

University of Groningen

Repatriation and the best interests of the child

Zevulun, Daniëlle

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Zevulun, D. (2017). *Repatriation and the best interests of the child: The rearing environment and wellbeing of migrant children after return to Kosovo and Albania*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Chapter 4

Migrant and Asylum-Seeker Children Returned to Kosovo
and Albania: Predictive Factors for Social-Emotional
Wellbeing after Return.

This chapter is based on:

Zevulun, D., Post, W. J., Zijlstra, A. E., Kalverboer, M. E., & Knorth,
E. J. (2017). Migrant and Asylum-Seeker Children Returned to
Kosovo and Albania: Predictive Factors for Social-Emotional
Wellbeing after Return. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*.

doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2017.1391076

Abstract

The return of rejected asylum seekers has a high priority on the national agendas of European States. In order to make well-informed asylum decisions involving children, knowledge of how asylum-seeker children fare after their return to their countries of origin is needed. This study aims to gain knowledge about the child-rearing environment and the social-emotional wellbeing of migrant children who have returned to Kosovo and Albania after a stay in a European host country. Based on a sample of 106 returned families, the study investigated the predictive factors for children's social-emotional wellbeing after return using regression analyses. The findings show that procedural characteristics and ethnicity predict wellbeing, mediated through the quality of the child-rearing environment. The most vulnerable children did not have a stable resident status in the host country, belonged to a minority ethnic group and were older adolescents. The findings indicate that the wellbeing of returned children is not only dependent on conditions after repatriation, but also on the conditions which the families left in the host country. To enable sustainable return in a child's best interests, the needs of vulnerable families and children should be thoroughly assessed prior to their return, and reintegration support should be tailored to their situation.

Introduction

Half of the world's asylum seekers are children (UNHCR, 2016). The return of asylum-seekers who have been denied residency has become a high priority on the national agendas of host states; once the situation in the country of origin is considered to be safe, asylum seekers are encouraged to return 'home'.

The situation of families and children who have returned to post-conflict societies is not formally monitored (ECRE & Save the Children, 2011), resulting in a lack of knowledge about the living circumstances of returned children and the impact of repatriation on their lives. Therefore, insight into how asylum-seeker children fare after return to their countries of origin and into the factors associated with this is lacking. Such knowledge could contribute to making well-informed decisions in asylum claims in which children are involved, and – if the claim to asylum has been denied – provide suggestions about the best strategies to support children before and after return.

Studies of the circumstances of adult returnees in post-conflict societies report obstacles and disappointment, such as changes in the homeland or negative attitudes from the local population, lack of social services and health care, no social network, unemployment, poor living conditions, an insecure and politically unstable situation, vulnerability as a returnee, and continuing persecution or discrimination (Carr, 2014; Ghanem, 2003; Huttunen, 2010; Lie, 2004; Riiskjaer & Nielsson 2008; Toscani et al., 2007; Webber, 2011). The few studies focusing solely on returned youngsters (Bowerman, 2017; Cornish, Peltzer, & MacLachlan, 1999; Gladwell & Elwyn, 2012; Hasanović, Sinanović, & Pavlović, 2005; Knaus et al., 2012) or in which children are included with adults (Lie, 2004; Riiskjaer & Nielsson, 2008), report additional problems for returnee children. These include difficulties adjusting to living in poverty, problems regarding access to education, language difficulties, the feeling of being a stranger in an unknown country, being bullied by peers, and severe social-emotional and psychological problems.

Asylum-seeker children may also be vulnerable to developing social-emotional problems before repatriation to the country of origin. The situation in the country of origin before they fled and the journey itself are often accompanied by adversities hindering the healthy development of a child, such as war, violence, loss of family and loved ones, or deprived socioeconomic circumstances. During their stay in the host country, children and their parents can also be exposed to other negative influences on their social-emotional wellbeing, which are often

related to the characteristics of asylum procedures and acculturation difficulties (Bronstein & Montgomery, 2011; Fazel et al., 2012; Hodes, 2000; Van Os et al., 2016). The situation in which the family and the children find themselves in the host country has also been found to be likely to affect the reintegration process and living situation after return to the country of origin (Ruben, Van Houte, & Davids, 2009; Van Houte & De Koning, 2008).

Procedural Characteristics and Living Situation in the Host Country

Negative influences during the stay in the host country are related to acculturation difficulties and the rights and obligations ensuing from the asylum procedure, such as restrictions on housing, social contact, welfare benefits and employment opportunities, frequent relocation, uncertainty and setbacks during the asylum procedure, and language difficulties (Hodes, 2000; Nielsen et al., 2008; Ryan, Benson, & Dooley, 2008; Silove, Steel, & Watters, 2000). Asylum seekers who are involved in a protracted asylum procedure and spend a long time in an asylum-seeker centre have greater risks of developing mental health problems (Hallas, Hansen, Stær, Munk-Andersen, & Jorgensen, 2007; Laban, Gernaat, Komproe, Schreuder, & De Jong, 2004). Parents' stress levels may increase the longer they are subjected to a constant sense of insecurity concerning their right to stay, which in turn may impact on their capacity to raise their children well (Nielsen et al., 2008; Van Essen & Bala, 2007). Families who have an irregular status and are obliged to leave the host country, often have few social ties and live in poverty. Contacts with childcare institutions or other officials are usually avoided in order not to be detected (Bloch, Sigona, & Zetter, 2014; Yoshikawa, 2011).

A stable residence permit, in contrast, gives a family the chance to settle in the host country, opportunities for employment and more successful integration (Bakker, Dagevos, & Engbersen, 2014). In turn, this influences the level of independence and self-esteem of the family (Bloch, Sigona, & Zetter, 2014). Studies of adult returnees have found that being able to support oneself during the stay in the host country and not having to rely on social benefits provides greater resilience after return (Carr, 2014; Van Houte & De Koning, 2008).

The outcome of the asylum procedure also influences the degree of voluntariness of the return. Forced return is expected to be the most disadvantageous kind of departure as asylum seekers are unable to mobilize resources beforehand (Cassarino, 2004). In addition, the often precarious economic and political situation 'back home' limits their possibilities (Lietaert,

Derluyn, & Broekaert, 2014). Additionally, for children particularly, the forced return can be a traumatic experience (Knaus et al., 2012).

Child and Contextual Characteristics

Apart from procedural factors, characteristics related to the child and the context in which the child lives may be associated with a child's social-emotional wellbeing. Studies on the association between gender and mental health in asylum-seeking children show wide variation. A systematic review of the risk and protective factors associated with mental health in displaced children in low and middle-income countries found female sex to be a risk factor for internalizing or emotional problems (Reed et al., 2011). However, a similar review focusing on displaced children in high-income countries found that in only approximately half of the studies did girls suffer more often from mental health disorders than boys (Fazel et al., 2012). Research on the situation of returnees suggests that adolescents face greater reintegration difficulties than younger children (King, 1977; Vathi & Duci, 2016). In addition, belonging to an ethnic group that is considered to be at risk of persecution or serious harm in the country of origin negatively affects wellbeing after return (Knaus et al., 2012). Studies of adult returnees found that they feel safer when they are part of the majority ethnic group, or when experiencing anonymity in a big city. When they are 'seen to be different', returnees can be subjected to stigmatization, discrimination and persecution (Carr, 2014, p. 9; Van Houte & De Koning, 2008). Thus, the area in which they live after return may also have an impact on a child's wellbeing. Returning to a remote rural area with few leisure opportunities, or areas where children are exposed to harsh responses from local citizens and strict social rules, may be detrimental to the returned child's psychosocial wellbeing (Vathi & Duci, 2016). In particular, children who were born or spent a long period of time in the host country are likely to experience acculturation problems as they return to an 'unknown country' (Kalverboer, Zijlstra, & Knorth, 2009). In addition, the length of time that has passed since the family returned may have an influence on the living situation and wellbeing.

