



Comparative Report on Re-Migration Trends in Central Europe

**Stefanie Smoliner (ZSI, Vienna),
Michael Förschner (ZSI, Vienna),
Josef Hochgerner (ZSI, Vienna) &
Jana Nová (Academy of Education, Bratislava)**

This project is implemented through the CENTRAL EUROPE Programme co-financed by the ERDF.



Re-Turn

Re-Turn is an acronym of the European project 'Regions benefitting from returning migrants'.

This document was prepared by the consortium of the Re-Turn project. For more information, please visit www.re-migrants.eu.

The project is funded by the ERDF in the frame of the CENTRAL EUROPE programme (contract no 1568CC19BC5FA1D9720AB3BD3220ACA9).

Series editor and project coordination:

Dr. Thilo Lang
Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography
Schongauerstraße 9
04328 Leipzig
T_Lang@ifl-leipzig.de
Tel.: +49 341 600 55-159

Copyright © Re-Turn Consortium, represented by Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography (IfL), 2012.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication can be reproduced in any form, by print or photo print, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

Content:

0. Executive Summary.....	5
1. Introduction	8
2. International Theories of Return Migration	10
2.1 The Neoclassical Approach.....	10
2.2 The New Economics of Labour Migration	10
2.3 Push-Pull Model (Lee 1966)	11
2.4 The Structural Approach	12
2.5 The Transnational Approach	13
2.6 The Social Network Approach	14
2.7 The Revisited Approach by Cassarino (2004)	15
2.8 Conclusion	16
3. Defining and Measuring Return Migration	17
4. Synthesized Findings: Return Migration Trends in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE)	24
4.1 Return Migration in CEE - Cross-Country Results	24
4.2 Return Migration in CE - Country Specific Survey Results	26
4.2.1 Return Migration in the CZECH REPUBLIC - National Report.....	27
4.2.2 Return Migration in AUSTRIA - National Report.....	29
4.2.3 Return Migration in GERMANY - National Report	31
4.2.4 Return Migration in HUNGARY - National Report	34
4.2.5 Return Migration in ITALY - National Report	36
4.2.6 Return Migration in POLAND - National Report	38
4.2.7 Return Migration in SLOVENIA - National Report	40
4.2.8 Return Migration in the SLOVAK REPUBLIC - National report (Jana Nóva).....	42
4.3 Synthesis of national results	45
4.4 Who comes back? Data Analysis of return migration based on Eurostat and LFS-Data	49
5. Return Migration - The Regional Perspective	55
5.1 Returning migrants and regional development: Theoretical concept	55
5.2 Regional economic and labour market profile	57
5.3 Perspectives for returning migrants.....	59
6. Conclusion	61

7. Literature:	65
ANNEX 1	72
ANNEX 2	75

Index of Charts:

Chart 1: Three possible scenarios of return migration	17
Chart 2: Share of nationals among immigrants, 2009.....	49
Chart 3: Returnees and Stayers according to age groups, LFS 2005-2008	50
Chart 4: Returnees according to gender (%), LFS 2005-2008	51
Chart 5: Returnees (aged between 17-62) according to educational attainment, LFS 2005-2008	51
Chart 6: Returnees (aged between 17-62) and their labour market status, LFS 2005-2008	52
Chart 7: Returnees (aged between 17-62) and their occupations, LFS 2005-2008 ..	53
Chart 8: Returnees (aged between 17-62) according to sectors of employment, LFS 2005-2008	53
Chart 9: Returnees (aged between 17-62) according to the area of residence, LFS 2005-2008	54
Chart 10: Educational profile of SVK returnees 2008-2011 in %.....	74

Index of Tables:

Table 1: Data source availability on return migration in Central European countries	21
Table 2: Immigration by citizenship, 2009, absolute numbers	49
Table 3: Sample of recent returnees in the LFS 2005-2008.....	50
Table 4: Number of registered unemployed returnees by country of previous employment in SK (orange = Partner countries of the Re-Turn project)	72
Table 5: Country profile of Slovakian unemployed returnees 2008- 2011 in %.....	73
Table 6: Number of registered unemployed returnees by education in SK (absolute numbers)	73
Table 7: Educational profile of returnees in SK 2008 -2011 (in %).....	73
Table 8: Regional allocation of unemployed returnees in Slovak Republic 2008-2011 (in absolute numbers)	74
Table 9: Number of registered unemployed returnees by occupation in SK	74
Table 10: The occupational profile of the unemployed returnees in SK 2008 - 2011 (in %).....	75

0. Executive Summary

Although return migration is of high importance in Central Europe, no comparative report on the region as a whole had been written so far. To provide a better understanding of the existing situation of return migration in Central Europe, and especially in the seven Project Partner Countries: AT, DE, CZ, IT, HU, PL, SI of the Re-Turn Project, similarities and differences between involved states and regions as well as the unexploited potentials of returnees to foster knowledge development have been analysed.

Skilled return migrants can stimulate knowledge-based development in their home country, but this is dependent on institutional and regional factors as well as context conditions. Returnees have to **prepare for their return** by mobilizing resources (human capital, financial capital and social capital). Further, they **need time**. Migrants have to stay in the destination country sufficiently long to allow accumulating knowledge and absorbing certain experiences and values. Here, especially the membership in various networks is important to link return migrants' capital with local resources. Also existing **traditional power relations and local values** shape return outcomes and may impact on the behaviour of returnees.

Based on the reviewed literature and own descriptive analysis of Labour Force Survey-Data 2005-2008, we come to the following main results:

- **Return migration is not a marginal phenomenon in Central Europe.**
According to international data provided by Eurostat for 2009, the share of nationals among immigrants was 75% for Poland (data refer to 2008), 29% for the Czech Republic, 23% for Germany, 13% for Austria, 10% for Slovenia and 8% for Hungary, Italy and the Slovak Republic.
- **Central European returnees tend to be younger compared to non-migrants and migrants staying abroad** (see Klagge und Klein-Hitpaß 2007 for Poland; Martin/Radu 2011 for Poland and Hungary; and data provided by SORS 2010 for Slovenia).
When returning, re-migrants are “young enough” to use their human capital to foster knowledge-based development in the origin country.
- **Central European returnees are positively selected in terms of education** (see Klagge und Klein-Hitpaß 2007 for Poland; Martin/Radu 2011 for Poland and Hungary; data provided by SORS 2010 for Slovenia; Ette/Sauer 2010 for Germany).
This means that returnees possess the potential to adding to know-how diffusion and the catching-up of the economy of the origin-country.
- **CE migrants cultivate connections with their home country when they are abroad** (see Horvath 2004 for Slovenia; Szemely/Csanady 2011 for Hungary and Breinbauer 2008 for Austria).
CE migrants are linked with members of their origin society. This may facilitate the re-integration process upon return.
- **CE returnees have a higher probability not to actively participate on the local labour market** (see Martin/Radu 2011)

Although returnees possess valuable human capital resources, they show a comparatively high tendency not to enter the local labour markets. Whether this is because returnees lack important social ties and networks in the origin country or because returnees can just afford to search longer for a job due to savings from higher earnings or because foreign work experience is a signal of being unsuccessful on local labour markets for employers, remains unclear.

- **Research provides mixed evidence with respect to :**
 - **the income pay-offs upon return**
Martin/Radu (2011) show for PL and HU, that returnees receive significant income premia both from self-employment and dependent employment.
On the other hand, Co et al. (2000) find that there is no wage premium for male returnees in Hungary. But female returnees earn a 67% premium over female stayers.
 - **better career opportunities upon return**
Vavrečková (2009) found that after returning home to Poland most of the returnees (tertiary-educated) managed to make use of the experiences they gained abroad. On the contrary, research by Grabowska-Lusinska (2010) shows that only 8% of Polish returnees could enhance their career after return, but the majority of the respondents state that either nothing has changed in terms of their career path or that the experience of migration has even enhanced the fragmentation of their career.
 - **self-employment activities among returnees.**
Martin/Radu (2011) found for Hungary and Poland that returnees are more likely to be self-employed than non-migrants. Different evidence is obtained by Klagge/Klein-Hitpas (2007) for Poland who report that highly-skilled returnees are mainly employees, but less-skilled returnees are more likely to start their own business.

Whether and to what extent returning migrants can help boosting regional development is to large extent dependent on the situation of the economy and the labour market they re-enter.

Data from the 7 case study reports indicate that the regions are predominantly characterised by traditional economy and an oversupply on the labour market with little chances of increased demand in the near future. This offers only limited employment perspectives for returning migrants even though their skills and their experiences and probably also their formal education and vocational training will be higher than average giving them a competitive advantage. A factor in their favour though is the aging of most of the regions, which should generally shorten the current excess labour supply.

Based on key findings, the following main policy implications for the Central European region can be formulated (see SOPEMI 2008: 192, 201f):

1.) Attract high-skilled return migration.

High-skilled return migration has the potential to positively impact on development in Central European Countries through the exchange of professional knowledge on methods, techniques and standards.

2.) Remove obstacles to return.

The intention of migrants to return to their home countries is largely influenced by institutional and context factors in the origin as well as in the destination country

3.) Create framework conditions that help returnees to realize their potential.

Origin countries should deal with the topic of the recognition of qualifications acquired abroad; promote brain circulation and engage high-skilled nationals in diasporas, through virtual or temporary return.

4.) Formulate a regional development strategy based on a wider and better skills basis.

The best chances and also the most effective use to be made of returning migrants lies with a pro-active regional development strategy supporting company-settlement, self-employment and regional restructuring based on higher and international skill levels.

1. Introduction

Migration is a highly discussed topic - both in sending as well as in receiving countries. There are multiple motives which cause people to migrate: people migrate in search of a new job, better career opportunities, higher income, better quality of life or as a result of political or religious persecution (Klagge/Klein-Hitpaß 2007: 1). For different reasons, some of the migrants return to their country of origin, and specifically the highly-skilled among them can be drivers of innovation and impact on the economic development. Return migration has the potential to reverse negative outcomes of brain drain and support sustainable economic prosperity in developing and newly industrializing countries (see Hunger 2004).

Compared to the huge empirical literature on migration in general, relatively few papers provide evidence on labour market outcomes of high-skilled return migrants in their home countries. There is a constantly growing literature on return migration in developing countries (e.g African countries), and recently, return migration has been discussed in the light of Central and Eastern European countries as well (see Klagge/Klein-Hitpaß 2007: 1). These countries experienced profound political and economic changes in the last two decades and need skilled return migration to reverse negative effects of brain drain.

Therefore, return migrants from Western European countries are a particularly important group on Central and Eastern European labour-markets. Precise, comparable numbers of returnees in CEE are still missing, but scholars put their number at about half a million these days. As they are a fast-growing group, they will be certainly above one million in a few years time (see Martin/Radu 2011: 2).

After the opening of the borders in 1990 and the EU enlargement, migration from the relatively poorer countries of CEE to the richer countries in Western Europe gained importance (Martin/Radu 2011). Many skilled and unskilled workers migrated, hoping to find jobs with better career opportunities and increased income. In 2004, some Western European countries started to grant free access to CEE workers, which increased migration flows from Eastern European countries again (Martin/Radu 2011). Labour inflows to Western European countries enhanced economic development (see Blanchflower et al. 2007), but 'the main home countries of intra-EU migrants experienced a negative supply shock with emigration adding to labour market bottlenecks and wage and inflation pressure' (Martin/Radu 2011: 3).

In the last years, the situation has changed. The economic crisis in 2008 hit many of the main destination countries (like UK, Ireland, Spain etc.) and 'CEE countries experienced a period of rapid economic expansion, resulting in increased job opportunities and fast convergence of wage and income levels between home and

host countries, especially for skilled labour' (Martin/Radu 2011: 3). These circumstances have made return migration attractive to many CEE workers.

According to the SOPEMI Report 2008, many migrants opt for temporary migration and return migration has to be seen as one part of the whole migration story. Between 20% and 50% of immigrants leave within five years of arriving in a country, some to return home and some to move to a third country (SOPEMI 2008: 163). Therefore, return migration is a highly important topic in Central Europe and will even gain importance in the upcoming years.

So far, no comparative report on return migration for the whole Central European Region has been written. Against this background, this report presents comparative insights of return migration in Central Europe and especially in the seven Project Partner Countries: Austria, Germany, Czech Republic, Italy, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia of the Re-Turn Project, funded by the European Union.

The main objective of this comparative report is to present the current situation of return migration in Central Europe, similarities and differences between involved states and regions as well as the unexploited potentials of returnees to be able to use return migration to foster knowledge development.

This report is organized as follows. **Chapter 2** provides an overview of international theories of return migration. The main aim of this part is to understand which micro and macro factors influence the decision to return and how contextual situations as well as institutional aspects shape return experiences and how they influence the re-integration of returnees in the origin-country. **Chapter 3** defines return migration and describes the available data sets, which can be used to analyse return migration in Central Europe. **Chapter 4** provides a detailed overview of the available research on return migration in Central and Eastern Europe. First, cross-country studies for the region are reviewed. Second, eight country reports on return migration are presented, based on a review of available country-specific research. Third, descriptive statistics on return migration in the eight project partner countries are provided based on Labour Force Survey Data from 2005-2008. **Chapter 5** explores skilled return migration to Central Europe and its impact on economic development in a regional perspective. The role of regional factors as providing opportunities or posing problems for migration-induced development will be analysed. Finally, **chapter 6** summarises key findings.

2. International Theories of Return Migration

Although theoretical considerations of return migration can be traced back to the 1960s, it was not until the 1980s that scholars started to debate on potential impacts of return migration on origin and destination countries. Recently, return migration processes in Central and Eastern European Countries have attracted attention, as these countries experienced profound political and economic changes in the last decade. Therefore, the number of empirical and theoretical approaches on return migration increased, but so far, there exists no broad in-depth theoretical framework for return migration (Schmidthals 2010: 283). Thus, general migration theories, which also cover the aspect of return migration, offer a possibility to better understand the magnitude and dynamics of return migration to origin countries (see Cassarino 2004).

Subsequently, six different theoretical approaches to return migration will be reviewed. They differ with respect to the level of analysis (individual or household), the primary motives which drive return (economic aspects, non-economic aspects) as well as micro- or macro dimensions of return migration.

2.1 The Neoclassical Approach

In the past, migration processes have often been explained using economic reasons. Economic approaches see migrants primarily as rationally acting individuals, who emigrated to maximize their earnings and career opportunities. In this light, returns to the home country occur, when migrants failed in fulfilling their aspirations related to the migration plan. 'They may for example underestimate the difficulty of mastering the host country language, of gaining recognition for foreign qualifications, or of putting their professional experience to profitable use. When they have an offer of employment, candidates for migration may underestimate the cost of living, and in particular the cost of housing, and thus overestimate the living standard and the savings capacity they will enjoy in the destination country' (Dumont/Spielvogel 2008: 178). Put differently, migrants who 'miscalculated the costs of migration and who did not reap the benefits of higher earnings' (Cassarino 2004: 255) return as a consequence of imperfect information, failed experiences abroad or downgrading of their human capital. Contrary to this approach, the New Economics of Labour Migration have a positive view of return migration.

2.2 The New Economics of Labour Migration

According to the New Economics of Labour Migration, migrants go abroad for a specific period of time to receive higher income and accumulate savings. A return to the home country is the logical consequence of the successful achievement of all migration related goals and targets. With the words of Cassarino (2004), return migration is a 'calculated strategy' and the 'natural outcome of a successful experience abroad during which migrants met their goals (i.e. higher incomes and

accumulation of savings) while naturally remitting part of their income to the household. Remittances are part and parcel of a strategy aimed at diversifying the resources of the household with a view to better compensating for the risks, linked to the absence of an efficient insurance market in home countries. They also constitute one explanatory factor in the return decision, together with the attachment to the home country' (Cassarino 2004: 255f). A return to the home country is part of the migration strategy of a migrant's household, not of the migrant itself. If the liquidity of the household in the home country is guaranteed, the expectations of the migrant's household are met and the return is organized. This temporary migration project definitely has an impact on the migrant's integration into the host society, his behavior towards human capital accumulation and his professional advancement in the destination country (see Cassarino 2004).

Shortcomings of both theories (the Neoclassical Approach and the New Economics of Labour Migration) include that the focus is only put on financial and economic factors, without explaining how remittances and accumulated human capital are used in home countries (see Cassarino 2004: 257). Returnees are exclusively viewed as 'foreign-income bearers' (Cassarino 2004: 257). Furthermore, these theories only explain which motives drive the intention to return, but they do not elaborate on how the return is organized and prepared. In addition it can be criticized, that the economic approaches do not touch the aspect to where returnees return and adapt their considerations accordingly. Another approach, influenced by neoclassical considerations, is Lee's Push-Pull Model.

2.3 Push-Pull Model (Lee 1966)

This theoretical approach followed the neoclassical considerations of Ravenstein (1885, 1889), who assumed 'that the main currents of migration flow from regions with fewer opportunities to regions with better prospects' (Schmidthals 2010: 284). Lee built on this notion but broadened the approach. By highlighting the importance of intervening obstacles and personal factors, he pointed out that migrants may act and behave irrationally. In addition, Lee described in his papers, that every migration flow produces a counter flow. Lee formulated the following reasons (Lee 1996: 22; cit. after Schmidthals 2010: 284):

- 'the acquisition of new attributes at destination that the migrants gain often allows them to return on improved terms,
- migrants became aware of opportunities at origin that they had not taken advantage of before, or they may use their contacts in the new area to set up business in their home area; and
- it is likely that children born at destination will accompany the return migrants, as many other people who have become aware of opportunities at the place of origin through the migrants' (Lee 1996: 22; cit. after Schmidthals 2010: 284).

A paradigm which takes personal and contextual reasons for return migration into consideration is the structural approach.

