



Deported Labours without Prior Assistance and the Risks of Re-Integration Challenges in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

Sami Ullah*, PhD Scholar Department of Sociology, University of Peshawar, Pakistan, samiroghani@gmail.com.

Dr. Rashid Khan, Professor Department of Sociology, University of Peshawar, Pakistan, rashid@uop.edu.pk.

Dr. Muhammad Israr, Assistant professor Department of Sociology, SBBU Sheringal Dir U.

Riaz Ahmad, Assistant professor Department of Sociology, SBBU Sheringal Dir U.

Muhammad Nawaz Khan, Assistant professor Department of Sociology, SBBU Sheringal Dir U.

Abstract- This study sought to investigate the deprivation, exploitation and lack of pre-deportation assistance in Host Country and its effects on post-deportation life of the deported labours in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. The data was collected from randomly selected, 322 deported labours by using close-ended social survey, and analyzed through univariate, bi-variate and multivariate level. It was found that the host countries did not promote assisted voluntary return migration, they did not inform migrants about deportation prior to departure, while they stopped the access of migrants to their personal belongings and those who have personal belongings at the time of arrestment, were confiscated from migrants in the host country. Similarly, they did not have specialized training opportunities prior to departure whereas the host and home countries and their embassies as well as the international community also did not offered any prior financial assistance for the successful re-integration of the deported people in their home country. This study would benefit policy-makers, decision-makers and stakeholders responsible for directing, supervising and implementing the successful re-integration of the deported labour in their country of origin.

Key Words: Deprivation, Exploitation, Lack of Pre-deportation Assistance in Host Country and Re-Integration Challenges in Home Country.

I. INTRODUCTION

Return migration is becoming an important component of the international migration debate (Ndreka, 2019; IOM, 2018) because it is sharply increasing and brought significant consequences. It is estimated that two migrants in five was deported from the host country within five years of arrival in developing countries (Wahba, 2015). In Slovakia, on average each tenth person working abroad had been returned (Masso et al., 2016). In Eastern Europe and Asia, return migration may imply that 20 to 30 percent of highly educated emigrants returned home when they are still productive in host country (Mayr and Peri, 2008). Dustmann and Weis (2009) estimated out the return migration rates of 40 percent for men and 55 percent for women returning from UK after five years, using data from the 1990s. Similarly, Pakistan is also facing with high deportation rate and increasing sharply every years (Hussain and Baggyley, 2005; FIA, 2016; International Organization for Migration, 2019). Therefore, return migration is not an isolated phenomenon but it needs to be seen in the larger context of the international migration cycle. Return migration can occur at different stages of the individual migration cycle such as shortly after the arrival from the home country or many years later. No one can predict when the return will happen (Ndreka, 2019). A developing trend of academic literature see that return migration and re-integration is a broad processes dependent upon various aspects and actors instead of the simple journey of "returning home" (Nguyen-Akber, 2014). Deportation and re-integration is a complex and multidimensional issue, which negatively affects individual and their families. Therefore, deported population experiencing multiple re-adjustment problems in their home country (Golash-Boza, 2014; Boodram, 2018; Schuster and Majidi, 2013; Cassarino, 2004; David, 2017; De Regt and Tafesse, 2016; Dako-Gyeke and Kodom, 2017). The re-integration of the deported people in their home country is even more challenging than their initial adjustment abroad (Tannenbaum, 2007). U.S. Scholars consistently find that deportation ignites fear and stigma in migrant communities, promotes distrust of law enforcement, fractures families, forces children into foster care, and diminishes the health, educational outcomes, and socioeconomic status of those left behind (Thornson, 2006; Hagan, Castro and Rodrigez, 2010; Abrego, 2011; Dreby, 2015; Zayas, 2015). These effects reinforce the fear of deportation, which keeps undocumented populations vulnerable to exploitation and abuse (De Genova, 2002).

Historical Structural Approaches helps to overcome the vacuum generated by neoclassical economics and Neo Economic of Labour Migration theories (Cassarino, 2004) by emphasizing that the migrants' deportation and their re-integration is influenced by the capitalists' structural discrimination and exploitation in both host and home countries (Dako-Gyeke and Kodom, 2017). These models viewed that the causes of international migration is due to the historically firmed macro structural forces. Such models also emphasizing the inherently associated discriminative and exploitative nature of the economic powers that structuring the global capitalism (Morawska, 2012; King, 2012), that cause uprooted and mobile population in developing world which prone to migration. Historical-Structural approaches towards migration and development tend to address migration as a negative phenomenon contributing to the further underdevelopment of sending societies. This pessimistic view perceived that migration as a process serving the interests of receiving nations in need of cheap labour, which seems worsen underdevelopment at the sending end. This pauperization, they assume, encourages further out-migration. This perspective essentially interpreted migration as a negative phenomenon such as "flight from misery" which contributes little to development. Many migration researchers have argued that migration has even contributed to aggravating problems of underdevelopment (Haas, 2007). Therefore, in the Historical Structural Approach, Dual Labour Market theory firmly associated and directly bearing the Historical Structural theorization of the causes and perpetuation of international migration (Faist, 2000; King, 2012). Dual Labour market theory was developed as a counter-reaction to the spread of the Neoclassical and Neo Economic of Labour Migration theories (Cassarino, 2004), which was found unable to explain continuous migration flows together with increasing problems of unemployment and poverty. In the famous book, *Birds of passage* Piore (1979) argued that the international labour migration is not motivated by push factors but inessentially it driven by pull factors. The dominant force for migration is the structural powers, demanded for specified types of flexible and chief labours in Dual Labour markets. He further urged that Dual Labour Market consist of primary and secondary sectors, where the primary sectors are well paid and specified for influential and native workers. Whereas the secondary sectors are considered for low-wages, low-scale, unpleasant and uncertain jobs which are specified for migrants workers because such jobs are avoided by local and influential workers (Hagen-Zanker, 2008; King, 2012). It is the structure and power of the labour market that creates discriminative and exploitative policies in order to promote the concept of dualism. Based on the above theories this study sought to investigate the re-integration problems of Pakistani labour deported without prior aid from the gulf countries mostly from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirate, Oman and Kuwait.

