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• « Between… » → Beyond a uni-directional view of migration
  • Basic idea of the MAFE project
    – « Migration between Africa and Europe »
  • Applied to family life of migrants
    – Reunification = a universal aspiration?

• Outline
  • African migration: between here and there
  • Couple reunification: state vs. self-selection
Sub-Saharan Migration: Between here and there
• African migration as a major policy concern

  – A fear of invasion, esp. since 2005 (Ceuta & Melilla, Canary Islands, Lampedusa, Malta, Sicilia)
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- In France, African migration commonly stigmatized in the public debate, including by Ministers
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Citizens of non-EU countries resident in the EU-27 (Eurostat, 2012)

Sub-Saharan Africa (12%)
Proportion de migrants rentrés au pays, en fonction de la durée écoulée depuis le départ
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Propension au retour en fonction de la période de départ du Sénégal

Afrique

Pays du Nord
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• African migration as a major policy concern

  – A fear of invasion, esp. since 2005 (Ceuta & Melilla, Canary Islands, Lampedusa)

  – In France, African migration commonly stigmatized in the public debate, including by Ministers

• In fact

  – A minority in stocks and flows of migrants in Europe … and significant returns

  – Well educated migrants
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Percentage of male migrants with tertiary education in France (2008, TeO Survey)

- Sub-Saharan migrants: 39%
- All migrants: 28%
- France (total): 30%
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• African migration as a major policy concern
  – A fear of invasion, esp. since 2005 (Ceuta & Melilla, Canary Islands, Lampedusa)
  – In France, African migration commonly stigmatized in the public debate, including by Ministers

• In fact
  – A minority in stocks and flows of migrants in Europe … and significant returns
  – Well educated migrants
  – Less family reunification than the average
Percentage of reunified migrants in France
(2008, TeO Survey)

Sub-saharan migrants
- Males: 11%
- Females: 22%

All migrants
- Males: 18%
- Females: 29%
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Migrante « autonome »

= Migrante arrivée en France alors qu’elle était célibataire ou migrante qui a laissé son conjoint au pays (« pionnière »)

NB : sans référence

- à la décision de migrer
- au statut socio-économique

Population :
Immig’ arrivés à l’âge adulte (>18 ans) Âgés de 18 à 60 ans en 2008

Source :
Beauchemin et al., 2013 d’après l’enquête TeO, 2008
• African migration as a major policy concern
  
  – A fear of invasion, esp. since 2005 (Ceuta & Melilla, Canary Islands, Lampedusa)
  
  – In France, African migration commonly stigmatized in the public debate, including by Ministers

• In fact
  
  – A minority in stocks and flows of migrants in Europe … and significant returns
  – Well educated migrants
  – Less family reunification than the average
  – … and a strong propensity to “live apart together across borders“ (LAT-AB)
- 1/4 has no nuclear family
- **Significant numbers of transnational families (20 to 60%)**…

Source: MAFE Project; Mazzucato et al. (2013, 2015)
10 years after separation:

- 1/4 were reunited in Europe
- 1/2 were joined in Ghana by their returnee parent
- 1/4 of the left-behind children are still separated from their migrant parent

Reunification in Europe is not the more likely outcome of a separation period.

Source: Mazzucato et al. (2013)
10 years after separation,
- more than 30% of the children are still separated from their parent(s) in most groups (exceptions: south-east Asia, EU15 in France)
- Higher levels of sep': SS Africa in F. and Sp., East Eur. In Sp
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Enfants d’immigrés ayant vécu hors France métropolitaine pendant au moins 1 an avant l’âge de 18 ans

Ensemble G2
- Filles : 5%
- Garçons : 5%

Europe du Sud
- Filles : 4%
- Garçons : 3%

Maghreb
- Filles : 6%
- Garçons : 7%

Afr. Subsahar’
- Filles : 12%
- Garçons : 21%

N = 449 (dont 236 filles) / 8 113 ind.
N = 93 (dont 53 filles) / 2 626 ind.
N = 126 (dont 72 filles) / 2 429 ind.
N = 118 (dont 52 filles) / 813 ind.

