unauthorized workers, and asylum seekers and refugees (Stalker, 2005 (Annex 1)).

Patterns of International migration

In the 1940s and 1950s, the major migrant streams were Europeans to North America and the Antipodes, and Jews to Israel while in the 1960s, people migrated highly to the other developed nations also who were in need of labor (Whitwell, 2002). These migrants came looking for better living standards and work opportunities. Migration to these countries involved lasting settlement including most legal rights of citizens, entailing the right to work and live.

In the 1970s and 1980s, family reunification, contract labor, and intra-regional and refugee movements typified the major trends in international migration (Whitwell, 2002). Many of the migrants are distinguished to be either skilled professionals or asylum seekers.

As international migration continues, the pattern has now become from less developed to the industrialized countries, while flows are also taking place between developing countries. In addition, more countries are senders or receivers of international migration than in the past. This may be attributed to the improvements in international communication resulting from globalization (Silj, 2001). Thus, the level of International migration has grown being a significant part of social change globally.

According to the UN's estimate, there were 175 million international migrants in the world in 2000 that represented more than a double increase from 76 million in

1960. By comparison, the world population only doubled from 3 billion in 1960 to 6 billion in 2000. As a result, international migrants represented 2.5 per cent of the world population in 1960 and 2.9 per cent in 2000 (IOM, 2005).

Consequently, sixty per cent of the world's migrants currently reside in more developed regions. Most of the world's migrants live in Europe (64 million), followed by Asia (53 million) and Northern America (45 million) (DESA, 2006). Nearly half of all international migrants are female and female migrants outnumber male migrants in developed countries. Three-quarters of all international migrants are concentrated in just 28 countries and one in every five international migrants live in the United States of America (DESA, 2006).

In Africa, there were an estimated 16.3 million migrants and close to 13.5 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) in 2002. According to ILO estimates, the number of labor migrants in Africa today constitutes one fifth of the global total. Moreover, by 2025, one in ten Africans will live and work outside their countries of origin (AU, 2002).

A chain of factors have contributed to the considerable increase in migration in this century including the increased facility of travel and communication resulting from globalization, persistent regional and sub-regional economic disparities, natural disasters, conflict, political instability, to mention some (AU, 2002).

Still even rising, the total figure of international migrants accounts for a small proportion of world's population. The most important and signified changes in recent time is that migrants are flowing to the industrialized countries and that there is increased concentration of migrants in the developed world; in a small number of countries (IOM, 2005). This can be strengthened by the fact that, during 2000-2005, the 2.6 million migrants from the less developed regions have moved to the more developed regions annually (DESA, 2006). From this, Northern America gained the most from net migration: 1.4 million migrants annually followed by Europe with an annual net gain of 1.1 million.

Process: How people migrate

People migrate in different ways such as: through colonial paths, family ties, networks, labor brokers, smugglers and traffickers to mention few.

Colonial history is one of the influential factors in decisions of migration and also in choosing a country of destination (Clark et al, 2003). The two countries that have instigated migrant movements are France and the United Kingdom by employing workforce from those countries they have colonized.

The other country that has influenced developing countries through economic and military pressure is the United States. Unlike the above two, it had few former colonies but yet was successful in controlling the underdeveloped countries, particularly near neighbors such as Mexico (Stalker, 2005). Hence,

in earlier periods the developed countries intentionally initiated the main global flows of migrants through colonial relations.

The other important way of migration is 'family tie'; where close family members of already settled residents are given priority by most receiving countries (Yamauchi, 2003). This notion comes up in close relation to the concept of human rights concerning family. As per Stalker (2005),

'The Universal Declaration of Human Rights establishes that everyone has the right to marry and that the family is the 'fundamental unit of society' entitled to protection from the state. But there are also sound social reasons for allowing migrants to be with their families, since workers with families tend to integrate better.'

Accessibility of ready networks on the other hand also has a significant impact on the choice of destination. This is sometimes what is referred as chain migration.

Networks are important in economic life because they are sources for the acquisition of scarce means, such as capital and information (Portes, 1995). Migrants have to make a decision on their destination after having sufficient information about documentation and visas (or how to travel without them). Moreover, they have to be able to be employed fast. In time, the already settled ones have been very useful sources of information and provide them with practical help including accommodation. Advising on employment is one of

the most important advantages a network supplies. Pioneer migrants usually arrange the conditions with the employer for their family and friends to come to the same place. This will result in spatial concentration of certain nationalities in a particular place referred as employment niches (Portes, 1995)

In this regard Stalker (2005) argued that;

'By the mid-1990s almost half of the economy motels in the US were owned by Indians, as a high proportion of the fruit and vegetable shops in many cities were owned by Koreans.'

With people moving around countries and connected by telephone and email, these networks become widened facilitating migration.

The other way of a fast growing migration is through labor brokers who are there to balance demand of labor with supply, mostly in the industry sector. Brokers are those on whom migrants who cannot take advantage of family contacts or migrant networks rely for jobs. Moreover, mostly they arrange transport and accommodation and take care of the problems of passports, visas and work permits for the migrants. They operate both in sending and receiving countries and make their money at both ends. Using private brokers can be expensive despite the fact that there is a probability that migrants upon arrival may find that they have been deceived and that the work and conditions are not as promised.

On the other hand, migrants may enter countries illegally using the help of smugglers. According to Stalker (2005),

'Smugglers act as extra-legal travel agents — hiding people in trucks for example, or supplying false passports , or bribing immigration officials. This is a dangerous, but usually very profitable, business. Chinese smuggling gangs, for example are known as 'snakeheads'. For a journey to the United States they charge around \$60,000; to the UK \$45,000, or to Eastern Europe or Japan \$12,000 most of which they require the migrants to repay from subsequent wages.'

Trafficking is also another way which is some how related but different from smuggling, though there is often some overlap and the perpetrators may be the same people. The main difference between the two activities is that smuggled people are traveling voluntarily while those being trafficked have in some way been coerced or deceived (Stalker, 2005)

Coercion may involve kidnapping when it extends to the worst but usually the ordinary form of trafficking is through deception. Traffickers usually refer themselves and appear as brokers offering to find officially permitted work abroad mostly for young women and girls. However, this is not the case often in that when migrants arrive in their destinations they learn that they are expected to offer sex rather than the decent work they thought they would be engaged in (Curran et al. 2005). It should be noted however that, not everyone

who migrates to offer sex, has been deceived or trafficked for there are many as well who are well aware of what they are getting into, so have only been smuggled. Hence, it is important to uphold the distinction between smuggling and trafficking especially for the process of prosecution of the real criminals.

An important issue that comes up in the process of migration is the issue of assimilation, adaptation and acculturation of migrants in their destination areas. Generally, the entire process of migration is closed because new arrivals tend to move to places where earlier immigrants have become organized and later generations will set up their destination there (Portes and Ruben, 1996). According to the assimilation theory this pattern is illogical because economic opportunities are better elsewhere. On the contrary, in reality, it is seen when individuals risk losing a range of social and moral resources for better well-being and for economic gain by going away to places other than places where their group is already established. Yet, usually as illustrated in the first argument, immigrants tend to prefer spatial concentration. This may be because, for members of the immigrant generation, spatial concentration has a lot of positive outcomes such as guaranteeing a valued life style, regulation of the pace of acculturation, and access to community networks for both moral and economic support (Portes and Ruben, 1996).

One important question in this assimilation process is 'to what sector of the destination society a particular immigrant group assimilates?' Accordingly, one path may follow the relatively straight-line theory of assimilation into the middle

class majority while a contrary type of adaptation may chose to go to down ward mobility and assimilation into the city under class; yet another may unite upward mobility and sensitive ethnic awareness within solitary immigrant communities (Ruben quoted in Portes, 1996)

As per Portes (1996):

'A variant of assimilation theory predict that identity shifts would tend to be from lower to higher status groups; where social mobility is blocked by prejudice and discrimination, lower-status group member may instead reaffirm their ethnic identity or adopt a p an ethnic label even despite a high degree of acculturation'

Migrant workers are usually engaged in unskilled works which are not preferred by the native workers of the host country. Similarly, those who are not recognized legally by the government of the host country take up secondary jobs not taken by most native workers. (McKinley et al, 2001).

Another issue to be raised in the assimilation process is the interaction between migrants and the native people. To understand this relationship, it is important to identify the way immigrants are treated by the host society and the government. Migrants assimilate to the value structure of the new societies at a different

degree. Usually this difference is attributed to the difference in perception to the desirability of the new culture and values. (Sowell, 1996)

On the other hand, migrants may face difficulties in their assimilation process. These problems may be due to certain barriers like language, discrimination etc. To cope with these problems of integration and assimilation, some chose to participate in various associations and public gatherings in the host countries. (Ashenafi et al, 2006). However, even so, the problems may still persist confirming the fact that assimilation to new systems and new societies is not an easy task. Yet, most migrants, though it will take time, succeed in integrating with the new societies after certain sacrifices and problems.

2.1.3 Reasons for migration

Social conditions in a given country play significant role to initiate people leave their place of origin. Currently Europe is experiencing a rise in the number of migrants even if the United States is still the preferred destination for the majority of the world's migrants (McKinley et al, 2001).

There are different theories that were designed to explain migration from different perspectives. These theories have been used by different theorists and have been explaining migration to a certain extent. Though they have been functional as

having global importance, they cannot always apply to the wide and diversified population of the world.

Migration theories face many problems as its subject matter is hard to define, difficult to measure, multifaceted and multiform, and thus resistant to theory-building. Even as the pool of theories, and especially of conceptual frameworks, available nowadays represents a clear improvement over the situation a few decades ago, their contribution to our knowledge of migration is still limited (Arango, 2000). The following are some of the theories pertaining to migration.

The Theory of Development in a Dual Economy

According to this theory, migration plays a great role in the development of economies of both receiving and sending countries. The emphasis is on the fact that people move from traditional and underdeveloped areas to more developed and modern areas where return or productivity is higher. Here the basic idea is that both the modern and the traditional sectors benefit where for the modern one, rate of wage decreases and productivity increases while similarly the traditional sector gains higher demand from the modern one (IOM, 2003).

This theory is limited only to the idea that as people migrate from traditional to modern areas, modern areas will benefit from the potential decrease of wage rate and increase of productivity while the traditional ones benefit from higher demand from the modern. However, it fails to recognize the fact that as people move in mass from traditional to modern areas, the modern areas may suffer from

over crowdedness, which affects the productivity, and at the same time the traditional areas lose their workforce.

The Neo-Classical Theory

According to writers in favor, migration lives as long as supply or push and demand or pull of labor exists in the labor market (Abye, 2003). In other words migration occurs where situations push labor to where jobs, wages and other economic factors are most advantageous. Therefore according to this theory, labor movement will come to an end when wage becomes equal between receiving and sending countries. The contribution of individual interest to migration has also become the later explanation under this theory. Migrants choose the destination where they can get the best benefits (IOM, 2003).

Nevertheless, this theory focuses solely on wage differential as the determinant factors of people's movement while it is the case that it is the well to do, upper and middle class, who are seen to migrate to the developed countries more than those belonging to the lower class or the poor.

The Dependency Theory

According to this theory, migration is the result of the existence of uneven dependency relationship in which the industrialized centers dominate the agricultural sector. The big cities are created by the exploitation of the periphery which positively affected cities development. As a result, people migrate from less developed to the more developed sectors (IOM, 2003).

The Dual Labor Market Theory

This theory explains migration in terms of the interest of the receiving country mostly the industrial nations. It argues that migration is initiated from the side of the host countries and clearly depends on their interest where they effort to attract the required labor. Therefore for this theory, the pulling factors have significant contribution for the movement of labor (Abye, 2003).

However, the argument may not be feasible in the current status of many developed countries towards migration as they are becoming stricter regarding visa application and that it has become more difficult to be acknowledged as a refugee in many of them.

The Theory of the New Economy of Professional Migration

It focuses on the role of the family in the decision making process of the migrant to move from country of origin to the destination while studying the causing factors of migration from the perspective of labor sending countries (IOM, 2003)

It emphasizes that the family is involved in a way when migration takes place. Unlike the neo-classical theory, the main focus of migration is diversification of income rather than wage difference. Moreover, it gives importance to the guarantee of survival in time of hardships than on the income differential (Abye, 2003) This theory helps to understand the fact that usually it is people with relatively better income who are attracted to migration while those with lesser

financial resources do not dare taking risks of not being successful in the host country (IOM, 2003).