Pre-deportation assistance is a key indicator for the successful re-integration of deportees. The absence of such re-integration programs can hinder the readjustment of deported labours in their country of origin. According to IOM (2011), one of the major issue in return migration is to measure the extent to which the pre-return assistance program is sustainable or successful. Cassarino (2004) and David (2015; 2017) stated that re-integration of the returnees' depends on return preparation including time, resources, willingness and readiness of migrants to return. The preparedness of migrants is not only depends upon the migrants' experience abroad, but (Cassarino, 2004; Hazan, 2014; Fonseca, Hart & Klink, 2015; De Haas, 2006) also on the perception that significant institutional, economic and political changes have occurred at home. What Cassarino (2004) missed is that return preparedness is also related to the pre-departure conditions. Persons who migrated under fair migration situations have a much better chance of completing the migration cycle than others. Those who are subjected to high migration costs and heavy indebtedness prior to departure are more likely to end up in forced labour situations and would find it difficult to save adequately and difficult to achieve a high level of return preparedness (Wickramasekara, 2019). Therefore, unwillingness and unpreparedness to leave the host country can adversely affect the success of return in their homeland, (Alpes, 2012; Drotbohm, 2011; Brotherton and Barrios, 2011; Hagen, Eschbach and Rodriguez, 2008; Zilberg, 2011; Peutz, 2006; Collyer, 2012) because some deportees' financial situation is worse than prior to their initial migration (Schuster and Majidi, 2013). On the other hand, David (2015) stated that the voluntary returnees are better off than involuntary returnees in terms of labour market out comes, because voluntary returnees has received more pre-deportation assistance than involuntary returnees. It means that If involuntary returnees do not find any job upon their return, there is greater likelihood of being unemployed for long time. Such unemployment situation (Van Houte, 2014) is a sign of vulnerability and a critical dimension of social exclusion.

Pre-deportation condition of the emigrants in the host country such as before and during deportation is very shocking (Kebede, 2011; Fernandez, 2010; Dessiye, 2011; ILO, 2011; Schuster and Majidi, 2013). Because, De Regt and Tafesse (2016) concluded that the Ethiopian returnees had horrific experiences between their arrest and their return home. They were imprisoned for a number of weeks, and treated very badly. They could not change their clothes, and sometimes barely had something to wear; they got very simple food and had to sleep outside in the heat. According to him, Saudi guards and policemen were

sleeping next to them and female returnees told that they were continuously on the alert fearing to be raped. Many women were sexually harassed and raped, while men were beaten up (Human Rights Watch, 2013; Rashid and Ashraf, 2018; Harkin, Lindgren and Suravoranon, 2017; United Nation, 2018; BPRSO, 2019; Dingeman, 2018). Deportees' experiences during their imprisonment were worse than what they had ever experienced during their stay in Saudi Arabia (HRW, 2013). Similarly, Wheatly (2011) and Cruz, Digeman-Cerda (2018) coded that deportees are also more likely to be criminalized, detained, and incarcerated prior to return and they may face greater stigma than voluntary returnees. Other studies show that migrants who are return without pre-deportation assistance facing greater re-integration challenges than others in Morocco (Van Meeteren, Engbersen, Snel and Faaber, 2014) and in Ghana (Setrana, 2017; Akyeampong, 2000). Thus Many deportees returned with nothing, and starting a new life with huge challenges (Kibria, 2014) because they lost their valuable savings abroad (Naik and Laczko, 2012). Therefore, most often, deportees facing with financial instability, which may expose deportees to danger due to the feeling of helplessness and increased sense of failure (Brotherton and Barrios, 2009; Pinedo et al., 2014; Pena et al., 2017). In such circumstances, migrants become vulnerable to the dangers and injustices that are associated with deportation (Tazreiter, 2006; Kanstroom, 2007; Schuster and Majidi, 2013; Baffo, 2015). Thus, De Genova (2015) argued that the law that illegalizes migrants is mostly invisible and borders have become a display of migrant deaths. The following procedure were adopt to investigate the issue.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study was carried out in districts Dir upper and Swat in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan to determine the re-integration challenges to deported labours in their home country. A sample size of 322 labours were selected randomly (Emory and Cooper, 2000; Sekaran, 2003 and Sekaran and Bougie, 2016) which has been deported at the age of 22-60 years, during 2011-2015 from Arabian gulf countries such as Kingdom of Saudi Arabia , United Arab Emirate, Oman and Kuwait. A Social Survey was undertaken to gather information from the respondents in their respective homes and work sites. The Alpha coefficient value for instruments was found at 0.8 for the present study, which indicated that each elements of the variables were highly reliable, internally consistent and appropriate for indexation (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2007). We strictly observed ethical consideration while caring out this study.

Table 1: Conceptual Framework

Background Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable
Age, Literacy Monthly income	Lack of Pre-deportation Assistance Program in Host Country	Re-integration Challenges to Labour Deportees

Table 1 Conceptual Framework for the Study

The data was analyzed through univariate, bivariate and multivariate level by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences software version 21 (SPSS). At univariate level, each responses were calculated by frequencies and percentages distribution. At bivariate level the dependent variable (*re-integration challenges to labour deportees*) was indexed and cross tabulated with each statement of independent variable (*Lack of Pre-deportation Assistance Program in Host Country*) to determine association between the variables. Similarly, Multivariate analysis was used in order to determine the spuriousness and non-spuriousness of relationships between the dependent and independents variable for controlling age, literacy and monthly income of the deported people as shown in (*Table. 1*). To check the association between the categorical data, statistical procedures such as Chi-square test as outlined by Tai (1978) and Odds Ratio analysis (Mary, 2009) were used to find out the strength and direction of association between the dependent and independent variable.

