

**Addis Ababa University**  
**School of Graduate Studies**  
**College of Developmental Studies**  
**Center for Gender Studies**

**Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees:  
The Case of Forced Migrant Returnees from KSA**

**By**  
**Hilawit Worku**

**July, 2017**

**Addis Ababa, Ethiopia**

**Addis Ababa University**  
**School of Graduate Studies**  
**College of Developmental Studies**  
**Center for Gender Studies**

**Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees:  
The Case of Forced Migrant Returnees from KSA**

**By**

**Hilawit Worku**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Center for Gender Studies in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts (MA) in  
Gender Studies**

**July, 2017**

**Addis Ababa, Ethiopia**

**Addis Ababa University**  
**School of Graduate Studies**  
**College of Developmental Studies**  
**Center for Gender Studies**

**Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees:  
The Case of Forced Migrant Returnees from KSA**

**Hilawit Worku**

Name of Student

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

**APPROVED BY BOARD OF THE EXAMINERS**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Adviser

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to thank my adviser, Dr Mulumebet Zenebe, for her intellectual comments, substantive inputs, friendly approach and assistance for conducting this research effectively.

I am grateful for the feedbacks I received from all instructors of CGS through the two seminars organized by the center after the proposal development and writing of findings.

I appreciate the Bureau of Labor and Social Affairs, specifically Ato Dereje Abera, for cooperating.

At last but not least, my special thanks go to the twelve men and women who participated in the interview process of this research. I am profoundly moved by their willingness to share their stories with me in spite of the personal nature and sensitivity of the subject matter.

## **Acronyms**

AAMFB: Addis Ababa Micro Finance Bureau

BOLSA: Bureau of Labour and Social Affairs

GBV: Gender Based Violence

IOM: International Organisation for Migration

KSA: Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

MOLSA: Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs

NGO: Non-Governmental Organisation

### **Glossary of terms**

***Ijarah:*** refers to employing the services of a person on wages given to him as consideration for hired services.

***Iqama:*** workers' national identity card or work permits in Saudi Arabia (Murray, 2013).

***Kafala:*** is a system where domestic workers' visa and legal status are tied to the sponsor; employers assume the dual responsibility of being employer and sponsor. Such responsibility includes different expenses including workers' national identity card or iqama, work permit, and wage. In return, the domestic workers are allowed to work only for the sponsor (Murray, 2013).

***Nitaqat:*** naturalization policy of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, officially known as Saudi nationalization scheme, implemented by its Ministry of Labor, aimed at eliminating unemployment and localizing jobs. It calls for an increase in the share of Saudi manpower to total employment and for expanding work opportunities for Saudi women and youth (Massoud, 2013).

***Umrah:*** is a non-mandatory lesser pilgrimage made by Muslims to Mecca, Saudi Arabia, which may be performed at any time of the year (Oxford dictionary, 2017).

## **Abstract**

This study explores the gendered dimension of reintegration experiences of Ethiopian migrant returnees from Saudi Arabia in to their communities following the massive deportation in 2013. Qualitative method was employed; and unstructured in-depth interview with twelve returnees (six of each gender) and two key informants was conducted. A thematic analysis was done using collection of three analytical tools: The three interrelated dimensions of reintegration (economic, social, and psychosocial) by Ruben et.al (2009); the three stages of migration by Cassario (2004); and Gender analysis. The common view amongst interviewees in relation to economic reintegration was that it is influenced by reasons to migration, the sociopolitical environment at destination, the working and living conditions at destination, the physical, emotional, and sexual abuses returnees experienced. Social reintegration implied to be highly dependent on success of achieving migration purpose, conflict before migration, and opportunities to retain communication with home. Psychosocial reintegration discussed by returnees to be influenced by their experiences at destination depending factors influenced their migration motives, emotional and psychological health, and their identification of themselves as part of home community. Taken together, these results suggest that there is an association between reintegration experience and the domestic working environment, the Kafala system, and the Guardianship system women lived through in Saudi Arabia. These factors by limiting women movement and options of opportunities; increasing their vulnerability to abuse; and decreasing their chance of achieving migration goals, they influence their reintegration experience negatively. Together these results provide important insight on how migration is a gendered phenomenon; hence, a program attempting to reintegrate men and women passed through it, had to be a gender responsive. Moreover, experience of migrants before and during migration is found to have determining impact on their reintegration; therefore, by putting on a gender lens, a reintegration program planning and implementation has to explore experience of returnees throughout all stages of their migration. The study recommends for the reintegration program to look critically in to the factors identified in the study; and to employ a holistic approach (that considers all stages and dimensions of migration, and gender) for successful reintegration of both men and women returnees.

## List of tables

| Table                                   | page |
|-----------------------------------------|------|
| Profile of key informants .....         | 28   |
| Profiles of research participants ..... | 29   |

## Table of Contents

|                                                                                                        |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction.....</b>                                                                            | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>1.1 Background of the study.....</b>                                                                | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>1.2 Statement of the problem .....</b>                                                              | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>1.3 Objectives of the study.....</b>                                                                | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>1.4 Research question .....</b>                                                                     | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>1.5 Operational definitions .....</b>                                                               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>1.6 Significance of the study .....</b>                                                             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>1.7 Scope and Limitation of the Study .....</b>                                                     | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>1.8 Organization of the thesis.....</b>                                                             | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>2. Review of literature and theoretical framework .....</b>                                         | <b>11</b> |
| <b>2.1.1 Return migration: .....</b>                                                                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>2.1.2 The case of deported Ethiopians from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia .....</b>                        | <b>13</b> |
| <b>2.1.3 Reintegration of migrant returnees .....</b>                                                  | <b>15</b> |
| <b>2.1.4 Gender and migration .....</b>                                                                | <b>17</b> |
| <b>2.1.5 Critical overview of reintegration theories .....</b>                                         | <b>20</b> |
| <b>2.1.6 The theoretical framework for analysis of the study: Holistic model to reintegration.....</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Chapter Three .....</b>                                                                             | <b>26</b> |
| <b>3. Research methodology .....</b>                                                                   | <b>26</b> |
| <b>3.1 Research design .....</b>                                                                       | <b>26</b> |
| <b>3.2 Study area .....</b>                                                                            | <b>26</b> |
| <b>3.3 Selection of participants .....</b>                                                             | <b>26</b> |
| <b>3.4 Data collection instrument .....</b>                                                            | <b>28</b> |
| <b>3.5 Method of data analysis.....</b>                                                                | <b>28</b> |
| <b>3.6 Ethical Considerations.....</b>                                                                 | <b>29</b> |
| <b>Chapter Four .....</b>                                                                              | <b>30</b> |
| <b>4. Findings.....</b>                                                                                | <b>30</b> |
| <b>4.1 Description of participants .....</b>                                                           | <b>30</b> |
| <b>4.2 Migrating experience of migrants; reason, route, and process of migration.....</b>              | <b>32</b> |
| Reason to migration .....                                                                              | 32        |
| Route and process of migration .....                                                                   | 34        |

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

|                                                             |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 4.3 Experience at destination .....                         | 37 |
| Living and working conditions .....                         | 37 |
| Physical, emotional, and sexual harassment.....             | 41 |
| Tension and conflicts; ethnical, racial, and religious..... | 45 |
| 4.4 Deportation and return experience of returnees.....     | 46 |
| 4.5 Reintegration of migrant returnees.....                 | 50 |
| The reintegration program .....                             | 50 |
| The reintegration experience of returnees.....              | 53 |
| Chapter Five.....                                           | 65 |
| 5. Discussion and Analysis.....                             | 65 |
| 5.1 Theoretical analysis of major findings .....            | 65 |
| 5.1.1 Economic reintegration .....                          | 66 |
| Economic factors affecting economic reintegration.....      | 67 |
| Chapter Six.....                                            | 84 |
| 6. Conclusions and recommendations .....                    | 84 |
| 6.1 Conclusions.....                                        | 84 |
| 6.2 Recommendations .....                                   | 87 |

## Chapter One

### 1. Introduction

This chapter introduces the issue under study with eight subsections. The first section, discussed the background of the study. The second section rationalizes the study topic by highlighting on the social problem and literature gap identified. The third section identifies the objectives of the study; and it will be followed by the fourth section that puts down the questions the research attempts to address. The fifth section by focusing on the terminologies that are mentioned throughout the study, it provides concise definitions. The sixth section, by highlighting on the literature gap and the objectives of the study, it describes the significances of the research. The seventh section points how the limitations. Finally, the eighth section presents an outline for the whole paper.

#### 1.1 Background of the study

Migration is an inevitable phenomenon; people move both inside and outside their country, for short or long time, forced or voluntarily. Globalization by making communication and transportation easier, it contributed to the increasing number of international migration every year. According to the UN International migration report 2015, the number of international migrants worldwide has continued to grow rapidly over the past fifteen years reaching 244 million in 2015, up from 222 million in 2010, 191 million in 2005 and 173 million in 2000 (UN, 2015). Hence, it can be said migration increasingly become central issue to human existence and development.

Migration is also a complex social issue that presents itself with many forms, multifaceted elements, and complicated consequences. According to Seferagi (as cited in

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

Adamnesh, 2006), when we talk about international migration, the concept of migration can be divided in to three broad parts: life before migration and the causes and process of migration; migrants situation in the host country; and 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. Among the three, even though its political significance has been increasingly acknowledged, return migration is hardly investigated (Laaser 2006).

Migrants return to their country of origin for different reasons; the motive behind returning can be a pushing factor from the host country, a pulling factor from home country, or personal choice. The return of Ethiopian migrants from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in November, 2013 for instance is a forced one. Following the newly developed law of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia that required all foreigner workers to legalize their work documents, more than 163,000 irregularly migrated Ethiopian workers were forced to leave the country (ILO, 2013).

During forced return different bodies will take part in the process of returning; government and people of host country, government and people of home country, and people returning, etc. In the case of Ethiopians deportation from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, government of Ethiopia, international organizations, and local nongovernmental organizations stood up to provide both short and long term assistances to the deportees. This research took the massive deportation of Ethiopians from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia as its starting point to make a gender analysis of the reintegration experiences of the returnees through the national reintegration program. The gender analysis provides an understanding to the shared and unique experiences of male and female returnees in the process of reintegration to their social and economic life.

Investigating shared and unshared challenges and opportunities by men and women returnees to reintegrate is the main purpose of the study.

### **1.2 Statement of the problem**

Migration is a livelihood strategy for many people within Ethiopia, and international migration is a desirable option for both skilled and unskilled individuals in search of better opportunities (Fransen & Kuschminder, 2009). Among the various destination countries, Ethiopians are estimated to be the second largest labor migrant population in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia after India (IOM, 2014). Among the existing Ethiopian migrant population in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, more than half of them migrated through irregular channels (RMMS, 2014). Hence, when Kingdom of Saudi Arabia developed and implemented the “Nitaqat law”, which requires all foreign workers to legalize their work documents and those who fail to do so face deportation, Ethiopians became the majority (within a couple of months, more than 163,000 Ethiopian migrants were expelled from the country (IOM, 2014)).

Deportees streamed in to Addis Ababa Bole International airport for days desperate, confused, and injured in different ways. International organizations like International organization for Migration (IOM), International Rescue Committee (IRC), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and Red Cross got busy in and outside the airport providing initial rescuing services to the deportees with the assistance of the Ethiopian government. While those direct services were easing the stress, the need for designing and implementing a sustainable return and reintegration program became clear. Consequently, the government took the initiative to respond to it through a reintegration program. This study explores reintegration experiences of returnees living in Addis Ababa to investigate the differential needs among men and women returnees to reintegrate; and to learn about their shared

and unshared economic, social, and psychological challenges and opportunities in the process of reintegration.

In addition to the need to explore the reintegration experience of Ethiopian massively deported migrants, there is a gap in migration literature on reintegration and its gender dimension that need to be filled. While reviewing different literatures, we can see migration is increasingly becoming subject for research in Ethiopia. Over the years, researchers, Emebet (2002); Adamnesh (2006); Regt (2007); Kushminder and Fransen (2009); Emerta et.al (2010); Bisrat (2010); Meskerem (2011); Mesfin (2011); Hunnes (2012); Gebrehiwot and Fekadu (2012); Abebaw (2013); Kushminder (2013); Adamnesh et.al (2014); and Melese (2014) looked in to the causes, patterns, trends, aspects, and consequences of migration. Among these, Adamnesh (2006) looked in to the different aspects of return migration without the gender differences; while Emerta et.al (2010); Meskerem (2011); Mesfin (2011); Tizita (2011); and Abebaw (2013) concerned with the aspects and challenges of female Ethiopian international migrants. The last four studies looked in to the women's experience of migration at destination country. Even though they gave focus to returnees, their emphasis was the impact or the reflection of the women's migration stories to their current life after return. There were no attempts to explore the reintegration experiences of the women after return. This gap was partially filled by the study conducted by Kushminder (2013) "the reintegration of female Ethiopian migrant returnees".

Nevertheless, Kushminder's research was a general one which looked in to the experiences of all kinds of female returnees (voluntary, forced, and from any country outside Ethiopia). The study added a lot to our migration literature in many ways; it looked in to the individual female experiences, and addressed the how and why questions of reintegration. However, since Ethiopian government never had a policy or prepared program to respond to

incidents like deportation, the questions of reintegration of the forced returnees remains unanswered by this study. The unpreparedness of migrants to return and the sending community to welcome them; the struggle of the structural environment to come up with a way to serve this amount of returnees at once; and the complex social, and psychological, and economical issues arise with the incident made Kushminder's study insufficient to describe and explain the experiences of deportees to reintegrate.

Moreover, the fact that men returnees were more than half of the total population of deportees (62%) from KSA (IOM, 2014), and all of the aforementioned studies focus were only on the female experience, makes the attempts of the researchers to answer questions under the return and reintegration experience of Ethiopian returnees leaning to one side. Therefore, this particular study by making a gendered analysis of the reintegration process it will capture the differential realities (challenges and opportunities) of both sexes. In addition, the study by focusing on the deported population of Ethiopian returnees; it will provide a perspective to understand reintegration after forced return.

### **1.3 Objectives of the study**

The general objective of this study is to investigate the similarities and differences in the reintegration experience of male and female returnees after their return from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia involuntarily during the massive deportation in 2013. More specifically, the study attempts to:

- Identify factors favoring or impeding the economic reintegration of men and/or women migrant returnees.
- Identify factors favoring or impeding the social reintegration of men and/or women migrant returnees.

- Identify factors favoring or impeding the psychosocial reintegration of both men and/or women migrant returnees.

### 1.4 Research question

- 1.4.1 What factors are favoring or impeding men and/or women migrant returnees' economic reintegration?
- 1.4.2 What factors are favoring or impeding men and/or women migrant returnees' social reintegration?
- 1.4.3 What factors are favoring or impeding men and/or women migrant returnees' psychosocial reintegration?

### 1.5 Operational definitions

The following definitions are selected among different definitions given by different scholars at different time; thus, only the implications made by these definitions are referred by these terms in this research.

*Illegal/irregular Migrants*: are persons who owing to illegal entry or the expiry of his or her visa, lacks legal status in a transit or host country (Regt, 2007). In this study, illegal/irregular migration refers to the men and women who reside in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia without necessary authorization or documents required to enter, reside or work there.

*Migrant returnees*: are persons returning to their country of citizenship after having been international migrants (whether short term or long-term) in another country and who are intending to stay in their own country for at least a year (Dumont & Spielvogel, 2007). In this study migrant returnees refer to those Ethiopian migrants returning to their country after having been international migrants at Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

*Forced return migration:* A migratory movement in which an element of coercion exists, including threats to life and livelihood, on the basis of an administrative or judicial act (IOM, 2011).

*Deported returnees:* those who were deported spoke of being apprehended and detained by the police or other local authorities while abroad because of their undocumented status (Kibria, 2004). In this study I used the phrase deported returnees interchangeably with forced migrant returnees; and both refer to the men and women Ethiopians who returned from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia following the deportation law (Nitiqat) on 2013.

*Reintegration of migrant returnees:* Reintegration in this study refers to the holistic process of returnees being reinserted back to their community through the three interrelated dimensions; economic, social networks, and a psychosocial dimension, and their interactions are critical to guarantee that migrant returnees are able to sustain their livelihoods and identity (Ruben et.al, 2009).

- *Economic reintegration:* refers to having an access to financial resources such as a sufficient and independent income, opportunities for advancement and the basic equipment for a long-term and self-sustaining existence with equal rights for all citizens.
- *Social reintegration:* refers to the possibilities of migrant returnees to become part of local social networks and to establish meaningful social contacts in the home country.
- *Psychosocial reintegration:* ability to express identity, providing an individual with a place in society and establishing connections with that society.

### 1.6 Significance of the study

This research explores the reintegration experience of Ethiopian men and women migrant returnees from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to learn about their shared and unique opportunities

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

and challenges while reintegrating; therefore, the study have implication to research, policy and program on migration.

First of all, the massive deportation of irregular migrants from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in 2013 was may be the first experience of Ethiopia to have the need to provide a service for large number of migrants at the same time; but it does not mean it was/will be the last. Thus, this study by looking in to the reintegrating experience of the first returnees it provides guiding information to design effective reintegration programs in the future. Findings of such study clearly set out the catalyzing opportunities and the hindering challenges of reintegration from perspectives of the returnees themselves; hence, their experience could provide a guide to design and/or review reintegration programs and policies.