The Migration networks theory

Migration is explained in terms of network according to this view. A network is 'a composite of interpersonal relations in which migrants interact with their family, friends or compatriots who stayed behind in their country of origin' (IOM, 2003). The interaction includes information exchange, financial assistance or helping migrants to find job. As the network is complicated and diversified, it gives different opportunities to the migrants (Portes, 1995).

In some cases, traffickers and smugglers who assist people to cross boarder illegally may create and make the network easy to happen. In this case, usually, migrants promise to pay the money incurred in this process of legal migration after they gain working in the host country. Such kinds of migrants are usually liable to violence and other related problems (Stalker, 2005).

Beyond and also in line with the theoretical explanations above, in reality, people migrate for multitude of reasons. Migrants have different background when they leave their country of origin; they might be either skilled or unskilled. Those migrants with saleable skills leave their country to be employed and earn reasonable income to make a living. However, those unskilled will engage themselves in any available job so that they can earn better than they did in their homeland (ILO, 2004).

This kind of movement is aligned with the terms of the neo-classical theory which explains migration in terms of push and pulls factors, and benefits in the host countries.

Most people migrate, either temporarily or permanently, to take advantage of opportunities in richer countries. The most tempting gaps in income are between industrial and developing countries. As explained by the neo-classical theory, these wage gaps are one of the reasons for people to decide migrating to the industrial or western countries. The largest wage gap between two neighboring countries is between the US and Mexico. An average factory worker in the US earns around four times more than one working in Mexico, and 30 times more than a Mexican agricultural worker (Stalker, 2005). Similar gaps are evident all over the world: between Burma and Thailand, for example.

However, what makes the theory not practicable is that this does not mean that wages everywhere would have to be equal to stop migration since people think not just about the present but about the future and when prospects brighten most people prefer to stay at home.

Another reason why people migrate is that many richer countries have jobs available for immigrant workers (Portes, 1996). This situation is evident in countries such as the United Kingdom which are desperately short of workers in many areas particularly in the health and education services. Yet, the 'dual labor market', theory ensures that there is an irreducible demand for

immigrants by the host countries to do the less popular work which local workers reject (Stalker, 2005). Hence, the host countries attempt to attract labor to their economy.

Another factor influencing emigration is the disruption caused by economic and social development. Development and modernization break up many of the relationships that hold communities together. Large-scale commercial agriculture in Latin America and the Caribbean Basin, for example, has displaced millions of small producers. Mexico is one of the clearest examples (Stalker, 2005). Nevertheless the underlying principle is similar; that the disruption caused by economic and social development makes people more mobile and creates the conditions for emigration. In other words, inconsistency of social conditions coupled with motivations of the people produce waves of external migrations (Seferagic, 1977).

Reasons of migration are not always linked to economic aspects. There are also those who migrate due to insecure political affiliation in the home country. These migrants are usually those who are asylum seekers in the host country.

The other is reason of family re-unification in the host country. Usually, when one member of the family migrates and finds the new place convenient, he/she wishes to bring the rest of the family to the host country. As a result, those family members who are living in the home country will have the ambition to do so in order to re-unite with the migrant family members.

Preference is also another reason to migrate. Especially, people living in the developing countries may prefer to have western life. Hence, they decide to migrate to the western countries to fulfill their preference.

2.1.4 Consequences of migration

Impact on the host countries

History suggests that immigration is not economically damaging. A strengthening argument for this fact is that the world's remaining superpower, the United State is populated almost entirely by immigrants and their descendants become richer and richer (Stalker, 2005). Other high immigration countries are also among the most developed and the wealthiest

Though this does not necessarily mean that immigration caused the increase in wealth, all these countries have used immigrants' labor to become richer.

Immigrants allow an economy to work more smoothly by filling vacancies across the jobs spectrum, at both the top and the bottom. At the top of the jobs market, immigrants can provide much needed professional skills, particularly in fast-growing economies (Silj, 2001) At the other end, many more young people in the richer countries now go to college or university and are less interested in manual work particularly in industries such as construction which is creating labor shortages. Immigrant workers can fill these gaps, not only by meeting immediate needs, smoothing out the peaks and ditches, but also by

releasing local people to do other work. The clearest example of this is using immigrants as nannies so that mothers, can go out to work as high-powered executives.

A common complaint is that immigrants move to richer countries to exploit public services. In fact, the vast majority of migrants only want to work as hard as possible. Studies in the USA in the early 1990s concluded that although immigrants may claim marginally more welfare than natives this is mainly because they are poorer (Stalker, 2005). In fact low-income immigrants are less likely to claim welfare than low-income natives. Even so, the US government tightly restricts immigrants' welfare rights.

The situation is of course different for illegal immigrants since they want to conceal their presence and avoid contact with the authorities.

Impact on the home country

Migration might help the destination country, but it does not necessarily mean a corresponding loss for the sending country. Migration is in some respect a form of trade which should allow all parties to gain. (Silj, 2001)

A potential benefit of migration for the sending countries might be to ease population pressures and reduce unemployment. One example is Mexico where of the 108 million people alive today who were born in Mexico around 8 million now live in the United States. This has the effect of reducing Mexico's annual population growth rate, but only slightly: from 1.8% to 1.5%

(Stalker, 2005). Globally, however, the demographic impact of emigration is far smaller. The world's population is growing by 77 million annually, but only two to three million people migrate each year.

Emigration would not necessarily relieve unemployment or underemployment directly. As it is expensive, emigrants need some kind of work already or savings or some collateral against which they can borrow. Their departure should open up some opportunities for others. But employment problems in developing countries are not going to be solved by emigration. Just as in the receiving countries, the balance between the number of jobs and the number of workers depends more on the efficiency of the economy in creating the right kind of opportunities

The other idea is that migration might bring financial benefits to the sending communities but it can also be socially disruptive (Macpherson, 2000)

According to Stalker (2005):

'Often the burden is borne by women. In countries where the majority of migrants have been young men, many of whom are married, this gives extra responsibilities to women who have to maintain the household. Some of the most dramatic effects of male emigration are to be seen in Africa, as in Lesotho where men can leave for up to 15 years to work in South Africa. When the woman becomes the head of the family, she may suffer from loneliness and the extra workload but she

can also gain greater independence. On the other hand, emigration can bring the extended family into play requiring the wife to stay with other family members, or at least get more frequent visits from parents and in-laws. So she may be less free.'

Nowadays, however, an increasing proportion of migrants are women – indeed, they now account for a larger number of international migrants. For some countries of origin, women now make up the majority of migrants, particularly from Africa (Emebet, 2003)

Emigration can also cost poor countries some of their most valuable people; brain drain. The thousands of dollars spent to educate a doctor or an engineer disappear when they take their skills abroad (Bhorat et al., 2002)

One of the main beneficiaries is the United States. But professionals from developing countries have been going all over the world. These departures are partly a result of people wanting to earn more and broaden their experience. But they are also a response to deliberate recruitment by richer countries. In some cases they achieve this by attracting foreign students who subsequently stay. In the United States only half of the foreign students receiving a doctorate or a postdoctoral qualification return to their native country within two years. The UK and France also actively seek foreign students (Stalker, 2005).

On the other hand, the main advantage of emigration for the sending countries is that emigrants send much of their earnings home in the form of 'remittances'; providing much needed foreign exchange (SELA, 2004)

For many countries, such as Egypt, and Bangladesh remittances have become a crucial source of income and foreign exchange. And they are also a vital source of income for millions of families where some spend more on food and other household essentials as well as education for their children and others on housing or land or on new businesses (Macpherson, 2000) Migrant remittances also have a beneficial 'multiplier effect' on the economy as a whole.

The other dichotomy of migration is that international migration is creating new social spaces. Though overseas Diasporas are scattered in communities all over the world, nowadays, with cheaper transport and communications, it is easier for these people to stay in close touch and to form more coherent 'transnational communities' (Stalker, 2005)

If the source and destination countries are close the migrants can travel regularly back and forth. This kind of circular migration is very common between Mexico and the United States, for example, and between countries in West Africa. Migrants have been able to take full advantage of advances in telecommunications; phone and email to keep in touch with their home communities.

Although most remittances stay within families, there are also many examples of migrants supporting community development back home. Mexicans in the United States, for example, have around 1,500 ‘hometown associations’, which have supported all kinds of community activity, from building new roads to repainting the church, to paying for fiestas as well as in business (Stalker, 2005)

2.2 Return migration

There has been relatively little empirical research on return migration. A possible reason for this may be the difficulty of getting adequate and reliable data on return migrants (McCormick and Wahba, 2004). In addition as most migration researches have centered on three other major themes: studies of the initial migration decision; studies of migrant adaptation, assimilation, acculturation, integration; and consequences of migration, there was lesser room for return migration (Aydemir and Rhobinson, 2006). Similarly, in the Ethiopian context, as well, nothing has been written on return migration.

Defining return migration is a difficult task. Yet, it is necessary to give a definition for the purpose of the study. Return migration as defined by some scholars is **‘the process where by people return to their country, or place of origin after a significant period in another country or region’**. (Ammassari and Black (IOM), 2001) However, this definition is not sufficient in that it doesn’t clarify what is meant by ‘significant period’. A more clarified definition given by

IOM (2003) is: 'the movement of a person returning to his/her country of origin of habitual residence after spending at least one year in another country. The return may or may not be voluntary.'

With increased temporary migration, particularly of highly skilled persons, voluntary return has become a major feature of migration in recent years. This is most widespread in countries experiencing vigorous economic growth, e.g. China, the Taiwan Province of China and Korea, or where there are financial and career incentives to return home

Usually it is those who are of the nationality of the country to which they are returning are referred as return migrants. There are four categories of return (Ammassari and Black (IOM), 2001):

1. Return of failure

This includes migrants who have failed to overcome problems they encounter in their destination and who could not be able to adapt to the new environment. These kinds of migrants are not significant in number and they usually do not have problem in reintegrating with the society in the home country since they come back quickly.

2. Return of conservatism

This includes those who have migrated to achieve a specific goal and usually save a significant portion of what they make both as remittance and to pursue

their plans back home. This means that they are more attached to their home country and the values of their home country prevail regarding goals and achievements.

3. Return of motivation

These are migrants who adapt perfectly in their new destination and go by its value systems through staying long time. But eventually they return back home with new ideas, values, skills and innovations to apply them in their home country.

4. Return of retirement

These are migrants who have finished their working lives who want to go back home to retire.

The third type of migrants is those who contribute significantly to their home country development. In any case to study the different aspects of return migration, it is useful to consider the causes of their return, how they re-integrate with the society and their contribution to the country's development.

2.2.1 Motives for return

Though most attention is focused on out-migration, a significant proportion of emigrants do return. This is most obvious in the case of contract workers. On the other hand, many people who migrate with the aim of long-term settlement

change their minds after a couple of years. Of the 30 million people admitted to the United States between 1900 and 1980, 10 million are believed to have returned eventually (Stalker, 2005).

Migrants look in to conditions in the home country in order to decide to return. These may include but are not limited to (Seferagic, 1977):

1. Employment opportunities and the buying or purchasing power of money
2. Adjustment or integration with the society (old neighborhoods),
3. Children educational background in the native language
4. Government response in their country of origin

Return motives are related to social, economic, family, and political reasons. Strong family ties and wish to join friends and family are important factors motivating migrants to return. In addition, unfavorable and unexpected condition in the host country and an aspiration to enjoy better social as well as economic status in the home county after accumulating sufficient funds are also important determinants of return (Ammassari and Black (IOM), 2001). But often most importantly the deciding factor will be the situation in the home country. If the economic position improves then migrants will be motivated to return. One of the most striking examples is Ireland which has now become a country of immigrants. (Stalker, 2005)

In addition to the above, Kirdar (2005) in his study of Turkish immigrants in Germany as argued that:

'Immigrants' return decision will be influenced by their demographic characteristics and labor market outcomes as well as the macroeconomic environment. There are two important macroeconomic factors that influence immigrants' return decision. These are the purchasing power parity and the relative wages between Turkey and Germany. Purchasing power parity is important because it determines the value of immigrants' asset holdings after returning to their home countries. Relative wages are also important because the difference between the wages in Germany and those in Turkey is a measure of the opportunity cost of returning.'

Usually migrants think that it would be most favorable for them to return after they have accumulated capital; both human and physical. This may be due to the fact that the returns to that much of a capital would be higher in their home country, especially if the home country is one of the developing countries. Accordingly, one will have higher purchasing power in the home country with the accumulated capital one has (Kirdar, 2005). Hence, from the illustration above it can be said that as the purchasing power of their savings potential of immigrants increase, they become more likely to return.

