



**Civil Society Days (CSD)
3rd Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD)
Athens, 2-3 November 2009**

Roundtable 2: Migrant Integration, reintegration and circulation for development

Session 2.2: Reintegration and Circular Migration- effective for Development?

Kathleen Newland and Aaron Terrazas
Migration Policy Institute, Washington, DC

DISCLAIMER: The analysis presented in this paper does not necessarily reflect the views of the CSD Organizing Committee or the Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation.

The boundary between temporary and permanent migration is eroding – in reality and in conceptual terms. Aided by cheap transportation and instantaneous communication, more and more people have important aspects of their lives located in two or more countries. Circular migration is one way in which people live in this new economic and social landscape, moving back and forth between (or among) the countries in which their businesses, families, properties and other interests are located. This new reality is challenging established ideas about international migration and the processes of migrant settlement and adaptation.

The relationship between circular migration and integration (in the country of destination) or re-integration (in the country of origin) is contentious. It is sometimes assumed that integration in the destination country and continued engagement in the country of origin are at odds, but empirical observation demonstrates that well-integrated migrants have the most to give back to their countries of origin, enjoy greater mobility, and can usually respond more easily to opportunities there.^[1] But how likely are circular migrants to become well integrated in the destination country? The answer depends more on the opportunities migrants encounter in the receiving country and the preparation that they have had before leaving home than on the fact that they are circulating. Can they speak the language of the receiving country? Do

their skills match the needs of the local labor market? Are channels of upward mobility open to them? Are the native-born residents hostile or welcoming to immigrants?

The duration of stay and voluntariness of departure also have an impact on integration. A migrant can hardly be expected to integrate if he or she is required to leave after a few months. In contrast, migrants who are able to develop and maintain long-term relationships (both personal and professional) in both the origin and destination countries can more easily move back and forth as circumstances change and new opportunities arise.

Similarly, the challenge of reintegrating circular migrants in the country of origin is less the result of circulation than of the conditions encountered upon return. For returning migrants who continue to be active in the labor force, the most pressing concern is finding productive employment. This, of course, is not a problem specific to reintegration; it is a development problem that affects migrants and non-migrants alike. However, if a migrant's skills (either acquired while working abroad or beforehand) are not in demand in the country of origin – in other words, if there are no suitable job opportunities – reintegration will be difficult. On the other hand, if migrants return to a vigorous job market with valuable skills acquired abroad, they are likely to be attractive hires. Moreover, migrants who develop business contacts abroad may be uniquely positioned to start new enterprises. The requirements for social and cultural re-integration are more difficult to specify. Migrants who have been continually absent for a long period of time may have trouble re-bonding with family and friends and re-adapting to local customs. But migrants who have been able to circulate regularly may have maintained these links more closely and therefore have an easier process of re-integration.

Defining Circular Migration

No standard definition of circular migration has been formally agreed. A commonsensical understanding is that it is a movement of individuals back and forth between the country of origin and another country or countries, involving both return and repetition (return from a single journey *without* repetition is more clearly referred to with the more common term “return migration”). In circular migration, *both emigration and return may be permanent or temporary*, giving rise to four possible patterns:

- the permanent return of permanent migrants (such as the return of Irish expatriates and their descendants to Ireland during the 1990)
- the temporary return of permanent migrants (such as the transnational entrepreneurs who split their time between California's Silicon Valley and their business ventures in their countries of origin)
- the permanent return of temporary migrants (such as the recent return of Japanese-Brazilians to Brazil after spending time as temporary workers in Japan)
- the temporary return of temporary migrants (such as the circulation of contract workers from the Philippines to the Middle East).[\[2\]](#)

