

Migrants' Multi-Sited Social Lives

Interactions between Sociocultural Integration and Homeland Engagement

Özge Bilgili

CMS 2 (3): 283–304

DOI: 10.5117/CMS2014.3.BILG

Abstract

This paper challenges the assimilationist assumption that suggests migrants cannot be simultaneously embedded in multiple societies. Based on survey data collected among Afghan, Burundian, Ethiopian and Moroccan migrants in the Netherlands, the paper shows that overall sociocultural integration in the Netherlands and sociocultural homeland engagement are significantly positively correlated. Moreover, it demonstrates that migrants with more contact with their co-ethnics in the Netherlands tend to engage more in sociocultural activities oriented towards their home country. Besides, the influence of favourable political and security situations and economic prospects in the home countries is brought to the fore in relation to migrant groups' sociocultural homeland engagement. The paper consequently highlights the prevalence of transnational ways of living and calls for theoretical adjustments in line with migrants' multi-sited social lives and more inclusive policy approaches that recognize the relevance of dual-citizenship in this contemporary context.

Keywords: Transnationalism, sociocultural integration, homeland engagement, return visits, migrants in the Netherlands

1 Introduction

In the past few decades, a growing number of social scientists have acknowledged that migrants do not simply assimilate into the host country and break off ties with their contacts in the home country (Levitt and Glick Schiller, 2004). Instead, they maintain strong social, cultural and political

relationships with their homeland (Khagram and Levitt, 2008; Faist, 2013). In the existing literature, competing arguments are put forward as to how these relationships are interlinked with migrants' integration processes in the host country. The assimilation theory suggests a negative association and states that only migrants who are not successfully integrated in the host society will have the incentive to maintain more contact with the home society (Portes et al., 1999; Snel et al., 2006). Conversely, the transnational perspective proposes that host country and homeland experiences can influence each other positively (Morawska, 2003; Levitt and Glick Schiller, 2004). Tsuda (2012) claims that integration in the host country may increase an individual's economic, social and cultural capitals, thus providing migrants with more opportunities, knowledge and incentives to contribute to their home country. In this paper, I seek to contribute to this debate by focusing on various components of the sociocultural dimension of migrant lives. Rather than treating integration processes in the host country and homeland engagement separately, I look at the inherent linkages between the two in order to respond to the following question: To what extent and in which ways is migrants' engagement in sociocultural activities oriented towards their home country linked to their sociocultural integration into the host country?

This question is of both societal and political relevance. From a development perspective, it is important to understand under which conditions migrants develop more sociocultural contact with their home country, especially given that social remittances are transferred through these relationships (Levitt, 1998). These transfers – including new ideas, practices, values, skills and identities – may alter people's behaviour and transform conceived notions about gender relations, democracy and so forth in sending communities, as well as contributing to development (Levitt, 1999). When we have a better understanding of migrants' sociocultural homeland engagement patterns, more inclusive and cohesive policies can be developed to augment the transfer and positive impact of social remittances. Furthermore, from an integration perspective, this research question allows us to challenge the assumption of incompatibility in embeddedness in multiple societies. This research does not show a negative association between integration and homeland engagement; rather, it provides evidence for the idea that migrants' can be simultaneously engaged in multiple societies without contradiction. Hence, the results of this research can be used in discussions regarding our understanding of integration and migrants' new ways of living. Consequently, the positive effects of migra-

tion can be enhanced for all parties involved through policies that better fit the current social realities.

In order to address the research question, I make use of survey data collected from first-generation adult Afghan, Burundian, Ethiopian and Moroccan migrants in the Netherlands. Hosting distinct migrant groups and being an immigration country where both integration and development policies are hotly debated, the Netherlands provides an appropriate case to study various migrant groups simultaneously. The migrant groups in question differ from each other extensively with regards to their migration history and group composition in the Netherlands. The Moroccan community is the largest migrant community of the groups studied with about 356,000 individuals, which constitutes 2.1 per cent of the total Dutch population. The Afghan community of about 40,000 people is the second largest migrant community, one which has grown substantially since 2000. The Burundian migrant community is the smallest, with about 3000 people, while the Ethiopian migrant community is one of the largest within the African migrant community with about 12,000 individuals (Bilgili and Siegel 2012).¹ With respect to migration motivations, Moroccans are known as labour and family migrants, while the other groups consist primarily of individuals who, at least initially, have fled their country of origin for political and security reasons, and are now characterised by additional family and student migration (Bilgili and Siegel 2012). Accordingly, in this paper, I also make group comparisons in order to highlight the role of contextual factors in sociocultural homeland engagement.

2 Theory and hypotheses

2.1 Transnational migration research

To date, researchers have not come to a complete consensus with respect to how the interrelationship between integration and homeland engagement works. According to the assimilationist perspective, homeland engagement and integration are found on a uni-dimensional spectrum and essentially rule each other out. Tsuda (2012) explains the assimilationist argument by the limited character of resources at hand. He states that time and money in particular are resources of limited kind, and if these resources are consumed for one purpose, there is less left for other purposes. Based on this idea, it is possible to argue for a “zero-sum” relationship between integration and homeland engagement. Conversely, transnational migration theory suggests that there may be a more positive association

between integration in the host country and engagement in the homeland because they are separate yet compatible processes (Marcelli and Lowell, 2005; Levitt, 2008; Levitt and Lamba-Nieves, 2011). In line with the transnational perspective, several researchers have concluded early on that, in the North American context, migrants who are well integrated in the host country also cultivate relations with the home country (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002; Guarnizo et al., 2003; Portes et al., 2003; Tamaki, 2011).