Another reason for return migration is that migrants have a preference for location. On the other hand, return migration may also be the result of unexpected events, either in the host country or in the home country (Ammassari and Black (IOM), 2001). Unexpected changes such as in income or in preferences for living in the host country, for example due to illness or death of family members back at home, might change the decisions of migrants.

The other significant factor explaining return migration is age; referred as return of retirement. The tendency for older migrants to return is higher in that as the age of a migrants increases, his/her probability of return will also increase (Zhao, 2001). Moreover, education significantly increases one's probability of return. The probability that the educated returns is far more than that of the illiterate who have been doing unskilled work in the host country. Hence, more educated workers are less likely to choose migration over local skilled employment so as to avoid safety hazards associated with migration and separation from families (Zhao, 2001).

As explained above migrants may decide to return due to the above different factors. Yet, since most of the time return is not organized and anticipated, there are limited services available in many countries towards handling returnees. Returnees also have demands, which they inquire to be fulfilled before they come back including the availability of jobs, appropriate salary,

favorable environmental conditions, hospitable society and a decent housing, etc (Seferagic, 1977).

All in all, in practice, motives for return revolve around the most important and determinant factors: family reasons, jobs and business expectations and broader expectation of being welcomed by family, relatives, former friends and society as a whole (Tiemoko, 2003)

2.2.2 Re-integration and assimilation of returnees

Returnees may be categorized into: those who come back for good and those who plan to re-migrate. The first usually have achieved their dreams and started a new life style upon their return and sometimes, they prefer to live in a place where other returnees settled which manifests changes of attitude (Sowell, 1996). On the other hand, those who tend to re-migrate, are most of the time those who were not in a good condition prior to migration and have not achieved enough upon return (ILO, 2000). The second group is usually those who do not expect a welcoming society. This may be because they feel that their structural values have changed from before and that they couldn't be in the same line as the non-migrant society.

Usually return migrants are wealthier than the people around them, which make them susceptible to resentment. Hence, at times, some who have spent most of their lives abroad and return home to retire can become a ready target for crime and others will find it difficult to settle. These will tend to re-migrate (Stalker, 2005).

On the other hand, migrants who have achieved success often do not encounter problems with their families; however those who did not fulfill the expectation of their family might face problems in the response they get from their family. Moreover, the society expects a lot from returnees including providing financial support being considered wealthy (ILO, 2000)

All returnees do not have the same experience in re-integrating with the society. Some may face difficulties which might result in disappointment while others may easily re-associate with the homeland community even though they have departed for a long time. Returnees might also be faced with distrust as the society develop an attitude that all migrants are wealthy and try to take advantage from them. In addition, many returnees complain on how things are done in their homeland which include: Government bureaucracy, inefficiency and problem of time management, etc. Due to this and other reasons, returnees become unsatisfied and unhappy in their home country (Gmelch, 1980).

As per Ammassari and Black (IOM) (2001):

'Readjustment problems have been considered as indicators of social change brought about by return migrants. Conversely, the more traditional their value orientation upon their return, the less likely they are to bring about innovation and social changes. Still, they are relieved to be back home in a familiar context. On the other hand they are often quite disappointed and easily irritated

with how things are done in the home country. Also the relationship between returnees and no-migrants is generally ambiguous.'

The other problem of returnees' is that they expect too much from their own society which does not fit with that of the actual situation on the ground (Gmelch, 1980). They may not consider the change in values they arrived at and suppose the society to be in the same line as they are, which is not the case in most instances. In this view returnees' process of re-integration in their home country may become a difficult task.

As illustrated above, the difficulty returnees face in readopting themselves with the socio-economic and cultural conditions of their homeland may contribute its part for their delay to return home.

2.2.3 Returnees' potential contribution for the home country's development

So far, there have been two major lines to explain the development implications of return migration. These are: capital transfer that implies the financial capital migrants have accumulated while working in the host country, and human capital that denotes capital acquired from abroad in the form of education, training and working experience. Yet, a third type of line; social capital transfer should also be considered as it is an important factor in a country's development (Ammassari and Black, (IOM) 2001).

According to Ammassari and black (IOM) (2001),

'The return of migrants with its human capital implications is one of the most commonly cited benefits of migration for the sending country, along with remittance and labor market effect. However, financial and social capital can also be mobilized through migrants' return. Migrants may accumulate savings while living and working abroad and bring them back once they return. They may also make professional and personal contacts, which prove useful and productive for their endeavors back home.'

Additionally, returnees have a significant impact on the economic development of their home country not only through financial capital but also in transferring their skills and way of life. Human capital transfers by return migrants are predicted to have positive effects on the home country's development. The main assumption is that these positive effects are largely produced in the work environment. In this regard three conditions determine the impact of the returnees (Ammassari, 2003):

1. That migrants have learned something abroad and have attained a certain level of experience;
2. That what they have learned is useful in their home context; and
3. That migrants are ready and able to apply their new skill and experience.

The above conditions fulfilled, returnees invest their savings, both financial and human, in projects, which guarantee success and they do not usually take a risk of facing failure. They also provide employment opportunities for their fellow citizens in their homeland. Yet, it is difficult to know the exact contribution of returnees to their national economy since the capital they brought with them is merged with the money that is sent home by migrants from host countries as remittance (Nicholson, 2004)

As per many research findings, sending countries are benefiting not only in the form of remittances from migrants abroad but also in terms of human, financial and social capital returns acquired by the migrants (Petras & Kousis, 1988)

On the other hand, however, people with low skills are highly inclined to engage in lower level of jobs in the countries of destination. When these migrants return home, they will not acquire the necessary skill to contribute to the development of their country (Sowell, 1996).

In addition, regarding, the financial capital contribution of migrants, some scholars conclude that a fairly small portion of migrants' savings are spent on productive investments. Savings are largely spent on conspicuous consumption to raise the status and comfort of return migrants and their family. A considerable amount of savings is spent in buying a house or a plot of land (De Haas, 2005). It is very common to see well to do migrants building luxurious houses and driving USVs (Utility Sport Vehicles). Their intention is to boast and prove to the surrounding

community that they have reached their goal and live comfortably. Yet, construction of such luxurious houses may play a role in the beautification of the area (Gmelch, 1980). However, since this kind of life style consumes their savings, they are usually forced to re-migrate (ILO, 2000).

In agreement with Sowell (1996), some scholars are doubtful about the capability of returnees to come up with occupational skills by indicating many unskilled jobs filled by migrant workers. They further argue that even the already adopted skills by migrants may not necessarily go in line with the home country's needs. On the other hand, there are people who effort to make a living by engaging in small business. This may be because of the fact that for most of the returnees it gives more satisfaction and is prideful to work in ones own country than migrating to another to work (Nicholson, 2004). Usually they prefer to hire their relatives and family members to run their business.

On the other hand, while the financial and human capital transfers have gained much attention, the contribution of social capital in the form of resources that can be mobilized through networks, associations or organizations has been neglected (Ammassari and Black (IOM), 2001). Social capital is built on mutual obligations and expectations, norms of reciprocity, trust and solidarity. Upon arrival, migrants in the host countries, establish links or social ties with people from their home countries who help them in making the new social connections with the new

community. After sometime, migrants themselves will start establishing their own social network building new social capital.

Yet, even if as said above, the contributions made by returnees to the development of their country is huge, it is still contentious since the contribution of returnees may also be very minimal depending on the type of human, financial and social capital they possess (Nicholson, 2004).

Chapter Three

Results and Discussions

3.1 An overview of returnees' Profile

3.1.1 Age and Gender Composition

From the author's experience, people perceive that return migrants are clustered around the age of retirement. However, this is not always true. The study showed that 60.5% of the respondents fall in the 24-34 age groups. Of this, 29% are concentrated in the 28-30 age groups. This indicates that the majority of returnees are in the class of the younger generation of the society. On the other hand, around one-third of the survey population is between the ages of 35-45 and 7.8% fall in the range 46-56, who are middle aged group. Those which might be designated as retired with the age of 57 and above are only 2.6%. This as a whole shows that relatively young people decide to migrate as they are more ambitious to changes and aspire strongly for better living standards. Moreover, it is them who take risks for the purpose of achieving brighter prospective opportunities and life chances. Hence, by the time they return, they will be in the age where they are more mature and active at the same time. The fact that the highest proportion of the returnees are found in the age of 30 while relatively higher proportion falls in the range 35-45 shows that the group representing the active population of the country takes the highest share among returnees. Thus, their contribution to the country's development can be significant.

Table 1: Age distribution of respondents

Age groups	Frequency	Percent
24 - 34	23	60.5
35 - 45	11	29.1
46 - 56	3	7.8
≥57	1	2.6
Not available	2	
Total	40	100.0

The sex distribution in Table 2 shows that 75% of the sample is males while the rest are females. This reveals male domination signifying gender imbalance among returnees. Though the literature indicates that international on-ward migrants are dominated by females, returnees in the case of Ethiopian show a different pattern. This may be attributable to the patriarchal culture absorbed by the Ethiopian people, where women are considered to have a role only in administering the household while the man is considered as the one who goes out and look for a job. Thus, women have very limited access to education and employment opportunities, and the probability that they migrate is much more limited than that of men.

Table 2: Sex distribution of respondents

Sex distribution	Frequency	Percent
Female	10	25.0
Male	30	75.0
Total	40	100.0

3.1.2 Marital status and children

The study showed that a higher proportion (67.5%) of returnees is single. In fact a large proportion of return migrants have never been married. Those who are married form 22.5% while those divorced are 10%. Of the married ones, 60% have returned with their spouses while 40% returned back alone. It, therefore, can be gathered from this that the largest group are unmarried. This points to the fact that being single facilitates the desire to return and re-unite with family in the home country. The return of Ethiopian men and women with out a spouse but accompanied by children is also noted to be significant in that 42.9% of the single and 7.1% of the divorced have children.

Table 3: Marital Status of returnees

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	27	67.5
Married	9	22.5
Divorced	4	10.0
Total	40	100.0

3.1.3 Educational back ground and field of study

The propensity to return increases with accumulation of human capital (Kirdar, 2005). The educational background of return migrants revealed that return migrants are highly educated with over 70% of the survey population possessing tertiary level education. Among these, 40% have first degree while 17.5% hold at least one graduate degree and

10% hold PhD or MD. Other forms of formal education categories (some college education, two-year college or technical education and others) are also noted among the rest of the respondents. This indicates that education significantly increases one's probability of return confirming the finding of the literature.

Table 4: Educational Background

Educational background	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
12th grade	4	10.0	10.0
Some college education	3	7.5	17.5
Two-Year college or technical education	5	12.5	30.0
Hold a first degree (BA or BSC)	16	40.0	70.0
Hold at least one graduate degree (MA or MSC)	7	17.5	87.5
Hold a PhD or MD	4	10.0	97.5
Other	1	2.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	

Regarding their field of study, more than a third (40%) was in the field of business while 15% were in ICT. On the other hand, other 'field of study' categories (medicine, engineering, law, psychology and others) form smaller proportions. The fact that the

majority are in the business and ICT field of study may indicate that the migrants have responded to international demands which emphasizes information and communication, international trade.

3.1.4 Number of years lived abroad (western countries) and lived at home since return

Respondents were asked how many years they have lived abroad before returning. Consequently as illustrated in Table 4, 7.5% of them have lived abroad for less than 4 years. 35% of the returnees have lived abroad for between 5-10 years of which 20% stayed there for 10 years. It is only 5% who have lived abroad for between 16-20 years. Similarly, another third (30%) of the sample have stayed in the country of destination for between the years 11-15 while 10% had lived outside for between 21-25 years. Lastly, while 10% of the respondents stated that they have been out for the years 26-30, another 2.5% of the survey population stayed for more than 30 years abroad. The fact that those with over ten years are around 58% indicates that Ethiopian returnees have an experience of staying abroad for many years. This indicates that they have been immersed in the life style of the country to which they have migrated. As a result, they have to start a new life upon their return which may have an impact on their re-integration process. Some may encounter problems of re-integrating to the new system upon their return. On the other hand, the rest, who stayed abroad for less than 10 years, still have maintained the links with their home country, which helps them to have some idea of the system and may not face problems of re-integration as that of the above.

Table 5: Percent distribution of returnees by number of years lived abroad

Number of Years	Frequency	Percent
< 4	3	7.5
5 - 10	14	35
11- 15	12	30
16 - 20	2	5
21 - 25	4	10
26 - 30	4	10
> 31	1	2.5
Total	40	100.0

After returning, as shown in Table 5, over half of the respondents (57.9%) have stayed between 1-4 years since their return to Ethiopia among which 47.4% have stayed for only 1-2 years. On the other hand, a little less than one-third of the returnees have made 5-8 years since their return while 10.5% of the respondents are in the 9-13 years of return range. The remaining 2.5% are those who have counted more than 13 years since their return. Clearly the majority of returnees are those who are less acquainted with the country, as they have not lived long in Ethiopia after returning. The expectation is that these people face difficulty in re-integration and assimilation, and may even have a desire to go back to the host countries.