Most of the working definitions of circular migration used in a policy framework add a prescriptive element to the definition of circular migration, indicating what it is *meant* to accomplish in policy terms. For example, the Global Forum on Migration and Development uses the following definition: “Circular migration is the fluid movement of people between countries, including temporary or more permanent movement which, when it occurs voluntarily and is linked to the labor needs of countries of origin and destination, can be beneficial to all involved.” The European Commission describes circular migration as “a form of migration that is managed in a way allowing some degree of legal mobility back and forth between two countries. The Consortium for Applied Research on International Migration (CARIM), based at the European Universities Institute, insists that circular migration is (or should be) temporary, renewable, circulatory (offering freedom of movement during each term), legal, respectful of migrants’ rights, and effective in matching labor *supply* in one country with labor *needs* in another. None of these take migrants’ integration or re-integration into account in describing a desirable pattern of circular migration. In this prescriptive vein, MPI weighs in with “a pattern of migration characterized by a migrant’s continuing engagement in both home and adopted countries” – a definition which assumes that circular migrants are integrated in both countries of origin and destination.

Circular migration should not be confused with conventional understandings of temporary migration, which does not build in the dynamism of a continuing engagement in both countries. With circulation, both countries stand to profit if migrants become better educated, more productive members of the community. Temporariness discourages the meaningful, high-return investments in people that are necessary for development and that contribute to economic growth. Employers have little interest in training a migrant whom they will never see again for higher skills or responsibility. This limits the occupational mobility of immigrant workers. Countries of destination, too, have little stake in the individual migrant who has no chance of becoming a member of the national community.

Integration has many dimensions. In this context, it means the process by which a migrant comes to participate in the institutions of the destination country society. Some observers emphasize the cultural and civic aspects^[3] – such as the degree to which immigrants adopt the values and habits of the destination country – whereas others prefer more quantifiable indicators of socio-economic progress^[4] (such as educational attainment, occupational mobility, and inter-generational transmission of poverty).

Integration into the labor market at destination is the priority for economic migrants, but other issues of *access* to social institutions and services and *participation* in political and civic institutions also determine the integration prospects of immigrants. For example, access to education and training (including language acquisition) allows immigrants to build their human capital. Access to financial services facilitates their ability to save money, acquire assets, and avoid excessive charges for remittance transfers, check cashing and so on. Political and civic participation gives immigrants a voice in their communities, to articulate their needs and their ideas about the life of the community. Finally, participation in social and religious institutions ranging from

charitable activities and church services to parent-teacher associations and sports teams are avenues toward active membership in the community – as are the multiple private interactions of family and social life.

The concept of re-integration of the returning migrant is concerned with the same issues of access and participation across the spectrum of economic, civic and social life. The term implies that the emigrant was integrated in his or her community or country before leaving it, which cannot be taken for granted – particularly when migrants come from marginalized communities such as indigenous or ethnic minority groups. (Circular migrants from marginalized backgrounds who succeed, however, may catalyze changes in social perceptions and attitudes toward minority groups in the country of origin.) Lack of integration in the labor market, for example, is one of the main reasons for emigration, as is social exclusion in some contexts. However, circular migrants are less likely to have lost touch with people and institutions in the country of origin than migrants who have been away for long periods continuously.

Increasingly, countries of origin and destination are coming to recognize shared interests in their shared populations. Both countries benefit from ensuring that immigrants and their children – including those who move back and forth across borders – succeed in building their human capital, achieve socio-economic mobility, and accumulate assets over time. And they are increasingly coming to recognize that both countries are responsible for the wellbeing of these shared populations. Immigrant integration and reintegration will likely remain controversial when framed solely in cultural terms, but there is far less disagreement on the socio-economic objectives of immigrant integration and reintegration policies. Moreover, government policies are arguably most effective when they target concrete goals of socio-economic integration rather than more controversial and less tangible cultural objectives.

Binational integration strategies: the case of Mexico

Binational immigrant integration strategies are government programs or policies that aim to improve the wellbeing of nationals regardless of where they reside. Some are collaborative efforts between governments in migrant origin and destination countries to address the needs of a common population – such as through the US-Mexico Binational Migrant Education Program which aims to address the supplemental academic needs of students whose parents regularly move between the United States and Mexico in search of agricultural employment. Another example is a financial literacy program in which Mexican consulates collaborate with the US Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and local banks to empower migrants to handle their money more productively.