Second, gender is an integral part of all social issues; researching migration without looking in to the different gender elements will therefore be gender blind. Men and women depart from their country for different reasons; migrate through different situations; live at their destination differently; invest their earnings from migration differently; treated by host country differently; and they return and reintegrate to their home country differently. Feminization of migration is a good evidence to show how looking in to migration with gender lens changes our perspective of it; feminization of migration evidently showed how women and girls migrate independently in contrary to the traditional assumption that they are passive agents in migration (Martin, 2005). Hence, this particular study, by making gender central to its analysis, it will provide answer to how the reintegration of return migration is gendered.

Lastly, this study will have significance to the academics; by providing the answer to how the reintegration of migrant returnees is gendered. It will add on the limited literature available on migration by providing detailed data on how people reintegrate. The deportee's

unique experience as a person who was part of a massive deportation will provide a different insight to migration.

### **1.7 Scope and Limitation of the Study**

This study mainly focused on Ethiopian migrant returnees from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; experiences of Ethiopian returnees from major destinations of similar groups (with participants) such as Qatar, Dubai, Yemen, Kuwait, and/or Bahrain are not part of the research.

Because of time and financial constraints, the research is limited only to returnees residing in Addis Ababa; and among them only few were willing to be interviewed and be part of the study. Primarily identified respondents, based on systematic random sampling, rejected to involve expressing their exhaustion of being information source for different stakeholders that promised them positive changes and benefits for their participation and being denied of that afterwards. In addition to time constraint; there were high rejection and withdrawal of participants during data collection; hence, longitudinal interviews, triangulation (through FGD), and broader sample size were not feasible to do in this research. Regardless, in order to ensure quality of data, available and willing respondents were interviewed in-depth and their original subjective views are carefully captured.

### **1.8 Organization of the thesis**

Including this first chapter, this thesis is organized in five chapters. The second chapter deals with the review of related literature and the theoretical framework of the thesis. The third chapter describes the method, approach and all methodological aspects that are employed to conduct this study. The fourth chapter presents the findings of the study in three major themes; migrating experience, experience at destination, return experience, and reintegration. Based on the literatures and theories discussed in earlier sections of the study, the fifth chapter analyses

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

and discusses the major findings. The analysis has three major themes; economic reintegration, social reintegration, and psychosocial reintegration. One theme addresses two of the research questions of the research; for instance the two questions concerning economic reintegration are discussed under the economic reintegration theme in the analysis. The last chapter, that is the conclusions and recommendations part, summarizes the findings of the study and proposes recommendations.

## Chapter Two

### 2. Review of literature and theoretical framework

This chapter presents the critical review done by the researcher in the major issues of the study; return migration, the specific deportation case of Ethiopian returnees from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the reintegration of migrant returnees, and gender and migration. After the presentation of the literatures, theories of migration that are relevant to return migration are discussed. At the final portion of this chapter, specific theories including gender as analytical tool are picked and discussed to be considered as the theoretical framework of the study.

#### 2.1 Review of literature

##### 2.1.1 Return migration:

At first glance return migration appears to be a simple phenomenon of migrants returning to their country of origin. However, further investigation reveals the complexities of return migration in terms of definition, categorization, reintegration, and the ability of migrant returnees to impact development in the country of return (IS Academy, 2012). On the basis of the work and research carried out by Gmelch (1980), migrant returnees are those re-migrating to their homeland to resettle. Within this defined groups, three kinds of returnees can be distinguished: temporary migrants (returnees who intended temporary migration); forced returnees (returnees who intended permanent migration but were forced to return); and voluntary returnees (returnees who intended permanent migration but chose to return) (Gmelch, 1980). This definition focusing on the other side of the return (the reason of leaving destination), it assumes return to be the last stage of migration; however, migration could be a cycle. For scholars of transnational migration, return migration is conceived more broadly, as a stage within an ongoing migration of spatial

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

mobility (Anarfi and jagare, 2005; and Eastmond, 2006). Therefore, return migration includes voluntary, involuntary, temporary, and/or sustainable return migration of people to their origin.

Among these groups of return migration, involuntary/forced return is defined as the compulsory return of an individual to the country of origin, transit or third country, on the basis of an administrative or judicial act (IOM, 2011). The administrative or judicial act compared to other involuntary return migrations (conflict or humanitarian crisis followed returns), makes deportation unique with mandatory and state sponsored character; and it acknowledges how it has long been a power claimed and exercised by states as migration controlling mechanism (Gibney & Hansen, 2003; Kibria, 2004). Therefore, the recent massive deportation of thousands of Ethiopians, Yemenis, and Somalis from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia following the “Nitaqat” regulations (unprecedented crackdown on irregular migration as part of a ‘Saudiization’ policy (first formulated in the mid-1990s) in order to replace migrant workers with Saudi citizens to encourage Saudi citizens, particularly the young, to work (RMMS, 2014)) is the compelling factor to cause the involuntary mass return of migrants.

Deportation prevents the deportee from returning to the destination country unless and until the order is revoked; and People who can be deported include noncitizens (including green card holders) with past criminal convictions; visa overstays; refugee/asylum seekers; and those who entered without inspection (Paoletti, 2010; IOM, 2011). Deportation also makes the return experiences of returnees unique when compared to other return migrations; the willingness of migrants to return is highly important as only those who are willing could be prepared through resource mobilization and activating social networks (Cassarino, 2004). Deported migrant workers are likely to derive less benefit from the migration episode in comparison to other

returnees; they are more likely to be among the more socioeconomically disadvantaged sectors of the migrant worker stream (Kibria, 2004).

### **2.1.2 The case of deported Ethiopians from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia**

Ethiopia experiences many types of migration. It has been a major origin country for both regular and irregular migrants; and one of the main routes used by irregular Ethiopian migrants is the Eastern one (Gulf States). The Eastern migratory route mainly leads to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA), the major destination country for irregular and regular migrants of Ethiopia (IOM, 2014). From Eastern African countries, Ethiopia is known to be the major supplier of migrant workers to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (RMMS, 2014). Working in Saudi has never been safe for migrants though; the threatening experiences Ethiopians have working in Saudi causes them multiple psychosocial traumas (Meskerem, 2011).

Migrants either used legal or illegal means to get to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia have usually been in risk of abusive treatment; the Kafala (sponsorship) system of the country gives all power to employers (Human Rights Watch, 2015). It ties migrant workers' employment visas to their employers and gives employer the responsibility for a hired migrant worker; employer must grant explicit permission before the worker can enter Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, transfer employment, or leave the country (Global detention Project, 2016). Therefore, when the grace period of “Nitaqat” Labor regulation law that had been passed by Kingdom of Saudi Arabia’s labor authorities in 2011 ended in November 2013, a detention and expulsion campaign marched on workers who did not have the proper residency and workers who were caught working for an employer who was not their legal sponsor.

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

The detention campaign followed the announcement of amendments by the Saudi cabinet of the 2007 labor law in April 2013. The amendment empowered police and labor authorities to enforce labor code provisions against undocumented workers; hence, following deportation, there were migrants returned to their home countries destitute and with no means to buy food or pay for transportation to their home areas due at times of deportation authorities refuse to allow to take their personal property (Human Right Watch, 2015).

In response to that, coordinated efforts were made by government of Ethiopia in collaboration with various stakeholders for emergency program to receive and accommodate these mass influxes. The relief program was supported by many organizations in providing assistance to welcome them, medical and psychological support, food, sanitation materials, temporary shelter, transportation, reunification with the family and others (IOM, 2013). Considering the trauma experienced during migration and deportation, the inability to gather savings, and the feeling of failure to meet migration goal, the need to a larger rehabilitation and reintegration program was clear. Thus, after easing the situation through the short term services, the government took another step to rehabilitate the migrants in their respective regions. In order to strengthen the government's efforts other stake holders also with IOM taking the lead donated fund, designed programs, and engaged in implementing rehabilitation projects (RMMS, 2014).

According to the Ethiopia Federal Anti-human Trafficking Task Force, the national reintegration has been implemented through the existing structure; all regional governments took the responsibility to run a rehabilitation program using previously existing budgets for job opportunity creation. The program also has been running in Addis Ababa by Addis Ababa labor and social affairs bureau taking the lead while the other stakeholders being the small-scale and

micro finance enterprise, TVET College, Addis credit and saving bureau, and health bureau (Addis Standard, Dec, 2013).

### 2.1.3 Reintegration of migrant returnees

After the process of return, returnees begin the process of reintegration. Reintegration also as return migration, is a complex concept; it is beyond the simple understanding of it as having once old life back after getting back home. Returnees go through the process of adjustment and the outcome of adaptation, culture shock and reverse shock. Researchers discuss integration in the context of returning refugees and argue that the environment to which migrants return is different from the one they left when migrating; and the process of reintegration is more difficult than the initial integration abroad (Preston and Brown, 1993; Tannenbaum (2007); Gmelch, (1980). For Sussman (2002), cultural adjustment is a key concept that measures the degree to which an individual identifies with the home country and the host country throughout the process of migration and remigration—simply put, it is a sojourner's cultural identity (Sussman, 2002).

Return migration besides being simplified, it is also generalized to be sustainable and having positive outcome to home country (Eastmond, 2006). The reality is much more complex, often related to the changed identity of migrants and modified context in their home country (Gmelch, 1980).

*“Some groups of migrants face special difficulties in rejoining the labour market in their home country. This is especially true of those who emigrated for non-economic reasons (e.g. refugees) or for those who were expelled from the country of destination. In these cases, return was not planned as a function of employment opportunities in the home country, and it may be harder to capitalize on the*

*migration experience. This reduces the expected benefits for the home country and also casts doubt on whether the return is sustainable* (Dumont and Spielvogel, 2008, p.199).

Reintegration of returnees is also dependent on multiple factors including the psychology of receiving community and the labor market. The majority who stayed at home may resist the changes migrants bring (Gemelch 1980); and returning migrants may in some cases find that they are resented or even rejected by non-migrants because they are seen as a privileged group (Dumont and Spielvogel, 2008). Mesfin (2011) in his case study describes the challenges presented by the receiving community to female migrant returnees; even though the cases explored in his study are not solely forced returnees, the research found that social and structural unwelcoming factors contribute to the failure of reintegration. The unsuccessful returnee women faced rejection by their families and the community as they failed to meet expectations to return with adequate material wealth and moreover, the returnees experienced shame, felt unproductive and faced outright rejection by their own kin and the local people. Also, they had no access to the formal labor market as they lacked high literacy levels or skills-related training (Mesfin, 2011). Moreover, when there is a mass return of migrants to a given region, their return may heighten existing tensions between labor supply and demand (Dumont and Spielvogel, 2008). Therefore, reintegration is a complex matter highly dependent on multiple factors; its sustainability and /or contribution to development could only be understood by considering its nature (forced/voluntary) and factors revolving it (returnee, receiving country, the social and economic changes throughout migration period, and etc.).

### 2.1.4 Gender and migration

Traditional migration theories has often failed to adequately address gender-specific migration experiences; in the 1960s and early 1970s the phrase "migrants and their families" was a code for "male migrants and their wives and children" (Boyd and Grieco, 2003). Unlike their absence in migration research, the migration of women has steadily increased. In 2013, women accounted for 48 percent of all international migrants worldwide (UN, 2013); and the high number of independent women migration (Feminization of migration) used as premise to advocate the inclusion of women and their migration experience in migration literature.

The internationalization and feminization of migration means that women make up a growing share of those migrating to work, and they are moving in new ways and in larger numbers (UNFPA, 2006). According to the United Nations working paper 2007, feminization of migration can be associated with three important factors; gender inequality in the country of origin, the change in the global labor market, and globalization (UN-INSTRAW, 2007). Women usually are the ones preferred by family to migrate because it is believed that they will sacrifice themselves to a greater degree than men for the welfare of their families (UN-INSTRAW, 2007); they are also attracted by the changing labor market as the demand of cheap female labor from poor countries increased (UN-INSTRAW, 2007); and globalization have increased both opportunities and pressures for women to migrate (Emebet, 2002).

As cited in Kushminder and Siegel 2009, a 2011 survey of 1,282 households with a current or return migrant shows feminization of migration in Ethiopia too; 'there is a strong feminization of migration occurring in Ethiopia, as 60 per cent of current migrants are female' (Kuschminder & Siegel 2014). As cited in Tizita (2011), these increasing number of female migration was affirmed by the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) Ministry of

Labour and Social Affairs (MOLSA) report of 2009 (Tizita, 2011). Among the majority from these female migrants, the relatively unskilled choose Arab countries especially Kingdom of Saudi Arabia as their destination country; migration issues like visa availability, payments for visa, minimum skill requirement, and labor demand from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's side made the country one of the first choices of migration for Ethiopian women (Kushminder, 2014).

Therefore, the women's movement, with its emphasis on the situation of women, caused some to question the near-invisibility of women as migrants, their presumed passivity in the migration process, and their assumed place in the home (Boyd and Grieco, 2003). In approximately three decades, gender and migration scholarship has moved from a few studies that included women immigrants or included gender as a dichotomous variable to a burgeoning literature that has made significant contributions to understanding numerous aspects of the migration experience (Nawyn, 2010).

During the 1960s and early 1970s, feminists acted to address the virtual absence of women in migration research, and the andocentric bias toward women migrants as they are all the time associational migrants. These acts were about remedying the exclusion of women from research (Pierrette, 2000); hence, in 1980s feminist were able to achieve "women in migration" by advocating the whereabouts of women in migration; however gender power relation was yet untouched.

In 1980s and 1990s migration researchers progressively focused on gendering migration patterns and the way migration reconfigures systems of inequality. Even though, most research at this stage focused on gender issues in the domestic arena; as gender is devoid from public sectors; they recognized the inter-sectionality of race, gender, and class; and the fluidity of

gender relations (Pierrette, 2000). The third stage, in 21<sup>st</sup> century, takes gender as a constitutive element of migration; reveal how gender is in cooperated into a myriad of daily operations and social, economic, and political strictures (Pierrette, 2000). Even though, gender progressed in migration literature, the larger field of migration studies has not yet fully embraced feminist migration analysis and theory; women as research subject and gender as analytical category continued to be marginalized within mainstream research (Pierrette, 2000; Nawyn, 2010). Therefore, even though there is progress in recognition of the importance of gender as factor of migration experience, there is still gap to be filled by studies investigating gender dynamics of migration.

Gender as integral part of migration research is also missed in Ethiopian context (see also chap 1.2). The study by Kate Kushminder and Sonja Fransen in 2009, concerns the history, factors, Impacts, and future prospects of Ethiopia's international migration while specific elements such as gender, nature of destination countries, and individual experiences being left out from the center of analysis. Even though studies like this one (Bisrat (2010) for instance) looked over different factors and are general, we could come across literatures that looked in to the female face of migration, the return experience of female migrants, and their reintegration.

Emebet Kebede in 2002 assessed the challenges faced by female Ethiopian labor migrants in Gulf States, while Meskerem Mulatu (2011) investigated the psychosocial and economic problems faced by female returnees; Mesfin Dessiye (2011) studied the challenges and prospects of female labor migration to the Arab Middle East; Tizita Tadese (2011) critically explored and summarized the different types of violence against women experienced by returnees from middle east; Abebaw Menaye (2013) studied the experiences of smuggled Ethiopian domestic workers who returned from the Gulf States; and Kushminder (2013)

investigated the reintegration experience of Ethiopian women returnees. Even though all five studies looked in to the women's experience of migration; there were no attempts of putting gender at the center and look in to the gender dimension of migration in our context.

### **2.1.5 Critical overview of reintegration theories**

Based on the few migration theories that indirectly concern themselves with return migration, acculturation and cultural identity model conceptualize potential of migrants to reintegrate as a one direction process surrounded with different factors determining its success or failure. Acculturation model describes how people integrate to host country while indirectly implying to their intentions and ability to reintegrate back to home country. Acculturation involves a subjective negotiation in which an individual must decide how to adapt to a new place: retain or abandon one's cultural identity. Acculturation strategies can be categorized as integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization. Integration and separation strategies of acculturation focus on maintaining country of origin cultural identity and character; while separation entails avoiding interaction with the dominant host culture, integration is a strategy adopted to "make the best of both worlds" as individuals try to maintain some degree of cultural integrity. On the other side, individuals adopting assimilation and marginalization strategies do not show any effort to maintain their original cultural identity. In the case of assimilation, individuals abandon their culture as a way to adopt and seek interaction with the dominant culture, claiming a new group identity. In the case of marginalization, however, individuals abandon their former culture without taking on the dominant culture (Berry et.al, 1992). Therefore, based on the dichotomous relationship represented by acculturation theorists that assumed to be between old and new culture, those used strategies of assimilation and

marginalization during integration would have difficulty of reintegration since they choose to abandon their culture.

For cultural identity model too reintegration success of returnee is defined on their characteristic of migration and integration at host country. According to the cultural identity model return migration entails re-contact with original culture, which usually triggers a shift in cultural identity of self-established values through adaptation. There are four potential identity shifts: affirmative, subtractive, additive, and global (Sussman, 2002). Affirmative identity shift occurs when migrants experience low adaptation to their host country, maintain home-culture identity throughout their cultural transitions, and react positively to returning by affirming to their home country identity. In contrast, both subtractive and additive identity shifts are exhibited by individuals who experience high adaptation in their host culture and subsequently experience high return distress (Sussman, 2002). The global identity shift “enables re-migrants to hold multiple cultural representations simultaneously” (Tannenbaum, 2007, p. 150). This group may have multiple international experiences which enable them to move in and out of cultures allowing them a sense of belonging to a global community; cultural adaptation to the host culture is often instrumental, which makes return a positive experience (Tannenbaum, 2007).

