

MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS' RELATIONSHIP: TOWARDS A DEEPER CONTEXTUAL REFLECTION

RICHARD EKE IMADE

*Department of International Cooperation Studies,
Graduate School of International Development (GSID),
Nagoya University, Nagoya,
Japan.*

And

UYI BENJAMIN EDEGBE

*Department of Social Work,
Faculty of Social Sciences,
University of Benin, Benin City,
Nigeria.*

Abstract

The impacts of out-migration on the relationship between migrants and non-migrants have been well documented in migration literature. However, earlier studies continue to under-represent the diverse actors and their different interests in transnational communities, whereas the claim that the acceleration of out-migration necessarily leads to confrontations, disharmony and perpetuation of negative stereotypes due to the non-extension of the benefits of migration to all the actors have been overstated. Ascribing such disharmony to migration-induced consumption styles obscures a complete understanding of the pre-departure and post-departure interactions within which out-migration facilitates harmony when remittances are used to fulfil obligations of 'shared poverty' and expectations of actors or undermine it when remittances are used to expand opportunities for some persons at the expense of others or when the expectations of actors are unmet.

Drawing from earlier studies which underscore the role of certain 'contextual or facilitating and undermining' conditions which alter migrants and non-migrants relationship in transnational spaces, we argue that transnational spaces constitute fields for redefining pre-departure stereotypes about the changed status associated with migration experience, the moral obligations of 'shared poverty' which migrants are expected to fulfil, and the re-configuration of power and resources.

While many earlier studies on the relationships between migrants and non-migrants assume that migrant-sending communities are necessarily homogenous and egalitarian (Reichert, 1982; Christiansen, 2013) prior to the pioneer migration experience (De Haas, 2010), and that migration is socially disruptive for existing

relationships in the transnational community (Abril and Rogaly; 2001, Wise and Covarrubias, 2009), other factors have been comparatively overlooked. For example, conditions at play in sending communities beyond migrants' remittances, which alter social relationships, redefine widely held stereotypes about 'ideal migrants', 'ideal non-migrants' as being 'responsible' or 'irresponsible' (Rodriguez and Schwenken, 2013, p. 375). Similarly, studies have revealed that 'pioneer migrants' are predominantly people of middle-class backgrounds, thus pointing to the fact that differences in lifestyles in transnational communities predate out-migration (Hunt, 2004; Portes, 2008; De Haas, 2005; 2010, p. 1588). While not contesting the fact that migration remittances could accelerate differences and stratification, these conditions are not new to human societies and were not created by migration (Davis & Moore, 1945, as cited in Ritzer, 2010, p. 238) and might not necessarily lead to negative stereotypes or conflict (Bourdieu 1999). Such beliefs tend to underestimate the role of the modernizing forces of colonialism and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in the diffusion of lifestyles in receiving countries upon which the creation and promotion of stereotypes about 'pull factors' are predicated (Gribble, 2008, Chin, 2008, de Haas, 2010, Rodriguez and Schwenken, 2013). An example of this is the role played by the Japanese media in connivance with the North Korean government in the conception of North Korea as 'heaven on the earth', which stimulated massive return migration of Japanese-Koreans (Asakawa, 2010, p. 2). Other studies have similarly confirmed that transnational stereotypes and orientations remain very strong irrespective of physical transnational mobility (De Bree, Davids and de Haas, 2010). The stereotypic conception of the ideal migrant lifestyles and benefits derived from receiving countries are actively promoted by various actors, especially the media, and this predates the migration experience of pioneer migrants. In turn, these images play important roles in the initial migratory decision making process (Rodriguez and Schwenken, 2013). When the culture of migration, including the accompanying stereotypes, becomes widely diffused in a society, it is integrated into wider social mobility strategies, and those in the community who do not take advantage of this status-enhancing option are considered lazy, lacking initiatives and undesirable (Reichert, 1982; Massey et al, 1993; Chin, 2008; de Haas, 2010).

The view of the relationship between migrants and non-migrants as necessarily contentious obscures the more optimistic view, which seeks to understand the relationship of migrants and non-migrants within the purview of facilitating and undermining factors, described by Portes (2008) and de Haas (2010) on the migration-development nexus debate and the discriminatory use of social capital/network, respectively. When migrants and non-migrants' relationships flourish or rupture, it is often symptomatic of changes in the interests of both actors. Migrants may come to perceive non-migrants as overly dependent on them, corrupt, lazy, lacking initiative, insincere, not looking after the family members left in their custody, and undermining

efforts of migrants to ascend the social ladder (Homans, 1974; Terry & Wilson, 2005; Gribble, 2008). On the other hand, non-migrants may feel that migrants are unwilling or hesitant to fulfil altruistic moral obligations associated with the notion of 'shared poverty' or when some measures of exploitations become inherent (Geertz, 1963; De Haas, 2010; Davidson, 2013). The situations described above more often than not provide incentives or disincentives for the migrants/non-migrants' relationship, as it had been argued that social relationships are sustained or undermined through perceived or actual benefits in relation to costs (Homans, 1974; De Haas, 2010, p. 1604-5).

