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1. Introduction

We are talking about migrant workers and not refugees in mortal danger. Otherwise, they would not choose to return to their country of origin.¹

This study explores the process of reintegration Ghanaian involuntary return migrants face after being deported from Western countries. In recent years, return migration has attracted experienced growing concern from both governments and organizations. The interest in return migration originates from various perspectives: in the Ghanaian context, return migration was desired at government level in order to contribute positively to the country’s development. On the other hand, with upcoming migration flows from the South in the 1970s, Western protectionist governments increasingly encouraged the migrants to return home. Their return was considered as the most durable and sustainable outcome and best option to the integration in the host societies (Hammond 1999). This approach of a ‘voluntary’ return soon turned into a ‘forced’ return procedure which has often been neglected up to the present day. As stated above, Israel’s Minister of the Interior Gideon Sa’ar argues that only those migrant workers would have to come back to their origin country without being placed in mortal danger upon return. In reference to the home context, the Ghanaian government generally assumes that forced returnees do not face any particular challenges back home. Yet there is no information about how returnees actually deal with their living conditions upon return, which makes the sustainability of return even more questionable.

For the purpose of this study, six Ghanaian involuntary return migrants, i.e. asylum seekers who were expelled from Western industrialized countries without expressing their personal desire to do so, were interviewed about their different motivations for migration and return experience and thus their perception of their individual reintegration. Since given migration patterns do often neglect the aspect of forced return migration, a bottom-up perspective of the study was applied. This study argues that such return can only be sustainable if returnees are provided with possibilities to become re-embedded in the respective home country in terms of economic, social network, and psychosocial dimensions. Hence, the sustainability of return is regarded as a continuous process of mixed embeddedness rather than reintegration.

¹ Statement of the Minister of the Interior of Israel Gideon Sa’ar in the year 2013, after having introduced an amended law concerning the maximal length of stay in a detention center for irregular migrants, from initially three years to one. In any other case, an indefinite detention of asylum seekers who cannot be deported was introduced (IRIN 2013).
The aim of the research project is to assess the returnees' subjective criteria by which they perceive their return and which factors tend to underpin their statements. Individual characteristics, the returnees' migration cycle as well as present socio-economic conditions in their origin country are taken into consideration and compared in order to analyze their self-perceived levels of individual re-embeddedness in Ghana. It should be mentioned that none of them was part of any voluntary assistance initiative funded by organizations or other government related institutions others than from their personal social networks. The description of the problem statement and research interest leads to the following research questions:

- To what extent a sustainable reintegration of deported Ghanaian returnees could take place?
- Which factors influence the process of re-embeddedness of the deported Ghanaians?

The idea of the topic arose during a three-month stay in the year 2012 in Ghana and contact with a former migrant who was forced to return from a European industrialized country back to Ghana. Throughout several discussions, my personal interest for further issues concerning asylum and migration in Europe grew. Intensified research demonstrated that there are currently only a few starting points for the field of forced return and the post-migration experience of involuntary returnees. In comparison to previous publications, the focus of this study is on forced migrants and their reintegration upon return. The following chapter demonstrates how the main research questions mentioned were to be answered.

1.1 Methodology

Particularly in development research, qualitative research is a suitable method including “any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification” (Strauss and Corbin 1990: 17). Thus, the data of this given study is analyzed on the basis of the grounded theory approach formulated by Glaser and Strauss (2005). Qualitative research follows analytic or interpretive procedures in order to set up later findings: “One does not begin with a theory, then prove it. Rather, one begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge” (Strauss and Corbin 1990: 23). Therefore, instead of making any pre-made hypothesis, a suitable theory evolved during the research process. Referring to the aim of this study, the questions were based on an actor-focused approach and thus excluding a predefined theory.
Important for the used technique is how the data is conceptualized. Depending on the purpose of the research, Strauss and Corbin (1990) name the 'kind of coding', the 'theoretical sampling' as well as the 'comparisons between phenomena and context' as central elements of the grounded theory. This is to explain complex everyday’s realities (ibid.). At this point, hermeneutics play an important part for the understanding of realities. It is considered as a continuous and open process which does not imply static results (ibid.). Depending on previous experience and knowledge, various perceptions and understandings do occur. Therefore, critical questioning and an open awareness for the interpretation need to be maintained during the research (Breuer 2009).

If the aim of the study is to generate theories, the “development of theoretically informed interpretations is the most powerful way to bring reality to light” (Strauss and Corbin 1990: 22). Nevertheless, the grounded theory does not try to impose any theory; it deals with a certain study area and links potential theoretical aspects to it (ibid.). Open analysis procedures shall help the research to adapt to given structural conditions whereas systematic research rules are neglected (Strauss and Corbin 1994).

A variety of data sources, whether it be with qualitative and/ or quantitative research methods, are used. Examples of the data sources are interviews, field observations with the help of literature research in the form of biographies, letters, newspapers or other media sources (Strauss and Corbin 1994). Concepts and relationships between these can be developed from the collected data (ibid.). Depending on the way how concepts and interpretations are formed during the research, the process is influenced accordingly (ibid.). The data analysis needs to be continuously scrutinized and compared in detail in order to reveal all kinds of incidents related to the research (ibid.). Data being analyzed at an earlier stage of the research might be found at a given time (ibid.). Further steps of the research process are now demonstrated in the following sub chapters.

- Research process

Personal networking in Austria and Ghana allowed me to get to know further six other Muslim Ghanaian deportees between 25 and 35 years who had been subject to deportation policies in Northern countries such as Italy and Israel. In order to establish a kind of personal and ‘trustful’ relationship before my research stay, I tried to maintain regular contact with the deportees and prepare them for the upcoming interviews. During that time, uncertainties concerning the research and both the respondents’ and interviewer’s positions were clarified. Furthermore, all respondents were willing to fill out a short questionnaire stating personal characteristics such as age, family status, religion and current situation as well as information
concerning their migration experience, for instance their year of return, profession in the host country etc. This questionnaire was not to be considered as quantitative research method to be evaluated together with the qualitative data. It was only conducted to get a general overview about the interview partners which let me structure my interview questions accordingly. In order to comply with the approach of the grounded theory and the adaptation of the research questions, the data interpretation, interviews and codes were conducted in a non-linear process.

The actual research took place between August and September 2014. Fortunately I was accommodated by a Ghanaian host for two months who was in close touch with the deportees. The first weeks consisted of orientation and further familiarization with the social system and the interviewees' social reality. From the beginning of the stay, I visited the interview partners with the Ghanaian host who played an important role as intermediary between both interview partners and interviewer. Before the interviews, the visits’ purpose and specific details about the research project were discussed. These discussions were necessary in order to gradually establish a trusting relationship and make the interview partners understand that I did not collaborate with any higher governmental authorities. The study's purpose was to highlight their post-migration experience due to forced return motives. Furthermore, I tried to adapt myself to the research field through constant reflection in terms of my own role as researcher and the methodology. In particular the gender background of the interview partners played a significant role which will be explained in the next subparagraph. Even though the applied methodology did not change during the research, an ongoing flexible and adaptable process of reflection needed to be followed (Froschauer and Lueger 2003).

- Target group

The study focuses on the post-migration experience of a male target group between 25 and 35 years old (on their return). According to Dannecker (2006), a gender-specific analysis of migration flows has been neglected both in public and scientific debates. Females are largely perceived as either dependant migrants following their husbands or families abroad, or victims of women trafficking (ibid.). Nonetheless, there are strong indications that migration in West Africa has become more and more feminized (Awumbila et al. 2009 in Jónsson 2009). Even though the literature indicates a greater percentage of females figuring dominantly in internal migration, mostly young men migrate internationally (National Geographic Guide on Human Migration 2005). However, this pattern seems to have become obsolete as more and more young women in Africa and Asia emigrate on their own to nearby destination
countries (Anarfi et al. 2003). Female migration has become even more striking in the last years, resulting in equal numbers for both women and men emigrating (Adjei 2006).

Nevertheless, the study solely focuses on male Ghanaian emigrants due to the given access of the researcher to the potential target group. What was a striking phenomenon of the research was the production of male migrants’ networks supporting each other in the idea of emigration. Dannecker (2009: 124) argues in return that in the context of Muslim women emigrating from Bangladesh, “a distinction of the ‘good’ women who have not migrated, and female migrants as the ‘bad’ others” has been constructed. In this context, interaction, exchanges and networking and thus solidarity between women are difficult to develop. Although female migrants who had returned, identified themselves very much with their female co-migrants, the development of networks or other social forms necessary for the renegotiation of gender relations is not very successful in an environment where female migration is constructed as un-Islamic and incompatible with the local culture” (Dannecker 2009:124-125). This statement demonstrates that the production of social networks and the interests of migrants can significantly differ by defined gender roles (ibid.).

- **Interview guidelines and interviews**

  The interview guideline contained semi-structured interview questions adapted to the main research question of this study. The questions were openly addressed and put simply in order to motivate the target group to speak about their life situation and thus comprehend profound background knowledge (Dannecker and Vossemier 2014). However, the order of the interviews was not strictly kept but slightly guided according to the respondents’ answers. Qualitative interviews tend to diverge from the order of the interview in order to let the interview partners point out relevant aspects so that other subject areas could arise through an open conversation (Bryman 2008). Strauss and Corbin (1994) recommend applying the guidelines of the grounded theory which are to be modified in compliance with the purpose of the research.

  The respondents’ behaviors and emotions needed to be taken into consideration in the course of further interviews. For instance, if the questions provoked too painful an experience far beyond personal privacy, the interviewees were asked if they needed some time to reflect or preferred not to respond to the given question. If later was affirmed, the conversation was slightly pointed in another direction in order to avoid any awkwardness or interruptions. In general, the interview partners were not to be influenced by the interviewers’ previous knowledge and assumptions on the research subject (Flick 2005).
All interviews were held in English because the interview partners were familiarized with English as the official language in Ghana and at the same time because the research study was a phenomenon reaching beyond the German-speaking population. Thus, no translation of the interview transcriptions into German was needed.

All interviews were conducted in a very friendly atmosphere. At the beginning, the polite reluctance came from both interview partners and interviewer because both had to face a completely new situation. However, the initial shyness was quickly overcome through some common small talk and a short presentation of the research project and its scope. Even if the interview partners were for the first moment surprised by my interest in their post-migration experience, they found it important and positive to get a chance to speak about it. I also asked for their consent on recording the conversation. The noisy backgrounds made it sometimes hard to transcribe the recorded interviews afterwards. This aspect leads to the next subchapter of communication process.

- Communication process

In terms of the communication process, the word ‘reintegration’ respectively ‘re-embeddedness’ was to be avoided in order not to direct the interview partners in one direction. I focused my research rather on how they defined the understanding of their individual experience of return in the process of communication. Their cooperation with the interpreter which at the same time had a confidential relationship with the interview partners immensely facilitated the communication process. Not only the interview partners felt freer to talk in the presence of their close friend (interpreter) who was aware of their personal state, the interpreter also supported the linguistic and logical understanding between both interviewees and interviewer. At the end of the interviews, there was enough time for questions and other concerns that the interview partners were likely to avoid during an interview situation and while the recording device was switched on.

The interview partners could freely decide where the interviews were to take place which was often in their own familiar or professional environment instead of in an unknown environment where they could feel at ease. After each interview, notes were taken on what was particularly relevant for the context of the interview such as gender, age, professional position and general impressions about the interviewees’ social environment. Furthermore, statements which were expressed by the respondents afterwards, for instance statements which they preferred not to express while being recorded or giving additional information that was relevant to the research.
• Role of the researcher
Before the research, the question often presented itself as to whether an empirical part would be possible which greatly depended on the respondents’ openness and willingness to communicate about such sensitive topics concerning their experience after deportation. In addition, I constantly had to question my own role, as a female researcher, facing male interview partners from another religious, cultural and social background. At the same time, it was not my aim to ‘exoticize’ and therefore make the interview partners feel uncomfortable in their role as a ‘research object’. However, these concerns turned out to be irrelevant as most of the interviewees responded positively to the interviews. Even though the first interviews were still marked by slight uncertainties and doubts, I gained in confidence over time and improved the interview questions and issues in the sense of the Grounded Theory.

• Data analysis
According to the grounded theory the collected data was analyzed on the basis of an open-coding analysis described by Strauss and Corbin (1990). Codes and memos were set up through the collected interviews, reflections and other comments from the interview partners. According to Strauss and Corbin (1996), coding breaks down, conceptualizes and recomposes the data in order to develop a new theory.

The first step consists of open coding – a process which allows to set up open and multiple interpretation perspectives, followed by the summarizing of concepts which seem to sort similar phenomena into categories (Strauss and Corbin 1990). The categories could partly be compared to the dimensions of the concept of ‘mixed embeddedness’ (see chapter 3.2). For instance, the returnees’ financial situation upon return could be assigned to the dimension of ‘economic re-embeddedness’. However, a constant comparison of statements and concepts was helpful in order to break down pre-assumptions and create ‘theoretical sensitivity’ (Strauss and Corbin 1990). Besides that, the established concepts and categories had to be compared to those of other research studies concerning ‘mixed embeddedness’ in order to further maintain the correspondence of given concepts and categories. “Though you do not want to enter the field with an entire list of concepts and relationships; some may turn up over and over again in the literature and thus appear to be significant” (Strauss and Corbin 1990: 50).
• Other sources of data
Due to the fact that migration and the aspect of ‘forced migration’ consists of a variety of
different aspects, a wide-ranged review of interlinked factors such as background information
about Ghana’s socio-economic performance, present migration theories and the
differentiation between the terms of ‘forced’ and ‘voluntary’ return had to be conducted. This
led me to consult and analyze primary as well as secondary resources. The latter consisted
of scientific articles, relevant internet sources, publications of international organizations as
well as NGOs. Primary resources were governmental and legislative texts or statistics from
the Ghana Statistical Service (GSS). The limitations of the research which arose during the
research process will be explained in detail in the following section of the research.

• Limitations of the research
A small number of limitations of the research should be taken into consideration. First of all,
the findings of the given research reflect only Ghanaian case studies and therefore are not
necessarily representative of forced returnees in Ghana. No general conclusions can be
drawn from the study.

Due to the short research period and the relatively long distance from the Ghanaian host
family to the interview partners, it was not always possible to stay in close contact with the
interview partners respectively and conduct several conversations with all of them. It would
therefore be necessary to conduct a long-term, quantitative study, including the returnees’
network, for instance their families and closer environment. This aspect is particularly
important in order to understand the networks’ attitudes towards the returnees and their life
situation post migration. Furthermore, the allocated time was not enough to study returnees
across the whole country.

Even though I was lucky to conduct my interviews with the given target group, I was mainly
dependent on the advice and information by the interpreter and the availability of the
interview partners which made an individual selection of interview partners impossible. A
different selection could have contributed to another outcome and conclusions of the thesis
accordingly. Furthermore, due to the fact that the interpreter and interview partners knew and
maintained a close relationship to each other, the interviews might have been influenced to
some extent as well. However, it must be stated that without the help of my interpreter, a
research about forced return migrants would not have taken place at all.

Despite the fact that I explained my role as independent researcher, it was partly
misunderstood from one of the returnees as I was once indirectly asked for some financial
assistance. This fact had to be taken into account during the data analysis as the interview partner’s answers could have been linked to his personal expectations.

Although I was acquainted with the cultural and social background, the interviews were sometimes difficult to conduct due to insufficient language or comprehension skills. Further, the use of a recording device made some of the interview partners feel shy and more silent. Often, relevant information about their personal feelings and behavior could be found out after the recorded conversation.

