

Extended abstract

Introduction

Europeans have a long history of migration. The option to resettle abroad has been regarded by many generations as an economically sensible and socially acceptable life choice. As regions of origin, destination or both, almost all European countries have some experience of migration (European Commission 2006). At the beginning of this millennium the net outflow of own citizens and the emerging lack of high-skilled labour in certain industries triggered fears in European countries, that their high potentials are leaving, resulting in economic competitive disadvantages. During the last four decades the “brain drain” debate played an important role in the study of international migration. The origins of this debate go back to the emigration of highly-skilled individuals from developing to developed countries during the second half of the 20th century (cf. Grubel/Scott 1966, Bhagwati/Hamada 1974). Over the past years and in the context of growing pressures on national economies to “compete for global talent” (Kuptsch/Pang 2006) this debate has lost its preoccupation with the migration-development nexus. Whereas in earlier times immigration from Southern to Northern countries has been the epicentre of this debate, the last years have seen an increasing interest towards migration flows between industrialized countries.

The factors which cause migration from lower to higher developed countries have been studied widely (for an overview see Massey et al. 1993). In contrast, the understanding of mobility between highly developed countries is more limited. At least two general factors explain this lack of knowledge: First, the issue did so far neither raise political nor scientific interest. Second, reliable statistical information on emigration flows is sparse and therefore more difficult to study than immigration (cf. Bilborrow 1997). In consequence, empirical data and information as well as theoretical reasoning are far from satisfying. Most of the available literature on emigration from highly developed countries focuses either on specific groups of migrants – e.g. students, academics (e.g. Kelo et al. 2006) – or is based on survey data on emigration intentions only (cf. Diehl et al. 2008, Dalen/Henkens 2007, Hadler 2006). Although the results of these studies are limited, they support the general assumption that it is mainly economically active and highly-skilled individuals who are internationally mobile. As a consequence, even if the level of emigration from industrialized countries is low, the economic consequences of highly qualified people leaving a country could be substantial.

Building on the recent political interest on the issue of emigration and the limited knowledge we have, the paper contributes to the “brain drain” debate in industrialized countries by focusing on the experience of the EU-15 countries. By making innovative use of the European Union Labour Force Survey (EU LFS), it focuses on two aspects: First, the paper describes the recent experience of the migration of highly skilled workers by analysing the size, structure and dynamics of emigration and return migration flows. Here, the focus is particularly on the educational selectivity of the EU-15 citizens emigrating from their home countries to its European neighbouring countries and how it developed during the last ten years. Second, the paper contributes to the theoretical debate on understanding emigration from high income countries. Starting with a simple neo-classical economic model we focus on the impact of human capital characteristics on individual migration decisions.

The paper addresses a number of shortcomings in the available literature. First, the actual knowledge about recent emigration from developed countries is quite limited. As argued above, most studies focus on migration intentions instead of actual migration flows. The paper follows similar attempts of assessing the emigration of highly skilled workers from Australia (Hugo 2006), Italy (Becker et al. 2004) or Scandinavia (Pedersen et al. 2002). The use of the comparative data of the EU LFS, however, does not only allow for the analysis of the actual size of the migration from the EU-15 but also to account for key factors explaining

emigration decisions. Second, the paper provides important information on the experience of the EU-15 countries. A third aspect this paper tries to address concerns the fact that most studies focus on out-migration only. However, the debate on out-migration in the development context made it clear that a more comprehensive understanding of the recent emigration experience of such countries has to take return migration of their citizens into account as well. Those who return might have accumulated human capital in the country of destination, so that their return might have positive effects on the society and economy of their home country. As a consequence, the emigration flows – originally portrayed as a “brain drain” – potentially develop into a “brain gain” for the home country.

Theoretical focus

In its descriptive part, the paper analyses the educational selectivity of out- and return-migration from and to the EU-15 countries and its development during the last ten years, whereas in its analytical part the paper focuses on key factors to account for individual migration decisions. To study these issues, the paper builds on the literature on the economics of migration and on the human capital theory in particular. The self-selection of migrants and the selectivity of migration flows have been most intensively studied by economists whereas sociological theories on migration are far less explicit about the selectivity effects of their main explanatory factors. To account for migration decisions, the basic economic model starts from the assumption that individual rational actors decide to migrate because a cost-benefit calculation leads them to expect a positive net return. Human capital characteristics are therefore the decisive factors accounting for individual migration decisions and rank high in the analyses of this paper (Hicks 1932, Sjaastad 1962).