Alternatively, binational strategies can take the form of independent efforts on the part of countries of origin to ensure that their citizens abroad have access to basic social services. In the Mexican case, these services are facilitated or, in some cases, provided through Mexico's extensive consular network in the United States in collaboration with the Institute for Mexicans Abroad (part of the Mexican Foreign Ministry) and liaisons at other Mexican government agencies. These initiatives are not

limited to government and often include civil-society and private-sector partners. They typically focus on the fields of elementary and secondary education, adult education and literacy, workforce training, healthcare, financial literacy and access, and civic participation.

While the evidence remains extremely limited, it appears that these initiatives represent a pragmatic attempt to provide basic protections to the most vulnerable among Mexican citizens who reside in the United States, to promote socio-economic mobility and to reduce the inter-generational transmission of poverty among Mexicans (both in the United States and in Mexico).

Source: Laureen D. Laglagaron, *Protection Through Integration: An Overview of Mexican Government Efforts to Build the Social and Human Capital of its Migrants in the United States* (Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute, 2009).

Reintegration Programs

Successful reintegration into the home country begins in the host country. Helping migrants think about, plan for, and prepare what they would do if they return to their countries of origin (many will already have a plan in mind) is essential. But it is not enough merely to plan; they will also need the right tools to succeed.

In spite of its importance, the reintegration of circular migrants is among the most overlooked policy interventions of the migration cycle. Existing experience with reintegration programs has tended to focus on providing protection and support to vulnerable humanitarian migrants – such as the victims of human trafficking,^[5] returning refugees and internally displaced persons,^[6] and in some cases, migrants who have been deported back to their country of origin.^[7] These services range from counseling and education (in the case of the child victims of human trafficking) to land grants and agricultural equipment (in the case of some returning refugees) to vocational training (for some deported migrants).

Increasing numbers of countries of origin are establishing some kind of institution, or assigning an existing one, to assist in the reintegration of at least a portion of the return flow of migrants. These include Ecuador's "Welcome Home" program and Morocco's National Agency for the Promotion of Employment and Skills (ANAPEC), which has as one of its responsibilities to assist returning migrants to reintegrate into professional life. For instance, Ecuador's "Welcome Home" program provides guidelines on the customs and tax regulations that returning migrants face.^[8]

The Philippines claims that its National Reintegration Center for Overseas Filipino Workers is the first of its kind in the world. Operated by the Department of Labor and Employment, it is a one-stop center catering to the needs of returning overseas Filipino workers (OFWs) and their families. This P7 million (US\$140,000) facility funded by the Overseas Worker's Welfare Administration, a government-run migrant welfare fund, offers an ambitious array of services from providing referrals to local

and overseas jobs, skills training programs and psycho-social services to helping well-financed returnees' to acquire formal investment instruments.[\[9\]](#)

The Center was established barely two years ago, and it is not yet clear how effective it has been – nor how effective its very small budget will allow it to be. Some members of the NGO community that provide services to migrants find that the Center has been active in referring clients to their programs but, beyond referral, does not provide any substantial support to NGOs or to migrants directly.

In early 2009, the Philippine government also initiated a new project, the Filipino Expatriate Livelihood Support Fund (FELSF), which aims to provide loans of up to P50,000 (US\$1,000) to migrant workers displaced due to the global economic crisis. The P1 billion fund (US\$20 million) is administered by the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) and the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA) and has the support of government lending institutions like the Development Bank of the Philippines (DBP) and Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP).[\[10\]](#) As of May 2009, the fund has disbursed over P73 million (US\$1.5 million) in loans to 1,473 applicants.[\[11\]](#) This is not the first attempt of the Philippine government to provide subsidized loans to migrants. Previous programs were discontinued due to very low repayment rates.[\[12\]](#)

A limited number of other programs provide support to returning labor migrants – typically vocational training and job placement assistance, and entrepreneurship support. (A more extensive research base focuses on circular migrants' cultural and social reintegration challenges. Given the limited scope for policy intervention on cultural adaptation, this paper does not focus on cultural reintegration.)