Therefore, based on the two theories, reintegration of migrant returnees could only be determined by looking in to factors related to the individual migrant. However, there are numerous factors that impact the ability of migrant returnees to reintegrate. According to Rogge (1994), there are structural and individual factors that impact reintegration of migrant returnees: the structural factors include the policies of the government of the country of return toward returnees, the receptiveness of the local government, the attitude of the local community toward returnees, and the number of people returning simultaneously (Rogge, 1994). Individual factors

that can impact the reintegration experience include the duration of the migration episode, the conditions in the country of migration, age, gender, the social networks of the individual in the country of return, and the conditions of the return (Rogge, 1994). In general, viewing reintegration as a two way process between the return migrant and the receiving society and acknowledging that migrants may undergo cultural changes are essential in conceptualizing reintegration (Kushminder, 2013).

Kate Kushminder in her dissertation paper “*Female Return Migration and Reintegration Strategies in Ethiopia*” generalized reintegration is multidimensional; it has four dimensions and returnees could reintegrate differently in each and across all dimensions. The multiple form of reintegration of returnees in cultural orientation, social network, self-identification, and access to rights and institutions, for Kushminder creates the four types of returnees - traditionalist, enclavist, vulnerable, and reintegrated. Hence, for her reintegration of migrant returnees is the process of migrants being supported to maintain their cultural and social identities by the host society; and the whole society acquiring equal civil, social, political, human, and cultural rights.

Other researchers and programs also tried to look in to the different dimensions of reintegration. The International Labor Organization in its report to the reintegration of return labor migrants of Sri Lanka on July 2013, it gives emphasis at investigating both the economic and social reintegration of the returnees (ILO, 2013). “*Effective approaches for reintegration*” were also presented by Fonseca, Hart and Klink by making the triple dimensions of reintegration; economic, social, and psychosocial, their focus of analysis (Fonseca et al, 2015).

To sum up, the analytical framework for reintegration programs currently is believed to be best if multiple components of return migration are taken under consideration. A holistic view of the scenario provides comprehensive information than a single perspective.

### 2.1.6 The theoretical framework for analysis of the study: Holistic model to reintegration

Based on the arguments so far, it is established reintegration is an essential part of return migration, as it empowers and protects returnees by providing them with the necessary tools and assistance for their reinsertion into the society of their country of origin. Moreover, understanding the complexity of reintegration of migrant returnees by recognizing its multiple dimensions and prospects is important. Therefore, the researcher employed a relatively comprehensive approach to understand the reintegration experience of men and women returnees. The theoretical frame work of this research is a collection of three analytical tools: the three interrelated dimensions of reintegration (Ruben et.al (2009); the three stage approach (Cassarino, 2004); and Gender analysis. In addition, two major prospects of return migration (condition of return (in this case - forced return), and nature of post arrival assistance (content of services provided by governmental organization in this case) are considered in the analysis.

For reintegration to be effective, Ruben et.al (2009), proposes availability of opportunities to become self-sufficient, access to social networks, and access to psychosocial health. A person to be considered reintegrated successfully; he/she have to find and define their position in society, and feel sense of belonging and possibilities for participation in society. For that, economic reintegration (ability to organize independent livelihood); social reintegration (getting access to or information on social contacts and relations); and psychosocial reintegration (construct one's identity, to feel at home, safe, and psychologically well must be achieved.

In addition to the theoretical claim on the interrelation of the three dimensions, according to the need assessment carried out by IOM 2013, the deported returnees were engaged in full and part time job with satisfactory payment while living abroad; and now, some of them are engaged in income generating activity that is inadequate to cover their living costs while most are fully

dependent on family; and that created tension between them and their social networks (IOM, 2013). Therefore, the researcher learns about the claimed relationship by the data and theory and the gender dimension of it from the returnees point of view.

The second analytical tool of this research is the three stage approach by Cassarino (2008); Cassarino views return migration as part of the migration cycle; all stages of the migration cycle influencing the willingness and preparedness of the migrant to return, consequently the success of his/her reintegration. Hence, the approach is structured along three main migratory stages: situation before leaving the country of origin; experience of migration lived in the main country of immigration; and return to the country of origin – Post-return conditions. The approach makes it possible to see how the intention of leaving (which in forced return may not be changed after return), experience of migration, and all dimensions of reintegration (economic, social, and psychosocial) influenced the reintegration experience of returnees.

The third analytical tool of this research will be gender. The researcher will be looking in to the needs, preferences, and differential/shared economic opportunities/challenges of migration and return of men and women. The main target of the researcher in general will be looking at the gender dimension of each and every area of returnee's response. Gender will be at the center throughout the research; because, the main target of this study is to learn about the factors that created unique and shared reintegration experiences of men and women after forced migration. Gender is deeply embedded in determining who moves, how those moves take place, and the resultant futures of migrant women and families. If international migration theory is to incorporate gender appropriately and effectively, it must take into account the subtle as well as

the obvious factors that coalesce to create different experiences all along the migration spectrum (Boyd and Grieco, 2003).

Because it is believed they could shape the reintegration experience of individuals, the prospects of reintegration that are going to be considered in the analysis of this study are also identified. Forced return is one of the major interests of the researcher; and if the level of preparedness of individual respondents, their ability and opportunity to gather their tangible and intangible resources needed to secure their return home was discussed in context of each dimension of their reintegration. How their preparedness influenced their economic and social reintegration is one of the focus of the researcher. In addition, elements of service provided by the reintegration programs also scrutinized in the reintegration experience of each respondent.

Therefore, the analytical tool of this study is the interrelated approach emerged out of all of the approaches mentioned above; each dimension is critically observed from the life experience of the individual before, during, and after migration; the effect of the deportation is discussed; and gender remains integral. A holistic approach hence is employed to understand the gender dimension of migrant returnees' reintegration.

## Chapter Three

### 3. Research methodology

#### 3.1 Research design

The research design used for this study emanates from the necessity to achieve the main objective of the study exploring individual experiences of reintegration. Qualitative research design is helpful in the generation of an intensive, detailed examination (Bryman, 2004); and it's important to develop concepts that enhance the understanding of social phenomena in natural settings, with due emphasis on the meanings, experiences and views of all participants (Neergaard & Parm, 2007). Hence, qualitative method in this study is used to look into details, personal realities of shared experiences, and subjective realities of migrant returnees in order to learn the gender dimension of reintegration of migrant returnees in Ethiopia. The method allowed associations that occur in people's thinking or acting and the meaning these have for people (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003).

#### 3.2 Study area

For this study, Bureau of Labour and Social Affairs (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia) is selected as study area. The bureau has been providing the reintegration service for deported returnees of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia residing in Addis Ababa starting from the crackdown in November 2013.

#### 3.3 Selection of participants

The data sources for the research were both primary and secondary; the primary data presents the information gathered from migrant returnees about their personal experience of reintegration both as a result of the reintegration service they received and independent from it

while the secondary data presents an understanding of the reintegration programs - the intended opportunities and expected challenges of returnees to reintegrate as a result of the programs.

The secondary data sources were reports, agreements; available printed and unprinted written materials from Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, and Addis Ababa labor and social affairs bureau.

The primary data sources in general were migrant returnees from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia that are residents of Addis Ababa. Non-probability sampling was employed to draw samples from the study population which enables researcher select participants as relevant to a particular research question (Woods & Namey, 2005). For this particular research each participant was selected using Convenience sampling (is a type of non-probability); members of the target population that meet the criteria of availability at a given time and the willingness to participate are included for the purpose of the study.

The only sampling criteria in this research was sex; since the primary purpose of the research is to do a gender analysis a category among respondents based on sex was mandatory. However, besides that, while selecting male and female respondents from a list provided by BOLSA, there were no criteria to pick a participant. The researcher interviewed returnees that were willing and available after pre assessment for their consent without taking any variables in to consideration. Doing that, possible bias towards returnees based on their culture, age, family background, and even success and failure to reintegrate was minimized.

In addition to twelve respondents, two interviews with key informants were conducted. One key informant is a senior expert at BOLSA; he was one of the officers leading the reintegration program until last month. The second key informant is a microfinance officer; he is

also currently assigned in different area, but for the last three years he worked on arrangement and facilitation of credit service for forced migrant returnees in Addis Ababa.

### **3.4 Data collection instrument**

Twelve in-depth interviews, six with men and six with women returnees were conducted to identify how the rehabilitation and reintegration helped them to improve their lives and to identify their major challenges and opportunities in reintegrating. The interviews helped the researcher to get a detail insight on the reintegration experience of the returnees; and to look in to the gendered dimension of each returnee's experience.

The in-depth interviews were gathered using unstructured interview technique so that the interviews could be open and flexible. The unstructured in-depth interviews allowed closeness between the researcher and the research participants so that the researcher can understand the issue from the participant's point of view.

### **3.5 Method of data analysis**

According to Karval (as cited in Asefach, 2012) qualitative methods of analysis focuses on the stories told during the interview and works out their structures and their plots which contain a temporal sequence, patterning of happenings (Asefach, 2012). In this research, the researcher transcribed recorded data carefully without changing the meanings of respondents' words and eliminating components of stories. While analyzing, the focus of the researcher was finding patterns among the collected stories and identifying the shared and unique experiences of respondents. Hence, the researcher organized related segments of data into categories; generated a description of the context; identified key themes; created connection between different themes; and interpreted the larger meaning of the data without altering the meanings.

Since the initial focus of the research was to understand the differential experience of men and women migrant returnees in reintegration after experiencing forced return, the analysis gave much emphasis for identification of differences and similarities between the men and women groups of returnees.

### **3.6 Ethical Considerations**

All ethical concerns were given due consideration in the process of conducting the study. Prior to the interviews consents were received from each participant; the confidentiality of their response was protected; and their freedom to discontinue their participation at any time they wish was guaranteed from the beginning. The researcher informed the study participants about the purpose of the research they are being asked to participate clearly and honestly; and to ensure the degree of confidentiality, names of the participants is changed by pseudonyms. Pseudonyms are used to conceal the identity of participants and to protect their privacy, as it is an important part of protecting research participants' anonymity (Marvasit, 2004). The researcher also respected professional integrity through exclusively including study participants views and experiences as they were expressed in the interviews.

## Chapter Four

### 4. Findings

This section sets out the major findings of the study; even though the main target of the research is the experience of migrants after their return, in order to see the interrelated aspects of their past experience with their return, the researcher also explored the migration stories of returnees. Hence, the findings are presented in four major parts; migrating experience, experience at destination, deportation and return experience, and reintegration experience of returnees. Before the presentation of the major findings, the subsection below summarizes the description of the research participants.

#### 4.1 Description of participants

The research participated 12 respondents; six of each sex. In terms of age, they were between the ages of 25 and 46 years. Even though all respondents are living in Addis Ababa currently; only two in the men group were born and raised in the capital while only two in the women group are from regions. All respondents arrived to Ethiopia during the massive deportation after staying for minimum of a year. Profiles of both participant migrant returnees and key informants are summarized in table 1 and table 2.

**Table 1: Profile for key informants**

| Name         | Sex | Education  | Educational level | Organization | Position                         |
|--------------|-----|------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| Dereje Abera | M   | Psychology | Bachelors degree  | BOLSA        | Senior foreign employment expert |
| Molla Cheru  | M   | Marketing  | Bachelors degree  | AAMFB        | Microfinance officer             |

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

**Table 2: Profile for research participants (migrant returnees)**

| <b>Name<br/>(pseudo)</b> | <b>Sex</b> | <b>Age</b> | <b>Marital<br/>status</b> | <b>Birth place</b> | <b>Currently living<br/>in sub city of A.A</b> | <b>Years of stay<br/>at destination</b> | <b>Educational<br/>background</b> |
|--------------------------|------------|------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Asefa</b>             | M          | 29         | Single                    | Wollo              | Kolfe Keraniyo                                 | 5                                       | 10                                |
| <b>Belay</b>             | M          | 46         | Divorced                  | Tigray             | Lafto                                          | 25                                      | 4                                 |
| <b>Kiros</b>             | M          | 34         | Married                   | Addis Ababa        | Addis Ketema                                   | 5                                       | 12                                |
| <b>Lemma</b>             | M          | 31         | Married                   | Hararghe           | Addis Ketema                                   | 1                                       | 10                                |
| <b>Mulugeta</b>          | M          | 26         | Married                   | Tigray             | Akaki                                          | 1                                       |                                   |
| <b>Nigussie</b>          | M          | 38         | Single                    | Addis Ababa        | Lidea                                          | 12                                      | 8                                 |
| <b>Alem</b>              | F          | 27         | Single                    | Jimma              | Yeka                                           | 4                                       | 3                                 |
| <b>Birtukan</b>          | F          | 34         | Single                    | Holeta             | Arada                                          | 9                                       | 10                                |
| <b>Hirut</b>             | F          | 30         | Divorced                  | Oromiya            | Arada                                          | 2 & 6months                             | 0                                 |
| <b>Iman</b>              | F          | 24         | Married                   | Addis Ababa        | Addis Ketema                                   | 8 & 5 months                            | 8                                 |
| <b>Tariqua</b>           | F          | 37         | Married                   | Addis Ababa        | Yeka                                           | 1 & 9 months                            | 0                                 |
| <b>Zeritu</b>            | F          | 34         | Married                   | Addis Ababa        | Addis Ketema                                   | 12                                      | Diploma/nursing                   |

### 4.2 Migrating experience of migrants; reason, route, and process of migration

#### Reason to migration

Various reasons such as lack of employment, inadequate income, loses of parents, seeking independence from quarreled family member, peer pressure and/or network at/from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia were mentioned by participants as driving factors for migration. Even though they are underlined and incorporated with other factors, economic problems quoted by all respondents as contributing to their decision to migrate. The key informant, the senior foreign employment assignment expert of BOLSA, also agreed with this. He said,

*“All returnees migrated mainly for economic reasons; either they are head of their family, single, single parent, married, or divorced; they were straggling economically. One may look for capital to start business, and the other may not even have adequate income to feed his/her family; either way they start their journey to fill their economic gaps”.*

Looking at the two groups, men and women, both identifying economic reasons for their migration, women connected it to their social responsibilities while men related it with their personal goals. Even though one of the female respondents, Hirut, identified personal goal, seeking better earning, as one of the factors for her migration; only Assefa, among male respondents, mentioned responsibility to support family as one of the reasons to his migration. Alem, discussed her migrating story as follows;

*“I used to support my mother and two brothers living in Jima by working in one local bar in Addis Ababa as a waitress; I used to get paid 100 ETB per month, and depend on my tips for my rent. I used to send any money left from my tip and rent to my mother. I am hardworking person, but working through out day and night didn’t*

*get me anything. When one of my brothers started his high school, I needed to send more money; that moment got me to my worst, and I started thinking of a better way to support myself and my family; and that led me to migration.”*

The other four female participants also made their journey about the need of their family as a result of loss of parents, unemployment of other family members, and expectation to provide better share by other family members.

Belay who lived in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for 25 years said; *“Before migration, I worked in Merkato employed as a tailor for 10 years. I was active and very good tailor; but, I didn’t have the capital to start my own business. So, when I was told about the money I could earn working as a daily laborer at construction sites in Saudi, I didn’t hesitate to decide”*.

Kiros also shared his reason as follows;

*“I came from Harar to Addis Ababa seeking better income; and I drove taxi for five years, and nothing had changed. So, I went to Saudi seeking better source of income”*.

Peer pressure and/or influence by network at destination were also shared factor both for male and female respondents; based on the information they and their families got about the better opportunities available in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, they made their decision with more confidence. Alem narrating how she finally made her mind to migrate;

*“My sister was working in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; she was the family’s major source of income; and I was following her steps. I was aware that working there won’t be easy; but she told me if I work hard and keep my head down, I will get the money I need to help our family. I was already working a lot and I have meal only*

*on good days; so I figured it wouldn't be my worst decision. I also got my sponsor through her employers".*

Similar opinion was also given by Mulugeta;

*"I never considered or even liked the idea of migration; I was an active young man who had multiple economic gaps but was working day and night hoping to fill as much of those I can. I was part of youth community group at our woreda; and one day while we were having tea, the lack of employment opportunities become our discussion point. The problem was shared by most of us, so, it continued to be for longer time. My friends then started to insist on going together to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; I was not in to it at first, but they introduced me with people they knew working at a construction company to convince me. I thought about it; and I decided to go because the money was far better than what I was making then".*

Similarly to the social responsibility and personal development goals, peer pressure and networks at destination was presented differently for the two groups. The male respondents except to Belay who went through umrah (religious visit), both those went through traffickers and those went through employment visa (construction contract works in this case), went together in group with their informants or peers. On the other hand, except to Iman (also went through Umrah), the female respondents said their networks informed them about the possible opportunities, and one have arranged her employer; but all went to Saudi alone and worked without contact with their informants and peers.