2.4 The Structural Approach

In the 1970s and 1980s, sociologists, social geographers and anthropologists started to think about return migration. Their considerations were mainly triggered by considerable return flows of the so-called ‘guest workers’ (*Gastarbeiter*). The structural approach focuses on situational and contextual factors in the origin countries to explain why some returnees appear as actors of change and innovation and others don’t. According to the structural approach existing power relations, traditions and values in the home country have an even stronger impact on the reintegration and the innovation potential of returnees than the returnees’ human and financial capital (Cassarino 2004: 259).

Looking at different expectations and motivations of returnees, Cerase (1974) suggested the following typology of returnees (taken from Cassarino 2004: 258):

- ‘Return of failure pertains to those returnees who could not integrate in their host countries owing to the prejudices and stereotypes they encountered abroad. Their difficulties in taking an active part in the receiving societies or in adapting themselves to host societies were strong enough to motivate their return (Cassarino 2004: 258)’.
- ‘Return of conservatism includes migrants who before emigrating had planned to return home with enough money to buy land with a view to <liberating themselves from loathsome subjection to the landowners> (Cerase 1974: 254 cit. after Cassarino 2004: 258). Because of these aspirations and strategies, conservative returnees only tend to satisfy their personal needs, as well as those of their relatives. Conservative returnees do not aim at changing the social context they had left before migrating, rather, they help to preserve it (Cassarino 2004: 258)’.
- ‘Return of retirement refers to retired migrants who decide to return to their home countries and to acquire a piece of land and a home where they will spend their old age (Cassarino 2004: 258)’.
- ‘Return of innovation is no doubt the most dynamic category of returnees in Cerase’s typology. It refers to actors who are <prepared to make use of all the means and new skills they have acquired during their migratory experiences> (Cerase 1974: 251 cit. after Cassarino 2004: 258) with a view to achieving their goals in their origin countries, which, according to them, offer greater opportunities to satisfy their expectations. Cerase notes that these returnees view themselves as innovators, for they believe that the skills acquired abroad as well as their savings will have turned them into <carriers of change> (Cerase 1974 cit. after Cassarino 2004: 258). Nonetheless, Cerase observes that these returnees are unlikely to be actors of change in their home countries because of the resilience of strong power relations and vested interests which prevent innovators from undertaking

any initiatives that could jeopardise the established situation and the traditional power structure (Cassarino 2004: 258)'.

According to the structural point of view, two factors influence the strength of the impact which returnees may have on the origin country: time and space (Cassarino 2004: 260). The aspect of 'space' pertains to the area, where returnees settle - whether it is a rural or an urban place (Cassarino 2004: 260).

The aspect of 'time' concerns - on the one hand - the years stayed abroad and on the other hand contextual differences, which occurred before and after migration (see Cassarino 2004: 259). The optimal duration of a stay abroad is difficult to define, but scholars indicate that a short duration is useless as returnees do not have the time to gain new skills. But a too long duration abroad may also be hindering as returnees may be alienated from their origin society or too old to innovate (Cassarino 2004: 259). '(...) an optimum length of absence might be found whereby the absence is sufficiently long to have influenced the migrant and allowed him to absorb certain experiences and values, and yet sufficiently short that he still has time and energy upon return to utilize his newly acquired skills and attitudes' (King 1986: 19).

Further, Byron and Condon (1996) point out that returnees have to comply with origin-specific symbolic and behavioral patterns in order to re-integrate and become re-accepted by members of the origin country. Therefore, they 'tend to orient their consumption patterns to unproductive investments and to conspicuous consumption' (Byron and Condon 1996: 100; cit. after Cassarino 2004: 260). Moreover, 'resources tend to be monopolised by the family members who invest savings in the building of big houses and in the purchase of luxury cars, instead of using savings to modernise, for example, agricultural machinery. These consumption patterns reproduce and breed the unequal relationship between the core (receiving countries) and the periphery (sending countries) - a fundamental of the structural approach to international migration, in general, and to return migration, in particular' (Cassarino 2004: 260).

The structural approach is criticized by many scholars. Firstly, because of its focus on economic and financial dimensions. Secondly, because of the fact that returnees' actions are seen very pessimistically. This is mainly because supporters of the structural approach believe that traditional values and patterns of behaviour will dominate in the long run and will not give a chance to innovative ideas. As returnees lost 'contact' to the origin society due to their stay abroad, they do not find the right words and actions to successfully pursue their interests. This thesis is strongly questioned by scholars who support a transnational approach.

2.5 The Transnational Approach

Representatives of the transnational approach see return migration as a part of the whole migration story and not as the final stop of the migration cycle. According to

this approach, migrants develop a transnational identity (or double identities) due to strong social and economic links to their home country. These links are established by regular contact with members of the origin society, frequent visits of the home country and the sending of remittances to family members. The links are maintained and fostered during the stay abroad, to facilitate the re-integration process upon return. 'Return takes place once enough resources, whether financial or informational, have been gathered and when conditions at home are viewed as being favourable enough' (Cassarino 2004: 264).

Interestingly, transnationalism does not only refer to sustaining strong links to family members and friends as well as to professional contacts, but also to 'the multifarious ways in which migrants feel linked to one another by their common ethnic origins and in-group solidarity' (Cassarino 2004: 263)

In this context, Al-Ali and Koser (2002: 10) argue that '(a) characteristic of transnational migrants is that they maintain economic, political and social networks that span several societies. What defines membership of these networks is a common country of origin or a shared origin.' Common ethnicity, common origin and kinship linkages appear to be the main factors that lubricate transnational activities and define transnational identities (Cassarino 2004: 163).

The transnational approach is similar to the social network approach in highlighting the importance of cross-border networks and links to prepare the process of return. But the two approaches differ with respect to the nature of networks and links.

2.6 The Social Network Approach

The social network approach states that migrants often belong to cross-border networks which involve migrants as well as non-migrants. Shared interest is the central dimension which causes people to form a network and exchange. Unlike representatives of the transnational approach, supporters of the social network approach believe that 'linkages reflect an experience of migration that may provide a significant adjunct to the returnees' initiatives at home. Social structures increase the availability of resources and information, while securing the effective initiatives of return migrants. Thus, the composition of networks, which consist of a multiplicity of social structures (Eccles and Nohria 1992), as well as the configuration of linkages, is of paramount importance to examine the fundamentals that define and maintain the cross-border linkages in which return migrants are involved' (Cassarino 2004: 265).

Like the structural and the transnational approach, social network theory also sees the returnees' motivations embedded and shaped by contextual (social, economic and institutional) dimensions at home as well as by the relevance of the returnees' own resources (see Cassarino 2004).

2.7 The Revisited Approach by Cassarino (2004)

In his research, Cassarino (2004) expresses the need to revisit the conceptual approach of the returnee suggested by international theories of return migration introduced before. He specifies the following reasons:

- First, the analytical framework of return migration needs to be broadened because of the growing diversity of migration flows (migrant students, asylum seekers, refugees etc.) (Cassarino 2004: 270).
- Second, liberal reforms in many migrant-sending countries have created the basis for increased business activities (Cassarino 2004: 279).
- Third, return became - because of cross-border mobility - a multiple-stage process (Cassarino 2004: 270).
- Fourth, it is easier for migrants nowadays to prepare for their return by using different technological means of communication (Cassarino 2004: 270).

In his theoretical considerations Cassarino (2004) highlights two pre-requisites, which are important for a returnee to be able to impact on the development of the origin-country: *resource mobilisation* and *preparedness*.

‘Resource mobilisation draws on the above-mentioned insights of social network theory and pertains to tangible (i.e. financial capital) and intangible (i.e. contacts, relationships, skills, acquaintances) resources that have been mobilised during the migration experience abroad’ (Cassarino 2004: 271). Resource mobilisation clearly differs with respect to the legal status, the experience of migration, the duration of the stay abroad, the socio-economic background as well as the motivations and projects of the returnees.

‘Preparedness pertains not only to the willingness of migrants to return home, but also to their readiness to return. In other words, the returnee’s preparedness refers to a voluntary act that must be supported by the gathering of sufficient resources and information about post-return conditions at home’ (Cassarino 2004: 271). In general, the higher the preparedness, the greater is the probability that a returnee is able to mobilise valuable resources, which will pay off in the origin country. In order to understand the way in which returnees mobilise resources, Cassarino (2004) states ‘these networks do not emerge spontaneously; rather, they are responsive to specific pre- and post-return conditions. They also generate a continuum between the migrants’ experiences lived in host countries and their situations in origin countries. This continuum regards exclusively those returnees who benefit from a high level of preparedness. Conversely, it is non-existent for returnees having a low or no level of preparedness’ (Cassarino 2004: 275).

In summary, returnees can be successful actors of change in their origin country, if

- ‘they prepare their return autonomously and long enough,
- conditions in receiving and sending countries are favourable enough to allow resources to be mobilised,

- cross-border social and economic networks are dynamic, and
- there is a continuum to allow resources to be mobilised not only before but also after return (Cassarino 2004: 276)'.

2.8 Conclusion

The comparative analysis of international theories of return migration has shown a range of different motives (of economic and non-economic nature) which drive migrants to return. Further, the structural approach and network theory offered valuable information regarding the contextual situation and the need to pay attention to situational and institutional aspects, which shape return experiences and influence the re-integration of returnees in the origin country. The revisited approach of return migration by Cassarino (2004) puts the focus on various micro and macro factors, which influence the decision to return and the return process itself and shape its impact on the development of the origin country.


3. Defining and Measuring Return Migration

Return Migration is a complicated issue: attempts to measure this phenomenon face two challenges:

- defining return migration, and
- data availability.

First, we will deal with the question of defining a returnee. Return is often part of a very complex migration process. Below, three possible scenarios are visualized:

Chart 1: Three possible scenarios of return migration



Source: SOPEMI 2008: 165

The United Nations Statistics Division for collecting data on international migration (UNSD, 1998) defines returning migrants in the following way: returnees are ‘persons returning to their country of citizenship after having been international migrants (whether short-term or long-term) in another country and who are intending to stay in their own country for at least a year’ (SOPEMI, 2008: 164).

This definition includes the following information:

- country of citizenship
- place of residence abroad
- duration of stay in the destination country
- duration of stay in the country of citizenship.

According to this definition a person’s origin country is his country of citizenship. This fact can be questioned, as it is possible that migrants obtain the citizenship of the destination country or people possess two citizenships. Therefore, we believe that for the Re-Turn project it is better to define returnees as:

‘persons older than 15 years of age, who returned to their country of birth after having been international migrants in another country’.

This revised definition includes the following information:

- country of birth
- place of residence abroad
- age (older than 15 years, as we are interested in the economically active age group).

Of course, using this definition it is not possible to differ between the various forms of return migration, indicated in chart 1, which would be in any case a very difficult task, as data availability of return migration is in general very scarce and limited with respect to international comparison.

Subsequently, different data sources which could be used to identify returnees will be presented and their main limitations discussed (see SOPEMI 2008: 166f):

1 - Data from Population Registries

Population registries collect data on the entries and exits from the country. Incoming migrants have to register upon arrival and people emigrating have to de-register. Therefore, this data set could be used to identify returning nationals.

Problematic about the use of data from population registries is:

- First, people could leave the country without de-registering and if they return, their entry to the country is not recorded.
- Second, it is not always possible to identify, to which country the emigrating person is moving.
- Third, no information on socio-demographic and labour market characteristics is collected.
- Fourth, the data collected is often not comparable between countries and not all Project Partner countries in the Re-Turn project have population registries. (Data of population registries are available for Germany, Austria, Belgium, Italy, the Netherlands, the Nordic Countries, Spain, Switzerland.)

2 - Longitudinal Surveys

Longitudinal Surveys are rich datasets, as they gather information at multiple points in time on the labour market activities and other significant life events of several groups of people. Based on longitudinal data it is possible to study the individual behaviour of people during a longer period of time. If a longitudinal data set contains the information about why people leave, longitudinal surveys provide for a direct measurement of emigration and eventually return.

Main limitations include the often fairly small sample sizes of longitudinal data sets and therefore the problems of representativeness for the broader population. In addition, a longitudinal survey with which return migration can be measured is only available for Germany (GSOEP). All the other project partner countries do not conduct longitudinal data on this topic.

3 - Population Census

Most population censuses collect information about the previous place of residence five years prior to census date. Using this information it is possible to compare returning migrants with people who never left the country according to various socio-economic characteristics. Unfortunately, no question about the duration of residence abroad is included in the data set, therefore the calculation of return rates differs from return rates computed from surveys conducted in the destination country.

The main limitation of this dataset is that those population censuses are conducted every decade, which means for some countries, that the data are comparatively 'old'. Especially with respect to profound changes, which took place in Central Europe in the last two decades and the economic downturn in 2008/09, return migration flows may have changed.

4 - Labour Force Survey (see Martin/Radu 2011: 7f).

For our purpose, the Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) is a very valuable source of information because of the common standardised set of questions used across the EU and the rather large size of the samples conducted. It is possible to identify recent return migrants using the retrospective information on the country of residence one year before the survey and the country of birth.

Additional interesting variables which are included in the dataset:

- general demographic characteristics (age, gender, marital status)
- educational attainment
- the individual's labour market activity and main job
- information on the labour market status one year before the survey
- household characteristics
- indicators for regions at NUTS 2 level.

Main limitations of this data set include that:

- First, returnees can only be identified during the first year upon their arrival from abroad. It is therefore not possible to analyse the re-assimilation patterns of returnees over a longer time span.
- Second, since the probability to be included in the LFS in the first year after return might be lower than afterwards, it is very likely that the actual magnitude of return flows is underestimated.

5 - European Social Survey

The European Social Survey (ESS) is a biennial multi-country survey covering over 30 nations. The first round was fielded in 2002/2003, the fourth in 2008/2009. In this survey returning migrants can be identified based on the following variables: Born in country, spent at least 6 months working abroad over the last 10 years and returned (available since round 2005)

Additional information which is available:

- socio-demographic information (age, gender, marital status)
- education
- current occupation
- income

The main limitations of this dataset is its

- fairly small sample size, and the fact that
- no information on previous job and income is available.

6- IOM Data

The IOM collects data on forced and assisted return. Assisted voluntary return includes organizational and financial assistance for the return and where possible, reintegration measures offered to the individual.

The data derives mainly from government records and IOM's programmes and research.

Main limitations of these data sets include, that the origin countries of assisted voluntary and forced returnees are often not documented. In addition, no information on further socio-demographic and labour market characteristics of the returnees is collected for project partner countries in the Re-Turn project. Last, IOM data are not representative, as not all returnees use IOM services for their return.

7 - Data from employment services in Slovakia (provided by Jana Nova)

The structure of the data available from Slovak Republic:

Data is available for re-migrants who have registered themselves as unemployed after the return from abroad. It is available on a monthly base for the years 2007-2011, including annual summaries, and it includes following information:

- Inflow (that is our target group - returnees from abroad registered at employment office)
- Out flow (brain drain) people who have found a job abroad and therefore their registration at employment office has terminated
- The re-migrants' numbers as to the end of each period (month, year).

From the above data the following characteristics about the unemployed re-migrants are available:

- Country of departure
- Region where they go to

The region where they originally come from is not available, but the rule of recording is, that after returning from abroad the re-migrants have to register in

the region of their last permanent residence in Slovakia. So it can be assumed that once they have not changed the place of their permanent residence in Slovakia during their stay abroad, it is the region they originally come from. Further information is provided in the data set:

- Gender - available since 2010
- Age - available since 2010
- Education
- Occupation

Descriptive statistics on Slovakian returnees is provided in ANNEX 1.

On the base of the Slovak example, it was agreed to ask the relevant National Offices (Offices) in the partner countries to provide the project team with the data similar to the Slovak data structure. Offices have been informed about the Re-Turn project and were asked for cooperation and provision of data in the given structure (please see Annex No. 1). The review of the addressed Offices in partner countries is displayed in the following Table:

Table 1: Data source availability on return migration in Central European countries

The country	The Office and contact person	The statement of data availability
Austria		Data with the details required are not produced
Slovenia	Statistical Office of the Republic Slovenia(SORS) www.stat.si info.stat@gov.si	Only paid data in required structure offered
Italy	i-statcontenuto@istat.it Utenza di Servizio i.stat ; i.stat@ISTAT.IT	Data with the details required are not produced
Czech Republic	Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, www.mpsv.cz Dept. of foreign employment Czech Social Security Administration(CSSA). www.cssz.cz	Data with the details required are not produced
Hungary	fh@lab.hu ; EURES adviser	Data with the details required are not produced
Germany	Statistisches Bundesamt B3-Press-und Informationsservice www.destatis.de	Data with the details required are not produced
Poland	Central Statistical Office of Poland, Information Division, Warsaw, www.stat.gov.pl	Data with the details required are not produced

The overview of the structure of the data which are or will be available in the partner countries regarding the re-migrants:

POLAND

The Central Statistical Office of Poland collects data on immigration to Poland by country of birth and citizenship. Immigrants born in Poland and with Polish citizenship can be treated as returning immigrants. Thus, data on returning immigrants include only:

- Polish citizens, who stayed permanently abroad and after returning registered for permanent residence in Poland

and

- Polish citizens, who stayed abroad for at least 12 months and reported their return from temporary stay abroad or Polish citizens for whom declared period of temporary stay abroad for at least 12 months expired.

These data by gender and country of previous residence are available and can be compiled. Data by age, marital status and return region require special preparation and have to be elaborated in one of the branches and preparation would take some additional time.

They do not have data on the actual number of returns from abroad. Data on the actual number of returns from abroad were collected in the Polish Census 2011. The census form included questions on departure and return from abroad.

The obtained results will be available by:

- year of return
- gender
- age
- marital status
- country of previous residence
- region of present residence
- level of education
- job performed before departure abroad (if person worked)
- job presently performed (if person works)
- is the work performed abroad in line with qualifications (if person worked abroad)

Most probably above mentioned data will be elaborated and possible to disseminate in the first quarter of 2013.