Characteristics Related to the Child-rearing Environment

In addition to the procedural, child and contextual characteristics, Wieggersma, Stellinga-Boelen and Reijneveld (2011) found that factors related to *family conditions* are important predictors of the psychosocial wellbeing of asylum-

seeking children. These include factors such as family size, broken families due to the decision to flee, mental health of the parents and education of the child.

Such factors determining the family context were also part of the assessment of the *quality of the child-rearing environment* in studies by Zijlstra et al. (2012, 2013). The scale with which the quality of the child-rearing environment was assessed (the 'Best Interests of the Child-Questionnaire': BIC-Q; Zijlstra et al., 2012, 2013) is based on ecological theories that view child development as constructed through children's interaction with their environment. Conditions at the micro-level environment of a child's upbringing (*i.e.*, relationships and circumstances in the family context) as well as conditions at the macro-level (*i.e.*, relationships and circumstances in the societal context) are assessed through the BIC-Q (Zijlstra, 2012).

In the study of the situation of asylum-seeking children in the Netherlands, a negative relationship was found between the quality of the child-rearing environment and children's emotional problems: the lower the quality of the rearing environment, the more the child suffered internalizing behavioural symptoms during their stay in the host country (Zijlstra et al., 2013).

Aim and Expectations

In the current study, we aim to gain insight into the child-rearing environment and social-emotional wellbeing of migrant and asylum-seeker children once they have been returned to their countries of origin after a stay in a European host country. Our main research questions concern the quality of the child-rearing environment that migrant and asylum-seeker children return to, and how they fare after their return to the country of origin. In addition, we wish to determine which factors predict the quality of the child-rearing environment and the social-emotional wellbeing of migrant and asylum-seeker children after return.

Figure 1 presents our conceptual model of the factors predicting the quality of the child-rearing environment and the social-emotional wellbeing of returned migrant and asylum-seeker children. In line with the literature described above, we expect that procedural characteristics affect the quality of the child-rearing environment as well as the child's social-emotional wellbeing. As found in the study by Zijlstra et al. (2013), we expect the quality of the child-rearing environment to be a predictor of the social-emotional wellbeing of returned children and, thus, to *mediate* the relationship between the procedural characteristics and the child's wellbeing. Previous research has shown that certain child and

contextual characteristics are potential predictors of migrant and asylum-seeker children's wellbeing. These include age, ethnicity, gender and the area in which they live after the return. It might also be possible that relationships between the procedural characteristics and the dependent variables differ for various subgroups. We therefore included the child and contextual characteristics as *moderators* of the relationships between the procedural characteristics and the quality of the child-rearing environment, as well as of the relationship between the procedural characteristics and social-emotional wellbeing.




Figure 1. Conditional process model for predicting a child's quality of the childrearing environment and social-emotional wellbeing after return to the country of origin

Method

This study has a cross-sectional design and was conducted in Kosovo and Albania. The data was collected between November 2012 and December 2014.

Population

The target population consists of migrant and asylum-seeker children who returned to Kosovo and Albania with their parents after a stay in a European host country. We chose these two countries because the Western Balkans was one of the highest source regions of asylum seekers in the European Union at the time the study was conducted. Asylum seekers from the Western Balkans mostly belong to the ethnic Albanian and the Roma populations, and face the lowest recognition rates of all asylum applicants in the European Union (EASO, 2013).¹²

Most of the data were collected within a European project to develop a monitoring toolkit for returned migrant children – the Monitoring Returned Minors (MRM) project.¹³ The aim of the MRM project was to develop a monitoring toolkit for returnee children, with which the needs and challenges of children after repatriation could be identified. This monitoring toolkit was developed in Kosovo and Albania. The ultimate aim of the MRM project was for knowledge obtained from the use of the monitor in various countries of origin to contribute to well-informed return decisions and support in cases of migrant children who have not been granted the right to stay in a European Union host country and have subsequently been repatriated to their countries of origin. After this project ended, seven additional cases in Kosovo were found. The same interviewers were involved and the methodology of the MRM project was used.

Sample

In total, 106 families participated in this research. The majority of the participants live in Kosovo (n = 85) and a smaller group in Albania (n = 21). We included families

¹² During 2013 and 2014, 9,725 people returned to Kosovo (either voluntarily or by force). In 2014, 429 returnees were school-aged children (6-17 years old), accounting for almost 10% of the Kosovar returnees in that year (The Government of the Republic of Kosovo 2015, 83-85). With respect to Albania, 133,544 adult returnees were registered between 2009 and 2013 (INSTAT and IOM 2014, 29).

¹³ The Monitoring Returned Minors (MRM) project was financed by the European Return Fund and ran from November 2012 until February 2014. The project partners consisted of Dutch, German and Kosovar organisations that work with migrants in EU host countries, and in the field of return and reintegration in the country of origin.

with children who stayed in European Union host countries as migrants or asylum seekers, returned between 2008 and 2013, and had children between the ages of 11 and 18 years old at the time of the research. In Kosovo, children belonging to the Roma minority ethnic group and children belonging to the Kosovar-Albanian majority ethnic group were both included. In Albania, only children with an Albanian ethnicity were included. Children were included according to an equal distribution of age groups (11-14 years old and 15-18 years old), gender, and rural or urban area.

Only one child per family was included. Therefore, siblings were randomly excluded. The children had lived in 12 different countries in the European Union – mostly in Sweden, Belgium, Germany, Italy and France – and the period in which they, or their parents, left the country of origin ranged from 1982 until 2013.

Variables and Measurements

Child and Contextual Characteristics

Three child-specific characteristics were included in this study: *the age of the child* (continuous), *gender* (female = 1, male = 0) and belonging to *a majority or minority ethnicity* (Roma = 1 or Albanian = 0).

Four contextual characteristics were included: *the living area after return* (rural = 1 or urban = 0), *country of return* (Albania = 1 or Kosovo = 0), *the child's length of stay in the host country* (continuous) and *the duration since return* (continuous).

Procedural Characteristics

Five procedural characteristics were included in this study:

The outcome of the migration procedure in the host country: The participants in our sample lived in different host countries, with each country offering different review systems and entitlements for asylum seekers and migrants. Therefore we did not include the type of migration procedure in our study, but focused on the degree of stability of the residence permit: whether the family obtained a stable residence permit (1) or not (0). Families who did not have a stable residence permit were either denied residency, obtained residency for a restricted period only, or were still involved in an asylum procedure.