In the European context, there is a new body of literature that looks into different dimensions of homeland engagement and paves the way for a rich discussion on the links between integration and homeland engagement. For example, in the political domain, while Koopmans and colleagues (2005) find political homeland engagement to be detrimental to integration, Mügge (2010) reaches the opposite conclusion and claims that these aspects are positively related. In their influential study on migrants in the Netherlands, Snel and colleagues (2006) have *not* found a negative correlation between social integration and feelings of belonging to the Dutch society and engagement in transnational activities. However, in the social domain, the work of Schans (2009) has shown a negative effect of duration of stay on frequency of contact with relatives in the country of origin. These studies all add to the growing debate surrounding transnationalism, but this field of research is still in its infancy. For a more in-depth discussion, sub-dimensions of a certain type of homeland engagement need to be comprehensively studied. Furthermore, incorporating new, emergent migrant groups with various migration histories to the literature allows us to speculate on the effects of group level and contextual factors in homeland engagement.

While recent research has attempted to fill these gaps (see Mazzucato, 2008; Van Bochove, 2010; Van Meeteren, 2012), the scope of these studies remains relatively small. More large-scale quantitative research on different migrant groups is needed in order to take the research a step further (Erdal and Oeppen, 2013). In this paper, I seek to address these limitations and bring together the integration and transnational migration literature, thus making a substantial contribution to the debate. Accordingly, in the following section, I develop a number of hypotheses regarding the four main components of sociocultural homeland engagement. Building upon the typology of home country related social and cultural activities developed by Al-Ali and co-authors (2001), in this paper I focus in particular on contact with their family and friends in the home country, return visits, association membership in the home country and home country related media and art consumption.

2.2 Links between sociocultural integration and homeland engagement

The underlying assumption of social integration is that the more migrants integrate to the host society, the less incentive they will have to remain in contact with their home country (Sana, 2005). As Tsuda (2012) explains, given their limited time and resources, migrants are forced to make a choice between the two contexts. Hence, simultaneously increased engagement in both contexts is not considered to be a plausible option. However, it can also be argued that the time and resources allocated to each of these social networks can be separate and independent. I argue that social contact with the host society is not necessarily linked to migrants' incentives to maintain contact with their family and friends in the home country, because these are distinct aspects of migrant lives. I first hypothesize that: (1) *Social contact with the Dutch society has no significant negative relationship with migrants' sociocultural homeland engagement.* In other words, I do not expect those who spend more time with the Dutch to be less likely to have contact with their family and friends in the home country, to make fewer return visits home, to continue to belong to associations or to consume home country media and art.

In addition, I take into account migrants' social contacts with co-ethnics in the host country as an integral part of social integration processes. Social integration is supposed to benefit migrants by providing them access to other resources and other (personal or organizational) networks that also enhance their resource base (Glick Schiller and Caglar, 2009). Most research on social integration focuses only on migrants' engagement with the host society, ignoring that being embedded in the social life in the host country can also be realized through contacts with co-ethnics (Putnam, 2007; Vervoort et al., 2011). This idea has paved the way for a new strand of research on the effects of migrant networks on migrants' lives in the host country. More specifically, most research on this topic has been investigating the differential role of these contacts (migrant networks) on integration related issues compared to contacts with the native population.² However, this also raises the question as to whether contact with the natives and co-ethnics in the host country relate differently to migrants' sociocultural homeland engagement.

One possible view is that contact with co-ethnics in the host country functions as a substitute for contacts with the home country. However, I claim that a higher level of contact with co-ethnics can actually increase migrants' incentive to maintain more contact with family and friends in the home country. Those who spend more time with other co-ethnics may

accumulate more interest in home country affairs. It can be argued that these relations feed into each other and function as a way of reinforcing the relationships in both contexts. Therefore, regarding the simultaneity between relationships with co-ethnics and sociocultural homeland engagement, I argue that: (2) *Those who have more frequent contact with their co-ethnics are more likely to engage in sociocultural activities oriented towards the home country.*

Another factor which needs to be considered in the specificity to this research is the language that migrants use at home, as this is also regarded as an important indicator of sociocultural integration in the host country. Language use at home is of particular interest because it can be seen as an indicator both of language proficiency and of preferences (Veltman, 1983). If an individual speaks only or some of the host country language at home, this is seen as an indicator of the person's orientation towards the host country, while exclusive native language use may be interpreted as the person's stronger affiliation with their home country and culture (Phinney et al., 2001). Accordingly, it can be argued that those who speak only their native language may be significantly more likely to be involved in their home country. Conversely, from a transnational perspective, one can argue that migrant preferences to use some or only Dutch at home is not necessarily a hindrance to engaging in sociocultural activities oriented towards the home country. Those who speak Dutch at home may still have strong connections with family and friends in the home country. When controlling for other factors, language use may not have a significant effect on migrants' homeland engagement. Consequently, with regards to the link between language use in the Netherlands and engagement in sociocultural activities in the home country, I hypothesize that: (3) *No significant difference exists between those who use only their native language and those who speak only or some Dutch at home with regards to their engagement in sociocultural activities oriented towards their home country.*

I test these hypotheses about leisure time spending and language use at home against all four types of homeland-oriented activities as I do not foresee any significant differences between them. If the results hold for all outcome variables, it will facilitate stronger conclusions about the links between sociocultural integration and engagement in homeland-oriented sociocultural activities. However, if there are differences, it will be necessary to discuss the underlying meaning of each sociocultural activity.