GERMANY

Statistisches Bundesamt

B3-Press- und Informationsservice

The data which have been requested are not covered by the range of official statistical data. Some information can be found in the section "Migration":

<http://www.destatis.de/jetspeed/portal/cms/Sites/destatis/Internet/EN/Naviga tion/Statistics/Bevoelkerung/Wanderungen/Wanderungen.psml>

CZECH REPUBLIC

The Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs does not collect the data in the structure which has been required for the RE TURN project.

The Czech Social Security Administration (CSSA) which falls under the United Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs does not register the data on the number of people returning back to the Czech Republic (re migrants). They deal with the issue of determining the country competence in terms of the legal status of the migrants. Within this the agenda they process for Eurostat is the annual statistics of exposed E101/A1 forms, which migrant workers should possess. They advised to use Eurostat statistics.

SLOVENIA

Statistical Office of the Republic Slovenia (SORS): The Office collects the data on citizens of the Republic of Slovenia, aged 18+, who were born in Slovenia and who in the observed period immigrated to Slovenia in the following structure:

- country of previous residence (to the whole population, data source: statistical survey on migration),
- sex (to the whole population, data source: statistical survey on migration),
- bigger age groups (to the whole population, data source: statistical survey on migration),
- education (to the whole population, data source: special processing of statistical data),
- occupation (persons in employment, data source: statistical survey Socio-Economic Characteristics of Population and of International Migrants),
- marital status (to the whole population, data source: statistical survey on migration and statistical survey on population).

Considering the structure of the paid data the working team has decided not to buy the data as far as the Slovenian data are not comparable with the employment data from i.e. Slovak Republic (for the SK we have socioeconomic characteristics of returnees who are unemployed, for Slovenia the socioeconomic characteristics would refer to the whole population - no comparison either) and because there is the option to use free data on immigration available on: http://pxweb.stat.si/pxweb/Database/Demographics/05_population/40_Migration/05_05N10_International/05_05N10_International.asp
http://pxweb.stat.si/pxweb/Database/Demographics/05_population/40_Migration/15_05N30_Socio_economic_Charact/15_05N30_Socio_economic_Charact.asp

HUNGARY

EURES advisor

They do not have comprehensive data on re-migrants. They can supply part of this data by aggregating the U-forms (the special form in which the data of unemployed Hungarians returning to Hungary who import their unemployment benefits from other European countries are recorded in the following structure: Date of birth, education, vocational qualification, language skills, the job they are seeking for). The data are available on annual basis.

4. Synthesized Findings: Return Migration Trends in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE)

Compared to the huge empirical literature on migration in general, relatively few papers provide evidence on labour market outcomes of high-skilled return migrants in their home countries. ‘So far, research has mainly focused on China, India, Taiwan or African countries (Klagge et al. 2007: 2)’. But recently, return migration has also been discussed in the light of Central and Eastern European countries. These countries experienced profound political and economic changes in the last decade and need skilled return migration to reverse negative effects of brain drain and foster knowledge-based development (Klagge et al. 2007).

This chapter reviews the current state of the art of remigration trends in the Central and Eastern European Region. First, main findings from comparative and cross-country studies will be presented. Second, available research based on country-specific survey data will be reviewed. Third, main remigration trends are presented based on a descriptive analysis of LFS-Data (2005-2008).

4.1 Return Migration in CEE - Cross-Country Results

Subsequently, two studies will be presented:

1 - ‘Skill Diffusion by Temporary Migration? Returns to Western European Work Experience in Central and East European Countries’ by Anna Iara in 2008

2 - ‘Return Migration: The Experience of Eastern Europe’ by Reiner Martin and Dragos Radu in 2011

AD 1) Skill Diffusion by Temporary Migration (Iara ,2008)

Iara (2008) used data from the Central and Eastern Youth Eurobarometer from 2003 to investigate earnings differences between young males from Central and Eastern Europe with and without Western European work-related experiences¹.

Based on her statistical analyses, in which she also controlled for selection effects, Iara (2008) came to the following main results:

- Western European work experience is rewarded on CEE labour markets. Controlling for several factors (e.g. age), young males with Western European work-related experience earn on average 30% more compared with stayers. Two interpretations of this finding are possible: First, this premium can be understood as evidence for a skill transfer which takes place during the stay in the host country. With the words of Iara (2008: i): ‘temporary migrants may upgrade their skills by learning on the job in countries with

1 The final sample contains information on 3831 individuals.

higher technological development, and subsequently bring human capital to their source country, thus adding to know-how diffusion and the catching-up of their economy'. Second, it is possible that foreign work experience from Western Europe signals 'higher productivity' or 'valuable human capital' to employers on CEE labour markets, who are in turn willing to pay more income for their employees. Although, based on the analysed data set it is not possible to decide which interpretation is correct, Iara (2008: i) supports the first one, arguing 'we show that the premium found for return migration does not primarily reward the language proficiencies of returning migrants, and we further provide indicative evidence that no earnings premium is obtained for work-related stays abroad in other central and eastern European transition countries'.

- In addition, Iara (2008) highlights the finding that the propensity to participate in Western European work-related experience is comparatively lower among those with low education levels. 'With the results of substantial earnings premia to such experience, temporary migration appears to improve the labour market situation of those who are in a relatively advantageous position already, instead of being equally accessible to the more disadvantaged' (Iara 2008: 33).
- Further, the results show that movers and stayers receive rewards for different human capital characteristics. For example, 'the less educated of the movers fare significantly worse than the stayers, compared with the better educated in the respective group' (Iara 2008: 32).

In conclusion, findings suggest that the temporary migration of people from CEE has a positive impact on the labour markets of the origin countries and contributes to the 'catch-up' (Iara 2008: 33) of CEE countries and the exchange of professional knowledge on methods, techniques and standards.

AD 2) Return Migration: The Experience of Eastern Europe, (Martin/Radu 2011)

Using data from Labour Force Surveys (2002-2007) and the European Social Survey (ESS 2006/07), Martin/Radu (2011) perform a cross-country analysis of return migration in five Central and Eastern European countries: Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Romania.

The aim of this study is to find out, how foreign work experience influences the labour market outcomes of return migrants in the respective countries.

In terms of socio-economic characteristics, findings show that return migrants are a positively selected group. 'At the time of return they are younger both compared to non-migrants and to the recent migrants still residing abroad. Apart from Romania, all countries seem to attract returnees who attained more years of formal education than non-migrants' (Martin/Radu 2011: 14).

With respect to income premia, the authors show that returnees receive significant income premia both from self-employment and from dependent employment.

Foreign work experiences are definitely rewarded on home country labour markets. Average income premia for work abroad range between 10% and 20%.

Further, Martin/Radu (2011) found that returnees have a higher probability to not actively participate on local labour markets. This finding could be explained by arguing that returnees lack important social ties and networks, which usually help to find a decent job on the home country labour market. Alternative explanations provided by Hazans (2008: 3) suggest, that ‘due to savings from higher earnings abroad, return migrants can afford to search for a job longer’. Hazans (2008) formulates the thesis, that returnees may be more self-confident and may aim ‘higher’ in terms of income and career opportunities due to their foreign work experiences and therefore search longer. But, of course, there is also the possibility that recent domestic human capital is more valuable than foreign work experience in specific jobs or that employers are just unsure about how to evaluate foreign experiences. Another explanation suggests that employers in the home country may take foreign work experiences as a signal of being unsuccessful in the local labour market (see Hazans 2008: 3).

Moreover, Martin/Radu (2011) found that returnees are more likely to be self-employed than non-migrants, but this finding is not robust. With respect to this finding, evidence is rather mixed. Wahba and Zenou (2008) show in their research on Egyptian returnees that a lack of social networks on the home country labour market makes it more difficult to become self-employed. Contrary, Martin/Radu (2011) believe that, due to their stay abroad, returnees may possess skills and character traits (like entrepreneurial skills and risk proclivity) which make them opt for self-employment.

Finally, Martin/Radu (2011) conclude, that if returnees are independent or self-employed, they can expect higher wages than non-migrants, which definitely makes a temporary migration more attractive than a permanent stay in the host country. With respect to the impact of return migration on the development of the entrepreneurial base of the origin country, the authors suggest a more detailed analysis of the professional development of returnees several years after their return.

4.2 Return Migration in CE - Country Specific Survey Results

As previously said, return migration is a scarcely studied domain in Central and Eastern European countries. Because of a lack of comparable data, the available papers in this research field are mainly based on country-specific survey data². Consecutively, seven ‘Country reports on Return Migration’ are presented.

²The sample of return migrants covered in these papers is often very small (see Martin/Radu 2011 for an overview).

4.2.1 Return Migration in the CZECH REPUBLIC - National Report

Research and data on brain drain and return migration in the Czech Republic are rather scarce. The few research studies that exist, suggest that, although emigration of highly-skilled nationals takes place today in Czech Republic, it is not yet causing a dramatic decline in the number of tertiary educated workers in the country (Vavrečková 2009). However, an exodus of highly-qualified Czechs may result in a short term destabilisation of certain economic sectors. 'The most significant impacts can be expected among relatively small professional groups of highly skilled experts, who are hard to replace if they go abroad' (Vavrečková 2009: 3).

The Czech Republic is experiencing a gradually growing immigration of foreigners along with a rather stable emigration of natives. Inflows of immigrants of Czech origin are also rather low (see Drbohlav et al. 2009). According to national statistics for the year 2009, about 39,000 immigrants entered the country. Due to the economic crisis, this was nearly half the number of entries registered in the previous year (78,000). Most of the foreign immigrants come from Ukraine, Slovak Republic and the Russian Federation. In 2009, outflows of Czech nationals almost doubled with respect to the year 2008, growing from about 6,000 to almost 12,000 persons. Most Czechs emigrate to Germany, the UK, the U.S., Canada or Switzerland.

In terms of return migration, inflows of German and Moldovan nationals more than halved. In contrast to the general trend, inflows from the United States continued to increase in 2009, albeit at modest level (about 2,500) (data, see SOPEMI 2010: 272).

Using qualitative face-to-face interviews, Vavrečková (2009) conducted a research study on tertiary-educated Czech specialists who had worked in qualified positions abroad and who have returned to the Czech Republic from a long-term stay abroad. 'The aim of the survey was to ascertain the degree of integration (adaptation) by Czech specialists of various professions who had returned from more developed countries to the Czech Republic' (Vavrečková 2009: 70). Main findings show, that 'the considerably higher incomes on offer is not the only motive encouraging university educated Czechs to work abroad: other motivations include the experience it would afford, the generally better equipped workplaces, the opportunity to make personal contacts and to establish a basis for future career progress' (Vavrečková 2009: 70).

All interviewed returnees rated their experience of working abroad very positively. Gained language skills (knowledge of four international languages, three of them to a very good standard, is no exception among the respondents), newly acquired expertise (finding out about work procedures, technologies, methods) as well as increased self-confidence and ability to cope with stress situations were seen as valuable souvenirs from the stay abroad. After returning home most of the respondents managed to make use of the experiences they gained abroad. They state that their time abroad positively affected their work career (Vavrečková 2009: 74).

Vavrečková (2009) also studied the migration attitudes of four groups of experts identified as being susceptible to migration, based on quantitative, standardized questionnaires. These chosen groups are doctors (N=462), IT/ICT specialists (N=276), technical engineers from corporate research and development (N=418) and doctorate students (N=523). The findings of the four questionnaires are analyzed and compared with the results of a survey of the migration attitudes of the Czech population as a whole.

Main findings include that ‘the readiness to migrate among the tertiary-educated is influenced by age, language skills, family circumstances and personal qualities. The majority of respondents were not motivated to leave the Czech Republic for good. The reason for this was strong family ties and concerns about the different socio-cultural environment and the status of being “foreign” in the receiving country’ (Vavrečková 2009: 58). Vavrečková (2009) found that there exist significant differences in the readiness to migrate between the different expert groups as well as the Czech population as a whole.

‘One significant finding is that, with the exception of technical engineers, the intensity of the inclination to migrate is markedly higher among the tertiary-educated than in the ordinary population. The declared foreign migration of specialists usually covers a longer period of time and comprises a higher proportion of potential permanent migrants compared to the population as a whole’ (Vavrečková 2009: 57).

Doctors, for example, show a high willingness to go abroad. The dissatisfaction with their income, especially among the young doctors entering the profession and ‘the moods and uncertainty surrounding the introduction of healthcare reforms’ (Vavrečková 2009: 57) increase the motivation to go abroad. Among IT specialists and technical engineers the willingness to go abroad is rather weak - their earnings level is close to that of foreign counterparts. In contrast, doctorate students show a high motivation to go abroad. ‘Scientists’ decisions to migrate are not determined primarily by income levels abroad but by academic and intellectual motivations (prestigious institutions, state-of-the-art facilities, interesting research projects), a broad base of international scientific contacts and their own social networks’ (Vavrečková 2009: 58).

Further, Vavrečková (2009) found, that scientific disciplines differ with respect to scientists’ willingness and preparedness to go abroad. ‘It was found that proclaimed potential mobility is higher among respondents from the medical sciences and natural sciences fields, who also display the lowest level of satisfaction at the prospects for future growth in their chosen field in the Czech Republic. Economists and representatives of technical sciences rate their prospects in the Czech Republic most highly and their motivation to work abroad is relatively low’ (Vavrečková 2009: 58).

Interestingly, up to the middle of the 1990s, the Czech Republic was experiencing internal migration - many scientists left the academic field and joined the private

sector (finance, business,...) (see Vavrečková 2009: 58). But since the accession to the European Union, spending on research constantly increased and enabled Czech scientists to find work in the domestic intellectual and academic sphere (see Vavrečková 2009: 58). Therefore Vavrečková (2009) concludes: ‘If the existing conditions remain unchanged we do not (therefore) expect a large-scale exodus of scientists going abroad. (...) We believe that the risk of brain drain does not at present represent pronounced quantitative losses in the Czech Republic, but rather qualitative losses. Among doctors, for example, it is alarming that experienced middle-aged specialists (with two and more attestations) are planning to go abroad as well as young doctors. As the Czech Republic does not possess sufficient information about incoming experts from abroad or about their degree of integration into Czech society, we do not know to what extent the incoming foreign experts can replace the outgoing Czech experts’ (Vavrečková 2009: 58).

4.2.2 Return Migration in AUSTRIA - National Report

Return migration makes up 13% of total immigration to Austria (data refer to 2010). In 2010, 16.000 Austrians returned to their home country (Eurostat database: migr_imm1ctz 1998-2010). Until now, only few study deal with return migration to Austria (Morano-Foadi 2005; Forstlechner 2010) and with high-skilled emigration from Austria (Warta 2006; Breinbauer 2008).

Breinbauer (2008) conducted a quantitative survey with Austrian mathematicians (N=59) living abroad. He finds that high-skilled Austrian workers mainly emigrate to gain new qualifications and competences as well as to improve their career chances (Breinbauer 2008: 182). Further, he explores that only 7 out of 10 emigrants are in contact with research institutes in Austria and about one third of the Austrian mathematicians living abroad do not hold any professional contact with other scientists of Austrian citizenship. In this context, Breitenbauer (2008) sums up that scientists abroad do not perform a bridging function for other Austrian scientists residing in Austria. With respect to researchers’ return potential, Breinbauer (2008) finds that it is fairly small. According to his results, two thirds of the respondents state that they want to stay in the destination county. Interestingly, half of the respondents recommend to junior scientists to go abroad but return after several years (Breinbauer 2008: 185). Breinbauer (2008) asked Austrian emigrants about how they think brain drain from Austria could be avoided. In this context, most respondents highlight the following changes in the Austrian science system: increased internationalization, development of a transparent and competitive scientific structure, reduction of bureaucracy and hierarchies, greater openness and more stable career opportunities for talented young scientists. In addition, there should be the honest willingness to work with international experts abroad (Breinbauer 2008: 188).

In line with these results, Warta (2006) analyses tertiary-educated Austrians who took part in an FWF mobility program (Erwin Schrödinger) and finds that “the use of new methodologies and techniques” as well as “specialisation” are major factors which drive Austrian researchers to go abroad. In terms of return migration, her research shows that only 50% of former grant holders went directly back to their

former position in Austria, 12% got another job in Austria, 8% received another research grant or further funding from the FWF, and 29% of tertiary-educated Austrians decided to stay in the destination country after the scholarship expired. This number even increased in the recent years (Warta 2006: 21). This rate appears high, but it is relatively low compared with the rate of researchers who received another funding, namely the Marie-Curie scholarship. 43% of former high-level Marie-Curie fellows stayed abroad after their fellowship expired (Warta 2006: 21). Warta (2006) analyses the reasons for not returning and shows that most Schrödinger fellows state that they had problems finding a job on the Austrian labour market. Warta (2006) believes that this reason may once have been important, but questions its validity for current times. Today the labour market for researchers has internationalized. Warta (2006) believes that low return rates can be attributed to the following factors: fellows tend to stay abroad because:

- 1- 'foreign work experiences promote the research career
- 2- the home institution of the fellow may not be able to integrate the fellow and his new competencies, and
- 3- a high proportion of fellows become professors, positions open to international competition (Warta 2006: 24f)'.

Contrary to Warta (2006), Biffl (2006) highlights that the segmentation of the Austrian labour market may still be one of the main barriers for nationals residing abroad. In Austria, only a profession in the internal labor market segment provides good wages and career prospects; but entering internal labor markets and career paths is very difficult and often only possible via internal career ladders. "A characteristic of Austrian career developments are low entry wages in an international comparison and slow wage increases as turnover is still high close to the entry port. Thus, entry wages tend to be below productivity but continued employment bears the prospect of recuperating foregone earnings from the age of the mid 30s onwards" (Biffl 2006: 26) Natives, residing abroad, may decide against a return to Austria, because they are not willing to start at the very beginning of a career path. As empirical research on this topic is missing, this aspect remains an open question.