Table 6: Percent distribution of returnees by number of Years since return

Number of years	Frequency	Percent
≤ 4	22	57.9
5 - 8	11	29.1
9 - 13	4	10.5
> 13	1	2.5
Not available	2	
Total	40	100.0

Respondents were asked if they consider returning back to where they have migrated. Concerning intention to re-migrate, 36.7% have responded that they have the intention of re-migrating back to the host countries, while the majority has replied that they would not consider it at all. Among these who consider re-migrating, 70% are those who have stayed for not more than 2 years after their return. Similarly, more than half of those who consider re-migrating to where they have migrated originally (54.6%) are those who stayed for a longer time abroad (for between 19-29 years) while almost a third (27.3%) of the same group are those who have stayed for between 10-12 years. This shows that those, who have returned since recently, are not yet well acquainted with the social, political, economic and cultural environment of the country. They feel insecure about the situation in the country and assume that they might not be well off living here or well integrated in the country. However, they may change their view and consider settling in

Ethiopia as they count more years, preferably with favorable working and living environment created.

Similarly, it can be inferred from the above that those who have stayed for a longer time abroad are those who have adapted to the western way of life and could not cope with the life style in Ethiopia. These people have been immersed in the life style of western countries and usually are not satisfied with what the country provides; therefore feel going back. Theoretically, one can also argue that those who have stayed abroad have frustrated from staying for too long which forces them stay for good once they come back to their country of origin; an exception contrary to the data above.

3.2 Reasons for on-ward and Return migration

The literature review indicates that, migrants may return for different reasons which include economic, social, political and family ties. On the other hand there also exists forced return in the case of some migrants due to unfavorable conditions in the host country including personal problems such as sickness while others may be deported by the host country for criminal records or illegal actions. However, in the Ethiopian migrants' case, there seems to be no literature dwelling on return migration in the past.

Before going directly to the reasons of migrants to return, it is important to see the reasons why they have migrated to the host country in the first place. Respondents were asked what factors urged them to migrate to the western countries.

According to the data, more than half (54.1%) have migrated for education while a little less than a third (27%) have migrated for political reasons namely instabilities in the government and lack of democracy within the country. On the other hand, close to 10% of the respondents stated that the factor that urged them to leave was a better standard of living in the host country. Other factors such as job opportunities and salary offer, and preference of western life were important motivational factors for another 10% of the respondents.

Table 7: Factors that urged returnees to migrate to the western countries

Determinant Factors of Migration	Frequency	Percent
Job opportunities and salary offer	2	5.4
Instability of the government and lack of democracy	10	27.0
Availability of living facilities	3	8.1
Educational systems in the country	20	54.1
Preference of western life	2	5.4
Not available	3	
Total	40	100.0

The various factors attained above exemplify the push and pull factors of migration indicated in the literature. It is however important to note that reasons to stay longer may not be the same as the original reasons for migration. A clear example of this is that 15% of those who stayed abroad for between 15-25 years have responded that their original reason for migration was educational system in the host country. In many cases, these

people have migrated with the intention of coming back when they complete their education. Yet, on the contrary they have decided to stay longer than they originally intended because of other reasons. A respondent who stayed for 15 years abroad but whose reason for migration was primarily education mentioned that:

'... Originally the reason why I have migrated to the US was to get advanced education and come back to my country upon completion. However, as I become incorporated in the system in the US and adapt the western way of life there, I came to think of staying longer to live and work there. Most importantly, what negatively affected my desire to come back to Ethiopia after finishing school was that when I came to Ethiopia at different times for vacation (for not more than one or two months), I used to see all the discouraging things that resulted from our underdevelopment and thought that I couldn't fit in the Ethiopian system. The problem was that I used to compare the ways of life in Ethiopia and in the US which are totally at two extremes...'

The above indicates that adaptation and, preference of western way of life may be one of the reasons for Ethiopian migrants to stay longer in host countries.

The impact of long-term migration is more serious for the sending country since it implies a continuous absence. It also affects the production of goods and impedes the migrants' social and religious contributions to family and community. Though these

migrants contribute to the home country by sending remittances to their families and friends, it may decrease over time as they start their own family and settle. It is thus beneficial for the home country if migrants return than stay away for longer time; they have to be encouraged to return and contribute to the country's development.

The reasons for returning back to Ethiopia were varied. In general however, it can be categorized into three: Family issues, unfavorable conditions in the host country including forced return, and a desire to work and live in Ethiopia

More than half of the respondents (57%) mentioned a desire to work and live in Ethiopia as their main reason for returning. These respondents stated that they have come back to work as there is better chance of having professional job and business opportunity, and good investment climate in Ethiopia. As discussed in the literature, often most importantly the deciding factor will be the situation in the home country (Stalker, 2005). If the economic position improves then migrants will be motivated to return. The Ethiopian returnees also happen to be more motivated due to the better situation in the home country, confirming the tendency cited in the literature. These type of migrants who return by motivation are those who contribute significantly to their home country development.

On the other hand, for others (32.5%) the most important reason was family tie including particular personal problems that the family at home is experiencing. This also is another factor that motivates many Ethiopians abroad to return. Hence, it substantiates the fact

that strong family ties and wish to join friends and family are important factors motivating migrants to return as discussed by Seferagic (1977).

The other factor which is determinant to returnees' motivation is unfavorable and unexpected condition in the host country (Ammassari and Black (IOM), 2001). In the Ethiopian returnees case too, 20% of the respondents stated that their reasons for return were unfavorable conditions in the host country including less opportunity to work, difficult challenges, and problems to afford the expenses of living abroad probably due to low salary. In addition, homesickness and feelings of loneliness, and problems in adapting abroad were mentioned by 7.5% of the respondents. This is what has been referred as return of failure by Ammassari and Black (IOM) (2001) which takes place when migrants fail to bear problems they come across in their destination and could not adapt to the new environment. Nonetheless, most of the respondents have implied that their stay abroad was successful as they have stated that they are well off as a returnee than before migration.

Sometimes, migrants decide to return without having a clear picture of the situation in the home country. This will result in disappointment and in some cases extends to re-migration (Stalker, 2005). In this regard, asked whether they think that their decision to return was the right one, almost 90% of the respondents said that they still think they had done the right thing. Other respondents (10.3%) have stated that their decision to return to Ethiopia is not the right one. This group obviously regrets their decision. Some think that they should have stayed longer to work and earn more while others regret coming as they

had the wrong picture of the country before returning. As a result, they will be disappointed when things cannot go on as they expected.

In order to better understand factors determining the decision to return, respondents were asked the encouraging factors that led them to decide to return back to Ethiopia. Accordingly, 46.7% stated the favorable political situation while nearly 80% emphasized the available opportunity to select a preferable place to work that could be either in the urban or rural areas. This has originated from the past experiences where there was undemocratic nature of government and choosing a place and sector to work was impossible in the Derg regime. Other factors such as due process of law (14.3%), less restriction on professional and social association (35.3%), better transportation and infrastructure system (14.3%), and less censorship of the press and speech (13.3%) were also considered as the encouraging factors.

The above acknowledges the fact that the opportunity of selecting a place to work is one of the important determinants of Ethiopian migrants to return which should be given due emphasis. The fact that favorable political situation has urged returnees to come back is an indication of the role and importance of good governance in affecting the location decision of migrants. As bad governance pushes people, good governance can pull them. This implies that governments should strive hard to attain good governance and create a stable political system in the country.

3.2 Re-integration and Assimilation of Returnees

The re-integration process involves a whole host of social, cultural and economical adjustments. Achieving these adjustments is an important factor that determines return migrants' contribution. Thus, government agencies as well as the community need to organize the reception of, and provide assistance to, these returnees. However, to date, very little monitoring is done to track the return migrants and research is generally lacking on their needs, difficulties and constraints (ILO/GPP, 2005).

The ease with which returnees were able to re-integrate with the society and the economic system back in Ethiopia varied considerably. Overall, 76.5% of the respondents feels that they have successfully re-integrated/re-assimilated into the main stream of the Ethiopian society and the system. In contrast, 23.5% of the respondents reported experiencing problems in re-adapting to life back home. For some of them, these problems, both social and economical, may have diminished over time while others have not still managed success in re-integration.

Returnees face a number of problems both in the socio-economic and socio cultural aspects. The most common statements by respondents were:

- 'It is very hard to communicate with the community, especially the elder people'
- 'The working environment is not conducive'
- 'There are unnecessary cultural barriers including language'
- 'Absence of openness or resistance to new ideas and theories'

- ‘People are dishonest and lazy lacking work ethics; they are not interested in work rather they are more attracted to money ’
- ‘The traffic problem really hinders one’s ability to work efficiently and results in frustration; people drive in the wrong manner’
- ‘It is hard to live contently in Ethiopia, where the living standards are too low, after living in a highly developed country for such a long time’
- ‘The political instability seems to be persisting in the country due to lack of good governance.’

As stated by Gmelch (1980) in the literature, those with the above opinion might have unrealistic expectations towards their own society and their country. The above statements also indicate that in view of their expectations, they do not like how things go in their homeland. This is because they have been immersed in the western life and could not expect a lesser environment thereof or, their structural values may also have changed from before which makes them unable to be in the same line as the non-migrant society.

Reintegrating with the socio-economic aspects of the country has been easier than with the socio-cultural faces (with the wider community) for most of the respondents.

With respect to the socio- economic aspects of the country, most respondents reported that they have readjusted and fit well in the system. In this regard, the highest proportion of respondents (67.6%) are generally satisfied with what they do here while close to a third expressed their dissatisfaction. Most described their satisfaction as they are being

able to contribute and make a change to the country. They also feel comfortable to work with other Ethiopians, and are self employed and can be able to grow their business vastly. This is due to the fact that most of them have achieved better living standards after their return than they had before migrating.

Achieving success while abroad has an important impact on re-integration after return. In this regard, for 71.1% of respondents it has been possible to improve their socio-economic condition back in Ethiopia due to their stay abroad. This evaluation was mainly based on the fact that they had been able to earn money by working abroad, which was also helpful to support their families. Some of the achievements gained by returnees compared to the pre-migration period include: better income and living condition, education and experience, and professionalism.

On the other hand the proportion of the unsatisfied respondents which takes up a percentage of 22.4% attributed their dissatisfaction to the difficult economic policy and low pay which impedes one's working ability, poor tax system, extended bureaucracy in government offices, lack of facilities such as communication infrastructure, poor political situation and poverty.

Returnees also face troubles in their socio-cultural re-integration. According to the literature, when people migrate for some time, they may face a whole host of unforeseen problems and changes upon their return concerning their family, friends and the whole community (ILO/GPP, 2005). Most of them are unprepared for these new realities and

are at a loss on how to cope with them. As a result, adjustment may be a long and complex process, with returnees having to come to terms with changed family relations, differences in how the community views them, and their own changed identity.

As per Ammassari and Black (IOM) (2001), problems of re-integration usually exist due to the changed value structure of return migrants as compared with the community in the home country. Therefore the relationship between returnees and non-migrants is generally ambiguous.

Nonetheless, in the case of Ethiopian returnees, their relationships with the community (neighbors, friends and colleagues) have not changed much as a result of their migration. This was so for the majority. However, there are some who have reported that a number of neighbors and friends appeared to be unsupportive and not ready to give a hand in any way. One of the returnees expressed his view as:

'Some of the friends and also relatives not close to me think that I am the wealthiest since I came back from the US. They have this perception about returnees which I don't know where it came from. Consequently, they tend to ask me for money all the time and even they expect me to give them some without being asked. I used to give money for all who have asked and every body was my friend. But now, as I have become stricter on money matters, every body began to isolate me. They are not even willing to give a hand when I need one'

Hence it can be understood that relationships with the community has not been easy for some returnees. As a result they felt unwelcome which may entail discouragement and despair. It seems to be for this reason that the highest proportion of returnees is socialized and associated more often with other returnees while relatively significant proportion associates more often with former family and friends who stayed in Ethiopia than with new Ethiopian friends. Fortunately, most of the respondents (82.1%) have close members of their family still living in Ethiopia, and almost the same proportion of respondents (83.3%) has close friends living in Ethiopia. These returnees may rely on assistance from their family and friends living in Ethiopia to facilitate their re-integration with the community after return.