Reciprocating or not the norm of shared poverty might be sufficient to explain the strong or weak relationship between migrants and non-migrants who are direct beneficiaries or losers of the expected proceeds from remittances. However, this might not be adequate to explain the threats posed to pre-departure elites by migrants, given their new found social and economic statuses which challenge previous configurations of resources and power in transnational communities. Nor does it explain the 'social suffering' that migrants feel when those with whom they identified prior to their migration experiences have unexpectedly advanced up the social ladder (Bourdieu, 1999; De Bree, Davids and De Haas, 2010). This suffering can also occur when migrants observe no significant differences between themselves and people who were of low-status prior to their migration experience, or those who perceive migrants as failures or 'losers', not because they do not meet expectations regarding remittances, but for deciding to seek opportunities outside their village (de Haas, 2010). This also contrasts with Christiansen's study (2013, p. 164) which claimed that non-migrants can only access urban goods when migrants provide them. For instance, in the early 1990s, as a child accompanying my parents to my rural community in Nigeria, a handful of local residents had commodities such as televisions, Gen Sets, UHF Video Cassette Players, and other goods which were thought to be the possessions of urban dwellers. This example shows that migrants and non-migrants relationships are actually more complex than what has been portrayed in previous studies.

The remaining sections of this paper are structured as follows: section two is the introduction which highlights some gaps in the transnational scholarship; section three attempts to conceptualize terms which consistently appear in this article; section four focuses on why people move and the processes of forming transnational orientations, identities and belongings; section five talks about specific transnational practices undertaken by migrants and non-migrants; section six is a discourse on migrant and non-migrant relationships facilitating and undermining factors in both sending and receiving countries, followed by a conclusion.

Conceptual Clarification

In order to give this paper a conceptual direction, basic concepts used herein need to be defined. Some of the concepts include: transnationalism, relationship, stereotypes and trafficking in persons or human trafficking.

Transnationalism is “a combination of civic-political memberships, economic involvements, social networks and cultural identities that link people and institutions in two or more nation states” (Morawska, 2001 cited in Mirdal and Ryyänen-Karjalainen, 2004, p. 7).

Relationship is “a state of being related or interrelated or the relation connecting or binding participants in a relationship” (Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, 1994, p. 987).

Stereotypes “homogenize traits held to be characteristic of particular categories of people, making them appear natural, necessary, unchangeable and reducing them to such traits without qualification to reproduce notions of others as radically different from those among whom the stereotypes circulate” (Ritzer and Ryan, 2011, p. 616).

Trafficking in Persons: Is “the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs” (UNODC-The United Nations Palermo Protocol Against Trafficking in Persons, 2007, p. 1).

Why do people move? The formation of transnational stereotypes, orientations and belongings

Unlike Christiansen’s study, which attributed the creation of stereotypes in transnational villages to migration-related remittances and consumption styles, stereotypes come into play even prior to the migration of pioneer migrants. Stereotypes constitute an integral tool through which the link between culture and the economic conception of migration emanates (Epstein and Gang, 2010) and are very influential in migration decision-making processes, as had been illustrated by various theories of migration. For instance, the neoclassical economics theory attributes migration to expected income, cost-benefits analysis and surplus labour versus surplus capital hypotheses (Sjaastad 1962; Todaro 1969; Harris and Todaro, 1970); the new economics of migration theory attributes migration to the need to provide alternative security for

the family and bridge relative deprivation gaps (Stark and Bloom, 1985); the dual labour market theory conceives of migration as resulting from pull factors or the economic peculiarities inherent in receiving countries (Piore, 1979); and the world systems theory attributes migration to the unequal structure of global economic, political and social relationships (Wallerstein, 1974; Also see Massey et al, 1993). The important question is how do prospective migrants come to know about the existence of opportunities for upward social mobility elsewhere if not through stereotypes of ideal situations in receiving communities which become diffused in transnational communities?

From the foregoing, it can be seen that initial migration stereotypes are essentially framed and perpetuated by forces which predate migration. Within this context, the role of both state and non-state actors, including the forces of modernization (transport and information and communication technologies) and colonialism have been very influential in the creation of the ideal and ideal non-migrants' stereotypes in sending communities (Gribble, 2008; Portes, 2008; Chin, 2008; De Haas, 2010; Rodriguez and Schwenken, 2013). The formation of transnational stereotypes does not necessarily involve physical migration (De Bree, Davids and de Haas, 2010; Rodriguez and Schwenken, 2013). Migration, being part of the general processes of globalization, has continued to weaken nation-states and reduce the importance of people's physical location while putting greater focus on their contributions to the social, cultural and economic development of the countries that they identify with (Rizvi, 2004; De Haas, 2005). Once started, migration provides an opportunity for redefining preconceived stereotypes in the transnational community, either for good or for ill (as had been emphasized by previous studies in this area, such as Reichert, 1982; Fresnoza-Flot, 2009; Portes, 2008; De Haas, 2010; and Christiansen, 2013). However, few studies have been conducted on the conditions under which pre-departure stereotypes are sustained when actors fulfil their interests or undermined when they are unable to achieve their objectives.

Transnational Practices

Transnational practices captured in the literature include the sending of remittances and gifts, frequent communication using phone calls, postal mails and the internet, eliciting family care for migrants' children or aged parents, building houses and investing in sending communities, periodic or reciprocal visits between sending and receiving countries, attending important cultural or social events in sending communities, or making financial contributions to the home area (Moon 2003; Schmalzbauer 2004; Dreby 2006; Fresnoza-Flot, 2009). In sum, transnational practices manifest in wider social, economic, political and cultural activities to which migrants and their non-migrant relatives attribute identity and belonging, irrespective of whether

individuals are there or not (Mirdal and Ryyänen-Karjalainen, 2004; Epstein and Gang, 2010; De Bree, Davids and De Haas, 2010).