Economic theorizing also helps to account for the selectivity effects of emigration flows. Borjas (1987: 534) demonstrates with a simple model that, given sufficiently high portability of skills between source and destination countries, and time-equivalent migration costs, labour migrants are positively selected on unobservable characteristics, such as abilities and productivities, if the source country has less dispersion in its earning distribution, and positively selected on observable skills, such as education, if the return from educational attainment is relatively higher than in the destination country. This is so because it would be relatively less rewarding for people with higher skills to migrate than for those with lower skills. Similarly, Borjas/Bratsberg (1996: 167) show for the case of return migration that the direction of selectivity of returnees depends on the initial migration flow. This implies that in the case where the migration flow is negatively selected on skills, return migrants are the “best of the worst”, and if it is positively selected on skills, return migrants are the “worst of the best”.

The empirical analysis builds on these basic theoretical propositions to explain migration decisions as well as the educational selectivity of emigration and return migration flows between the EU-15 countries. The available empirical evidence which utilizes this theoretical reasoning provides rather inconsistent findings so far: Regarding emigration, some studies contend that migrants represent a positively selected group from the home country because they are more ambitious and willing to work or have higher educational levels than those who stayed behind (Portes/Rumbaut 1996, Feliciano 2005). However, others have argued that only some migrant groups are favourably selected or that positive selectivity declines over time (Massey 1987, Massey/Espinosa 1999). Similarly, on return migration results are also inconsistent with Jasso/Rosenzweig (1988) and Massey/Redstone Akresh (2006) showing that skilled immigrants are the most likely to return to their home countries,

whereas Bauer/Gang (1998) found that they are negatively selected with regard to income and human capital.

Empirical Approach

For the empirical analysis of emigration and return migration of EU-15 citizens, the paper uses the European Union Labour Force Survey (EU LFS) which is carried out on an annual basis since 1983 in today about thirty European countries. While the EU LFS was originally not intended to measure spatial mobility, since 1992 the survey questionnaire includes questions that allow an estimation of the stock of foreign immigrants, years of residence in the member state and the international flows of immigrants. Although, the data on spatial mobility has to be used with care (cf. Martí/Ródenas 2007), it constitutes an important data source for measuring international migration in Europe because it provides comparable information for a large number of countries and over a long period of time. In particular, it allows the analysis of the socio-economic structure of emigration and return-migration flows between European countries – a valuable information because most European countries either do not register emigration at all or those which register it do not collect socio-economic information.

For the empirical analysis of migration flows, the paper makes use of that information where respondents indicate that they have moved into another member state and that they have stayed in the respective country for not longer than one year. Based on this information, the analysis concentrates in a first step on the description of the educational selectivity of intra-European emigrants and return migrants of each EU-15 country (or country group) separately, focusing on the developments between 1996 and 2006. In a second step, we investigate individual migration decisions of these emigrants and return migrants based on a logistical regression model analysing the influence of basic demographic and socio-economic factors (i.e. human capital characteristics) on the migration prevalence between high income countries. To address the “brain drain – brain gain” question, the paper estimates the educational selectivity of European out- and return-migrants of the different European member states separately and in intra-European comparison. For out-migration the paper focuses on immigration information collected in the EU LFS by all EU-15 countries on immigrating citizens from one of the other member states. To assess the selectivity of emigration flows, the paper compares this group with the educational background of citizens remaining in their home country. Similarly, the study investigates the selectivity of return migrants by comparing the educational level of migrants moving to their European home country from one of the other EU-14 member states during the last 12 months. Here, we compare the return migrants with those migrants who continue to stay in one of the other member states.

Conclusion

Based on this comprehensive research design, the paper addresses at least two pressing issues in the current debate: First, the descriptive analysis allows a detailed assessment of the educational selectivity of emigration from a high income country. Using the example of the EU-15, the paper demonstrates how selectivity developed during the last ten years and the additional analysis of return migration provides information to address the question whether we should be speaking about a “brain drain” (higher level of education of emigrants compared to return migrants) or a “brain gain” (higher level of education by return migrants compared to emigrants). Second, the multivariate analyses in this paper expand on the knowledge base

about emigration from a high income country by using comparative data on actual migration decisions instead of information on intentions only. Overall, the paper contributes to our empirical knowledge and theoretical understanding of recent migration flows as well as provides necessary information to assist policy-making in Europe.