The type of return: whether the family returned voluntarily (1) or by force to the country of origin (0).

Employment and income in the host country: whether parents or family members were employed in the host country and earned the whole or part of their income in the host country through employment (1) or relied on social benefits only (0).

Residence situation in the host country: whether the family lived in a private dwelling at some point during their stay in the host country (1) or only lived in reception facilities for asylum seekers (0).

Assistance before or after the return: whether the family received any type of assistance before or after return to the country of origin (1) or no assistance (0).

Table 1. Sample characteristics of the total research group (N=106)

Child and contextual characteristics	N (%)	Min.	Max.	Mean (SD)
Gender				
Boy	59 (56%)			
Girl	47 (44%)			
Ethnicity				
Roma (in Kosovo only)	30 (28%)			
Albanian (in Albania and in Kosovo)	76 (72%)			
Living area after return				
Rural living area	36 (34%)			
Urban living area	70 (66%)			
Country of return				
Kosovo	85 (80%)			
Albania	21 (20%)			
Age		11.3	18.7	14.4 (1.9)
Child's length of stay in the host country (years)		0.2	18.3	5.9 (4.9) ^a
Length of return in the country of origin (years)		0.1	6.5	2.1 (1.3)
Procedural characteristics				
Outcome migration procedure				
Stable residence permit	21 (20%)			
No stable residence permit	85 (80%)			
Type of return				
Voluntary return	42 (40%)			
Forced return	64 (60%)			
Family income in the host country				
Family income	36 (34%)			
Social benefits only	70 (66%)			
Residence situation in the host country				
Private house at some point during the stay	83 (78%)			
Reception facilities for asylum-seekers only	22 (21%)			
Unknown	1 (1%)			
Assistance before or after return				
Yes	72 (68%)			
No	30 (28%)			
Unknown	4 (4%)			

^a The child's length of stay in the host country is skewed: 25% of the sample stayed between 2 months and 2 years in the host country, 25% between 2 and 3.4 years, 25% between 3.4 and 10.8 years, and 25% between 11 up to 18.3 years abroad.

Quality of the Child-Rearing Environment

Kosovar professionals assessed the quality of the child-rearing environment that the asylum-seeker children returned to in Kosovo and Albania using the 'Best Interests of the Child-Questionnaire' (BIC-Q; Zijlstra et al. 2012, 2013).

A previous study into the content validity of the child-rearing conditions in the cultural context of the Western-Balkans indicated that the conditions in the BIC-Q are recognized as important in the local practices and values of child-rearing in Kosovo and Albania (Zevulun et al., 2015 – see chapter 2). A study into the construct validity of the BIC-Q in the Kosovar and Albanian cultural context shows a strong scale ($H = .73$; $Rho = .97$) (Zevulun et al., submitted – see chapter 3). The separate samples in these two validation studies are also part of the current study.

The BIC-Q consists of seven conditions in the context of the child's family upbringing, and seven conditions in the societal context. Professionals complete the BIC-Q after observations of the circumstances in which the child is being brought up and through an interview with the parents and the children. It assesses the quality of the child-rearing environment in relation to the following 14 child-rearing conditions: 1) adequate physical care; 2) safe direct physical environment; 3) affective atmosphere; 4) supportive, flexible child-rearing structure; 5) adequate examples by parents; 6) interest; 7) continuity in upbringing conditions, future perspective; 8) safe wider physical environment; 9) respect; 10) social network; 11) education; 12) contact with peers; 13) adequate examples in society; 14) stability in life circumstances, future perspective.

The criteria for qualifying the child-rearing items consist of four levels: 'unsatisfactory' (0), 'moderate' (1), 'satisfactory' (2) or 'good' (3). The total quality of the rearing environment can be summed up and covers a range from 0 to 42: the higher the total score on the BIC-Q, the higher the quality of the child-rearing environment. Thus, a total score of 0 means that all 14 conditions were qualified as 'unsatisfactory', and a score of 42 means that all conditions were qualified as 'good'.

Social-Emotional Wellbeing

The social-emotional wellbeing of the children after return was measured using the self-report version of the 'Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire' (SDQ; Goodman, 1997).

The SDQ is a screening instrument that provides indications of social and emotional strengths and difficulties of children. The questionnaire consists of

25 items with five subscales measuring emotional problems, conduct problems, hyperactivity and attention difficulties, problems getting along with peers, and kind and helpful behaviour. The self-report version is applicable for children between 11 and 17 years old. The questionnaire gives a total score of social-emotional problems and provides cut-off points based on a UK community sample for close to average, slightly raised, high or very high scores. The SDQ has good psychometric properties and has been used in other studies of culturally diverse populations in both Western and non-Western countries (Goodman, Renfrew, & Mullick, 2000; Mullick & Goodman, 2001). The instrument has been used before with migrant children in EU host countries (Bean, 2006; Derluyn, Broekaert, & Schuyten, 2008; Wieggersma, Stellinga-Boelen, & Reijneveld, 2011), including Albanian migrant children (Motti-Stefanidi et al., 2008; Motti-Stefanidi, Pavlopoulos, Obradović, & Masten, 2008; Motti-Stefanidi, Pavlopoulos & Tantaros, 2011).

As the children in our study lived in different host countries and spoke various languages, the child could choose to complete the SDQ in the language that was most familiar to them. The questionnaire is available and validated in various languages. There is, however, no *self-report* version of the SDQ in Albanian as yet. For the purpose of this study, we translated the questionnaire into Albanian in the case a child preferred to complete the questionnaire in this language. Following the procedure described by Beaton, Bombardier, Guillemin and Ferraz (2000), the questionnaire was forward and back translated (from English into Albanian, and back into English) by independent translators. Subsequently, two Kosovar professionals participating in this study, with a background in psychiatry and medical sciences (see below), checked the Albanian translation. The psychometric properties of the *self-report* version in the Albanian language were not investigated.

Procedure

Four Kosovar interviewers were trained by two of the authors in the assessment procedure using the BIC-Q during a two-day training programme in January 2013. The interviewers worked for non-governmental organizations in the field of mental health care and reintegration of returnees, with one interview pair having a background in psychiatry and medical sciences, and the other pair in education, management and economics.

At the time of the study, returnees to Kosovo and Albania were not automatically registered. The Kosovar interviewers therefore contacted

municipalities and regional officers in all seven regional districts of Kosovo and in one district in northern Albania to obtain contact information for returnees known to the municipality. The quality and details of the information varied for each municipality, and in some districts it was more challenging to find participants through this procedure. Therefore, in Albania and in one district in Kosovo, children were also recruited through schools. In another district in Kosovo, several cases were identified by a social worker working with returned families.

The returned families and children were visited and interviewed in their homes. The Kosovar interviewers conducted a semi-structured interview focusing on the 14 child-rearing conditions, which lasted between one to two hours per family. One of the interviewers mainly focused on the parents, and the other on the child.