Rationale for Transnational Practices: Altruistic or personal interest

There has been a debate as to whether engagement in transnational practices such as sending remittances is informed by altruistic considerations or enlightened self-interest. For instance, a study in Egypt, Morocco, and Turkey found out that both motivations were important for sending remittances (Van Dalen, Groenewold and Fokkema, 2005). Migrants consider it a moral obligation to engage in transnational practices, including remittance, as a means of guaranteeing a seamless return to their communities of origin should they return, as well as for various forms of emotional and social support. Similarly, non-migrants rely on migrants as alternate social capital to fast track their upward social mobility, and as liberators of their families and communities (Duval, 2004; Terry and Wilson, 2005; Gamlen, 2008; Christiansen, 2013).

Transnational studies have established that migrants, return migrants and non-migrants are predominantly linked by ties of kinship, friendship, and village in the home and host countries, and they continue to be emotionally attached to such relationship in order to satisfy a variety of interests (Van Dalen, Groenewold and Fokkema, 2005; Portes, 2008; De Haas, 2010; Epstein and Gang, 2010; Christiansen, 2013). While non-migrants expect migrants to liberate them and their villages from poverty due to their advantageous positions, experiences, and sometimes skill and education, migrants also expect their relationship with non-migrants to guarantee their security and status and facilitate a smooth return to their village (Christiansen, 2013). Such informal norms of reciprocity are geared towards reinforcing the bonds between migrants and non-migrants and serve to legitimize a commitment to norms of 'shared poverty' as synonymous with being 'responsible', and non-commitment as being 'irresponsible' on the part of actors (Geertz, 1963; Dean, 2007). Successes notwithstanding, very often this interactional process is not without friction in terms of gaps between actors' expectations and what is socially and economically feasible, given the limitation of resources. Thus, harmony and disharmony have become integral parts of transnational relationships depending on whose interests are satisfied, unsatisfied or perhaps threatened (Zweig and Fung, 2004; Christiansen, 2013).

Migrant-Non-Migrant Relationships: An Explanatory Framework

From the premises of the Exchange theory as put forward by George C. Homans, Peter Blau, and Richard M. Emerson, the social behaviours of migrants and non-migrants are seen within the purview of exchange (reciprocity) (Ritzer, 2005). Essentially, relationships between migrants and non-migrants are based on the expectation of rewards by both sides and the higher the rewards or expectations, the

greater their commitment to the relationships (Homans, 1974). In other words, when migrants and non-migrants perceive the costs invested into sustaining their transnational relationships as higher than the expected benefits or rewards, they are less likely to sustain that relationship. For instance, a study of Filipino migrant mothers in France discovered that the amount of gifts that migrants sent to non-migrants were a function of the intimacy of the relationship to them and their relevance in the maintenance of the migrant mothers' households (Fresnoza-Flot, 2009).

Factors Facilitating and Undermining Migrants and Non-Migrants' Relationships

Factors which facilitate and undermine migrants' and non-migrants' relationships are found throughout transnational literature but efforts have not been made to condense them into an integrated perspective. In this section, we shall begin by reviewing certain factors in sending communities which serve to strengthen or strain relationships between migrants and non-migrants, and factors in receiving countries which produce differential results as well.

Factors in Sending Communities

➤ Obligation of Shared Poverty versus Stereotypic Dissonance (Collective Consciousness versus Individual Consciousness)

Beyond individual migrants' rational calculations prior to migration, from the new economics theory of migration we understand that the family or group membership is important in the decision-making process (Stark and Bloom, 1985; Massey et al, 1993). Consequently, both migrants and non-migrants continue to maintain transnational links to pursue their interests, whether altruistic or personal. To this end, both migrants and non-migrants subscribe to moral obligations of 'shared poverty', which are coupled with various stereotypes about the proceeds that migration promises and the notion of being 'good migrants' in terms of spreading the wealth to poorer family and community members or helping them set up businesses or migrate themselves (Geertz, 1963; De Bree, Davids and De Haas, 2010, p. 495). When such shared informal obligatory norms are fulfilled, relationships are strengthened for as long as both actors continue to feel that the costs of sustaining such relationships are less than the reward from them. Conversely, when the reward constantly falls below the perceived cost, the relationship is likely to wane. In other words, both migrants and non-migrants draw upon already formed stereotypes to define roles and expectations with respect to fulfilling their parts in the exchange relationship. When these expectations are fulfilled, the stereotypes are likely to remain positive. Accordingly, discriminatory interactional practices are undertaken by actors based on how they perceive or feel that the other possesses certain desired characteristics (ability and capacity to increase rewards and constantly reducing the cost of support) while excluding those

not possessing such characteristics (inability or incapacity to increase rewards and constantly raising the cost of support) (De Haas, 2010).