### **Route and process of migration**

Three of the men participants smuggled by illegal brokers; two went through an employment visa (that expired before years of their return) for contract work; and one went

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

through Umrah visa (expired after two month of arrival). There is one woman (Zeritu) participant who was smuggled by brokers while five of them went through a employment visa (Kafala system), and one used the Umrah system. Those smuggled to Saudi starved, travelled in overcrowded boats, spent days sleeping hiding in jangle, walked through desert, and while one of them was physically abused, the two were economically abused by brokers.

Lemma narrating his experience of being smuggled to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia;

*“Before I went to Jijiga to bail out my lifelong best friend from jail, I was a federal police serving in Addis Ababa who had no plan to migrate. But I meet my friend; he talked about his plan to leave the country. He drew a perfect plan of getting to Saudi and working for a great salary for me with assured speech; so, I believed him and after considering how it could change my life, I followed him. My sisters paid for the brokers by giving money to other brokers (knew each other with the ones with me) in Ethiopia every time we got to a border; and the journey took almost three months. While taking boats, me and my friend got separated; so, I went to Yemen along with other migrants. At Yemen boarder we were searched by four Yemeni polices; they were paid off by the brokers, so they were just checking if anyone carried weapon or drug. When they search me, they felt a bump on my shoulder and pulled my shirt to see what it was. I have bruise on my shoulder that I got from carrying weapon during trainings and patrols as a federal police. When they see that, they recognized it, and flipped out; they said I might be a spy. The brokers didn’t make any attempt to defend me when they took me to a confined room underground of abandoned house to torture me. They tied up my legs and hands and suspended me upside down; they punched me and hit me with metal*

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

*taking turns for two days. I thought that was how I'll die; but on the third day, I heard them leaving the house, so I managed to untie myself and escape in a way I still don't understand how. After leaving the house I run for miles without knowing where I am going, forth or back. When I reach to a main road, I couldn't keep up, so my legs crumpled and I lay on the street. I was about to faint when two Ethiopians, a man and a woman, stand by me and trying to talk to me. The woman realizing that I was hurt and tried to help me; she cleaned my face, gave me water, and when she asked the man to take me with them, he said no. So, they took me to the side of the road and left. After resting there for few minutes that I don't know how long, I started walking and crawling to the direction they walked away. A Yemeni man found me, and took me to his house almost carrying me on his shoulder. His wife and children took care of me for days; until I regained my energy and my wounds dry, they gave me water and food. After a week, I thanked them and started walking towards the border to find brokers to come back here. But, when I found the brokers; I was told that going backward is riskier than forward. So, I went to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia with them; and when I crossed the border to Saudi, I didn't believe I made it alive".*

Those went through the Umrah and employment visas, travelled through airline, hence, didn't experience problem in their journey. However, they become illegal migrants after the expiration of their visas, or after breaking their contracts to leave abusive employer and/or find better income. Four of the female respondents went through the Kafala system, and become illegal migrants escaping from their abusive employers' home. Three of the men respondents at

the beginning worked on construction sites, and after their contract ended, they stayed there and worked at different areas without any living or working permit.

### 4.3 Experience at destination

From arrival to deportation, living and working condition in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is described as difficult by all of the research respondents; long working hours with heavy workload, lack of rest, withholding/denial/cutting of salary, and discrimination and abuse in defiance of racial, religious and gender identities are among the challenges faced by the research participants.

#### Living and working conditions

Living conditions of the men respondents described by them as they had options to live separately from their employers which gave them freedom. Two of the men respondents, lived most years of their migration time in dormitories prepared by construction companies. The dorms are described as they were manageable to live by both while the rented homes by the other men respondents described as decent with full access to water, toilet, and air conditioning. One of the men respondents, Kiros, talked about his living arrangement as follows;

*“I lived in a two bedroom apartment for four years with an Ethiopian girl (later girlfriend and wife) who helped me figure my way after a month since first time I went to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The place had enough space to both of us; we had everything we needed including shower, toilet, kitchen, and bedrooms with access to water and air conditioning”.*

Talking about freedom, he also said,

*“Unless you got caught by a police, living irregularly is better than living at your employer’s house. All men except to those who were working on farms lived in their*

*own houses by sharing or renting individually. Living in your own place gives you freedom; you can go out whenever you want; eat what you like; and get rest when you need it. For women renting house is not easy, they have to have man to rent for them or live with them; even when she was the one paying the higher share during the times I didn't have work, the house we were living in was rented under my name. Unless their man company takes advantage of the situation (there are men who refuse to pay their share or scam them on the price of the house) women also had similar freedom living in rented houses. In contrary though, women, even those who are free in their houses, they don't have freedom to move on the streets, they are tied up by a norm that prohibits them from walking on the streets without a man's company".*

Regarding the working conditions, participants described similar experiences in different ways; overwork, lack of rest, and denial/withholding/cutting of salary. Respondents worked for longer hours with lack of rest, mistreatments, and lack of food. Mulugeta when he decided to go to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, he was convinced by his friends the payment he will be getting will worth the hard work he will sign up to;

*"I signed a contract to be paid 120 riyals per day; I calculated the money and I figured I wouldn't be able to get half of it doing anything here, so, I made my decision thinking I know what I'll be facing. But, when I got there, it was beyond I could ever imagine. The working site was on desert bordering Kuwait and Saudi; the temperature is 46°C in a normal day, and the work was cleaning after construction of buildings. The dorm we were provided with had very thin mattresses; after working for over 18 hours we slept on that. For 15 hours a day*

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

*starting from 5:00 pm up to 6:00am I work with maximum 1 hour of break. The work had hazards too; there were some who lost their hands and legs”.*

Zeritu before and in between of incarceration, she worked at different houses in difficult conditions;

*“Five months in jail after getting to Saudi, and I was bailed out by one of the agents of the broker who smuggled me to the country. I don’t know how they dealt with the police, but I was bailed and taken to my first employers. I worked in that house for two years straight for more than 20 hours a day treated like an animal. I slept for less than 4 hours a day; slept on the kitchen floor; insulted and spit on by my madam every day; and my madam used to take me to her relatives and friends too to do their household chores. She made me sign on a paper to assure my salary payment giving me nothing; I was her slave. She gave me only bread to eat; her friends and relatives sometimes let me eat their leftovers. I was getting sick mentally; and before I run away, I started hallucinating. Living and working in that house, I missed the days I spent in jail”.*

The men respondents, expressed how the labor work all of them engaged in once or more times while they were in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia were good paying but extremely exhausting and stressing. The better work line for the men, which all of them engaged in too on their lucky times was Taxi driving; they expressed it as time and energy taking but manageable.

Even though the working and living condition described by all of the research participants as difficult; there were times by some of them it provided them skills, freedom, and money. Among the women respondents, Zeritu spent 10 out of 12 years in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia jail. As quoted earlier, her employment life at Saudi left her with abuse and no money;

but, talking about her years at the jail, she mentioned an opportunity to develop the skill she rely her life on now.

*“My first experience in Saudi was jail; I was beaten, pushed around, and tortured there; but after living two years as a slave working as a maid, I realized the prison was not the worst thing ever happened to me in Saudi. So, hoping to find Ethiopians before getting caught, I run away from the house I was working empty handed. Just before I made it to the area where most Ethiopians live; I get caught by police and imprisoned again. For four years I was living in prison; and I developed mechanism to stay out of trouble. I became submissive and yet active in the things I had to be; I got selected by the prison guards as peace keeper among mates. Through that I got the chance to meet visitors (volunteers) first hand. When the volunteers asked me what I want informally; I said to learn how to tailor. One of the volunteers employed professional tailor and provided interested mates a chance to learn. I learnt how to design and tailor shirts, dresses, trousers, and sweaters in that jail. I was out of prison for 4 months after that, and imprisoned again for almost two years before I came here. Thus, when I went to jail for third time, I volunteered to teach others and improved my skill in there. I had many bad days in prison, but I also had the chance to make the best out of it and get the skill I need and used to start new life here”.*

Belay who is also a tailor too said,

*“I was a tailor before going to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; but there I became a great one. I worked with different people and learnt different ways of tailoring from each of them. I worked with Turkeys, Kingdom of Saudi Arabians, Indians,*

*Indonesians, and other Ethiopians; all of them had different skills and I got to learn all of them”.*

In general, all participants, men and women, had experienced harsh working conditions; however, two of the women and two of the men respondents recognized the positive thing they got from it. Besides Belay, Mulugeta started his current cleaning business along with his friends after years of working as cleaners in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Hirut too, even though she didn't make it her business now; she said she developed great skills of housekeeping and cooking while she was working for her only employer in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for two years.

### **Physical, emotional, and sexual harassment**

Rights of participant migrants discussed to be violated by employers, the structural system of the country, citizens of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and by each other. Looking at the responses of participants of the research in general, those lived in their own spaces or together with their friends, experienced similar form of abuses while those lived in their employer's residence shared similar experience. Iman, among the female respondents, lived with her husband in a rented house, and Zeritu was in prison for almost ten years in the twelve years she had been in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Hence, while Iman's abuse experience is found to be similar with the men respondents; Zeritu's found to be unique from all of them.

The Kafala system in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia explicitly entitles employers to control employees' right to change employment and leave the country. According to the respondents, the system besides giving employers the power to own their employees, it implicitly avoids questioning their accountability. Zeritu, worked for few months at two houses in the different period she was not in prison; both of her employers denied her salary; she got her Iqama through

brokers but was given directly to her employers. Because she doesn't have her document she was imprisoned by her employers. Zeritu said;

*“In Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, I was never free; I was prisoner either in the prison or outside. I was denied of my salary by both of my employers; I was obligated to over work by my first employer; and I was subject of emotional abuse by my second employer. At my first house, I worked for my madam and her relatives with no pay and food; and at my second house, my madam used to spend her day insulting me and thinking ways to torture me. It was when my second madam's husband tried to rape me that I run away and gave my hand to the police”.*

Being legal in Saudi means being property of someone in exchange. Asefa discussing why he chose to be illegal, he said;

*“When I first went to Saudi to my first construction work, I had the living/working permit (Kafala). But, since I have seen the money cost and the abuse I could be exposed to as a result of having a sponsor, I lived in Saudi without it for years. I know women working for years without any payment, and I had a friend paying lots of money to have the permit. You have the document or not, you are at risk of abuse; the Iqama saves you only from prison. I chose to manage my life around the fear of being caught by police than being controlled by individual”.*

In addition to the Iqama, women are exposed to more risks because of Sharia law of the country. Among the six respondents, Iman had the better freedom; she lived with her husband, never been victim of harassment by her employers, and had the opportunity to choose her employers because of the network she had in the country. However, discussing the structural environment of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, she said,

*“The Iqama ties you to your employer, so, if you get good employer, the vulnerability comes with the system also goes away. So, I never had been harassed by employer because I always find my employment through my father’s friends there. However, I had difficulties of moving in the country because women are not allowed to. I was victim of policy abuse; even going to my work place with my husband or someone sent by my employers, police stopped me, searched me in undignifying manner, and took me to station without a reason. I had a friend who was thrown to jail while running to pharmacy to bring pills for her sick roommate; she was taken by the police without being questioned of her status. So, living in Saudi as immigrant is very difficult, and living as women makes it worse”.*

Except to Iman, all women respondents were subjects of employer harassment. Birtukan living and working in five different houses she was abused by all of them, and she narrates her story as follows;

*“I don’t know what is wrong with me, but I never been employed by a good boss. At my first two houses I suffered from overload of work, lack of sleep, and deprivation of food. At my third, fourth, and fifth house, I was harassed by my madams and their men. At my third house, the husband was famous to his abusive behavior; there were three servants at the house and he approached all of us at different time. He had three wives; and I was hired to his first wife. She knows his behavior; so, she denies me water to clean myself and she used to call me “whore” if she thinks I looked good. My poor hygiene and dressing however didn’t stop her husband from harassing me; he tried to rape me three times, and at last I run away. At my fourth house I was raped by the first son of my madam; I still don’t understand what my*

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

*madam was thinking, but I knew she set me up to it. She told me to wash myself and gave me her dress to try on; while I was changing her son passed her and came to me. She sat in the next room when I shout throughout it. Finally, at my fifth house, I was raped by the head of the house multiple times and got pregnant. When he realized I got pregnant, he promised he will take care of me and rented me an apartment. I gave birth to my son there, and was deported by authorities without letting him know of my leaving. After all of those years, I came back to my country with a new baby emotionally disturbed”.*

Asefa talked about the abuse men and women migrants are susceptible to; he described how abuse is experienced by men and women differently as follows:

*“My salary had been withheld by my first employers; I got less money from what I had agreed on; I was bitten by gang and robbed; and I had been physically abused by group of police men without a reason. Even though each of us lived different life, men migrants as I told you, we are victims of more of physical abuse. Unless we get killed we have better chance of getting better from the abuse we experienced. However, women usually are abused sexually; that kind of situation messes your mind not your body. I had a neighbor whose wife was raped and kidnapped by group of police men; he was asked to pay money for her release. The police men abused the woman in many ways that she became mentally sick over time; she had to come to Ethiopia for treatment. You know I can say my problem is big when I face it, but may seem easy for other person; but, the situation you see there is incomparable between men and women. It is not only for them, but for anyone who*

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

*see what they have to go through, their life is very difficult, and the harm they bear is beyond what you can be told”.*

### **Tension and conflicts; ethnical, racial, and religious**

Respondents talking about their life outside work; they discussed the ethnical, religious, and racial tensions and conflicts existing between Ethiopians, Arabs and Ethiopians, and Ethiopians and mixed race Kingdom of Saudi Arabians.

Asefa said;

*“Ethiopians became harsh to one another over the years; there is segregation among Ethiopians living in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and since we are not that many as we are here, you feel it. Munifah is a place where most Ethiopians live in Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; in there, there is a place where Tigriyans live separately from Oromos. There are Ethnic groups who lived together, I first did, but, mostly you see how negatively they treat each other; it is all wrong”.*

Iman on the other hand talked about the religious discrimination saying,

*“I am a Muslim so, I was never been mistreated by anyone based on my religion; but a woman working in the same house with me was treated differently by the family just because they have a hunch that she is a Christian. The madam once dragged her out of the kitchen and slapped her saying ‘you ruined our food with your evil spirit’”.*

Belay agreed with this by mentioning how he lost his deal to start bigger garment business with one Kingdom of Saudi Arabian man because his employees convinced the man that they are truly Muslims and he is acting.

*“The man knew me for years and wanted to work with me; he even gave me an advance payment to buy few materials. Just before we started our business, I was caught by the police and deported; so, when I was here for a month and fifteen days to re-apply a visit visa, my employees told on me that I am Christian. He automatically changed his words, and found them partners when I came back”*

Regarding racial discriminations, Lemma said,

*“In Riyadh, there are many Ethiopians, Eritreans, and Yemen mixed Kingdom of Saudi Arabians; and Ethiopian are not liked either by the mixed Saudi’s or Eritreans. There is always tension between us and them; especially the mixed races, they hate us. During the deportation the mixed Kingdom of Saudi Arabians killed one Ethiopian man and raped one Ethiopian woman; that created big conflict among the two. The conflict was out of police control too; I still don’t know how I managed to escape out of that and got to our embassy”.*

In general, the ethnical among, and thereligious and racial discrimination on Ethiopian migrants by different people, was discussed as one of the challenges at destination by the study participants.

### **4.4 Deportation and return experience of returnees**

Even though the deportation policy was made public and all research participants confirmed that they had the information before the end of the grace period; except two men (Assefa and Belay) and one woman (Zeritu), all participants returned without being ready. They all had the information clearly on the decision and the grace period of the policy; but they said, they didn’t think the implementation of it will be strict. According to the respondents, the policy was not the first to be announced on immigrants, and deportation is not new practice in Kingdom

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

of Saudi Arabia. Most heard or experienced a time where prior policies were made and yet most migrants stayed; and most said deportation is always been a practice by the country taken frequently to manage irregular migration. Iman stayed back when her husband left during the grace period; and she described her deportation process as follows;

*“All the time I have been in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, I spent half of my earning for our family there and half of it for my sisters here. It was when my baby is born that I realized I need to save more; but just after few months, the policy was out and the grace period started. I sent my baby with my friend here to my sisters before the grace period began; and my husband decided to leave when he saw the emerging tension between mixed race Saudis and Ethiopians. My husband didn’t like what he was seeing around our living area and also his work place; so, during the grace time, leaving everything behind to me, he came to Ethiopia. I stayed hoping the tension will go down; but just after the grace time ended, people started to be killed and thrown out of their houses. Kingdom of Saudi Arabian’s are also made accountable by the policy if they hired or rented house to irregular migrants; so, I was fired by my madam and told by my land lords to leave their house in three days. It was at that moment that I realized I am not ready to come home and I don’t want to; but I didn’t have option. I tried to find a way to save my assets; in three days I was not able to find anyone who could buy me off my furniture. Hence, I collected the things I can carry and gave my hands to the police; before being taken to the airport, I stayed in prison for 10 days”.*

Similarly, except to Assefa who started his process of leaving before months, Belay who managed to stay at relatives, and Zeritu who was already in prison, all participants spend few

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

days (5 up to 10) in prison and ‘prison like warehouses’ before being taken to the airport. At their stay, they were given food; but because of the suffocated as a result of their large number, and the absence of sleeping space, their time during the deportation process was difficult.