(N non pondéré)

Source : Grysole et al. 2013
• Economic reasons to live apart
  – Better for earning maximization (reunification is costly) [Neo-Classicals]
  – Better for risk sharing and mutual insurance [NELM]
  – Migration to reach a target before returning and reunifying at origin [NELM]

• Social norms – socio-cultural specificities
  – Extended and « ubiquitous families » (Lututala 1989)
  – LAT as a common arrangement (Pilon 2006)
  – « Couples of low consistency » (Findley, 1997)
  – Fosterage
  – Gender relationships

• Policy constraint?
  – Restrictive measures to limit reunification in the 1990s in Europe
  – Self-selection vs. state-selection
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Background
Framework
Hypotheses
• **Objective**: question the common assumption that family reunification is not a self-selective process

• Family reunification as a *multi-level « selection act »*

(1) **Self-selection**
  - Self = couple
  - With possible divergences within the couple (bargain)
  - Under influence of the social context at origin
    - Gender and family norms

(2) **State-selection** at destination, through immigration policies
  - Who is eligible?
  - Conditions to reunify?
  - Security of status (how renewable)?
  - Rights granted to reunified migrants?
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State selection

- Basic selection criteria:
  - Matrimonial status
  - Socio-economic status (housing conditions, migrant’s earnings)
  - [Partner language skills]
  - …
- Variations over time and across countries

« Restrictive » countries
- France
- UK
- The Netherlands

« Permissive » countries
- Spain
- Italy
- Belgium
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State selection

• Question: do restrictive policies actually reduce reunification?
  – No quantitative evidence so far (?)

• Debate in the literature on migration control (in general):
  – Unefficiency, unintended effects
  – « Substitution effects » (Czaika & de Haas)

• Evidence of « de facto » reunification
  – Migrants’ agency (Bledsoe & Sow 2008)
  – Non eligible couples can reunify through other legal channels
  – Possibly « on the fringes of the law » (Gonzalez-Ferrer 2011)
Self selection

• Evidence of non-reunification:
  – qualitative lit’ on « transnational families »
  – rare numbers (Kanaiaupuni 2000, Baizan et al. 2014)

• Economic rationale for LATAB:
  – Earning maximization
  – Risk sharing & mutual insurance (NELM)
  – vs. emotional cost

• In SS Africa, « couples of low consistency » (Findley 1997)
  – Extended families, strong influence of the elders
  – Lineage solidarity > couple solidarity
  – Distance btw partners:
    • Emotional: spouse choice, age gap, polygamy
    • Geographical: « Ubiquitous families » (Lututala 1989) – LAT is common
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Self selection

• At origin, social forces against reunification
  – Intergenerational relationships
    • Left behinds under control of in-laws: labour force & remittances insurance
  – Gender norms / roles expectations
    • A « good wife » is not expected to migrate
    • A threat to social order (exposure to egalitarian norms, risks of divorce)

• Left behind women: aspirations and bargaining power
  – How to gain more autonomy?
    • By moving / reunifying or stayning behind?
  – Women’s education as a factor of reunification:
    • Greater benefit in terms of gender relationships (Parrado & Flippen 2005)
    • Higher incentive (discrimination at origin, employment prospects at dest’)
    • Greater agency to subvert patriarchal authority / convince their husband
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The degree of ‘patriarchality’ influences...
- Female migration (LAMP results, Massey et al. 2006)
- Reunification
  - Within Senegal: more patriarchal ethnic groups reunify less (Baizan 2013)
  - Ghana vs. Senegal (Riccio 2008)
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Hypotheses

• H1: LATAB is a common and long-lasting arrangement, with a propensity that varies with the context at origin
  – more reunification in more gender egalitarian societies, i.e., more from DRC and Ghana than from Senegal
  – more reunification in times of trouble at origin

• H2: The propensity to reunify is independent from the level of policy restrictiveness in destination countries
  – Against policy expectations / migrants’ agency / substitution effects

• H3: *Still*, ind’ who comply with official selection criteria are more likely to regroup [self and state selection]
  – Legal status, polygamy, low socio-economic conditions at destination

• H4: More educated women are more likely to regroup [self-selection]
  – Especially in patriarchal contexts (Senegal vs. DRC and Ghana)
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Data & Method

the MAFE Project

Migrations between Africa and Europe
• A multi-site survey

• In Africa:
  – Capital cities (+ Kumasi in Gh.)
  – Stratified random samples
  – Per origin country
    • 1,100 to 1,600 hh
    • 1,000 to 1,200 ind.

• In Europe:
  – Samples representative (as far as possible) at the national level
  – No sampling frame (except in Spain)
    • Quotas (age, gender, SES)
    • A combo of selection methods
  – 420 to 600 migrants per origin
    • 150 to 300 migrants per destination country
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• Multi-level Databases
  – Individual data – life histories (in all countries)
  – Household data (only in Africa)
  – Contextual databases (incl. Impol DB on policies) – Country level

• A wealth of retrospective data
  – Full life histories: family, occupation, investments, migration (short and long stays, attempts, routes…), migrants networks
  – Some in the household questionnaire
  – Contextual DB = series

• Identical questionnaires in all countries
  – Data files with identical structures and variables (minor exceptions)
  – Preliminary efforts to standardize concepts & identify translation issues (e.g., legal status, children, partnerships)
LATAB couples