To understand the reasons for return, Forstlechner's research (2010) is very useful. In his comparative, qualitative study on self-initiated return migrants to the UK, France, Germany and Austria, he conducted 42 interviews (5 qualitative interviews with Austrian returnees) and showed that respondents returned to their home countries because of a multitude of reasons: family reasons, financial reasons, employment contract termination in the host country as well as bureaucratic issues (e.g. problems with visa for partner and children). When returning, Forstlechner (2010) finds that most respondents did not receive, seek or expect any help from the government. When asked about how the government could incentivize and accompany the return progress, the majority of returnees either did not discuss this question or reacted with surprise. According to Forstlechner (2010) "14 out of the 25 respondents rejected the concept of government help for repatriation entirely" (Forstlechner 2010: 168). Those respondents who provided recommendations, identified the following possibilities that could - at least

partially- ease the return process: financial incentives (e.g. tax breaks), help with procedures (e.g. educational attestation of children's education) and better support and advice from the embassy in the host country (Forstlechner 2010: 169). Morano-Foadi (2005) conducted research dealing with the international mobility of scientists in the discipline of physics and life science in the United Kingdom, Portugal, Italy, Austria and Greece. For Austrian returnees she finds that 'the longer one is away, the more complicated the return is' (Morano-Foadi 2005: 150). Although she generally finds that mobility is considered a 'plus' (Morano-Foadi 2005: 156) in Austria, returning scientists are exposed to various return and reintegration problems, which are not further described in the study. Morano-Foadi (2005) concludes her research saying 'returnees are not welcomed back' (Morano-Foadi 2005: 156).

To sum up, from previous research we know that highly-skilled emigrants leave Austria to gain new qualifications and skills and to boost their career. Most of them are very satisfied with their stay abroad and considerable shares of them do not hold any professional contact with other researchers in Austria. The return potential among Austrian emigrants is fairly small- the majority fears problems on the Austrian labour market when coming back. If they return, main reasons for repatriation are family reasons, financial reasons or bureaucratic issues.

4.2.3 Return Migration in GERMANY - National Report

As Germany is a declared immigration country, most research on migration addresses the aspect of immigration. In 2010, 789,000 immigrants entered the country. Immigrants mainly came from Poland (126,000), Romania (75,000), Bulgaria (39,000), Hungary, Turkey and the U.S. (each 30,000) (data, Statistisches Bundesamt Wiesbaden). But Germany is not only an immigration country; a considerable number of German citizens also leave the country. In 2010, 141,000 nationals left Germany. The most popular destination countries for German citizens were Switzerland (22,000), the U.S. (13,000) and Austria (11,000).

Statistical analysis by Übelmesser (2006) and Erlinghagen (2009) point out that German emigrants are a positively selected group with respect to age and education compared to non-mobile Germans. More than half of German emigrants, aged 25-64, have a tertiary degree - but only one quarter of the German non-mobile population has obtained academic credentials (Ette/Sauer 2010). In addition, Sauer/Ette (2007: 73) found that German emigrants are not only 'male, single and young' but also 'older, married and wealthy', as there exists a fairly large retirement emigration from Germany. In general, international migration of German nationals occurs mainly in Western Germany, regardless of which type of migration.

Liebau/Schupp (2010) show in their research based on data of the Socio-Economic Panel 2009, that every eighth German national thinks about going abroad and every eleventh German national thinks about leaving Germany within the next twelve months (Liebau/Schupp 2010: 2).

Heimer/Pfeiffer (2007) conducted a quantitative on-line survey of German emigrants, who are between 20 and 65 years of age. Based on the results of cluster analysis, the researchers could identify the following five main motives for emigration.

1 - The biggest cluster contained skilled Germans who emigrated because they wanted to increase their life quality. Intentions to return are rather low in this group. 61% of the interviewees could not think of returning to Germany within the next years (Heimer/Pfeiffer 2007: 31).

2 - The second cluster is made up of German academics whose main motives for emigration were unsatisfactory income and employment perspectives in Germany. Return motivation is very high within this group; more than half of those interviewees state that they will return in the upcoming years (Heimer/Pfeiffer 2007: 32).

3 - The third largest cluster contained young academics who emigrated because they were looking for new experiences and challenges. A return to Germany is very likely within the next years (Heimer/Pfeiffer 2007: 32).

4- Cluster four is made up of highly-skilled, established professionals, who emigrated because they were looking for new perspectives. Two-thirds state they intend to return to Germany in the upcoming years. (Heimer/Pfeiffer 2007: 32).

5 - The last cluster contained family-oriented skilled workers. Their main motive for emigration was the improvement of family- and friendship relations abroad. Occupational reasons have taken a back seat. In this group, the motivation to return to Germany is very low. (Heimer/Pfeiffer 2007: 33).

Liebau/Schupp (2010) also studied main motives for emigration and found that already collected experiences from a stay abroad, social ties abroad and unsatisfactory financial conditions (Liebau/Schupp 2010: 2,5) in the home country caused Germans to move away.

According to Ette/Sauer (2010) the share of highly-skilled Germans emigrating has strongly increased in the last two decades. This fact has raised the question among scholars of whether Germany is experiencing brain drain. For example Holzner et al. (2009) and Brückner (2010) state that the rather low- and medium skilled immigrant flows to Germany cannot compensate for the high outflows of highly-skilled nationals. At the moment, current research shows, that this fear proves to be unfounded.

- First, attitude and actual behavior do not go hand in hand to a strong degree. Only 4% of Germans, who stated that they want to go abroad in 1998, actually went abroad until 2009 (Liebau/Schupp 2010: 7).
- Second, the emigration of Germans is in the majority of cases not permanent. About 68% of German emigrants return after their stay abroad (Liebau/Schupp 2010: 3, estimation for the year 2008).

According to official data, 115,000 Germans (including 3,360 ethnic Germans - *Spätaussiedler*) returned in 2009 (data, Statistisches Bundesamt Wiesbaden).

Findings by Heimer/Pfeiffer (2007) also support the high return potential among Germans living abroad. Results from an online-survey of high-skilled German emigrants shows, that more than two-thirds of the academic respondents working in science and research state that they have already organized their return home. According to Enders/Bornmann (2002), German emigrants spend around 3 to 5 years abroad until they decide to return.

Interestingly, people in dependent employment are more prone to return than self-employed respondents.

With respect to main motives for a return migration, the authors highlight private reasons (social ties to family and friends), occupational- and income specific aspects (unfulfilled occupational expectations), personal well-being and homesickness. Only a very small number of interviewees stated that they could not afford a living in the destination country. (Heimer/Pfeiffer 2007: 41, 44).

According to research by Ette/Sauer (2010) and Liebau/Schupp (2010) based on representative SOEP data, German returnees are a highly-selected population. Liebau/Schupp (2010) show for example, that the higher the educational credentials a German emigrant possesses, the more this person opts for a temporary rather than permanent migration. This finding is validated by research of Ette/Sauer (2010) who found that the share of highly-educated people is even higher among German returnees than among German emigrants. This means that the most skilled people return to Germany. Interestingly, in term of high-skilled occupations, true differences exist: the share of scientists among German returnees equals that of German emigrants, but the share of executives and senior management is significantly lower among German returnees than among German emigrants.

Nevertheless, to conclude, findings point on average more into the direction of brain circulation than brain drain. Although many highly-skilled Germans decide to emigrate, most of them return after several years. On the long run, Germany might even benefit from this brain circulation taking place.

4.2.4 Return Migration in HUNGARY - National Report

According to recent Hungarian Statistics, Hungary is experiencing a significant share of skilled emigration. About 13% of skilled migrants from Hungary are residing in another OECD country in 2000 (Szemely/Csanady 2010: 32). The traditional migration destinations are Austria and Germany - skilled and semi-skilled Hungarian workers come to those countries. More recently, qualified Hungarians migrate also to new destinations, e.g. UK and other EU 15 countries, where they often take jobs for which they are overqualified (see Hars 2010). Research for the period of 2008-2009 shows that 3/4 of all Hungarian emigrants are men (Hars 2010: 3). Previous research also proved the circular character of Hungarian emigration; most emigrants from Hungary prefer several shorter periods of labour migration in the destination country (Hars 2010: 3).

Hungary is experiencing a significant share of return migration as well. These return migrants are either motivated by their desire to retire in their home country or they want to make use of new opportunities accorded by Hungary's transition to a market economy (Co et al. 2000). Return migration is the strongest from the new destination countries (Hars 2010: 8).

The share of Hungarian returnees increased during the crisis, while emigration was increasing as well (Hars 2010:5). According to HU LFS Data, 'the most successful returnees seem to be those who had non-manual jobs abroad. They hardly experience a period without work following employment abroad. Returnees with lower education are more likely without a job; but in the period of the crisis the difference became smaller' (Hars 2010: 6, 7).

Martin/Radu (2011) compared Hungarian returnees with non-migrants with respect to observable characteristics such as education and age using the Labour Force Survey 2002-2007. They show that at the time of return, returnees are younger and better educated than non-migrants. In addition, returnees are more likely not to participate in the labour market or to switch into self-employment than non-migrants (Martin/Radu 2011: 14). Potential explanations for this finding suggest that a lack of human and social capital on the local labour market may be responsible, or returnees may just search longer for a job and aim 'higher' than non-migrants due to their savings from abroad. Martin/Radu (2011) also show that returnees receive significant income premia both from self-employment and from dependent employment (Martin/Radu 2011: 14).

Research by Co et al. (2000) on return migration in Hungary shows rather different results. They use data from the Hungarian Household Panel Survey (1993 and 1994) and come up with a sample of 3145 people in working age, out of which 167 were returnees (Co et al. 2000: 59). Using different econometric estimation techniques and controlling for self-selection into migration and return, they consistently find that there is no wage premium for male returnees; on the contrary, female returnees who have been to OECD countries earn a 67% premium over those who

have not been abroad (Co et al. 2000: 71). According to the authors this can be explained by the following two factors: 'First, there is a clear dichotomy in the types of industry men and women enter. The results suggest that the types of industries men enter (e.g. heavy industries and construction) do not offer any wage premium for foreign experience; while the industries women enter are exactly those industries where foreign experience matters (e.g. financial services). Second, say there is wage premium to having gone abroad, the insignificant abroad coefficient for men suggests that 'lost contact through having gone abroad may have resulted in lower wages' (Co et al. 2000: 71). Hence, the high income premia for women result from the skills acquired abroad which are valued in specific industries of the local labour market and the possible undergoing of wage cuts which experienced women who have not been abroad during the transition phase (see Co et al. 2000: 71).

In order to assess the return potential among migrants, Személyi/Csanády (2011) use a snowball-sampling approach to survey skilled Hungarians living and working outside their country of origin. To sum up the main results, the authors found that 'return is more likely if the respondent owns property in Hungary, emigrated no sooner than 5 years before taking the survey and does not work in the education/research sector' (Személyi/Csanády 2011: 44).

The main push factors responsible for leaving Hungary were income aspects, professional development/career opportunities and the overall political situation. 'Current emigrants are also pushed by the limited job market in Hungary for professionals in the natural and technical sciences, especially in R&D' (Személyi/Csanády 2011: 44).

Concerning their current situation, Hungarians are in general more satisfied with their job in the destination country than with their last job in Hungary (Személyi/Csanády 2011: 38).

'In their last job in Hungary they earned (corrected for an average yearly salary increase in Hungary since the year they left) typically between net 1.5 million and 3.5 million HUF (around \$9-20,000) per annum, while currently their salary is between 6 and 16 million HUF (around \$35-90,000). This means that they earn an average of 4 times the money they would earn if they had stayed' (Személyi/Csanády 2011: 39). Despite these income advantages, migrants only send to Hungarian family members a few percent of their current income (Személyi/Csanády 2011: 39).

With respect to contact to Hungarians the authors found that 'regardless of years spent abroad most of them (migrants) maintained at least 6 contacts. It is worthwhile to mention that half of them also often meet Hungarians in their current country of residence. Talking about other connections, one in six is a member of a Hungarian professional institution in Hungary and only 5% are members of a cultural one. If we compare it to such relations in the current country we find the ratios of 15% and 50%, respectively. It seems common in this group that professional relations to Hungarian institutions in the country of

residence and in the source country are equally important' (Személyi/Csanády 2011: 42).

Asked about their future plans '40% answered yes to the question of returning to Hungary, though one third of them only after 10 years. 30% were unsure, a further 30% said no' (Személyi/Csanády 2011: 39-40).

The authors of this study conclude that 'the results suggest that as long as the mentioned differences do not decrease significantly, return migration will be moderate. So will the emigration continue while these differences prevail.' (Személyi/Csanády 2011: 44)

4.2.5 Return Migration in ITALY - National Report

There is relatively little research on brain drain (Avveduto and Brandi 2004; Becker, Ichino and Peri 2004; Brandi and Cerbara 2004; Brandi and Segnana 2008) and return migration (Monteleone and Torrasi 2010; Biondo and Monteleone 2010) in Italy.

According to Migration Statistics by Eurostat (2003), Italy received 440,301 immigrants in 2003, from which only 47,530 were nationals (returnees) and 392,771 were non-nationals (Herm, 2008: 9). The fact that a considerable number of highly-skilled Italians are leaving the country is well-established. Italy exports 30,000 researchers per year and only 3,000 researchers enter the country (The Chronicle, 2006). Migration statistics show that the profile of Italians emigrating has almost reversed. 'Initially, the subjects in question had low-level education (...) and today's emigrants are chiefly highly qualified workers' (Monteleone/Torrasi 2010: 18). If the flows of skilled Italians emigrating during the recent years is measured, one can see that 'the number of Italians returning to Italy from abroad minus the number of Italian graduates emigrating is always negative' (Monteleone/Torrasi 2010: 5); an interesting finding, showing that Italy's return migration is not consistent with migration trends for most European countries. Mayr and Peri (2008) as well as Dustmann and Weiss (2007) show in their research that people from richer countries (East Europe, Asia and Latin America) have a higher probability to migrate and to return home compared to people from poorer countries (e.g Africa) (see Biondo/Monteleone 2010: 2). This seems not to be valid for Italy.

In their research on Italian return migration, Monteleone and Torrasi (2010) deal with two research questions. First, they want to find out, whether the Italian brain drain can be considered temporary or permanent. Second, they want to estimate the emigration potential of highly-skilled Italians living in Italy.

Based on the results of their empirical online-survey (N=1,400), they conclude for the first research question that 'in Italy, the brain drain seems to be permanent: emigrants seem unwilling to return to their country of origin as they are attracted

by better conditions in the country of destination; over 70% of interviewees revealed a low propensity to return to Italy or none whatsoever' (Monteleone/Torrise 2010: 2). In addition, the researchers analyzed the profile of Italian researchers that emigrate from Italy: 'The researchers are young and well-qualified; they decided to emigrate to enhance their knowledge and work experience. The expectations of researchers abroad are not disappointed. Generally, the level of social and working satisfaction is very high. The interviewees stated that they had worked abroad for a long time, and that the longer they stay abroad the lower is their propensity to return to Italy. People who work in a foreign country are more satisfied with their jobs and have more incentive to increase their productivity as they live in an economic and social context which appreciates, both in terms of remuneration and academic recognition, the work they do' (Monteleone/Torrise 2010: 20).

To answer the second research question, Monteleone/Torrise (2010) carried out another online-survey with 4,700 Italian researchers, living in Italy. 'It emerges from the survey that if researchers do not emigrate in the first part of their life they are likely to stay in Italy forever: the longer an agent spends in Italy, the more difficult he/she will find it to leave in the future. The reason is fundamentally linked to family ties that are created at a later stage and after the start of employment' (Monteleone/Torrise 2010: 20).

Biondo and Monteleone (2010) address in their research the potential reasons for the low propensity of highly-skilled Italians to return and formulate key solutions for policy makers. According to the researchers, Italian brain drain experiences appear to be a consequence of a structured set of problems which engrave on the Italian scientific research (Biondo/Monteleone 2010: 5).

Based on previous research they sum up the following potential causes (see Biondo/Monteleone 2010: 2):

- scarce availability of research funds;
- either scarce or not meritocratic career opportunities;
- lack of adequate infrastructures;
- very low wage structure and therefore life-style limitations;
- environment not sufficiently stimulating.

In terms of solutions to the brain drain problem, Biondo and Monteleone (2010) highlight the need to build up a new incentive system for academic workers and a more stimulating environment to develop scientific excellence. In detail they suggest the following options:

'**First** of all a new framework in educational system can be desirable as students could enter faculties with more basic knowledge, leaving the academic sector the role for giving them applications and scientific attitudes, instead to strengthen

previous weak scholastic curricula. **Secondly**, enrolment procedures for academic careers may find new solutions to select more profitable work force.

Thirdly, research needs experience but also young force and enthusiasm. Therefore, the incentive to focus on the lowering of the average age for academic personnel is strong: usually the more experienced agents can cover leading roles, but the younger can hold more dynamic and well-paid positions.

Fourthly, the existence of a strong and well visible link between academic research and firms' innovation appears to be widely desirable. This could guarantee the existence of funds for research for technical sciences.

Last but not least, economic treatment of professors is a key note in all of this framework. Academic personnel is often made by people who severely dedicated their younger years to study. This individuals must find opportunities to gain what they deserve: chances to demonstrate their value before entering; chances to grow in their career after they find their job' (Biondo/Monteleone 2010: 6).

4.2.6 Return Migration in POLAND - National Report

Based on previous research, one can conclude that until now Poland has experienced already three phases of return migration. 'The first phase lasted till 1938, and involves traditional return migration, which were the result of mass economic emigration of Poles to the United States in 1919-1938 (Chałasiński 1936, Niemyska 1936, Walaszek, 1983). In the communist period (1945-1989) the migration system was dominated by emigration. Statistical data show that out of more than 3 million emigrants only 55,000 returned in the years 1961-1989, which is the second phase. Political and other emigrants that left Poland before 1990 and came back since then constitute the third and current phase of return migration' (Klagge/Klein-Hitpaß 2007: 8).