Furthermore, the interview partners were more willing to talk about migration experience abroad than the actual research topic of their personal re-embeddedness. As the interviews were conducted in a chronological way about their migration experience in order to gain a general overview about their experience abroad, their post-migration cycle was only at the end of the interviews.

1.2 Structure of the thesis
The structure of this given thesis is grouped into 5 chapters. Chapter 1 explained the initial situation and recent political relevance of the topic. Arising research questions, explanations about the applied methodology as well as limitations of the practical part of the research were demonstrated.

Chapter 2 explains the development of the aspect of return migration and its role in migration theories. Hereby, for the relevance of the study, a differentiation of forced and voluntary return is undertaken in order to demonstrate the neglect of forced return within international migration theories. To conclude, the historical background of migration patterns including return migration in Ghana is illustrated.

Chapter 3 gives an insight into what is meant by the sustainability of return being interconnected with the applied concept of ‘mixed embeddedness’ for the research. The three dimensions of this concept as well as potential individual characteristics, migration cycle and degree of assistance in Ghana as factual criteria determining the returnees’ re-embeddedness will be explained in detail.

Chapter 4 summarizes the outcomes of the research: individual characteristics and the migration cycle of the target group are described in order to evaluate their return experience according to the concept of ‘mixed embeddedness’.

Chapter 5 provides an overall conclusion and gives information about the most important outcomes of the study.
2. What is return migration and its role in migration theories?

*Migration is an enduring theme of human history and is considered one of the defining global issues of the twenty-first century (Awumbila et al. 2008: 2).*

In comparison to the last century where international flows were considered as one-way flows of European and Asian migrants to North America, the process of migration is nowadays shaped in a multifaceted manner. Due to increasing possibilities of technology and communication, a large number of mobility movements occur, be it by human beings, finances, goods and services, technology, information channels or ideologies (Gmelch 1980). Migration flows are obviously not only to be considered in one way, but naturally generate counter flows being defined as return movements (Appadurai 1996). Empirical studies demonstrate various factors turning return migration into a manifold and heterogeneous phenomenon. But still, return migration has generated unclear definitions up to this day (Cassarino 2004; Ammassari and Black 2001).

The American anthropologist Gmelch (1980) explains various concepts of return migration. In Anglo-American literature, the term is often used synonymous with remigration, second-time migration and repatriation. According to Gmelch (1980: 136), return migration constitutes a “movement of emigrants back to their homelands to resettle”, assuming return migration as final stage of the migration cycle. Conversely, migrants staying temporarily, either for a shorter or longer stay, or without any intention of a final return to their country of origin are not included within this definition (Gmelch 1980). Hence, this definition of return migration makes it difficult to distinguish between someone staying for a 'short visit' or intending to resettle permanently (ibid.).

In contrast to Gmelch’s assumptions, return migration is nowadays regarded as an open and continuing 'back and forth' movement within migration cycles (Anarfi and Jagare 2005). The initial systematic and theoretical approach was published by Frank Bovenkerk (1974). The Dutch anthropologist highlighted the lack of literature defining migrants’ influences on their countries of origin. He formulated the typologies of actors as well as the migrants' motives for return and their capacity of the returnees' reintegration which have not lost their validity to date (ibid.). However, due to the lack of literature and quantitative data collection beyond different disciplines before the 1960s, the aspect of return migration has either been partly or entirely neglected in comparison to other subjects (Brecht 1995; Gmelch 1980).
In-depth discussions about the phenomena of return migration followed in the 1970s, after the first initial global economic recession due to the current oil crisis and thus the inversion of migration movements within Europe. In the years 1973 and 1974, a first peak level of guest workers from Southern Europe had to react to restricted immigration policies from Germany and France by returning to their home countries (Brecht 1995; Ruben et al. 2009; Davids and Ruben 2008). Besides that, the countries mentioned initiated the first ‘re-integration assistance’ programs while encouraging return through financial and investment incentives (De Haas 2006) According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), return migration of migrants’ groups was considered as a stable and the ‘best’ solution, compared to integration in the host country or remigration to another country (Ruben et al. 2009). Hammond (1999) broaches the issue that ‘going home’ was regarded as ‘the most natural’ thing to do; it was taken for granted that “once returnees are back in their native country their roots will be reestablished” (Hammond 1999, cited in Ruben et al. 2009: 912). Kjertum further states “that once the refugee has returned ‘home’, things are back ‘in their right order’.” (Kjertum 1998, cited in Ghanem 2003: 12). Besides that, Kjertum highlights that repatriation is not necessarily the ‘end’ of the ‘refugee cycle but “the beginning of a new cycle comprising the social, political, and economic reintegration in the home country” (ibid.).

In order to implement the heterogeneity of returnees within the ongoing discussions of return migration, Cerase (1974) introduced four typologies of returnees on the basis of Italian migrant workers returning from the US and linked their situation within the host country, their individual experience and their personal expectations of their return to their home country (Cerase 1974 in Currle 2006). As mentioned above, these typologies point out that those situational and contextual factors are the condition to evaluate if the migrants’ return was to be considered as ‘sustainable’. The four typologies consist of following aspirations, expectations and needs (Cassarino 2004):

- **Return of failure**: due to given prejudices and clichés towards the migrants, they were prevented from integrating in the respective host countries which makes them more willing to return home.
- **Return of conservatism**: Under this category, migrants with the previous intention of returning home after having acquired sufficient financial means in order to obtain their own piece of land and no more being dependent on their landowners. Due to their rather egocentric aspirations and those of their families, they do not mean to change “their social context they had left before migrating; rather, they help to preserve it” (Cassarino 2004: 257).

---

2 The aspect of ‘re-embeddedness’ will be further analyzed in chapter 3.
3 The ‘sustainability’ of return will be explained in chapter 3.1.
• **Return of retirement**: after a certain amount of labour time within the host countries, the migrants decide freely to return to their origin countries in order to spend their old age and obtain a piece of land.

• **Return of innovation**: as the least static category of Cerase’s typology, it concerns actors, which by the means of acquired skills and experience during their time abroad, are willing to achieve new opportunities within their origin countries. Through their acquired experience, they regard themselves occupying a role of ‘innovative mediators’, what can consequently contribute to satisfying their personal expectations. However, Cerase states that this category of returnees is unlikely to change their home countries because of the existence of strong traditional power structures without any attempt of innovation.

Gmelch (1980) refined Cerase’s typologies in further linking the returnees’ motivation for return together with their individual intentions. The migrants’ decision to return is determined by their individual opportunities both in countries of destination and of origin. Gmelch’s main classification of returnees is according to the length of time of staying abroad and their reasons for returning (ibid.). Hence, his first category consists of returnees who intended temporary migration: their return is defined by the objectives they set themselves during the time of emigration, mostly characterized by financial means in order to construct a house or start a business back in their home country (ibid.). On the other hand, Gmelch (1980) classified those returnees who, due to external factors such as family conditions in the origin country or other economic constraints in the host country, intended permanent migration but were forced to return. The third type of returnees includes those who initially intended permanent migration but chose to return. Their mental costs such as homesickness and failure of adjustment led to their decision of return, therefore, to an environment which makes them feel comfortable and secure (Gmelch 1980).

In this context, it can be argued that return migration in academic literature has broadly been perceived as a voluntary practice (Mensah 2012). As Cerase (1974) demonstrates, forced returnees had not been implemented within his typologies as he concentrated more on the migrants’ motivation and intentions of return. Gmelch’s second type includes the fact of forced return indeed, but emanates rather from the returnees’ personal decisions. The explanation shows that the returnees felt subject to restrained social or economic conditions both in the destination and home countries. However, political constraints are not mentioned in Gmelch’s typology what leads to the conclusion that the returnees did not have to undergo any procedure of expulsion out of their destination country (Currle 2006).
However, this study contextualizes deported returnees who were not able to regard their individual opportunities within both countries of destination and origin. It can be assumed that this category can neither be classified into Cerase’s nor Gmelch’s classification of returnees. Cerase’s typologies require that the returnees’ decision is based on their individual intentions which in case of forced deportation cannot be taken into consideration.

Since return migration was represented as a ‘natural’ and ‘obvious’ phenomenon of the ending migration circle, it was in fact considered ‘voluntary’ and generating ‘sustainable’ reintegration into their host countries up to the 1980s (Chimni 1999; Black and Gent 2004; Ghosh 2000). While Western European immigration policies were further tightened due to rising ‘flows of refugees’ in the destination countries, it was assumed that return could positively contribute to the origin countries in terms of brain gain and financial and social remittances involvement to the returnees’ local economies and thus a reduction of income disparities (Black and Koser 1999; Binford 2003 in Spaan et al. 2005). However, the often voluntary concept of sustainable return fostering development was considered by the migrants themselves as repulsive and economically disadvantageous and therefore led to a discourse of involuntary return (Gmelch 1980; Black and Gent 2004; Chimni 1999).

The factual issue of forced deportations initially came up in the 1990s within scientific literature (Currle 2006). While new migration movements, not only of Yugoslavian war refugees, but also of Cambodian and Vietnamese as well as African refugees were arising, a reduction of refugee aid occurred. Director McNamara of the UNHCR’s Division of international Protection spoke out on that issue as follows: “imposed return has become necessary because of pressure of host states and a lack of money to care for the refugees” (Reuters 1996, cited in Ghosh 2000: 216). Bradley (2006) dealt with legal questions and organizations for involuntary returnees, Koser (2001) in cooperation with the IOM, analyzed the reintegration of asylum seekers and irregular migrants as well as the repatriation procedure through European government programs. However, the lack of articles shows that ‘forced return’ has mostly been neglected. Further, despite the application of Western European policies concerning return migration, research about rejected migrants and their post-migration experience can hardly be found (Ruben et al. 2009).

It can be questioned why forced return migration has not been regarded within theoretical approaches above. As mentioned, increasing interest in the political and scientific framework of return migration only arose from the 1970s which could to some point explain the unsought topic of forced return up to the present day. At the same time, the economic crisis and missing financial means in Western countries were confronted with upcoming globalization movements, including irregular and regular refugee movements from former
conflict and other less prosperous regions which made Western policy makers react with restrictive immigration regulations.

As Cassarino (2008) states,

Since the 1990s, the growing politicisation of international migration movements, the ensuing adoption of restrictive laws regarding the conditions of entry and residence of migrants, asylum seekers and refugees, reinforced border controls, the heightened debates on national sovereignty and identity, constitute the main ingredients that have gradually been conducive to different perceptions of migration, in general, and to return, in particular. Such new taxonomies as ‘voluntary return’ and ‘forced return’ started to shape more intensive public discourse and action by governmental and intergovernmental institutions (Cassarino 2008: 99).

This dichotomy of ‘voluntary’ versus ‘forced’ return should be kept in mind in particular for the relevance of this study. The different typologies of returnees demonstrate that the motives for return are crucial to influence the opportunities and constraints for the returnees’ livelihoods. However, and due to the fact that none of the set-up typologies include those returnees who were forced to return due to restricted migration policies, the following chapter illustrates a clearer differentiation between voluntary and forced return. This differentiation is particularly relevant for this given work in order to the returnees’ situation once having deported back home.

2.1 Differentiation of forced and voluntary return

Depending on the voluntariness of return, the respective implications on migrants and the communities to which they return can significantly differ (Van Houte and De Koning 2008). A differentiation of forced and voluntary return needs to be undertaken in order to understand to what extent the forced returnees underlying an asylum denial in Western industry nations, could still build up their sustainable livelihoods and thus reintegrate back in their home country Ghana. For this purpose, the European Migration Network (EMN) uses the overall definition of return as follows:

Broadly, the movement of a person returning to his/her country of origin, country of nationality or habitual residence usually after spending a significant period of time (i.e. excluding holiday visits, business meetings and typically considered to be for a period of time of more than three months) in another country. This return may or may not be voluntary (EMN 2012: 178).

As the Global Migration Group (GMG) argues, migrants voluntarily decide to return to their country of origin after having accumulated a sufficient amount of savings in the destination countries. As a matter of fact, such voluntary return may likely contribute to the “migrant’s own development in both economic and social dimensions” (GMG 2010: 12). As Dustmann (2003) states, if financial constraints can be overcome through those higher returns in the home countries, migrants may more likely to return to their home country. In
this case, ‘voluntariness’ is given because the returnees were able to carefully organize their return instead of being pressured to return.

Noll (1999) states what policy makers mean by ‘voluntary return’: ‘voluntary return’ for them occurs if returnees are obliged to return home without experiencing any forceful expulsion. This kind of voluntary return often goes along with fewer financial incentives (so called ‘Assisted Voluntary Return’ Programs) for the potential returnees – a method which is often preferred to deportation methods evoking even costlier political, economic and psychological procedures. Noll argues that such a kind of “return can never be voluntary when there is no plausible (legal) alternative” (Noll 1999, cited in Van Houte and De Koning 2008: 2) to stay within the countries of destination: The returnees do not have any other choice than returning home and at the same time no legal alternative to stay within the respective destination country. Even if they are not physically or psychologically compelled, a ‘voluntary’ return under these conditions can be questioned accordingly (ibid.).

Dimitrijevic et al. (2004) define ‘voluntary return’ as follows: “[...] after reviewing all available information about the conditions in their country of origin, refugees decide freely to return home” (Dimitrijevic et al. 2004, cited in Van Houte and De Koning 2008: 2). This definition stands opposed to the first definition above: every ‘voluntary returnee’ (often used by NGOs and political makers in the frame of ‘Assisted Voluntary Return’ Programs) who does not receive any legal and permanent stay and at the same time must return without expressing his or her explicit will, is defined as ‘involuntary’. This statement is important to keep in mind for this study: it regards any kind of return which had not been personally desired by the migrants themselves, and after reviewing all available information, as involuntary.

According to Van Houte and De Koning (2008), among those that are concerned with ‘involuntary’ return, it still has to be differentiated “between involuntary returnees who were forcibly pushed out of the country, and those who were pressured to return by authorities or, did not see a possibility to stay in the host country” (Van Houte and de Koning 2008: 2). This differentiation can be applied to the case of the interviewed Ghanaian deportees leading to ‘involuntary return’: Four out of six interview partners stated that their deportation happened in a ‘voluntary’ framework. All of them were underlying an asylum denial in Israel, were arrested and detained in an Israeli detention center, where they claimed to have been released after having spent an indefinite period of time. The only condition for their release was to accept their deportation. In this case and in reference to the above-mentioned definitions, the returnees would indeed fall under the category what policy makers may call ‘voluntary return’ as they were not forcefully expelled out of the Israeli state. However, due to their forced detention, they were neither offered any possibility to review all the possible
conditions in their country of origin nor could they access any other plausible alternative what makes them undergo a forced return procedure. Though, it can be stated that all four Ghanaian interviewees had resided within the same country which, as a result, does not necessarily mean that mentioned example of ‘voluntary’ or ‘involuntary’ can be applied as a general case. In the other two examples, the deportees were expelled without any plausible alternative option of staying in the respective host countries nor any possibility of ‘voluntary’ return at all. In this case, a ‘forced’ return can indeed be assumed.