With regard to association membership in the home country, I take into account association membership in the Netherlands to test the level of involvement in civic life across both contexts. I also test whether consump-

tion of home country related media and art is similar to the consumption of Dutch media and art. I conceptualize these aspects of migrants' lives as part of their social and cultural capital. Just as human capital is transferable from one country context to another (albeit imperfectly in most cases) (see Chiswick and Miller 2007, 2009; Basilio and Bauer, 2010), migrants can also transfer their social and cultural capital to the host country. I therefore posit that: (4) *Those who are a member of an association in the Netherlands are more likely to be a member of an association in the home country.* (5) *Those who consume Dutch media and art are more likely to consume home country related media and art.*

The hypotheses of this paper are developed in line with the transnational perspective as it seeks to accommodate more satisfactorily the new realities of migrants' lives. My conception of transnationalism is based on the possibility of simultaneous embeddedness in multiple contexts given the cross-border relationships that migrants develop with their home country while residing in the host country (Glick Schiller et al., 1992a, 1992b; Basch et al., 1994; Tsuda, 2012).

3 Data and methods

The data used in this paper was collected for the Migration and Development: A World in Motion project in the Netherlands in 2010-2011.³ During the fieldwork, 247 Moroccan, 351 Ethiopian, 165 Burundian and 259 Afghan households were interviewed, totalling 1,022 households.⁴ The data was collected among first-generation migrant households, and includes extensive information on household members' background characteristics, migration history, integration processes and homeland engagement. In total, information was gathered from 891 Moroccans, 682 Ethiopians, 348 Burundians and 824 Afghans. For one third of the surveys, stratified random sampling with quota system was used, while for the rest snowball sampling with many entry points we used due to logistic and practical challenges.

To give an overall idea about the sample, it can be stated that the distribution of gender is balanced. Approximately 70 per cent of the sample is composed of adults (18 and over). Only a small percentage of the sample is above retirement age (5.3%). Some 35 per cent of the sample is married. Considerable differences exist between the groups with respect to educational background. A higher proportion of individuals have low levels of education in the Moroccan sample (15% with no formal education), and the highest share of individual with tertiary education and above is

from the Ethiopian sample (34% with tertiary education). Finally, the naturalization rate is relatively high among all migrant groups, the highest being among the Afghans with 87 per cent and the lowest among the Burundians with about 47 per cent.

In this paper, I make use of different subsamples depending on the outcome variable. For contact with family and friends in the home country and return visits I use a subsample composed of first-generation respondents who were born in one of the four origin countries, as these questions were asked only to the main respondent from each household. For association membership in the home country and home country related media and art consumption I use a bigger sample, and include all first-generation migrants born in one of the four origin countries.

3.1 Dependent variables

There are four main components of sociocultural homeland engagement. The first two consist of frequency of contact with family and friends in the home country and whether the respondent makes temporary return visits. The frequency of contact is measured on an 8 point scale going from “no contact at all” to “every day” contact. Those who are in contact are then asked if and how often they go back to their country of origin. This question is answered with a 6 point scale ranging from “no visits” to “a few times every year”. In the analysis, I treat these as dummy variables. This means that rather than looking at the frequency, I make a distinction between migrants who have no contact at all with their home country and those who have at least some level of engagement.

Another way to operationalize sociocultural homeland engagement is to ask respondents if they are a member (active or inactive) of an association based in their home country. Types of associations given in the survey included religious organizations, sport or recreational groups, art, music or educational organizations, labour unions, political parties or humanitarian and charitable organizations. I also treat this variable as dichotomous and construct it in such a way as to identify only if the person is part of an organization or not. I also look at media and music consumption through the use of newspapers, music and internet. The questions in this section asked how often a member of the household listens to home country music, visits websites about the home country, or reads home country newspapers. The following frequency scale was used for these questions: 1=every day, 2=several times a week, 3=once or twice a week, 4=a few times a month, 5=less often/never. To construct a variable that encompasses all

these aspects, I add the scores of an individual for each question and create a continuous variable.

3.2 Independent variables

Social contacts in the Netherlands: Regarding social contacts, respondents were asked separately how often they spend time with the native Dutch or their ethnic community members during leisure time. There were six answer categories ranging from every day to never (1=everyday, 2=several times a week, 3=a few times a month, 4= several times a year, 5=less often and 6=never).

Associational membership in the Netherlands: The respondent is asked whether they are active or inactive member of an organization in the Netherlands. For the purposes of my analysis, rather than counting the number of organizations, I only look at whether someone is a member (active or inactive) or not.

Language use at home: The respondent is asked in what language they speak at home. For this question, the respondent was allowed to state Dutch, native language (if different from Dutch), partly Dutch and partly native language or other. From this variable, I create a dichotomous variable with which I make a distinction between those who speak only the home country language versus who speak some Dutch or only Dutch at home.

Media and art consumption: The variable is constructed in the same way as home country media and art consumption. The frequencies of consuming Dutch music, internet and newspapers are added in order to come up with a continuous variable.

Other control variables: These include country of birth, citizenship status, employment status, highest level of education (ISCED), years in the Netherlands, having family in the Netherlands, gender, age and marital status.

3.3 Analysis

Before performing the analysis, I conducted collinearity checks to determine whether I needed to leave out any variables based on the rule of having a condition number smaller than 35. I also checked correlations between variables before making the final decisions about the models. There was no problematic correlation between the independent variables (rule of thumb: correlation $\sim <.6$). -I then performed the appropriate statistical analysis depending on the structure of the variables. For social contact, return visits and association membership in the home country, I ran binary logistic regression, and for home country related media and art consumption, I used multivariate regression.