Birtukan was taken by police from her apartment without collecting her belongings; and she tells her deportation story as follows;

*“I was cooking for my baby, when policy knocked my door; I heard about the policy on television, but I was planning to hide not to leave. The police men told me to show my legal documents or leave to the station with them; so, I grabbed my baby, picked up my money, few cloths for my baby, and left. You will be looked in the computer to check if you arrived legally; and if you did, you will stay for longer days to check if you didn’t commit any crime. Hence, since I used to have sponsor; I was interrogated on where I worked after running away from my first house. I denied that I had employments, because it can take more process. So, they took me to a prison like warehouse located far from the city; there were no shops or anything around it. The warehouse is located in middle of farms; it is storage for agricultural products. There were many people there; both me and my baby cannot sleep or eat; other deportees tried their best to help me, but it was the hardest 5 days. I was worried about my baby; he couldn’t breathe or eat”.*

After staying for few days at the warehouses and prisons, migrants were taken to the airport and travelled directly to Ethiopia. At their arrival, five of each group respondents received assistance from governmental and non-governmental organizations; Birtukan continuing to narrate, said, *“At the airport, there were many people; we were large in number, but so did the assistant providers. Immediately after my entry to the airport; I was led to a table for registration;*

*then to my baby checkup table, than to my health checkup table; then I was given 900 birr; and finally they assigned me to shelter behind the airport. I had my two sisters in Addis, but I was not ready to face them with at the time, so, I stayed for 6 days at the shelter”.*

Belay even though planned his leave after the policy had been declared, he said he was too scared to face his family and to face the change. He said,

*“I lived in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for almost 25 years and I was comfortable there than here; lots had been changed in Ethiopia since I left. I was too scared to call my family and to start thinking of the future; so, after arrival I went directly to a hotel near to Gerji to give myself a bit more time to manage”.*

Unpreparedness to think of the future and to plan life ahead was also a feeling shared by Iman, Assefa, Hirut, Tariqua, and Kiros. Zeritu said,

*“Even though I was in prison, my mind was waiting for the moment I leave that country; when a police came and told all of migrant prisoners about the policy and the availability of the opportunity to go to Ethiopia, I didn’t hesitate to take it”.*

The only legal migrant who become part of the deportation process at the end was Alem. Alem was convinced by another Ethiopian who started working as cleaner before months from the deportation to run away and join other Ethiopian working in café. Alem narrates her change of status from regular to irregular migrant and her deportation story as follows:

*“I was working for a woman who was second wife to her husband; she didn’t have children, so the work was not much. However, after few months she started taking me to her relatives to serve them; after working for few times, she suggested making it business. It is called Ijarah; I’ll go to different houses and work, and she shares my payment. I was already working too much, so, I figured why not got paid. I*

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

*worked for almost four years, and I saved around 100,000 ETB only from that. During the grace period, one of her cleaners (Ethiopian) convinced me if I invest this money to a café business owned by her friends, I could double it in few months. I took few days, but finally I agreed and runaway with her. On our way, we got in middle of police and immigrants conflict; and when a guy get shot and fall down next to me, I shouted. Noticing my accent (our faces were covered) the police started to chase us; in the middle I fell down from the stairs and got caught. They arrested me and took all my saving; just because of my decision to run away, I became empty handed deportee within a day. I was arrested for 10 days; I was mad at myself, I hated myself; and finally, I got deported empty handed with one leg barely functioning”.*

In conclusion, as all of the research respondents knew about the policy, but hoped and stayed unprepared to leave; hence, it can be said, return of migrants were informed but unprepared. The deportation in general put them through a process that was not comfortable to eat or sleep; and the welcoming at their arrival described to be good enough by all of them. Their mentality of wanting to stay, and having no clear plan of the future described as it made their return frustrating by ten respondents out of fourteen.

### 4.5 Reintegration of migrant returnees

#### The reintegration program

According to Ato Dereje Abera, the senior foreign employment assignment expert of BOLSA, the reintegration program provided to the forced returnees of 2013, is the first of its kind. Following to their mass return, Ethiopian government called for assistance from the international community, and both local and international organizations contributed in the short

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

and long term assistance. The reintegration program was planned by MOLSA and passed down to regional governments for implementation; the key informant said,

*“The program is big, but it was passed to us as one activity along the labor and social issues we are committed to. After getting registered at their Kebele, we send them to micro finance office of their location”.*

He also said returnees were called out for registration and first level training through media; and returnees also confirmed their start of the reintegration is from the call out and the training.

As it is written down on the plan document of the foreign employment assigning team, and a special newsletter published by BLOLSA on December, 2016, the reintegration program has three major components; economic, social, and psychological. The psychological preparation training given by the office for 3,400 returnees was carried out at Kokeb meeting whole around Megenagna for hundreds of people at a time. Belay described the training as follows,

*“For consecutive six days I received my first training; it was an informing platform on the opportunities available in the city to returnees to re-engage economically. Few returnees got back before us and built successful businesses were part of the training; they shared their testimonial stories as motivation”.*

Ato Dereje gave similar description of the training and added,

*“The training was motivational but was not delivered as a psychological intervention; the setting, number of people, and the program itself was not effective to be called psychological intervention for reintegration”.*

In response to the need of returnees with psychological problems, Ato Dereje mentioned the referral system their office used as it had been complementary to the program. Local organizations dedicated to deliver psychosocial and psychiatric services previously to the mass

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

deportation were targeted and communicated. Only female returnees who didn't have family or not able to be reached, were referred to these organizations to be supported with their mental health and living condition. In general, the national reintegration program set out the one week training as its only psychological reintegration element.

To address the need for social reintegration of returnees, BOLSA committed itself on community outreach awareness creation activities.

Using existing organizational institutions and social structures in local communities, it was planned to reach 1,500 people with awareness creation discussions through a two times per month campaign in five sub cities; and 19121 (127.47%) people were able to be reached.

The economic reintegration on the other hand, had two types of interventions; employment and entrepreneurship. According to the special edition newsletter of BOLSA, except to 666 returnees, who portion of them started their own business, become mentally unable to function properly, and refused to continue in the process; all returnees registered to the psychological preparation continued to receive service for economic reintegration. Among these returnees, 1184 of them (337 men and 838 women) choose to engage in entrepreneurship and formed 559 enterprises among each other. The other 1,550 returnees got training on the area of their choice and found/assigned to employment (BOLSA, 2016; page 4).

Ato Dereje describing how returnees start their business through the reintegration program said,

*“People who choose to involve in business were trained, organized in groups to form enterprise, and sent to the microfinance Bureau of Addis Ababa. The Bureau then allocated them with spaces and credit to work with”.*

According to Ato Molla Cheru, microfinance officer at Addis Ababa Micro Finance Bureau during the time, the allocation of space and credit varied from group to group. Those enterprises asked for credit with better savings got better amount of money while those enterprises composed of economically weaker members got smaller amount of money. The space for work also was allocated based on the type of business they choose to do; those involved in services are allocated to relatively active areas than those involved in industrialization. He used as an example and compared two enterprises, that one member of each are participant of this research, to show the difference in resource allocation. The enterprise Lemma is member of, a brick factory, was discussed by him as having the most far located places allocated by the agency while the enterprise Assefa is member as located at the center of the city in Mesalemiya as they provide restaurant service.

In general, the reintegration program found to have three major divisions; economic, psychological preparation, and social. The economic component is referred as the strongest and most structured by the key informants.

### **The reintegration experience of returnees**

In the discussions about their adjustment and reintegration after return, the study participants talked about their social networks, the structural system for reintegration, and their personal feelings that hindered and/or catalyzed their reintegration. The most discussed factor as a shared opportunities are the availability of the reintegration program, the progressive change in attitude of the community towards them, and the motivation they got from each other. On the

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

other hand the most shared challenges by the study participants were the bureaucracy they have to deal with for economic reintegration, facing the sense of failure just after return, rejections by social networks at the beginning, and unaddressed questions and needs by the program.

Regarding to their adjustment back in to the social and economic environment, respondents experienced mixed vibe from the community and the structural environment. Belay said,

*“After arriving to the airport I headed to a hotel; after staying there for five days, I met a guy who proposed me a spare room to stay. I was welcomed open handed by a stranger; but when I met my family after two weeks, they were looking at my hands wondering what I have to give them. It was confusing; some get that you were suffering, and some don’t. After months though, my family also become supportive, especially after I started working, everyone become supportive. I think people are either expecting you to do something for them, or are afraid that you seek their support”.*

Similarly, Zeritu’s, Alem’s, Kiros’s, and Lemma’s families showed their expectation to provide gifts and/or contributions at the beginning; but later after observing their situation progressively become supportive. Alem said,

*“I came literally empty handed; no baggage, no money, or nothing. I stayed for days at a shelter; then after staying for a week at my old house renter’s, I went to my village Limmu in Jimma. When I stayed for a week at my old land lord’s house; they were empathetic. They gave place to sleep, food to eat, even offered me money to go to hospital (my leg was injured from falling while being raced by police during deportation). But, when I got to my family, except to my mother, everyone*

*was showing their expectation; and when they realize I was not able to provide, they started to show their rejection. My brothers even seeing my injury and how my moral was crushed, they asked me to buy them “bajaj” (a three wheel vehicle) and help them open up a video store. It was all funny and confusing; I tried but I couldn’t ignore it. So for few days the thinking that I should have been smart to fulfill my primary goal of my migration which is supporting my family almost killed me. But my mother was supportive, after taking me to hospital to be treated, she gave me money and told me to come to Addis. My brothers also started to show their support over time”.*

Analyzing her own situation, Zeritu relates the interventions by different originations and the change in attitude in the community as follows,

*“I came empty handed, I was happy to be here, but again I was confused. My family welcomed me at the airport and took me; but, living with them they showed their disappointment in many ways. I can’t tell you saying this and that, but I felt their disappointment and judgment, and it made me want to kill myself. I was unhappy; so, I begged my mother for some money, rented a one room house, and left from my families. There I bought few things and started to make clothes; people who knew I was a returnee pointed their figures at me, called me prostitute, and reported me to police for working without permit. I felt their hate every day; but there were people who were supportive, who connected me with merchants, and who informed me about available opportunities to returnees. Those few supportive people gave me energy; and I felt the change in attitude among those reflecting their hate towards me too. When police came after hearing report about my unregistered work, they*

*tell me to try to avoid conflicts; and officials and civilians were explaining my side to those who were against me. May be I cannot say which bring what change; but, I saw people increasingly becoming positive towards returnees; and I think the program and involvement of multiple bodies brought the change. Young people were volunteering to provide assistance, the media was awakening the community, and time to time people were getting what we went through”.*

While those mentioned above were straggling with mixed feelings, Asefa, Hirut, Mulugeta, Iman, and, Nigussie were welcomed by their families, relatives, and friends open handed. However, they also faced some challenges in their social lives; Hirut’s brothers were supportive, but were putting pressure on her to start family. She explains her situation as follows;

*“My brothers are happy about my return; they never wanted me leaving. I went seeking opportunity to earn and save some money to start new business. They said I don’t need to pressure myself for getting successful; they wanted me to have some break for myself. When they heard about the reintegration program, they came to me and said I can be part of it if I am ready and also I can wait if I am not ready. They are protective and supportive; so, out of concern, they started to ask me about my plan to start family. Our eldest brother even started to bring men to me; he didn’t mean to push me, but he was”.*

Iman also said;

*“My husband, my sisters, and few friends prepared a welcoming party for my arrival; everyone was happy about my return. Especially my husband wanted me to relax; and he started to worry much. He engaged himself with many things to make me feel secured economically; but, that was stressing me. In addition to that, the*

*city was surprising for me; lot was changed and everything became expensive. I went out to buy milk for my baby and used double of the money I planned to. The expensiveness of life in Ethiopia made me realize I should do something more if I want to survive. Everything is expensive here, and the realization that I need a lot more than what I have to raise a child stressed me out; there are times I feel like crying with no reason; I am so scared for myself and for my baby”.*

On the other hand some respondents were rejected by their families; Birtukan was kicked out from her sisters’ house while Tarkqua is still straggling with her husband’s verbal and economic abuse. Tariqua’s said her husband use every chance to deny her money for household consumption saying ‘use your prostitute money’; and he talks about her disobedience to him and her ‘shame full’ act in Saudi to her children. She said, *“He assumes I was commercial sex worker while I was in Saudi; and whatever I try to say anything, he call me ‘slut’ and dismisses me”*. On the other hand, Birtukan’s sisters were mistreating her and her baby for almost a year to show their rejection. Birtukan with watery eyes and trying to hold in her emotion said,

*“My sister once picked up my baby from her bed and put him on the floor; and she called on me and said ‘keep your bastard out of my room’. What a person could do any more than that to hurt you. My other sister was not much better too; she insulted me whenever she can. Neighbors were also pointing at me; and I knew everyone was showing their disapproval to my baby. I thought of remigration, killing myself, and becoming commercial sex worker; but having my baby on my hand helped me ignore all those feelings and hope for better future”.*

In relation to their ability to access resources, opportunities, and basic services to establish a self-sustained livelihood, participants talked about the elements of the reintegration

program by connecting it with other available opportunities and their existing resources and skills. Assefa started talking about the reintegration program and his experience of economic reintegration by saying “I was lucky having the support of my family and friends; you cannot have either the motivation or resource to restart your life again without having people around you. ‘Sew le sew medhanitu new’”. He as most of respondents started his engagement in the program by participating in the psychological preparation training. He said,

*“The training was motivating; it was a good start for most of us; at least it gives you hope”.*

After the training, all of the study participants except to Zeritu, Belay, and Mulugeta, started taking a technical vocational training of their choice. Zeritu and Belay proved their skill of tailoring and started a process to get individual working space while Mulugeta along his friends showed their capital and skill and demanded a work space as a group. There are also participants who took all trainings, joined enterprises, but later, quit and went on with their own way for different reasons. Kiros and Nigussie for example, took training on food preparation and joined enterprises; but Kiros being exhausted by the bureaucracy and Nigussie being tired of the disagreements within his group left the program. Currently, Kiros is driving taxi while Nigussie is planning his migration to Dubai.

All participants recognizing the benefit of the program said its availability by itself gave them hope and empowered them to plan their life in Ethiopia. Zeritu said,

*“I was challenged by my family and neighbors; even when I was trying to work, there were barriers everywhere. Thus, getting the government support and realizing I am not alone inspired me. All I had was my skill; just by proving my skill and*

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

*depositing small amount of money, I was able to get access to credit and be in process of securing a working space”.*

Zeritu is one of the most successful in her economic reintegration among the many beneficiaries of BOLSA. She was honored by the organization; invited to motivate and train other returnees; and as recognition of her achievements, she was awarded by BOLSA. Talking about the reasons to her success she talks about the life she led in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, here determination to make it in her country, and the support she got from BOLSA.

Belay, who is also working by his own starting from the beginning, talked about the positive aspects of the program along with the challenges he faced. He said,

*“I was very happy to know we have support from the government; in the psychological motivation training, I was able to learn that there are many opportunities available for returnees. I have the shop I am working at because of the program; I was also able to buy more sewing machines as a result of the credit I got. However, I faced challenges that delayed my work and even weakened my growth; I struggled a lot to get the place, and I am still struggling to find the credit I need. I was told at first that individuals won’t be given working spaces; but later they gave me hope; and finally it took two years. In the two years, I spent my money on living costs and on my attempt to start my business in a rented place. When I finally got the space, I found that there was misfiling and the place was also given to another people. I and a youth enterprise had same kind of paper entitling us the place. To figure that issue, it took around 6 months; and realizing I am losing more money in the process, I agreed to share the place. Now I have ¼th of one full working space; I myself don’t want the whole place, but quarter of it is very small. I*

*am also asking for credit; I am asked to deposit some money I don't have to get the credit; sometimes their criteria are not reasonable. In general, the availability of the program is good; in a society where migrants are expected to do much, being unable to do so is very stressing. I had money and skill on my return; but there are people returning with nothing; I am sure the program gave them something to rely on. But, there is no uniformity in the process; you'll be told you cannot work by your own while there are individuals who are working in that situation. I for example don't want to work in enterprise because it is more beneficial for me to work by myself; you shouldn't push me to work in a team and hold me back".*

The enterprise is the one thing most participants present as their challenge; while Assefa, Imman, and Nigussie talked about the increasing quarrel and conflict comes with the increasing number of members, Hirut and Birtukan mentioned how their role as mothers is ignored by members. Nigussie said,

*"I joined nine women I meet during training to form an enterprise; we shared 2000ETB each and started to buy materials for restaurant work. We had issues working together since we all had different needs and backgrounds; we were trained on how to cook and some of us know how to manage business, but none of had any idea on how to work in such large team. Business is hard without having to do it with people you know for few months. We were straggling to create balance when Microfinance made their visit and decide to add four people in our enterprise. They said the place is large to 10 people; at that moment I realized how they are focused on number than quality. They didn't ask our challenges; if they would they wouldn't decide to add people on us. After the four people come in, we couldn't*

*agree on anything; in a month I decided I should look for something else. Now I am planning to head to Dubai; I have sister I sent to Dubai when I was in Saudi. Now my sisters started the process for me; I can't rely on fate for our enterprise find some peace some day and depend my livelihood on it".*

Birtukan also said she was exhausted with everyone's demands and needs; *"I am a mother of a 7 month baby; and they expect me to work for more than 8 hours. Each member wants to pass order; that's not how you work in a team, there has to be some kind of intervention to train us on how to lead organizations".*