This chapter demonstrates that the terms ‘voluntary’ and ‘involuntary’ return need to be questioned in all single cases as literature and media often tend to cover the de facto reality of how return had taken place. Hence, Cassarino (2008) states:

*The gradual pervasiveness of this dichotomy (voluntary versus forced return) in public discourse and policies on migration and return is today unquestionable. However, the extent to which it reflects the composite nature of return flows and returnees’ experiences is highly debatable. There are two interrelated reasons supporting this argument. The first lies in the fact that the dichotomous approach to return, as it stands now in current policy measures, serves security-oriented purposes and proposes one-size-fits-all solutions aimed at securing the effective departure of unauthorised migrants and rejected asylum-seekers. The second reason is that neither conditions in countries of origin after “return” (or expulsion) nor reintegration are considered* (Cassarino 2008: 99).

The following chapter further illustrates the different approaches of return migration in order to explain how returnees have been represented within international migration theories and located in space and time and the neglect of forced return.

### 2.2 International theories of return migration

Different international migration theorists dealt with the subject of migration movements in the frame of economical, structural and sociological approaches and therefore included return migration as a sub-category. The following systematization of theoretical approaches as well as the illustration of returnees aims to provide a better overview on the historical development of return migration and the different dynamics behind this term. Based on Currie’s (2006) comparison, it should be demonstrated to what extent the theories include the issue of forced return. In order not to go beyond the scope of this work, exclusively economic, structural as well as new sociological approaches are demonstrated as most relevant approaches.
2.2.1 Economic approaches

Economic approaches are one of the oldest migration theories (Cassarino 2004). They deal with the question how migration influences economically, for instance economic growth and a country’s labor market within a certain space and time (ibid.). Economic approaches can be divided into two different, relatively opposed approaches: on the one hand, neoclassical approaches are about how individuals tend to improve their economic situation through migration into countries with higher wages. As participants in the global market, they respond to market uncertainties and signals. Costs caused by migration and decreasing social bonds are opposed to positive outcomes such as a permanent residence permit or a secure income in the host country (ibid.). Return migration within this mentioned approach is considered as a failure of migration objectives with migration costs higher than outcomes (Currle 2006). Neoclassical approaches therefore consider return migration as an individual failure resulting from the economic objective of migration, i.e. an increase in income has not been achieved (Cassarino 2004).

In contrast to neoclassical approaches are the New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM) where return migration is calculated and planned as a positive result of the migration cycle (Cassarino 2004). Migration is temporarily restricted in order to improve one’s own economic situation. Positive outcomes are advantageous through the migrants’ return and in particular the remittances that are sent to family members in the country of origin (ibid.). The migrants’ return becomes relevant whenever economic objectives and thus the migration are evaluated as positive success (Constant and Massey 2002).

Both theories with exclusively economic factors neglect the fact that there could be other factors than success or failure which result in return movements. Individuals are only considered as economic instead of ‘social’ actors. Migrants’ decisions and strategies are not connected to their social and political context within their origin country at a certain time (Cassarino 2004). This approach tends to disregard reintegration of migrants after return and the actual effects on the returnees’ country of origin (ibid.). Regarding the research question, the aspect of forced return migration does not find its way into economic approaches.

2.2.2 Structural approaches

Structural approaches which are often used in sociology and geography include both individual migrants’ decisions and the socio-political situation with a certain ‘degree of innovation’ of the respective country of origin (Cassarino 2004). The decision to return is embedded within the economic, social and political context and goes beyond the sole consideration of migrants being economically oriented. Unlike economic theories, structural approaches do not focus on the success or failure of the migration experience within the
decision of return; it is rather emphasized on how return migrants can generate productivity once they arrived at their home place (Cassarino 2004). According to Cassarino (2004: 257), “the returnees’ success or failure is analyzed by correlating the “reality” of the home economy and society with the expectations of the returnee". Referring to the above-mentioned ‘degree of innovation’, central in this approach is, on the one hand, the economic impacts on the returnees’ home countries; on the other hand, which criteria are crucial for their individual reintegration process (Gmelch 1980; Cassarino 2004). Economic effects instead of cultural and social aspects between home and destination countries as well as the transfer of social capital and ideas are considered (ibid.). Despite the differentiated aspect of return migration, the subject of forced migration remains unconsidered within the framework of structural approaches as the approach assumes individual return decisions instead of initiated expulsion to the migrants’ home countries.⁴

Unlike economic theories, structuralist approaches include the subject of reintegration upon return and further ‘challenges’ connected with the last. However, among those four categories of returnees, there is no evident class for returnees being forced to return. All categories assume that returnees freely decide themselves to return, corresponding to their individual intentions. What turns the structuralist approach innovative is the consideration of the origin countries’ conditions after return (Currle 2006). Involving these conditions makes it easier to broach the issue of reintegration and economic development and return countries. However, it can be assumed that the issue of forced migrants within structuralist approaches is once again being neglected (ibid.). No independent typology of returnees has been set up for their explicit reference. On the one hand, this lack of typology can be due to the missing scientific debates about forced migration at the time of the authors’ publications, on the other hand, due to an intentional lack of reporting.

2.2.3 New sociological approaches

New sociological approaches link complex and heterogeneous relations of return migration and perceive globalization and mobilization processes. An advancement of these approaches allows a better understanding of circular migration and among those involuntary return movements (Currle 2006). Thus, it can be distinguished between the Transnationalism Theory and Social Network Theory (ibid.).

Transnationalism attempts to set up a conceptual framework in order to calculate social and economic relations between both countries of destination and origin (ibid.). Economic and sociological relations within sociological approaches are to be regarded as influencing factors

⁴ One of the representatives of the structuralist approaches is Cerase whose typologies of returnees were explained in chapter 2.
on the migrants’ identity and dynamics of migration movements. Return is not to be looked at as a final point of the migration cycle but rather as a piece of a circular system between social and economic bonds (Cassarino 2004). Clear definitions of countries of origin and destination as well as migration, remigration and mobility cannot be made (ibid.). An economic, political and social network beyond national borders is built up (ibid.; King 2000).

The transnationalism approach is based on interrelated concepts: the transnational identity and transnational mobility (Cassarino 2004). The transnational identity consists of a mixture of identities that were acquired from both country of origin and destination and have a positive impact when the migrants have to negotiate their place within host and origin societies (ibid.). Unlike the structuralists’ assumption, those ‘double identities’ make them become better prepared for their return (ibid.). The returnees do not experience a conflict of reintegration as they recognize the need for ‘adjustment’ to the respective social, political and economic conditions in home countries without abandoning their ‘double identity’ (ibid.). Through their transnational mobility which is to be seen synonymous to the ability to keep in regular touch with the home countries through ‘back-and-forth movements’ and several practices, they can benefit from a better prepared process of return and reintegration while at the same time maintaining their acquired identity in the destination country (ibid.). However, further analysis of the returnees’ motivations cannot be assumed (Currle 2006).

The Social Network Theory considers returnees as “bearers of tangible and intangible resources” (Cassarino 2004: 265), examines how returnees prepare their return by means of cross-border networks independent from ethnic origins. These networks are based on past connections made in the destination countries but also interpersonal relationships before migration (ibid.).

Both theories include the maintenance of strong linkages to the returnees’ home countries. One potential criticism of these networks is that the failure or success of a migrants’ return experience cannot solely result from former migration experiences and their social network (Cassarino 2004). This is due to a shift in migration flows, permanently increasing communication and mobilities; social capital is to be regarded within the Social Network Theory (ibid.). At the same time political borders and the aspect of forced migration are not concretized within the above mentioned theories.

Having gained an insight of the aspect of return migration in Western literature and politics, the next chapter demonstrates how the aspect of return migration in the Ghanaian context has been dealt with.
2.3 Historical background of migration and return migration in the Ghanaian context

In order to connect the topic of return migration to the relevant geographical region Ghana, it is crucial to know how West African regions have particularly shaped the discourse of (return) migration and human mobility (Anarfi et al. 2003; Agyeman and Setrana 2014): mobility has always been a characteristic aspect within West Africa, “with school scholars, traders and other travelers moving between the region and other parts of the continent, most frequently North Africa” (Taylor 2009: 3).

Going forward to the 20th century, Ghana is the first country in Sub-Sahara Africa achieving its independence and thus a great forerunner for foreigners within one country, in comparison to other African countries. Due to its resulting relatively well-off economy, the country becomes an attraction pole for other African economic immigrants and thus for many decades a country of net immigration (Twum-Baah et al. 1995). According to Bump (2006), “the 1960 census indicates there were 827,481 persons of foreign origin living in Ghana, accounting for approximately 12 percent of the total population” (Bump 2006: s.l.). Due to the economic boom in Ghana at that time, international emigration concerns a rather minor percentage of highly-skilled Ghanaians such as students and professionals migrating to the United Kingdom and other English-speaking countries (Anarfi et al. 2000). For instance, there are approximately only 100 Ghanaians in Canada in the year 1967 (Owuso 2000).

It was only from the 1965 ongoing when an upcoming economic mismanagement and political instability, enormous emigration movements of both foreign and Ghanaian nationals occur. Ongoing loss of employment forces many nationals to leave their country in search of jobs. Most of the emigrants were professionals such as teachers or lawyers, being invited to assist such countries as Botswana, Nigeria or Zambia in their independence efforts (Anarfi et al. 2000). However, after the decline of Nigeria’s economy which was at that moment considered as main the destination for Ghanaian emigrants, they have to suffer several deportation procedures as other non-nationals in the year 1983. From this moment on, other Non-African destinations, in particular the United States, Canada and in Western Europe the United Kingdom, Germany, Holland and Italy are targeted (Asiedu 2005; Awumbila et al. 2008; DRC 2007).

The semi- and especially high-skilled migration from Ghana to Northern industrial states, especially of medical professionals, is established, representing the highest percentage of highly skilled emigrants (46%) from West Africa from the 1980s (Bump 2006). Van Hear (1998) emphasizes “long-standing movements abroad of Ghanaian professionals and
students. Ghana may have lost 14,000 qualified teachers, among them 3,000 university graduates, in the period 1975-81" (Van Hear 1998: 205). By the mid-1990s, the number of Ghanaian nationals staying abroad rises to a percentage between 10 and 20 percent of the total population which was approximately between one and three million persons in 33 countries (Peil 1995).

The main destinations being targeted by Ghanaian nationals need to be taken into particular consideration: According to Development Research Center (DRC) in the IOM’s Country Profile about Ghana from 2009, “over 71 per cent of the total number of Ghanaian emigrants – live in ECOWAS countries” in the year 2005 - instead of Northern industrial countries as the main destination target (DRC 2007, cited in IOM 2009: 57). In 2006, the total number of 189,461 Ghanaian emigrants residing in OECD countries was less than one percent of Ghana’s total population (OECD Migration Database 2008 in IOM 2009: 57). The IOM further relies its data on numbers concerning return migration provided by the Ghanaian Statistical Service (GSS) as well as Ghana Immigration Service (GIS) responsible for the processing and analysis of the information concerning ‘official’ Ghanaian population figures. However, mentioned quantitative data has to be taken into account with caution. As the references show, a number of macroeconomic organizations were consulted, neglecting irregular immigration to industrial countries. As indicated within the Migration Country Profile 2009 provided by IOM, there is no available data on trans-Saharian migration of Ghanaians emigrants. Thus, the data provided by the responsible services GSS and GIS might diverge from the factual number of Ghanaians living abroad (IOM 2009).

According to Bump (2006),

there is little doubt that they are among the largest groups from sub-Saharan Africa in Western Europe with particularly high numbers that range somewhere between 20,000 and 100,000 in Great Britain, Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands (Bump 2006, cited in Nieswand 2014: 405).

But not only European countries seem to be attractive; North America is likely to be considered as the main destination for Ghanaian migrants. According to Parrillo (2000), “between 1991-1998, Ghana was the third leading source of African immigration to the United States” (Parillo 2000, cited in Oppong 2004: 85). As stated, the expulsion of Ghanaian nationals from their main destination Nigeria caused return migration to firstly appear in scientific literature from the 1980s onwards, resulting in various forms of ‘voluntary’ and ‘involuntary’ return.5

5 The missing data can on the one hand be explained by the restructuring of the Ghanaian statistical Service between 1947 (the year of establishment of the so-called ‘Office of the Government Statistician’) and 1985 (the introduction of the Statistical Service law launching the responsible Statistical Service) (Statistical Service Ghana 2015). On the other side, it is questionable if the lack of numbers of return migrants can be referred to the missing interest in return migration issues.
Return was not only the result of compulsion. It is indeed true that, despite the continuous number of Ghanaian nationals striving for greener pastures abroad (Van Hear 1998), more and more returnees were doubtlessly affected by the economic crisis in Western countries. The latter aspect, and at the same time the recent solid political situation and other economic improvements such as the discovery of oil in Ghana, prompted them to return (IOM 2009; Awumbila et al. 2009, cited in Setrana and Tonah 2014: 2). Black et al. (2003) conducted a quantitative survey regarding remittances of Ghanaian returnees on the local economic development. It could be verified that investment in small enterprises instead consumable goods was undertaken (ibid.). Ammassari (2004) treated the subject of return from the perspective of national-building and the development of entrepreneurship in Ghana.

One reason for the Ghanaian government to alter the Ghanaian return migration approach was to attract high-skilled Ghanaian nationals back to Ghana (Awumbila et al. 2008). As Sjenitzer and Tiemoko (2003) state, this attempt was made in order to transfer acquired higher education skills from abroad back to Ghana and to facilitate job improvements for the returnees concerned. Through this attempt, human capital creation in Ghana was promoted after the 1990s (ibid.; Twum-Baah et al. 1995).

Referring to Rodriguez and Schwenken (2013), the production of emigrants respectively returnees is often desired. The authors state that governments and national private sectors often undertake

_investments in producing the ‘ideal’ migrant. Interestingly, despite the fact that these various actors’ aims may be at cross purposes, in some cases to promote migration and in other cases to prevent migration (and this can be performed in either overt or subtle, hidden ways), we also find points of convergence in the ways the ‘ideal’ migrant is produced by them_ (Rodriguez and Schwenken 2013: 386).

As it was the case in both countries such as the Philippines and India, emigrants could be considered as a kind of “colonial subjects” (ibid.) who had to undergo a process of ‘modernization’ to become “agents of development” (ibid.). Nowadays, they are perceived as “the idealized mother, the productive worker, the development/ citizen-subject, the returnee, and so on” (Rodriguez and Schwenken 2013: 386).

These examples can be applied in the case of Ghanaian ‘desired returnees’ just as well as the Ghanaian government’s attempt was to attract the highly-skilled workers. Comparing the above-mentioned ‘subjectivation’ of migrants to the given research question of this work, deportees returning from Western countries were not considered as ‘lucrative’ returnees and rather neglected within the Ghanaian return migration politics.
In regard to the return of Ghanaian nationals within the last 20 years, the Ghana Living Standard Survey (GLSS) 1998/1999 states that “10 per cent of the stock of emigrants return in any given year” (GLSS 1999, cited in IOM 2009: 66). These figures do not seem to have decreased within the last decades: According to IOM’s figures from 2009, the whole total number of Ghanaian arrivals “from 2000 and 2007 steadily increased from 18.6 per cent to 34.6 per cent. Of the 1,090,972 Ghanaians who left Ghana from 2000 to 2007, only 153,632 did not return within that period” (IOM 2009: 13). Once again, these figures need to be regarded with caution: even though GIS reports the total number of Ghanaian and non-Ghanaian arrivals and departures travelling from and to Ghana, the organization does not make any clear distinction between Ghanaian in-coming short visitors and (permanent) repatriates (ibid.).