➤ **Remittances as Sources of Family/Community Unification Versus Fragmentation**

Migrants rely on non-migrants for a variety of reasons, including looking after their investments, children, helping them purchase socially desirable materials within their transnational village, procuring relevant documents from key offices/departments of the state among others (Fresnoza-Flot, 2009). However, sometimes in the course of helping migrants to perform these various duties or expectations, it is not unusual to experience distrust in the management of resources meant for these purposes. For instance, a Nigerian based in Europe remitted money amounting to 10,000 US Dollars to her mother to purchase a plot of land for her in Edo State, but the mother instead used the money to finance the migration of the migrant's elder brother without her consent. Eventually the brother was repatriated, and when the migrant found out about this, it became a source of strain in the family relationship. The use and distribution of remittances can ease or increase tension, leading to the fragmentation of transnational families and communities. Where remittances are used to create 'favourites' and 'un-favourites', and family and community members strive to outsmart one another in access to remittances (De Bree, Davids and De Haas, 2010; De Haas, 2010, p. 1605), the possibility of strain in relationships becomes heightened. Also, when migrants rely on their fellow migrants to help transmit resources to their family members in transnational village in order to reduce costs or because they do not enjoy legal status in their receiving communities, often migrants are exploited by their fellow migrants, and this tends to create tensions among family members left behind and migrants themselves (Fresnoza-Flot, 2009). This was the case of a Nigerian migrant who, being a professor in his host country, used the library recycling program offered by his university to procure and ship large numbers of books as his philanthropic contribution to enrich the libraries in his transnational village, only for the village leadership to conspire among themselves to sell the books to the locals. Another migrant in Italy was planning to open a boutique in his home community, and was very happy that a fellow migrant who happened to be from the same transnational village was shipping some goods back home. He approached his compatriot to help him ship some of his start-up kits and goods prior to his return, but to his dismay, the fellow absconded with his goods and relocated. This became a source of conflict not only between both migrants, but also between both families in their transnational community.

➤ **Optimum Versus Excessive Pressure/Cost Versus Benefit**

Notwithstanding commitment to the notion of shared poverty, when migrants are constantly under pressure from non-migrant family or community members for financial or other assistance, which the migrant are unable to meet, the possibility of strain in relationship is heightened (De Haas, 2010). Migrants might become dissatisfied with excessive dependence on them, as various studies have revealed that remittances are basically used to expand consumption rather than productive spending in transnational villages or communities (Van Dalen, Groenewold and Fokkama, 2005; Terry and Wilson, 2005; Fresnoza-Flot, 2009; De Haas, 2010). Very often, migrants and non-migrants experience conflict over mismanagement of remittances. While migrants expect that non-migrants will invest part of the remittances into productive ventures to reduce over-dependence on them, they are usually shocked to see the reverse, such as in the case of Filipino transnational 'grandmothering' (Fresnoza-Flot, 2009). When migrants perceive that the cost vis-à-vis the benefits they derive from their investments in transnational relationships are considerably higher, they might be tempted to re-consider investing further in such relationships (Homans, 1974).

➤ **Changed Status Versus Threatened Status**

Strained relationship between migrants and non-migrants can be avoided if observed differences in consumption styles and other cherished expectations of non-migrants are satisfied within such relationship as in when such differentials culminate in an increased desire to be part of the migration chain too due to the diffusion of a culture of migration in the transnational community (Massey et al, 1993) or when non-migrants prioritize investment in human capital over immediate gratifications of consuming urban goods (Reichert, 1982; Christiansen, 2013). However, relationship might be strained for instance, where consumption narrows the available resources at the disposal of non-migrants (Abril and Rogaly, 2001) and where migrants spend their remittances on purchasing land, building or buying houses, setting up commercial enterprises etc (Christiansen, 2013) and obtaining competitive resource advantages vis-à-vis non-migrants as in the general preferences for spouses with migrant background in Guadalupe studied by Reichert, (1982, p. 418-9) thus threatening the traditional or pre-departure configuration of power, including gender relationship (Reichert, 1982; Fresnoza-Flot, 2009; Bélanger and Linh, 2011; Christiansen, 2013). For instance, Gribble's (2008) study revealed how non-migrant Chinese felt resentment towards their migrant kin who returned to take up key positions in the economic and political spheres of their community using the skills and knowledge learned through their migration experience. The case of the Eritrean return migrants who were viewed as unpatriotic for migrating during the war and resented by their non-migrant counterparts also stands out (Koser and Van Hear, 2003). The local elites such as the money lenders

and property owners in the migrants' communities of origin usually have access to privileges, including playing dominant roles in patronage politics and marrying the most beautiful women in town. Since this category of people constitutes the nucleus of what has been described as extractive political and economic elites (Acemoglu and Robinson, 2012), it is not uncommon for them to perceive migrants as agents of innovation whose economic emancipation pose a threat to their dominance in rural communities.

Similarly, a competitive rather than cooperative relationship may arise when migrants emphasize obvious differences through consumption, or become overly judgmental about community lifestyles and act like every non-migrant is a failure, as in the cases studied by Reichert (1982) and Christiansen (2013). In a closed society where social norms prohibit members from marrying outside their groups or marrying from particular groups, a migrant might resolve to do otherwise as a way of demonstrating individualism, as Christiansen's study observed in the case of Kurdish villages, but such conduct might be deemed to be offensive to his or her group (De Bree, Davids and De Haas, 2010). Another instance is the monetization of rotational communal labour in the village which migrants excuse themselves from, due to their improved status (Reichert, 1982, p. 417). Migrants themselves sometimes experience shocks when they perceive that the people left behind seem to have made more progress than they have made from their migration experience. In such cases, they are usually less positive about continuing to send remittances, reasoning that such people are already well off, as in the case of the Kurdish migrants who argued that "...there were no longer any poor people in the village" (Christiansen, 2013, p. 169).