The above problems and difficulties that returnees face in their relationships with the community and in re-integrating in the system need to be addressed. According to ILO/GPP (2005:17), policy makers (and indeed migrants themselves) suppose that returnees will be able to invest their savings or find remunerative employment, fit to any changes in their personal and family lives and pick up where they left off with minimal support. However, the reality is quite different, and in fact, some may be forced back into the migration cycle looking for new life abroad.

One way of facilitating re-integration is membership in different associations where people get together and discuss issues. These associations may help returnees re-socialize with the community as they are tools of communication and information exchange. In this regard, more than half of the respondents stated that they are members of different

associations of which three-fourth are members of groups belonging to the same profession while the rest 25% are members of groups belonging to the same place of childhood. This will assist them in associating better with work colleagues and partners that will give them a better picture of professional society. However, on the other hand, a very insignificant proportion of the respondents (2.6%) affirmed that they are members of Idir while relatively higher but still small proportion stated that they are members of Iqub (25.6%).

What is observed from this is that most returnees are fond of professional associations or activities related to work environment rather than participating in societal and cultural activities. This will considerably minimize the chance to communicate with the wider community.

Another factor which determines re-integration is returnees' living standard in day to day activities as compared to the society. Usually most returnees are wealthier than the non-migrant society (Stalker, 2005). It will therefore be feasible to argue that they live in a higher living standard than the wider non-migrant society. Hence, the places they go around and spend time, and their social environment as a whole is different from that of the society. As a result they may not have the chance to fully integrate with the wider community. The case of Ethiopian returnees also confirmed this statement as illustrated in the literature by Stalker (2005).

Accordingly, as they have lived in a country where the living standard is higher, most returnees seek to continue living in this high standard even in Ethiopia. For this reason,

according to the data, most returnees prefer to go to high and middle class restaurants and bars than going to low class ones. Though this could be directly attributed to the issue of affordability, in this case it should also be extended to the issue of preference. Moreover, 40% of the respondents who have children send their children to schools where most foreigners go while 60% send their children to private schools. The fact that, the proportion that sends to schools where most foreigners go is very significant shows that returnees prefer living in high standard to which they are used to while staying abroad.

This may be adhered, as mentioned before, to the fact that their value structure have changed to some extent. Nonetheless, it can be argued that, the changed value structure of these returnees, as it opens the door for facilitation of social change, will help in bringing about innovation (Ammassari and Black (IOM), 2001). If they are more traditional value oriented there will be lesser room for innovation and technology to take place.

All in all, it is noted that government should focus on the institutional mechanism of re-integration program management, including the creation of responsible units. The management structure should be based on the interest of returnees to be an effective mechanism that would also likely inspire the Diaspora. Re-integration programs to assist return migrants to readjust and to fit back into the working environment, society and family should be planned being able to reach the mass of returning migrants. This way, return to the country of origin would no longer be a nightmare for potential returnees trying to re-integrate.

3.4 Developmental dimensions of Return migrants

Return migrants have a significant impact on the economic development of their home country. This could be through transfer of different forms of capital upon their return. As is illustrated in the previous sections, in the Ethiopian returnees' case, the return is largely due to desire to work in business in suitable business opportunities. Therefore, it is likely that return migrants continue to be productive upon their return. This can be strengthened by a relatively optimistic view of the respondents for the near future, and supported by their statement of not having the intention of going back or re-migrating. Though most of them accept that there is progress in many aspects, some express their view that the government has failed to extend the necessary support to change the circumstances that drove them to work abroad. These circumstances stated by respondents include: Extended bureaucracy and inconveniences in government offices, Low salary, Political disruption and lack of freedom leading to poverty, Obstinacy on the part of government and lack of trust from the people and Poor tax system.

While acknowledging the recent initiatives made by the government to encourage return migrants, and migrants abroad to return back, some returnees felt that government can be more assertive in facilitating negotiations to work in partnership.

On the other hand, the most commonly stated positive changes include: Initiation of support for Ethiopians in Diaspora and return migrants, Development of construction, Encouraging policies and working environment, Expansion of the Ethiopian Airlines,

Growth and improvement in infrastructure, Liberalization of the investment policy and more investment opportunities, Growing of the private sector, More government concern in public welfare, Considerable increase in the purchasing power of the people, Booming of the entertainment field and Opportunity and growth of modern technology

In addition, it was observed that returnees are not only looking for government initiatives but also other initiatives from international organizations such as IOM and private sector as well as the community.

According to the news released by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2004);

'The International Organization of Migration (IOM) has articulated that Ethiopians in Diaspora are expressing a profound interest to make contributions to the development endeavors in their country. The IOM Mission in Ethiopia, Charles Kwenin said that the mission has so far received an overwhelming response of the Diaspora community from across the world to its website launched last March, in collaboration with government and international partners, to mobilize Ethiopians living abroad. The chief, who stated the diverse nature of contributions the Diaspora want to make, added that some are expressing interest to transfer skills and knowledge from where they are in online teaching, telemedicine and other areas. The chief, who noted that there are a lot of positive changes in the country, said the organization is, therefore, engaged in

helping the country utilize the Diaspora for development. He said in this regard, IOM is assisting the Diaspora through the program of migration for development of Africa, which was also endorsed by AU Council of Ministers.'

This initiative taken by the IOM is also one of the features to which returnees are looking forward to see its continuance.

An important issue related to these initiatives is; whether repatriation programs that are based on incentive schemes to induce migrants to return affect the well being of the migrant positively or negatively. Optimizing individuals should increase their benefit if they accept the return incentives satisfactorily (McCormick and Wahba, 2004). However, although the repatriation programs provide different incentives, in many cases these may have been insufficient to realize certain plans of return migrants. It is therefore for this reason that, in the Ethiopian case too, some returnees may have assessed both government and other bodies' initiatives as 'lesser than expected'. In some cases, they even think that their decision to return was wrong.

None the less, the larger proportion of returnees does not regret their decision to return and have no plan of re-migrating. Hence, with some exceptions, which should not be neglected, as most returnees are satisfied with their working environment, the initiatives taken by either government or other organizations are considerable.

3.4.1 Development implications of different forms of capital transfer by returnees

The literature indicates that the development implications of return migration can be explored in two major lines: financial capital in terms of savings accumulated while working abroad and human capital acquired abroad in the form of education, training, and work experience.

1. Financial capital and engagements in investment

As stated in the literature, migrants may accumulate savings while living and working abroad and bring them back once they return (IOM, 2001). The accumulation and bringing back of savings clearly depends on their economic status. Thus, in order to understand the economic and social status of returnees, one has to see their employment and source of income both before and after return. In this regard, respondents were asked to indicate which employment activities they were engaged in while they were overseas as well as currently after their return.

Back in the host country where they have migrated, 80% of the respondents were employed by other persons while 15% were self-employed. On the other hand, regarding their employment activities, about 27% of the respondents were engaged in 'general services' while 19.5% and 22% were in Professional/expert and other activities respectively. Other occupational categories such as Executive, and Mid-

administrative/management were also mentioned by smaller proportion of the respondents.

Engaged in the above activities, most people (58%) earned more than USD 1800 per month while they were abroad. A relatively lesser proportion and at the same time important percentage of returnees (15.5%) used to earn between USD 1000-1400. This indicates that, assuming they have made savings to a certain amount; most of them are well off in their society when they return.

Regarding current occupation, the highest proportion (63.2%) is engaged in investment, while 18.4% took on the professional/expert area. As a result, more than two-third (71.1%) of the survey group pointed out that they are financially better off as a returnee than before migrating or leaving Ethiopia.

While, according to their educational background, the highest percentage of respondents amounts to those who got in the business field of study back in the host country, it corresponds well to the fact that the majority of returnees are engaged in investment. These people however, seem to be involved in occupations other than business in the host countries, as the occupation with the highest percentage was general services while being abroad.

Overall, since most of the returnees are engaged in the investment area, this will be a plus for the country's development as investment is one key input. In relation to this, the

Ministry of Foreign Affairs revealed that overseas Ethiopians and foreign citizens of Ethiopian origin are engaged in different investment areas with an aggregate capital of over 7.5 billion birr (The Ethiopian Herald, 30 May 2006: 10). The areas in which they are engaged include; agriculture, health, hotels and tourism etc as stated by the Community Affairs Directorate in the Ministry. The Ministry also disclosed that the number of overseas Ethiopians and foreign citizens of Ethiopian origin who invested in Ethiopia is increasing and that it has reached over 800 (The Ethiopian Herald, 30 May 2006: 10). Though this data do not particularly refer to returnees, it is an indication of the magnitude of investment in which returnees might also have participated.

On the other hand, in addition to investment, most of them were able to transfer capital to their home country upon their return as more than 80% of the respondents spent their money on assets in Ethiopia.

As Gmelch (1980) and King (1986) quoted in Ammassari and Black (2001) has argued, savings are spent on conspicuous consumption to raise the status and comfort of return migrants and family. In our case as well, returnees spent their savings more on cars and houses rather than on significant and productive businesses. Here, it should be noted that this does not mean that spending on consumption or housing is valueless. It definitely will serve to raise the status of return migrants and their families indirectly assisting the country's development.

In this regard, half of those who possess assets in Ethiopia, own a house, while 20% own business and 10% own shares in different companies, and almost all own an automobile. Most of the house owners acquired their house by buying from individuals (33%) and a significant proportion (27.8%) through the lease system while the rest got their house through other means. This implies that most of the returnees have not encountered problems in acquiring assets as they were employed and were able to save sufficient money in the host countries.

All in all, it can be inferred that return migrants are transferring their capital, which they have accumulated and are engaged in different economic activities, by investing in their home country. Moreover, the contribution of return migrants in the form of paying taxes, importing and exporting products, and employing people is worthwhile and this reduces government expenditure and lowers unemployment rate in the country.

The above illustration clearly indicates that Ethiopian returnees are making a significant contribution to the economic development of the country by transferring their financial capital they acquired from abroad.

2. Human capital

Migrants acquire skills while staying abroad if they study or work in the industrialized countries. Hence, when they return they will bring their new skills and experiences to the home country which has a positive impact on the country's development. Thus, bringing

new skill and experience is what is called transfer of human capital by returnees (Ammassari and Black (IOM), 2001).

As stressed in the literature, the impact of return migrants in the workplace depends on the facts that they have acquired new skills and experience which is useful in the country of origin's context, and that they are willing and capable to apply what they have gained abroad (Ammassari, 2003). On the other hand, according to other scholars such as Sowell (1996), only a minority of migrants have gained skill while working abroad. This is because the majority did not learn new skills since they have been doing unskilled work.

The educational background of return migrants in the Ethiopian case, as illustrated in Table 4, however revealed that return migrants are highly educated with over 70% of the survey population possessing tertiary level education. Among these, 40% have first degree while 17.5% hold at least one graduate degree and 10% hold PhD or MD. Other forms of formal education categories (some college education, two-year college or technical education and others) are also noted among the rest of the respondents.

In addition, more than a third (40%) was in the field of business while 15% were in ICT. On the other hand, other 'field of study' categories (medicine, engineering, law, psychology and others) form smaller proportions. The fact that the majority are in the business and ICT field of study may indicate that the migrants have responded to international demands which emphasizes information communication, and international trade. This would greatly contribute in the development endeavors of the country as the country should move forward in line with international demands.

On the other hand, it may be feasible to argue that there is higher probability of most migrants being engaged in unskilled work in the industrialized countries as illustrated in the literature. However, in this study it was observed that those who decide to return are mostly those who are educated aiming to work and live in Ethiopia. These people not only bring back new skills and experiences but also can be sources of innovative ideas mostly by being engaged in professional occupations.

Nonetheless, the issue whether these return migrants are able to use their new skills and ideas remains as an open question. Some respondents mentioned that Ethiopia is one of the poorest countries in the world, and there is no adequate infrastructure and facility that would enable them apply their skills and experiences. Despite this, however, some have affirmed that they are contributing to the country's development through transferring knowledge by teaching and contributing to the progress of education by engaging in different educational activities, by sharing their experiences in the business sector and applying technology in the country which they have learned abroad.

When all's said and done, the return of all financial and human capital back to Ethiopia will have a big role in both poverty reduction and sustainable development. Nevertheless, it is important to examine both the opportunities and obstacles that return migrants face in order to realize their role. Thus, return migrants can make significant contribution to the development of different areas of business and to employment creation. As affirmed by most of the respondents, the opportunities enabling them to make the said contribution include: better working environment, different initiatives taken by government such as

incentive schemes, upgrading technology, infrastructure improvement, growing private sector, liberalized investment policy and better opportunity to select place of work. On the other hand, the obstacles pointed out by respondents include: extended bureaucracy in government offices, lack of work ethics, negative attitude and change on the part of the community, shortage of appropriate infrastructure that would enable returnees to apply their skills, poor tax system, policy constraints, high land value and political instability.