4 Descriptive analysis

4.1 Sociocultural homeland engagement

According to the survey results, a large proportion of migrants are in contact with their family and friends in the home country, with 87 per cent of the respondents stating that they have contact with their family and friends in the home country. About half of the respondents stated that they have made at least one trip back home since their arrival. However, there are clear differences between the migrant groups with respect to their homeland engagement through social contacts. Almost all Moroccan and Ethiopian migrants have contact with their family and friends in the home country, while the proportion of Afghans and Burundians who have contact with the homeland is less. A similar pattern is observed in the visits made to the home country. In particular, a large share of Moroccans, 91 per cent, makes temporary short visits back to Morocco, while a much smaller proportion of the other groups visit their home country.

Table 1 Sociocultural homeland engagement by country of birth (%)

	Moroccans	Afghans	Ethiopians	Burundians
Contact with home country				
No	6.5%	30.3%	2.0%	19.8%
Yes	93.5%	69.7%	98.0%	80.2%
Return visits to home country				
No	8.8%	64.3%	44.0%	75.8%
Yes	91.2%	35.7%	56.0%	24.2%
Association membership in home country				
No	81.0%	92.5%	77.9%	77.4%
Yes	19.0%	7.5%	22.1%	22.6%
Home country media and art consumption				
Low	57.1%	33.0%	11.9%	30.9%
Medium	25.4%	37.0%	26.2%	27.0%
High	17.5%	30.0%	61.7%	42.1%
N	411	644	451	235

I also observe that a large share of the migrants is not part of an organisation based in the home country; only 16 per cent of first-generation migrants are a member.⁵ Among those who are members, the largest proportion is Burundians, followed by Ethiopians and Moroccans. However, home country media and art consumption gives a different picture. Although the proportion of Afghans and Burundians who do not have contact with family and friends is relatively large compared to Moroccans and Ethiopians, their involvement in home country related media and art is relatively higher. Inter-

estingly, Moroccans who are one of the most active groups with respect to sociocultural homeland engagement do not show high levels of home country media and art consumption. However, this result should not be taken on its own considering that Moroccans also show low levels of consumption regarding Dutch art and media, as will be discussed below.

4.2 Sociocultural integration in the Netherlands

Overall, I observe similarities in the sociocultural integration patterns of Afghans and Burundians on the one hand, and between Ethiopians and Moroccans on the other hand. Almost 60 per cent of all migrants speak only their home country language at home. Burundians stand out as the group of migrants who seem to speak at least some Dutch at home (63%), while more than half of the other groups speak only their native language. When considering the frequency of contact with co-ethnics, I observe that the Burundians are by far the group who has the least contact with their co-ethnics (54%). They are followed by Afghans of which 47 per cent have infrequent contact with their co-ethnics.

Table 2 Sociocultural integration in the Netherlands by country of birth (%)

	Moroccans	Afghans	Ethiopians	Burundians
Language use at home				
Only or some Dutch	36.0%	40.8%	41.3%	63.1%
Home country language	64.0%	59.2%	58.7%	36.9%
Leisure time spending with co-ethnics				
Infrequently	13.0%	47.1%	39.9%	53.7%
Intermediate	24.3%	32.8%	39.9%	34.1%
Frequently	62.7%	20.1%	20.2%	12.2%
Leisure time spending with Dutch				
Infrequently	45.8%	20.9%	29.4%	19.7%
Intermediate	16.7%	15.6%	25.3%	14.2%
Frequently	37.5%	63.5%	45.3%	66.1%
Association membership in the Netherlands				
No	41.3%	40.2%	23.4%	11.9%
Yes	58.7%	59.8%	76.6%	88.1%
Dutch media and art consumption				
Low	59.4%	33.4%	45.8%	23.5%
Medium	23.8%	35.6%	23.6%	29.5%
High	16.8%	31.0%	30.6%	47.0%
N	411	644	451	235

While more than half of the Afghan (64%) and Burundian (66%) migrant population spend time with the Dutch population regularly and frequently, more than half of the Ethiopian (55%) and Moroccan (63%) spend time with the Dutch population infrequently. Furthermore, the survey data show that more than 65 per cent of the total sample is a member of at least one organization. Ethiopians and Burundians in particular stand out as migrant groups that are highly involved in associations. Finally, the results about the level of consuming Dutch music and media are relatively similar to spending leisure time with the Dutch population. About 60 per cent of the total sample can be considered to be oriented towards the Dutch population, but within the groups, Afghans and Burundians seem to be the migrants who are oriented the most towards the Dutch social and cultural life.

Having mapped the sociocultural integration and homeland engagement patterns of migrant groups on a descriptive level, I observe that the migrant groups overall seem to have a relatively high engagement in both contexts, but there are many differences that exist between the groups.

5 Main results

In this section, I test the hypotheses developed in the theory section. Firstly, I find that there is not enough evidence to suggest that having more contact with the Dutch society through leisure activities is negatively linked to engagement in sociocultural activities oriented towards the home country. Independent of leisure time spent with Dutch people, migrants have contact with family and friends in the home country⁶ or make return visits. The results also indicate that those with more contact with the Dutch are not less likely to be a member of an association in the home country or consume less home country related media and art. This is the first result that illustrates that engagement in sociocultural activities in the home country is not a substitute to social integration in the Netherlands, and that these processes can coexist without negatively influencing each other.

I also find that having more contact with co-ethnics in the Netherlands is positively related to more social contacts with friends and family in the home country (OR=1.20, $p < .05$), and home country related media and art consumption ($\beta = .21$, $p < .01$). Nevertheless, I do not find a significant correlation between this independent variable and return visits and association membership in the home country. This means that mi-

grants are equally likely to be part of an association or make return visits to the home country independent of their level of their contact with co-ethnics in the Netherlands.