The interviewers started the conversation with the parents and child together, focusing on factual information concerning the family and their migration history, such as demographics, family size, dates of departure and return, and which languages the child spoke. If possible, the children and parents were then split up to allow the child to speak freely with the interviewer and complete the SDQ independently of the parents.

After the interviews with the parents and child, the interview pairs discussed the child-rearing conditions based on the interviews and observations of the environment, and considered how they would qualify the 14 child-rearing items according to their local perspective on child-rearing. The results of the SDQ were not used for the qualification of the child-rearing environment in the BIC-Q.

Ethical considerations

The data in this study were collected as part of a project approved by the European Commission, and executed in line with the regulations applicable at that time. Several ethical concerns played a particular role in our research. As other scholars have noted, asylum seekers' responses may be part of a 'survival strategy' (Jacobsen & Landau, 2003) and there may be various unspoken reasons for them choosing to participate in the research (e.g., hoping to gain assistance). Therefore, we had to take care in our research that the families were well informed that the purpose of the home visits was to undertake research. Informed consent was sought verbally, both before the home visit and at the start of the interviews. Before signing informed consent forms, all of the children and parents were informed that participation was voluntary, that they could

withdraw from the research at any time without having to give an explanation, and that everything they said during the interview would remain confidential and be analysed anonymously. At the end of the MRM project, the children who had the most difficulties and where there were great concerns about their environment were provided with assistance (for an evaluation of the support given to these children, see Zevulun et al., submitted – in chapter 5). All families received ten euros per child participating in the research.

Data Analysis

Firstly, we inspected the data through descriptive statistics and obtained the means and standard deviations of the SDQ and BIC-Q scores. Secondly, we examined whether there was multi-collinearity between the predictors and moderators. It became apparent that there was a large overlap between all procedural variables, and with some of the child and contextual characteristics. We were able to combine these variables, leading to a new procedural variable of ‘outcome by procedure and ethnicity’, consisting of four categories: children with a stable residence permit in the host country, Albanian (0), without a permit in the host country, Roma (1), without a permit in the host country and returned voluntarily, Albanian (2), without a permit in the host country and returned by force, Albanian (3) (see Table 4 in Appendix 1).

All the predictors that overlapped with this new variable were removed from further analyses (‘employment and income in the host country’; ‘residence situation in the host country’; ‘assistance before or after the return’; ‘country of return’; and ‘child’s length of stay in the host country’). Subsequently, we tested the complete conceptual model in four steps. The first three steps explored which predictors contributed to the model, which were then used as input for the final step.

Step 1: Univariate Associations of the Predictors with BIC-Q and SDQ.

In the first step, we established univariate associations through t-tests, ANOVA tests and linear regression analysis of the procedural, child and contextual characteristics with the dependent variables: 1) ‘quality of the child-rearing environment’ (BIC-Q total sum score), 2) ‘emotional problems’, and 3) ‘peer problems’ (the SDQ subscales for which the returned children showed the highest problem scores, see results in Table 2). In addition, we measured the association between the BIC-Q and SDQ subscales through linear regression analysis.

Step 2: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis on BIC-Q and SDQ

In the second step, we conducted a multiple linear regression analysis of the quality of the child-rearing environment and on emotional and peer problems, with the significant predictors (at 10% level) from Step 1, including interaction effects. We checked the model assumption through distribution of the residuals.

Step 3: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis on SDQ with BIC-Q included as a Predictor

Subsequently, we added the quality of the child-rearing environment as a predictor variable to the multiple linear regression model of emotional and peer problems. Again, the model assumptions were checked. This determined the variables that could be included as moderators and confounders in the final conditional process analysis.

Step 4: Conditional Process Analysis Including Mediator, Moderator and Confounder

In the third step, we conducted a conditional process analysis using Hayes' (2013) PROCESS macro in SPSS. Conditional process analysis can be used to understand "...the conditional nature of the mechanism or mechanisms by which a variable transmits its effect on another and testing hypotheses about such contingent effects" (Hayes 2013, p. 327).

We explored how 'outcome by procedure and ethnicity' affected the social-emotional wellbeing of returned children and through which other mediator or moderator variables. In order to conduct the conditional process analysis, we used model 4 in the PROCESS macro, which allows multi-categorical X-variables. The confounders and moderators (interaction effects) were included as covariates. As small heteroscedasticity was found in the residual analysis, we conducted the conditional process analysis with heteroscedastic consistent standard errors. In addition, bias-corrected bootstrap confidence intervals (at the level of 1000 samples) were used for the indirect effect in order to respect the irregularity of the sampling distribution.

Results

Descriptive Statistics: Dependent Variables

Regarding the overall quality of the child-rearing environment, the average score was 26 ($SD=12$) out of 42 (see Table 2). Thus, on average, the conditions were scored just below 'satisfactory'. Child-rearing conditions that were often of a *moderate* or *unsatisfactory* quality were 'education', 'stability in life circumstances' and 'adequate physical care'. Child-rearing conditions with an often *satisfactory* or *good* quality were 'safety in the wider environment' and 'respect'.

Regarding the social-emotional wellbeing, one child in our research sample could not complete the SDQ due to cerebral palsy. Most children scored within the *close to average* thresholds of the SDQ subscales (see Table 2). The children showed the highest scores on the 'emotional problems' and 'peer problems' subscales. A separate analysis showed that around 32.4% of the children fell within the thresholds for *high* or *very high* scores on emotional problems, and 29.5% within the thresholds for *high* or *very high* scores on peer problems. 'Emotional problems' and 'peer problems' were therefore selected as the dependent variables in our subsequent analysis of social-emotional wellbeing.

Univariate Associations of the Predictors with BIC-Q and SDQ

Table 3 shows that 'outcome by procedure and ethnicity' is associated with the 'quality of the child-rearing environment', and with 'emotional problems' and 'peer problems' ($p < .001$, respectively $p = .004$). The 'age of the child' is associated with 'peer problems' ($p = .038$) and 'the living area after return' is associated with 'quality of the childrearing environment' ($p = .076$).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the BIC-Q (N=106) and SDQ (N=105) scores for the total research group

	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
BIC-Q					
Total quality of the childrearing environment ^a	25.9	12	25	2	42
SDQ					
Total problems score ^b	11.3	6.6	11	0	28
Emotional problems ^c	3.9	2.8	4	0	10
Peer problems ^d	2.6	2.1	2	0	9
Conduct problems ^e	2.1	1.5	2	0	8
Hyperactivity ^f	2.7	2.1	3	0	7

^a Sumscore of all the 14 BIC-Q childrearing conditions. Scoring categories are unsatisfactory (0), moderate (1), satisfactory (2), or good (3). The higher the total quality score, the higher the quality of the childrearing environment (min. = 0, max. = 42).

^b The total problems score is the sum score of all four subscales (min. = 0, max. = 40). Thresholds for the total problems score as indicated on the scoring form: Close to average (0-14), slightly raised (15-17), high (18-19) and very high (20-40).

^c Thresholds for the emotional problems score: Close to average (0-4), slightly raised (5), high (6), very high (7-10).

^d Thresholds for the peer problems score: Close to average (0-2), slightly raised (3), high (4), very high (5-10).