While the opportunities need to be strengthened and enhanced, both government and the community as a whole should strive and work together to lessen, and eliminate, the above illustrated obstacles.

3.4.2 Suggestions to future initiatives: By Return migrants

The main reasons that are given for migration are mostly linked to the socio-economic conditions in the country of origin and perception of migrants that there are better living conditions in the country of destination.

Almost two-third (62.5%) of the respondents cited absence of job opportunities and low salary offer as the reason why many Ethiopians leave their country. In addition 12.5% of the respondents stated that unavailability of living facilities is an important factor pushing Ethiopians to go abroad. A poor educational system in the country is also cited as the main reason by the same proportion of respondents. Other factors such as stability of government and extent of democracy within the country, and preference of western life

were also mentioned by some respondents added to the reasons of migration of Ethiopians.

Related to this, asked if they believe that Ethiopians abroad can contribute to the country's development if they return, almost all (93.8%) have answered to the affirmative. Some of the common explanations given by most respondents on 'how the Ethiopians abroad can contribute to the country's development' include: enhancement of foreign currency, transfer of capital and creation of job opportunities, bringing new ideas and skills, and knowledge sharing.

Hence, as return migration is a plus to development, returnees should be encouraged to engage in different activities. Most of the respondents have suggested a number of initiatives to be taken by the government, by the community and by the Ethiopian migrants who are living abroad in order to make the working environment more attractive and ensure their developmental contribution. In this regard, the government is expected to facilitate better access to information for the Diaspora, encouraging more research output, creating welcoming environment on its side, and move to the provision of more encouraging incentives.

In addition, as regards the working environment, the government should also be able to provide the people government assurance to work, design initiatives for elimination of bureaucracy and corruption, lower land value, improve the taxation system, educating civil servants engaged in different government offices to be more efficient, and facilitate the improvement and building of appropriate infrastructure enabling returnees apply their

skills and foreign experience. The political stability is also another focus point as the government ought to build democratic institution through the improvement of the democratization process, ensure the political stability, and strive to design programs towards eradication of poverty and achieving sustainable development.

Similarly, the Community is also another factor having an impact on the successful re-integration and contribution of returnees. Hence, a welcoming, supportive and Non-resistant community for new ideas and foreign experiences is inevitable. The initiatives that the community could take to support may be convincing relatives abroad to return to Ethiopia; creating positive conditions to work together with the returnees and adopting culture and peace tolerance; and building motivation and the ethics to work.

Lastly, the Ethiopian migrants abroad (Diaspora) are expected as well to: assist the government in the democratization process; invest in productive activities and create job opportunities; develop a center of communication with the home country; establish ongoing links and work closely with the Ethiopian government and preferably return to their home country.

These suggestions by returnees should be given due consideration in order to maximize the development contribution of migrants.

Chapter Four

Institutional and Legal support for Return migration

4.1 Institutional support

Institutional constraints may be important factors affecting returnees' interest to work in Ethiopia.

There are institutions established to support and provide assistance to the Diaspora. One of these institutions is the Ethiopian Expatriate Affairs (EEA) under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, established in January 2002 as the General Directorate in charge of Ethiopian Expatriate Affairs. It supports the Diaspora by recognizing their roles to their country's development.

In order to put together a smooth relationship between Ethiopians in Diaspora and their country, the focus of the General Directorate are: serving as a liaison between different Ministries and Ethiopians in Diaspora, encouraging the active involvement of the Ethiopians in Diaspora in socio-economic activities of the country, safeguarding the rights and privileges of Ethiopian expatriates, and mobilizing the Ethiopian community abroad for a sustained and organized image building.

Accordingly, the General Directorate is engaged in a number of activities including:

1. Disseminating precise and useful information to the Ethiopian community abroad through various media outlets;

2. Conducting research to identify problems of the Ethiopians in Diaspora in order to improve legislation that is crucial for their participation and contribution; and
3. Ensuring the well being, safety and security as well as the rights and privileges of Ethiopians abroad

For the smooth running of its activities, the EEA has established links with Federal Ministries and Regional Governments through out the country. In order to further facilitate the contact between the Diaspora and their country, each Ethiopian Embassy has assigned a diplomat who is solely responsible for handling community issues.

The other institutions that serve the same purpose as the EEA are regional bureaus as Diaspora sections. These regional bureaus are also supporting the Diaspora in their integration process and by providing information.

One of these regional bureaus that has been established and is functioning actively is the Oromiya Diaspora Directorate under the Oromiya Public Mobilization, Labor and Social Affairs Bureau. According to Ato Samuel Geda, Director of the Directorate, it has been not more than three months since its establishment. He also stated that the office used to function under the President's Office as one wing for the past six months before the establishment of the Directorate.

The main functions of this office are the same as the EEA with an overall aim of enabling the Diaspora contribute to the economic development and democratization process of the country. In this view, the Directorate has a vision to facilitate the re-integration and

settlement of the Diaspora upon their return. This office also helps returnees settle in their country of origin in many ways.

According to Ato Samuel, there is an Oromiya Diaspora Committee established by the government to follow up the activities of different sectors in this regard. The Directorate being a member of the committee implements directives issued by the committee. In this regard, the committee has issued directives for the provision of urban land for the construction of residential buildings for those organized in housing cooperatives free of charge and with lease payments. This directive also allows provision of land individually for those who are engaged in investment as an incentive. He also noted that, so far, 1087 returnees have registered to acquire land.

Though both EEA and the Directorate have the same mission and mandate, they differ as EEA is a Federal one, while the Directorate functions only in the Oromiya region and to Ethiopians of the Oromo origin and foreigners of Oromo Origin. There are also other regional sections dealing with the Diaspora. Nonetheless, they are not well organized like that of the Oromiya Directorate.

Thus far, the EEA has prepared different documents. These are:

1. Information booklet for Ethiopians and foreign nationals of Ethiopia living abroad, designed to acquaint Ethiopians and Foreign Nationals of Ethiopian Origin with services provided by government institutions. The information in this booklet contains services given by the Federal Investment Commission, the Ministry of Trade and Industry, and The Addis Ababa City Government

2. The Addis Ababa City government Acts and Civil Status Documents Service. The main Section of Civil Status Documents Service is the 'Manual for the Issue of Marriage and Birth Certificates'. This will make the process of marriage and birth certificates easier as any body will have all the information they need in this document.

These documents will help the Ethiopian Diaspora get information about the conditions in Ethiopia. The other initiative taken by the government regarding information dissemination is the starting of ETV Broadcasting via Satellite to all viewers across the globe. Ethiopians and friends of Ethiopia all over the world can watch its informative and entertaining shows. This will help in bridging the information gap between the Ethiopians in Diaspora and enables them to follow up the situations in the country.

Most of the respondents have been in contact with a number of institutions. The most commonly contacted institutions were the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopian Airlines, Immigration, Ministry of Trade and Industry, Investment Office, Inland Revenue, Commercial and National Bank, and Ethiopian Television Agency. More than half of the respondents (55.2%) have received support from these government institutions. The institutions have been giving services to the returnees in areas such as import of belongings and investment goods, business establishment, duty free home supplies and vehicles, work and resident permits, and investment permit. However, respondents did not mention any support either from the EEA or the Oromiya Diaspora Directorate. This may be because of the fact that these offices are not yet well developed and are not known broadly by most of them.

On the other hand, most of the respondents (81.3%) have affirmed that the support they received from the stated institutions was satisfactory while some asserted that they didn't get the kind of support they need. Some of the suggestions forwarded by these respondents for the improvement of the institutions include:

1. Training for the employees doing the work and additional work force for increased efficiency;
2. Positive attitudes and availability of personnel in the office at working hours; and
3. Organized information and simplified process

4.2 Legal framework

It is important to link ongoing researches on return migration and development to emerging policy and government initiatives in the field. As a result existing policy initiatives taken by the government of Ethiopia are targeted towards encouraging the return of Ethiopian migrants abroad. There are certain legal documents that encourage the Ethiopian Diaspora to participate in the development endeavors.

One of the key issues is the importance of policy making in the identification of circumstances that favor investment of resources on return as well as type of capital that can be best invested towards development. Consequently, the Council of Ministers has brought in to force proclamation No. 280/2002, re-enactment of the investment

proclamation as amended by proclamation No. 375/2003, hereafter referred as 'the proclamation'. Along with this, the Council also has issued the regulation on Investment Incentives and Investment Areas Reserved for Domestic Investors No. 84/2003, hereafter referred as 'the regulation'.

Often, certain investment areas are reserved only for domestic investors excluding foreign investors in different countries. The main rationales behind this restriction may be to make basic industries broadly available to local investors, to keep public services and issues of national security in the production of war materials from the hands of foreigners (Abdujebar, 2003).

Similarly, in the Ethiopian case as well, the proclamation has exclusively reserved certain areas of investment only for local or domestic investors that are provided in the schedule of the regulation. These areas under article 1 of the schedule cover activities that do not require such complex technologies and can be performed by indigenous technological capacity or domestic know how. In addition, notwithstanding the above provision of the regulation, the schedule under article 2 also reserves four areas of investment exclusively for Ethiopian nationals which are:

1. Banking, insurance, and micro credit and saving services;
2. Forwarding and shipping agency services;
3. Broadcasting services; and
4. Air transport services using aircraft with a seating capacity of up to 20 Passengers.

As per the proclamation, domestic investor means “an Ethiopian or foreign national permanently residing in Ethiopia having made an investment, and includes the government, public enterprises as well as a foreign national, Ethiopian by birth, and desiring to be considered as a domestic investor”.

According to this definition, the proclamation has recognized ‘Ethiopian by birth’ persons as domestic investors if they desire to be considered as one. Hence, return migrants of Ethiopian by birth, though they have changed their nationality as that of the host country, are considered as domestic investors and have the privilege of being engaged in the areas reserved for domestic investors. Thus, the proclamation does not treat them as foreign investors.

On the other hand, Foreign investment is permitted only on areas other than those reserved under the proclamation for the Government (Article 5) or joint venture with government (Article 7) or for Ethiopian nationals (Article 6 of the proclamation and Article 2 of the schedule in the regulation) or other domestic investors (Article 6 of the proclamation and Article 1 of the schedule in the regulation). The government’s rationale for this exclusion of foreigners from certain areas seems to be protection of local entrepreneurs, to avoid monopolies of certain areas and national security. In addition, as the regulation has reserved most of the trading activities for domestic investors, foreign entrepreneurs are left with limited room of investment. This will defeat the objective of attracting foreign direct investment which is one of the tools for the country’s

development. However, the proclamation also has set incentive schemes that neutralize the above restriction.

Coming back to the core of the discussion, the bottom line is that as returnees are considered as domestic investors regarding investment, even if they have changed their nationality, they are beneficial in contrast to other foreigners. Hence, the areas open for domestic investors are also open for returnees.

On a related matter, as incentives are useful tools to attract capital and technology for a country's development, the proclamation under article 9(1) directs specification of areas of investments eligible to incentives to the regulation. As a result, the regulation has specified investments eligible for incentives regarding income tax exemption and exemption from the payment of customs duty.

Income tax exemption

As per article 2(5) of the regulation, income tax is defined as 'tax levied on profits from business and categorized as the revenue of the Federal government, Regional Governments or as their joint revenue'. The regulation has specified activities that are eligible for income tax exemption under article 4(1) as:

1. Manufacturing;
2. Agro-industrial activities; and
3. Production of agricultural products to be determined by the directives to be issued by the board.

However, the mere fact that an investor is engaged in one of the above doesn't make one eligible for the exemption as there are certain requirements attached to it.

Exemption from custom duties

The regulation under article 8 and 9 allowed an investor to import duty free vehicles, capital goods and construction materials (such as machinery, equipment and accessories) necessary for the establishment of new enterprise or for the expansion or upgrading of an existing enterprise. In addition, an investor eligible to import duty free capital goods is also permitted to import spare parts whose value is not greater than 15% of the total value of the capital goods to be imported.

In the case of return migrants, as they are considered as domestic investors they are equally eligible to the incentives specified in the regulation. Hence, the above privileges and incentives can be considered as encouraging initiatives for return migrants.

In addition to the above, regarding immovable property, the proclamation under article 40(1) states that a foreign national taken for a domestic investor or a foreign investor shall have the right to own a dwelling house and other immovable property requisite for his investment. What makes it more encouraging is that the above article includes those who have invested prior to the issuance of this proclamation as stated in the same article of sub-article 2. This is an important provision because the civil code of Ethiopia under articles 390-393 specifically restricts ownership of immovable property by a foreign national.