Vocational Training and Job Placement

During the 1970s, the French Development Agency (AFD) and the Algerian National Institute of Adult Occupational Training cooperated to provide vocational training to prepare returning migrants for highly skilled work in the country of origin.[\[13\]](#) The European Union and Mali's joint Center on Migration Information and Management (*Centre d'Information et de Gestion des Migrations*, CIGEM) offers job placement and training services for migrants returning to Mali. Under the aegis of Spain's co-development agreements with Morocco, Colombia, and Ecuador, some nonprofit groups provide training to migrants while they are working in Spain and micro-finance support for enterprise development upon their return to their home countries.

Few rigorous evaluations of vocational and placement programs for returning migrants exist – in some cases as a result of their novelty and in other cases due to a lack of data. An AFD evaluation of the France-Algeria vocational training partnership for returning migrants in the 1960s found disappointing results and eventually led to the program's termination.[\[14\]](#) A renewed program, applying to a dozen countries, was instituted after the oil crisis of 1974, and trained nearly 2,000 migrants in seven years. Its mixed record of accomplishment led to the conclusion, among others, that success was absolutely dependent on very close cooperation between the countries of origin and destination to make sure that the right kind of training was being offered to the right people for jobs that did exist.[\[15\]](#) If we assume that vocational training

and job placement services are comparable to the employment services offered to non-migrants in developing countries, some evidence suggests that they can improve private-sector employment rates, although the gains are small relative to costs.[\[16\]](#) However, existing evidence focuses on middle-income countries; the results may be very different for low-income countries where there are few job opportunities in the formal sector. The World Bank concluded over a decade ago that managing worker retraining programs requires strong professional expertise and coordinating capacity, which may be beyond the means of some developing country governments.[\[17\]](#) More extensive (and recent) evidence from developed countries indicates that government-managed worker retraining and skill acquisition programs are costly undertakings with marginal benefits; private sector involvement is essential.[\[18\]](#)

Support for Entrepreneurship

Unless they are part of a broader development strategy targeted toward a specific sector, the available evidence suggests that there is reason to be skeptical about attempts to retrain workers for jobs that do not exist. This line of criticism has led some countries to prioritize entrepreneurship and enterprise development among returning migrants. Extensive evidence describes the entrepreneurial ventures of return migrants: For instance, data on return migrants in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia collected by the European University Institute's "Return Migrants in the Maghreb" project show that the share of entrepreneurs among the migrants increased from 1.8 percent at the time of departure to 11.1 percent among returned migrants to Algeria, from 0.7 to 15.9 percent in Morocco, and from 1.2 to 28.2 percent in Tunisia.[\[19\]](#)

Past attempts to promote entrepreneurship among circular migrants have suffered from a number of pitfalls. First, entrepreneurship is an inherently risky undertaking and, even in the best of business environments, many entrepreneurs fail. Second, not all circular migrants – especially those who have spent the majority of their careers abroad accumulating financial capital while investing little in their own human capital – have the skills necessary to become successful business owners. Third, recent research on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in developing countries suggests that policymakers should take caution when viewing these businesses as the same dynamic creators of jobs and wealth as they are in many developed countries.[\[20\]](#) Many SMEs in developing countries enter already over-crowded sectors with very low productivity and razor-thin profit margins; in such circumstances, they create few formal jobs, often relying on informal family-based labor.

On balance, broad brush attempts to reintegrate circular migrants through vocational training and enterprise development overlook the pivotal question of why (and how) participation in these programs might be more effective for circular migrants than for other participants who lack work experience abroad. An important challenge for policymakers is thus to design reintegration programs that build upon circular migrants' experience abroad to help them lead productive lives.

Support to the Families of Return Migrants

Even labor migration is never just about workers. It has broader social and political implications, and reintegration policy should not overlook these dimensions. While the heads of families may have prepared extensively for return, often their families have not. Reintegration policies for the families of circular migrants are important – both at the most basic levels of public services such as education and health care and in efforts to attract high or middle-skilled expatriates. The challenges are magnified when a migrant returns with a foreign-born spouse or children who have been raised abroad. Those who do not speak the local language may find themselves isolated; the foreign credentials of a spouse may not be recognized. Indeed, circular migration raises many challenging policy questions beyond the already complex issues around labor recruitment and matching.