^e Thresholds for the conduct problems score: Close to average (0-3), slightly raised (4), high (5), very high (6-10).

^f Thresholds for the hyperactivity score: Close to average (0-5), slightly raised (6), high (7), very high (8-10).

Table 3. Regression coefficients and mean scores BIC-Q (N=106) and SDQ (N=105) for returned children, specified by child, contextual and procedural characteristics. Associations tested through linear regression analysis, independent samples T-test, and ANOVA test.

	BIC-Q:	SDQ:	SDQ:
	Quality of childrearing environment^a	Emotional problems^b	Peer problems^b
Child, contextual and procedural characteristics	<i>b (SE)</i>	<i>b (SE)</i>	<i>b (SE)</i>
Age	.42 (.63)	.09 (.15)	.23 (.11) ^c
Duration since return in the country of origin	.98 (.92)	-.19 (.21)	-.02 (.16)
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Gender			
Boy (n = 59)	25.7 (12.1)	3.8 (2.8)	2.7 (2)
Girl (n = 47)	26.2 (12)	4 (2.8)	2.6 (2.3)
Living area after return			
Rural (n = 36)	28.8 (10.3) ^d	4.4 (2.6)	2.9 (2.1)
Urban (n = 70)	24.4 (12.7)	3.7 (2.9)	2.5 (2.1)
Outcome by procedure and ethnicity			
With permit, Albanian (n = 21)	39.4 (4.2) ^e	1.6 (2.5) ^e	1.3 (1.2) ^e
Without permit, Roma (n = 30)	15.9 (7.7)	4.7 (2.7)	3.5 (2.3)
Without permit returned voluntarily, Albanian (n = 16)	28.1 (9.6)	4.3 (2.3)	2.6 (2)
Without permit returned by force, Albanian (n = 39)	25.4 (11.3)	4.5 (2.6)	2.7 (2.1)

^a The higher the score on the BIC-Q, the higher the quality of the childrearing environment.

^b The higher the scores on the SDQ, the more emotional problems and peer problems a child faces.

^c Significant correlation between age and peer problems ($p .038$). Positive coefficient indicates that the older the child, the more peer problems.

^d Significant association between living area after return and the quality of childrearing environment ($p .076$).

^e Significant association between outcome by procedure and ethnicity and the quality of childrearing environment, and emotional problems ($p < .001$) and peer problems ($p .004$).

Selection of Moderators and Confounders through Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

The multiple linear regression analysis showed that 'outcome by procedure and ethnicity' remained a significant predictor of the 'quality of the child-rearing environment', 'emotional problems' and 'peer problems' when the covariates of 'age' and 'living area after return' were included in the model. In addition, the outcomes of the multiple linear regression analysis showed that 'age' could be included as a *moderator* in the conditional process analysis, and 'living area after return' as a *confounder* (see Appendix 2 for more details about the multiple linear regression analysis).

Conditional Process Model for Predicting Social-Emotional Wellbeing

Prediction Model for 'Emotional Problems'

Figure 2 presents the estimated effects of the conditional process model. It shows that 'outcome by procedure and ethnicity' affects the 'emotional problems' a child faces after return *through* the 'quality of the child-rearing environment', when examined with the 'living area after return' and the 'age of the child'.

The outcome by procedure and ethnicity variable affected the quality of the child-rearing environment, although the effect was different for the subgroups. *Children who did not have a permit in the host country who were of Roma ethnicity* had a 23.5 point lower score on the quality of the child-rearing environment than the children who had a permit who were of Albanian ethnicity (see $\alpha_1 = -23.5$, $SE = 1.7$). Also, *children who did not have a permit who were of Albanian ethnicity* (both the voluntarily and forced returnees) returned to an 11 and 13 point lower quality of child-rearing environment, respectively, than the children who had a permit in the host country ($\alpha_2 = -11.3$, $SE = 2.65$; respectively $\alpha_3 = -13.51$, $SE = 2.03$).

The quality of the child-rearing environment was found to influence the emotional problems a child experiences. The score on emotional problems decreased 0.12 points with every point that the quality of the child-rearing environment increased ($b_7 = -.12$, $SE = .03$).

The outcome by procedure and ethnicity variable affected emotional problems through the quality of the child-rearing environment (see the indirect effects (ab) in the caption of Figure 2). In addition, there was no significant direct effect of outcome by procedure and ethnicity on emotional problems ($c_1' = .23$, $SE = 1.08$; $c_2' = .98$, $SE = 1.09$; and $c_3' = 1.13$, $SE = .93$).

The age of the child slightly influenced emotional problems, although this effect was not significant - neither for any of the subgroups. The living area after return had a small independent effect on the emotional problems of returned children. Children returning to a *rural living area* had higher emotional problem scores than children returning to *urban areas* ($c_g' = .93$, SE = .56). However, this effect was not significant.




Figure 2. Conditional process model for predicting emotional problems.

** $p < .001$; b = unstandardized coefficient; $N=105$ (see appendix 3 for specification of model coefficients).

The indirect effect of X on Y through M is $b(a_1^*b_1)$ = 2.79, $SE = .67$, 95% CI [1.41, 4.07] for Roma children, $b(a_2^*b_1)$ = 1.34, $SE = .41$, 95% CI [.66, 2.28] for Albanian children without a permit and returned voluntarily, and $b(a_3^*b_1)$ = 1.60, $SE = .44$, 95% CI [.74, 2.52] for Albanian children without a permit and returned by force.

Quality of the childrearing environment: $R^2 = .47$, $F(3,101) = 67.84$, $p < .001$

Emotional problems child: $R^2 = .38$, $F(9,95) = 11.80$, $p < .001$

Prediction Model for 'Peer Problems'

Figure 3 reveals that the 'outcome by procedure and ethnicity' variable affects the 'peer problems' that a child faces after return through the 'quality of the child-rearing environment'. In addition, 'age' moderates the effect of 'outcome by procedure and ethnicity' on 'peer problems'.

The effects of the outcome by procedure and ethnicity on the quality of the child-rearing environment were the same as in the previous model (for predicting emotional problems). The quality of the child-rearing environment was found to influence the peer problems a child experiences: the score on peer problems decreased by .09 points with every point that the quality of the child-rearing environment increased ($b_1 = -.09$, $SE = .02$). The outcome by procedure and ethnicity variable affected peer problems through quality of the child-rearing environment (see the indirect effects (ab) in the caption of Figure 3). There was no direct effect of outcome by procedure and ethnicity on peer problems: the b -coefficients were all close to zero ($c_1' = .02$, $SE = .66$; $c_2' = -.01$, $SE = .57$; and $c_3' = .07$, $SE = .46$).

Instead, the effect of outcome by procedure and ethnicity on peer problems was conditioned by the age of the child. Age influences the peer problems of a child significantly, but the slopes differ for the children in the various subgroups. The score on peer problems for *children without a permit* - both of the majority and minority ethnicity - increases with higher age through the positive slopes (see $c_5' = .75$, $SE = .25$; $c_6' = .69$, $SE = .26$; $c_7' = .77$, $SE = .20$). For *children with a permit*, the score on peer problems decreases with higher age (see the reference category; $c_4' = -.34$, $SE = .15$).