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^c \frac{(O_{ij} - e_{ij})^2}{e_{ij}}$$

Here, (χ^2) = Chi-square for two categorical variables. $\sum_{i=1}^r$ = Sum of i^{th} row
 $\sum_{j=1}^c$ = Sum of j^{th} column. O_{ij} and e_{ij} = Show the observed and expected outcome, as noted by Chaudry and Kamal (1996). Sometime the assumptions of Chi-square test are violated in the data, to overcome these discrepancies the Fisher Exact test instead of simple chi-square test as devised by (Baily, 1982) was used:

$$\text{Fisher exact test} = \frac{(a+b)!(c+d)!(a+c)!(b+d)!}{N!a!b!c!d!}$$

Here a, b, c, d represented the observed numbers in four cells of contingency table and N representing the total number of observations.

Odds ratio analysis was used to determine the strength and direction of an association between the risk factors and outcomes (Norton, Dowd and Maciejewski, 2018). Pearson chi-square test was used (Mary, 2009) to calculate Odds Ratio therefore, the each elements of independent variables were cross-tabulated with the indexed dependent variable for possible outcome. The following procedure was used for the calculation of the odds ratio.

$$\text{Odds Ratio} = \frac{PG_1/(1-PG_1)}{PG_2/(1-PG_2)}$$

III. RESULTS AT UNIVARIATE LEVEL

Table No. 2, pertained to the perceptions of the respondents regarding the lack of pre-deportation assistance program in host country. The table showed that more than half (59.0 %) of the respondents revealed that there were lack of awareness campaign in the host country to promote “assisted voluntary return migration”, whereas 41.0 % respondents disagreed with this statement. Responding to the statement whether, during arrestment the host country did not inform migrants about their deportation prior to departure, then almost half (51.6 %) of the respondent agreed whereas, 48.4 % denied the statement. Similarly, almost (73.0 %) of the respondents agreed that migrants were not given proper time to collect their belongings prior to deportation, while 27.0 % of the respondents rejected the statement.

Table: 2. Frequencies and Percentage Distribution showing Lacks of Pre-deportation Assistance Program in Host Country.

Lacks of Pre-deportation Assistance Program in Host Country	Yes	No	Total
Host countries do not have policy program to promote “assisted voluntary return migration”.	190 (59.0)	132 (41.0)	322 (100)
During arrestment, host country do not inform migrants about their deportation prior to departure.	166 (51.6)	156 (48.4)	322 (100)
Host countries do not gives proper time to emigrants in order to collect their belongings prior to deportation.	235 (73.0)	87 (27.0)	322 (100)
The immigrants’ authorities of the host country confiscate all the necessary loges form emigrants prior deportation.	171 (53.1)	151 (46.9)	322 (100)
There is lack of specialized training programs for emigrants prior to deportation about how to re-integrate successfully in their home country.	194 (60.2)	128 (39.8)	322 (100)
Host countries do not have any financial assistance programs for migrants prior to deportation.	186 (57.8)	136 (42.2)	322 (100)
Pakistani embassy do not have financial or in kind, assistance programs for emigrants to meet their deportation needs.	195 (60.6)	127 (39.4)	322 (100)
Pakistani government is lacking assistance for the safe return of the citizen.	221 (68.6)	101 (31.4)	322 (100)
International organization do not provide any kind of assistance for emigrants prior to deportation.	184 (57.1)	138 (42.9)	322 (100)

Values in the table shows frequencies and values in parenthesis representing percentage

Similarly, the deportees were asked about whether the immigrants’ authorities of the host country confiscated all the necessary loges form emigrants prior to deportation, almost (53.1 %) of the respondents accepted while 46.9 % rejected this statement. Answering to the question, whether there were lack of specialized trainings for emigrants prior to deportation about how to re-integrate successfully in their home country, than (60.2 %) of the respondents agreed while 39.8 % disagreed with that statement. Furthermore, (57.8 %) of the respondents agreed that the host countries were lacking financial assistance for migrants prior to deportation, whereas 42.2 % respondents refuted this statement. When we asked about further financial assistance, almost more than half (60.6 %) of the respondents stressed that there were lack of financial or in kind assistance from Pakistani embassy with emigrants to meet their deportation needs, while 39.4 % respondents rejected the statement. When the deportees were asked about whether, Pakistani government were lacking assistance for the safe return of the citizen, thus (68.6 %) of the respondents believed while 31.4 % vetoed the statement. Similarly, (57.1) of the respondents believed that, the international organization did not provide any kind of assistance for emigrants prior to deportation while the remaining 42.9 % respondents rejected the statement.

Association between the Lack of Pre-deportation Assistance in Host Country and Re-Integration Challenges to Labour Deportees at Bivariate Level.

Table No. 3, provided understanding about the association between the lacks of pre-deportation assistance program in host country and re-integration challenges to labour deportees. It was observed

that the host countries did not have policy program to promote *assisted voluntary return migration* whereas a highly significant ($P = 0.000$) association was found with their re-integration challenges to labour deportees. The Odds Ratio ($OR = 3.284$) indicated positive association and explained that the absence of program to promote *assisted voluntary return migration* in the host country created almost three time more re-integration challenges for deportees in home countries than assisted voluntary return migration. Moreover, during arrestment, the host country did not inform migrants about their deportation prior to departure was also high significantly ($P = 0.000$) associated with the re-integration challenges to labour deportees.