The policy experience with reintegration programs for the families of return migrants is thin. However, there are limited examples of programs to assist the children of return migrants (including those born abroad) to integrate into elementary and secondary schools. For instance, during the late 1960s and 1970s, the Greek government experimented with academic supports to the school-age children of return migrants, including supplemental after-hours and weekend instruction in Greek language, professional development for teachers working with the children of return migrants, and parental involvement in school activities.[\[21\]](#) Similarly, since 1982 the Mexican Ministry of Public Education has operated a program targeted at addressing the educational needs of students who move regularly between Mexico and the United States, including facilitating the reintegration of the children of return migrants into Mexican schools. Under the Binational Migrant Education Program (PROBEM),[\[22\]](#) school administrators in the United States and Mexico have developed the “Binational Student Transfer Document.” This document conveys a student’s academic achievements and progress between schools officials on both sides of the US-Mexico border so as to minimize the disruption in a students’ academic progress that can occur when students move between countries.

The Policy Challenge

Where circular migration is framed in terms of a relatively short period of employment abroad, socio-economic conditions are unlikely to change dramatically in the country of origin over the course of a single cycle. At the same time, promoting endless circulation is not a coherent development strategy. *The challenge for policymakers is to design circular migration policies that add value to the migration process*, allowing migrants to build sufficient financial, human and social capital – that is, to acquire money, skills, ideas, and contacts – to enable them to undertake productive activities in their countries of origin. There are a number of promising programs that attempt to do this. Below, we describe two kinds of reintegration initiatives that build upon circular migrants’ experience abroad:

- Making human capital investments in circular migrants cost-effective, and
- Identifying circular migrants’ comparative advantage for entrepreneurship.

Making human capital investments in circular migrants cost-effective

Private sector participation – often paired with public support – is necessary in most attempts to make human capital investments costs effective. Moreover, worker-training programs that include input from employers can improve the relevance of skill acquisition to the labor market.

In order for large-scale circular migration programs to be sustainable, they can neither rely on public support alone nor simply be based on a corporate social responsibility model. Employers must be able to justify the extra expenses that are inevitably involved in most short-term circular migration programs. These include for instance, the relatively high costs of international recruitment, skill translation and credential certification for middle- and more highly skilled workers, and the unavoidable structural costs of high labor turnover. In addition, under some programs, employers are also expected to cover international travel and lodging for circular migrants. When employers are asked to invest in human capital development or skills and training into the package for development purposes, the cost structure can become prohibitively high.

Government and civil society can pursue two lines of strategy to make short-term circular migration programs more feasible for employers. First, employers may be more amenable to accepting human capital investments and training costs for their workers if there is a longer horizon for them to accrue the returns on their investments. In policy terms, this means that governments should build long-term employer-employee relationships into circular migration programs. In addition, this would reduce recruitment costs. Second, governments and civil society must identify which human capital investments benefit the public at large and partner with employers to pair vocationally oriented training programs provided by the private sector (e.g., training programs that make workers more productive on the job) with training programs that focus on skills that contribute to the public policy goal of helping circular migrants contribute to sustainable development in their communities of origin (such as entrepreneurship training, marketing).

While training and education programs are important, policymakers should not discount the human capital gains accrued from work experience and on-the-job training (which blurs the distinction between education and work). The record of teacher and nurse/doctor exchange programs and sponsored internships, for instance, highlights the potential benefits of circular migration programs that blend work with education and training.

As entrepreneurs, circular migrants' comparative advantage lies in (a) their direct link to businesses and communities outside their country of origin and (b) their potential exposure to cutting edge (or simply novel) technologies and production process. Indeed, based on surveys conducted in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia, Flore Gubert and Christophe Nordman find that migrants who receive vocational training while abroad are more likely to become entrepreneurs upon return to these countries.^[23] Still, they conclude that no causal link between vocational training and entrepreneurship can be proven. In their study, over three-quarters of businesses started by returning migrants were small, employing fewer than 10 people.^[24] These

data suggest that an additional challenge beyond helping circular migrants start small businesses is to help their businesses grow.