Finally, children returning to rural areas showed slightly more peer problems than the children returning to urban areas ($c_8' = .48$, $SE = .44$); however, this effect was not significant.




Figure 3. Conditional process model for predicting peer problems

****p<.001; *p<.02; b = unstandardized coefficient; N=105 (see appendix 3 for specification of model coefficients).**
 The indirect effect of X on Y through M is $b (a_1 * b_1) = 2.02$, $SE = .53$, $95\% CI [1.02, 3.11]$ for Roma children, $b (a_2 * b_1) = 0.97$, $SE = .33$, $95\% CI [-.42, 1.76]$ for Albanian children without a permit and returned voluntarily, and $b (a_3 * b_1) = 1.16$, $SE = .35$, $95\% CI [.55, 1.96]$ for Albanian children without a permit and returned by force.
 Quality of the childrearing environment: $R^2 = .47$, $F(3,101) = 67.84$, $p < .001$
 Peer problems child: $R^2 = .38$, $F(9,95) = 7.45$, $p < .001$

Discussion

In this study, we investigated the quality of the child-rearing environment and the social-emotional wellbeing of migrant and asylum-seeker children returned to Kosovo and Albania, and the factors predicting how the children fare after return. The findings show that the stability of the residence permit in the host country and belonging to a majority or minority ethnic group predict the social-emotional wellbeing of returned children, mediated through the quality of the child-rearing environment. The children who had a stable residence permit in the host country had a higher quality child-rearing environment and less emotional and peer problems after return. This is likely to be explained by the opportunities that asylum seekers are given in host countries, dependent on their residence permit. Families who did have a permit were in a better position in the host country – they were able to work, build up their lives, and returned completely voluntarily to the country of origin.

Of all the returnee children *who did not have a residence permit in the host country*, the children belonging to the Roma minority ethnicity faced the lowest quality child-rearing environment. This finding was also expected based on other studies, notably conducted by non-governmental organisations. Generally known as a marginalized community in European countries (FRA, 2016), the Roma population in Kosovo – especially the returnees – live in poor socioeconomic circumstances and are often segregated from the rest of society (Human Rights Watch, 2010).

The Roma children in our sample had not obtained a stable residence permit in the host country, and were mostly returned by force. For the Albanian children who did not obtain a residence permit in the host country, we could not find indications that the specific *return procedure* affected the quality of the child-rearing environment and the social-emotional wellbeing of the children: the Albanian children who had not received a permit in the host country and who returned *voluntarily* were in a similar situation and expressed a similar level of social-emotional wellbeing as the Albanian children without a permit who returned *by force*. This indicates that the decision to return voluntarily, as the result of having exhausted all legal possibilities to stay in the host country, may not be a completely voluntary and open choice to return to the country of origin (Webber, 2011).

The age of the child was related to the peer problems a child faces after return. The findings show a positive slope for the peer problems of children who had not received a permit in the host country, meaning that their peer problems score increased with age, while a negative coefficient is shown for Albanian children who had a permit. We do not know exactly why this moderating effect was found for this group of children. A possible explanation could be related to the fact that the children who had a permit, generally had a more stable and secure life during their stay in the host country. These children often visited their countries of origin during holidays, and as a result were often familiar with the Kosovar and Albanian language and culture, and knew where they were returning to. The children who stayed in the host country without a residence permit generally grew up in insecure and unstable life environments, and might have been less connected with Kosovo or Albania, or a social network, before returning. Nevertheless, future research should provide more insight into the effect of age on social-emotional wellbeing after return, and to the role of a residence permit in the host country in this regard.

Returning to a rural or urban living environment showed no significant effect on the social-emotional wellbeing of returned adolescents. In this study, the categorization into 'rural' and 'urban' living environment may not have been sufficiently specific to capture specific deprived areas in the country or within cities (Reijneveld, Verheij, & De Bakker, 2000). In some cases, the 'rural-urban' distinction did not seem to suffice, for example for families living in a town or city but far from facilities such as health or day care, which could impact on a child's opportunities for healthy development. Thus, future studies into the situation of returnee children could consider creating a different category to estimate the effect of the living environment on the child's social-emotional wellbeing.

Strengths and Limitations

Few academic studies focus on the situation of returned migrant and asylum-seeker children in their countries of origin. While return is often considered as the most 'durable solution' for the host country and for rejected asylum seekers, "...the experiences of returnees themselves remain completely lacking in government discourses as well as in return programmes" (Lietaert, Derluyn, & Broekaert, 2014, p. 146-147). This study was a first exploration of how children are faring after return to the country of origin and the factors associated with this return. This knowledge can assist policymakers in host countries to make

better-informed decisions in asylum procedures, and in the assessment of how children can best be supported in their return.

One limitation of the study is that it had a cross-sectional design. Moreover, the children were not subjected to a clinical investigation of their social-emotional wellbeing. Using the SDQ, we screened the children to determine whether there were indications of mental health problems from the child's perspective. Nevertheless, a more thorough investigation using multi-informant information could provide better evidence on each child's social-emotional wellbeing. Regarding the interpretation of the scores, there is no benchmark available on the prevalence of social-emotional problems of adolescents in Kosovo and Albania. As psychometric properties and cut-off scores may vary across populations, we followed the suggestion of Vostanis (2006) and only assessed the continuous scores in our analysis.

The conditional process model assumes that the mediator of 'quality of the child-rearing environment' was measured without any measurement errors, which may be difficult to completely guarantee. The relatively small sample size does, however, not permit more advanced models. We were not able to separate the parents and children in all of the interviews. In such cases, we assumed that the opportunity for the child to disclose their stories was not impeded if the parents were interviewed by one of the interviewers, while the other interviewer simultaneously focused on the child and, hence, the parents could not hear their child's answers or see the child's answers on the SDQ.

As returnees are often not monitored or structurally registered after their return, it proved difficult to include a large number of returned families through a truly random procedure. However, most findings in this study are supported by the existing literature and research on child development and migration studies, and we therefore assume the findings to be valid. Nonetheless, more research is needed into the factors predicting the social-emotional wellbeing of migrant children after return, in particular with regard to the differing effect of age across the subgroups. Due to the small subgroups in our sample, we had to reduce the number of factors included in our model. As a result, certain variables might have been overlooked in our analysis, which could also be important explanatory factors of children's wellbeing after return (e.g., events that parents and children experienced before, during or after migration and repatriation which impacted on their wellbeing).

Implications for Research and Practice

Future studies might consider including factors that may be found at different levels and in different phases of the migration process. Firstly, the security situation and circumstances for returnees in their countries of origin are expected to be important factors influencing children's wellbeing and reintegration after return. The countries in this study can be unstable due to poverty and high unemployment, high crime rates, societal problems, or inter-ethnic tensions (EASO 2016, 2016), however, Kosovo and Albania are both considered as 'safe countries of origin' by many European Union member states. Future studies into the situation of returned children – both those who were unaccompanied minors and those who were accompanied by their families in the host countries – should be conducted in other regions to which asylum-seeker families are repatriated. It would also be interesting to include control groups of local non-returnee children in future studies.