In addition to their inability to work in team, and the pressure put by microfinance office to add on members in their enterprises; participants mentioned other structural barriers on their economic reintegration. Bureaucracy, limited attention to their needs, lack of support, and location of working spaces are shared challenges. Mulugeta talking about the challenges he faced while trying to get credit and buy materials with his business partners said;

*"We were made to come back and forth just to get credit; we had the money we were asked for to deposit, we had everything we are demanded to do, but, it took us months to access the credit. In those months we could have made progress in our work. We are always going back and forth every time we tried to get anything we need; the bureaucracy make you burn out at some point. We also struggled with the rules and limitations on how we should use our money by Addis Credit and Saving. We had our first credit from Microfinance office; and when we needed more we went to Addis Credit and saving; that is our next available option. They gave us the money, but they were deciding for us on how to use our money. That is probably to*

## Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees

*ensure we used the money properly, but you cannot follow someone around and made choices for them”.*

Assefa also talked about the support returnees need, asked for, and didn’t get from public sectors saying,

*“Our restaurant has limited capacity; if we want to compete in a bid, we need to be competitive with restaurants that have the capacity to work with small or none advance payments. We cannot compete with others; hence, we asked for BOLSA to ask on our behalf at least governmental organizations made their bids invite exclusive only to returnees and other small enterprises so that we won’t be invisible. We are not asking for money, but the platforms where we can compete and work fairly”.*

Regarding to their working place locations Tariqua said,

*“I am working in a rented space because there were no customers at the place I was provided by the program. At first I had small capital, so I was given very small shed around Arat Kilo; it was perfect place to find customers for a Jebenna Bunna. I was able to save lots of money from that work; and I was also awarded 50,000ETB by ILO for my achievement. Thus, I wanted to invest all of it and open up a small restaurant; I requested a place and I was given in a building where there is no customer. The building was located far from the main road, construction sites, or even offices; it was in the middle of nowhere. I could not work there; so, now I am trying to make it by myself”.*

Her claim was recognized by other respondents and the Key informant from BOLSA too. AtoDereje (BOLSA), said the location of the working spaces discouraged many; and there are

people who are hold back by it. My key informant also confirmed some of the challenges discussed by the respondents; he said,

*“It is very frustrating for people to work with people they never meet; and Microfinance is adding pressure on them by making them add members. There are also problems in offices at making their life hard; there is lack of coordination among offices creating delay on them. However, all problems relating to the reintegration is not resulted from the structural problems; most returnees’ expectation is high; you cannot spoon feed everyone. If anyone in Addis got the support we give to returnees, anyone would be happy from the service. The program gave them entitlement; but I also seen people feeling like the right to be provided everything”.*

In contrary to this suggestion though, Birtukan says, *“we don’t know for sure what we can and cannot do; the program is good but not enough. Especially women are not getting the service we need; I am disturbed and I need more of emotional support. But the program is rigid; you should meet deadlines to get access to it; and if you were psychologically disturbed, depressed, or raising a child at the moment; the opportunity just goes away”.*

Similarly Iman and Tariqua said they were not ready when they start the reintegration process just not to miss the deadline; Iman left her baby at neighbors and Tariqua skipped her hospital appointments to be part of the first training. Birtukan and Hirut still are emotionally disturbed; Birtukan left her enterprise saying she needed to take one at a time while Hirut said she is not mentally well yet but needs the money.

In conclusion, participant returnees discussed differential challenges to their reintegration; all acknowledge the positive contribution of the mere existence of the reintegration

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

program. However, four of the research participants left the program with dissatisfaction; three of them are women and related their reason with the rigidity of the program and their enterprises to give space to their needs (resulted from their responsibilities as mothers and their emotional and mental instabilities). The two men respondents raised the issue of the microfinance office pushing enterprises to add members by prioritizing its recognition for the number of people it capacitated over the desire of enterprises to grow, and lack of skill among returnees to work in a team and prepare shared goal. While talking about the components of participants recommended for the reintegration program to be sensitive of their unique experiences in relation to their gender and forced return.

## Chapter Five

### 5. Discussion and Analysis

This section demonstrates the theoretical interpretation and discussion of reintegration challenges and opportunities of forced Ethiopian returnees. This is done under three themes; economic, social, and psychosocial reintegration. Each subsection is analyzed using the theories discussed in chapter two; and gender was at the center throughout the process. Each section summarizes related findings from different themes as found to be connected based on the theories. The overall purpose of this section hence is to address the research questions of the study.

#### 5.1 Theoretical analysis of major findings

Reintegration of migrant returnees is a result of returnees acquiring the essential conditions to achieve a certain level of 'reintegration' which is characterized by the complex interweavedness of economic, social network and psychosocial dimensions (Ruben et.al,2009) within the influence of their individual experience at different stage of their migration (Cassarino, 2008). Hence, the reintegration of each respondent is analyzed according to their individual statements. Potential factors which favor and impede their reintegration are identified; and their reflections of their migration experience at different stages of their migration facilitated the analysis of their process of reintegration.

At each stage of migration, multiple factors influenced the different dimensions of reintegration for the migrant returnees. Before migration, financial instability, loss of parents, desire for better income, and responsibility to support family. During migration, sociopolitical environment of destination and the exploitation returnees were subject to as a result, better income, better access to basic needs, and deportation process. Finally, after return, lack of

capital, access to credit and working space, and economic expectation of family were referred as influential factors for reintegration.

The factors in the beginning of returnees' migration story, either were positive or negative, their influence had impact on their story at destination and/or during reintegration. For instance, according to the findings of this study, migrants' economic problems are behind their decision to migrate; it pushed them out of their country and made them persist through multiple problems at destination. Abusive and traumatizing experiences at destination on the other hand, created long lasting effect on the physical and psychological health of migrants. The webbing effect of both the economic limitations, and the living and working challenges of migrants, hence are hindering successful reintegration for forced Ethiopian returnees from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The sections below discuss factors of reintegration in detail under three themes; economic, social, and psychosocial reintegration respectively. Each section addresses two consecutive research questions of the study at once; hence, under the three sections, all six questions of the study are discussed.

### **5.1.1 Economic reintegration**

Economic re-embeddedness is guaranteed by an access to financial resources such as a sufficient and independent income, opportunities for advancement and the basic equipment for a long-term and self-sustaining existence with equal rights for all citizens. These characteristics are to be maintained by an independent and stable income ensuring sustainable return (Dimitrijevic *et al.* 2004 in Ruben *et.al*, 2009). All participants got similar service from the reintegration program, but only four of them (three men and one woman) found it fit with the situation they are in. Those found the program sufficient confirmed the working space they are given, the credit

access they have, and the social support they got assisted them to get to the point they are now. The other eight participants described their economic situation as limited to be called ‘sufficient’; and most of them referred limited access to financial resources and social network as their barriers. The shared and unique factors for the economic reintegration of migrants are discussed below in detail.

### **Economic factors affecting economic reintegration**

In this study, economic factors are quoted as major influential factor for migration experience. Starting from their decision to migrate up to reintegration, returnees identified economic challenges and opportunities as determining of their whole migration stories. Zeritu during her interview described how her whole story of migration was determined by her limited financial capacity. She left to Saudi looking for better income, stayed in prison for years hoping for her freedom to achieve her financial goals, and after return, she struggled to recover because she didn’t have any money.

Even though economic factors were influential to all returnees’ personal reintegration experience, it was not a gender neutral aspect. All women respondents decided to take the journey of migration based on the demand of their families to provide remittance to their family. On the contrary, five out of six men respondents migrated to meet their need of better source to accumulate capital for future business. According to Emebet (2002), women migrants are driven to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia as a result of their social responsibilities; and female migrants tend to spend their savings on household welfare than men migrants (Morrison et.al, 2008). On the other hand, because of high demand for domestic workers, women migration routes are mainly legal while men migration routes are illegal (Key informant/ IOM, 2014). The legal route makes women part of the kafala system automatically, hence, they become property of their employer

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

before their arrival. On the contrary, men take the riskier route that leaves their lives to fate, and later have relatively better living and working options at destination. While the route taken by most women participants made their experience at destination difficult, the men's route showed us their suffering before arrival and until they settle back in to the country.

After migration, economic exploitation at destination was also discussed as one of the major challenges for immigrants; withholding/cutting/denial of salary were common practices that all returnees experienced; but again, women's working environment (domestic) was expressed as more exploitive than the daily labor, driver, and/or, construction works men returnees were part of. Historically, domestic work is considered to be beyond the legal reach of legislation; both the Ethiopian legal system and the legal systems in Middle Eastern countries exclude domestic work from being regulated by the labor law. The exclusion of domestic work from the labor law limits the right to take action in case of mistreatment or violation of rights (Emebet, 2002). Therefore, the major migration goal, earning better income is hindered by multiple factors for women than men who have the chance to escape abusive work environment. Here it can be argued that, since resource mobilization patterns vary with the experiences of migration of the returnees and that defines reintegration differentially (Cassarino, 2004); women might have less resource during return and different opportunity for reintegration.

Comparison regarding the options available to acquisition of resource and opportunity to mobilize them for reintegration has been made by Kushminder (2013). The author connected the better opportunity available for professional migrants to mobilize resource with their better chance of return and reintegration. She also compared how these groups have better chance than domestic migrants. However, besides among female returnees from different host countries, there is also differential experience among returnees of different gender at the same destination

country. The findings of this study, shows us how opportunities available to men and women in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, can influence their opportunity of accumulating and mobilizing resource, and later influencing their reintegration at origin.

Even in such hardships, except for four, all returnees said they earned better income working there than before migration. Hence, availability of better employment opportunities and salary are the two economic factors discussed as positive for their lives both during migration and after return.

After return, women as their main migration reasons were related to expectation of family for economic support, the pressure from their families and neighbors were described by the respondents as influential to their access to social networks, their sense of belonging to the community, and their motivation to participate actively in the economic sphere negatively. Tariqua and Alem talked about how their inability to achieve economic migration goals made them feel helpless because the families they left behind to help are still expecting high from them, and they failed to meet that. The original motives for out-migration influence the reintegration process (Ruben et.al, 2009); and for this study, most women having motives of assisting family is not achieved during return; hence that can have influence on their motivation and support to reintegrate.

In relation to the reintegration program, the program provided economic opportunities for returnees through credit, enterprise, and working spaces. As it is discussed in the findings the major part of the reintegration program is economic; and as it is mentioned above, for the participants, the major factors affecting their reintegration are economic. Hence, the study shows that the program is sensitive to the major concern of returnees (economic). However, the procedures within the reintegration program such as the criteria to get credit and working space,

and it's unresponsiveness to conditions and special needs of returnees as a result of their migration experience are described to be problematic by all respondents. Therefore, unlike the claim made by Ruben et.al, that economic assistance in general has significant positive impact to reintegration (Ruben et.al, 2009); opportunities presented at destination also have bigger impact to reintegration (Cassarino, 2004). Therefore, it can be said that availability of services doesn't guarantee the access to resources and benefits. Let alone in case of forced return, a reintegration program for migrants in general should consider the special needs of migrants resulted from their differential experience at destination as well as during return.

To start with, the economic component of the program neglected special needs of migrants including gender issues throughout its implementation. In the beginning, trainings were provided in fixed period of time without assessing the challenges targeted beneficiaries could go through after forced return. Second, most returnees, especially women, as it is established earlier, had difficulties to save up their salary. Thus, only those who were able to save few, or have financial support from family were given credit showing their deposits. Those who didn't have saving were relying on those have within their enterprises to be part of the program. In these situations, those contributed some have less power than those contributed more. Women returnees working in most exploitive environment, and expected to send remittances, they probably have less chance of accumulating income; thus limited decision making power in enterprises and less chance of working alone. Economic reintegration is more than having access to sustainable livelihood (assets); it is also about having the capabilities to maintain and expand on these assets (Ruben et.al, 2009). Among six female respondents, two left their enterprises because they were not able to exercise any power as a result of their limited financial power.

Therefore, it can be argued that, those had better working and saving opportunities at destination, have better access to livelihood opportunities and sustainable reintegration.

### **Social structure affecting economic reintegration**

Returnees' social experiences are related to their economic reintegration; women respondents had limited social interaction and freedom of movement at destination that affected their financial freedom while they were in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and their economic power after return. Their limited capital during return affected their membership in enterprises, their power in enterprises, and their access to credit. Hirut talked about how her limited financial capacity that resulted from her limited freedom to create network and find opportunities in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, limited her status to access better information and influence decision in her enterprise during reintegration. At destination better work opportunities are found by being illegal and save the cut off salary to sponsor and avoiding chance of being controlled by employer. As it was mentioned in the findings, men by being out of sponsors' control, they worked in better environments with improved salary and lived along with other Ethiopians having social communication and sharing information about opportunities. On the contrary, women worked in the domestic sector, controlled by employers, and far from any social communication or information sharing from other Ethiopians either about destination or their country of origin.

The major socio-structural factor at destination that was identified by all respondents as affecting their reintegration upon return was the Kafala system that exposed them to multiple form of exploitation. In addition to the Kafala system though, female returnees struggled to reintegrate economically as a result of the *Guardianship* system; a sociopolitical system that emerged out of the governing law of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Sharia. The Kafala system is a

system where domestic workers' visa and legal status are tied to the sponsor; employers assume the dual responsibility of being employer and sponsor. Such responsibility includes different expenses including workers' national identity card or iqama, work permit, and wage. In return, the domestic workers are allowed to work only for the sponsor. If the domestic workers decide to leave their sponsors, in addition to stiff monetary penalty, they will be obligated to leave the country immediately at their own expense instead of having their employers cover their return airfare at the end of their contract (Murray, 2013).

Kafala system made respondents worked under it (all women respondents) vulnerable to economic and labor exploitation; it also described as impacting their social and psychosocial reintegration. Women returnees talked about the isolation and loss of belongingness they experienced as a result of it; one of the respondents was separated from everyone she knew in Ethiopia and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, because she was denied to work leave or phone calls. Another respondent also talked about how the exploitation and abuse she experienced because of the system, made her feel less of herself. Lack of communication with contacts and affected self-esteem influenced how they reinsert themselves back to the community. In their attempt to reconnect, besides limited economic capacity, returnees' (especially women) detached relationship made reintegration difficult. Social networks are crucial for understanding the ways in which returnees mobilize resources while being involved in dynamic cross-border networks that are responsive to specific pre- and post-return conditions (Cassarino 2004).

Working under the Kafala system, women are more vulnerable than men because the working space is domestic for women; and escaping this environment is not also guaranteed with better option for them. As it is established on the previous chapter (see Chapter 4.2.2), neither renting living space nor moving from place to place is possible to women in Kingdom of Saudi

Arabia. “The sociopolitical environment of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia applies the interpretation of Sharia as the law of the land, elevates the Quran and the Prophet’s traditions to the status of a constitution, and has institutionalized the religious establishment and its perceptions of women into governance structures” (Human Right, 2016). Let alone immigrants, women of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia have limited rights in the country; guardianship system of the country requires women to have men guardian to move or to participate in any public affair. Therefore, women returnees were tied up by the Sharia law to improve their economic options in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in addition to the Kafala system that affected men returnees too.

### **Abuse, and conflict with social networks as factors affecting economic reintegration:**

The physical, emotional, and sexual harassment experienced by returnees was found to affect their economic reintegration after return. The financial loss they faced because of abuse based on their gender and race, made returnees capacity less in their economic reintegration. All participants said their financial capacity would have been better if they were not economically, physically, and/or sexually abused while migration. Asefa in regard to this said *“I lost a lot of money because of organized robbery on immigrants by a Saudi gang”*; and Alem said *“if the police didn’t take my savings during deportation, I would have the capital to make my business better”*.

Birtukan would be best example to demonstrate the impact of abuse on economic reintegration of migrant returnees. She was abused by all five of her employers, raped by the two, and got pregnant at last. She spent most of her income in between of escaping and finding employments; and after return she used all of her savings on basic things for her and her baby. Even though any irregular migrant is at risk of racial abuse, working in domestic setting under the control of their employers, women are more vulnerable to multiple forms of GBV. The

impact of experienced abuse in general is not considered by the reintegration program; and gender issues in relation to women increased vulnerability has not recognized in any components of the program. Women respondents talked about how people treated them differently because of the abuse they experienced or even by just assuming they went through sexual harassment or commercial sex work. Their status is defined by the community as deviant, and returnees having no control of occupying the control they feel helpless. Therefore, besides having emotional and mental problems as a result of abuse, women are struggling with people's perception of them.

At this point, the link to the theoretical aspect of forced return migration needs to be established. In response to Cassarino's model preparedness and willingness of return, except to three, all interview participants were not willing to return at the time of their deportation as their initial reasons for migration had not been fulfilled (see chapter 4.3.3). Hence, it can be argued that returnees who didn't made up their minds to return were less prepared for their reintegration in Ethiopia than those who independently plan their return to their home country without being forced to return. In reference to the status of the participants, the returnees' lack of sufficient resource mobilization while residing in the host countries has partly not offered any potential for their home country indeed. Among the most recognized success of returnees by the program authorities is Zeritus (see page 56) and she was one of the three respondents who was willing to return; and Belay even though he struggled to get working space and that delayed his economic reintegration, he said he was prepared to return that he mobilized all of his resources to Ethiopia during return.