References

- Bauer, Thomas K.; Gang, Ira N., 1998: Temporary Migrants from Egypt: How long do they stay abroad?, IZA Working Paper No. 3. Bonn: Institut für die Zukunft der Arbeit
- Becker, Sascha O. et al., 2004: How large is the "Brain Drain" from Italy? In: *Giornale degli Economisti e Annali di Economia* 63: 1-32
- Bhagwati, Jagdish; Hamada, Koichi, 1974: The Brain Drain. International Integration of Markets for Professionals and Unemployment: A Theoretical Analysis. In: *Journal of Development Economics* 1, 1: 19-24
- Bilsborrow, R. E. et al., 1997: International Migration Statistics. Guidelines for Improving Data Collection Systems. Geneva: International Labour Office
- Borjas, George J., 1987: Self-selection and the earnings of immigrants. In: *The American Economic Review* 77: 531-553
- Borjas, George J.; Bratsberg, Bernt, 1996: Who leaves? The outmigration of the foreign-born. In: *Review of Economics and Statistics* 78: 165-176
- Dalen, Hendrik P. van; Henkens, Kène, 2007: Longing for the Good Life: Understanding Emigration from a High-Income Country. In: *Population and Development Review* 33, 1: 37-65
- Diehl, Claudia et al., 2008: Auswanderung von Deutschen: kein dauerhafter Verlust von Hochschulabsolventen. In: *DIW Wochenbericht* 05/2008: 49-55.
- European Commission/EUROSTAT, 2006: Employment in Europe, 2006 report, Luxembourg 2006.
- Feliciano, Cynthia, 2005: Educational Selectivity in U.S. Immigration: How do Immigrants compare to those left behind? In: *Demography* 42, 1: 131-152
- Grubel, Herbert; Scott, Anthony, 1966: The International Flow of Human Capital. In: *American Economic Review* 56, 1-2: 268-274
- Hadler, Markus, 2006: Intentions to migrate within the European Union: A challenge for simple economic macro-level explanations. In: *European Societies* 8, 1: 111-140
- Hicks, John, 1932: *The Theory of Wages*. London: MacMillan
- Hugo, Graeme J., 2006: An Australian Diaspora? In: *International Migration* 44, 1: 105-133
- Jasso, Guillermina; Rosenzweig, Mark R., 1988: How Well do U.S. Immigrants do? Vintage Effects, Emigration Selectivity, and Occupational Mobility. In: *Research in Population Economics* 6: 229-253
- Kelo, Maria et al. (eds.): EURO-DATA. Student mobility in European higher education. Bonn: Lemmens Verlags- und Mediengesellschaft
- King, Russell, 2000: Generalizations from the History of Return Migration. In: Ghosh, Bimal (Hrsg.): *Return Migration: Journey of Hope or Despair?* Genf: International Organization for Migration and the United Nations: 7-56
- Kuypsch, Christiane; Pang, Eng Fong (eds.): *Competing for global talent*. Geneva: International Labour Organization
- Martí, Mónica; Ródenas, Carmen, 2007: Migration Estimation Based on the Labour Force Survey: An EU-15 Perspective. In: *International Migration Review*, 41, 1: 101-126
- Massey, Douglas S. et al., 1993: Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal. In: *Population and Development Review* 19, 3: 431-466
- Massey, Douglas S., 1987: Understanding Mexican Migration to the United States. In: *American Journal of Sociology* 92: 1372-1403
- Massey, Douglas S.; Redstone Akresh, Ilana, 2006: Immigrant Intentions and Mobility in a Global Economy: The Attitudes and Behavior of Recently Arrived U. S. Immigrants. In: *Social Science Quarterly* 87, 5: 954-971
- Massey, Douglas; Espinosa, K. E., 1999: What's driving Mexico-U.S. Migration? A Theoretical, Empirical, and Policy Analysis, in: *American Journal of Sociology* 102, S. 939-99
- Pedersen, Peder J. et al., 2002: Emigration in the Scandinavian Welfare States. In: Paper presented at the European Society for Population Economics Conference, 13-15 June 2002, Bilbao
- Portes, A.; Rumbaut, R. G., 1996: *Immigrant America: A Portrait*, Berkeley: University of California Press
- Sjaastad, Larry A., 1962: The costs and return of human migration. In: *Journal of Political Economy* Vol. 70, Supplement: 80-93