Poland has been a typical emigration country until 1989. Since then, its migration situation has changed, and Poland can nowadays be characterized as an emigration-immigration country (see Korys/Weinar 2005). Since the opening of the borders, large numbers of Poles and their foreign-born children (second generation of Poles) as well as immigrants from other Western and Eastern European countries entered. Especially interesting is here, that the number of highly-skilled immigrants is fairly large. Poland's accession to the European Union in 2004 was again a trigger for many Polish emigrants to return - but, in addition, also many especially young and well-educated Poles left Poland to live and work in England or Ireland (see Klagge/Klein-Hitpaß 2007: 8).

According to the Polish Population Census conducted in 2002, which provides detailed information on returning migrants, 69,700 Polish nationals, half of them female, have returned to Poland in the period 1989-2002.

According to the PPC, highly-skilled returnees mainly come from the U.S. (17.6%), Germany (15.9%), Great Britain (7.5%), France (5.7%) and Canada (4.9%). The majority of them are at age of economic activity - 90% of them are between 25-59

years old, less than 10% is at retirement age (data, see Klagge/Klein-Hitpaß 2007: 12).

Klagge and Klein-Hitpaß (2007) also highlight the high educational level of Polish returnees:

‘In comparison to the Polish population as well as to Polish emigrants, adult return migrants are relatively well educated. 27% of them hold the highest educational degree (university degree); while this percentage is as low as 14% in the adult Polish population and 10% among adult Polish emigrants (Central Statistical Office)’ (Klagge/Klein-Hitpaß 2007: 9).

Most of the highly-skilled returnees are employees. ‘Almost 90% of them work in the service sector and the vast majority represent professions such as high-ranking officials, managers and specialists. In comparison with other return migrants those with a university degree are strongly overrepresented in these positions, but have a lower level of self-employment’ (Klagge/Klein-Hitpaß 2007: 12). Only 13% are self-employed without employees and 9% employ other people (Klagge/Klein-Hitpaß 2007: 12). Interestingly, out of 69,700 returnees, 28% left Poland again before 2002. But the people who left were generally lower skilled than those returnees who decided to stay and live in Poland also after 2002 (see Klagge/Klein-Hitpaß 2007: 9).

Grabowska-Lusinska (2010) analysed the career patterns of returnees on the basis of an ethno-survey (N=406). The results show that approx. 8% of the returnees could enhance their career after return, but the majority of the respondents state that either nothing has changed in terms of their career path or that the experience of migration has even enhanced the fragmentation of their career (Grabowska-Lusinska 2010).

Budnik (2007), doing research on potential Polish emigrants, found that ‘the propensity to emigrate for unemployed people is significantly higher than the propensity to emigrate of employed or workers out of the labour market’ (Budnik 2007: 6). Her findings are validated by a report on the objective and subjective quality of life in Poland (Social Diagnosis 2005), which states that over 20% of unemployed were interested in working abroad. Budnik (2007) further analysed the situation of Polish returnees and found that ‘return migrants had around three times higher probability of finding a job after a return to the source country than unemployed or non-participants. If the return migrants were positively selected or they were able to accumulate a job relevant human capital abroad, an increase of emigration after 2004 might be seen as a factor reinforcing labour market activity foremost of those who would otherwise find it hard to enter employment’ (Budnik 2007: 14f).

Interestingly, research by Heffner/Soldra-Gwiżdż (1997) showed that returnees are rather heterogeneous in terms of their educational level according to their previous

place of residence. German return migrants with dual Polish-German citizenship 'were on average, less educated and did not have special qualifications before or after returning to Poland. Despite this fact, upon return many of them would start their own businesses. The main reason for their return is their failure in the receiving country related to economical and integration problems. They mostly return to places from which they left, what shows that they maintain strong ties with the sending region' (Klagge/Klein-Hitpaß 2007: 14). The authors argue that these results do not reflect the general situation of returnees in Poland.

Polish social scientists (Weinar 2002, Górný/Osipovic 2006) have conducted several qualitative interviews with Polish returnees. The most important finding from their research is that the main motivation to come back to Poland goes beyond economic reasons and the returnees' own economic well-being. Most of them state that they want to contribute actively to the economic, social and political development in Poland - thus making them potential innovation actors with respect to local and regional development (Klagge/ Klein-Hitpaß 2007: 13, 15).

The qualitative studies also revealed that the majority of the interviewed returnees intend to stay in Poland (Iglicka 2002). Of course, some returnees state that they were disappointed with the political and economic situation of the country and thus decided to emigrate again. 'In a study on return migration of second-generation British Poles, Górný and Osipovič (2006) showed (...) that at the beginning of the 1990s (many of them) took part in recreating the country's economy, thus realizing their ideological reason of return. After 1993, when a post-communist government began to rule and the situation on the labour market had started to deteriorate (increasing unemployment), they lost their faith in the possibility to support Poland's development' and thus went back to Britain (Klagge/Klein-Hitpaß 2007: 14).

4.2.7 Return Migration in SLOVENIA - National Report

Slovenia is neither primarily an emigration country nor does it have an emigration tradition like neighboring countries (e.g. Croatia). According to Horvath (2004), Slovenia experiences brain circulation, but not brain drain (see Horvath 2004: 87). In 2009, 27,400 foreigners immigrated to Slovenia. The vast majority were citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina (47%). A further 13% were from Kosovo, 11% from Macedonia and 11% from Serbia. Most immigration is temporary labour migration, in particular for construction (data, see SOPEMI 2010: 320).

In terms of emigration, data based on deregistration from registers shows that about 3,700 Slovene citizens emigrated from Slovenia in 2009, the majority to Germany (18%), Croatia (13%) and Austria (12%). This is a decline of about 22% vis-à-vis 2008. In particular, registered emigration to Germany has declined strongly (data, see SOPEMI 2010: 320).

The Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia (SORS) provides data on return migration. In 2010, 2,711 nationals entered Slovenia, 1,553 men and 1,158 women. 59% of male returnees and 53% of female returnees were in an economically active age (between 20-59 years) when they entered Slovenia (data, SORS 2010³).

With respect to educational qualifications, data shows that 31% of Slovenian returnees have obtained tertiary education, 53% possess upper secondary education and 16% basic or less education. In terms of occupations, 30% of Slovenian returnees work in a highly-skilled job (managers, scientists), 36% hold a medium-skilled job (technicians, service workers) and 33% work in elementary occupations (data, SORS 2010).

Compared to other ex-Yugoslavian countries, Slovenia has a strong economy and is on a good way towards a knowledge-based economy. Living standards and the socio-economic development of the country are relatively high, acting as ‘pull-factors’, which attract scientists and experts from poorer countries in the European Union (see Horvath 2004). With the words of Horvath (2004): ‘Brain circulation positively influences socio-economic development and contributes to the pluralistic and multicultural image of the country. Also, it aids the development of the technology required to maintain a competitive economic profile. In this comparative overview, Slovenia is an illustration of a country without brain drain, which corresponds strongly to its higher stage of development and consolidated democracy’ (Horvath 2004: 87).

Research by Scott (2002) shows that according to the available unofficial data around 2-3% of highly-educated Slovenians left the country in the last decade. This number is not worrying at all, as it is generally known that approximately the same number of foreign highly skilled people enter Slovenia. Edvard Kobal, Director of the Slovenian Scientific Foundation, confirmed the assumption that brain circulation is taking place in Slovenia. ‘Kobal states that the inflow of foreign students and highly skilled labour to Slovenia is almost equal to the emigration of highly skilled Slovenians. This situation is perceived as normal in the academic community’ (Horvath 2004: 89).

Results from a survey on Slovenian scientists show, that ‘push factors’ like a decent standard of living, which generally cause highly-skilled nationals to emigrate, are already achieved by most of Slovenian scientists. ‘The majority of the interviewees placed themselves slightly above the middle of the social ladder’ (Horvath 2004: 88). In addition, Slovenian scientists expressed an optimistic attitude when asked about their nearer future. Results of the survey also show that Slovenian respondents ‘had many more contacts with foreign countries than the respondents in the region on average; almost half of them were participating in joint projects with foreign countries, which implied that in the observed year on average 30% of them planned to go to the West and a much lower percentage to the East’ (Bevc 1996: 17, according to Horvath 2004: 88).

³http://pxweb.stat.si/pxweb/Database/Demographics/05_population/40_Migration/05_05N10_International/05_05N10_International.asp, 27th of June 2012

Based on the results of this survey, a very interesting finding could be achieved: when Slovenian respondents were asked about the motives which caused them to emigrate for some time, they generally referred to economic motives (Bevs 1996). This introduces a new aspect into the discussion on brain drain. 'While under conditions of brain drain science-based motives represent a reason to migrate, under conditions of brain circulation, when conditions for adequate scientific work are guaranteed, economic reasons prevail as the main criteria to emigrate' (Horvath 2004: 88).

Research on highly-skilled Slovenians, living abroad, shows that they are interested in returning to the research sphere of Slovenia's higher education system (Horvath 2004: 88). 'In addition to that, Slovenian scientists abroad cultivate the connections with their home country, especially with the institutions where they obtained their degrees. Some of them even work as consultants or researchers in Slovenia. Although there is still no available data to empirically confirm this correlation, one can assume that the participation of those scientists positively influences the country's development' (Horvath 2004: 89).

4.2.8 Return Migration in the SLOVAK REPUBLIC - National report (Jana Nóva)

Emigration from the Slovak Republic

According to the Labour Force Survey for the second quarter of 2010 the number of Slovak citizens working abroad reached 130,500 (Statistical Office 2010b: 87). Slovaks working abroad constitute 5.6 per cent of total employed persons in the Slovak Republic. Mostly young people (up to 34 years) go abroad, who finished their education and started their careers and professional skills development.

Research by Kešelova (2007) shows that among Slovak emigrants who have an idea of their length of stay abroad (62.6%), there is almost one fifth of people who are planning to stay abroad permanently; 46.7% want to stay abroad for more than one year. Most people emigrate from the Prešov region in the Slovak Republic. This region has been - for a long time - facing the highest unemployment rate in the country and shows a high concentration of Roma citizens.

Returnees in the Slovak Republic

In 2008, a new phenomenon occurred; Slovak nationals living abroad started to return home as many of them lost their jobs due to the global economic crisis in destination countries. Lots of Slovaks returned to the eastern part of the Slovak Republic, which has been facing high emigration in the previous years. But Slovaks also returned to the cross border regions (border to Hungary), which have always been affected by commuting migration.

It is estimated that currently, 1/3 of returned migrants are registered as unemployed at Employment Offices in the Slovak Republic. Data of the National Labour, Social Affairs and Family Office (ÚPSVAR) show that the majority of

unemployed returnees possess secondary or vocational education and about 6% possess tertiary educational degrees (see data in Annex 1). But formal qualifications of returnees differ strongly according to the country of destination. Slovaks returning from the Czech Republic and Hungary have in general lower educational qualifications than Slovaks returning from the UK. Returnees with lower qualifications show consequently more problems getting integrated into the local labour market than highly-skilled returnees.

Although return migration is a scarcely studied domain in the Slovak Republic, some research exists, exploring returnees' potentials and expectations. Williams/Baláž (2005) study three subsamples of Slovak nationals returning from the UK: professionals and managers, students and au pairs. The results of this research show that returnees from all three subsamples were able to enhance their competences, even the last group - the au-pairs, who were formally employed in low skilled, routine jobs (Williams/ Baláž 2005: 452). Further, almost one half of the returnees felt they had improved their job positions upon return. The highest positive proportion - 56 % was amongst students, but this partly reflects leaving formal education to enter employment. However, 48 percent of professionals considered they had improved their job positions since their return. Au pairs realized the least benefits in terms of enhanced jobs but, nevertheless, 34 percent claimed improvements. These findings lead to the critical question, asking for the extent to which these improvements were related to the migration experiences. Based on interviews this question was explored in relation to status and income effects. Half of the interviewees felt that they had improved their status or their income due to their stay in the United Kingdom. Even short term mobility has had the potential for all three types of migrants to realize economic benefits.

Research by Williams/Baláž (2005) also shows that a considerable number of returnees become self-employed: 9.3 percent of professionals, 10.9 percent of students and 6 percent of au-pairs established businesses upon returning from the UK. The entrepreneurs in all three subgroups stressed the importance of their visits to the UK in becoming self-employed. They highlighted that the output of staying abroad should not so much be seen in acquiring and transferring specific professional knowledge or skills, but in the broader experience of being abroad (Williams/Baláž 2005: 457). In terms of newly acquired competences and knowledge, all three groups of returned migrants stated that they had significantly improved their English language competence. The largest gains in foreign language competences were realized by au-pairs, reflecting the fact, that they had the lowest level of competence before going abroad and high rates of attendance in formal language courses. However, most interviewees considered they had improved their competences not through formal channels but through practice (Williams/Baláž 2005: 461).

Further, interviewees highly appreciated the benefits of improved self-confidence, learning new approaches to work, a greater ability to deal with new challenges and

acquiring new ideas. Some returnees highlighted the fact that they had gained a deeper understanding of the institutions and practices of Western European societies. The most valued were also things such as a total change of mind, ability to manage crises, ability to communicate and independence.

To sum up, Williams/Baláž (2005) show that foreign work experiences can have a positive impact on personal development and career opportunities. But when considering returnees' chances for the successful re-integration into the local labour market, crucial factors that have to be considered are local power structures, traditions and the institutional openness towards newly acquired knowledge.

These aspects are explored in another research undertaken by Williams/Baláž (2008) which focuses on the learning and knowledge transfer experiences of mobile doctors in the Slovak Republic. The theoretical basis of this research is Blackler's (2002) typology of knowledge (embrained, embodied, embedded, and encultured) and the main research question is whether internationally mobile doctors have the potential to learn and transfer distinctive knowledge, different to that available in the origin or the return setting. The majority of doctors interviewed were overwhelmingly positive (14 out of 19) about how international experiences had influenced their work after returning to the Slovak Republic. Regarding knowledge transfers to Slovakian colleagues after returning, the authors state that tacit-to-tacit transfers were most common, for example in seminars, or simply by talking to colleagues. Further, the authors highlight that there are differences in the degree to which organizations were open to external knowledge. Junior - and sometimes even senior colleagues - complained about the difficulties they had in introducing new ideas to systems characterized by strongly embedded knowledge and infused by centralized power structures. But generally, interviewees stated that knowledge transfers were possible, ranging from minor changes within existing systems to replacing whole systems.

The growing number of returnees in the Slovak Republic has gained the attention not only of public bodies but also of private initiatives, trying to facilitate the effective exploitation of returnees' human capital. One example is the project **SlovenskoCalling** (www.slovenskocalling.sk) which had been run from 2009 to 2011. Its main goal was to explore the return potential among Slovak nationals living and working abroad. In a survey conducted by SlovenskoCalling in 2010, 401 respondents participated (female: 53%; male: 47%). Almost two thirds of them were between 25 and 35 years of age and 60% had university education. 82% of respondents lived and worked in Europe, particularly in Ireland, England, Czech Republic, Austria and Germany - and 12% lived and worked in the USA. 54% of Slovaks living and working abroad wanted to return and the main reasons for returning were reasons related to family, friends and local relations.

4.3 Synthesis of national results

The Country Reports provide a very heterogeneous picture on project partner countries in terms of:

- the migration history (whether they are sending or receiving countries),
- the amount of migrants returning to their home countries, and
- the importance of return migration for the local labour market and the economic development.

Austria, Germany, Italy and the **Czech Republic** are declared immigration countries. Therefore, most research for these countries focuses on aspects of immigration and integration issues of immigrant groups. Although emigration of highly-skilled nationals takes place in Austria, Germany, Italy and the Czech Republic and research shows that these numbers tend to increase in the last years; outflows of nationals are not yet causing a dramatic decline in the number of tertiary educated workers in these countries. But, the exodus of nationals may result in short-term destabilization of certain economic sectors on regional level, where high-skilled nationals are hard to replace. For the year 2009, the share of returning nationals among the total number of immigrants entering these countries, ranges between 9% (Italy), 13% (Austria), 23% (Germany) and 29% (Czech Republic) (Eurostat 2009). According to national surveys, the return potential of highly-skilled nationals living abroad seems to be relatively high in the case of Germany and the Czech Republic. Most of their national emigrants intend to return within several years. The return potential among Austrian and Italian highly-skilled emigrants seems to be fairly low. Especially Italian scientists are unwilling to return, as they are attracted by better career opportunities and working conditions in the destination country.

Poland, Hungary and **Slovenia** became so-called emigration-immigration countries in the recent years. According to national research, Slovenia is not experiencing brain drain but brain circulation. Although many highly-skilled Slovenians leave the country for Germany and Austria, they can be replaced with the relatively large numbers of foreign students and highly skilled labour entering Slovenia. Because of Slovenia's comparatively strong economy in CEE and its progress towards a knowledge-based economy, living standards and the socio-economic development of the country are relatively high. These factors attract scientists and experts from poorer countries in the European Union (see Horvath 2004). The number of returning nationals among all immigrants was relatively low in 2009 (10%), but national research shows that more and more highly-skilled Slovenians living abroad are interested in returning to the research sphere of Slovenia's higher education system.

In contrast, **Poland** and **Hungary** experience significant outflows of skilled nationals. National research points out that especially since their accession to the European Union, these countries are suffering severely from brain drain. The

number of returnees is fairly small for Hungary (8% of all immigrants are nationals, 2009) and fairly large for Poland (75% of all immigrants are nationals, 2009). Both countries need high-skilled return migration to reverse the negative outcomes of brain drain and to foster economic development and increase international competitiveness. According to national studies, the return potential among Polish nationals and Hungarian nationals living abroad is considerably large. In the case of Poland, a lot of them want to return to contribute actively to the economic, social and political development of the country. Hungarian nationals living abroad are more attracted by new opportunities accorded by Hungary's transition to a market economy. This return potential has to be successfully used by these countries to ensure sustainable economic prosperity in the long run.