Thus, returnees, even if they are foreign nationals (have acquired other nationality), they can own immovable property requisite for their investment as the specific law (the proclamation) prevails over the general (the civil code).

The other incentive scheme initiated by government is the exemption from customs duty for returnees for personal and household goods. This exemption is provided in the Council of Ministers Regulation No. 88/2003. Hence, returnees are allowed, even if they are not engaged in investment to bring their consumption goods duty free as long as they fulfill the requirements set in the directive No. 7/2003 as amended by directive No. 22/2003.

Overall, the above legal initiatives taken by the government are some how encouraging. However, more incentives need to be implemented in order to attract other Ethiopian migrants abroad to return.

Chapter Five

Conclusion and Policy implication

5.1 Conclusion

It is clear that most respondents went abroad mainly to improve their living standards through education and to support their families back home, and due to the insecurity they had regarding political stability. Yet, aspirations to live and work back in Ethiopia and family ties are the main reasons for return.

Moreover, re-integration in the home country is not very difficult though there are some who face problems. The major problems worth considering are non-welcoming and resistant to changes and new ideas community lacking work ethics, and also non-favorable working environment due to bureaucracy in government office and other bottlenecks.

The other over riding factor determining the success or failure of the returnees' re-integration back home appears to be their ability to secure a relatively good standard of living after return. Many earn money abroad which enables them to live in Ethiopia, hence, are happy to be re-united with their families and work in Ethiopia, as they can afford to sustain relatively high standard of living when compared with the Ethiopian community at large.

In addition, most returnees are able to transfer financial capital through acquiring assets such as business, cars and house and also to transfer human capital as most acquire skills and experience through tertiary trainings and other studies they obtain. Hence they will be able to transfer both human and financial capital; through working and professional networks.

Many Ethiopians desire to migrate mainly due to scarce job opportunity and low salary. The unavailability of living facilities and poor education system are also some of the factors that are considered as push factors.

In addition, the government is taking initiatives to encourage returnees to involve in development endeavors of the country and the Ethiopians abroad to return back. Though these initiatives are appreciable, the obstacles should be eased in order to make them able to transfer capital and in effect contribute to the country's development.

Finally, the results of this study show that re-integration of returning migrants in all aspects including work environment and social life can be challenging. But it also shows that, with the right support, from government and the community at large, their re-integration can be facilitated and encouraged so that returnees are able to cope successfully with the many problems they encounter upon return.

In addition, the Ethiopian migrants abroad also could be encouraged to return and contribute to sustainable development together with the Ethiopian non-migrant community.

5.2 Policy Implication

It can be seen that Ethiopian migrants have accumulated relevant human and financial capital abroad and that its transfer through return has positive impacts on the development of the country. Although return migrants are in a position to bring change back home, the economic, socio-cultural and political conditions significantly influence their willingness and ability to be involved on development initiatives.

Hence, without good will and planning, the community as well as the government cannot be effective facilitators of the reintegration process. Therefore, it is required that major elements necessary for an effective reintegration should be fulfilled.

It is therefore highly desirable that the government and the community help in facilitating these processes by creating an appropriate policy framework and by promoting better economic, social and political conditions for return.

In formulating appropriate policy responses to this situation, the following recommendations are made:

1. As there are very minimal studies on international migration, to the knowledge of the author, research into the migration both, out ward and return migration, should be done and should be supported with a view to assisting the government to formulate future policies and administrative arrangements to better involve in the re-integration process
2. The findings of this study show that many Ethiopians migrate to other countries, especially to the industrialized ones in search of quality education, better living facilities, and job opportunities. Moreover, lack of political stability is also among the important reasons why people migrate. Thus, efforts to improve housing, education, welfare, rule of law, political stability and access to livelihood opportunities in Ethiopia should be made to attract the Ethiopian migrants. In addition, to support the migrant's decision to return, information on conditions and prospects in Ethiopia should be disseminated for the Ethiopian Diaspora
3. While the findings of this research affirm that migrants' reasons to return are mainly to live and work in Ethiopia, the government should support them by creating favorable working and living environment.

4. As indicated by the study returnees encounter problems of socio-economic re-integration. Hence, existing processes for the reintegration and assimilation of return migrants should be improved and strengthened. In relation to this problem, the capacity and willingness of Ethiopian civil society to support returnees should also be built in a manner that would encourage returnees and the Diaspora as well to participate in the development activities

5. Returnees face problems while in contact with different institutions. This may be because of the fact that there is no qualified manpower to do the job and the already existing ones are not trained adequately. Therefore, strengthening institutional development, through facilitating ways of staff development and equipment development is necessary so as to facilitate their re-integration and assimilation process.

6. In order to alleviate problems of re-integration by returnees, the government should give it serious consideration and create a program where by this will be taken care of. In this regard, it may disseminate return-related information for community and service providers; and post-return monitoring to ensure appropriate and sustainable delivery of re-integration assistance, and make necessary adjustments to the program.

7. The study reveals that the government has taken different initiatives to support returnees. These initiatives include the establishment of institutions that assist and support returnees in their business engagements. Yet, more can be done to encourage returnees and the Ethiopian Diaspora as well. Therefore, the already taken initiatives by the government should be strengthened at the same time working on more new encouraging ones so as returnees could be able transfer both financial and human capital they accumulated abroad

8. Lastly, though there are existing incentives developed for the purpose of encouraging migrants, more encouraging incentive schemes should be built in a manner that would satisfy Ethiopian Diaspora to consider returning and also returnees to actively engage in the development activities

Reference

Books and Articles

- Abdujebar Hussen (2003) *Legal protection of the foreign investors vis-à-vis investment law: A comparative analysis*, Unpublished Bachelor Thesis, Faculty of Law, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa
- Abye Tasse, (2003) *Ethiopian Migration: Challenging Traditional Explanatory Theories*, Paris, France
- African Union (2006) *Draft Strategic framework for a policy on migration in Africa*, unpublished Document, African Union
- Aissetu Barry, Ashenafi Hagos, Bisrat Yared, Mulumebet Goshu, and Selamawit Abebe (2006) *Situation of Returnees from Western Countries*, Unpublished, Graduate School of Social Work, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa
- Akokpari, J (2000) *Globalization and Migration in Africa*, African sociological Review 4(2), pp 72-92
- Ammassari, S (2003) *From nation-building to entrepreneurship: the impact of elite return migrants in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana*, International Workshop on Migration and Poverty in West Africa, University of Sussex
- Ammassari, S and Black, R (2001) *Harnessing the potential of migration and return to promote development: Applying concepts to West Africa*, Center for migration research, University of Sussex, United Kingdom

- Arango, J (2000) *Explaining migration: A critical view*, International Social Science Journal, vol. 52, issue 165, pp. 283-296
- Arsdol, M, Guarin, G and Lam, S (2003) *Migration patterns in North East Asia*, Monterey Institute of International Studies
- Aydemir, A and Robinson, C (2006) *Return and Onward Migration among Working Age Men, Family and Labor Studies Statistics*, Minister of Industry, Canada
- Bhorat, H, Meyer, J and Mlatsheni, C (2002) *Skilled labor migration from Developing countries: Study on South and Southern Africa*, International migration Program, ILO, Geneva
- Black, R. and Koser, K. (eds. 1999). *The end of the Refugee Cycle? Refugee Repatriation and Reconstruction*. (Refugee and Forced Migration Studies Vol.4)
- Clark X., Hatton T., Williamson J. (2003) *What explains cross border migration in latin America?* Retrieved on March 15 from www.cenpo.ro/files/Cross-border Migration. PDF
- Curran, S, Garip, F and Chung, C (2005) *Advancing Theory and Evidence about Migration and Cumulative Causation: Destination and Gender in Thailand*, Princeton University
- De Haas, H (2005) *International migration, remittances and development: myths And fact*, Centre for International Development Issues Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands

- Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) (2006), *International Migration*, United Nations, New York, NY, USA
- Ethiopian Expatriate Affairs (2006), Retrieved on June 5, 2006 from http://mfa.gov.et/Ethiopians_Origin_Abroad/Ethiopia_Origin.php
- Gachter A., (2003) *Ambiguities of migration: Bulgaria since 1998*, International Migration Branch, International labor office, Geneva
- Getachew, M. and Maigenet, S. (1991) *The Ethiopian Revolution of 1974 And The Exodus of Ethiopia's Trained Human Resources*, The Edwin Mellen Press, New York.
- Gmelch, G., (1980) *Return Migration: annual review of anthropology*, vol. 9, 135-159, New York
- ILO, (2000) *Preventing Discrimination, Exploitation and Abuse of Women Migrant Workers: An Information Guide Booklet Back Home: Return and Reintegration*, Gender Promotion Program, International Labor Office, Geneva.
- ILO, (2004) *International Labor Conference towards a Fair Deal for Migrant Workers in the Global Economy*, 92nd Session, (2004), Report VI, ILO Geneva
- ILO/GPP (2005) *Preventing Discrimination, Exploitation and Abuse of Women Migrant Workers*, An Information Guide, Gender Promotion Program, International Labor Office, Geneva
- IOM (2003) *Managing Migration: Challenges and Responses for People on The Move*, International Organization for Migration Report Series, Switzerland.

- IOM (2005) *Internal Migration and Development: A Global Perspective*, Geneva, Switzerland
- IOM (2005) *World Migration: Cost and Benefit of International migration*, Geneva, Switzerland
- Kebede. E (2003) *Ethiopia: An Assessment of the International Labor Migration Situation: the case of female labor migrants*, International Labor Office (ILO)
- Kirdar, M (2005) *Determinants of return migration of Turkish immigrants in Germany*, Turkey
- Lidgard, J and Gilson, C (2002) *Return Migration of New Zealanders: Shuttle and Circular Migrants*, New Zealand Population Review 28(1), 99-128, Population Association of New Zealand
- Macpherson, C (2000) *Some social and economic consequences of migration: a Curriculum paper for Samoa*, Department of Sociology University of Auckland Auckland, New Zealand
- McCormick, B and Wahba, J (2004) *Return International Migration and Geographical Inequality: The Case of Egypt*, Research Paper No. 2004/7, UNU-WIDER, London
- McKinley, B., Klekowski, A., Koppenfels, V., and Laczko, F. (2001) *Challenges For the 21st Century: Voluntary or forced, international migration is a global phenomenon that requires international cooperation among nations*, Forum for Applied Research and Public Policy

- Nicholson, B. (2004) *Migrants as Agents of Development: Albanian Return Migrants and Micro-enterprise*, Retrieved on May 15, 2006 from www.cenpo.ro/files/07%20Migration.pdf
- Petras, E. & Kousis, M. (1988) *Returning migrant characteristics and labor Market demand in Greece*, International migration review, vol.22, No.4. The center for migration studies of New York, Inc.
- Portes, A (1995) *The Economic Sociology of Immigration: Essay on Networks, Ethnicity, and Entrepreneurship*, New York, Russel Sage foundation
- Portes, A (ed. 1996) *The new Second Generation*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation
- Portes, A and Rumbaut, R (1996) *Immigrant America: A Portrait*, Berkley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press
- Seferagic, D. (1977) *Scientific Work in Yugoslavia on Migrant Returnees and Their Impact on the Mother Country*: International Migration Review, Vol.11, No.3, Center for Migration Studies of New York, Inc.
- Silj A., (2001) *Globalization and migration*, Draft work in progress, unpublished
- Sistema Económico Latinoamericano (SELA) (2004) *Current Trends in Migrants' Remittances in Latin America and the Caribbean: An evaluation of their social and economic importance*, Caracas, Venezuela
- Sowell, T. (1996) *Migration and Cultures: A world view*, Basic Books, A division Of HarperCollins Publishers, Inc. NY

- Stalker, P (2005) *Stalker's guide to International Migration*, Retrieved on March 20, 2006 from <http://pstalker.com/migration/index.html>
- Tiemoko, R (2003) *Migration, Return and Socio-Economic Change in West Africa: The Role of Family*, Sussex Migration Working Paper no. 15, Sussex Centre for Migration Research, University of Sussex
- Whitwell, C (2002) *'New migration' in the 1990s: a retrospective*, Sussex Migration Working Paper no.13, Sussex Center for migration research
- Yamauchi, F (2003) *Are Experience and Schooling Complementary? Evidence From Migrants' Assimilation in the Bangkok Labor Market*, International Food Policy Research Institute Washington, D.C. and Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development Tokyo
- Yohannes Gebresellasie (2006) *Reversing the trend of brain drain: the case of Ethiopian Diaspora*, Press Information and Documentation Directorate at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)
- Zhao, Y (2001) *Causes and Consequences of Return Migration: Recent Evidence From China*, China Center for Economic Research, Beijing University

Legal documents

- Federal Negarit Gazeta of the Federal democratic republic of Ethiopia, 8th year No.27, Addis Ababa 2nd July 2002, Proclamation no. 280/2003, *Re-enactment of the investment Proclamation*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

- Federal Negarit Gazeta of the Federal democratic republic of Ethiopia, 10th year
No.8, Addis Ababa 28th October 2003, Proclamation no. 375/2002,
Amendment to the Investment Re-enactment, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Federal Negarit Gazeta of the Federal democratic republic of Ethiopia, 9th year
No. 34, Addis Ababa 7th February 2003, Regulation No. 84/2003,
*Investment Incentives and Investment areas reserved for domestic
investors*, Council of Ministers, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Federal Negarit Gazeta of the Federal democratic republic of Ethiopia, 9th year
No. 81, Addis Ababa 18th July 2003, Regulation No. 88/2003, *The revised
regulations on the importation of goods on Franco-Valuta basis*, Council
of Ministers, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Ministry of Revenue, Addis Ababa, Directive No. 7/2003, *The Directive of
Ministry of Revenue issued on the provision of importation personal
effects duty free or non duty free privileges*, Ministry of Revenue, Addis
Ababa Ethiopia
- Ministry of Revenue, Addis Ababa, Directive No. 22/2003, *The Directive of
Ministry of Revenue issued to amend Directive No. 7/2003 on the
provision of importation personal effects duty free or non duty free
privileges*, Ministry of Revenue, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Annexes

Annex 1

Categories of Migrants

Settlers - People, the majority of whom are joining close family members, with a purpose of residing lastingly in the country of destination; mostly, though not always, the western countries.