To sum up, returnees identified their need to economic stability as having impact on their economic as well as other dimensions of reintegration. However, as it is discussed so far, economic reintegration is not only about financial incentives and presentation of economic

opportunities. Economic reintegration of returnees can be determined by multiple factors that are differential on experience of migrants. The reintegration program even though prioritized economic dimension, it failed to look in to the different aspects it revolves around. Gender is one of the personal characteristics integral to reintegration experience of returnees (Ruben et.al, 2009).

### **5.1.2 Social reintegration**

As it was demonstrated from several of the interviews, social networks are crucial for the returnees' sense of belonging. As David and Van Houte (2008) state, the involvement in a local community organization and the feeling of safety are crucial aspects when it is about to analyze the returnees' individual role within society. This section aims to analyze what factors influenced social relations of returnees; in which way social contacts were determining factors in the respondents' social well-being; and how that affected their level of social networks reintegration.

All participants mentioned a significant correlation between the emotional and material support from their social environment and the perception of their individual reintegration. The aspect of retaining strong links with friends and family, and having social contacts at destination were the main issues discussed during the interviews. Here again, the interviews demonstrated that gender is integral at shaping experience of returnees; because of factors before, during, and after migration, female respondents seem to have more difficulties of having and keeping social networks. As it is discussed earlier (see p 65), female returnees migrating reasons are highly related to their social responsibilities to support family, and most didn't achieved their entire migration mission, had negative impact on their relationships upon return. Tariqua, the one among all interviewees focusing the most on the aspect of family relations, felt pretty ashamed and at the same time afraid of her husband's reaction concerning her deportation. She also talked

about her feeling of being at home is not there as her husband doesn't empathize her experience; social relations provide migrants with the feeling of being accepted (Boekstijn, 1988).

In terms of individual experiences before migration, quarrels with social contacts are also factor that influence the sense of belongingness of returnees'. In addition to Tariqua, Birtukan migrated having conflict with her closest social network, and both had difficulty of reintegrating back to their social lives. Both didn't want to return because of the conflict they have, and as a result, they described that they lost belonging to their social networks.

While in the contrary Asefa and Hirut talked about how support from their social networks helped them gain sense of security. Even after their deportation, Hirut's and Aseffa's family instead of judging them, they were aware of their stressed and disturbed mind and respected their situation, ascribing their return to better fate and great future. Both of them described how the support they have from their social contacts assisted them feel sense of security and familiarity. Hirut especially emphasized how their support helped her regain her confidence; she said she was losing hope as her purpose of migration (saving capital to settle her own business here) was not achieved. However, the proposed capital from her brothers, it is the trust coming from her close social contacts that made her get a positive feeling about her own social reintegration.

Speaking generally, based on the individual perceptions of reintegration of the returnees', it can be argued that, those returnees whose social networks are instable and conflict-ridden, may have greater difficulties during reintegration than those having migrated for financial reasons but with stable social networks. Those returnees who suffer from financial constraints are more likely to become reintegrated if they can be part of their former social networks. The fact of

gaining ground within their social networks might influence their psycho-social reintegration in a positive way, even though their economic situation may still be problematic.

In addition to the factors at origin, their controlled and limited communication and movement at destination was also affecting women's social networks. Social networks are important for acquiring information as well as sharing personal and intimate relations (Ruben et.al, 2009). The Kafala system, the domestic working environment, and the guardianship system by limiting their freedom affected their opportunity to persist and/or make contacts at origin and destination. Alem and Zeritu talked about how their restricted access to social networks affected their access to information and their whole experience at destination, and later their reintegration after return. Alem working with and for her madam (she worked at several houses sharing most of her payment to her boss), she never had the opportunity to meet her sister living in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia or even have the knowhow of saving and sending money process and procedure. During her deportation process her all saving (she was holding in cash) was taken by police and she struggled to reintegrate because of it. Therefore, it is implied by the respondents that barriers for contacting social networks at destination can be an impending factor for returnees' social reintegration.

After return, migrants' inability to be part of local social networks and to establish meaningful contacts affected their reintegration in many ways. The social networks could help returnees get access to information, goods and services, and housing or work; it is important insurance device for migrant returnees. Based on the interviews, all respondents understand the impact of success and failure of reconnecting; those who have support of their families recognize its contribution, and those who didn't have it, mentioned how it affected them. These networks add to social capital, comprising features of social organization, reciprocity, networks,

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

information flows, and social safety nets that emerge from the relationships amongst individuals. Social capital could lead to a more efficient and stable position of individuals in society (Ruben et.al, 2009). Two respondents (one man and one woman) explained how their networks are supporting them to reintegrate even though they returned with limited financial capital to restart their lives. This shows the importance of reconnecting to social networks to have sense of security and belonging to the community. Once sense of belonging to a group also contributes to his/her self-confidence and inspiration to start life again in country of origin economically. Hence, social networks are capital, returnees need to feel connection to their community, and to feel the desire to work and grow in their country.

The reintegration program regarding to assisting returnees reconnect to their social networks, it doesn't have any formal procedure that was designed or implemented. However according to the key informant (BOLSA), officials were exercising mediation in cases where there were misunderstandings and conflicts between families and returnees. He talked about cases where pregnant and women with children were rejected by their families; and how he and other officials mediate to help them solve their issues. In addition to that, there were cases where the bureau was tracing families and reunifying returnees who were mentally unable to know the where about of their families, and of those lived in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for many years that they lost contacts of their family. Both mediation and family reunification activities however were done by the will of the officials at BOLSA. There was no commitment to address these issue by the program; and there is no way to ensure if all needs of returnees regarding social networks were addressed. Having a reintegration program for forced migrants without a plan to reconnect them with their social networks is problematic. It has a negative implication to the

effort of economic reintegration; and it also discriminate those are in able to reconnect with their networks.

To sum up, the respondents personally considered the maintenance with their social ties as crucial for their personal re-integration. Through a regular exchange of important information, for instance about Ethiopia's recent economic and political situation, and their financial support of their social network this made them feel better prepared for both their psycho-social and economic reintegration after deportation. Only those respondents who were not willing to keep in regular touch with their family discussed how they feel less secure and supported by their families in the home context. Thus, it can be concluded that the maintenance of social networks in the home country can indeed influence all other dimensions of reintegration.

### 5.1.3 Psychosocial reintegration

Psychosocial reintegration is linked to the scale of how an individual can freely develop a multitude of identities acquired within a certain time through different social interactions. This section thus evaluates the way in which returnees developed ideas, identities, and culture through their migration and therefore influenced their sense of belonging once back to their society. The way respondents acquired a certain character arising from their experience as irregular migrants and deportees; and how that influenced their psycho-social reintegration is discussed.

Identity formation is a process, and in this context, Cassarino's three stage approach (Cassarino, 2008) is fit to show how migrants' identity was changing throughout the different stages of migration and influenced their reintegration. Motives of leaving can affect reintegration process; radical sociopolitical upheavals followed by forced migration are threatening to self-identity; and unpredictable shocks in the lives of migrants and the belief that they cannot influence their life course can become a threat to self-efficacy and self-esteem (Ruben et.al,

2009). Women returnees were more vulnerable to abuse, and based on the interviews they described sense of isolation and confusion because of it. As it is discussed so far, women returnees left to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia expecting a lot for themselves and for their families; and most were treated harshly by the host community. Birtukan and Zeritu who were victim of multiple abuses and incarceration for years respectively, discussed how their unpredicted situation at destination affected their confidence, and how they stopped making plans thinking they cannot influence their lives. Return migration of people who were subject to systematic discrimination is usually a painful and difficult process (Ruben et.al, 2009).

Birtukan described how frustrating migration experience abroad limited her feeling of belonging to home society. Feelings of loss of social structures and cultural values may occur when the returnees' identities no longer suit the cultural context in their home country; Birtukan faced multiple forms of abuses while she was in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; and she narrated her story as she lost control of everything in her life. As she returns with her baby born out of wedlock from an Arab father, she was scared of people's reactions. As she said earlier (see p 40 & also 54), she felt rejected by everyone as if she chose to be out of the cultural norms; and as a result she felt she doesn't have place in the society.

Besides the vulnerability to abuse, and mismatch of motive and experience of migration; gender is also integral to the psychosocial reintegration of returnees, because identity and safety feelings appear to be better guaranteed for migrant returnees that enjoyed semi-secure and independent housing, enabling them to maintain self-esteem (Ruben et.al 2009). According to the findings of this study, living conditions of men and women returnees were distinctive as men had better access to free living and movement while women were controlled whether by their employers or by the men whose name is on their renting deal. The limited movement of women

had also limited their capacity of establishing contacts abroad or accumulating savings due to restricted participation options they had. Hence the Kafala and Sponsorship system implied as factor for unsuccessful reintegration of female migrant returnees. This indicates that participation options provided during the asylum period are of key importance for reinforcing identity feelings amongst migrants, thus also influencing their prospects for return migration (Ruben et.al, 2009).

In association to length of stay, Blay and Zreritu talked about their shared feelings of fear to reinsert themselves back in to the society; Belay for twenty five and Zeritu for twelve years lived in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia being away from contact of their social networks. During their return, both felt lost; especially Belay discussed his confusion of what to expect (see chap 4.2.4), and the pressure of high expectation of success from networks in relation to length of stay.

The reintegration program in relation to the psychosocial needs of returnees is discussed to relate by its community outreach awareness creation interventions. The community awareness creation campaigns held by BOLSA at several sub-regions of the city (see chap 4.2.4) was implied to contribute for the progressive positive attitudinal change among the community by all respondents; hence it could contribute for returnees' sense of being understood and welcomed. Once again, its form of intervention was not targeting the returnees, rather it was based on the need of creating awareness to prevent migration and challenge the culture of migration within community. Therefore, the community level intervention of the program indirectly assisted the psychosocial wellbeing of some returnees; for those reached to doubting their membership as a result of traumatizing and challenging experiences at destination, the reintegration program didn't impact their need. For instance needs of rape and other sexual harassment survivors to intensive therapy and motivation to engage socially and economically are neglected by the program.

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

Social and economic reintegration was also discussed to be integral to the psychosocial reintegration; those identified themselves as having sufficient income source and those reconnected with their social networks described their feeling of being accepted and sense security to be high and well. Those having reached a certain level of economic reintegration are more likely to quote their own experience abroad as a plus factor and at the same time the willingness to stay in Ethiopia instead of leaving. Those who are still suffering from insufficient financial means or lacking social networks are rather traumatized of former expectations prior to migration, current happenings linked to their deportation or showing a less positive attitude towards the conditions in Ethiopia. This behavior can be traced back to the fact that they have not built up their self-confidence yet and still have to get over past experiences and reflect on alternatives of improving their life situation, even if it is out of their origin country (Koser 2001). Especially those whose migration plans could not become fulfilled and not be compensated by other solutions, are likely to suffer from psychosocial strains.

To conclude the discussion on holistic reintegration of returnees, based on the theoretical analysis of the returnees' experience, it can be said that the three dimensions of reintegration are linked with each other. Linking this aspect of interwovenness to the migrants' experience of forced return in the Ethiopian context, it can be argued that the deportees' individual experiences based on their personal characteristics, aspirations in the host context, their experiences and targeted contributions to their home context, are not effectively addressed by the reintegration program. The program by focusing on economic reintegration, it attempted to influence returnees other aspect of reintegration; however, economic reintegration is dependent of the social and psychosocial factors; and for it to be successful, individual factors had to be considered (Ruben et.al, 2009). In addition, the emotional, sexual, and physical harassment returnees experienced

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

found to have negative impact on returnees life after return; the traumatic life threatening experiences leave Ethiopian women with long lasting psychological problems (Meskerem, 2011); and without help to deal with their problem, they are not fully able to reintegrate themselves.

## Chapter Six

### 6. Conclusions and recommendations

#### 6.1 Conclusions

With the changing trend in international migration, there is a growing awareness in social science research that the consideration of gender is critical when studying the motivations, outcomes, and barriers to international migration. Nevertheless, there has been little effort to explicitly model the differences between men and women with respect to the determinants and outcomes of international migration (Gaye and Jha, 2011). Therefore, this particular research takes exploring the gender dimension of reintegration as its mission; it critically looks in to the migration experience of men and women migrant returnees in order to identify the shared and unique factors that have impact on their reintegration.

In order to gain more insight into the return conditions in the frame of their forced return experience as well as aggravating economic, social, and psychosocial circumstances, the meaning which the deportees give both to their return experience and reintegration had to be assessed. For this purpose, the multidimensional concept of reintegration including dimensions of economic, social networks and psychosocial reintegration was applied to the aspect of forced return migration. The following assumptions can be made to the research questions.

In response to the first research question, what are the shared and unique factors favoring and impeding men and women migrant returnees' economic reintegration? The study discussed, because both for men and women migrants primary reason for migration is insufficient income, economic reintegration can be influenced by individuals ability to accumulate financial capital. The gender aspect of financial accumulation however is broader and complex issue; migrants'

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

ability to accumulate savings depends on factors that are at their first, middle, and end stage of migration. Motives for migration, economic need, is related to personal development goals for men while it is based on social responsibility to women; and living and working conditions of women were bounded by sociopolitical systems that exposed them to the most unregulated working environment (domestic) in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Both men and women are bound by the Kafala system that entitles employers ownership of their employees. While all men respondents worked out of that system because there was available living and working options for them without it; all women respondents worked in that system because other sociopolitical system (Guardianship) hinders them to do otherwise.

At destination, both men and women were subjected to multiple form of abuse including economical. However, because of the patriarchal socio economic structure, women discussed their increased vulnerability to it and their inability to escape abusive environment without risking other vulnerabilities in relation to not having guardian or sponsor. After return, since their financial capacity is limited because of multiple factors at destination; women have less possibility of getting service that is sensitive to their needs. The exploitation at destination and its consequence found to limit women's economic reintegration more than it did men's. At home also, since their primary purpose of migration, economic support to family, is not achieved, women have less social support; hence have less chance of successfully reintegrating.

In response to the second research question, what are the shared and unique favoring and impeding factors for men and women migrant returnees social reintegration? The study once again discussed motives for leaving; sociopolitical environment of destination; and return without achieving migration purpose, might be the major three areas where men and women experience of reintegration differs. For all returnees, economic capacity found to be positive

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

input to social reintegration; and conflict with social network and inability to persist communication as negative. Opportunities to achieve motive of migration as discussed earlier is difficult to women, and since it is a responsibility to 'all' than 'self', women have more difficulty to have social support than men. In addition, the gender norm at home may get conflicted by the victimization of women migrants that their chance to reconnect with their community becomes difficult. At this point, the interrelation of the economic reintegration and social reintegration is clear; those have better capacity of economic reintegration may have better chance of reconnecting to their social networks, and vice versa.

Finally, regarding to the last research question, what are the shared and unique favoring and impeding factors for men and women migrant returnees' social reintegration? The research discussed shocking and traumatizing experiences, having no control over working and living situations, and long stays at destination; and being rejected by host community to be major factors that may affect the self-esteem and self-confidence of migrants; and as a result negatively influences their sense of belonging to home community. As it is established so far, except to the time spent at destination, traumas experienced, controlled living and working conditions and rejection by home community are more common for female respondents than men respondents. Therefore, once again factors circling the migration life of women migrants have more negative influence on their reintegration. Psychosocial reintegration as it is related to identity and ability to express that; it is basic to returnees' economic and social reintegration. Hence, the three dimensions of reintegration are interwoven; and it is important to see reintegration as it is whole than sum of each dimensions.

To sum up, the three dimension of reintegration of migrant returnees, economic, social, and psychosocial are evidently basic to successful reintegration of forced migrant returnees. In

cases where there is force on the return of migrants, it is important to make the assistance provided to returnees responsive to their situations resulted because of unwillingness and unpreparedness to return. Moreover, it is important for reintegration program to be gender responsive by critically analyzing the differential experience of men and women migrant returnees.

### 6.2 Recommendations

The conversations I had with most of my interviewees highlighted the need to improve the reintegration program in many ways; the following are my recommendations based on the findings of this research to the Ethiopian government in general, and to MOLSA and BOLSA in particular.

Any initiative that attempts to address the issues of forced migrant returnees should acknowledge the dimensions and phases of migration; a reintegration program should be based on the learning and understanding of migrants' experience. Since the whole purpose of reintegration is making return sustainable; the personal and circumstantial factors of returnees must be incorporated in the program. The Ethiopian government by acknowledging this fact, rather than inserting the reintegration mission for the returnees into existing procedure of national employment issues; it has to take serious responsibility to research specific needs of returnees and design program to be responsive.

As it has been discussed so far, the major challenge for migrants had been the exploitation they face at destination; a reintegration program besides attempting to address issues after return, it has to be incorporated with other initiatives before and during migration. Migration in Ethiopia needs to acknowledge and validate the existence of the intricate challenges faced by migrants, especially domestic workers. The government needs to undertake a

## **Reintegration of Ethiopian Migrant Returnees**

comprehensive study on the challenges of migration and return migration of migrant domestic workers in order to make informed decisions that would yield sustainable solutions. In addition, the government needs to look at the experiences of other countries like the Philippines that have developed a very efficient legal bureaucratic system and bilateral agreements with host countries involving domestic workers and labor migrants.

As it was one of the major concerns for returnees, and the most influential to their successful return, it is imperative that the government of Ethiopia to improve the working conditions of women migrant workers in the Middle East. The government should negotiate for improved labor contract of the women migrants and ensure the implementation thereof. Since negotiating and including better working conditions in the contract doesn't ensure implementation, the government should enhance the capacity of its consulates and embassies in the host countries to effectively demand and enforce the labor contract of its citizens.