➤ **Migration Debt Financing: Prospects and Challenges**

Studies have shown how debt or network-financed migration and human trafficking with its attendant processes could strain relationships between migrants and non-migrants (Chin, 1999; Davidson, 2013) due to the deceitfulness that characterises such migrations (UNICEF, 2007). Prospective migrants sometimes aggregate enormous resources from friends and relatives, and sometimes use properties as collateral or obtain debt-financed migration directly from traffickers or smugglers with assurances of better jobs at their final destinations. However, on getting to their destination, they often find themselves in very demeaning and dehumanizing jobs and living conditions in which they have little or no options due to the moral pressure (and sometimes life-threatening sanctions) to repay the migration-induced debts (Abril and Rogaly, 2001; Davidson, 2013). Such gaps between the expectations of the trafficked or smuggled migrant and his/her non-migrant family members back home and realities in the destination country have the potential of not only straining relationship between the trafficked and their

sponsors, but also between the traffickers or smugglers and non-migrants family members, as in the cases of Nigerian migrants in Europe studied by Cole and Booth (2007) and Kara, (2010). However, where both actors are able to adjust their expectations to suit the realities in destination countries, the possibility of a strained relationship are greatly reduced (Davidson, 2013).

Closely related to the above, the family members of traffickers and even traffickers might be expecting a certain level of allegiance or loyalty from the trafficked or their family members because they have given them an escape route from poverty, but when such loyalty or allegiance is not forthcoming, resentment might set in.

➤ **Human Trafficking: Victors Versus Victims**

Informal social networks play significant roles in perpetuation of migration streams (Massey et al, 1993). Recruitment of prospective migrants, procuring travelling documents, facilitating travel by outsmarting official channels, and helping in the adjustment of migrants are particular functions of both formal and informal social networks (Chin, 2008; Rodriguez and Schwenken, 2013). However, migration through informal networks sometimes also exposes migrants to life-threatening risks, the magnitude of which are not usually revealed to prospective migrants during their recruitment, which often involves the consent of family members who are oblivious of these risks (Chin, 2008; Davidson, 2013). Notwithstanding the risks involved in the transnational smuggling of people, success usually involves a great deal of celebration by not only the new migrants and the traffickers, but also their family members at home. In such cases, traffickers are seen as liberators of people from poverty for facilitating such transnational border crossing, and this serves to further strengthen the relationships between their migrants and non-migrant relatives back home. However, the process of trafficking or smuggling is not always successful, sometimes involving great economic, psychological and social costs, including loss of migrants' lives in transit or at the destination. Under such circumstances, tensions are heightened between traffickers or smugglers and the migrants and their families (Chin, 2008; Davidson, 2013).

➤ **Migration: Frequent Interaction Versus Interaction Lag**

Studies have shown that skilled and regular migrants are more likely to engage in circular migration than unskilled and irregular migrants (Reichert, 1982; Portes, 2008; De Haas, 2010; Rodriguez and Schwenken, 2013). From this premise, we can infer that the greater the level of involvement of migrants in circular migration, the greater their involvement in transnational practices, which in turn serves to build stronger links or bonds between them and non-migrants.

➤ **Society's Internal Labelling Process**

Where there is a widespread characterization of migrants as social outcasts in a transnational community, the relationship between migrants and their family and community members might be threatened right from the outset (De Haas, 2010). This view contrasts with those represented in Christiansen's study, in which she described the Kurdish villages as homogenous and harmonious, without considering the possibility of individuals being compelled to conform to coercive social norms, or the well-documented fact that migration is not available to all and that dissent, conflict and the desire to escape could be possible motivations for pioneer migrants to depart (De Haas, 2010).

Non-migrants could also perceive and label migrants as 'failures' because they could not cope with the requirements of life in their communities (De Haas, 2010). Non-migrants might resent them as moral outcasts or deviants who infiltrate valued customs and traditions of local people with alien and offensive practices, such as females wearing trousers, smoking in public and openly purchasing contraceptives (Christiansen, 2013, p. 174). However, when such people begin to see a change in the status of migrants due to the influx of remittances and changes in the standard of living of migrants' family members, two things are likely to happen: they might reconsider their initial stereotypes and probably seek migrants' assistance to migrate themselves, or hold tenaciously to earlier stereotypes and continue to portray negative behaviour and attitudes towards the migrants irrespective of the changed status. Depending on the economic or moral pressure and prioritization, actors here may adopt different attitudes and behaviour towards each other. Thus, where there is no meeting point in the contestation of meanings between migrants and non-migrants, a strain in the relationship could be expected (Christiansen, 2013).

Factors at Receiving Communities

➤ **Migration debt financing: Prospects and Challenges**

Debt or network-financed migration and human trafficking offer both opportunities to escape from poverty and at the same time expose participants to risky crossings and debt slavery in destination countries (Chin, 1999; Davidson, 2013). While there are many instances of human traffickers resorting to deceit and promises of plum jobs at destination during the recruitment of their victims, some prospective migrants are actually aware of the risky means adopted by traffickers to outsmart authorities at various borders (UNICEF, 2007; Davidson, 2013). Such sponsored trips often involve the prospective migrants entering into debt-bonds with the understanding between them, their family members and the traffickers or smugglers that they will repay the debts when they start working in their destination (Davidson, 2013).