Contract workers - People, like seasonal workers or others who will be on longer-term contracts, of a year or more, accepted to other countries for a definite period in accordance with the duration of their contract on.

Professionals – Those who are transferred from one country to another being staff members of transnational corporations. This category is likely to involve fairly small numbers when compared to the others.

Unauthorized workers – Groups, at times referred as ‘undocumented’ or ‘illegal immigrants’ that are considerable in number in most immigration countries. Some of these unauthorized workers enter the countries through smuggling while others are overstaying their visas, or are working on tourist visas.

Asylum seekers and refugees - Runaways who chose to migrate in order to avoid any hazards or risks; they are recognized as 'refugees' if the destination country accepted their request for asylum. Being a refugee is not a matter of personal choice but of governmental decision in accordance with legal guidelines. Nonetheless, in some cases of mass journey i.e., when significant numbers of people flee across a border they simply are acknowledged as refugees without going through the individual process (Portes and Ruben, 1996: 23)

Annex 2

Questionnaire

The objective of the questionnaire is to gather information from returnees who have once migrated to the western countries regarding their motives of return, how they re-integrate with the Ethiopian society, how they can contribute to the country's development and suggestions towards encouraging Ethiopian migrants to return.

This study generally aims at the relationship of migration and development specifically examining the case of returnees and tries to indicate ways of increasing returnees' contribution to the country's development and encouraging those who are abroad to return.

Instruction: The questionnaire has two parts. The first part is intended to collect personal data and some related issues while the second part comprises details of the questionnaire designed to address the objectives of the study. Please respond to the questions by encircling the number of your choice. For some open ended questions please respond legibly. Your goodwill, cooperation and genuineness are most appreciated. Please do not write your name.

Part I: Demography

1. Sex: 1) female 2) male

2. Age

3. Martial status: 1) Single 2) Married 3) Separated 4) divorced
5) Living together

4. Is your spouse from your country? 1) Yes 2) No

5. If your answer to question no. 4 is 'No' which country is she/he from?

6. Do you have children? 1) Yes 2) No

7. What is your level of formal education?

- 1) 12th grade completed
- 2) Some college education
- 3) Two-year college or technical education
- 4) Hold a first degree (B.A or Bsc.)
- 5) Hold at least one graduate degree (MA or MSC.)
- 6) Hold a PhD or M.D.
- 7) Other (please specify)

8. From which country was your last degree or certificate?

9. What is the educational back ground of your spouse?

- 1) 12th grade completed
- 2) College or technical education
- 3) Hold a first degree (B.A. or B.SC.)
- 4) Hold at least one graduate degree (M.A. or M.S.C.)
- 5) PHD or M.D.
- 6) Other (please specify)

10. What was/is your field of study? Please specify your area

11. What was/is your spouse's field of study? Please specify the area?

12. Did your spouse return to Ethiopia with you?

13. What is the educational level of those children who are living with you in Ethiopia?

- 1) Pre-school
- 2) Elementary school
- 3) High school
- 4) Vocational training
- 5) College
- 6) Graduate school

Part 2: Past and Current status

1. Were you employed in the US/Europe before returning to Ethiopia?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

2. If your answer to question no. 1 is 'Yes', please indicate your position

- 1) Executive
- 2) Mid-administrative/Management
- 3) Professional/expert
- 4) general service
- 5) other (please specify)

3. How much on average did you earn per month (USD) back there?

- 1) Less than 200
- 2) 200-600
- 3) 600-1000
- 4) 1000-1400
- 5) 1400-1800
- 6) 1800 and more (please specify)

4. If your answer to question no. 1 is 'No', please indicate what you were doing

- 1) Student
- 2) Self employed (please specify)
- 3) Unemployed

5. For how many years did you stay abroad?

6. How many years since you return to Ethiopia?

7. Did you closely follow the political, social, economic or cultural changes in Ethiopia before returning?
- 1) Yes, always
 - 2) Sometimes
 - 3) No, I do not
8. If your answer for question no. 7 was 1) or 2) what is the source of your information?
- 1) Ethiopian news paper
 - 2) Letters from home
 - 3) Informal means (word of mouth)
 - 4) Books written about Ethiopia
 - 5) Other foreign news media (news papers, radio, etc)
9. In which year did you migrate to the US/Europe?
10. What are the factors that urged you to migrate to the western countries? (multiple answers are possible)
1. Job opportunities and salary offer
 2. Stability of the government and extent of democracy within the country
 3. Availability of living facilities
 4. Educational systems in the country for yourself
 5. Educational systems in the country for your children
 6. Preference of western life
- If others please specify
12. When did you return to Ethiopia?

13. Do you think your decision to return to Ethiopia was the right one?

- 1) Yes 2) No

14. What factors encouraged you to return back to Ethiopia? (Multiple answers are possible)

1. Favorable political situations
 2. Due process of Law
 3. More opportunity to select a place to work
 4. Less censorship of the press and speech
 5. Less restriction on professional and social association
 6. Better salary for professionals
 7. Good research facilities (computer services, advanced technological research equipment, libraries, etc.....)
 8. Better housing, education and health facilities
 9. Better transportation and infrastructure systems
- If others please specify

15. Do you regret your return to Ethiopia?

- 1) Yes 2) No

16. Would you encourage others to return to Ethiopia?

- 1) Yes 2) No

17. What is your current occupation or means of living?

- 1) Investment
- 2) Professional/ Expert
- 3) Management
- 4) Other (please specify)

18. Are you satisfied with your occupation?

Please explain

19. If your answer to Q. 17 is Professional/Expert, what is your area of engagement?
20. What positive changes do you observe in Ethiopia concerning your field of occupation?
21. If your answer to question no. 17 is investment, what is the sector on which you are investing? Please explain why you chose this kind of investment.
22. Are you satisfied with the investment environment in Ethiopia?
1) Yes 2) No
23. If you answer to question 22 is No, please state what the reasons are
24. What suggestions can you make for the investment environment to be attractive to Ethiopian migrants to return?
25. Are you financially better off as a returnee now than when you were living in Ethiopia before migrating?
1) Yes 2) No
26. Please illustrate what achievements you have gained now as a returnee compared to the pre-migration period
- 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
27. Do you believe that the achievements you have gained now as a returnee are the results of your migration? Please explain
28. Do you own assets in Ethiopia?
1) Yes 2) No
29. If your answer to question 28 is 'Yes' please specify and if it is 'No' please explain

what the reasons are.

30. Do you own a house?

- 2) Yes 2) No

31. If your answer to Q. 30 is Yes, how did you obtain the land?

- 1) Through the lease system
- 2) Given freely by the government
- 3) Bought from individuals
- 4) Other (please specify)

Part 3: Re-integration and re-assimilation

1. Do your parents or other members of your family still live in Ethiopia?

- 1) Yes 2) No

2. If your answer to question no.1 is 'Yes', please specify which member of the family?

3. Are many of your close friends out of Ethiopia currently?

- 1) Yes 2) No

4. With whom do you associate most in Ethiopia?

Please rank your answer with a scale of 1 to 4

- 1) Being most often and 4) being rarely

- 1) Other returnees
- 2) Other foreign nationals
- 3) Former family and friends who
 stayed in Ethiopia
- 4) New Ethiopian friends

5. If you have children who came with you, where do they go to school?

- 1) In schools where most foreigners go
- 2) In public schools
- 3) In private schools
- 4) In schools where most Ethiopians go

6. In what kind of restaurants and bars do you prefer to eat?

Please rank your answer with a scale of 1 to 3

1) being most often and 3) being rarely

1. High class restaurants and bars
2. Middle class restaurants and bars
3. Low class restaurants and bars

7. How often do you eat traditional Ethiopian food?

- 1) Almost always
- 2) At least 2 to 3 times a week
- 3) Rarely
- 4) Not at all

8. Do you participate in religious activities?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

9. Are you a member of any of the following?

- 1) Groups belonging to the same ethnicity
- 2) Groups belonging to the same place of childhood
- 3) Groups belonging to the same profession

10. Are you a member of Idir in your neighborhood or in your work place?

- Neighborhood: 1) Yes 2) No
- Workplace: 1) Yes 2) No

11. Do you participate in Iqub?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

12. Do you speak in a language other than your native language with any of the following people at home?

- 1) Spouse
- 2) Children

- 3) Ethiopian friends who are returnees
- 4) Ethiopian friends who lived here

13. If your answer to question no. 9 is 'Yes' or 'No' to all the categories
Please explain why in both cases

14. Do your children understand the current political and economic conditions in
Ethiopia?

15. If your answer to question 14 is 'Yes' please explain how they perceive the situation
and how they feel about it?

16. Do you think your children's view might affect your decision to stay here in
Ethiopia?

17. What are the things you like most about Ethiopia?

18. Do you feel that you are successfully integrated or being re-assimilated into the main-
stream of the Ethiopian society?

1) Yes

2) No, not at all

19. What problems did you encounter in re-integrating back in Ethiopia?

20. Would you consider returning to where you have migrated in the near future?
Please explain the reasons

21. Would you consider going to work in another country?

22. If your answer to question 21 is 'Yes', please write your main reason

23. What are the things you dislike most about Ethiopia?

Part 4: Institutional involvement

1. Which of the governmental institutions have you been in contact with regarding your status in Ethiopia and your return? Please list
2. Did you receive any kind of support from these governmental institutions?
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
3. If your answer to question 2 is 'Yes', please illustrate what kind of support you received
4. Was the support received from the institutions satisfactory?
5. Before you return to Ethiopia, what kind of support did you expect to receive upon your return?
6. What suggestions do you have about how these institutions could improve the support they provide?

Part 5: Contribution to the country's development

1. Do you feel that you are contributing to the development of Ethiopia by working in Ethiopia rather than working abroad?
 - 1) Yes, always
 - 2) Most of the time
 - 3) No, not at all
2. Please explain how to question 1
3. What do you think are the reason(s) why many Ethiopians leave their country to live

and work in another countries? Please be specific in your answer

4. Do you believe that Ethiopians abroad can contribute to the country's development if they decide to return? Please explain why and how?
5. What do you think can be improved on the side of the government in order to attract Ethiopians who live abroad to return to their home country?
6. What do you think can be improved on the side of the Ethiopian community to attract Ethiopians who live abroad to return to their home country?
7. What do you think should the Diaspora do to help (facilitate) the returning of migrants?

Thank you for your cooperation

Kindly, please return the questionnaire for the persons who have distributed to you no later than May 3, 2006. If you encounter any problem please contact me through the following address:

E-mail: aatnafu@aaau.edu.et or adamne6@yahoo.com

Tel: (251) 91 1229402 or (251) 11 1243404 (Off.)

Adamnesh Atnafu

Graduate Student

Regional and Local Development Studies (RLDS)