These two observations suggest that export-oriented industries may be a promising sector for enterprise development among circular migrants – for instance, integrated with the supply chains of their former employers or marketing products to their former communities. Although there are limits to export-led growth – particularly in the context of the current global economic climate – there is general consensus that it is very difficult – if not impossible – for countries to substantially improve the quality of their lives without expanding export capacity.^[25] However, these types of joint business ventures require meaningful relationships and trust between the employer and (former) employee – underlining the importance of encouraging long-term relationships between employers and circular migrants.

Another promising area for policy intervention is to facilitate small business finance. Data from the European University Institute survey on return migrants in the Maghreb show that migrant entrepreneurs overwhelmingly rely on personal savings to finance their business startups.^[26] Assisting circular migrants to save – for instance through France’s recently launched co-development savings accounts – will certainly ease credit constraints. Perhaps more significantly, providing circular migrants access to credit in the destination country where lending is often more accessible can also facilitate enterprise development. (In some cases, this may raise currency risk – and potentially loan defaults – where loans are issued in destination-country currencies and where origin country currencies are highly volatile. Currency hedging may be able to reduce some of this risk, but clearly more technical feasibility analysis is necessary.)

Circular Migration in Times of Economic Crisis

Many countries of origin that promote circular migration tend to frame it in terms of reducing domestic unemployment by expanding job opportunities abroad for their less skilled workers. (They may also see it as a way of reducing the perceived losses from the permanent emigration of highly skilled citizens.^[27]) The attraction of circular migration for many destination countries is its flexibility: more immigrants can be admitted during times of high labor demand, and fewer when demand tapers off. In a downturn, expiring contracts can be allowed to lapse. In a global recession, such as that of 2008-2009, the countries of origin have to absorb returning migrants at a time when their own economies are also contracting. (This point has not been lost to some critics of circular migration in the developing world.^[28]) Spain, for example, reduced the intake of migrant workers under its *Contingente* program from over 16,000 in 2008 to only 901 in 2009; the rate at which Ireland issues work permits fell from its peak of 3,693 in July 2007 to 623 in March 2009.^[29] Malaysia went so far as to void current contracts of migrant workers from Indonesia in 2009.

Under normal economic circumstances, there is excess demand for low-skilled workers in many developed countries, and developing countries can provide these workers. Relying on circular migration as a strategy to manage domestic unemployment, however, makes countries of migrant origin vulnerable to decisions

taken elsewhere – and these decisions may not always be purely economic. The outbreak of the 1991 Gulf War forced hundreds of thousands of migrant workers to repatriate on an emergency basis. Severe deterioration in diplomatic relations between a source and destination country, or a political decision to court a xenophobic public by expelling migrants, may have an effect as devastating as a global recession on the affected countries. Large scale returns under compulsion create the worst possible scenarios for reintegration.

Conclusion

The sprawling literature on the development impacts of return[\[30\]](#) and circular migrants can offer important lessons for policymakers seeking to design more development-friendly circular migration programs. First, research suggests that voluntary returnees are more successful than involuntary returnees in their country of origin, in part because they have spent significant time and energy preparing for return – even temporary returns are purposeful and contemplated.[\[31\]](#) Second, migrants have a wide variety of reasons for voluntary return – both temporarily and permanently – to their countries of origin, but these reasons are often closely related to the reasons they migrated in the first place.[\[32\]](#) This suggests that policy makers would benefit from a clear understanding of the incentives that migrants respond to when making decisions to return.

There is no consensus definition of circular migration, but the lack of conceptual precision need not be an impediment to policy development and experimentation on circular migration. Farsighted policymakers will recognize that circular migration – in its various forms – is an on-the-ground reality that is anchored in migrants’ natural preferences. Experience suggests that government attempts to “enforce” circularity will likely result in leakages to informal corridors and may perpetuate cycles of dependence. Rather, policymakers are beginning to recognize that ensuring labor circularity does not have to come at the expense of migrants’ rights. The policy tool kit to facilitate circular migration has become much more nuanced, more high-tech, and attuned to the dynamics of incentives and choice. And where circulation is voluntary, the development dividends are unquestionably greater.