Further, national research is reviewed, which focuses on *motives* of returning migrants, their *resource mobilisation* and their *preparedness to return*. These factors are, according to Cassarino (2004), important for a returnee to become an actor of change and to be able to impact on the development of the origin-country. Subsequently, main findings are summarised.

In line with economic approaches to return migration (reviewed in the Chapter 'International Theories of Return Migration') income aspects, professional development and career opportunities are the main push-factors which motivate CE nationals to emigrate (see Szemely/Csanady 2011 for Hungary; Bevs 1996 for Slovenia; Monteleone/Torrise 2010 for Italy; Biondo/Monteleone 2010 for Italy; Heimer/Pfeiffer 2007 for Germany; Liebau/Schupp 2010 for Germany; Vavrečková 2009 for the Czech Republic and Breinbauer 2008 for Austria). In addition, national research from Italy shows that after economic motives, difficulties in accessing research funds and a lack of adequate infrastructures are important push-factors for researchers (see Monteleone/Torrise 2010). Further, research for Germany states that increased life-quality, looking for new experiences and challenges, looking for new perspectives and family-orientation (Heimer/Pfeiffer 2007) as well as already gained experiences from an earlier stay abroad and social ties abroad (Liebau/Schupp 2010: 2,5) can be potential push-factors of great importance. Thus, according to national research, highly-skilled nationals in CE emigrate mainly but not always because of economic and science-based reasons; if economic reasons are not important, increased life-quality, better infrastructure and the experience of new challenges play a great role.

According to literature on return migration, highly-skilled returnees, which stayed several years abroad and have mobilized a lot of resources, have the greatest chances to succeed as actors of change in the origin country.

The national 'Reports on Return Migration' show that CE returnees are positively selected with respect to *age*. Returnees tend to be younger compared to non-migrants and migrants staying abroad (see Klagge und Klein-Hitpaß 2007 for Poland; Martin/Radu 2011 for Poland and Hungary; and data provided by SORS 2010 for Slovenia). The fact that most returnees in CE are in an economically active age is of great relevance for home country labour markets. Returnees are old enough to

have mobilised various resources, but they are still young enough to pursue their goals and use their capital to foster knowledge-based development in the origin country.

Further, CE returnees seem to be positively selected with respect to **education**. National survey data in CE countries shows, that the share of highly-educated people is higher among returnees than among stayers (see Klagge und Klein-Hitpaß 2007 for Poland; Martin/Radu 2011 for Poland and Hungary; data provided by SORS 2010 for Slovenia; Ette/Sauer 2010 for Germany). This means that returnees upgrade their skills by studying at the university or learning on the job in countries with higher technological development, and subsequently bring human capital to their source country. Thus, a lot of CE returnees possess the potential to adding to knowledge diffusion and the catching-up of the economy of the origin country.

A review of the seven country reports also showed, that CE migrants cultivate the **connections** with their home country when they are abroad, especially scientist, with the institutions where they obtained their degrees (see Horvath 2004 for Slovenia; Szemely/Csanady 2011 for Hungary and Breinbauer 2008 for Austria). This means that CE returnees fulfil another pre-requisite, which is important for successfully impacting on the economy of the origin country: they are linked with members of their origin society. This is a very valuable asset, as it informs people about post-return conditions in the origin country and facilitates the re-integration process upon return.

So far, the synthesis has shown that in general, CE returnees fare very well with respect to resource mobilisation. They are comparatively young, well-educated and have maintained links to their origin countries. Now the question is, whether their mobilisation of resources pays off in the origin country. Main findings from national research, presented in the seven 'Country Reports on Return Migration', show a differentiated picture.

First, Martin/Radu (2011) found that returnees from Hungary and Poland have a higher probability not to actively **participate on the local labour market**. Further, Hars (2010) differs according to educational qualifications and states for Hungarian returnees, that the most successful are those who had non-manual jobs abroad. They hardly experience a period without work following employment abroad. Returnees with lower education are more likely without a job (Hars 2010: 6, 7).

Possible explanations for these findings are:

- Returnees have a lack of important social ties and networks in the origin country which may result in difficulties entering the home country labour market,
- returnees can afford to search longer for a job due to savings from higher earnings abroad,
- returnees may search longer due to the fact that they are more self-confident and aim 'higher' in terms of income and career opportunities,
- foreign work experience is not valuable on the home country labour market,

- employers are unsure about how to evaluate foreign experiences, or
- employers in the home country may take foreign work experiences as a signal of being unsuccessful in the local labour market.

Based on the available data it is not possible to decide which explanation is empirically correct.

Second, research provides mixed evidence with respect to **higher income and earnings** of returnees than stayers. On the one hand, Martin/Radu (2011) show for Poland and Hungary, that returnees receive significant income premia both from self-employment and from dependent employment. On the other hand, Co et al. (2000) find that there is no wage premium for male returnees in Hungary. But female returnees earn a 67% premium over female stayers. The authors explain this finding by arguing that the high income premia for women result from the skills acquired abroad which are valued in specific industries of the local labour market and the possible undergoing of wage cuts which experienced women who have not been abroad during the transition phase (see Co et al. 2000: 71).

Third, country-specific survey data provides again mixed evidence with respect to the enhancement of **career opportunities** upon return. Vavrečková (2009) conducted a study in the Czech Republic and found that after returning home most of the respondents (tertiary-educated) managed to make use of the experiences they gained abroad. They state that their time abroad positively affected their work career. On the contrary, research by Grabowska-Lusinska (2010) for Poland shows that only 8% of the returnees could enhance their career after return, but the majority of the respondents state that either nothing has changed in terms of their career path or that the experience of migration has even enhanced the fragmentation of their career.

Last, national surveys report mixed findings concerning the tendency of returnees to start their own **businesses**. Martin/Radu (2011) found for Hungary and Poland that returnees are more likely to be self-employed than non-migrants. Different evidence is obtained by Klagge/Klein-Hitpaß (2007) for Poland who report that highly-skilled returnees are mainly employees, but less-skilled returnees are more likely to start their own business.


In conclusion, the synthesis of national results of the Country Reports has shown that CE returnees are a positively selected group with respect to age and education. In addition, CE returnees tend to maintain professional links with their home country during the migration phase, which may facilitate the re-integration process upon return. Further, national results show mixed findings concerning the labour market integration and the labour market outcomes of returnees. Whereas some studies point out that returnees receive significant income premia upon return, others cannot support this finding and even show that the experience of migration may enhance the fragmentation of the career path. Last, research points into the direction that returnees more often switch into self-employment than non-migrants, but this finding is not supported by all research done in the CE region.

4.4 Who comes back? Data Analysis of return migration based on Eurostat and LFS-Data⁴

1. Is return important for Central Europe?

In the chart below, the share of nationals among immigrants is visualized. Immigration by nationals includes both returning migrants and citizens born abroad, who are immigrating for the first time. For the year 2009, the share of nationals returning is highest in Poland (75% - data refer to 2008), followed by the Czech Republic (29%) and Germany (23%). For all other countries, the share of nationals immigrating is fairly small.

Chart 2: Share of nationals among immigrants, 2009



Source: Eurostat, 2009

Table 2: Immigration by citizenship, 2009, absolute numbers

Country	Nationals among immigrants
Austria	9,500
Czech Republic	21,700
Germany	79,200
Hungary	2,300
Italy	36,200
Poland	35,900
Slovenia	2,900

Source: Eurostat, 2009

⁴ The results and conclusions are those of the authors and not those of EUROSTAT or the European Commission.

2. Who are the returnees?


Using the Labour Force Survey it is possible to identify recent return migrants using the retrospective information on the country of residence one year before the survey and the country of birth. For the years 2005-2008, the sample contained the following numbers of returnees and stayers. In Slovenia only 16 returning migrants could be identified, therefore this country was excluded from the analysis.

Table 3: Sample of recent returnees in the LFS 2005-2008⁵

Country	returnees	stayers
Austria	558	792,597
Czech Republic	758	986,766
Germany	272	612,979
Hungary	206	1,211,180
Italy	549	2,704,464
Poland	674	810,029
Slovenia	16	258,233
Slovak Republic	162	446,791

Source: Own calculations, LFS 2005-2008

Chart 3: Returnees and Stayers according to age groups, LFS 2005-2008




Source: own calculations, weighted data, LFS 2005-2008

Chart 3 shows that returnees are positively selected with respect to age. Returnees are consistently younger than stayers in all project partner countries.

⁵ The results and conclusions are those of the authors and not those of EUROSTAT or the European Commission.

Chart 4: Returnees according to gender (%), LFS 2005-2008




Source: own calculations, weighted data, LFS 2005-2008

Chart 4 shows that the number of male returnees roughly equals the number of female returnees. This is true for the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary and Italy. In Austria, almost 60% of the returnees are female and in Poland almost 60% of the returnees are male.

3.) Is Return Brain Gain?

Chart 5: Returnees (aged between 17-62) according to educational attainment, LFS 2005-2008




Source: own calculations, weighted data, LFS 2005-2008

Chart 5 provides evidence that recent returnees are relatively well educated in all project partner countries. Especially Hungary and Germany receive a large number of tertiary-educated returnees. The percentage-point-difference between highly-skilled returnees and highly-skilled stayers ranges from 8% in Poland to 28% in Hungary (other countries: 11% difference in Austria, 13% difference in Italy and the Czech Republic, 14% difference in Germany). 43% of recent Hungarian returnees and 34% of recent German returnees hold a tertiary degree, while the percentage is 15% for Hungarian stayers and 20% for German stayers. Compared to the other countries, Italy receives the highest amount of low-skilled returnees (45%), nevertheless this percentage is lower than the amount of low-skilled among Italian stayers (49%).

4.) Has the labour market re-integration been successfully?


Chart 6: Returnees (aged between 17-62) and their labour market status, LFS 2005-2008



Source: own calculations, weighted data, LFS 2005-2008

Returnees aged between 17 and 62 are more often unemployed than stayers. This is an established finding for all project partner countries except Hungary; in the Hungarian sample, no unemployed returnees could be identified. The share of unemployed returnees is largest in Poland with 21%. Only 8% of Polish stayers are unemployed respectively. With respect to the share of inactive people in economically active age the findings show that in Austria, Germany and Italy returnees show higher shares of inactive people than stayers. For the Czech Republic, Hungary; the Slovak Republic and Poland the opposite is true.


Chart 7: Returnees (aged between 17-62) and their occupations, LFS 2005-2008



Source: own calculations, weighted data, LFS 2005-2008

In terms of labour market success, main findings show that the share of managers and professionals is higher among returnees than stayers. This is true for Austria, Germany, Hungary and Italy. For the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic and Poland the reverse is true. Interestingly, the share of people holding elementary occupations is larger among Czech returnees and Italian returnees compared to national stayers.

Chart 8: Returnees (aged between 17-62) according to sectors of employment, LFS 2005-2008




Source: own calculations, weighted data, LFS 2005-2008

Chart 8 shows for all countries, that the majority of recent returnees are employed in the service sector. In all countries, except Italy and Poland, the share of returnees employed in the service sector is larger than the respective percentage of national stayers.

5.) Where do returnees live?

Chart 9: Returnees (aged between 17-62) according to the area of residence, LFS 2005-2008



Source: own calculations, weighted data, LFS 2005-2008

Chart 9 provides evidence that recent returnees mainly live in densely populated areas in Austria, Germany, Hungary, Italy and Poland. The share of returnees who live in thinly populated areas is significantly below the respective percentage of national stayers. This is not true for the Czech Republic. Most return migrants in the Czech Republic live in thinly populated areas.

5. Return Migration - The Regional Perspective

The possibilities returning migrants offer for regional development was analysed for eight case study regions from Central Europe in Czech Republic, Germany (2), Hungary, Italy, Poland (2), and Slovenia. This chapter analyses general and specific features of the case study regions based on reports carried out by the local Re-Turn project partners. The possibilities the case study regions offer for returning migrants and the strength they manage to get out from the additional labour force available will be assessed within the framework of New Endogenous Growth Theory.

Box 1: New Endogenous Growth Theory

In contrast to more traditional concepts New Endogenous Growth Theory underlines the importance of internal factors for development. Factors are not externally given but a consequence of actions from within the region. This implies that investments in research, education and information transfer and especially coordinated measures across different political fields can change development possibilities. This has high implications for assessing the contribution of education and skills up-grading but also for the way collaboration and networking of institutions and individuals are taken into account in development strategies (see also box 3).

5.1 Returning migrants and regional development: Theoretical concept

Migration changes the pattern of labour market supply of a region. For a receiving region this means a plus in quantitative terms, and depending on the qualification of migrants, also in the skills profile available. Depending on the economic situation, this can lead to an increase in economic growth due to better availability of labour, or to downwards pressure on wages in unfavourable conditions for certain sectors of the economy.

For the regions, where migrants come from, the effects will likely be opposite, but they can also show adverse characteristics. A shortage of labour will typically slow down economic growth perspectives, especially if emigration leads to a brain drain and to an aging of the work force (both effects are typical). In some situations though, excessive labour supply can be reduced by emigration, i.e. when major structural changes in agriculture lead to high unemployment of people formerly employed in farming industry. The pressure on the labour market can thus be weakened by international mobility.

Considering the effects of returning migrants a basic assumption can therefore be that results will be positive:

- a) if there is demand for labour; and more specifically, demand for the specific skills, returning migrants add to the regional spectrum already available; and
- b) if they can link into the labour market easily.

Box 2: Labour market imperfections

Labour markets are characterised by a number of imperfect elements setting limits to its functioning as a 'market place'. Imperfect information is one, referring to both the entrepreneurial side not knowing about the available qualifications of individuals searching for work, and to job seekers who do not know which vacancies are and, perhaps even more important, will be available in the future. This leads us to the next characteristic: time. It is more important for the labour market than for any other to take into account the time span it takes to change qualifications and the limits this can cause for supply, with negative effects on production possibilities of companies. Professional mobility will often be limited, and more so than geographical mobility due to free movement of labour regulation between (most) EU countries.

Other limits usually stated with reference to the labour market are wage bargaining agreements restricting downwards flexibility of the price of labour, and discrimination of certain groups or attitudes because of real or assumed social criteria.

It is important to identify the state of the labour market to find out how to act.

Structural unemployment refers to the difference between the features required to obtain a job and the individual's qualification (both in a narrow and wider sense), while **frictional unemployment** relates to the time span needed to find appropriate work. Important for our considerations is also the concept of **demand deficient unemployment**, describing situations when companies just do not offer a sufficient number of jobs to empty the market, which is usually due to weak overall economic situations. The contrary is **supply deficient limitations to growth** due to labour shortages.

In some of the case study regions the exodus of preliminary young, skilled workers has led to a shortage on the labour supply, thus hindering economic development (limiting also possibilities for a future oriented economic restructuring). The return of these qualifications, partly up-skilled due to international experience, should enhance development perspectives. For this to take place will require that returning migrants settle in places where they are needed, and that their skills are being recognised and made known to companies. The latter links to the importance of social capital, arguing that knowledge about job opportunities is being primarily spread through private networks and contacts. It is therefore crucial if returning migrants can link into their old networks quickly. In addition formal institutions like employment services and regional enterprise centres should screen their qualifications and skills and provide specific support to make best use of the potential they offer.

Box 3: Social Capital

The notion of social capital refers to the value of social relations individuals possess and the role of cooperation and confidence to get collective or economic results. The position and possibilities in society are not only defined by one's capital endowments, education and skills level, but also by contacts and the networks people are bound or linked to. Social networks are needed to find job opportunities and move up career paths, as well as for starting business and attracting customers. The most effective labour market search strategy still relates to social information channels. Economic activity is based on collaboration which is in itself dependent on confidence and trust. For development to be successful depends on the 'extent to which ways and means can be found to forge mutually beneficial and accountable ties between different agents and agencies of expertise' (Woolcock, 2001). In poor communities, social capital is often the decisive factor to reach certain results, thus compensating for other, missing elements.

To describe an optimal situation this would mean that returning migrants settle in a place where they can build on their social capital and where their skills are recognised and meet the demand expressed by companies. Effects will be reduced when this fails to take place, and can even turn negative when the returning migrants increase the unemployment rate as their qualifications and skills are not asked for.

As a starting point it is therefore necessary to obtain a clear picture of the economic situation of the case study regions and especially of labour market shortcomings. Generally speaking, the eight case study regions are rather different in this respect. Several regions face labour shortages and would need additional skills, others are already facing high unemployment and the open question is what kinds of jobs returning migrants should take.

5.2 Regional economic and labour market profile

The economic and labour market profile of the region is the underlying factor defining the perspectives of returning migrants to enter the job market and the influence this might have for future development.

Participation rates: There is no unanimous picture of participation rates for participating regions, though most are characterised by comparatively low participation and corresponding high unemployment rates, which makes the general conditions on the labour market less favourable. Data show participation rates between 50 and 55% for the main working age group in the two Polish case study regions (25-44 years) and in Harz region (25-49 years) respectively. The overall volume of employment does not indicate a need for migration backflows. Also migration from other areas (as a possible indicator for labour market demand) is small. In Swietokrzyskie region there has been a major outflow of human capital with more than 106,000 people leaving the region from 2006-2011, not matched by inflow at all (close to 400).

This is a clear indication that returning migrants will not find employment automatically, even though their skills level might help them to compete successfully for some jobs.

Low wages: One of the most important factors hindering the case study regions in attracting especially skilled workers are low wages, compared with not only international but also national competing regions. For returning migrants this could mean that jobs offered will be paid far beyond what they would get in other countries, with the open question to what extent cheaper living costs will offset the difference. Podravska region in Slovenia can be taken as an example for this situation, where the average income is 15% lower than national average, and a little bit more than half of the neighbouring Austrian province of Styria.