Table No 3: Association between the Lack of Pre-deportation Assistance in Host Country and Re-Integration Challenges to Labour Deportees

Values in the table shows frequencies and values in parenthesis representing percentage. (χ^2) indicates chi-square

Independent variable	Responses	Dependent variable		Total	Statistics of χ^2 , P-Value, & OR
		Re-integration Challenges			
		Yes	No		
Host countries do not have policy program to promote "assisted voluntary return migration".	Yes	138 (42.9)	52 (61.1)	190 (16.1)	$\chi^2 = 25.591$ $P = 0.000$ $OR = 3.284$
	No	59 (18.3)	73 (22.7)	132 (41.0)	
	Total	197 (61.2)	125 (38.8)	322 (100.0)	
During arrestment, the host country do not inform migrants about their deportation prior to departure.	Yes	128 (39.8)	38 (11.8)	166 (51.6)	$\chi^2 = 36.603$ $P = 0.000$ $OR = 4.247$
	No	69 (21.4)	87 (27.0)	156 (48.4)	
	Total	197 (61.2)	87 (27.0)	322 (100.0)	
Host countries do not gives proper time to emigrants in order to collect their belongings prior to deportation.	Yes	168 (52.2)	67 (20.8)	235 (73.0)	$\chi^2 = 38.922$ $P = 0.000$ $OR = 5.015$
	No	29 (9.0)	58 (18.0)	87 (27.0)	
	Total	197 (61.2)	125 (38.8)	322 (100.0)	
The immigrants' authorities of the host country confiscate all the necessary loges form emigrants prior deportation.	Yes	131 (40.7)	40 (12.4)	171 (53.1)	$\chi^2 = 36.545$ $P = 0.000$ $OR = 4.218$
	No	66 (20.5)	85 (24.4)	151 (46.9)	
	Total	197 (61.4)	89 (27.6)	322 (100.0)	
There is lack of specialized training programs for emigrants prior to deportation about how to re-integrate successfully in their home country.	Yes	142 (44.1)	52 (16.1)	194 (60.2)	$\chi^2 = 29.668$ $P = 0.000$ $OR = 3.624$
	No	55 (71.1)	73 (22.7)	128 (39.8)	
	Total	197 (61.2)	125 (38.8)	322 (100.0)	
Host countries do not have any financial assistance programs for migrants prior to deportation.	Yes	138 (42.9)	48 (14.9)	186 (57.8)	$\chi^2 = 31.401$ $P = 0.000$ $OR = 3.752$
	No	59 (18.3)	77 (23.9)	136 (39.4)	
	Total	197 (61.2)	125 (38.8)	322 (100.0)	
Pakistani embassy do not have financial or in kind, assistance programs for emigrants to meet their deportation needs.	Yes	142 (44.1)	53 (16.5)	195 (60.6)	$\chi^2 = 28.207$ $P = 0.000$ $OR = 3.507$
	No	55 (17.1)	72 (22.4)	127 (39.4)	
	Total	197 (61.2)	125 (38.8)	322 (100.0)	
Pakistani government is lacking assistance for the safe return of their citizens.	Yes	152 (47.3)	69 (21.4)	221 (68.6)	$\chi^2 = 17.127$ $P = 0.000$ $OR = 2.741$
	No	45 (14.4)	56 (17.4)	101 (31.4)	
	Total	197 (61.2)	125 (47.3)	233 (100.0)	
International organization do not provide any kind of assistance for emigrants prior to deportation.	Yes	136 (42.2)	48 (14.9)	184 (57.1)	$\chi^2 = 29.308$ $P = 0.000$ $OR = 3.577$
	No	61 (18.2)	77 (23.9)	138 (42.9)	
	Total	197 (61.2)	125 (38.8)	322 (100.0)	

value while (p) shows the level of significance and OR indicated Odds Ratio.

The Odds Ratio ($OR = 4.247$) showed positive association and stated that when the host country did not inform migrants about their deportation prior to departure, it created 4.247 time more re-integration challenges for deportees in home countries than when pre deportation information were provided. Although, it was investigated that the host countries did not given proper time to emigrants in order to collect their belongings prior to deportation whereas a highly significant ($P = 0.000$) association was found with re-integration challenges. The Odds Ratio ($OR = 5.015$) demonstrated positive association and stated that given no proper time to emigrants in order to collect their belongings prior to deportation generated 5.015 time more re-integration challenges for deportees in home countries than when proper time for emigrants were provided. Furthermore, it was observed that confiscated all the necessary loges form emigrants prior to deportation was highly and significantly ($P = 0.000$) associated with re-

integration challenges for the deported labours. The Odds Ratio (OR = 4.218) demonstrated positive association and stated that confiscating all the necessary loges form emigrants prior to deportation generated 4.218 time more re-integration challenges for deportees in home countries than keeping all the necessary loges.

Although, it was observed that, lack of specialized training programs for emigrants prior to deportation in host country was highly and significantly (P = 0.000) associated with re-integration challenges to labour deportees. The Odds Ratio (OR = 3.624) proved a positive association and identified that the lack of specialized training programs for emigrants prior to deportation caused 3.624 time more re-integration challenges for deportees in home countries than specialized trainings were offered for deportees. Similarly, a high significant (P = 0.000) association was found between the host countries did not have any financial assistance programs for migrants prior to deportation and the re-integration challenges to labour deportees. The Odds Ratio (OR = 3.752) verified positive association and showed that the lack of financial assistance programs for migrants prior to deportation by host country resulted 3.752 time more re-integration challenges for labour deportees in home country than financial assistance were offered by host country. Moreover, Pakistani embassy did not have financial or in kind, assistance programs for emigrants to meet their deportation needs was significantly (P = 0.000) associated with re-integration challenges to labour deportees. The Odds Ratio (OR = 3.507) confirmed positive association and indicated that the lack of financial or in kind, assistance programs offered by Pakistani embassy for emigrants generated 3.507 time more re-integration challenges for deported labour in home country than financial assistance were offered by Pakistani embassy.