Well designed circular migration policies enable individuals to develop and maintain long-term, meaningful relationships in both their countries of origin and destination. These relationships occur in both work and social contexts. Employers benefit from productive workers who are reliable and have the opportunity to develop firm-specific human capital – in other words, who know the particular requirements of their jobs and workplaces. Most studies on occupational mobility show that there are substantial wage gains from job transitions within the same employer – particularly for lower skilled workers.[\[33\]](#) For societies as well, social cohesion and productive investment decisions (for instance, in education, business relationships and contributions to community life) are based on long-term expectations of returns. Reducing the uncertainty of these returns by reducing the arbitrary elements of circular migration will enhance their development impacts for migrants and their communities at both ends of the migration relationship.

Finally, family considerations are often an important input in any migrants' decision to return. Policy cannot overlook the reintegration challenges specific to the families of circular and return migrants.

Key points for discussion

- Vocational training with a view to reintegration of migrants returning to their countries of origin has a mixed record of success. What factors can increase the chances that such programs will be successful?
- The destination countries' need for a flexible labor market and the origin countries' need for external sources of employment seem to indicate a fundamental conflict of interest, which shows itself most starkly during an economic downturn. What kinds of bilateral or multilateral agreements could help to reconcile the two policy goals?
- What kinds of cooperation between institutions in origin and destination countries could be established to facilitate the reintegration of the family members of return and circular migrants?
- What are some of the actions that civil society organizations and the private sector can take to promote successful reintegration and integration of migrants who move back and forth between two or more countries?

2

[1] Alejandro Portes, Cristina Escobar, and Renelinda Arana, "Bridging the Gap: Transnational Ethnic Organizations in the Political Incorporation of Immigrants in the United States," (working paper 07-06, Center for Migration and Development, Princeton University, December 2007), <http://ideas.repec.org/p/pri/cmgdev/1028.html>; Amelie Constant and Klaus F. Zimmermann, "Circular Migration: Counts and Exits and Years Away from the Host Country," (Discussion Paper Series IZA DP no. 2999, Institute for the Study of Labor, Bonn, August 2007).

[2] See Dovelyn Agunias and Kathleen Newland, *Circular Migration: Trends, Policy Routes and Ways Forward*, Migration Policy Institute, Washington, DC, 2006.

[3] See for example, US Department of Homeland Security, Task Force on New Americans, *Building an Americanization Movement for the Twenty-first Century: A Report to the President of the United States from the Task Force on New Americans*, Washington DC, 2008.

[4] See for example, James P. Smith and Barry Edmonston, eds., *The New Americans: Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal Effects of Immigration* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 1997).

[5] Keo Chenda, *Life after Reintegration: The Situation of Child Trafficking Survivors* (Geneva: International Organization for Migration, November 2006).

[6] See for example, *Forced Migration Review: Home for Good? Challenges of Return and Reintegration*, no. 21, (September 2004).

[7] See for instance El Salvador's "Bienvenido a Casa" (Welcome Home) program. "Repatriaciones," Ministerio de Justicia y Seguridad Pública, accessed June 25, 2009, www.seguridad.gob.sv/web-seguridad/migracion/repatriaciones.htm; the Catholic Relief Service operates a similar program in Honduras.

[8] Secretaría Nacional del Migrante (SENAMI), "¿Qué es Bienvenid@s a Casa?" (Quito: SENAMI, 2009) <http://www.migranteecuadoriano.gov.ec/content/view/30/38/>.