Next, I look at language use at home as an indicator of sociocultural integration in the Netherlands. For all dependent variables, I reject the hypothesis regarding language use at home. Contrary to what I expected, the results show that those who speak only the native language at home are significantly more engaged in their home country. Only the coefficient of language use at home for return visits is marginally significant while the coefficients for the other sociocultural homeland activities have a higher significance level.

Table 3 Results for sociocultural homeland engagement

	Contact with family and friends in the home country Binary logistic regression Odds ratios	Return visits to the home country Binary logistic regression Odds ratios	Association membership in the home country Binary logistic regression Odds ratios	Home country related media and art consumption Multivariate regression Coefficients
Country of origin				
Morocco	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Afghanistan	0.23*** (.09)	0.04*** (.02)	0.27*** (.07)	2.20*** (.25)
Ethiopia	5.99*** (4.07)	0.26*** (.98)	0.47*** (.13)	3.41*** (.28)
Burundi	0.37** (.17)	0.04*** (.02)	0.94 (.27)	3.02*** (.33)
Highest level of education				
Primary	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Secondary	0.56** (.18)	0.78 (.22)	1.22 (.30)	.83*** (.22)
Tertiary	1.26 (.48)	0.83 (.25)	2.27*** (.58)	1.10*** (.25)
Employment status				
Employed	Ref.		Ref.	Ref.
Student	0.72 (.27)	0.74 (.21)	2.03*** (.54)	.30 (.26)
Unemployed	0.53*** (.20)	0.63* (.19)	1.72** (.48)	.75*** (.28)
Inactive	0.26*** (.12)	0.55* (.20)	1.34 (.42)	-.03 (.29)
Income per capita				
Low	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Middle	1.69** (.49)	0.96 (.23)	1.34* (.30)	-.18 (.20)
High	1.78* (.62)	1.81** (.50)	1.78** (.45)	.17 (.24)

	Contact with family and friends in the home country Binary logistic regression Odds ratios	Return visits to the home country Binary logistic regression Odds ratios	Association membership in the home country Binary logistic regression Odds ratios	Home country related media and art consumption Multivariate regression Coefficients
Language use at home				
Only or some Dutch	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Only origin country language	1.86**(.51)	1.40*(.32)	1.97***(.40)	1.26***(.20)
Leisure time with Dutch	0.98(.08)	0.96(.06)	1.00(.06)	.68(.06)
Leisure time with co-ethnics	1.20**(.13)	0.92(.07)	1.12*(.09)	.21***(.08)
Association membership in the Netherlands			4.13***(.94)	
Dutch media and art consumption				.21***(.03)
Legal Status (Citizenship)				
Only Dutch or dual citizenship	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Only origin country citizenship	1.28(.51)	0.37***(.10)	0.84(.20)	.39*(.39)
Years in NL>5 years	1.55(.70)	1.55*(.53)	0.45***(.13)	-.40(.32)
Control variables				
Family in NL	1.24(.38)	2.18***(.55)	0.36***(.09)	-.84***(.25)
Female	1.00(.29)	0.95(.19)	0.63***(.11)	-.54***(.18)
Married	1.71*(.57)	1.60**(.34)	2.12***(.51)	.95***(.23)
Age	1.08*(.06)	1.03(.05)	1.04(.05)	.18***(.04)
Age squared	0.99(.00)	.99(.05)	.99(.00)	-.00***(.00)
Constant	0.45(.69)	4.87(6.20)	0.02***(.02)	-4.79***(1.07)
Observations	793	773	1,346	1,294
Pseudo R-squared	.23	.30	.20	Adjusted R-Squared .35

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Finally, it is significantly more likely that those who are a member of an organization in the Netherlands (OR=4.13, p-2 sided<.01) are also a member of an organization in the home country. The results regarding home country related media and art consumption based on multivariate regression are parallel to findings on association membership. In other words, if a

migrant consumes more Dutch media and art ($\beta=.21$, $p<.01$), they are also significantly more likely to consume more home country related media and art, and these behaviours are therefore not negatively related to each other.

The control variables included in the models also provide interesting insight into who engages in sociocultural activities oriented towards the home country. Within the scope of this paper, it is worthwhile mentioning one of the results that is extremely relevant for development and integration policy making; the analysis shows that those who have only origin country citizenship ($OR=.37$, $p<.01$) are significantly less likely to make trips back home. This means that those who have only Dutch citizenship or dual citizenship make more visits to the home country.

6 Migrant group differences in sociocultural homeland engagement

When considering the relationship between country of origin and sociocultural homeland engagement (see Table 3), I observe that variation exists with respect to different types of activities. Compared to Moroccans, Ethiopians have significantly more contact with their family and friends in the home country, while Afghans and Burundians have significantly less contact. However, Moroccans are significantly more likely than all other groups to make return visits home. Although Ethiopians have more contact with family and friends, they are not more likely to make visits back home. Moroccans are also more likely to be part of an association in the home country than Ethiopians and Afghans, but the difference between Moroccans and Burundians is not significant in this regard. While these results suggest that Moroccans are the most active group in sociocultural homeland engagement, this view is challenged by their home country related media and art consumption. The other three groups are significantly more likely to consume home country related media and art than Moroccans. What, then, can be said about group level differences?