Qualification levels: Some of the regions show rather good qualification levels as compared to the economic structure. For both German case study regions, data shows only 5% (Görlitz) and 8.5% (Harz), respectively, with low education and the same is documented for Central Transdanubia (HU) with 8,1%. Also Podravska (SI) is performing well in educational terms with only app. 13% at ISCED 1 or 2. On the other end there are Ossola (IT) with 60%, both Ústecký kraj (CZ) and Swietokrzyskie (PL) with 54% and Lodz (PL) with 47%. As low qualification levels are usually considered as a hindering factor for attracting business from abroad in central EU, returning migrants could prove to upgrade the economic profile of these regions. Interesting is the case of Usti (CZ): The traditional industrial structure, mainly related to coal mining, led to a development where many companies are not searching for qualified, but rather for skilled workers with practical experience. This is reflected in the low average qualification level, but also in companies' search strategies. Again this could be positive for returning migrants, given that they will have better experience and different skills as compared to local people.

Aging: All regions are faced with an aging population and a decreasing young population; Podravska (SI) for example had to face a reduction in job entrants of 9% in only 5 years (aged 15-24; 2006-2011) and a substantial increase in both aged 45-65 (+5%) and aged 65+ (+11%). Other regions are confronted with a substantial reduction in the main working age 25-44 (Ossola (IT), Harz (DE), Görlitz (DE)). This should offer job opportunities for skilled people with experience filling emerging shortages in the coming years.

Economic and entrepreneurial structure: Employment by sector shows an oversized production sector for most regions (Central Transdanubia (HU) 59%, Ústecký (CZ) 49%, Harz (DE) and Ossola (IT) 32 %, Lodz (PL) 30%), and in some even an exorbitantly high primary sector: With a share of employment in the primary sector of 48% in Swietokrzyskie (PL), 40% in Görlitz (DE), and 20% in Lodz (PL) it is clear that major restructuring is still to come, even if mining and quarrying are taken into consideration as major employers.

For returning migrants this means that they will have to find jobs in the ‘old’ industries unless they start their own business. In combination with regional development strategies, though, their different skills level could be a driving force for supporting new companies in their development.

Location and regional infrastructure: The closeness to bigger cities and the linkage to international road networks are stated in all but one case (Ossola, IT) as positive factor supporting development perspectives. Landscape and cultural heritage are highlighted as positive factors in most reports, though some of the regions are characterised by old industrial structures (e.g. Görlitz (DE), Swietokrzyskie (PL), and Ústecký (CZ)). This goes in line with emphasizing housing possibilities at reasonable prices in proximity of more attractive work places (with the exception again of Ossola), and could be a positive factor for company settlement. On the contrary, the industrial past and present is highlighted as a key pull factor for attracting investment and people for the Central Transdanubian case study region (HU).

5.3 Perspectives for returning migrants

Following from the regional characteristics summarised above the following recommendations can be given as an intervention strategy both supporting returning migrants and making best use of the additional strength they add to the labour market profile of the respective regions.

The regions are characterised by a very traditional pattern of economic activity, comparatively low employment and corresponding high unemployment rates, and low wage levels. All this does not create a favourable climate for additional people looking for work. Given the international experience and the different skills profile of returning workers, this might be a perfect input for these regions to change their economic profile. Companies, who want to restructure, and enterprises newly attracted to the region because of proximity to cities and international transport infrastructure could be interested in better skilled personnel, and returning migrants’ profiles could therefore form part of an investment attracting strategy.

This would require active comprehension of returning migrants in such a strategy, by screening their profiles and marketing it. This would help them not only to obtain a job, but also to obtain one in a more future oriented company.

Self-employment is definitely another option in the case study regions. As they all lack entrepreneurs (and entrepreneurial spirit), the absence of jobs matching the qualifications of returning migrants could lead them to try to start their own business, thus making best use of the knowledge they gathered. This could definitely be a major impulse to the local economy. To be successful, this would nonetheless require support in business start-up and financing, and perhaps also in specific entrepreneurial qualifications.

There are many regions in the EU facing problems similar to the ones outlined in the case study reports. Most of them rely on regional export oriented economic activities (including tourism), which means that they try to produce something which they sell to the wider economy. For some of these regions, their specific

geographic location in close proximity to other, much more dynamic regions might open some chances if economic activities focus on serving these areas. Returning migrants could constitute an important asset for such a strategy with their experience in international settings.

For other regions, the possibility to participate on international level on equal terms will be out of reach in spite of all the investment coming from EU and national resources, at least for the coming years. It would be more appropriate to pay some attention to perspectives for endogenous development, in the sense of identifying (typically small) local niches for small companies and single entrepreneurs to serve mainly local needs. There are many examples on EU level that such local initiatives can create many thousand jobs, one by one, based on creativity, understanding and networking of local communities.

Considering the flexibility, experience and skills of returning migrants, they could support such a strategy by bringing in foreign know-how and combining it with local features. They could do this both being employed or self-employed.

6. Conclusion

The main focus of this comparative report was to present the current stage of knowledge concerning the situation of return migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Based on the reviewed literature, we can conclude, that the understanding of the phenomenon is still fragmentary, due to a lack of comparative international studies, difficulties in defining and measuring return migration and scarce data sources.

It is against this background that this report presents synthesized and comparative insights of return migration in Central and Eastern Europe and especially for the Project Partner Countries of the Re-Turn Project, which is funded by the Central Europe Programme.

In this report, data on the share of nationals returning to project partner countries are provided and show that return migration is not a marginal phenomenon. According to international data provided by Eurostat for 2009, the share of nationals among immigrants was 75% for Poland (data refer to 2008), 29% for the Czech Republic, 23% for Germany, 13% for Austria, 10% for Slovenia and 8% for Hungary and Italy.

The economic crisis in 2008, which hit many of the main destination countries (like UK, Ireland, Spain etc.) of CE migrants and the expanding transformation economies in Eastern Europe are factors which make return migration attractive for many CE workers. Return migrants in Central and Eastern Europe are a fast-growing group and given these circumstances, many scholars believe that their number will increase in the upcoming years.

This report provides a review of the current state of the literature on return migration for Central European countries. We present synthesized findings, mainly focusing on the following questions:

- Why do highly educated migrants return?
- Who are the returnees in the Central Europe in terms of socio-demographic and labour market characteristics?
- Can CE returnees become actors of change?

In this report, international economic and social theories of return migration were reviewed. Main findings show that in the light of structural theories, return migration is part of the whole migration project and often planned from the beginning. According to economic theories, main motives which cause people to return are of financial nature. Structural theories add that motives may vary over the lifecycle and are influenced by family objectives. In addition, network approaches highlight opportunities in the home country which may cause migrants to return. As migrants stay in touch with people from the origin country, they are able to inform themselves about current changes with respect to the home country's economy or political situation and may then decide to return or not. According to network approaches, these links are very valuable resources which facilitate the re-integration process upon return.

According to international migration theories, skilled return migrants can become actors of change and can stimulate knowledge-based development in the origin-country but this is dependent on institutional and regional factors as well as context conditions. Returnees have to prepare for their return by mobilizing resources (human capital, financial capital and social capital). Therefore they require conditions which are favourable enough to allow resources to be mobilised. Further, they need time. Migrants have to stay in the destination country sufficiently long to allow accumulating knowledge and absorbing certain experiences and values. Here, especially the membership in various networks is important to link return migrants' capital with local resources. Also existing traditional power relations and local values shape return outcomes and may impact on the behavior of returnees.

The synthesis of cross-country and national results has shown that Central European returnees are a positively selected group with respect to age and education. In addition, in terms of resource mobilisation, research shows that CE returnees tend to maintain professional links with their home country during the migration phase, which facilitates the re-integration process upon return. Further, national results show mixed findings concerning the labour market integration and the labour market outcomes of returnees. Whereas some studies point out that returnees receive significant income premia upon return, others cannot support this finding and even show that the experience of migration may enhance the fragmentation of the career path. Last, research points into the direction that returnees more often switch into self-employment than non-migrants, but this finding is not supported by all research done in the CE region.

The descriptive analysis of return migration based on LFS-Data 2005-2008 supports empirical findings from cross-country and national research. In our analysis, we find that recent returnees are consistently younger and better educated than stayers in all project partner countries. Especially Hungary and Germany receive a large number of tertiary-educated returnees. We also find that returnees in an economically active age are less often employed and more often unemployed than stayers. This is an established finding for all project partner countries except Hungary. These findings suggest that although returnees possess valuable human capital resources, they show a comparatively high tendency not to enter the local labor market. Whether this is because returnees lack important social ties and networks in the origin country, or because returnees can just afford to search longer for a job due to savings from higher earnings, or because foreign work experience is a signal of being unsuccessful on local labour markets for employers remains unclear.

Whether and to what extent returning migrants can help boosting regional development is to large extent dependent on the situation of the economy and labour market they re-enter. Data from the eight case study regions indicates that the regions are predominantly characterised by a traditional economy and an oversupply on the labour market with little chances of increased demand in the near future. This offers only limited employment perspectives for returning migrants even though their skills and their experience and probably also their

formal education and vocational training will be higher than average giving them a competitive advantage. A factor in their favour though is the aging of most of the regions, which should generally shorten the current excess labour supply.

Based on key findings from the report, the following main policy implications for the Central European region can be formulated:

1.) Attract high-skilled return migration

High-skilled return migration has the potential to positively impact on development in Central European Countries through the exchange of professional knowledge on methods, techniques and standards. Central European Countries should encourage the return of their skilled nationals by applying different return policies (see SOPEMI 2008: 201f), e.g.:

- offering reintegration assistance
- offering access to special social services
- giving permission to earn premium interest rates or hold convertible foreign-currency accounts
- encouraging migrants to seek representation in institutional structures, or
- establishing systems of information and cultural outreach to expatriate communities

2.) Remove obstacles to return (see SOPEMI 2008: 192f)

According to the theoretical literature and empirical evidence, the intention of migrants to return to their home countries is largely influenced by institutional and context factors in the origin as well as in the destination country. The portability of social benefits and the right to come and go between the home and host country are important topics (see SOPEMI 2008: 192f) to be dealt with. According to international research, two factors play a considerable role in international mobility: access to the nationality of the host country and the acquisition of permanent residence status of the host country. According to the SOMPEMI-report (2008) naturalisation is a big topic, because ‘naturalised immigrants know that they can always come back to the host country to seek health care, for example, or if conditions in their home country deteriorate (e.g. political or economic instability)’ (SOPEMI 2008: 193). Second, only being allowed to reside in the host country for a specific amount of time risks that migrants ‘feel frozen’ in the destination country and react by avoiding mobility (SOPEMI 2008: 193).

3.) Create framework conditions that help returnees to realize their potential (SOPEMI 2008: 203f)

Initiating change and stimulating economic development is a highly difficult and complex task. How high-skilled return migrants can contribute to succeed in this task still needs to be explored. So far, main findings suggest, that origin countries should:

- deal with the topic of the recognition of qualifications and experience acquired abroad
- install effective migration programmes, which promote brain circulation, and
- engage high-skilled nationals in diasporas, through virtual or temporary return

These options promote the transfer of skills and technologies and facilitate the re-integration process of a returnee upon return.

4.) Formulate a regional development strategy based on a wider and better skills basis

The best chances and also the most effective use to be made of returning migrants lies in a pro-active regional development strategy supporting company settlement, self-employment and regional restructuring based on higher and international skill levels. Such a strategy could not only help the returnees themselves, but rather use their better and different qualification to support the regional economy, and thus increase overall economic prosperity and employment in the longer term.

7. Literature:

Al-Ali, N. and Koser, K., (eds.) (2002): *New Approaches to Migration? Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home*. London: Routledge.

Avveduto. S. and Brandi. M. C. (2004): *Le migrazioni qualificate in Italia*. Studi Emigrazione. vol. XLI. pp. 797-829.

Becker. S. O.. Ichino. A. and Peri. G. (2004): *How large is the “brain drain” from Italy?*. *Giornale degli Economisti e Annali di Economia*. vol. 63. pp. 1-32.

Bevc, M. (1996): *Potential external and internal brain drain - Slovenia, Final Report*, Institute for Economic Research, Ljubljana.

Biffi, G. (2006): *Small-Scale Study III: Conditions of entry and residence of third country highly-skilled workers in Austria*. IOM-Vienna.

Biondo, A. and Monteleone, S. (2010): *Return Migration in Italy: what do we know?* Working Paper nr. 2010/01. University of Catania- Department of Economics.

Blanchflower, D. G., J. Saleheen and C. Shadforth (2007): *The impact of the Recent Migration from Eastern Europe on the UK Economy*.
<http://www.bankofengland.co.uk/publications/speeches/2007/speech297.pdf>

Brandi M.C.. Cerbara L.. (2004): *I Ricercatori stranieri in Italia: fattori di push e pull*. Studi Emigrazione. anno XXXI . no. 156.

Brandi M.C.. Segnana M. L.. (2008): *Lavorare all'estero: fuga o investimento?*. in *Consorzio Interuniversitario Alma Laurea (ed.) X Indagine Alma Laurea sulla condizione occupazionale dei laureati*. Il Mulino

Breinbauer, A. (2008): *Mobilität österreichischer und ungarischer Mathematiker. Ein Beitrag zur Brain Drain-Debatte in einem kleinen Segment Hochqualifizierter*. Vienna University Press.

Brücker, H. (2010): *Deutschland leidet unter einem Brain Drain*. In: *Wirtschaftsdienst*, 3: 138-139.

Budnik, K. (2007): *Migration Flows and Labour market in Poland*. National Bank of Poland. Working Paper No. 44.

Byron, M. and Condon, S. (1996): A comparative study of Caribbean return migration from Britain and France: towards a context-dependent explanation. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS 21 (1): 91-104.

Cassarino, J. (2004): Theorising Return Migration. The Conceptual Approach to Return Migrants Revisited. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies (IJMS)*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 2004: 253 -27.

Cerase, F. (1974): Expectations and reality: a case study of return migration from the United States to Southern Italy. *International Migration Review* 8 (2): 245-62.

CENSIS (2002): Un capital intellettuale da valorizzare: indagine conoscitiva sul fenomeno della fuga dei cervelli all'estero. Roma. Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio Venezia.

Chałasiński, J. (1936): Emigracja jako zjawisko społeczne' (Emigration as a social phenomenon), *Przegląd Polonijny*, 4: 495-501.

Co, C.; Gang, I.; Yun, M. (2000): Returns to returning. *Journal of Population Economics* 13: 57-79.

Drbohlav, D. (2008): Teoretická analýza fenoménu brain drain, RILSA internal study.

Drbohlav, D.; Hárs, Á. and Grabowska-Lusińska (2009) : Experiencing immigration. Comparative analysis of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland. IDEA Working Papers No. 14. online: http://www.idea6fp.uw.edu.pl/pliki/WP14_Experiencing_immigration.pdf, 27th of June 2012

Dumont, C.; Spielvogel, G. (2008): Return Migration - a new perspective. SOPEMI Report 2008: 161-212.

Dustmann C. and Weiss Y. (2007): Return migration: Theory and Empirical evidence. CReAM. CDP No 02/07 London.

Eccles, R. G. and Nohria, J. 1992. *Networks and Organizations. Structure, Form, and Action*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Enders, J.; Bornmann, L. (2002): Internationale Mobilität bundesdeutscher Promovierter - Eine Sekundäranalyse der Kasseler Promoviertenstudie. In: *Mitteilungen aus der Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung* 35, 1: 60-73.

Erlinghagen, M. (2009): Deutschland ein Auswanderungsland? In: DIW Wochenbericht 39/2009: 663-669.

Ette, A.; Sauer, L. (2010): Auswanderung aus Deutschland. Daten und Analysen zur internationalen Migration deutscher Staatsbürger. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Eurostat 2009: Online Database. migr_imm1ctz 1998-2010, 2nd of July 2012

Fassmann, H. (2003): Transnational Mobility. Conception and case study. (Transnationale Mobilität. Konzeption und Fallbeispiel). In: "SWS Rundschau" (vol. 43) issue 4, p. 429-449.

Górny, A. and Osipovič, D. (2006): Return migration of second-generation British Poles. CMR Working Papers No 6/64, Warsaw: UW, (http://www.migracje.uw.edu.pl/obm/pix/006_64.pdf)

Grabowska-Lusinska, I. (2010): People on the move. Return Migration to Poland. Presentation on the European Job Mobility Day, Brussels, 16th Nov. 2010.

Hárs, A. (2010): Return Migration. The case of Hungary. Presentation at the European Job Mobility Day, Brussels, 16th Nov 2010.

Haunschmidt, M. (2003): Intents of return and stay of Turkish migrants in Austria (Rückkehr und Verbleibeabsichten türkischer MigrantInnen in Österreich), diploma thesis, University of Vienna.

Hazans, M. (2008): Post-enlargement return migrants' earnings premium: Evidence from Latvia. Online: http://www.eale.nl/Conference2008/Programme/PapersF/add73485_rqMnrIXBYn.pdf.

Heimer, A.; Pfeiffer, I. (2007): Gründe für die Auswanderung von Fach- und Führungskräften aus Wirtschaft und Wissenschaft I A 2 - 020815 -12.

Heffner, K. and Sotdra-Gwizdź, T. (1997): Migracje powrotne na Górny Śląsk z socjologicznej perspektywy (Return migration to Upper Silesia from a sociological perspective). CMR Working Papers Nr 9, Warsaw: UW (<http://www.migracje.uw.edu.pl/obm/pix/009.pdf>)

Herm, A. (2008): Recent migration trends: citizens of EU-27 Member States become ever more mobile while EU remains attractive to non-EU citizens. Population and social conditions. Eurostat. Statistics in focus 98/2008.

Hofbauer, S.; Unterwurzacher, A.; Schütz, B.; Reizenzein, D. (2006): Return Migration in Austria. Austrian contribution to the European Research Study Project III: „Return Migration in the EU Member States“.