According to Mazzucato (2007),

little data exist on return migration in Ghana. Surveys contain too small samples to be nationally representative thus making only tentative conclusions possible. There is a need for a large-scale, systematic data collection effort in order to accurately assess the scale and effects of return migration in Ghana. (Mazzucato 2007: IV).

Furthermore, as there is no clear differentiation of quantitative data concerning voluntary and forced return (IOM 2009; GLSS 2014), no further conclusions about the socio-economic characteristics, especially about those Ghanaians undergoing deportation from origin destination countries can be made.

Referring to the deportation of Ghanaian nationals from the Second Millennium, it can be stated that approximately 20,000 emigrated Ghanaians were deported between 2001 and 2007 (IOM 2009). The Annual Report from 2010 provided by GIS specified 925 Ghanaian deportees from countries of destination such as the United Kingdom, Israel, Saudi Arabia as well as the USA in 2010 (Agyeman and Setrana 2014). Compared to the number of 1,347 expelled Ghanaians from different countries in 2007, the total number of deportees seems to have decreased (IOM 2009). However, IOM (2009) clearly states that there is no clear schematic of numbers of Ghanaian deportations throughout the last decade. Further, divergent figures are published, depending on the respective source: A recent article published by Ghana Nation states that in 2012, besides 237 ‘voluntary’ returnees, approximately 3,000 Ghanaians were deported from all over the world (Abotsi 2014) and thus much higher than the numbers stated above. Referring to these figures of deported Ghanaians, it can be questioned to what extent Ghana’s socio-economic performance influences present ongoing migration movements to other ‘better off’ industrialized countries.

---

6 According to Black et al. (2003), the GLSS provide information on the “total number of residents who have lived abroad and then returned, dividing these into people who have resided in the neighboring countries Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Mali, Nigeria, and Togo, and those who have moved beyond this region” (Black et al. 2003: 8).
2.3.1 Excursion: socio-economic performance in Ghana

In terms of growth, Ghana is one of the West African forerunners with a relatively high macro-economic stability. As the International Monetary Fund (IMF) states, Ghana was in fact the first country in West Africa (it reached the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) before 2015) to reduce poverty and hunger by half (IMF 2012). As the only West African country, Ghana was ranked from a low to a medium developed country by the United Nationals Development Program (UNDP) in the year 2011 (UNDP 2013).

Ghana’s current value of Human Development Index (HDI) amounts to 0.558, ranking the 135th out of 187 countries (UNDP 2013). Ghana’s average Gross Domestic Product (GDP) amounted to 4.3% per annum in the 1990s and from 2001 onwards and developed further to 7.3% in 2008 (ibid.). In 2006, the GDP was $12.5 billion, the Per Capita Income $540 (Awumbila et al. 2008). Despite the fact that the GDP has been rising positively since the economic reforms in 1983 (ibid.), Ghana’s economic performance has highly been vulnerable to external shocks such as the global financial crisis and thus a following economic loss to 4.1% of growth rate in 2009 (IMF 2012). Ghana’s growth rate experienced a gradual increase to 14.4% in the year 2011 (ibid.).

On the other hand, the relation to poverty needs to be measured accordingly. Since 2010, the UNDP Human Development report has ceased to include the sole coefficients such as the daily income level (in $) and instead introduced a so-called Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) in 2010 (UNDP 2013). However, in order to compare past data with current poverty trends, the income level needs to be taken into consideration: whereas the poverty rate was very high in the years 1991/92 (51.7%), approximately 28.6% of Ghana’s total population lived below the income line of $1.25 in 2005/06 (ibid.). This MPI followed the Human Poverty Index (HPI) measuring a population’s longevity, knowledge and a decent living standard (ibid.). The MPI included these last three dimensions and in addition more indicators such as lack of income, disempowerment, poor quality of work and threat of violence (ibid.). According to the most recent study from 2008, Ghana’s MPI has a value of 0.144 (ibid.). This indicator means that “31.2 percent of the population lived in multidimensional poverty […] while an additional 21.6 percent were vulnerable to multiple deprivations” (UNDP 2013: 5). One aim of the Ghanaian government was to improve the provision of social services in order to fulfill its MDGs. For instance, free maternal health care services for pregnant women as well as free riding and feeding programs for school children were introduced (Awumbila et al. 2008).

In terms of development assistance, Ghana is highly dependent on donor countries with a net Official Development Assistance (ODA) of USD 1.815 million in 2011 and a bilateral ODA
share of 49% of Ghana’s GDP (OECD Aid Statistics). The main multilateral and bilateral donors are the International Development Association (IDA), United States, IMF, United Kingdom, African Development Bank (AfDB), EU Institutions, Canada, Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands (ibid.)

Despite Ghana’s decreasing poverty rate, poverty continues to strongly contribute to the insufficient employment and educational sector. The emigration of both skilled and non-skilled Ghanaian workers from health and educational sectors do indeed counteract Ghana’s socioeconomic development and wealth. The inequality of salaries for workers in the public sector and the incapacity of the government to reform present remuneration systems as well as the shortage of job opportunities in the private sector are crucial for economic difficulties in the country and thus ongoing migration movements from Ghanaians to other Northern ‘more developed’ states (Anarfi et al. 2003; Awumbila et al. 2008).

2.4 Theoretical approaches of return migration and its relevance for the aspect of forced return migration

The historical development of return migration has doubtlessly shaped the above-mentioned theoretical approaches. Within these theoretical approaches, a tendency towards homogeneous categories of voluntary returnees can be observed: whereas economic approaches initially treated migrants as economically oriented actors returning in a voluntary manner after having achieved their goals, structural approaches conducted intensified research on the returnees’ motives for return as well as their ability for reintegration and thus the development potential of the respective origin countries. Forced return was for the first time conceptualized within recent sociological approaches, attempting to introduce a closer differentiation of returnees.

Moreover, only a small number of models consider the fact that not all returnees fulfill the same starting conditions upon return, especially those that were expelled from the destination countries. One example is Cassarino’s model which includes the heterogeneity of returnees and their potential for reintegration and personal development in the returnees’ home country, independent from origin countries, social background, motivation, prospects and skills (Cassarino 2004).

Variables such as ‘preparedness’, legal status, the returnees’ motivation, resource mobilization and the respective length of stay within the host countries should be taken into consideration within the analysis of the returnees’ potential (Cassarino 2004). For instance, the level of ‘preparedness’, which encompasses the returnees’ intention (‘willingness’) and
the actual willingness to return (‘readiness’), must be integrated within the model and can strongly differ in terms of the returnees’ resource mobilization and preparedness (Cassarino 2004). Applying to this model to forced return, rejected asylum seekers are less likely to accumulate sufficient resource mobilization and thus less willing to return. Return needs to be considered as a continuous process requiring time, resources and awareness of both conditions in host and home countries which is not given for forced returnees (ibid.). Cassarino (2004) assumes that the respective level of ‘preparedness’ is crucial for future impacts on the origin countries. Depending on the factual pre-return conditions, the respective reintegration of returnees can hence turn out to be more complex (ibid.). If they do not offer any broad potential for their home country, they are even more likely to repatriate once having returned home due to their incapacity of decision-taking (De Haas 2005).

The second chapter described how return migration has only been considered as a positive view of migration and an increasing development, with the outcome of remittances topping the amount of official development assistance (De Haas 2006). Considering return as a voluntary decision, the issue of forced return for ‘less desirable’ categories of migrants has in fact been neglected within theoretical approaches of return migration (Ghosh 2000). A positive perception of the returnees is assumed without implying the reason and decision of former emigration (Black and Koser 1999). Western justifications by calling ‘voluntary’ return as a sustainable solution for both destination and home countries may likely to have ‘covered’ the conditions that returnees were exposed to. Return as voluntary decision further ignores the aspect that migrants face challenges and building relationships during migration hence do “no longer share many of the basic notions that underlie their traditional culture” (Gmelch 1980: 143). Hammond (1999) states that a loss of property, restricted economical conditions and opportunities, poor political governance and social structures such as basic health care and personal security can especially occur in post conflict countries (ibid.; International Development Committee 2004). Instead of arriving ‘at home’, the returnees may feel themselves to be resettled to a ‘new place’ due to altered local circumstances. Obviously, these conditions of instability can generate further conflicts between returnees and the local residents in the respective country which at the same time leads to greater societal pauperization (Black and Gent 2004; Ghosh 2000). The UNHCR mentions that expelled asylum seekers or irregular migrants, who could temporarily be protected in Western Europe, could put “additional pressure on [countries] already facing the difficult challenge of integrating refugees in a context of very limited absorption capacities” (UNHCR 2004, cited in Black and Gent 2004: 15).
Consequently, disputes on sustainable return and development for migrants who had been sent back to their country of origin against their explicit will are to be treated with caution. As stated previously, the circumstances in the home countries upon return play a significant role in the given thesis in order to identify what the migrants face once being sent back. Poor living conditions can induce the returnees attempt to remigrate to their former country of destination what does not imply a sustainable return (Koser 2001; International Development Committee 2004; Black and Gent 2004).

The following chapter creates a link between the aspect of forced return and a concept to analyze the deportees' reintegration in Ghanaian society. Thus, the migrants are to be conceived in a process of 're-embeddedness' upon arrival, going beyond the fact of 'reintegration' (Ruben et al 2009). A clear distinction of these two concepts will be discussed in the next chapter.

3. Post migration experience and the so-called concept of ‘mixed embeddedness’

Return migration is more than just the process of someone's return to his or her home country. Ruben et al. (2009) emphasize that return migration is an on-going process, reaching beyond Gmelch’s definition of “the movement of emigrants back to their homeland to resettle” (Gmelch 1980: 135). Every level of migration conditions the migration cycle which at the same time is dependent on pre- as well as post-migration experience. Often, migrants, and particularly those suffering from forced migration, can pass through unforeseen multiple challenges and expectations upon return (Davids and Van Houte 2008). Not only the returnees themselves have changed after a certain time of living within an economic and social context entirely different from the one of the respective home society; it is often their former environment in the home society which is subject to certain changes and is perceived differently by the returnees themselves. Through an integral viewing of all migration steps and life experiences of the interviewed deportees from Ghana, their return and thus reintegration process need to be analyzed by means of the multidimensional concept of 'mixed embeddedness' (Davids and Van Houte 2008; Gmelch 1980). Through this concept, it is found out to what extent a reintegration could factually take place. Often, ‘return’ is often linked to the ‘sustainability of return’. But what exactly can be defined as sustainable return? Which dimensions are responsible for the latest?
3.1 Sustainability of return

The sustainability of return migration is closely linked to reasons for return and return must be voluntary in order to be considered sustainable (Black and Gent 2004, cited in Anarfi and Jagare 2005).

Speaking about return migration, there is an important and connected aspect that is employed in scientific literature: the sustainability of return. Van Houte and De Koning (2008) argue that sustainability cannot only be measured by the criteria if the migrants intend to re-migrate or not (Van Houte and De Koning 2008; Black and Gent 2004; Koser 2001). The term ‘sustainability of return’ requires a wide range of interconnected factors. Van Houte and De Koning (2008) emphasize that “one has to look at all aspects of a returnee’s livelihood [...] On an economic and social dimension and also in terms of identity, these aspects influence each other in a process that is continuous” (Van Houte and De Koning 2008: 6). According to the UNHCR, the ‘sustainability of return’ is used as a synonym of reintegration and can be defined as the “the reentry” of former refugees into the social, economic, and cultural structure of their original community” (Dimitrijevic et al. 2004, cited in Van Houte and De Koning 2008: 6). This definition presumes that an entire adaptation to the dominant host society takes place where migrants return to a society without considering the fact that they have acquired their own identity and position while being away from home (Ruben et al. 2009). Therefore, it is necessary to further develop a definition reaching beyond the term of an entire adaptation and exceeding what is called ‘reintegration’ respectively a ‘sustainable return’.

In the study of Black et al. (2004), a concept of sustainability by means of three dimensions was defined: First, depending on the individual situation, the subjective point of view of returnees has to be taken into account. Secondly, the objective evaluation of the returnees’ conditions and third, the aggregate conditions within their home country demonstrate the main criteria (ibid.). Hence, the involvement of not only socioeconomic elements within the home country, but the individual evaluations of returnees are to be involved (ibid.). This subjective perception concerning their sustainability of return can differ in relation to the returnees’ individual experience before migration, within the host countries, the return conditions as well as the decision-making process of returnees (ibid.).
3.2 The concept of ‘mixed’ embeddedness

The concept of ‘mixed embeddedness’ applied in this study “refers to the process in which a person, organisation or company is able to participate in a given society depending heavily on the identity dimension” (Davids and Ruben 2008: 96). The concept argues that ‘sustainable return’ can be only considered if the returnees acquire the essential conditions to achieve a certain level of ‘reintegration’ which is characterized by the complex interweavedness of economic, social network and psychosocial dimensions within the individuals’ migration experience (ibid.). For instance, the authors argue that general living conditions in the origin countries such as working possibilities, housing as well as social networks influence the individual success of the returnees (ibid.).

Even though the concept of ‘mixed embeddedness’ reaches beyond the sole level of ‘integration’, it does not introduce defined rules but involves the individual identity of each returnee within the continuous process of ‘re-embeddedness (Black and Gent 2004.)’. The concept claims that individuals can set up their position and sense of belonging through more interrelated, multifaceted dimensions within the home society in which they act. A complete image of an entire adaptation to prevailing norms in the home society is abandoned while maintaining a certain identity required in the host countries (Ruben et al. 2009).

The concept of a successful re-embeddedness should not be given as the only means to analyze how returnees can become embedded into their home society. Rather, it is applied in this study in order to categorize the subjective findings of the Ghanaian interview partners into predefined categories. Nevertheless, other unmentioned dimensions are likely to turn out as more or less important as those within the concept of re-embeddedness. The following figure demonstrates how the dimensions of the concept of re-embeddedness are interwoven and thus how a sustainable return could take place within a certain framework:

---

7 The concept of embeddedness originates in New Institutional Economics and was for the first time introduced by the American sociologist Granovetter in 1985. According to the sociologist, trust constitutes a central part of social networks which in turn implies successful work progresses in organizations. Further, the term of ‘Mixed Embeddedness’ used by Aldrich, Waldinger (1990) and Kloosterman (2006) should be employed in order to analyze the migrants’ interrelations through the embeddedness in both host and home society (Kloosterman et al. 1999).
Figure 1: (Re-)Embeddedness (adapted from Ruben et al. 2009: 914)

Finally, Davids and van Houte (2008) split this mentioned concept into three interrelated dimensions as follows: 

3.2.1 Economic Embeddedness

An economically 'successful' 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). In practice, an economic embeddedness is fulfilled if they have access to work, financial savings, education, health and housing for oneself as well as one’s next generation. (Ruben et al. 2009; Van Houte and de Koning 2008).

---

According to Van Houte und Davids (2009) a multidimensional approach includes a political dimension. Owing to the central role of individuals within the concept of re-embeddedness, the political dimension is only taken into account with regard to the individual identity of the returnees and thus within the psychosocial dimension (ibid.).
3.2.2 Social Networks

Social networks play an essential role for the returnees’ sense of acceptance as a decisive factor of embeddedness (Davids and Van Houte 2008). Personal relationships based on shared values and beliefs contribute to an increased psychosocial well-being and a sense of identity within the home context (ibid.). Through the exchange of personal and confidential information the returnees’ sense of security and familiarity is strengthened (ibid.). Further, social organization and safety can represent a crucial component of an efficient and stable role within society (Davids and Van Houte 2008). According to Cassarino (2004: 265), “such 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”.