In order to make the services provided to migrant returnees whole, one program may not have the capacity; hence, cooperation with other stakeholders is important. As it was discussed earlier in the findings, women who suffered from different forms of GBV and need intensive care and shelter, are neglected by the program. Only based on humanity, officials at BOLSA reached out to NGOs that are committed to same mission and found service for those who demanded it by coming to them. However, the national program has no element that negotiates terms or opens up opportunities to survivors of differential traumas. Hence, first of all, the program itself somehow must have a means to incorporate the needs of these returnees; and for reaching all, it has to work in coordination formally with different stakeholders. Case management and referral and linkage has to be formally incorporated in the program to reach to civic organizations and NGOs that can cater to the psychological and economic needs of most

migrant returnees; and the referral mechanism and follow up procedures have to be developed properly.

Finally, as it is established by this study, economic factors are major determinants of migration and reintegration. Challenges faced by respondents to be part of the economic reintegration process are mainly related to criteria and processes in the program. First of all, the program considering the forced nature of return, it should adopt flexible requirements to provide credit or working space. Second, gender had to be integral to the economic component mostly because economic reintegration is harder to women because of their migration experience and their roles and responsibilities in the society. Hence, the program besides being flexible, it has to plan and implement gender responsive economic interventions. Finally, by recognizing the effect of economic reintegration to and by other dimensions; the program has to give emphasis on interrelating and strengthening connection between the different components of reintegration.

## References

- Abebaw Menaye. (2013). *Experiences of trafficked Ethiopian domestic workers who returned from the Gulf States: Implications for intervention and policy development*. School of Social Work. Addis Ababa University.
- Adamnesh Atnafu. (2006). *Aspects of Ethiopian return migration*. Department of regional and local development studies, Addis Ababa University, School of Graduate Studies, AAU.
- Addis Standard Magazine, December, 2013
- Advanced Academic update overview: *return, reintegration, and development*, Maastricht Graduate School of Governance, Maastricht University, IS Academy Policy Brief | No. 11
- Alfa-Shaban, A. (2017). *Ethiopians illegally resident in Saudi refuse government help to return – PM worried*. Africanews. <http://www.africanews.com/2017/05/21/ethiopians-illegally-resident-in-saudi-refuse-gov-t-help-to-return-pm-worried//>
- Anafri J. and Jagare S. (2005). *Towards the sustainable return of West African transnational migrants; what are the options?* Paper for World Bank Conference on New Frontiers of Social Policy. Arusha, Tanzania. Dec 12 – 15.
- Asefach Haileselassie. (2012). *An Investigation into the Experiences of Female Victims of Trafficking in Ethiopia*. University of South Africa.
- Berry W., Poortinga H., Segall H. & Dasen R. (1992). *Cross-Cultural Psychology: Research and Applications*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Bielefeld. B. Marvasti, A. (2004). *Qualitative research in sociology*. London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Bisrat Yared (2006). *Migration of Skilled Ethiopians; Cause and Impact: The Case of Ethiopians in Washington D.C*. Graduate School of Social Work. Addis Ababa University.

Boekestijn C. (1998). *Intercultural migration and the development of personal identity: the dilemma between identity maintenance and cultural adaptation*. International journal of intercultural relations.

Boyd M. and Grieco E. (2003). *Women and Migration: Incorporating Gender into International Migration Theory*. The Online Journal of the Migration Policy Institute. Migration Information Source. Migration Policy Institute. <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/women-and-migration-incorporating-gender-international-migration-theory>

Bryman A. (2004). *Social research methods*. (2nd Ed). New York: Oxford University Press.

Cassarino J. (2008). “*Return migrants to the Maghreb countries reintegration and development challenges*”. European University Institute. Robert Schuman Center for Advanced Studies.

Cassarino J. (2004). “*Theorizing Return Migration: The Conceptual Approach to Return Migrants Revisited*”. International Journal on Multicultural Societies (IJMS).

Dauids T. & Van Houte M. (2008). *Remigration, Development and Mixed Embeddedness: An Agenda for Qualitative Research*. The Conditions of Modern Return Migrants. International Journal on Multicultural Societies (IJMS).

Dimitrijevic M., Todorovic Z., and Grkovic N. (2004). *The Experience of Decision-Making and Repatriation Process. Return of Serbian Refugees to Croatia*. Belgrade. Danish Refugee Council.

Dumont J. and Spielvogel G. (2008). *Return Migration: A New Perspective*. International Migration Outlook. OECD.

Eastmond M. (2006). *Transnational Returns and Reconstruction in Postwar Bosnia and Herzegovina*.

Emebet Kebede. (2002). *Ethiopia: An assessment of the international labor migration situation: The case of female labor migrants*. Gender Promotion Program International Labor Office (GENPROM) working paper number 3, series on home migration, Geneva.

Fransen S. and Kuschminder K. (2009). *Migration in Ethiopia: History, current trends and future prospects*. Paper series: Migration and development country profiles. Maastricht University.

Gaye A. and Jha S. (2011). *Measuring Women's Empowerment through Migration*. UNESCO. United Nations Development Programme, Statistics Unit. Vol. 13, No. 1. [www.unesco.org/shs/diversities/vol13/issue1/art4](http://www.unesco.org/shs/diversities/vol13/issue1/art4)

Gibney M. and Hansen R. (2003). *Asylum policy in the west: past trends, future possibilities*. Discussion paper No.2003/68, United Nations University. World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER).

Gmelch G. (1980). *Return Migration*. Annual Review of Anthropology, Vol. 9. Annual Reviews. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2155732>

Human Rights Watch. (2015). *Detained, Beaten and Deported: Saudi abuses against migrants during mass expulsions*. Printed in USA.

ILO. (2013). *Reintegration with Home Community: Perspectives of Returnee Migrant Workers in Sri Lanka*. ILO Country Office for Sri Lanka and the Maldives. IMR Volume 43 Number 4.

IOM. (2014). *Assessment of the Socioeconomic Needs of Ethiopian Returnees from KSA*. IOM Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

IOM (2013). *The Migrant Newsletter*.

IOM. (2011). *Glossary on Migration*, 2nd edition, No 25, International Migration Law, Richard Perruchoud and Jillyanne Redpath-Cross, eds.

- Kibria N. (2004). *The experience and effects of deportation: Returning international labor migrants from Bangladesh*. Working paper.
- Koser K. (2001). *The Return and Reintegration of Rejected Asylum Seekers and Irregular Migrants*. An analysis of government assisted return programmes in selected European countries. IOM Migration Research Series No. 4. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.
- Kuschminder K. (2014). *Shattered Dreams and Return of Vulnerability: Challenges of Ethiopian Female Migration to the Middle East* (IS Academy Policy Brief N.18). Maastricht: Maastricht Graduate School of Governance.
- Kushminder K. (2013). *Female Return Migration and Reintegration Strategies in Ethiopia*. IS Academy. Maastricht University.
- Laaser M. (2006): Rückkehr und Entwicklung – Folgen von Rückkehr im Herkunftsland, Kurzexpertise für das Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge.
- Massoud A. (2013). *The Nitaqat Program*. The Ministry of Labor, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. ITU, Human Resources Development Fund. Saudi Arabia.
- Marina de Regt. (2007). *Ethiopian Women in the Middle East: The Case of Migrant Domestic Workers in Yemen*. Paper for the African Studies Centre seminar of 15 February 2007. Amsterdam School for Social science Research. University of Amsterdam. Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Marvasti A. (2004). *Qualitative research in sociology*. London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Mesfin Dessiye. (2011). *The Challenges and prospects of female labour migration to the Arab Middle East: A Case study of women returnees in the town of Girana, North Wollo, Ethiopia*. University of Bergen.
- Meskerem Mulatu. (2011). *Psychosocial and Economic Experiences of Gulf States Returnee Ethiopian Women Domestic Workers*. Addis Ababa University, School of Graduate Studies.

Morrison R., Schiff M., and Sjöblom M. (2008). *The international migration of women*. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / World Bank. A co-publication of The World Bank and Palgrave Macmillan, USA.

Murray E. (2013). *Hope for reform springs eternal: How the sponsorship system, domestic laws and traditional customs fail to protect migrant domestic workers in GCC countries*, Cornell International Law Journal.

Nawyn S. (2010). *Gender and Migration: Integrating Feminist Theory into Migration Studies*. Department of Sociology, Michigan State University. Sociology Compass.

Neergaard H. and Parm J. (2007). *Handbook of qualitative research methods in entrepreneurship*. MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall.

Oxford dictionaries. (2017). *Oxford living dictionaries*. Oxford University Press.  
<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/umrah>

Paoletti E. (2010). *Deportation, non- deportability and ideas of membership*. Refugee studies centre: Working paper series No.65, Oxford department of international development, University of Oxford.

Pierrette S. (2000). *Feminism and Migration*. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Sage Publications. <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

Ritchie J. & Lewis J. (Eds.). (2003). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. London: Sage Publications.

RMMS (2014). *The letter of the law: Regular and irregular migration in Saudi Arabia in a context of rapid change*. Mixed migration research series, Nairobi, Kenya: RMMS.

Rogge R. (1994). *Repatriation of Refugees: A not so Simple "Optimum" Solution*.

Ruben, Van Houte, and Davids (2009). *What Determines the Embeddedness of Forces-Return Migrants? Rethinking the Role of Pre- and Post-Return*. The International Migration Review, Vol. 43, No. 4. Center for Migration Studies of New York, Inc.

Sussman N. (2002). *Testing the cultural identity model of the cultural transition cycle: Sojourners return home*. International Journal of Intercultural Relations.

Tannenbaum M. (2007). *Back and forth: Immigrants' stories of migration and return*. International Migration. 45: 147–175. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2435.2007.00430.x

UN. (2015). *International Migration Report*. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, New York.

UN. (2013). *International Migration Report*. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, New York.

UNFPA. (2006). *The State of World Population 2006: A Passage of Hope, Women and International Migration*, UNFPA

UN-INSTRAW. (2007). *Gender, remittance and development*. Feminization of migration; working paper 1.

Woods, P. (2006). *Successful writing for qualitative researchers (2nd ed.)*. Published by Routledge in London and New York.

## **Annex 1**

**Addis Ababa University**

**College of Developmental Studies**

**Center for Gender Studies**

### **Appendix 1: Consent form**

My name is Hilawit Worku who is second year Gender Studies masters student at Addis Ababa University; I am expected to work on a thesis as partial fulfillment of Master's Degree in Gender Studies. To this end, I have chosen to study the gender dynamics in the experience of deported men and women returnees from Saudi Arabia under the title "Gendering Reintegration experience of forced Ethiopian return migrants from Saudi Arabia".

I will be gathering information through interviews that will last for approximately one hour where participation is voluntary. You have the right not to participate if you are not willing; you have the right to ask any question that is not clear or which you feel uncomfortable any time you liked to ask. You have the right to withdraw when you feel so uncomfortable. Once you consent to participate, you can skip questions you do not want to answer, end the interview session or you may withdraw from the study at any time if you are uncomfortable. The interview will take sixty minutes on average; feel free to share what you think is relevant since there is no right or wrong answer.

Be aware that there might be moments in which you feel embarrassed or feel pain during interview because we are talking an issue that may be painful. Well the study is not meant to hurt you or embarrass or create pain up on you. But the experience you have may have such nature

and you may feel the pain again. I want you to freely express the pain or emotion you felt, I am not here to judge you, I am here to get the story right.

Finally I want to assure you that the researcher will respect your privacy and only collect information for the purpose of the study. If you face any discomfort by your participation in the study you can contact me by telephone or e-mail.

Cell phone: +251 910 43 28 28

E-mail:- heluworku@gmail.com

**Informant:**

Name -----

Signature -----

Date -----

**Researcher**

Name-----

Signature -----

Date-----

.

## **Annex: 2**

**Addis Ababa University**

**College of Developmental Studies**

**Center for Gender Studies**

### **In-depth interview guide for key informants concerning returnees from KSA during the mass deportation in 2013**

This interview guide is prepared to provide detailed information for a research that investigates the reintegration experiences of men and women forced returnees from KSA in 2013. Interview with key informants is expected to inform on rehabilitation service components, structure, benefit, and contributions to the reintegration of the returnees. The research is qualitative; therefore, its validity is highly dependent on the genuineness of the information given by respondents. I hereby request you to respond the following questions openly and honestly so that the intended goal of the research could be achieved. Thank You.

#### **Part One: Background information**

1. Sex:    M ☐                      F ☐
2. Name of organization: .....
3. Position in the organization: .....
4. Educational background: .....

**Part two:**

1. How returnees recruited to the reintegration? What were the eligibility criteria's?
2. What special efforts during planning and implementation of the reintegration program were/are done to include unique needs of men and women?
3. Who are the major recipients of your service (men/women)? Why?
4. What are the specific components of the reintegration program?
5. How each service component assists returnee to build on their economical capacity?
6. How the program helps the returnees to re connect to their community?
7. How the program helps the returnees to rehabilitate from the psychological impact their migration life and returning experience had on them?
8. How each service component is interrelated with the other? Did they show any impact on one another?
9. What shared and unique challenges do men and women face to reintegrate? Are there any interventions you provide to address these challenges?
10. Were there cases reported to you where families/relatives/neighbors were resisting integrating returnees?
11. If yes, what your program did to address such challenges of the service recipients?
12. Based on your experience of working with deportees, which sex group faces the biggest challenge to reintegrate economically and socially? Why?
13. Based on your experience of working with deportees, what is your opinion on how/if the deportation (force to the return) has an Impact on the success/failure of their reintegration?
14. What you have to add on our discussion? Anything you think would inform on the reintegration of men and women?

**Thank You!**

### **Annex 3**

**Addis Ababa University**

**College of Developmental Studies**

**Center for Gender Studies**

### **In-depth interview guide for returnees from KSA during the mass deportation in 2013**

This interview guide is prepared to provide detailed information for a research that investigates the reintegration experiences of men and women forced returnees from KSA in 2013. The research is qualitative; therefore, its validity is highly dependent on the genuineness of the information given by respondents. I hereby request you to respond to the following questions openly and honestly so that the intended goal of the research could be achieved. Thank You.

#### **Part One: Background information**

5. Sex: M ☐ F ☐

6. Age: .....

7. Place of birth: .....

Current living address:.....

Sub region: .....

District: .....

8. Marital Status: (mention if there is change before and after migration/return)

Single ☐

Married ☐

Divorced ☐

Widowed ☐

9. Occupation:

Before migration: .....

During Migration: .....

After migration: .....

## **Part two: Before migration and migration experience**

*(This section explores the life migrant had before migration, and attempt, achievements, and challenges of returnee during migration to understand the experience and status of the individual in KSA)*

1. When and how (process and route of migration) did you migrate to KSA?
2. What was the main reason for your migration? (Economic and social)? How you being a man/woman shaped your plan to migrate to KSA?
3. For how long you planned to stay in KSA?
4. What did you do in KSA?
5. How was your living condition in KSA (economic and social status)?
6. What were the factors (policies/laws and practices of KSA, social relations, and/or economic opportunities) helped you achieve your migration plan?
7. What challenges (policies/laws and practices of KSA, social relations, and/or economic opportunities) you faced living and working in KSA? And how each challenges made you feel?
8. From the opportunities you mentioned, which ones were very fitting for you as a man/woman? And which challenges affected you differently because you are man/woman?

### **Part three: Return and reintegration experience of returnee**

*(This section discusses the return and reintegration experience of respondents; process, challenges, opportunities, etc. They experienced while and after returning).*

1. How did you heard and respond to the “Nitiqat law” (the deportation law)?
2. How did you prepared yourself for the return? Did you get the chance to gather your property and arrange transportation?
3. How your un/preparation affected your return process (departing, traveling, and arriving)?
4. Did you experience any violence by the people or police after the “Nitiqat” law was out? If so, what kind? And how that experience affected you?
5. Did you get any service during your arrival (here) from governmental or non-governmental organization? If so, what kind? For how long?
6. Did the short term arrival assistance help you to resettle back to your country? If so, How?
7. How your family/ friends/ relatives/neighbors welcomed you back in to their lives? And how their reaction made you feel? And how it affected your life in the past three years?
8. Were there any support (economic or other) given to you besides from IOM or BOLSA?
9. How did you learn about the reintegration program?
10. When and where did you get enrolled in the reintegration program?
11. What are the basic services you get from the reintegration program?
12. Do you think one component of the reintegration program has positive/negative impact on the other? (How the economic support you get helped you to re integrate with your

community socially/ and how the psychological support you get helped your economical and/or social reintegration)?

13. Are there any unique service components you get because you are man/woman? Or vice versa?
14. Over the years, how are you treated differently in the service provision as a man/woman?  
And how the common and unique supports you get from the program helped you to reintegrate back in to your community? (To communicate with your family and friends; to seek and lend assistance from anyone; to be part of social gatherings...etc.)
15. Is there any resistance from the community toward you or anyone else who is deported from KSA to lend help or participate you in the social sphere? If there is how that can affect your feeling/ motivation to work/ future plan to re migrate?
16. How the program helped you plan, develop, and/or start your current work/your business?
17. Do you have a plan of remigration?
18. If yes, why? (Because of your experience during migration or the reintegration program)?
19. Do you have anything to add on your experience/ on the service you are given/ or any point you want to add?

**Thank You**