- Males in Europe and females in Africa (in MAFE countries)
- Couples married or not; union possibly started after migration
- Data arranged as couple-year files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female left behinds in Africa</th>
<th>Male migrants in Europe</th>
<th>Number of couples</th>
<th>Number of couple-years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>4,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR-Congo</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# LATAB Study - Data Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>PARTNERS</th>
<th>INTERVIEWEE'S COUNTRY</th>
<th>PARTNER'S COUNTRY</th>
<th>SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS</th>
<th>Other variables...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>U1 - Fatima</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>U1 - Fatima</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>U1 - Fatima</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>REUNIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>U1 - Fatima</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>U1 - Fatima</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>LATAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>U1 - Fatima</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>U1 - Fatima</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>U1 - Fatima</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Employed - Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>U1 - Fatima</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Employed - Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>U1 - Fatima</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Employed - Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>U1 - Fatima</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
Event history analyses

- Kaplan-Meier estimates → Reunification timing
- Logit discrete-time models → Factors of reunification

  • Dependant variable:
    - Reunification in Europe (in a MAFE country)
    - Overall reunification = legal + de facto

  • Right censoring:
    - Time of the survey, end of partnership, migrant’s departure out of a MAFE country (incl. reunification at origin)

  • Independant variables:
    - Context at destination: destination*period (before / after 2003)
    - Conditions of migration: legal status, visits at home,
    - Couple situation: years in LATAB, married, started at a distance, polygamous, nb of children
    - Socio-eco characteristics: men’s SES, women’s education

  ❖ Separate models for each origin
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Results
- LATAB is common and long lasting
- Less frequent in more gender egalitarian & political turmoil contexts
Against policy expectations, in more restrictive countries (blue lines),
- LATAB is less frequent
- reunification is more common
### Couple’s characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Congolese couples</th>
<th>Ghanaian couples</th>
<th>Senegalese couples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration since LATAB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=3 years</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3 years</td>
<td>0.12***</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Union started at a distance (ref: no)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.61**</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Married (ref: no)</strong></td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>7.96***</td>
<td>4.06***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polygamous couple (ref: no)</strong></td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.16***</td>
<td>0.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children (number)</strong></td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.73***</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Migration conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visited partner (ref: no)</th>
<th>Congolese couples</th>
<th>Ghanaian couples</th>
<th>Senegalese couples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.18*</td>
<td>1.69*</td>
<td>10.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Partners’ socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female's level of education (Left behind at origin)</th>
<th>Congolese couples</th>
<th>Ghanaian couples</th>
<th>Senegalese couples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary and less</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td><strong>4.45</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td><strong>4.06</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>7.89</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male's socio-economic status (Migrant at destination)</th>
<th>Congolese couples</th>
<th>Ghanaian couples</th>
<th>Senegalese couples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not employed/Student</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled or self employed</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.88+</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled and Professionals</td>
<td><strong>3.07</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>2.73</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>2.53</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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– LATAB is a common and long-lasting arrangement…

– LATAB largely depends on the social context at origin
  • Reunification more frequent in more gender egalitarian societies
  • Women education more influential in patriarchal contexts
    → Self-selection, under the influence of the origin social context
  • Gender relationships = a universal driver?

– Influence of states at destination?
  • Against policy expectations, reunification is not less frequent where policies are more restrictive
  • Ind’ who comply with official selection criteria are more likely to regroup … which may reflect both state and self-selection (convergence)
  • Migrants’ agency especially salient in context of severe crisis (DR Congo)
Conclusions
• A conceptual shift
  • rather “Family Migration between Sub-Saharan Africa and Europe”
    – Families living apart together
    – Reunification at origin
  • than “Family Migration from Sub-Saharan Africa to Europe”

• A statistical challenge
  • Generating data with a double-view of migration and family
  • Amount of split families? For how long?
  • What are the explanatory factors? Political vs. other factors

• Necessity to overcome a double Western-centric bias
  • A statistical / methodological bias: unilateral view of reunif’
  • A conceptual / ideological bias: ‘traditional’ western view of family
Better disentangle state and self-selection
  - Very rough measure of policies effects
  - No insights on couple bargain

The functioning of transnational families
  - How « consistent » are LATAB couples?

Other forms of transnational arrangements
  - Children sent back in origin countries
  - 1 out of 5 sub-Saharan boys born in France (vs. 5% on average)

Studying the consequences of separation
  - In home countries, well-being of left behind and sent back children?
  - In destination countries
    - School success and economic integration of lately reunified children?
    - Re-integration of returning children of the second generation?
    - Effect of isolation on migrants integration?
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