3.2.3 Psychosocial Embeddedness

Psychosocial well-being comprises the ability of an independent shaping of identity and relationships within a society (Giddens 1991) According to Stuart Hall et al. (1987), ‘identity’ is based on the concept of the postmodern subject as a “moveable feast: formed and transformed continuously in relation to the ways we are represented or addressed in the cultural systems which surround us” (Hall 1987, cited in Bolaria and Hier 2006: 250). Instead of being biologically determined, it is produced by a set of historical occurrences. Therefore, “the subject assumes different identities at different times, identities which are not unified around a coherent “self”” (ibid.). Potentially, individuals are able to require a multitude of potential identities, dependent on the individual interaction with social interrelations and during a certain time period (ibid.). Ghanem (2003) states that besides that, personal interests, the freedom to construct one’s own identity and its wider acceptance increase the sense of belonging (ibid.; Appadurai 1996). On the one hand, migrants with a positive return experience might gain an enhanced status because of newly acquired skills and, therefore, a stronger sense of belonging (Van Houte and de Koning 2008). On the other hand, changes in geographical and cultural settings can cause unutterably serious effects in terms of hybrid identity construction (ibid.). 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 (ibid.). Feelings of being torn between at least two identities might come up with psychological dysfunctions (Ghanem 2003; Bhugra and Becker 2005).
3.2.4 Individual characteristics influencing the deportees’ ‘embeddedness

In order to analyze the deportees’ re-embeddedness at a microeconomic level, the deportees’ individual characteristics such as their migration cycle, assistance within the respective origin country as well as individual characteristics are not to be isolated from other migration stages as they are the main criteria determining the re-embeddedness prior to factual return (De Haas 2005). These criteria do particularly affect the context of the Ghanaian deportees who were deprived of individual experience and contextual factors regarding their decision to return.

- Individual characteristics
  For instance, individual characteristics such as age, gender, marital status, and socio-economic background are other criteria besides the migration experience influencing the returnees’ re-embeddedness (Ghanem 2003). Other aspects such as ethnicity and religion could lead to innersocietal conflicts and thus have effects on the remigration cycle (Ruben et al. 2009). For instance, this could happen if there had been former conflicts between ethnically different group members who are exposed to another ‘clash’ after one of those return to the country of origin (ibid.).

- Migration cycle
  The returnees’ migration cycle can be distinguished by three phases within the migration cycle: the phase prior to migration, the transition phase from one state boundary to another as well as the phase upon arrival in the host country. In each phase, the migrants’ perspectives are influenced by economic, political and personal opportunities. Consequently, the fourth and potentially last step of return migration, the so-called process of ‘re-embeddedness’, is influenced by the three other stages (Ruben et al. 2009). Initial reasons for emigration from the country of origin, return motives within the transition phase of migration as well as return and re-embeddedness resulting from the post-migration phase have to be analyzed (Boyd and Grieco 2003). Looking at the diverse prospects for deported returnees, unforeseen shocks and threats, for example the involuntary decision of return, can influence the migrants’ self-identity and thus result in a lower self-esteem and trust within former social networks (Timotijevic and Breakwell 2000). As mentioned above, the fact of being unprepared to return implicating insufficient financial means and information about post-return circumstances can further harm the return process (Cassarino 2004).
• Return assistance

As a third external factor, offered return assistance has impacts on the deportees’ return. Assistance does often result in non-comprehensive and inefficient perspectives often resulting from financial means (grants, travel expenses), material means (grants for accommodation and work materials) as well as non-material means (psychosocial counseling) etc. (Ruben et al. 2009). Material and practical support are nevertheless the most used form of assistance, psychosocial needs of deported returnees has been neglected (ibid.).

3.3 Summary

Davids and Van Houte (2008) note that the deported returnees, due to the legal basis and inadequate financial resources, have no other choice than to return. The individual re-embeddedness can widely vary according to the returnees’ own intentions (ibid.). Besides pre- and post-migration phases, the particular conditions and the integration within the origin country as well as preparedness of return play a crucial factor of re-embeddedness (ibid.). The latter may turn out to be disadvantageous in case of involuntary returnees (ibid.). Therefore, a successful re-embedding is notably counteracted. It can be assumed that, due to the insufficient preparedness of return, the acceptance of the returnees’ networks in the home countries and hence their reintegration may become more difficult in the host country than for those returnees having acquired a higher level of preparedness (ibid.).

To sum up, it should be noted that the sustainability of return and re-embeddedness is to be regarded from a subjective and actor-oriented view. Objective and economic migrations models are neglected. Through a sole bottom-up approach the process of re-embeddedness can be classified. Apart from return conditions, a certain time frame and lifestyle within receiving countries as well as the reasons for migration are incorporated in the concept of re-embeddedness (Van Houte and David 2008).

---

9 As the deported returnees did not receive any specific return assistance, be it due to deficient immigration policies or the resistance against respective assistance programs, the aspect of return assistance will be omitted in this study. The aspect of personal assistance of their family members of other social networks is included in the chapter ‘social networks’.
4. Outcome of the research

This chapter illustrates the respondents’ re-embeddedness considering theoretical approaches as well as the Ghanaian context upon return. A general overview of the challenges and problems the interview partners had to face in the frame of their forced return migration experience will be provided. The chapter is divided into following sections: the respondents’ reasons for migration, their migration cycle as well as their experience while residing as asylum seekers abroad are explained in order to demonstrate how their experience of deportation influenced their later re-embeddedness in the Ghanaian context.¹⁰

4.1 Reasons for migration

Reasons for migration stated by the respondents are characterized by a set of different factors which in the post-migration cycle might influence the deportees’ re-embeddedness in Ghana. As Nuro (1999) states, reasons such as employment and educational constraints made Ghanaian high- and low-skilled workers emigrate to Europe and North America from the 1990s (Anarfi et al. 2003; Awumbila et al. 2008). This historic fact has not lost its validity up to date, considering that four of six respondents of this study tried to overcome their economic and educational instability through migration.

4.1.1 The respondents’ individual perception within their family household

Linked to latest fact was their role as male family member and therefore financial supporter for the entire family’s wellbeing.¹¹ Through their role as eldest brother of multi-child families, they either feel responsible for the sake of the entire family or need to find financial support for themselves or other family members. This financial support is to nourish the family members or to offer education possibilities and other general financial assistance. Mahmud’s statement shortly summarizes the situation of the family’s breadwinner:

_I am the head of the family. My side, my parents’ side, my mother’s side. So all eyes on me. And then, the kind of work that I was doing here, it cannot contain all us. It cannot help me and then to help somebody. So I used to find out some way to go and get something that I can develop myself, develop my family. And that’s the reason why I left this country, going to find something for my family._ (Mahmud, 20.08.2014)

It is often the high number of children resulting from Muslim polygamous families with mostly two women or their weakened professional situation leading to financial constraints and thus the care of all children. Zoulou is particularly concerned by the fact of not having to rely on

¹⁰A general overview about the interviewed returnees can be found in chapter 6.2.
¹¹Despite the increasing number of feminine migration within the West-African context (Adepouju 2006), this given work focuses on masculine migration patterns (see chapter 1.1).
his family's pocket and thus feels responsible in financially supporting his family by finding a job outside of the country:

*I have a big family, like you know, my father married, let's say, two women, and we are eight in numbers. And my father can't take care for all of us, so what I have to do is: I have to go out, work, maybe I can get money; through then, I can take care of myself and the rest and myself* (Zoulou, 25.08.2014).

Considering their role as a male breadwinner and eldest, ‘responsible’ son of the family, a heavy psychological pressure weighs on the interview partners, which makes them even more willing to strive for an economic escape out of Ghana to industrialized countries. The psychological pressure is likely to be higher depending on the respondents’ marital status: the respondents can even face higher expectations coming from their wives and children.

Most of the interview partners were able to acquire some financial help through their social networks or partly family members in order to leave Ghana for greener pastures. Half of the respondents received adequate assistance in acquiring visa documents and could for instance fly by air to countries such as Egypt or Libya instead of taking the ‘road way’\(^{12}\). From the fact that the migrants could afford their travel abroad, it could be assumed that they were relatively well off financially; however, personal life circumstances such as the desperate selling of all acquired items and professional equipment for the travel or search of job opportunities and their individual position within their family made them choose to depart – a migration experience which would have been impossible without their social networks or selling everything that they possessed.

*All my business is before I have my own business but during the time that I’m travelling, all these things are vanished now because all my money that I had during that time, I used it for that thing [referring to emigration costs].* (Mahmud, 20.08.2014)

### 4.1.2 Educational constraints

Connecting their individual perception about their position within their family household and as ‘side effect’ of their sufficient financial constraints, they were more likely to underlie educational constraints. Most of the interview partners were about to finish junior or senior high school and had to interrupt or completely leave further higher educational opportunities behind which made them partly become low- and semi-skilled workers. However, two interview partners were indeed striving for financial incentives in order to pay their own school fees and equipment for higher educational institutions within Ghana respectively reach industrialized Western countries for privileged education opportunities. Zoulou went to a private school for IT studies for about six months before departure, Aminu was about to...

\(^{12}\)The author applies the respondents’ jargon and what they understood by that term: following undocumented road ways from Ghana through Togo, Benin, Nigeria/Niger, Chad, Libya and/or Egypt and further to European countries or, as the interviews demonstrate, countries such as Israel.
complete his first year in technical engineering at the Polytechnic when they got convinced to leave everything behind for better education opportunities abroad:

_I can remember, when I completed in this school, I tried to find a job. At the same time, I wanted to go to school. I try as much as possible but I couldn't. So I was like ‘mum, I want to continue my education to the university. But the university is too expensive, I can’t!’ – ‘Ok, you know what we’ll do? Since you love computer, why don’t you go to computer classes?’ And I have to pay. I just pay only half the amount. Two years. I just did this for only six months. And stop. I couldn’t go further because I don’t have money._ (Zoulou, 25.08.2014)

_So I completed my first year and things weren’t easy. Because I could not even get money to procure handouts and all that._ (Aminu, 18.09.2014)

Considering the fact that economic uncertainty lead to educational constraints and likewise, they thought that the only way which could let them follow higher education was the way out of Ghana.

### 4.1.3 Political insecurity and family conflicts

As third reason for migration, the _political insecurity_ can be stated. According to IOM’s Migration Profile of Ghana (2009), almost 100,000 Ghanaians were seeking asylum in Western countries because of political conflicts arising between 1981 and 1992. Recent articles state that tribal clashes do still occur (Tuttor 2012). Particularly Boni and Bari decided to emigrate due to political as well as tribal conflicts:

_When I travelled to Israel, you know that time we have problems. So, I mean, we have some problem even with the country self […]. That time we are fighting. When they get me, they will kill me._ (Bari, 01.09.2014)

_The problem is: my father killed somebody, so that family, they hate us, you know. So they don’t like to see us in my parents’ village. Because my father, our father kill their father. So it’s like a tribal war._ (Boni, 08.09.2014)

### 4.1.4 Wrong conceptions of their migration experience prior to return

The named reasons for migration need to be linked to their expectations and the _unawareness_ respectively ignorance about upcoming asylum procedures and thus insufficient living conditions which make them finally choose to depart. Often, it is not only their personal unawareness but the fact that their own social networks influence their decision of departure. This particularly occurred in Aminu’s case which at the beginning was not even convinced that his financial means could make him go far:
So one day a friend of mine came to the school and said ‘Hey, Aminu. With this struggle, I know what you are going through.’ Because sometimes I have to go to him to support me with money to buy food and all that to go to school. So he said that somebody told him about Libya. And they said ‘Libya is very good and all that. If you go, you can easily make money and later, you can go to Europe and all that.’ According to him, they said that Libya is closer to Italy and within some few hours you are in Italy. So for that matter I say ‘forget of this school and go to Libya’. So when I can, I can go to Europe. So I told him, ‘now that I don’t even have money to buy my fees and pay my rent, how more do I get money to pay for course of travel?’ (Aminu, 18.09.2014)

Another point can be made by the fact that some of the human coyotes assisting the migrants on the road triggered false promises, persuading the migrants of better living conditions upon arrival. Notably Mahmud and Boni were very surprised about either the way the human coyotes first made them believe that they could easily enter Israel in a legal matter or about the place (what they themselves call ‘asylum camp’) where they had to present themselves at their arrival. It seemed to be new for them that they were not automatically allowed to work as they counted on various job opportunities in Western countries.

So, that time we hold the interview paper, but with this interview paper\textsuperscript{13}, we cannot go long and then you cannot use it to work. ‘Cause the person, the connection man, the agent that lead us, he didn’t tell us the truth. This is the situation of Israel, they are not giving us a working permit […]. And then, the time that we realize, that we enter Israel, we see the different situation. What he told us is not the same thing that we saw in Israel. (Mahmud, 20.08.2014)

For instance, one of their ideas was often linked to their concept of following a professional career as football player(s). In four out of six interviews, football was named as a reason for ‘trying their luck’ abroad. One of the interview partners stated that on his way, a human coyote deceived him into thinking that through the coyote’s help, he could easily reach the Israeli border where he could start a professional career as football player:

\textit{I’m a football player, I’m a football player! But the agent took us, since we are players. Since we know how to play football.} (Mahmud, 20.08.2014)

Zoulou was rather surprised that once having arrived in Israel, his asylum procedure impeded him from pursuing any higher education possibility or a school specialized in IT:

\textit{And I asked them ‘why can’t I go to English school?’ They said ‘you don’t have papers. You don’t have any documents so there is no way for you to go to school.’ So, I have to say, I have no any other option. I had to back off.} (Zoulou, 25.08.2014)

\textsuperscript{13}Remark of the author: with this so-called interview paper, the interview partner refers to one document which he got before the hearing in the frame of his asylum procedure.
Summing up the main reasons mentioned above for the migrants’ departure, it was mainly due to psychological pressure resulting from the fact that they were mostly considered as the eldest brother, or son, being responsible for themselves or the rest of the family. Furthermore, their weakened economic instability and partly political conflicts made them feel insecure about their own life situation and that of their families. Through their own beliefs or their social network, they were convinced that leaving to Westernized countries would make them able to afford their education or support their families at home through a wide range of job opportunities, among those the possibility of working as professional football players. Prior to departure, they were often not aware of the asylum procedure that they had to face upon arrival.

4.2 Situation abroad

Within the migration cycle, it is also important to have a look at the returnees’ living conditions abroad which can also influence their individual re-embeddedness once upon return in Ghana. The following chapter illustrates the migrants’ situation while being abroad and is divided into the following subchapters such as the economic situation, acquired skills, social ties as well as their intention of returning once upon arrival in the respective destination countries. Once again, the chapter refers to single statements from some of the interview partners. However, these statements cannot be taken as overall assumptions for all of them and other returnees.