However, contrary to their expectations, they are often compelled to undertake very demeaning, exploitative and dehumanizing jobs because of threats and moral pressure, which gives them little or no option to escape from such slave-like conditions (Abril and Rogaly, 2001; Shah, 2011; Davidson, 2013). Such gaps between the expectations of the smuggled migrants and their non-migrant family members back home and the realities in the destination countries have the potential of not only straining relationship between them and their sponsors but also between the sponsors and non-migrants family members when migrants send feedback to their transnational family or village. This is especially true when the sponsor is a close family or community member, as in the cases of Nigerian migrants in Europe studied by Cole and Booth (2007) and Kara, (2010). However, where both sides are able to adjust their expectations to suit the realities in destination countries, the possibility of a strained relationship is greatly reduced. Instead, the new migrant settles in the custody of his 'benefactor' and gradually works, notwithstanding the risks or dehumanizing nature of the job, to pay off the migration debt incurred (Davidson, 2013, p. 14). In the same vein, relationship between migrants and non-migrants could either be strengthened or undermined when individuals continue or break a migration chain by refusing or failing to activate pre-departure informal covenants with family members to facilitate the migration of other family members once they are successful in their host community. This is one way of fulfilling the moral obligation of shared poverty.

➤ **Migrants' Networks: Facilitation Versus Saturation**

While migrants' capacity to act as 'bridgeheads', facilitating the migration of others, could serve to strengthen the relationship between migrants and non-migrants, acting as 'gatekeepers' as a strategy of coping with saturation and scarcity of opportunities in the destination or narrowing the definitional criteria of ideal migrants could strain their relationship with their non-migrants counterparts (De Haas, 2010, p. 1604).

The process of selecting ideal migrants is also anything but objective. Bridgeheads do not facilitate migration for all people, but judge who possesses the subjective or objective characteristics to benefit from network migration. These characteristics include being hardworking, humble, smart, fulfilling the moral obligation of shared poverty, being able to take risks and to muster the required resources or capital, and possessing sufficient commitment to moral obligations, altruism, self-interest or a combination of factors with a view to helping prospective migrants (Van Dalen, Groenewold and Fokkama, 2005; Fresnoza-Flot, 2009; De Haas, 2010). The selective facilitation of migration for some at the expense of others, in effect gate keeping, increases the possibility of feelings of marginalization and exclusion from the proceeds of migration amongst non-beneficiaries in

transnational families or communities, while at the same time strengthening the relationship between migrants and selected beneficiaries (De Haas, 2010).

➤ **Migrants' Status: Regular Versus Irregular and the Level of Transnational Engagement**

New migrants at the destination often expect a lot of assistance from the informal associations of established migrants in host countries. Sometimes the reality matches their expectations in terms of being able to leverage established compatriots for a better life in the destination, and thus reinforce feelings of collective solidarity, which could spread to non-migrant family members and serve to further strengthen existing bonds. At other times, when established migrants do not have the capacity or choose not to fulfil such expectations, relationship between migrants and non-migrants could be threatened as such acts may be interpreted as not being committed to the culture of shared poverty (Geertz, 1963; De Haas, 2010, p. 1603).

The notion that regular migrants, especially skilled ones, are more likely to maintain stronger transnational relationships with their sending communities is not new in transnational studies (Reichert, 1982; Portes, 2008; De Haas, 2010). Accordingly, maintaining transnational relationship hinges on the capacity of the migrants. For instance, where a migrant does not have adequate resources to participate in transnational actions because of being unemployed, earning a low salary or not having the requisite documentation, his capacity might be constrained. Similarly, where the migrant opposes the leadership of his transnational family or community, as in the case of the Nigerian professor cited above, he might be unwilling or choose not to maintain a transnational relationship with them, even when able to do so (Koser and van Hear, 2003).

➤ **Level of Family/Community Support in Travelling**

The understanding of migration as a family or group strategy for mitigating unforeseen circumstances and relative deprivation rather than an individual safety net, as propounded by the new economics of migration theory (Massey et al, 1993; De Haas, 2010) often also involves massive investment by family members in the financing of a member's migration (Stark, 1991; Antman, 2012). Because of this, drawing from the premise of exchange theory we can hypothesize that migrants who receive greater financial or social support from their families or communities for migrating would be under more pressure to strengthen transnational bonds compared to one who received less assistance.

➤ **Second Generation Transnationality: Migrants Marrying People from the Host Country Versus from the same Background**

The possibility of declining commitment to the maintenance of transnational relationships by second and third generations of migrants has been underscored in various studies (Haller and Landolt, 2005; Epstein, 2008; Christiansen, 2013), but not many studies have focused on the implication of migrants marrying in their host communities as a strategy for legalizing or regularizing their status through their transnational relationships and those of their children (Chin, 2008; Shah, 2011). Moreover, the picture painted by the above studies of declining relationships between migrants and non-migrants with the emergence of the second and third generation of migrants underestimates the agency and ability of second and third generations to navigate their way through transnational institutions when they are brought up in households that expose them to strong influences from their ancestral homes (Levitt, 2009).

The above argument also does not reflect the case of migrants who are opting for the education and socialization of their children in their transnational communities, as in the case of some Chinese migrants in Japan who send their children back to schools in China because they feel that the curriculum of Japanese schools was “too easy and lacking discipline” and others who complained that it lacked “diversity and multiculturalism” (Oishi, 2012, p. 11). To the above debate, we believe there is the need for more rigorous studies on the generational shift of transnational orientation and belonging between second and third generation children born to migrant couples of a homogenous ethnic or racial background and those born of one migrant and one citizen of the host country. However, there seems to be a widespread perception among many male and female migrants that transnational orientations and belongings are stronger among the second than third generation of the former compared to the latter. Consequently, some migrants, besides marrying citizens of their receiving countries, are resorting to keeping discreet marital relationship with spouses of the same ethnic backgrounds with them outside the marital homes they share with their spouses in the host countries (Shah, 2011). In the light of the foregoing, we hypothesize that migrants who marry spouses from their own ethnic or racial background would be more successful than the reverse in instilling transnational orientations in their children.