Similarly, a highly significant (P = 0.000) association was observed between Pakistani government was lacking assistance for the safe return of the citizen and re-integration challenges to labour deportees. The Odds Ratio (OR = 2.741) approved positive association and directed that the lack of Pakistani government assistance for safe return of their citizens engendered 2.741 time more re-integration challenges for deported labour in home country than the assistance were provided by Pakistani government. Although, it was observed that lack of assistance offer by international organization for emigrants prior to deportation was found highly significant (P = 0.000) with re-integration challenges to labour deportees. The Odds Ratio (OR = 3.577) supported positive association and observed that the lack of assistance offered by international organization for emigrants prior to deportation created 3.577 time more re-integration challenges in home country than the assistance was provided by international organization.

Association between the Lack of Pre-deportation Assistance and Re-integration Challenges to Labour Deportees Controlling Age of the Respondents at Multivariate Level.

The relationship between various independent and dependent variables were worked out by controlling some background variables such as age, literacy and monthly income of the respondents in order to know whether the relationship between the independent and dependents variable at bi-variate level were spurious or none-spurious. Therefore, the effects of age on the lack of pre-deportation assistance in the host country and re-integration challenges to labour deportees were disclosed that the deportees with 23-30 years age had positive (OR= 9.675) and highly significant (P = 0.000) relationship between aforesaid variables as shown in (Table, 4).

Table: 4: Association between the Lack of Pre-deportation Assistance Program in Host Country and Re-integration Challenges to Labour Deportees (Controlling Age, Literacy and monthly Income).

Background variable	Independent variable	Dependent variable		Total	Statistics of χ^2 , P-Value, & OR
		Re-integration challenges			
Age, Literacy, Monthly Income	Lack of Pre-deportation Assistance Program	Yes	No		
		23-30 Years of Age	Yes	43 (44.8)	20 (20.8)
	No	6 (6.3)	27 (28.1)	33 (34.4)	
31-38 Years of Age	Yes	34 42.0	13 (16.0)	47 (58.0)	$\chi^2 = 7.292$ P = 0.007 OR= 4.636
		No	7 (8.6)	27 (33.3)	
39-46 Years of Age	Yes	21 (37.5)	11 (19.6)	32 (57.1)	$\chi^2 = 21.139$ P = 0.000 OR= 10.088
		No	7 (12.5)	17 (30.4)	
47-54 Years of Age	Yes	23 (33.8)	18 (26.5)	41 (60.3)	$\chi^2 = 13.951$ P = 0.000 OR= 10.222
		No	3 (4.4)	24 (35.3)	

55-62 and above Years of Age	Yes	10 (47.6)	4 (19.0)	14 (66.7)	$\chi^2 = 6.109$ P = 0.012 OR = 15.000
	No	1 (4.8)	6 (28.6)	7 (33.3)	
Literate	Yes	70 (39.3)	34 (19.1)	104 (58.4)	$\chi^2 = 29.975$ P = 0.000 OR = 5.960
	No	19 (10.7)	55 (30.9)	74 (41.6)	
Illiterate	Yes	61 (42.4)	32 (22.2)	93 (64.6)	$\chi^2 = 41.291$ P = 0.000 OR = 17.538
	No	5 (3.5)	46 (31.9)	51 (35.4)	
10,000-20,000 Monthly Income	Yes	75 (41.9)	35 (19.6)	110 (61.5)	$\chi^2 = 4.412$ P = 0.036 OR = 20.000
	No	9 (5.0)	60 (33.5)	69 (38.5)	
21,000-30,000 Monthly Income	Yes	38 (39.6)	22 (22.9)	60 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = 47.761$ P = 0.000 OR = 14.286
	No	6 (6.3)	30 (31.3)	38 (37.5)	
31,000-40,000 Monthly Income	Yes	10 (31.3)	7 (21.9)	17 (53.1)	$\chi^2 = 19.737$ P = 0.000 OR = 8.636
	No	8 (25.0)	7 (21.9)	15 (46.9)	
41,000-50,000 & Above Monthly Income	Yes	5 (45.5)	1 (9.1)	6 (54.5)	$\chi^2 = 0.098$ P = 0.775 OR = 1.250
	No	1 (9.1)	4 (36.4)	5 (45.5)	

Values in the table shows frequencies and values in parenthesis representing percentage. (χ^2) indicates chi-square value while (p) shows the level of significance and OR indicated Odds Ratio.

On the other hand the relationship between aforesaid variables were positive (OR= 4.636) and significant (P = 0.007) for the deportees with 31-38 years age. Similarly, the correlation of the above variables were positive (OR = 10.088) and highly significant (P = 0.000) for deportees with 39-46 years age. Moreover, the deportees with age of 47-54 years had positive (OR= 10.222) and highly significant (P = 0.000) association between aforesaid variables. Further, the relationship between the above mentioned variables were found highly positive (OR= 15.000) and significant (P = 0.012) for the deportees with 55-62 and above years of age. The significant value in the table indicated a strong association between the above mentioned variable, however, the Odds Ratio value indicated that the association between the lack of pre-deportation assistance and re-integration challenges to labour deportees was spurious for all age group. The results further indicated that lack of pre-deportation assistance in host country created greater re-integration challenges for labour deportees with above 39 years age than below 39 years age, while the above 55 years age group were the most vulnerable group to re-integration challenges.

