

RETURN MIGRATION – REASONS, CONSEQUENCES AND BENEFITS

RAMONA PÎRVU, GHEORGHE AXINTE*

ABSTRACT: *Return migration is probably the aspect of the migration cycle, which was granted the lowest attention, perhaps because most research resources are located in highly developed countries, while most of the returning most returnees return to developing countries.. This is especially unfortunate because perceptions about the process of returning to the country of origin and attitudes towards returning migrants have a significant impact on migrants and their host communities. Rollback, sometimes called remigration, is considered by some authors as the final stage of the migration process, which further comprises the step preparation / decision to migrate and actual migration phase or installation of migrant destination country selected.*

KEY WORDS: *international migration; employment; return migration; remittances.*

JEL CLASSIFICATION: *J21; J08; J64.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In the context of transnationalism paradigm in the study of migration, the return is no longer regarded as a last step of a linear process because migrants prepare this stage through numerous visits and financial and social remittances (Vlase I., 2011).

Decisions to migrate or to return permanently to their home country are not taken at the individual level but at the level of domestic groups or families, although the reasons for those members may be diverse, sometimes conflicting. But empirical studies show that reintegration in the country of origin is not exactly a smooth one. In reality, migrants are not always aware of the rapid changes that can let them know their society of origin, even under intense communication with other family members or community of origin. On the other hand, the migrant returned home after 10 or 20 years of residence in another country is not the same as the person who left the country

* *Assoc. Prof. Ph.D., Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Economy Department, University of Craiova, Romania, pirvu_ramona@yahoo.com
Lecturer Ph.D., University of Pitesti, Romania, g.axinte@yahoo.com*

at that time, his expectations and those of the company to him can be completely different (Vlase, 2011).

Faini (Faini, 2002) believes that migrants can be encouraged to study abroad for improve training quality and employability. Not all migrants remain in the receiving countries forever, nor do they necessarily cross over great periods of time. They can return, bringing with them experience and entrepreneurial spirit (Ratha, 2003).

2. CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS AND THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PHENOMENON OF MIGRATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

In the context of transnationalism paradigm in the study of migration, the return is no longer regarded as a last step of a linear process because migrants prepare this stage through numerous visits and financial and social remittances (Vlase, 2011).

Decisions to migrate or to return permanently to their home country are not taken at the individual level but at the level of domestic groups or families, although the reasons for those members may be diverse, sometimes conflicting. But empirical studies show that reintegration in the country of origin is not exactly a smooth one. In reality, migrants are not always aware of the rapid changes that can let them know their society of origin, even under intense communication with other family members or community of origin. On the other hand, the migrant returned home after 10 or 20 years of residence in another country is not the same as the person who left the country at that time, his expectations and those of the company to him can be completely different.

Faini (Faini, 2002), believes that migrants can be encouraged to study abroad for improve training quality and employability. Not all migrants remain in the receiving countries forever, nor do they necessarily cross over great periods of time. They can return, bringing with them experience and entrepreneurial spirit (Ratha, 2003).

We consider two types of questionable effects associated with return migration. The first is related to the increase of income which the experience of working abroad brings to the migrant. Thus, it must be assessed whether the income which the migrant has the ability to obtain after return, on the basis of new skills acquired abroad, are greater than those carried out by similar workers, who have not experienced the work abroad. The second concerns the professional choices that the migrants make when they return to their country of origin, by bringing a greater inclination towards independence and the development of small enterprises of the repatriated migrants than non-migrants.

Work experience abroad is an important aspect in the reintegration in the country. It depends on the accumulation of specific skills, abilities, and knowledge that can help, or hinder access to the labor market of the country of origin. Work experience is relevant in our case, both in terms of duration and type of skill or new skills (Vlase, 2011).

Remaining migrants abroad have succeeded in a significantly greater proportion than returned migrants to enter the labor market in Romania before the first departure. Almost half (48%) of the people that came back (compared with 38% of the remaining migrants) have left Romania without trying or not being able to enter the

labor market in the country. Most have found work abroad, but given the lack of experience and qualifications, in terms of labor market in contraction, have entered the most vulnerable positions.

As a general rule, returning emigrants who have achieved financial success abroad are seen favorable and can even acquire a role model status. On the other hand, those who return home having failed in an attempt of employment and residence abroad may be made to feel that they have not fulfilled the expectations of family and friends. Perceptions are nuanced by their voluntary or involuntary return (IOM, 2011).

At the destination Romanian migrants are employed most often in the secondary sector. In the absence of institutional support, informal migration networks took over the responsibility for the integration of migrants in the host country, favoring the secondary sector employment, but offering limited possibilities of occupational mobility. The modest social status abroad opens opportunities for social ascent in the community of origin, where they spend/invest the savings from migration and remittances.

The recession has affected all sectors of the economy, and especially those areas in which the migrants worked, whether they were workers from the EU or not.