Conclusions

This paper has argued that harmonious or disharmonious relationship between migrants and non-migrants goes beyond consumption style-induced causation, contrary to the postulations of previous studies, and that there are various actors pursuing diverse interests in the transnational community which have been consistently under-represented. It revealed how broader pre- and post-departure interactive processes,

including structures of power and resources, significantly redefine the relationship between those who migrate and those who remain in villages or communities of origin. Thus, the relationship between migrants and non-migrants will not rupture as long as non-migrants perceive that they are receiving or are actually enjoying rewards from the relationship, irrespective of the consumption styles exhibited by migrants. Such differences in consumption styles could in fact stimulate the admiration of migrants by non-migrants and provide further motivation to migrate or seek alternative social mobility routes to achieve a similar lifestyle in the future.

Non-migrants are also not helpless in terms of exclusively depending on migrants to access urban goods, as claimed by Christiansen (2013), but are actors in the reciprocal but asymmetrical spread of information through the global forces of transport and ICT, which link global processes with the local realities of peoples and cultures. To clearly understand the relationship between migrants and non-migrants requires disaggregating the various actors in transnational villages and communities and investigating the role of fulfilled, unfulfilled and threatened interests in strengthening or undermining such relationships. While this paper cannot claim to have completely bridged the gaps in knowledge in the field of transnational studies, it has tried to adopt a broader view of the various spheres of interaction where the relationship between migrants and non-migrants could be facilitated or undermined.

References

- Abril, Elena Ruiz and Rogaly, Ben (2001). *Migration and Social Relations: An Annotated Bibliography on Temporary Migration for Rural Manual Work*. IIAS/IISG CLARA Working Paper, No. 16.
- Antman, M. Francisca (2012). The Impact of Migration on Family Left Behind. *International Handbook on the Economics of Migration*’. Retrieved on the 5th February, 2014 from: www.iza.org/MigrationHandbook/16_Antman_The%20Impact%20of%20...
- Asakawa, Akihiro (2010). Humanitarian Disaster Under Humanitarianism: Repatriation of Koreans in Japan to North Korea and Its Root Cause. *Forum of International Development Studies*. Vol. 39.
- Bélanger, Danièle and Linh, G. Tran (2011). The Impact of Transnational Migration on Gender and Marriage in Sending Communities of Vietnam. *Current Sociology* 59 (1), 59–77.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999). *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*. Oxford: Polity Press. Chin, James K. (2008). Trends and Government

Policies: Reducing Irregular Migration from China. In *Human Trafficking: Challenges and Initiatives*, pp.142-167. Hyderabad, India: The ICFAI University Press.

Chin, James K. (1999). *Smuggled Chinese*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Christiansen, C. Connie (2012). Migrants and Non-Migrants in Kucukkale: Consumption and Cultural Differentiation in the Transnational Village. In *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39, (1), 161-178.

Cole, J. and Booth, S. (2007). *Dirty Work: Immigrants in Domestic Service, Agriculture and Prostitution in Sicily*. New York: Lexington.

Wise, Raúl Delgado and Covarrubias, Humberto Márquez (2009). Understanding the Relationship between Migration and Development: Toward a New Theoretical Approach. *Journal of Social Analysis*, 53 (3), 85–105.

Davidson, Julia O'Connell (2013). *Troubling freedom: Migration, Debt, and Modern Slavery*. Migration Studies. Oxford University Press. Pp.1-20. Retrieved from: <http://migration.oxfordjournals.org/> on 14th January, 2014.

Dean, M. (2007). *Governmentality; Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage Publications.

De Bree, June; Davids, Tine and De Haas, Hein (2010). *Post-Return Experiences and Transnational Belonging of Return Migrants: A Dutch–Moroccan Case Study*. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd & Global Networks Partnership.

De, Haas, Hein (2010). The Internal Dynamics of Migration Processes: A Theoretical Inquiry. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(10),1587-1617. UK: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

De De Haas, Hein. (2005). International Migration, Remittances and Development: Myths and Facts. *Third World Quarterly*, 26 (8), 1269–84.

Dreby, J. (2006). Honor and virtue: Mexican parenting in the transnational context. *Gender & Society*, 20 (1), 32–59.

Duval, D. T. (2004). Linking Return Visits and Return Migration Among Commonwealth Eastern Caribbean Migrants in Toronto. *Global Networks*, 4 (1),51-67.

- Epstein, S. Gil (2008). Herd and Network Effects in Migration Decision-Making. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(4), 567 – 583.
- Epstein, S. Gil and Gang, N. Ira (2010). Migration and Culture In G. S. Epstein, & I. N. Gang, (Eds), *Frontiers of Economics and Globalization, Migration and Culture*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Fresnoza-flot, Asuncion (2009). *Migration Status and Transnational Mothering: The Case of Filipino Migrants in France*. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd & Global Networks Partnership.
- Gamlen, C. (2013). The Emigration State and the Modern Geopolitical Imagination. *Political Geography*, 27, 840-856.
- Geertz, C. (1963). *Agricultural Involution, The Processes of Ecological Change in Indonesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gribble, Gate (2008). Policy Options for Managing International Students Migration: The Sending Country's Perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 30(1), 25-39.
- Haller, William and Landolt, Patricia (2005). The Transnational Dimensions of Identity Formation: Adult Children of Immigrants in Miami. *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28 (6), 118-221.
- Harris, J. R., and Michael P. Todaro (1970). Migration, Unemployment, and Development: A Two-Sector Analysis. *American Economic Review* 60, 126-142.
- Homans, C. George (1974). *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*'. Revised Edition. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Hunt, Jennifer (2004). Are Migrants More Skilled than Non-Migrants? Repeat, Return, and Same-Employer Migrants. *The Canadian Journal of Economics/ Revue canadienne d'Economique*, 37(4), 830-849.
- Jain, Sonali (2012). For Love and Money: Second Generation Indian-Americans 'Return' to India. *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(5), 896-914, Routledge. Retrieved on September 16, 2013 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2011.641576>