The influence of literacy on the pre-deportation assistance program in host country and re-integration challenges to labour deportees indicated that the literate deportees had positive (OR = 5.960) and highly significant (P = 0.000) relationship between aforesaid variables as shown in (Table No 4). Likewise the relationship between aforesaid variables were positive (OR = 17.538) and significant (P = 0.000) for the illiterate deportees. The significant value in the table indicated a strong association between the above mentioned variable, however, the Odds Ratio value indicated that the association between the lack of pre-deportation assistance program and re-integration challenges to labour deportees was spurious. The results further indicated that the lack of pre-deportation assistance program created greater re-integration challenges for illiterate deportees.

The influence of monthly income on lack of Pre-deportation assistance program and re-integration challenges to labour deportees showed that the deportees with 10,000-20,000 monthly income had highly positive (OR = 20.000) and significant (P = 0.036) relationship between the aforesaid variables as shown in (Table No. 4). In addition, the association for aforesaid variables was positive (OR = 14.286) and highly significant (P = 0.000) for the deportees with 21,000-30,000 monthly income. Similarly, there was positive (OR = 8.636) and highly significant (P = 0.000) relationship between the after said variables for the deportees with 31,000-40,000 monthly income. Moreover, the relationship between above mention variables were positive (OR = 1.250) and none-significant (P = 0.775) for the deportees with 41,000-50,000 monthly income. The Odds Ratio values indicated that the relationship between the lack of pre-deportation assistance and re-integration challenges to labour deportees was significant and spurious when the monthly income of deportees was controlled. The Odds Ratio further indicated that lack of pre-deportation assistance created greater re-integration challenges for labour deportees with 10,000-20,000 and 21,000-30,000 monthly income as compared to other monthly income of the deportees in their country of origin.

IV. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

The study found that the lack of pre-deportation assistance program in host country was strongly associated with the re-integration challenges to labour deportees in their home country as shown in (see Table 2, 3 and 4). The study found that the lack of pre-deportation assistance program in host country had a strong association with post-deportation re-integration challenges to the deported people in their country of origin. The host countries did not have policy program to promoted *assisted voluntary return migration*. They did not informed migrants about their deportation prior to departure and given no time to collect their belongings prior to deportation, while if there is necessary loges with migrants at the time of arrestment were also confiscated by the emigrants' authority in the host country during deportation. The host country did not have specialized training opportunities prior to departure while the host and home countries and their embassies as well as the international community also did not offer any prior financial assistance programs for the successful re-integration of the deported people in their home country. This nature of return created re-integration challenges to labour deportees in their country of origin and showed exploitation of the capitalist against labour migrants in the host country. Labour migrants are doubly exploited and stigmatized by capitalist in the dualistic labour market of the host country because firstly, migrants had been exploited in bad jobs of the secondary labour market by paying lowest wages and, secondly they did not protect migrants and given no rights and opportunities for returning labour rather exploited and stigmatized them severely. This probably demonstrated that the exploitation of capitalist against labour migrants are not only exist in foreign labour market but also deep rooted in local labour market of the home country because they did not insured the safe returning of their citizens. This exploitation degraded deportees socially and economically. In this situation, deportees were unable to find prestigious jobs in the local labour markets due to the exploitative nature of return. The study show that the wage differences are not due to the skills variations of individual but the exploitation and stigmatization of the host and home country which directed deportees to follow different paths to survive in the local labour market, that actually generated segmentation in the labour markets. These results are consonant with the findings of Cassarino (2004) by stating that the un-preparedness or unwillingness to leave the host country are strongly associated with the re-integration challenges to labour deportees in their country of origin. Therefore, a strong return preparation are required for the successful re-integration of labour deportees. Dako-Gyeke and Kodom (2017) found that the post return life of the migrants are greatly affected by the reality of the host and home country, while Schuster and Majidi (2013) concluded that the successful re-integration of returnees is depends upon the nature of return. Similarly, David (2015) studied that the voluntary returnees have more likelihood of re-integration in the home country than involuntary returnees. Therefore, the deported people were unable to find prestigious jobs rather they were adjusted in low pay jobs in the segmented labour market. These structural forces create cheap and flexible labour, which are restricted to fill lowest segments according to the demand of the dual labour market, whereas the disadvantageous deportees are often tracked on paths of downward mobility over generations, while privileged deportees have more opportunities to craft paths to upward mobility (Dingeman, 2018) in the dualistic labour markets. Future researches should be continue to highlight the impacts of anti-immigrants policies in host countries. Similarly, the host country should protect immigrants and could stop discrimination and exploitation against immigrants during arrestment and deportation. Host country should provide proper time, counseling and should prepare immigrants mentally for deportation which could help them to re-integrate successfully in home country. Deportees should facilitate with financial or in kind support by the host and home country as well as by the international community in order to secure re-integration of deportees in their country of origin.

REFERENCES

1. Abrego, L. J. (2011). Legal consciousness of undocumented Latinos: Fear and stigma as barriers to claims-making for first-and 1.5-generation immigrants. *Law & Society Review*, 45(2), 337-370. *Afghans in Pakistan*. Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit. <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/country,AREU,PAK,47c3f3cb0,0.html>.
2. Akyeampong, E. (2000). Africans in the diaspora: The diaspora and Africa. *African affairs*, 99(395), 183-215.