In addition, the children participating in this study lived in different host countries within the European Union – with each country having different policies and measures regarding asylum seekers (Bronstein, Montgomery, & Dobrowolski, 2012; EMN, 2014) and return assistance (Beltman, 2012). Therefore, future research could consider including variables that determine a child's situation during the stay in the host country, such as the duration of stay (Kalverboer, Zijlstra, & Knorth, 2009) and the parents' and children's wellbeing and the quality of the child-rearing environment *before* return (cf. Zijlstra, 2012). In addition, the differences in cultural standards and child-rearing practices between the host country and the country of origin, and the specific impact this might have on the individual child, should be taken into account (Zevulun et al., 2015). Furthermore, the involvement of the child in the decision to return (Vathi & Duci, 2016), and their preparedness for the situation after return may also be important determinants of a returned child's wellbeing. Finally, we did not consider the reasons for leaving the home country,¹⁴ nor which specific reasons were decisive for the issuing of a residence permit in the host country (e.g., for

¹⁴ Based on the dates of departure, only a small part of our Kosovar sample migrated before or during the war in Kosovo in 1998 and 1999 (16.5% and 7% of the Kosovar research sample respectively); most of the participants left Kosovo after the war. About half of our Albanian sample left between the fall of the Communist regime and the Kosovar crisis (1990-1999), when many Albanians migrated from their country due to political crises, and escaping social and economic marginalization (King, 2005). More recent asylum seekers from Albania and Kosovo usually leave their countries due to the high unemployment rate and difficult access to the labour market, societal problems, blood feud practices, lack of social infrastructure and health care, or education-related problems (EASO, 2013).

labour purposes, or status as a refugee or temporary protection). Children in families who fled their homes due to socioeconomic circumstances may face different kinds of difficulties after return than children who fled due to war, violence or other humanitarian reasons.

Our findings also have certain implications for migration policies and practices. The world's leaders recently reasserted their commitment to protect the rights of all migrant children in the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants – "...regardless of their status, and giving primary consideration at all times to the best interests of the child" (UN General Assembly, 2016, para 32). Despite the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC, 1989) being ratified by nearly all countries worldwide, and the principle of the best interests of the child being included in the European regulations on asylum policy,¹⁵ there is still a lack of consideration of children within the asylum procedure in various European countries (see Kalverboer, 2014; Montgomery & Foldspang, 2005). However, making up around 30% of asylum applicants in the European Union (European Commission, 2017) – and their wellbeing and future prospects often being an important reason for parents to seek a better future through migrating abroad (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2002) – children will remain an important group on which to focus in the field of migration.

Currently, the situation and wellbeing of returned asylum-seeker children and families is not formally monitored. Monitoring the situation after return can provide valuable insights, not only for policy and practice regarding the repatriation of rejected asylum seekers, but also regarding asylum-seeking and migrant families who are currently residing in host countries. First of all, the findings suggest that the children in families who had a stable residence permit and were able to build up their lives in the host country, fare better after return. This finding is supported by research on adult returnees, which shows that the migrants who were best integrated and were able to work in host countries, were more resilient and more embedded after their return (Carr, 2014; Van Houte & De Koning, 2008). Asylum-seeker parents who did not obtain a residence permit, in contrast, often face stress and insecurity during their stay in the host country, experiencing powerlessness and a lack of autonomy to build their own lives (Gorashi, 2005), and being emotionally less available for their children (Van

15 See Article 24 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (2000/C 364/01); Article 6 of the Revised Dublin Regulation (604/2013); Article 20 of the Qualification Directive (2011/95/EU); Article 23 of the Reception Directive (2013/33/EU); and regarding return specifically, Article 5 of the Return Directive (2008/115/EC).

Essen & Bala, 2007). Thus, the wellbeing of returned migrant and asylum-seeker children is not only dependent on the conditions after repatriation, but also on the social and economic conditions under which the families lived in the host country.

In order to improve the sustainability of return, the needs of vulnerable families and children should be assessed prior to their return (Carr, 2014). Our findings indicate that asylum-seeker children who are most vulnerable after return are those who belong to a minority ethnic group, who did not have a permit in the host country and who are older adolescents. These families and children should be supported with reintegration, and the children's interests should be taken into account to enable a beneficial and durable situation after their return. In a future study, we will analyse how returned adolescents value the reintegration assistance they received, and how children and families could best be supported, to ascertain good development opportunities after return and considering their rights. Above all, any type of return should "...respect the rules of international law and must in addition be conducted in keeping with the best interests of children and with due process" (UN General Assembly, 2016, para 58).

Appendix 1

Table 4. Cross-tabulation showing multicollinearity of the four most significant predictors

Outcome of the migration procedure	Type of return	Country of return	Ethnicity	N
No stable permit				
	Forced return	Kosovo	Roma	25
			Albanian	36
		Albania	Roma	-
			Albanian	3
	Voluntary return	Kosovo	Roma	5
			Albanian	13
		Albania	Roma	-
			Albanian	3
		Total	Roma without a stable permit	30
			Albanian without a stable permit	55
Stable permit				
	Forced return	-	-	-
	Voluntary return	Kosovo	Roma	-
			Albanian	6
		Albania	Roma	-
			Albanian	15
		Total	Roma with a stable permit	-
			Albanian with a stable permit	21

Appendix 2

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis on BIC-Q and SDQ

Table 5 shows that the only significant predictor of 'quality of the childrearing environment' in the multiple linear regression analysis is 'outcome by procedure and ethnicity'. The interaction effects of age and living area do not affect the quality of the childrearing environment.

Table 5. Multiple linear regression analysis on quality of the childrearing environment (BIC-Q)

Predictor	<i>b</i> (SE)	95% CI
Constant	40.94 (2.67)	[35.64, 46.24]
Outcome by procedure and ethnicity (With permit, Albanian is ref. category)		
Without permit, Roma	-25.96 (3.27)	[-32.45, -19.47]*
Without permit returned voluntarily, Albanian	-15.76 (4.76)	[-25.22, -6.31]*
Without permit returned by force, Albanian	-16.49 (3.23)	[-22.91, -10.06]*
Living area after return (urban is ref. category)		
Rural	-2.61 (4.13)	[-10.80, 5.59]
Rural * Without permit, Roma	6.61 (5.89)	[-5.09, 18.31]
Rural * Without permit returned voluntarily, Albanian	7.48 (6.80)	[-6.02, 20.98]
Rural * Without permit returned by force, Albanian	5.58 (5.19)	[-4.73, 15.89]
Age (centred around mean)		
Age * Without permit, Roma	-.18 (1.45)	[-3.05, 2.70]
Age * Without permit returned voluntarily, Albanian	-.28 (1.85)	[-3.94, 3.39]
Age * Without permit returned by force, Albanian	.88 (1.43)	[-1.95, 3.71]

Linear regression analysis shows that, as expected, 'quality of the childrearing environment' associates significantly with social-emotional wellbeing after return ($b=-.12$ and $b=-.09$; $p<.001$); the *higher* the quality of the childrearing environment, the *less* emotional- and peer problems a child faces after the return. Therefore, the score on the BIC-Q is included as a predictor in table 6a and 6b, to assess how the other predictors affect 'emotional problems' and 'peer problems' when the 'quality of the childrearing environment' is included in the model.