- Kara, S. (2010). *Inside the Business of Sex Trafficking*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Koser, Khalid and Van Hear Nicholas (2003). Asylum Migration and Implications for Countries of Origin. United Nations University: *World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER)*. Discussion Paper 20.
- Levitt, Peggy (2009). Roots and Routes: Understanding the Lives of the Second Generation Transnationally. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(7), 1225-1242.
- Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (1994). 10th Edition. US: Merriam-Webster's Incorporated
- Massey, Douglas S.; Arango, Joaquin; Hugo, Graeme; Kouaouci, Pellegrino, Ali Adela and Taylor, J. Edward (1993). 'Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal'. *Population and Development Review*, 19(3), 431-466. Retrieved from: <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0098-7921%28199309%2919%3A3%3C431%3ATOIMAR%3E2.0.CO%3B2-P>
- Moon, S. (2003). Immigration and Mothering: Case Studies From Two Generations of Korean Immigrant Women, *Gender and Society*, 17(6), 840–860.
- Mirdal, G. M. and Ryyänen-Karjalainen, L. (2004). Migration and Transcultural Identities. The European Science Foundation (ESF) Standing Committee for the Humanities, Forward Look Report 2. Retrieved on 23rd October, 2013 from: http://www.esf.org/fileadmin/Public_documents/Publications/Migration_and_Transcultural_Identities.pdf
- Oishi, Nana (2012). The Limits of Immigration Policies: The Challenges of Highly Skilled Migration in Japan. *American Behavioural Scientist*. Retrieved from <http://abs.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/04/12/0002764212441787>
- Piore, Michael J. (1979). *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor in Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Portes. Alejandro (2008). Migration and Development: Reconciling Opposite Views. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(1), 5-22. London: Routledge.
- Reichert, Joshua (1982). A Town Divided: Economic Stratification in a Mexican Migrant Community. *Social Problems*, 29(4), 411-423. University of

California. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/800030> on 23rd October, 2013.

- Ritzer, George (2011). *Sociological Theory. Eight Edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc
- Ritzer, George (2005). *The Encyclopaedia of Social Theory*. London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Ritzer, George and Ryan, J. Michael (2011) . *The Concise Encyclopaedia of Sociology*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Rizvi, Fung (2004). Rethinking Brain Drain in the Era of Globalization. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Education*, 25(2), 175-192
- Rodriguez, Robyn M. and Schwenken, Helen (2013). Becoming a Migrant at Home: Subjectivation Processes in Migrant-Sending Countries Prior to Departure. *Population, Space and Place* 19, 375-388.
- Schmalzbauer, L. (2004). Searching for Wages and Mothering From Afar: The Case of Honduran Transnational Families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66 (5), 1317–31.
- Shah, Prakash (2011). *Transnational Family Relations in Migration Contexts: British variations on European Themes*. RELIGARE (Religious Diversity and Secular Models in Europe–Innovative Approaches to Law and Policy-www.religareproject.eu.) Working Paper No. 7.
- Sjaastad, Larry A. (1962). The costs and returns of human migration. *Journal of Political Economy*. Pp. 80-93.
- Stark, Oded (1991). *The Migration of Labor*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Basil Blackwell, Inc, pp. 216–20.
- Stark, Oded and David E. Bloom (1985). The New Economics of Labor Migration. *American Economic Review* 75, 173-178.
- Terry, F. Donald and Wilson, R. Steven (2005). *Beyond Small Change: Making Remittances Count*. Inter-American Development Bank: Bendixen and St. Onge.

- Todaro, Michael P. (1969). A Model of Labor Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries. *The American Economic Review* 59, 138-48.
- United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (2007). *Fact Sheet on Child Trafficking in Nigeria*. Retrieved from: www.unicef.org/wcaro/WCARO_Nigeria_Factsheets_ChildTrafficking.pdf on 14th January, 2014.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2007). *The Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking*. Retrieved from: <http://www.unodc.org/pdf/gift%2520brochure.pdf> on 4th February, 2013
- Van Dalen, P. Hendrik, Groenewold, George and Fokkema, Tineke (2005). The Effect of Remittances On Emigration Intentions In Egypt, Morocco, And Turkey. *Population Studies*, 59(3), 375-392.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1974). *The Modern World System, Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.
- Welch, M. R., R. E. N. Rivera, B. P. Conway, J. Yonkoski, P. M. Lupton and R. Giancola (2005). Determinants and Consequences of Social Trust. *Sociological Inquiry*, 75 (4), 453–73.
- Willies, K. (2005). *Theories and Practices of Development*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group
- Zweig, D. and Fung, C.S. (2004). Redefining the Brain Drain: China's Diaspora Option. Centre of China's Transnational Relations. *Working Paper, 1*. The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. Accessed on 20th October, 2013 from: <http://www.cctr.ust.hk/articles/pdf/workingPaper1.pdf>.