4.2.1 Economic situation and educational opportunities

During the conversations with the migrants, they often mentioned that they could not reach the level of recognized refugees and thus not receive an adequate work permit or access to a higher educational institution and actively participate in their countries of destination as they previously wished. The interviews show that various words demonstrate their unintentional passivity and invisibility, particularly at the beginning of their stay in the host countries. Furthermore, they did not know any place where and to whom they could address their personal concerns which made them constantly feel insecure and the perception that they were ‘unwelcome guests’. Upon arrival, the four asylum seekers in Israel were brought to (what they called) ‘African churches’\(^\text{14}\) where they could exchange ideas about the upcoming or current asylum procedure and irregular job opportunities. One migrant in Italy was directly received at an official asylum reception center. Through the initial inactivity and thus non-existing remittances they previously intended to send to their family and social

\(^{14}\)Remark of the author: the interviewees used the term ‘African churches’ for Nigerian or Ghanaian churches in Israel. According to the interview partners, there were no asylum reception centers in Israel which made African asylum seekers stay during the time of their asylum procedures.
networks, this made them suffer even more in terms of economical and psychological pressures. Once again this aspect can be linked to the fact of their individually perceived role as being responsible for the family’s wellbeing:

But the time I’m in Italy, every day I’m thinking ‘where should I go and work and send money for my parents?’ So if you are with them, even if you don’t have anything, they know that you are there, you are with them, you don’t have anything, you are living with them. Maybe you are in trouble; they know you go to find money to bring to them. But if you are in Europe and you tell them ‘there’s no money’, they don’t believe you. So [...] every day you are thinking ‘where should I get work to do and send money for my parents’, and they are here counting years for you. You do many years, two years, three years. And you didn’t send anything. (Muntar, 14.09.2014)

After a certain time, the interviewees who were in Israel realized that the only way to find work was to cooperate with a so-called ‘agent’\textsuperscript{15} who, through an unofficial way, offered them low-wage and clandestine employment opportunities. All of them practiced jobs as construction workers and mechanics or in gastronomy such as dishwashers, housekeepers, or bakery assistants. At the same time, this method to find work was not stated by the migrant residing in Italy: Muntar had to personally look for clandestine employment. After realizing that the only job he could find in Italy was to harvest fruits, he decided to visit his brother in Germany and at the same time look for another undocumented working possibility there, relatively well-paid in comparison to the remuneration in Italy.

As the migrants did not have any right to assert any claim concerning labor laws, they were subject to various exploitation and fraud methods. While they sometimes had to wait several weeks to receive their salary, they were often not paid for the amount of work that they had actually worked which made them be entirely dependent on their agents’ decisions.

But as you don’t have anything to do, you must work with the agent. But if maybe per hour you are supposed to earn fifty dollar, my agent is supposed to give me for that hour twenty-five or twenty dollar. So you know the percentage that he is getting. (Mahmud, 20.08.2014)

It’s not easy. So...before I enter Italy, the work I do most is farm work, like harvesting fruits [...] So they pay me, for one hour five euro. And then, after some time, they didn’t pay you a whole month. (Muntar, 14.09.2014)

However, through these undocumented job opportunities, all of the interview partners managed to overcome the insufficient and impersonal living conditions in either asylum reception centers of African churches and were able to share an apartment with friends. From this aspect, it can be concluded that even though they could partly overcome the difficulties of inactivity, they still kept in mind working in clandestine employment and could be caught at any moment. Further linked to this inactivity is the fact that Zoulou could not pursue any higher educational institution and instead only had to attend a language school.

\textsuperscript{15}Remark of the author: the term ‘agent’ was used by the interview partners to describe a person who procures undocumented employment opportunities for the migrants.
due to his ongoing asylum procedure what finally made him feel to ‘intellectually stagnate’ (Zoulou, 25.08.2014):

But I saw that it was just a refugees’ school. They didn’t teach much. It was like, you are with the kids, they only teach you some kind of, […], funny things. You know, like I have finished secondary school, but I will be added with children who are just studying primary […]. Educational, it’s not compatible, understand. It’s like, I’m ahead of time so I don’t need it. So what I need is a higher institution. (Zoulou, 25.08.2014)

4.2.2 Acquired skilled in the host countries

The four asylum seekers in Israel were offered the possibility of participating in this kind of (what they called) ‘refugee school’ where they could be taught Hebrew. Only a little is known about this school. It can only be assumed from the statement from Zoulou above that this was solely focusing on some basic Hebrew language skills instead of an educational training (see chapter 4.2.1). Muntar, having stayed in Italy, did not deliver any information concerning an offered language course. The clandestine employment opportunities in the gastronomy or construction sector did not offer them any adequate skills which they could have used back in Ghana. Once again, the fact of not having been able to acquire adequate skills can be referred to their lack of legal stay in the respective host countries and thus long-lasting moments of inactivity.

4.2.3 Social networks abroad

In reference to the living conditions, it can be questioned who the migrants got in touch with and lived together. They experienced their first discriminative acts from their human coyotes, by being asked to pay a high amount of money for their trafficking. If they were not able to pay the money, their families needed to help them out. Due to this discrimination, those migrants who used to travel by the ‘road way’, often could not move any further forward and suffered from the bitter situation of working in another African until they were are to afford their journey:

Some people, that's their business. There are many people on the road. Those whose parents are not paying, they are still living there. So if you have someone who will pay they will take you inside the car and go to the bank. And you will pay them. And if you don't have the money to pay with you, you will call your family and they will send them money before they leave you in sudden time. (Muntar, 14.09.2014)

Upon arrival in their destination countries, social contacts to the local population were mostly lacking due to the missing opportunities of where and how to meet them as well as a general mistrust towards asylum seekers. The interview partners addressed the fact that preconceived opinions made the local population be distrustful about African asylum seekers and their individual capacities such as a higher general education or just the adaptation to their country of origin. One of the respondents mentioned one experience about a contact with a female friend assuming that ‘Africans’ generally live in rural areas without any
connection to education and urban life:

I can remember: I have one experience with a white lady. She’s my friend so we used to chat. And one day, she asked me: ‘do you live in a city?’ I said ‘yes. […] I’m a student back home.’ And she asked ‘What do you do best?’ I say ‘I repare computers’. And she laughed! And she told me that I can't, the only thing I'm good at is, I can scrub toilet very well. (Zoulou, 25.08.2014)

Not all interview partners were willing to talk in detail about the discrimination and thus humiliating experience they had with the local population or other people who were not facing the same situation of seeking asylum.16 On the other hand, some of the interview partners argued that they had never had any problem with the local population in terms of discriminative or racist acts. Thus, the discrimination which the Ghanaian migrants suffered from during their time as asylum seekers depended on their subjective experience, feelings and reactions on discrimination during their time abroad:

People are talking about racism and I saw it. But I don't take it. I think that if you give that to your mind, it will affect you. But if you don't, you are free. (Zoulou, 25.08.2014)

Considering their individual feeling about social networks, the migrants themselves felt surprised and at the same time glad that they could meet 'like-minded', that is to say other asylum seekers originating from African countries with whom could maintain a sense of belonging and at the same time have cultural ties and customs with. Moreover, they felt particularly linked to those with the same geographical places of origin.

Already, it's on my mind that at least, that place, nobody know me. I don't have any family. My family is Ahmed and Fuad from Ghana. We are like brothers, we are like family, we are just like one father and one mother. They are my family. So we don't have any family, nobody knows us there. Or we just came there, for the sake of the family. (Mahmud, 20.08.2014)

The first week, when I went to the immigration office, I saw Ghanaians, Nigerians, Congolese, Cameroonians, you know? Before I thought that I’m alone in Israel. So I see a lot of people and then I’m very happy! That time I feel all right. (Boni, 08.09.2014)

Concerning the maintenance of social contacts in their home country, five out of six kept in regular touch with their social network in Ghana. This fact can be referred to what has been mentioned in the ‘transnational approach’ (chapter 2.2.3): contacts to transnational networks abroad and in their home country have usually not been disrupted. Thus, it can be concluded that on the one hand, all of the interview partners were focused on maintaining their social ties with their families and networks in Ghana, and on the other hand with Africans who they were more likely to feel close to while residing abroad.

---

16This unwillingness to speak of discriminative acts can be referred to the dynamics and different roles between interviewee and interviewing person.
4.2.4 Envisaged return plans before deportation

Another part of this research was to link the Ghanaian deportees’ intentions and thus willingness of return to their factual re-embeddedness within their home society. Did the respondents actually envisage return at a later time?

As the interviews show, the majority of respondents generally considered their stay as temporary and planned to return to their home countries after having acquired a sufficient amount of financial savings or higher educational opportunities. Their envisaged return plans depended on their initial reason for migration and the political and economic stability as well as family relations:

*Already, it's on my mind that at least, that place, nobody knows me. I don't have any family, nobody know us there. Or we just came there, for the sake of the family: of ourselves, to find something, after that we will come back to our country to find something to do. That's the only thing we went to Israel but we know that, like me; in my mind; I know, even if I spend 10 years there, I will come back to country, my family.* (Mahmud, 20.08.2014)

Some of the respondents planned to pursue educational programs and thus find better paid jobs which made them finally able to resettle in Ghana:

*So what I have to do is: I have to go out, work, maybe I can get money; through then, I can take care of myself and the rest and myself. Or even, if when I get money, I can come back and settle in my own country.* (Zoulou, 25.08.2014)

Bari who left due to political conflicts, considered a factual return after these conflicts had come to an end. For him, it was clear that his stay was only temporary in order to raise financial resources as well as to bridge a certain time of the lasting conflicts. Muntar, who indeed kept tight contact to his family members and friends, became more attracted by the idea of travelling and visiting his brother in Germany; no return had been mentioned in the near future. In Boni’s case, his family situation and the fact of being at the others family’s mercy could be one reason for not coming back:

*I don't like to come back to Ghana but they [referring to Israeli authorities] were catching me to the prison. They are telling me that they will have solved all my problems. I can come back. […] But in my village they don't know that I'm here.* (Boni, 08.09.2014)

From the interviewees’ statements, once again a general conclusion concerning envisaged return cannot be drawn from the case study. However, the tendency shows once again that the respondents kept strong ties with their social network in Ghana or family members in other countries abroad in and were thus planning to join those family members or return home after they have achieved their initial aims of migration. Only one migrant did not intend any return to Ghana at all.
4.3 Dimensions of re-embeddedness

In the frame of the analysis model of ‘mixed embeddedness’, the following chapter demonstrates in what way the respondents could finally become embedded in their family networks and economic circumstances. At the same time, the psycho-social aspects of re-embeddedness need to be further linked to these aspects: in what way do the respondents feel back at home and socially accepted? The re-embeddedness of each of the respondents is to be ‘analyzed’ according to their individual statements. Potential factors which favour and impede their re-embeddedness respectively are identified. Important to state is that each of the interview partners spent at least two years back in the country of origin. All of them could reflect on their migration experience which facilitates an analysis of their individual process of re-embeddedness.

4.3.1 Economic embeddedness

As stated in chapter 3.2.1, an economic re-embeddedness is successful if financial resources such as a permanent and stable income and thus a self-sustaining development can be accessed and maintained (Dimitrijevic et al. 2004 in Ruben et al. 2009). In practice, we can speak of an economic re-embeddedness if the respondents find work through which they automatically have access to education, health and housing for themselves, for previous as well as future generations (Ruben et al. 2009; Van Houte and de Koning 2008). All these factors combined are part of an economic re-embeddedness and thus a sustainable livelihood. For this analysis, the question had to be raised: as the deportees did not fall under the category of ‘voluntary’ returnees (see chapter 2.1), how could they manage to save financial resources from their stay abroad? What acquired skills could they acquire and were these decisive for their individual economic re-embeddedness upon return?

Concerning the financial protection, the interviews obviously showed that none of the deportees could acquire any financial savings while staying abroad. Zoulou summarizes this fact as follows:

*I can remember, when I came, I was holding only thousand dollars. (Zoulou, 25.08.2014)*

Even if they achieved to perform some low wage jobs and collect some small amounts of money in their destination countries, they were either prevented from transferring this money to Ghana by the national authorities or the financial situation was insufficient to make them set up their own project at home. Furthermore, the acquired skills while practicing low-skilled jobs in the host countries are not necessarily sufficient for the economic re-embeddedness in Ghana. Mostly, the practiced jobs (see chapter 4.2.1) do not fit into the Ghanaian context and are thus generally not of use in their home country. Indeed, this aspect shows that it was
due to their pending or expired asylum procedure leading them to restrictive conditions in the host countries and making them unable to practice any other than clandestine and mostly unprofitable employment opportunities for a better life upon return. Based on these conditions in the host countries, their individual economic re-embeddedness is explained in detail.

Three out of six conducted interviewees in fact consider themselves being ‘economically well’ re-embedded. Zoulou, being determined that his return could make him progress more than staying ‘educationally and economically paralyzed’ after several weeks in the Israeli detention center, tried to push the Israeli officers to release him to Ghana as soon as possible. He already knew that the only way to get out of the detention center was to force the authorities to conduct a ‘voluntary return’.17 Although his initial aim of increasing his educational opportunities had not been fulfilled, the fact of having to return would still enable him to find any opportunity to raise income, further his education and establish housing possibilities.

*I don’t want to waste my time, I’m too young! And I know, if I come back to my country I can do one or two things ‘cause I’m not a lazy person. And besides that, I’m also a student. So maybe I can strive, you know, to, to earn or to get what I have lost.* (Zoulou, 25.08.2014)

With the help of his family’s encouragement and little seed capital for the rental fee of the shop, he was further able to establish his own business for computer repair and thus the possibility of access to stable income back in his home country. Through a wide-ranging ‘mouth-to-mouth advertisement’, his social network made him sell their goods in his shop from which he has been able to benefit from a profit share and build up his own house up till now. His initial aim of migration which was to overcome educational constraints in Ghana could further be solved by both his professional activity and the resulting funding possibility for his education.

Generally speaking, the case of Zoulou seems to be a perfect example of economic re-embeddedness. Through sufficient financial resources from family members and his individually acquired know-how, he was able to find a suitable level of re-embeddedness for himself. Furthermore, all other cases where economic embeddedness could have been achieved in some way, the respondents clearly needed to acquire financial support either from their family or other social contacts who finally helped them to set up a profitable business.

---

17 Even though Zoulou decided ‘voluntarily’ about his individual deportation, he had no other choice than returning. At this point, the differentiation of forced and voluntary return needs once again to be questioned at this point (see chapter 3.2.1).
Bari, after one year of unemployment in Ghana, received financial aid through other family members and friends which made him buy a car and at the same time start a business as mechanic and driver up to the present day. During the interview and several meetings with Bari, it became clear that he feels very glad and self-confident about his situation:

*I have my own car and I think I’m doing something which is very good. I think it’s positive for me.* (Bari, 01.09.2014)

Aminu who, through his deportation, was able to get in touch with the German charitable association ‘Cap Anamur’\(^{18}\) (Aminu, 18.09.2014) who invited him to openly address the challenges of African refugees who try to cross the Mediterranean in the hope of better life conditions. Through his actions, he could draw international and media attention to him and the issues concerned. Fortunately, by building up a relationship with international organizations which were willing to support him financially, he could complete his university program and now works in a NGO fully funded by Miserior.\(^{19}\) The aspect of a stable income, housing and thus educational opportunities makes him feel economically well-embedded:

*Currently the situation is different from before I left because I left as you can see, I have my certificate from the university. And that is what I’m using to work. I’m now fully employed by my office [...] I can now offer support to my parents, both my mother and father at home. I did on my only true way to help them. My wife and two kids, I’m helping them.* (Aminu, 18.09.2014)

However, all the examples do not confirm that it had been similar in all other cases; half of the respondents reported opposing results. Mahmud who was arrested and deported without any possibility of taking his savings kept in his home in Israel, arrived with empty hands. Without any financial funding, be it on the part of his family or other social contacts and all previous savings as fashion designer spent on the travel abroad, he has not been created any chance of setting up his own business. Being unable to construct his own house, he needed to move into his family’s house upon return which he personally considers as a step back:

*What I gained with the money that I work all my life time, four years in Israel, I left it. So I came to this country with empty, zero. So that’s my sadness. So the time, the day I enter this country, already I’m glad to be in my country but I feel sad. So now that I came back, I let my family four years. What will they think? I mean, I’m supposed to take care of my family, but now my family is supposed to take care of me. But now, it’s all a money matter. I don’t have money now to start any kind of business.* (Mahmud, 20.08.2014)

Referring to his initial reason for migration, which was to nourish and care for his family’s well-being (see chapter 4.1.1), Mahmud still considers his forced return as a personal failure and thus being incapable of contributing to his family’s wellbeing. In this case, the instance of

---

\(^{18}\) Cap Anamur- Deutsche Notärzte e.V. is a German Humanitarian organization, including rescue operations for refugees arriving from the Mediterranean Sea.