3. Alpes, M. J. (2012). Bushfalling at all cost: The economy of migratory knowledge in Anglophone Cameroon. *African Diaspora*, 5(1), 90-115.
4. Baffo, K. R. (2015). *Deportation and Re-integration: Challenges and Coping Strategies among Deportees in the Nkoranza Municipality of Ghana* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Ghana).
5. Baily, K. D. (1982). *Methods of Social Research: (2nd ed)*. New York. *Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. P. 408*.
6. Bali Process Regional Support Office (BPRSO). (2019). *A policy guide on returns and reintegration for Bali Process Members* (Bangkok). Available at: <https://www.baliprocess.net/UserFiles/baliprocess/File/BP%20Policy%20Guide%20on%20Returns%20and%20Reintegration.pdf>. Accessed 2 July 2019.
7. Boodram, C. A. S. (2018). Exploring the experiences of deportation and re-integration of aging deported men in Trinidad and Tobago. *Gerontology and Geriatric Medicine*, 4, 2333721418754950.
8. Brotherton, D. C., & Barrios, L. (2011). *Banished to the homeland: Dominican deportees and their stories of exile*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
9. Cassarino, J. P. (2004). Theorizing Return Migration: The Conceptual Approach to Return Migrants Revisited. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* 6 (2):253-279.
10. Chaudry, S., & Kamal, S. (1996). *Introduction to Statistical Theory* (6thed.). Lahore: Ilmi Kutub Khana, p. 269.
11. Collyer, M. (2012). Deportation and the micro politics of exclusion: The rise of removals from the UK to Sri Lanka. *Geopolitics*, 17(2), 276-292.
12. Cruz, E., & Dingeman-Cerda, K. (2018). Macías-Rojas, Patrisia, From Deportation to Prison: The Politics of Immigration Enforcement in Post-Civil Rights America. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 43(3), 293-296.
13. Dako-Gyeke, M., & Kodom, R. B. (2017). Deportation and re-integration: Exploring challenges faced by deportee residents in the Nkoranza Municipality, Ghana. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 18(4), 1083-1103.
14. David, A. (2015). *Back to square one – socioeconomic integration of deported migrants*.
15. David, A. M. (2017). Back to square one: socioeconomic integration of deported migrants. *International Migration Review*, 51(1), 127-154.
16. De Genova, N. (2015). The border spectacle of migrant 'victimisation'. *The Passerelle Collection*, 107.
17. De Genova, N. P. (2002). Migrant "illegality" and deportability in everyday life. *Annual review of anthropology*, 31(1), 419-447.
18. De Haas, H. (2006). *Engaging Diasporas: how governments and development agencies can support diaspora involvement in the development of origin countries*. Available at http://www.eldis.org/fulltext/EngagingDiasporas_HeindeHaas.pdf. Accessed May 16, 2017.
19. De Haas, H. (2007). *Migration and development: A theoretical perspective; paper presented at the conference on 'Transnationalisation and Development (s): Towards a North-South Perspective'*, Center for Interdisciplinary Research, Bielefeld, Germany, May 31-June 01, 2007.
20. De Regt, M., & Tafesse, M. (2016). Deported before experiencing the good sides of migration: Ethiopians returning from Saudi Arabia. *African and Black Diaspora: An International Journal*, 9(2), 228-242.
21. Dessiye, M. (2011). *The Challenges and Prospects of Female Labour Migration to the Arab Middle East: A Case Study of Women Returnees in the Town of Girana, North Wollo, Ethiopia*. MA thesis, Faculty of Psychology, University of Bergen.
22. Dingeman, K. (2018). Segmented re/integration: Divergent post-deportation trajectories in El Salvador. *Social problems*, 65(1), 116-134.
23. Dreby, J. (2015). *Everyday illegal: When policies undermine immigrant families*. University of California Press.
24. Drotbohm, H. (2011). On the durability and the decomposition of citizenship: the social logics of forced return migration in Cape Verde. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(3-4), 381-396.
25. Dustmann, C., and Weis, Y. (2009). Return Migration: Theory and Empirical Evidence from the UK. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 45 (2): 236–256.
26. Emory, C. W., & Cooper, D. R. (2000). Business Research Methods, *International Journal of Management*, 16, 276-286.
27. Faist, T. (2000). *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
28. Fernandez, B. (2010). Cheap and disposable? The impact of the global economic crisis on the migration of Ethiopian women domestic workers to the Gulf. *Gender & Development*, 18(2), 249-262.