With Burundians and Afghans having fewer social contacts with family and friends in their home countries overall, it can be argued that, due to the unstable political and security situation in Burundi and Afghanistan, social networks may have been largely disrupted (Cernea, 1990; Marx, 1990). Many family members and friends of Burundians and Afghans may also have fled their country of origin to live in other parts of the world. More importantly, Burundians and Afghans may even have experienced

losses in their network due to conflict in their home country. Conversely, it may be easier for Moroccans to maintain contact with their relatives in Morocco.

Moreover, the fact that Moroccans are the ones that make the most visits can initially be explained by the shorter distance between the Netherlands and Morocco and, consequently, cheaper travelling costs. Moreover, in Morocco, as an emigration country, return visits are an important phenomenon especially during the summer time. It is part of the migrant culture to spend time in the home country and bring back goods and gifts to family and friends in Morocco. In fact, it has become such a common phenomenon that the Moroccan government has engaged in special activities to facilitate these visits for Moroccans. For instance, "Opération transit", managed by the Fondation Mohammed V pour la Solidarité since 2000, is an initiative whose objective is to reduce the delays, harassment and abuse that migrants experience at the borders, and to accelerate various administrative procedures for returning migrant visitors (Bilgili and Weyel, 2009). This is a key example of how the Moroccan state has changed its relationship with Moroccans abroad and developed its diaspora engagement policies since the 1990s (de Haas, 2007).

Interestingly, after controlling for individual level characteristics, I found that Moroccans are significantly more likely to be a member of a homeland association compared to Afghans and Ethiopians. This difference can be explained by the fact that Moroccans continue to keep up relations with their local community organizations and mosques more easily due to frequent visits back to the home country. The smaller difference between Burundians and Moroccans can perhaps be explained by the increased involvement of the Burundian community in the politics of their home country, due to homeland engagement being a more selective behaviour among those who have a strong interest in the affairs of their home country (see 'Selective transnationalism' in Levitt et al., 2003).

A final point of interest relates to the consistency among migrants in terms of engaging in different types of sociocultural activities. The Ethiopian migrant group is clearly involved equally in all dimensions of homeland engagement, except for return visits which may be restricted by temporary migration plans, costly travel prices, and the fact that the majority of the migrants are students. However, less consistency is observed among the other groups. For example, while maintaining high levels of social contact with family and friends in Morocco, it seems that the Moroccan migrants do not follow news, visit websites or listen to music from their home country as much as the other migrant groups. Conversely, Burun-

dians and Afghans who do not have much contact with relatives in the home country seem to consume much more media and art oriented towards their home country. Why is there not a consistency between the different dimensions of sociocultural homeland engagement?

One possible answer to this question may be that media and art consumption is a substitute for social contacts with family and friends. On the one hand, Moroccans who are able to contact their family in Morocco more often and more easily learn about their country's affairs through these contacts rather than via more formal channels such as reading newspapers and surfing the Internet. On the other hand, Afghans and Burundians who face challenges in maintaining strong relations with their acquaintances but are still interested in their home country affairs consume more media. In this regard, it is important to recognize that while we assume to measure similar aspects of a certain dimension of a life, these intriguing results show us that different types of homeland oriented activities may have diverse meanings for migrants. Finally, given that the Moroccan community in the Netherlands is larger and more well-established, they may be more interested in what is produced and happening among Moroccans in the Netherlands rather than in Morocco itself. In this regard, the overall size, concentration, social cohesion and embeddedness of a migrant community may influence the overall engagement of a migrant group in their home country's media and art. It would be interesting in future studies to further examine the role of such contextual and group level factors in order to fully understand how integration and homeland engagement are interlinked.

7 Conclusion

From its beginnings, the transnational perspective has been critical towards exclusive integration to the host country and hence of classical assimilation theory (Faist, 2000). Unlike the integration theories that are bounded by the nation-state, transnational migration theory regards the lives of traditional migrants as "a continuous flow of people, goods, money, ideas that transgress national boundaries and in so doing connects physical, social, economic and political spaces" (Mazzucato, 2005). It is this notion of connectivity that distinguishes transnational migration theory from previous integration theories. Taking this idea as my starting point, in this paper I have shown that multiple patterns and different levels of sociocultural integration and homeland engagement exist within migrant

groups. I have then investigated the links between sociocultural integration and homeland engagement, and demonstrated that there is not enough evidence to suggest a negative association between the two. Consequently, it is fitting to suggest that migrants can be simultaneously embedded in multiple contexts, and treating homeland engagement and integration as separate issues leads to an incomplete view of migration and ultimately to ineffectual policies (Mazzucato, 2008).

Furthermore, in the introduction, I emphasized the particular importance of sociocultural homeland engagement as it provides the channels through which social remittances are transferred. If migrants who are socioculturally integrated are equally likely to maintain contacts with their home country as those who are primarily concerned with their co-ethnic community in the Netherlands, this may give us some indication of the quality differences in transfer of social remittances. The more time migrants spend with the host society, the more new and different sociocultural capital they accumulate.

Levitt (1998) argues that migrants who interact more with the host society learn more about different features of the new culture and reflect more intensively on existing practices. In this regard, it is important to acknowledge that more socioculturally integrated migrants may have other types of knowledge and information to share with their family and friends in the home country. This certainly does not mean that co-ethnically oriented migrants do not have anything to offer back. On the contrary, even if they do not “actively explore their new world”, they can still take in new ideas and practices by “observing the world around them, listening to the how other describe it, or learn about it by reading the newspaper or watching television” (Levitt, 1998: 931). Yet, being bounded to their ethnic community; they may be weaker and draw on fewer sources.