\(^{19}\) Miserior is one of the biggest German Relief Organizations for Development Cooperation.
forced return migration does not only contribute to a failed economic re-embeddedness, but also to a loss in the psychosocial dimension (see chapter 4.3.3).

In terms of economic re-embeddedness, Muntar and Boni live both in similar economic conditions. Both have stayed in Ghana for more than two years since their return without yet having found any adequate job, leading to the lack of any permanent and stable income as well as access to a self-sustaining development of their families and themselves. While Mahmud and Muntar are still trying to look for a job through their social networks and because of their position as male providers of the family, Boni rather does not consider any possibility of work at all due to his precarious situation among his family conflict (see chapter 4.1.3) and the insufficient remuneration in Ghana:

Here, in my city, I don't do anything to get money. I tried to get money before but you work very hard and you don't get money. They pay you but you can't do anything with that money. Just eating. Buying food and soap to bath, and clothes. You cannot put it in the bank because it's nothing. (Boni, 08.09.2014)

In this case, it can be argued that besides his initial aim of migration, Boni is not interested in looking for further employment opportunity and thus economic re-embeddedness in Ghana. Present conflicts between his and another family and the resulting lack of existing social networks highly influence his willingness to return and stay in his home country (see 4.1.3). During the time of the interview, he himself was accommodated in one of his friend’s house and dependent on other incomes from his social network what leads to a feeling of absent economic re-embeddedness.

It can be assumed that half of the respondents themselves report a ‘sufficient’ level of economic re-embeddedness leading them to access to a sustainable livelihood. However, in each of the interviews, the respective level of economic re-embeddedness has still been dependent on the financial support that they had received from their social networks in Ghana or abroad. Through these social networks, they were able to acquire a sufficient amount of seed capital from which they could set up further business projects such as their own business with computers or cars or, as it occurred in Aminu’s case, the cooperation with an organization or company. Through this, a permanent and stable income and thus self-sustainability could be achieved. In terms of economy, these respondents consider themselves as highly re-embedded. In the other cases, the respondents were not able to acquire a sufficient amount of ‘financial means’ that could make them construct their self-reliance and sustainable livelihood. Being highly dependent on any other low source of income from their social networks in Ghana or remittances from relatives abroad, they rather consider themselves having a low level of economic re-embeddedness; no independent income-generating projects could be fulfilled.
At this point, the link to the theoretical aspect of forced return migration needs to be established. In response to Cassarino's model of heterogeneous types of returnees, the respondents' unrecognized status as former asylum seekers made them follow documented and legal job opportunities and thus insufficient, irregular financial means in the respective host countries. These circumstances might contribute to a lower economic re-embeddedness than that of those returnees following regular and non-clandestine job opportunities. Another aspect is their preparedness and willingness of return: all interview partners were not willing to return to Ghana at the time of their deportation as their initial reasons for migration (see chapter 4.1) had not been fulfilled. Hence, it can be argued that even if the respondents were planning to return back to Ghana, they were less prepared for their re-embeddedness in Ghana than those returnees who could independently plan their return to their home country without being forced to return. In reference to Cassarino (see chapter 2.2.3), the returnees and their lack of sufficient resource mobilization while residing in the host countries has partly not offered any potential for their home country indeed.

Back in their Ghanaian context, no return assistance in terms of financial incentives, or for job improvements was offered to the return migrants as 'less desired' returnees, which did not assist them in their individual process of 're-embeddedness'. As a consequence, it can be argued that their economic re-embeddedness is broadly influenced by the individual experience of gathering financial means from their social networks in the destination countries. Depending on the individual social networks which the returnees are likely to maintain during their stay abroad, the economic re-embeddedness can significantly differ.

Furthermore, the specific duration of stay of the migrants need to be analyzed: the interviews show that this aspect influences the returnees’ level of re-embeddedness which can be demonstrated by Aminu’s example: due to his unsuccessful attempts of migration and detention on the Mediterranean, he was the only one who had not spent approximately three years in a Western industrialized country. However, having been deported back to Ghana after his attempt of migration made him get in touch with social contacts, he was with their help able to accumulate sufficient financial means and thus build up his own organization. Even if it is just one out of six, this case shows that one reason for a successful re-embeddedness cannot be attributed to the returnees' length of stay abroad but rather to the question ‘who’ they were able to meet (see chapter 'social networks'). As a matter of course, it needs once again to be assumed that due to the low number of cases, the hypothesis applied in this study cannot be claimed as constant. The next chapter demonstrates the link between the returnees’ economic re-embeddedness and their ability to construct and maintain their social networks at home.
4.3.2 Social networks

As it was demonstrated from several of the interviews, social networks are crucial for the returnees’ sense of belonging. Through a feeling of sharing their personal concerns and life stories, the respondents feel to some extent secure despite their relatively weakened economic situation. 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 chapter aims to analyze in which way social contacts were determining factors in the respondents’ social well-being and thus their level of social networks re-embeddedness upon return.

In five out of six interviews, the respondents mentioned a significant correlation between the emotional and material support from their social environment and the perception of their individual ‘re-embeddedness’. The aspect of retaining strong links with friends and family was one of the main issues discussed during the interviews. Mahmud, the one among all interviewees focusing the most on the aspect of family relations, felt pretty ashamed and at the same time afraid of his family’s reaction concerning his deportation. However, in his interviews he clearly stressed that his family never let him down, even when he got deported to Ghana ‘with empty hands’.

_My family is happy! They see that I’m alive and as my brothers [referring to Ghanaian friends in Israel] already called them and they knew what happened to me over there. So since the day I arrive here, they welcome me, they treat me well. They don’t want anything to happen to me because they like me. They know during the time I was there, they know how I was taking care of the family. So but since I didn’t come back here, I didn’t bring anything, they are still encouraging me._ (Mahmud, 20.08.2014)

In contrast to Mahmud, Zoulou being more convinced and self-confident about his return, decided to openly tell his family himself about the Israeli detention center and the induced deportation. Instead of judging his sons’ and brothers’ empty hands, his family was aware of his stressed and disturbed mind and respected his ‘failed return’, ascribing his deportation to a kind of ‘religious will and protection’:

_My family...actually, you know. They are religious. So they told me that whatever happened, it’s good! Maybe in Israel something might happen to me. And God doesn’t want anything to happen to me. That’s why I was deported back home, peacefully. But I’m here! I’m healthy! I’m ok. Here I am, so what’s the problem? They said: come sit with us! Although we don’t have anything to give him, but you know, life goes on. So forget about anything, just be yourself._ (Zoulou, 25.08.2014)

In terms of wider social contacts such as friends, Zoulou realized that he can still count on lasting friendships which he has kept after his departure, but at the same time tries not to answer too intimate questions concerning his deportation and thus ‘failed return’ from friends. Besides the seed capital from his family, it is the trust coming from his close social contacts that makes him get a positive feeling about his own ‘social networks re-embeddedness’.
Similar cases stress how trust among social networks is essential for the returnees’ re-embeddedness in their former origin context. The importance of trust can be particularly demonstrated by the example of Muntar who had not obtained any regular and stable income in the first year of his arrival: it was thanks to his Ghanaian social networks abroad and in Ghana that he can financially be supported by sharing the earnings of container shipping from Europe to Ghana up to date.

Work? Right now, I will tell you that I haven’t found any work. But sometimes, some of my friends, they will bring the goods\(^\text{20}\) and I go and take it from Takoradi harbour. I go and bring it and, maybe some of their friends, they will come and take it. And these friends pay me maybe, and then I will send their money to my friends abroad and I will get something. (Muntar, 14.09.2014)

As already mentioned, despite the fact that Muntar has not yet received any regular income, the dimension of ‘social networks’ conditions his ‘economic re-embeddedness’ to a wide extent. If Muntar did not have any link to his social contacts, letting him be part of the container shipping as financial income, his economic re-embeddedness would certainly be influenced in a negative way or not be existent at all.

Another essential part of social networks can be referred to the respondents’ marital status. According to the interviews and the respondents’ individual life style, they all consider marriage and having their own family as essential part of their present and/or future life and thus as a general factor for their personal ‘re-embeddedness’. Three out of six respondents have already been married and with at least two children at the time of the conducted interviews what makes them even feel better socially embedded.

Among the three other cases, Zoulou still keeps in mind to strive for higher education in countries with free education such as Latvia before finally settling in Ghana and creating a family there. He does not marriage consider as one of the ‘main factors’ improving his individual re-embeddedness. Mahmud, prioritizing income instead of funding his own family, judges an early marriage in Ghana with a critical eye:

In this situation I cannot marry because the woman will be suffering. And even more the children. Because I don’t want my children to suffer like the way I’m suffering. Like the way my parents have been suffering. (Mahmud, 20.08.2014).

Only Boni was not willing to speak about his own family as well as his individual family planning in any detail. One of the reasons could be linked to, as mentioned, his general lack of tight social networks and thus his unsteady life situation within Ghana. Over and above, Boni can be regarded as a counterexample in terms of his initial reason for migration. His statements demonstrate that due to his lack of political and social safety, he was not, and is

\(^{20}\)Remark of the author: Ghanaian friends from abroad organize some container shipping where he can help.
not willing to become re-embedded within the Ghanaian society and former social networks. He does not want anybody to know about his return to Ghana and feels observed and feared everywhere he goes:

You know, the people in my village, they don’t know that I’m back. And I don’t like to see anybody. If one person comes to see me here, it’s very dangerous. (Boni, 08.09.2014)

Comparing the returnees’ re-embeddedness, it can be argued that those who migrated due to political insecurity or family conflicts may have greater difficulties in becoming re-embedded if these conflicts still persist. This aspect that is important to keep in mind is comparing the individual perceptions of re-embeddedness of Bari and Boni. While the political conflict in Bari’s case could be solved, he was able to achieve a stable income through the solidarity with(in) his social network. On the other hand, Boni still suffers from an ongoing tribal clash and thus lost most of his sense of belonging to any social network, which in turn influences his economic and thus general re-embeddedness upon return. It can be observed that once again, the initial reason for migration, in this case of political nature respectively conflicts among families, is being neglected by national authorities when it comes to the migrants’ process of return. Compared to other migrants being able to freely decide to return, this category of deportees as in Boni’s case might face aggravated return conditions.

Speaking generally, those returnees who left due to political or tribal conflicts and whose social networks are instable and conflict-ridden, may have greater difficulties in becoming re-embedded than those having migrated for financial reasons but with stable social networks. Those returnees who suffer from financial and educational constraints in Ghana are more likely to become re-embedded if they can be part of their former social networks in Ghana. The fact of gaining ground within their social networks might influence their psychosocial re-embeddedness in a positive way, even though their economic situation may still be problematic.

Once again, the statements mentioned illustrate the interwovenness of the dimensions of ‘economic re-embeddedness’ and ‘social networks’ of the deportees. On the one hand, the maintenance of trustful social networks can contribute to an economic advantage and other related aspects. On the other hand, through an economically unstable situation, family formation in terms of marriage does not occur, even though if latest is expressed and desired by almost all respondents. These aspects contribute to a weakened self-confidence and thus lower degree of the third dimension of ‘psycho-social re-embeddedness’. At the same time, if they can reach a stable income and other economic benefits, they are more likely to have a
higher family support and consequently a better re-embeddedness within their social networks as well as higher psycho-social re-embeddedness.

Concluding the chapter of social networks embeddedness, the respondents personally considered the maintenance with their social ties as crucial for their personal re-embeddedness; they were more willing to come back and thus better re-embedded upon return. Through a regular exchange of important information, for instance about Ghana’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 re-embeddedness after deportation. Only one respondent who was not willing to keep in regular touch with his family feels less secure and supported by his 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 re-embeddedness. Once again, the theoretical aspect of transnational approaches should be mentioned. Despite the fact that in the case of forced migrants, transnational approaches are not to be understood as constant ‘back-and-forth movements’, the returnees may be able to maintain these networks which upon return facilitate their process of return and re-embeddedness (see chapter 2.3.2).

4.3.3 Psycho-social re-embeddedness

As mentioned in chapter 3.2.4, Giddens (1991) links a psychosocial re-embeddedness to the scale of how an individual can freely develop a multitude of identities acquired within a certain time through different social interactions. The degree of being accepted and feeling at home without having to force oneself to adapt to the given society is crucial for someone’s individual psycho-social re-embeddedness (ibid.). This chapter evaluates the way in which the Ghanaian deportees could gain an enhanced status through their migration and therefore a stronger sense of belonging once back in the Ghanaian society. It also needs to be discussed in which way the respondents acquired a certain character arising from their experience as asylum seekers abroad and influencing their psycho-social re-embeddedness after deportation.

As the interviews show, five out of six Ghanaian returnees have not lost their relationship to their ‘roots’ and still identify themselves with their home country. They still know where they come from. These conclusions can be drawn from the fact that all respondents maintained close contact to ‘like-minded’ people of the same origin or other African countries, or both with family members and friends in Ghana and in their destination countries. The five interview partners considered returning to Ghana once having acquired a sufficient amount of financial savings or higher educational opportunities (see chapter 4.2.3 and 4.2.4). All of them were surprised at the number of Ghanaians or other African migrants they met in the
same situation abroad and with whom they could share their personal concerns with (see chapter 4.2.3).

Another reason could be that the respondents were not offered many possibilities of getting to know the local population of their respective destination country. Their insecure residence status and thus insufficient financial means and the distrust of the host countries’ resident population had made them interact among their ‘own groups’ (Aminu, 18.09.2014) and maintain or rebuild their own identity. A third reason can be associated with the migrants’ length of stay. All of them spent a maximum duration of 48 months abroad and travelled from the age of 18 years on. After having spent a relatively long time of life within their countries of origin in comparison to their actual length of stay abroad linked with stated aspects above, they did not experience any significant change of mentality.