29. FIA. (2016). *Statistics of Deported People from Gulf Countries*, Mardan: Federal Investigation Agency (Immigration Wing).
30. Fonseca, A., Hart, L., & Klink, S. (2015). *Re-integration: effective approaches*. Geneva: International, Switzerland: p. 13. Available at [https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/our work/DMM/AVRR/Re-integration-Position-Paper-final.pdf](https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/our%20work/DMM/AVRR/Re-integration-Position-Paper-final.pdf). Accessed 24 Jan, 2018.
31. Golash-Boza, T. (2014). Forced transnationalism: transnational coping strategies and gendered stigma among Jamaican deportees. *Global Networks*, 14(1), 63-79.
32. Hagan, J., Castro, B., & Rodriguez, N. (2010). The effects of US deportation policies on immigrant families and communities: Cross-border perspectives. *NCL Rev.*, 88, 1799.
33. Hagan, J., Eschbach, K., & Rodriguez, N. (2008). US deportation policy, family separation, and circular migration. *International Migration Review*, 42(1), 64-88.
34. Hagen-Zanker, J. (2008). *Why do people migrate? A review of the theoretical literature. A Review of the Theoretical Literature (January 2008)*. Maastricht Graduate School of Governance Working Paper No.
35. Harkins, B. (2016). *Review of labour migration policy in Malaysia*. Bangkok: International Labour Organization (ILO).
36. Hazan, M. (2014). *Understanding return migration to Mexico: towards a comprehensive policy for the reintegration of returning migrants*. Available at <https://ccis.ucsd.edu/files/wp193.pdf>. Accessed 18 April 2017.
37. Human Rights Watch. (2013). *Saudi Arabia: Labor Crackdown Violence Ethiopian Workers Allege Attacks, Poor Detention Conditions*. Available at <http://www.hrw.org/news/2013/11/30/saudi-arabia-labor-crackdown-violence>. Accessed 30 Dec 2016.
38. Hussain, Y., & Bagguley, P. (2005). Citizenship, ethnicity and identity: British Pakistanis after the 2001 'riots'. *Sociology*, 39(3), 407-425.
39. International Labour Organization. (2011). *Trafficking in Persons Overseas for Labor Purposes: The Case of Ethiopian Domestic Workers*. Addis Ababa: ILO Country Office.
40. International Organization for Migration. (2011). *Glossary on migration: International migration law (2nd ed.)*. In R. Perruchoud & J. Redpath-Cross (Eds.). Geneva, Switzerland: IOM.
41. International Organization for Migration. (2011). *International Migration Law*. Glossary on Migration. P. 82.
42. International Organization for Migration. (2019). *Pakistan Migration Snapshot*. Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand.
43. K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. (6th ed). Routledge 2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN.
44. Kanstroom, D. (2007). *Deportation nation: Outsiders in American history*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
45. Kebede, E. (2001). *Ethiopia: An assessment of the international labour migration situation: The case of female labour migrants*. Geneva: ILO.
46. Kibria, N. (2014). Returning international labor migrants from Bangladesh: the experience and effects of deportation. https://cis.mit.edu/sites/default/files/documents/ReturningInternationalLaborMigrants_Kibria_0.pdf. Accessed 05 July 2017.
47. King, R. (2012). *Theories and typologies of migration: An overview and a primer*.
48. King, R. (2012). *Theories and typologies of migration: an overview and a primer*. –Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations 3/12. Malmö Institute for Studies of Migration, Diversity and Welfare (MIM).–Malmö.
49. Mary, L. (2009). The odds ratio: calculation, usage, and interpretation, *Biochemia Medica*; 19 (2).120-130.
50. Masso et al. (2016). *Return migration patterns of young return migrants after the crisis in the CEE countries: Estonia and Slovakia*. Strategic Transitions for youth labour in Europe.
51. Mayr, K., and Peri, G. (2008). *Return Migration as Channel of Brain Gain*. CREAM Discussion Paper No 04/08.
52. Morawska, E. (2012). *Historical-Structural Models of International Migration*, in Martiniello, M. and Rath, J. (eds.) *An Introduction to International Migration Studies*. Amsterdam University Press, 55-75.
53. Naik, A., & Laczko, F. (2012). *The bittersweet return home*. *Forced Migration Review*, 39. Available at <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/north-africa/naiklaczko.pdf>. Accessed May 14, 2015.

54. Ndreka, A. (2019). Return migration and re-integration of returnees challenges in the origin country. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(2), 20-27.
55. Nguyen-Akbar, M. (2014). The tensions of diasporic 'return' migration: how class and money create distance in the Vietnamese transnational family. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 43(2), 176-201.
56. Pena, J. M., Garcini, L. M., Gutierrez, A. P., Ulibarri, M. D., & Klonoff, E. A. (2017). Traumatic events and symptoms among Mexican deportees in a border community. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 15(1), 36-52.
57. Peutz, N. (2006). Embarking on an Anthropology of Removal, *Cultural Anthropology*, 47/ 2: 217-41.
58. Pinedo, M., Burgos, J. L., & Ojeda, V. D. (2014). A critical review of social and structural conditions that influence HIV risk among Mexican deportees. *Microbes and infection*, 16(5), 379-390.
59. Piore, M. J. (1979). *Birds of passage: Migrant labor and industrial societies*. Cambridge University Press.
60. Rashid, S.R., Ashraf, A.A., (2018). *A framework of services for reintegration and remigration of international labour migrants from Bangladesh* (Dhaka, IOM and ILO).
61. Schuster, L., & Majidi, N. (2013). What happens post-deportation? The experience of deported Afghans. *Migration studies*, 1(2), 221-240.
62. Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business*. USA: Hermitage Publishing Services.
63. Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. John Wiley & Sons.
64. Setrana, M. B. (2017). Back Home at Last! Factors Influencing Return and Reintegration of Ghanaian Returnees. *Journal of Identity & Migration Studies*, 11(1).
65. Tai, S. W. (1978). *Social Science Statistics, Its Elements and Applications*. California: Goodyear Publishing Company.
66. Tannenbaum, M. (2007). Back and forth: Immigrants' stories of migration and return. *International migration*, 45(5), 147-175.
67. Tazreiter, C. (2006). Between state sovereignty and invisibility: monitoring the human rights of returned asylum seekers. *Australian Journal of Human Rights*, 12(1), 7-25.
68. Thornson, D. B. (2006). Choiceless Choices: Deportation and the Parent-Child Relationship. *Nevada Law Review*. 6(3):1165-1166.
69. United Nations. (2018). *International Migration Policies: Data Booklet (ST/ESA/SER.A/395)*.
70. Van Houte, M. (2014). *Moving back or moving forward?; Return Migration after Conflict*.
71. van Meeteren, M., Engbersen, G., Snel, E., & Faber, M. (2014). Understanding different post-return experiences. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 2(3), 335-360.
72. Wahba, J. (2015). Who benefits from return migration to developing countries?. *IZA World of Labor*.
73. Wheatley, C. (2011). Push back: US deportation policy and the reincorporation of involuntary return migrants in Mexico. *The Latin Americanist*, 55(4), 35-60.
74. Wickramasekara, P. (2019). *Effective Return and Reintegration of Migrant Workers with Special Focus on ASEAN Member States*. The ILO ASEAN Triangle Project, International Labour Organization, Bangkok.
75. Zayas, L. H. (2015). *Forgotten citizens: Deportation, children, and the making of American exiles and orphans*. Oxford University Press, USA.
76. Zilberg, E. (2011). *Space of Detention: The Making of a Transnational Gang Crisis Between Los Angeles and San Salvador*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.