Those who have obtained a higher level of sociocultural integration can be considered as “purposeful innovators” who actively absorb new ideas and practices to expand and extend their cultural repertoire. Given the difference in their approach, this group may be likely to have more versatile, productive and innovative practices and knowledge to transfer. Considering that my research did not show that this group is less interested in their home country, it would be important to develop ways to engage them more actively in development-oriented initiatives.

With regard to civic engagement and media and art consumption, I confirmed the hypotheses of significant positive association. In line with the conclusion Itzighson and Saucedo (2002) arrive to, based on the ex-

periences of Latin American migrants in the US, I conclude that engagement in these aspects of life in both the home and host countries are positively related to each other. This means that those who are more involved in the sociocultural life of their home country are also likely to be more involved in these dimensions of life in the Netherlands. The most important conclusion to be drawn from this result is that if migrants seem to be less involved in civic life or to participate less in cultural activities in the host country, this cannot directly be interpreted as “little interest of integration” as discussed in the public discourse according to which migrants are to be blamed for their lack of engagement in social affairs in the host country.

It is important to emphasize that migrants' may be transferring their cultural capital from one context to the other, and therefore a positive association is found between the two types of behaviour. This strongly supports the idea of multiple embeddedness, and highlights the complementarity between social contact with co-ethnics and sociocultural homeland engagement. A plausible way to enhance the positive association between integration and development may be to further encourage the active involvement of migrants in both their home and host countries, without compelling them to make a choice about permanent residence.

Finally, while host country citizenship seems to be of little importance for engagement in some types of sociocultural activities that do not demand physical presence in the home country, it is important because of the capability it gives to migrants for return visits. While Tamaki (2011) and Waldinger (2008) have found American citizenship of high relevance for return visits in the North American context, in this paper, I have shown that having dual citizenship is significantly positively linked to return visits compared to having only home country citizenship. In other words, dual citizenship is strongly linked to more mobility, allowing migrants to be simultaneously embedded in multiple contexts. Having only origin country citizenship can be considered as a precarious legal status in the Netherlands, and this makes it more difficult for migrants to make visits. Citizenship status can thus be an important facilitator of home country engagement: not only does it imply a connectedness to and identification with the society, but is also an instrument that facilitates international travel. This interpretation opens an important discussion about how legal integration can in fact be an influential pre-condition for certain types of sociocultural homeland engagement, and how integration related indicators may in fact be positively linked to home country engagement.

Notes

1. These data gathered from the Central Bureau of Statistics (2011) include first- and second-generation migrants.
2. These studies include issues such as accommodation, knowledge exchange about life in the host country and job search mechanism etc. (see Aguilera, 2002; Ryan et al., 2008; Aguilera and Massey, 2003; Jacobs and Tillie, 2004).
3. For the survey: http://mgsog.merit.unu.edu/ISacademie/docs/RMFM_nl_household_survey.pdf
4. These 1,022 surveyed households were distributed across 11 provinces of the Netherlands. In line with the concentration of migrant populations in bigger cities and urban areas, 51.7 per cent of the surveys were conducted in Noord-Holland (11.3%) and Zuid-Holland (40.4%) where the largest cities of the Netherlands – Amsterdam, Rotterdam and The Hague – are located.
5. Van Bochove (2012) also indicates in her research that being part of a home country association is exceptional among middle class migrants in Rotterdam.
6. As discussed earlier, these contacts can be maintained through various channels such as telephone calls, e-mails, letters, and chats but also visits both to and from the home country.

References

- Aguilera, M.B. (2002). The impact of social capital on labor force participation: Evidence from the 2000 Social Capital Benchmark Survey. *Social Science Quarterly*, 83(3), 853-874.
- Aguilera, M.B. & Massey, D. S. (2003). Social capital and the wages of Mexican migrants: New hypotheses and tests. *Social Forces*, 82(2), 671-701.
- Al-Ali, N., Black, R. & Koser, K. (2001). Refugees and transnationalism: the experience of Bosnians and Eritreans in Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration studies*, 27(4), 615-634.
- Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N. & Blanc-Szanton, C. (1994). *Nations unbound: Transnational projects: Post-colonial predicaments and deterritorialized nation-states*, Langhorne: Gordon and Breach.
- Basilio, L. & Bauer, T.K. (2010). Transferability of Human Capital and Immigrant Assimilation-An Analysis for Germany. *Ruhr Economic Paper*, (164).
- Bilgili, Ö. & Weyel, S. (2009). Migration in Morocco: History, current trends and future prospects. Paper Series: Migration and Development Country Profiles.
- Bilgili, Ö. & Siegel M. (2012). The Netherlands Country Report. IS Academy Project Output. Maastricht Graduate School of Governance.
- Cernea, M. (1990). Internal refugee flows and development-induced population displacement. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 3 (4), 320-339.
- Chiswick, B. & Miller, P.W. (2007). "The International Transferability of Immigrants' Human Capital Skills" *IZA Discussion Paper* 2670.
- Chiswick, B.R. & Miller, P.W. (2009). The international transferability of immigrants' human capital. *Economics of Education Review*, 28(2), 162-169.
- De Haas, H. (2007). Morocco's Migration Experience: A Transitional Perspective. *International Migration*, 45(4), 39-70.