Another interwovenness of these three dimensions can be referred to the aspect that two of the interview partners were able to pursue a higher education through the help of their social networks upon return. If the migrants’ initial aim was to pursue educational opportunities abroad, this assistance finally made them become more embedded in terms of education and thus a higher self-esteem through educational progress and economic success which they could not reach abroad:

And the education that I wanted to, when I came back I was able to further my education to the tertial level. I went to complete my program at the Polytechnic, went to the university […]. (Aminu, 18.09.2014)

Contrary to what national authorities might assume, Aminu’s ‘failed’ migration experience as initial asylum seeker turns out to positively contribute to human capital creation in the Ghanaian context. As it has been stated in chapter 2.3, the Ghanaian authorities set special value on the involvement of Ghanaian nationals abroad, trying to pull high-skilled workers back to their home country by generating incentives in higher job positions and higher status. In comparison to forced return migration and automatically migrants who are ‘less desired’ to return home, the ‘desired’ group of returnees could automatically reach a higher level of economical and thus psycho-social re-embeddedness. Forced migrants are only able to strive for higher education if they can prove the sufficient financial means themselves. Aminu having acquired a significant degree of re-embeddedness through his social contacts with Miserior, is proud of his migration experience and looks at the aspect of ‘undesired forced migration’ in the Ghanaian context from a critical perspective:
When we came we were received by BNI, the Bureau of National Investigation. Just to find out whether we told them we were not from Ghana. We told that we were from Sudan. And that was because we wanted to use the Darfour crisis to seek for asylum. So later when they realized that we were Ghanaians that they deported us back to Ghana. So when we came BNI came in and said at the airport, later at the airport they said that we disgraced the name of Ghana and I told them: ‘No, we didn’t!’ In the first place we told them we were not from Ghana. So in reality they have no right bringing us to Ghana. They should have sent us to Sudan. That is what I told BNI. And second, ’cause they said we disgraced the name of Ghana up there. I told them ‘No! You know, we have gone, we went for greater passage. If we were successful, the remittances would have come to Ghana, to what? To contribute in the development of our governm... (Aminu, 18.09.2014)

This quotation demonstrates that despite the severe issues in the host countries such as the refusal of a legal residence permit and the deportation to their home country, they still consider their experience from abroad as a significant aspect of differentiating themselves to their fellow citizens who had not travelled. Half of the interviewees claim that through their gained experience they could discover things that others did not have to face in Ghana, even if their experience involved hard and disagreeable life conditions – ones that other types of migrants who did not experience any deportation procedure did not have to pass through. Furthermore, the aspect of wrong expectations needs to be looked at: five out of six migrants would not even have left Ghana if they had known about the miserable living and working conditions abroad or if the conditions in the home country would be improved. Some even stated that being aware of the situation abroad would have stopped them from emigrating:

_Because they are ignorant about what is going. Because if I had known all that I have gone through, I don't think I would have even attempted of going._ (Aminu, 18.09.2014)

This aspect is particularly interesting as the returnees’ perceptions about Western destination countries changed in such a way that they do not even desire to return. At the same time, they are still proud of having experienced seeing how industrialized countries function and no longer share their fellows’ opinion of ‘Europe as a paradise’ (Muntar, 14.09.2014).

Muntar explains the last point as follows:

_I get experience! I will tell you that I got more experience and my eyes are open now. I saw many things! So, that's why I say, the one who lives here, he can't compare himself to me now. Even if I went and didn't bring anything. You can't compare yourself to me. So, I suffered, but I get a lot of experience in travelling._ (Muntar, 14.09.2014)

To the question as to what his stay abroad personally brought him, Zoulou answers that there are other ways of developing himself instead of just trying to find his luck abroad:
As for this, I would say 'ok, well..', one day, I needed to know, travel out for money, understand to establish myself but I couldn't have that money. But I gain experience through there. So it's like I didn't lost either. I didn't get the money either but I learned some experience. You know, I've learned how to live on my own because at first, I thought it is only when you travel that you can be someone. And now, I've learned that even if you don't travel and once, you can still become someone. Without you going anywhere. (Zoulou, 25.08.2014)

Further, he mentions that through the kind of low-level job abroad he could even change his ideas and consider these kinds of jobs any more as a female preserve:

I gained a lot of experience. Imagine, like my home. If my mum told me to scrub her toilet or her place, I say 'Come on! Mum, what do you mean? Wasn't my younger ones [referring to younger brothers and sisters] there?' But in Israel, I did it for money. So today, I can do it for my mum with pleasure. If I can do it to someone, why can't I do it for my mum? (Zoulou, 25.08.2014)

At the same time, some of them feel proud that other Ghanaian residents and especially their social network appreciate them for having spent some time abroad, another important aspect for their individual psycho-social re-embeddedness.

Like when I came back from Israel, we are with friends and they see me differently! They say ‘Hey! This guy has travelled; he's just coming from Israel! (Zoulou, 25.08.2014)

Now that I’m back I’m even coping with the work that I'm doing because my people, my parents are happy with what I'm doing. Happy in the sense that they know that I'm safe on life. You know, one thing they like is they're just proud: my son is doing well. He's saving the lives of the youth. That's one thing why they're happy. And when I came back I was able to further my education, they're also happy again. I went to complete my program at the Polytechnic, went to the university. They're happy. (Aminu, 18.09.2014)

However, it must be stated that once again not all of the respondents are proud of their experience abroad and their current life situation. Those having reached a certain level of economic re-embeddedness in Ghana are more likely to quote their own experience abroad as a plus factor and at the same time the willingness to stay in Ghana 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 Ghana. 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 high expectations abroad (see chapter 4.1.4) could not become fulfilled and not be compensated by other ‘solutions’, are likely to suffer from psychosocial strains.
Mahmud’s statement in particular leads to this aspect:

You know, sometimes I cannot forget, that is very sad for me. I don’t want, but sometimes when I remember and then I just give everything to God. (Mahmud, 20.08.2014)

The last chapter shows that more than the half of the deportees feel psychologically embedded within the Ghanaian society. This assumption can be based on the following reasons: through the relatively positive treatment back in Ghana and their feeling of not letting outsiders know or judge their deportation, they feel relatively ‘superior’ to their Ghanaian fellows who have not attempted to travel to industrialized countries and thus have less experience. Through a certain degree of high economic re-embeddedness, more than half of the respondents are able to manage their financial resources and therefore, they have to deal less with stress and other financial uncertainties. Through their positive experience back in Ghana, they strongly identify themselves with their own culture and people while at the same time recognizing the less positive aspects of industrialized countries such as discriminating treatment during their asylum proceedings and aggravating job opportunities. Furthermore, half of the interview partners intend to positively contribute to their home country’s development and are optimistic about their further life in Ghana. Two counterexamples show that they are indeed likely to suffer from a permanent lack of psychosocial re-embeddedness. Often, those with less or inexistent economic re-embeddedness have to deal with stress, depression and other traumatizing life conditions.

Once again, the examples show that the three dimensions of re-embeddedness are linked with each other. Linking this aspect of interwovenness to the migrants’ experience of forced return in the Ghanaian context, it can be argued that the deportees’ individual experiences, aspirations in the host context, their experiences and targeted contributions to their home context, are neglected.
5. Overall conclusion

The aim of this given study was to explore the individual process of re-embeddedness Ghanaian involuntary return migrants face after being deported from Western countries. While theoretical approaches of return migration show the tendency of creating homogeneous categories of (voluntary) returnees, there have only been little efforts to raise awareness of the issue of forced return migrants. As Cassarino states, forced migrants do indeed need to be regarded as a particular category: depending on both their complex reasons for migration and the factual experience abroad, the respective return experiences differ accordingly (chapter 2.4).

In order to gain more insight into the return conditions in the frame of their forced return experience as well as aggravating economic circumstances in Ghana, the meaning which the deportees give both to their return experience and re-embeddedness had to be assessed. For this purpose, the multidimensional concept of embeddedness including dimensions of economic, social networks and psychosocial embeddedness was applied to the aspect of forced return migration (chapter 3.2). However, only a small number of individual interviews was conducted which makes the study not representative.

The following assumptions can be made to the first research question: 
**To what extent a sustainable reintegration of deported Ghanaian returnees could take place?**

Upon return, the deportees, not having acquired a sufficient amount of resource mobilization during asylum proceedings abroad and thus being less prepared for their return than other ‘voluntary’ returnees, do in the first moment depend on financial support of their social networks (chapter 4.3.2). If this financial support is sufficient, they are able to build up their individual projects such as a house construction or company start-ups. Three out of six respondents were for this reason able to bring up their own projects which make them feel economically better re-embedded than those without any financial resources from their social networks (chapter 4.3.1). At the same time, they can obviously sustain a more positive image of their own identity by feeling at home and thus enhance their psychosocial well-being (psychological re-embeddedness) than those who still psychologically struggle due to a lack of economic re-embeddedness and/or social networks. Besides that, a strong personality and the will of residing in Ghana (psychological re-embeddedness) can definitely result in a higher involvement in social networks as well as the attempt of achieving higher economical outcomes in their home country (chapter 4.3.3).

While three of the respondents declare to have reached a secure and high level of re-embeddedness in all three interwoven dimensions (economic re-embeddedness,
psycho-social re-embeddedness and social networks), the remaining three do still show a deficiency in at least one of these dimensions: they were not able to acquire sufficient financial means and thus unable to develop their personal livelihood and psychosocial well-being. This psychosocial dimension is again linked to their traumatic and disappointing experience during migration as well as their feelings and sensations of insecurity upon return which can further decrease their feelings of belonging to the Ghanaian home society (chapter 4.2.1). At the same time, the lack of social networks due to anxiety of family conflicts can impede the other dimensions respectively (chapter 4.1.3).

Hence, the empirical study reveals the interwovenness of all three dimensions being relevant for the deportees’ re-embeddedness (chapter 3.2). At least two of the dimensions need to be fulfilled in order to influence the other dimension(s) in a positive way and thus guarantee a sustainable return process. Generally spoken, it can be questioned whether forced return migration can therefore be linked to sustainable return at all.

The second research question could be analyzed as follows:

Which factors influence the process of re-embeddedness of the deported Ghanaians?

At first, the process of re-embeddedness is impeded by restrictive Western immigration policies. In comparison to other (voluntary) migrants, deportees do not get the possibility offered of preparedness and willingness to return. During their time abroad, it was due to the absence of preparedness and willingness resulting from their induced deportation procedure that all of the respondents were not willing or prepared for their return (chapter 2.4). In the case of the migrants residing in Israel, the study outlines that they had no other option than being detained for an indefinite time and did thus voluntarily initiate their own deportation procedure. The aspect of forced return differentiates them from other types of (voluntary) migrants being able to prepare their return, particularly in terms of resource mobilization and psychological preparation (chapter 2.1).

Secondly, the returnees’ re-embeddedness is impeded if contextual factors at the national level such as an insufficiency in the employment and educational sector make the Ghanaian population leave for Western industrialized countries, as it also occurred in the case of the Ghanaian returnees. Instead of counteracting the phenomena of emigration by considering ‘undesired migrants’ as additional creation of human capital, Ghanaian authorities focus on how to attract Ghanaian high-skills nationals from abroad (chapter 2.3).

As a third factor, a process of re-embeddedness is also related to the deportees’ individual characteristics and the position within their migration cycle. Depending on initial reasons for migration, expectations as well as living circumstances abroad, their return experience can
differ accordingly. For instance, if they consider their stay abroad to be temporary while maintaining strong links to the Ghanaian society, they will automatically feel better prepared for their return (chapter 4.2.4). Due to their own false expectations and those of their social networks prior to and post migration (chapter 4.1.4), the migrants tend to feel held back in their process of re-embeddedness. This factor can be linked to their individual position within their family households. Regarding themselves as eldest brother and son and therefore having to support their families, their forced return may further trigger feelings of guilt and frustration (chapter 4.1.1).

**Outlook**

But what happens to those who do not feel re-embedded in their home society after a certain time upon arrival? Even though they are aware of ongoing discriminative life conditions in industrialized countries, they still consider having a bigger chance abroad than in their national context and can or do partly not want to become re-embedded. Instead of further neglecting the socio-economic performance in the home countries respectively trying to overcome restrictive Western immigration policies, return is to be considered particularly as an ongoing process requiring time, resource and awareness of both conditions in the destination and home countries. Hence, this study reveals that forced return migrants do not become discouraged through the inhumane deportation methods of Western industrialized countries.

*All my wish now, maybe if I get money again, I will go back. But the place that He [referring to God] will choose for me and the right woman. Me myself I cannot even choose it, maybe here in Ghana or anything. Only I put everything for God, I give it to the Almighty.* (Mahmud, 20.8.2014)

*My plan is that right now, I don’t think I would prefer to go back to Italy. I think that, if countries like Germany, Canada, US or Britain, Australia, something like this. I will travel again. But if like the way I faced Italy, I don’t think I would like to go. And I also think that if you have something to do here, I don’t think I would go.’* (Muntar, 14.09.2014)

The third respondent is planning to leave the country on the same day after the conducted interview. His personal life story and the ongoing family conflicts make him feel embedded in none of the mentioned dimensions.

From this aspect, return cannot only be assumed as a sustainable outcome post migration. Specific education campaigns demonstrating the problems and risks of illegal migration as well as approaches in terms of economic and educational advantages in the Ghanaian context need to be introduced in order to counteract the phenomena of forced return migration.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Highest acquired education</th>
<th>Education/ acquired skills after return</th>
<th>Current residence</th>
<th>Host country</th>
<th>Current profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahmud Suleman</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Junior high school (9 years)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Mampong, Ghana</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>jobless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoulou Mohamed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Senior high school (12 years)</td>
<td>Currently pursuing IT studies</td>
<td>Tafo/ Kumasi, Ghana</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Self-employed as IT expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bari Mohamed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Junior high school (9 years)</td>
<td>Driver's licence</td>
<td>Tafo/ Kumasi, Ghana</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Self-employed as driver/mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boni Mohamed</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Junior high school (9 years)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Nima/ Accra, Ghana</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>jobless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muntar Ibrahim</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Senior high school (12 years)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Aboaso/ Kumasi, Ghana</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Casual works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aminu Munkaila</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Senior high school (12 years) and 1 year of university</td>
<td>Completed Tamale Polytechnic and University</td>
<td>Tamale, Ghana</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Executive Director at AFDOM (Afr. Dev. Org. for Migration)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Interview guideline

1. Questions concerning experience prior to migration
   - How is it that you left Ghana?
   - Did you have any specific destination in mind? If yes, why?

2. Questions concerning experience during migration
   - Can you describe your first weeks in xxx (destination country)?
   - What did surprise you after arrival?
   - What was your (daily) life like?
   - Have you ever thought about a potential return while being in the host country? If yes, under which conditions?

3. Questions concerning experience upon return/re-embeddedness
   - What happened after you came back? What were the first things you did?
   - Could you gain ground as a member of society and family?
   - Did the situation change after some time?
   - Did the situation differ from the one before you left?
   - In summary, how would you evaluate your return, and why?
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This master thesis deals with the process of reintegration Ghanaian involuntary return migrants face after being deported from Western countries. For the purpose of this study, six Ghanaian involuntary return migrants who were expelled from Western industrialized countries were interviewed about their migration and return experience during a 2-months field research in their origin country Ghana.

In the frame of the concept of mixed embeddedness, the returnees’ economic, social networks and psychosocial re-embedding was to be assessed. Generally speaking, the study demonstrates that those deportees who have not acquired a sufficient amount of resource mobilization during asylum proceedings abroad are less prepared to return than other ‘voluntary’ returnees. Without any initial financial support from their social networks, they cannot build up their individual business projects and at the same time enhance their psychosocial well-being. While three of the respondents declare to have reached a secure and high level of re-embeddedness in all three dimensions (economic re-embeddedness, psycho-social re-embeddedness and social networks), the remaining three do still experience a deficiency in at least one of these dimensions: they were not able to acquire sufficient financial means and thus unable to further develop their personal livelihood and psychosocial well-being. At the same time, the lack of social networks due to family conflicts can impede the other dimensions respectively. Hence, the empirical study reveals the interwoveness of all three dimensions of re-embeddedness. At least two of the dimensions need to be fulfilled in order to influence the other dimensions in a positive way and thus guarantee a sustainable return process. As stated, in three cases a sustainable return procedure did not occur. These three respondents still reflect on further attempts of emigration as they consider having more opportunities for a sustainable livelihood abroad than in their home country Ghana. Therefore, they do not become discouraged by Western deportation methods.
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