Table 6a shows that the outcome by procedure and ethnicity is a significant predictor of 'emotional problems', but only when quality of the childrearing environment (BIC-Q) is excluded as a predictor in the model. After inclusion of the quality of the childrearing environment, 'age' seems to moderate the relationship between 'outcome by procedure and ethnicity' and 'emotional problems' however has a significant effect for one subgroup only, namely the *children without a permit who returned by force (of Albanian ethnicity)*.

Table 6b shows that the outcome by procedure and ethnicity is also a significant predictor of 'peer problems', but only when quality of the childrearing environment (BIC-Q) is excluded as a predictor in the model. 'Age' moderates the relationship between 'outcome by procedure and ethnicity' and 'peer problems' for all subgroups, with or without inclusion of the 'quality of the childrearing environment' in the model.

'Living area' is not a significant moderator of the relationship between 'outcome by procedure and ethnicity' and 'emotional problems' or 'peer problems'. This variable is therefore not included as a moderator in the conditional process analysis, but instead as a *confounder* only.

Table 6a. Multiple linear regression analysis on emotional problems (SDQ), without and with quality of the childrearing environment (BIC-Q) as a predictor.

Predictor	Without BIC-Q as predictor		With BIC-Q as predictor	
	<i>b</i> (SE)	95% CI	<i>b</i> (SE)	95% CI
Constant	1.13 (.74)	[-.34, 2.59]	5.85 (1.29)	[3.30, 8.40]
Outcome by procedure and ethnicity (With permit, Albanian is ref. category)				
Without permit, Roma	3.66 (.90)	[1.87, 5.45]*	.67 (1.08)	[-1.48, 2.81]
Without permit returned voluntarily, Albanian	3.43 (1.31)	[.82, 6.04]*	1.61 (1.28)	[-.93, 4.14]
Without permit returned by force, Albanian	3.03 (.90)	[1.25, 4.82]*	1.23 (.92)	[-.61, 3.07]
Living area after return (urban is ref. category)				
Rural	1.75 (1.14)	[-.52, 4.01]	1.45 (1.05)	[-.63, 3.52]
Rural * Without permit, Roma	-2.08 (1.63)	[-5.31, 1.15]	-1.32 (1.50)	[-4.30, 1.66]
Rural * Without permit returned voluntarily, Albanian	-2.05 (1.88)	[-5.78, 1.67]	-1.19 (1.73)	[-4.63, 2.25]
Rural * Without permit returned by force, Albanian	-.67 (1.44)	[-3.52, 2.19]	-.13 (1.32)	[-2.76, 2.5]
Age (centred around mean)				
Age * Without permit, Roma	.58 (.40)	[-.21, 1.38]	.56 (.37)	[-.16, 1.29]
Age * Without permit returned voluntarily, Albanian	.61 (.51)	[-.4, 1.62]	.58 (.47)	[-.35, 1.50]
Age * Without permit returned by force, Albanian	.67 (.40)	[-.12, 1.45]	.80 (.36)	[.08, 1.52]*

Table 6b. Multiple linear regression analysis on peer problems (SDQ), without and with quality of the childrearing environment as a predictor.

Predictor	<i>Without BIC-Q as predictor</i>		<i>With BIC-Q as predictor</i>	
	b (SE)	95% CI	b (SE)	95% CI
Constant	1.20 (.56)	[.09, 2.31]	4.68 (.98)	[2.73, 6.62]
Outcome by procedure and ethnicity (With permit, Albanian is ref. category)				
Without permit, Roma	2.26 (.68)	[.91, 3.62]*	.06 (.82)	[-1.58, 1.69]
Without permit returned voluntarily, Albanian	1.75 (1.0)	[-.23, 3.72]	.41 (.97)	[-1.53, 2.34]
Without permit returned by force, Albanian	1.53 (.68)	[.18, 2.89]*	.20 (.70)	[-1.19, 1.60]
Living area after return (urban is ref. category)				
Rural	.92 (.86)	[-.80, 2.63]	.70 (.80)	[-.89, 2.28]
Rural * Without permit, Roma	-.46 (1.23)	[-2.91, 1.99]	.10 (1.14)	[-2.17, 2.37]
Rural * Without permit returned voluntarily, Albanian	-1.40 (1.42)	[-4.23, 1.42]	-.77 (1.32)	[-3.39, 1.85]
Rural * Without permit returned by force, Albanian	-.72 (1.09)	[-2.89, 1.44]	-.33 (1.01)	[-2.33, 1.68]
Age (centred around mean)				
Age * Without permit, Roma	.76 (.30)	[.16, 1.36]*	.75 (.28)	[.19, 1.30]*
Age * Without permit returned voluntarily, Albanian	.79 (.39)	[.02, 1.56]*	.77 (.36)	[.06, 1.47]*
Age * Without permit returned by force, Albanian	.68 (.30)	[.09, 1.28]*	.78 (.28)	[.23, 1.33]*

Appendix 3

Table 7. Model coefficients for the conditional process models in figure 2 and 3

		<i>Dependent variables</i>										
		M			Y			Y				
		Quality of the childrearing environment			Emotional problems child			Peer problems child				
Predictor variables		b	SE	p	b	SE	p	b	SE	p		
X = 1 (<i>Without permit, Roma</i>)	a ₁	-23.50	1.70	.00	c ₁ '	.23	1.08	.83	c ₁ '	.02	.66	.97
X = 2 (<i>Without permit returned voluntarily, Albanian</i>)	a ₂	-11.30	2.65	.00	c ₂ '	.98	1.09	.37	c ₂ '	-.01	.57	.98
X = 3 (<i>Without permit returned by force, Albanian</i>)	a ₃	-13.51	2.03	.00	c ₃ '	1.13	.93	.23	c ₃ '	.07	.46	.87
M (<i>Quality of the childrearing environment</i>)		-	-	-	b ₁	-.12	.03	.00	b ₁	-.09	.02	.00
W (<i>Age</i>)		-	-	-	c ₄ '	-.37	.41	.37	c ₄ '	-.34	.15	.02
Age x X=1		-	-	-	c ₅ '	.54	.48	.26	c ₅ '	.75	.25	.00
Age x X=2		-	-	-	c ₆ '	.48	.52	.36	c ₆ '	.69	.26	.01
Age x X=3		-	-	-	c ₇ '	.81	.45	.08	c ₇ '	.77	.20	.00
Control (<i>Living area after return</i>)		-	-	-	c ₈ '	.93	.56	.10	c ₈ '	.48	.44	.27
Constant	i ₁	39.43	.93	.00	i ₂	6.17	1.35	.00	i ₂	4.79	.96	.00
		R ² = .47			R ² = .38			R ² = .38				
		F (3, 101) = 67.84,			F (9, 95) = 11.80,			F (9, 95) = 7.45,				
		p < .001			p < .001			p < .001				