- Erdal M.B. & Oeppen, C. (2013). Migrant balancing acts: understanding the interactions between integration and transnationalism. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39(6), 867-884.
- Faist, T. (2013). Transnationalism and cross-border migration. The Encyclopedia of Global Human Migration.
- Glick Schiller, N., Basch, L. & Blanc-Szanton, C. (1992a). 'Transnationalism: A new analytic framework for understanding migration', *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 645 1-24.
- Glick Schiller, N., Basch, L. & Szanton-Blanc, C. (1992b). Towards a transnational perspective on migration: race, class, ethnicity, and nationalism reconsidered, New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Glick Schiller, N. & Caglar, A., (2009). Toward a comparative theory of locality in migration studies: migrant incorporation and city scale. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35 (2), 107-202.
- Itzigsohn, J. & Saucedo, S. (2002). Immigrant incorporation and sociocultural transnationalism. *International Migration Review*, 36(3), 767-98.
- Jacobs, D. & Tillie, J. (2004). Introduction: social capital and political integration of migrants. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 30(3), 419-427.
- Khagram, S. & Levitt, P. (eds) (2008). The Transnational Studies Reader: Intersections and Innovations. London: Routledge.
- Koopmans, R. & Statham, P. (2003). 'How national Citizenship Shapes Transnationalism: Migrant and Minority Claims-making in Germany, Great Britain and the Netherlands', in Joppke, C. & Morawaska, E. (eds). Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Levitt, P. (1998). Social remittances: Migration driven local-level forms of cultural diffusion, *International Migration Review*, 32 (4), 926-48.
- Levitt, P. (2008). Taking Culture Seriously: Unexplored Aspects of the Migration-Development Nexus, SSRC Migration and Development Conference Paper No. 13.
- Levitt, P. & Glick Schiller, N. (2004). Conceptualizing simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society. *International Migration Review*, 38(145): 595-629, Fall 2004.
- Levitt, P. & Lamba-Nieves D. (2011). Social remittances revisited. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(1), 1-22.
- Levitt, P., DeWind, J. & Vertovec, S. (2003). 'International perspectives on transnational migration: an introduction', *International Migration Review*, 37(3), 565-575.
- Marcelli, E.A. & Lowell B.L. (2005). Transnational Twist: Pecuniary Remittances and the Socio-economic Integration of Authorized and Unauthorized Mexican Immigrants in Los Angeles County. *International Migration Review*, 39, 69-102.
- Marx, E. (1990). The social world of refugees: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 3(3) 189-203.
- Mazzucato, V. (2008). The double engagement: transnationalism and integration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(2): 199-216.
- Morawska, E. (2003). Immigrant transnationalism and assimilation: a variety of combinations and the analytic strategy it suggests. See Joppke, C. & Morawska, E. 2003, pp. 133-76.
- Mügge, L. (2010). Beyond Dutch borders: transnational politics among colonial migrants, guest workers and the second generation. Amsterdam University Press.
- Phinney J.S., Romero I., Nava M. & Huang D. (2001). The role of language, parents, and peers in ethnic identity among adolescents in immigrant families. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 30(2), 135-153.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. & Landolt, P. (1999). The study of transnationalism: pitfalls and promises of an emergent research field, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2): 217-37.
- Portes A., Guarnizo L. & Haller W. (2003). Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of

- Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108 (5): 1211-1248.
- Putnam, R.D. (2007). E Pluribus Unum: diversity and community in the twenty-first century the 2006 Johan Skytte prize lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30, 137-174.
- Ryan, L., Sales, R., Tilki, M. & Siara, B. (2008). Social networks, social support and social capital: the experiences of recent Polish migrants in London. *Sociology*, 42(4), 672-690.
- Sana, M. (2005). Buying membership in the transnational community: Migrant remittances, social status, and assimilation. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 24, 231-261.
- Schans, D. (2009). Transnational family ties of immigrants in the Netherlands. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(7), 1164-1182
- Snel, E., Engbersen, G. & Leerkes, A. (2006). Transnational involvement and social integration. *Global Networks*, 6 (3), 285-308.
- Tamaki, E. (2011). Transnational Home Engagement among Latino and Asian Americans: Resources and Motivation. *International Migration Review*, 45, 148-173.
- Tsuda, T. (2012). Whatever Happened to Simultaneity? Transnational Migration Theory and Dual Engagement in Sending and Receiving Countries. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38 (4), 631-649.
- Van Bochove, M., Rusinovic, K. & Engbersen, G. (2010). The multiplicity of citizenship: transnational and local practices and identifications of middle-class migrants. *Global Networks*, 10(3), 344-364.
- Van Bochove, M. E. (2012). *Geographies of belonging: the transnational and local involvement of economically successful migrants*. Faculteit der Sociale Wetenschappen (FSW); Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS).
- Van Meeteren, M. (2012). Transnational activities and aspirations of irregular migrants in Belgium and the Netherlands. *Global Networks*, 12(3), 314-332.
- Veltman C. (1983). *Language Shift in the United States*. New York: Mouton.
- Vervoort M., Flap H. & Dagevos J. (2011). The ethnic composition of the neighbourhood and ethnic minorities' social contacts: three unresolved issues. *European Sociological Review*, 27 (5), 586-605.

About the author

Özge Bilgili is currently an evaluation researcher at Maastricht Graduate School of Governance and Barcelona Center for International Affairs working for the “Integration policies: Who benefits?” project where she assesses the impact evaluations of integration policies on migrants’ integration outcomes in seven policy areas in 18 countries. She is also a PhD research fellow at the Maastricht Graduate School of Governance, Maastricht University where she works for the Migration and Development: A World in Motion Project financed by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (IS Academy) focusing on the situation of immigrants in the Netherlands. Her research interests include immigrant integration, integration policies, transnationalism, social and economic remittances, Diaspora engagement, impact evaluations, quantitative and qualitative research methods.

E-mail: ozge.bilgili@maastrichtuniversity.nl