Holzner, C. et al. (2009): Fiskalische Wirkungen der Auswanderung ausgewählter Berufsgruppen. In: Ifo-Schnelldienst 17/2009: 28-33.

Horvath, V. (2004): Brain Drain. Threat to Successful Transition in South East Europe? Southeast European Politics no.1: 76-93.

Hunger, U. (2004): Brain Gain. Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Data on a New Research Perspective in Development and Migration Theory. IMIS-Beiträge 24: 213-221.

Iara, A. (2008): Skill Diffusion by Temporary Migration? Returns to Western European Work Experience in Central and East European Countries. Wiiw Working Paper Nr. 46.

Iglicka, K. (ed) (2002): Migracje powrotne Polaków. Powroty sukcesu czy rozczarowania? (Poles' return migrations. Return of success or disappointment?). Warsaw: Institute of Public Affairs.

King, R., (ed.) (1986): Return Migration and Regional Economic Problems. London: Croom Helm.

Klagge, B. and Klein-Hitpaß, K. (2007): High-skilled return migration and knowledge-based economic development in regional perspective. Conceptual considerations and the example of Poland. Centre of Migration Research No. 19/77.

Klagge, B.; Klein-Hitpaß, K.; Fihel, A.; Kindler, M.; Matejko, E.; Okólski, M. 2007: High-skilled return migration and knowledge-based economic development in regional perspective. Conceptual considerations and the example of Poland. CMR Working Papers No. 19/77. online: http://pdc.ceu.hu/archive/00003367/01/high_skilled_return_migration.pdf

Koryś, P. and Weinar, A. (2005): Immigration as a Labour Market Strategy: Poland', in Niessen, J. and Schibel, Y. (ed) *Immigration as a Labour market strategy - European and North American Perspectives*. Migration Policy Group, Brussels, 1-31.

Lee, Everett S. (1966): A Theory of Migration. In: Demography, 5. Jahrgang, Nr. 1, 1966, S. 47-57; auch abgedruckt in J. A. Jackson (Hrsg.): Migration. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969, S. 282-297 (Sociological Studies, Bd. 2) - [ISBN 978-0-521-13568-9](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780521135689)

Liebau, E.; Schupp, J. (2010): Auswanderungsabsichten: Deutsche Akademiker zieht es ins Ausland - jedoch nur auf Zeit. In: DIW Wochenbericht 37/2010: 2-9.

Martin, R. And D. Radu (2011) Return Migration: The Experience of Eastern Europe, International Migration (forthcoming).

Mayr K. and Peri G. (2008): Return Migration as a Channel of Brain Gain. Working Paper no. 14039. <http://www.nber.org/papersw14039>.

Monteleone S. and Torrisci B. (2010): A Micro Data Analysis of Italy's Brain Drain, University of Naples "Parthenope" Discussion Paper.

Morano-Foadi, S. (2005): Scientific Mobility, Career Progression, and Excellence in the European Research Area. International Migration 43 (5): 133-162.

Niemyska, M. (1936): Wychodźcy po powrocie do kraju (Re-emigrants after return to the country), Warszawa: Instytut Gospodarstwa Społecznego.

OECD (2005): Database on Immigrants and Expatriates. Population 15+ by Nationality, Country of Birth (Detailed Countries) and Educational Attainment. Last update: November 2005. Paris, verfügbar unter: http://www.oecd.org/document/51/0,2340,en_2825_494553_34063091_1_1_1_1,00.html

Reinprecht, C. (2003): On the living situation of elder migrants in Austria. In: Heinz Fassmann, Irene Stacher (eds.), Austrian migration and integration report. Demographic developments - socio-economic structures - legal framework (Zur Lebenssituation älterer Migrantinnen und Migranten in Österreich. In Heinz Fassmann, Irene Stacher (Hrsg.), Österreichischer Migrations- und Integrationsbericht. Demographische Entwicklungen - sozioökonomische Strukturen - rechtliche Rahmenbedingungen), Vienna, Drava Verlag, Klagenfurt/Celovec, p. 212-223.

Ravenstein, E.G. (1885): The Laws of Migration. In: Journal of the Royal Statistical Society 46: 167-235.

Ravenstein, E.G. (1889): The Laws of Migration: Second Paper. In: Journal of the Royal Statistical Society 52: 241-305.

Sauer, L.; Ette, A. (2007): Auswanderung aus Deutschland: Stand der Forschung und erste Ergebnisse zur internationalen Migration deutscher Staatsbürger, Materialien zur Bevölkerungswissenschaft, Heft 123. Wiesbaden: Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung.

Schmidthals, J. (2010): Return migration to East Germany - Motives and Potentials for Regional Development. In: Salzmann, Thomas; Edmonston, Barry und James Raymer (Hrsg.): Demographic Aspects of Migration. Wiesbaden 2010, S. 281-301.

Scott, A. (2002): Science in a Bigger Europe. The Scientist, vol. 17, no. 8, available at: http://www.thescientist.com/yr2003/apr/prof2_030421.html.

Social Diagnosis 2005 (2005): University of Finance and Management and the Council of Social Monitoring report.

SOPEMI (2008): International Migration Outlook. OECD.

SOPEMI (2010): International Migration Outlook. OECD.

SORS 2010: Online Database:
http://pxweb.stat.si/pxweb/Dialog/varval.asp?ma=05N1006E&ti=&path=../Database/Demographics/05_population/40_Migration/05_05N10_International/&lang=1, 2nd of July 2012

Statistics Austria (2010): Migration und Integration. Zahlen. Daten. Indikatoren.

Személyi, L and Csanády, M. (2011): Some Sociological Aspects of Skilled Migration from Hungary. Social Analysis, 1, 1: 27-46.

The Chronicle (2006): Italy Suspends Brain-Drain Program. May 26. Vol. 52. Issue 38. p. A49. section International.

Übelmesser, S. (2005): To Go or not to go: Emigration from Germany. In: CESifo Working Paper No. 1626.

Übelmesser, S. (2006): To Go or Not to Go: Emigration from Germany. In: German Economic Review 7, 2: 211-231.

Vavrečková, J. (2009): The Effect of Brain Drain in the Czech Republic and Earnings Motivation for Qualified Specialists to Work Abroad. Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs, Prague.

Wahba, J. and Y. Zenou (2008): Out of sight, Out of Mind: Migration, Entrepreneurship and Social Capital, paper presented at the conference "Migration and Development" Universités de Lille, June 26-28, 2008

Walaszek, A. (1983): Reemigracja ze Stanów Zjednoczonych do Polski po I wojnie światowej. (Return migration from USA to Poland after first world war). Zeszyty

Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego DCLV. Prace Polonijne, Zeszyt 7. Warszawa-Kraków: PWN.

Warta, K. (2006): Evaluation of the FWF Mobility Programs Erwin Schrödinger and Lise Meitner, July 2006. Wien, verfügbar unter:
http://www.fwf.ac.at/de/downloads/pdf/fwf_mobility_report.pdf

Weinar, A. (2002): Reemigranci jako aktorzy zmiany społecznej (Re-emigrants as actors of social change), Warsaw: Institute of Public Affairs, 39-76.

Williams, A.M. and Baláz, V. (2005): What Human Capital, Which Migrants? Returned Skilled Migration to Slovakia From the UK. *International Migration Review* 39 (2): 439-468.

Williams, A.M. and Baláz, V. (2008): International return mobility, learning and knowledge transfer: A case study of Slovak doctors. *Social Science & Medicine* 67 (11): 1924-1933.

Woolcock, M.; „The Place of Social Capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes“, OECD www.oecd.org/dataoecd/5/13/1824913.pdf, 2011

Woolcock, M. (2001); “Using Social Capital: Getting the Social Relations Right in the Theory and Practice of Economic Development”; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

ANNEX 1

Re-migrants in the Slovak Republic

by Jana Nóva

Tables below have been produced based on data provided by the National Employment Office. The structure of the data recorded by the Office has been changing over the last 4 years and therefore it is not possible to compare characteristics like age and gender for the given period (2008-2011).

Table 4: Number of registered unemployed returnees by country of previous employment in SK (orange = Partner countries of the Re-Turn project)

Country of the previous employment	State as to			
	31.12.2008	31.12.2009	31.12.2010	30.10.2011
CZ	2943	4088	3700	3332
HU	962	1443	1026	1128
UK	1039	1199	1027	892
IT	397	610	654	567
DE	380	446	470	439
AT	219	307	400	646
IE	233	322	218	211
PL	156	111	90	67
NL	58	92	109	138
ES	43	58	56	51
FI	21	50	69	58
CY	48	44	50	30
FR	25	35	21	39
EL	21	24	29	23
SI	27	24	19	23
BE	5	23	29	23
DK	14	30	18	18
LU	6	7	11	10
SE	7	7	6	8
MT	1	2	4	2
EE	1	2	3	1
PT	2	3	1	1
RO	1	1	1	1
BG	0	2	0	1
LT	0	2	0	1

The most significant destination countries of the unemployed returnees over the last four years in Slovakia have been in the statistical order (based on the average values across the four years) the following countries: Czech Republic, Hungary, UK, Italy, Germany, Austria, Ireland and Poland.

Table 5: Country profile of Slovakian unemployed returnees 2008- 2011 in %

As to	Country of the previous employment, % of SVK returnees								
	CZ	UK	HU	IT	DE	IE	AT	PL	Total
2008	44,53	15,72	14,55	6	5,73	3,53	3,31	2,36	6609
2009	45,76	13,42	16,15	6,83	4,99	3,61	3,44	1,24	8932
2010	46,76	12,82	12,8	8,16	5,87	2,72	4,99	1,12	8011
2011	43,21	11,57	14,67	7,35	5,69	2,73	8,38	0,08	7710
On average	45,07	13,38	14,54	7,09	5,57	3,15	5,03	1,2	

The majority of unemployed returnees come from neighbouring country Czech Republic (on average annually around 45 %). Hungary and UK are another two countries from which the Slovak citizens have been returning (on average annually around 14 %) and subsequently registered as unemployed.

Table 6: Number of registered unemployed returnees by education in SK (absolute numbers)

As to	ISCED Level of Education ⁶						
	1	2	3C	3-3A	4,5B	5	6
31.10.2011	204	1208	2513	2946	201	631	7
31.12.2010	211	1380	2829	2899	170	517	5
31.12.2009	225	1519	3384	3174	132	495	3

Table 7: Educational profile of returnees in SK 2008 -2011 (in %)

As to	ISCED Level of Education							
	1	2	3C	3-3A	4,5B	5	6	Total
31.10.2011	2,64	15,67	32,59	38,21	2,61	8,18	0,001	7710
31.12.2010	2,63	17,23	35,32	36,2	2,12	6,45	0,001	8011
31.12.2009	2,52	17,01	37,89	35,54	1,48	5,54	0,000	8932
31.12.2008	3,15	19,16	33,86	37,37	1,15	5,25	0,001	6609
On average	2,74	17,27	34,92	36,83	1,84	6,36	0,001	

⁶ For a description of educational categories, please see ANNEX 2.

The majority of unemployed returnees possess ISCED 3 (upper) secondary education (period from 2008 - 2011). On average 17% of the unemployed returnees have obtained lower secondary education and 6% possess higher educational degrees.

Chart 10: Educational profile of SVK returnees 2008-2011 in %




Table 8: Regional allocation of unemployed returnees in Slovak Republic 2008-2011 (in absolute numbers)

As to	REGION								Total
	BA	Trnava	Trenčín	Nitra	Žilina	Bystrica	Prešov	Košice	
12/2008	68	264	416	1029	733	1076	2014	1017	6609
12/2009	105	355	463	1644	1289	1197	2675	1204	8932
12/2010	118	304	394	1201	1201	988	2755	1050	8011
12/2011	131	337	451	1536	1102	943	2781	1068	8349

Table 9: Number of registered unemployed returnees by occupation in SK

State as to	ISCO occupational group ⁷										A*	Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0		
31.12.2008	32	64	295	245	487	100	834	782	3029	0	741	6609
31.12.2009	46	78	354	301	525	136	1289	948	3451	0	1804	8932
31.12.2010	36	72	285	215	580	133	1033	657	2831	1	2168	8011
31.10.2011	31	81	260	219	702	99	816	573	2691	0	2238	7710

*A (persons without occupational status)

⁷ For a description of occupational groups, please see ANNEX 2.

State as to	ISCO occupational group											Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	A(11)*	
31.12.2008	0,048	0,97	4,46	3,71	7,37	1,51	12,62	11,83	45,83	0	11,21	6609
31.12.2009	0,52	0,87	3,96	3,37	5,88	1,52	14,43	10,61	38,64	0	20,2	8932
31.12.2010	0,45	0,9	3,56	2,68	7,24	1,66	12,89	8,2	35,34	0	27,1	8011
31.10.2011	0,4	1,05	3,37	2,84	9,11	1,28	10,58	7,43	34,9	0	29,02	7710
On average	0,36	0,95	3,84	3,15	7,4	1,49	12,63	9,52	38,68	0	21,88	

Table 10: The occupational profile of the unemployed returnees in SK 2008 - 2011 (in %)

The majority of unemployed returnees (almost 39% on average) in SVK in 2008-2011 belong to the occupational group 9 - elementary occupations.

On average 12% have been craft and related trade workers and 9% have been plant and machine operators and assemblers. The growing number of the SVK unemployed returnees falls to the group A (another's - persons without occupational status) - almost 30% in 2011.

ANNEX 2

Occupational groups

The following categories are used by Employment Offices in SVK:

- 1 - Legislators, senior officials and managers
- 2 - Scientists and knowledge workers
- 3 - Technical, healthcare, education staff and workers in related fields
- 4 - Administrative staff
- 5 - Service and shop workers
- 6 - Skilled agricultural and forestry workers and workers in related fields
- 7 - Craftsmen and qualified producers and refiners, repairmen
- 8 - Plant and machine operators
- 9 - Unskilled workers
- 0 - Professional soldiers
- A - Person without occupational status

Levels of education

The following categories are used by Employment Offices (EO) in SVK

- 0(EO) - Not completed primary education and no education
- 1(EO) - Completed primary education
- 2(EO) - Apprenticeship (without matura)
- 3(EO) - Vocational secondary education without matura
- 4(EO) - Completed secondary education with matura
- 5(EO) - General secondary education with matura
- 6(EO) - Completed secondary vocational education with matura
- 7(EO) - Post secondary education
- 8(EO) - Higher education (Bachelor and Magister level)
- 9(EO) - Research Education

The grouping used in the Comparative Report so to be in tune with the ISCED 1997 classification:

- 1: primary education or first stage of basic education /0(EO)+1(EO)/
- 2: lower secondary education or second stage of education /2(EO)/
- 3C: upper secondary education without matura /3(EO)/
- 3 -3A: upper secondary education with matura /4(EO)+5(EO)+ 6(EO)/
- 4, 5B: post secondary non tertiary education / 7 (EO)/ borne in mind that the contents of the 5B education in Slovakia is more relevant to the post secondary than to higher education
- 5: first and second stage of higher education / 8 (EO) /
- 6: PhD. Level of education /9(EO)/

Regions benefitting from returning migrants

After 1989 Central Europe has gone through important political, economic and social changes. The entry of many CE countries to the European Union during first decade of 21st century enhances the European integration. Joining European space accelerated economic growth of these countries and opened work migration flows, mainly from Central Europe to North-Western Europe.

Economically motivated migration of in particular young and well educated people from the New Member States to high-income countries is currently dominating international migration flows in Europe thanks to the free right to work in any other EU Member State. This is intensifying a brain drain process for many regions in Central Europe and certainly for the Re-Turn case study regions.

On the other hand statistics show the willingness of these people to come back to their countries. However, this process is often associated with significant problems of reintegration. Often the home regions neglect the returning migrants' contribution to regional economic development of these countries, and they do not support migrants in their return. It is estimated, that up to 50% of these outmigrants would return to their home countries within 5 years after emigration - a huge potential for

Project message:

“Re-Turn perceives returning migrants as a key factor for innovative regional development and therefore it creates new services and tools in order to facilitate their return and reintegration in their home region.”

regional development as these people gained new social, cultural and professional competencies while being abroad.

Re-Turn's main objectives are linked to the development and implementation of services needed to support migrants in their wish to return, the promotion of returning migrants as a human capital resource for innovative business development, the creation of framework conditions for reintegration into their home countries' labour markets and social communities. The project aims at developing, testing and implementing joint strategies, new support policies, tools and services in the participating regions.

Target groups:

1. decision takers, senior officers from regional authorities and labour market organisations
2. training and qualification organisations
3. business associations and economic development organisations
4. social groups representing migrants
5. returning migrants

Further information:

www.re-migrants.eu

Dr. Thilo Lang

Leibniz-Institut für
Länderkunde (Leibniz
Institute for Regional
Geography)

Tel: +49-341 60055-159

email: T_Lang@ifl-leipzig.de

The project seeks to gather original knowledge on the specific situation of returning migrants. Therefore an online survey is available under <http://return.ifl-leipzig.de> until July 2012 addressing emigrants who have already returned home, or who want to do so in the future. This knowledge will be used to push the topic of 'return migration' on the political agenda, providing an account of the specific motivations and problems of returning migrants, and offering solutions for regional stakeholders to support them in their return.

Project information:

Project partners:

Countries involved: Germany, Poland, Czech Republic, Austria, Hungary, Slovenia, and Italy

Case Study Regions:

Ústí Region (CZ)

Görlitz Region (DE)

Harz Region (DE)

Mid Pannon Region (HU)

Lodz Region (PL)

Swietkrzykie Region (PL)

Piemonte Region (IT)

Podravska Region (SI)

Main outputs:

1. *CE remigration online visualisation platform*
2. *Toolkit with methods and instruments of success stories*
3. *Handbook with Transnational joint planning and management tools*
4. *Tools and services to re-attract emigrants*
5. *Transnational Strategy for attracting and reintegrating migrants*

Project duration: 5/2011 - 4/2014

ERDF funding: 1.774.160,56 €