[9] Veronica Uy, *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, *RP opens first reintegration center for migrant workers*, March 12, 2007

- [10] Philippine Information Agency, Press Release, *Gov't earmarks P1-B for Fil-Expat Livelihood Support Fund, PGMA tells OFWs in Riyadh*, <http://www.pia.gov.ph/default.asp?m=12&fi=p090205.htm&no=08>
- [11] Overseas Workers Welfare Administration, Press Release, *FELSF loan availments surpass P73M for 1,473 borrowers*, <http://www.owwa.gov.ph/news/2009/06/felsf-loan-availments-surpass-p73m-for-1473-borrowers/>
- [12] Dovelyn Rannveig Agunias and Neil Ruiz, *Protecting Overseas Contract Workers: Lessons and Cautions from the Philippines* (Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute, 2007) http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/MigDevInsight_091807.pdf.
- [13] René Brochard, Guillaume Cruse, Paul Henri d'Ersu, Roger Lebhar, Henri Loisel, and Michel Wagner, "La formation des travailleurs immigrés en vue de leur réinsertion dans l'économie de leurs pays d'origine, Premier bilan du programme 1974-1981," (Paris: Caisse Centrale de Coopération Economique, Division Formation Migrants, June 1981).
- [14] Brochard, Cruse, d'Ersu, Lebhar, Loisel and Wagner, 1981.
- [15] *Ibid.*
- [16] On Mexico, see Angel Calderón Madrid, *Revisiting the Employability Effects of Training Programs for the Unemployed in Developing Countries* (Inter-American Development Bank, Latin American Research Network Working Paper No. R-522, May 2006). On Hungary, see Christopher J. O'Leary, "An Impact Analysis of Employment Programs in Hungary," *Economics of Transition* 5, no. 2 (November 1997): 453-487.
- [17] John Middleton, Adrian Ziderman, and Arvil Van Adams, *Skills for Productivity: Vocational Education and Training in Developing Countries* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 1993).
- [18] Amit Dar and Indermit S. Gill, "Evaluating Retraining Programs in OECD Countries: Lessons Learned," *World Bank Research Observer* 13, no. 1 (1998): 79-101.
- [19] Flore Gubert and Christophe J. Nordman, *Return Migration and Small Enterprise Development in the Maghreb* (Badia Fiesolana, San Domenico di Fiesole: European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, 2008).
- [20] Abhijit V. Banerjee and Esther Duflo, "What is Middle Class About the Middle Class Around the World?" (MIT Department of Economics Working Paper No. 07-29, December 2007).
- [21] Micheline Rey, *The School Re-Integration of the Children of Greek Emigrants in Their Parents' Country of Origin* (Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation, 1985).
- [22] Secretaría de Educación Pública, "Programa Binacional de Educación Migrante," http://www.mexterior.sep.gob.mx:7008/2_probem.htm.
- [23] Flore Gubert and Christophe J. Nordman, *Return Migration and Small Enterprise Development in the Maghreb* (Badia Fiesolana, San Domenico di Fiesole: European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, 2008).
- [24] *Ibid.*
- [25] World Bank, *The Growth Report: Strategies for Sustained Growth and Inclusive Development* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2008).
- [26] Flore Gubert and Christophe J. Nordman, *Return Migration and Small Enterprise Development in the Maghreb* (Badia Fiesolana, San Domenico di Fiesole: European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, 2008).
- [27] Whether or not the emigration of the highly skilled actually constitutes a loss for developing countries continues to be a point of considerable academic debate.
- [28] Aderanti Adepoju, Ton van Naerssen and Annelies Zoomers, *International Migration and National Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: Viewpoints and Policy Initiatives in the Countries of Origin* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 2008).

[29] Michael Fix, Demetrios G. Papademetriou, Jeanne Batalova, Aaron Terrazas, Serena Yi-ying Lin, and Michelle Mittelstadt, *Migration and the Global Economic Crisis* (Washington, DC and London: Migration Policy Institute and the British Broadcasting Corporation World Service, September 2009).

[30] Return is inevitably part of circular migration – either as a singular or periodic occurrence.

[31] Jean-Pierre Cassarino, ed., *Return Migrants to the Maghreb Countries: Reintegration and Development Challenges* (San Domenico di Fiesole, Italy: Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute, 2008).

[32] See generally Oladele O. Arowolo, "Return Migration and the Problem of Reintegration," *International Migration* 38, no. 5 (2000): 59-82.

[33] Peter Gottschalk, "Wage Mobility within and between Jobs," (Boston College, Economics Department, Working Paper, April 2001).