Among the remaining migrants abroad and those returning to the country during the economic crisis, there are some significant differences, which indicates that the remaining migrants were still at the first departure from the country better qualified, better prepared to adapt to the demands of the labor market from abroad. The return of the Romanians is a recent phenomenon, but it already occurs differently depending on gender, age, occupational skills, social and economic capital transferable in the community of origin. For understanding the behavior of return of migrants and sustainability projects for reintegration in the country of origin is important a historical analysis of the phenomenon of migration of that community. Romania is still a country with a recent history of emigration, in contrast to other countries where there are such studies (Vlase, 2011).

Migration has many positive effects, such as a style and a better standard of living, and a relationship of quality in relation to public institutions, access to education, to new values and social and cultural practices that promote openness, equal opportunities and a new understanding of the relationship between the sexes.

A study of Soros Foundation (Migration and development) appreciates the positive effects of local economic development, stimulating entrepreneurship and increased tolerance in areas with high migration index and migration associated negative effects such as dependence to income from migration, abandoned children, human trafficking (Soros Foundation, 2010).

In principle, the tastes and motives of migrants suffer changes as a result of the experience in developed industrial countries. Individuals acquire the "habit" of a lifestyle, including consumption that are difficult to support in the country of origin on their return increasing the likelihood of re-turns in the previously destination space. In this respect, it is clear that does not increase the likelihood of migration of other individuals but that of those with migration experience. In the new economy of migration explanation could be considered as a permanent risk reduction strategy of the household income in circumstances where the economic situation does not improve at

the destination in order to obtain incomes comparable to those from abroad (Ailenei). Return migration contributes to local development even more than remittances. Remittances are used largely for consumption, while the savings, that often are a prerequisite for the purpose of return migration, are rather used for productive activities. The savings reinvested and entrepreneurial activities of migrants returning home can be a real and important benefit of migration.

At the same time we appreciate that there is a certain intellectual gain as a result of migration; a number of migrants have achieved qualifications or have developed knowledge of new technologies while working abroad.

In certain circumstances migration may be favorable to the formation of human capital. Indeed the Governments of certain countries are perhaps less apprehensive about this migration of brain drain than the literature suggests. The lack of job opportunities for graduates means that migration can be seen as a political and economic strategy. Stark (Stark, 2005), claims that migration policy can limit the strategic use and behavioral response to the concept of migration for the benefit of all workers.

Many migrants' skills and experience gained abroad did not help to find a better work at home, especially because they have worked in areas other than those for which they have qualified in their home country. Rarely migrants find their jobs in the same sector in which they worked abroad. Other migrants have acquired new skills or knowledge. Failure to integrate into the job market in the home country, as well as poor infrastructure, especially in rural areas, have become motivating factors (push factors) to continue the migration (CIVIS, IASCI, 2010).

In general the Romanians demonstrate a strong desire to return home and to reside permanently in their country of origin. No matter how hard they worked or how long they stayed abroad, many migrants feel strangers in the land of migration. Returning home is subject to a number of factors. The most important and the most often mentioned are the following:

- A secure and well paid job;
- Economic, political, environmental and social best in country;
- Achieving the objectives of making savings through migration and the ability to save data;
- The continuation of the global economic crisis;
- Other factors: homesickness, relatives, health, etc.

The period 2008-2010 becomes the subject of the discussion centered on the idea of return migration – economic and financial crisis being intended as a cause of such a circular phenomenon. The reality is, however, another, delaying the return migration to manifest as a spectacular phenomenon, Romanian labor migrants defying the logic of this narrowing of all labor markets. In the opinion of an expert, a representative of an institution of state, expressed in an interview aired by mass-media, there seems to be a crisis, no matter how tough it will be less harsh in a rich country than in a poorer country. Intuitively, without substantiation of claims statement on statistical data, the statistician expert seems to be right: “reverse migration”, return migration, delay to occur (Soros Foundation, 2011).

At the same time it is a plausible hypothesis that through superior capacity for integration in the country of destination, the characteristics of social worlds they

carry with them (different from those of the migrants with secondary education, for example), migration for work, even temporary at first, can form the final migration, because „depending on the duration of residence and forms of incorporation in destination countries we can distinguish several layers of Romanian diaspora recently emigrated. On the one hand, there are those for whom migration has meant a possibility of mobility not only spatial, but also an increase in their social status: high qualified specialists, small entrepreneurs, workers employed in various formal and integrated systems and social protection schemes. They, as a rule, are not only legal residents of the respective countries but they reunited families, and have developed linguistic and cultural skills, interacting with the states in which they live. Long-term, they don't exclude returning to the country, but in the medium term they strengthen their roots in countries of emigration (Horvath, 2011).

The period 2008-2010 generated in Romania concerns and discussions of public policy related to return migration – economic and financial crisis being intended as a cause of such circulatory phenomenon. As is evident from the interviews conducted in the empirical research, experts from the Romanian system of migration management have denied in the autumn of 2009 such a comeback. Their arguments are simple: *„if he has legal work permit he has no reason to return, because he has welfare benefits abroad, at shares which Romania cannot enjoy; if he does not have a legal work permit, he rather find work there than in Romania, in order to meet the needs of survival.”* Indeed, the phenomenon of massive return of the Romanians gone to work abroad hasn't occurred. Migration rollback does not manifest itself as a spectacular phenomenon, Romanian labor migrants defying the logic of this all compactions of labor markets in the EU. Intuitively, without substantiation of claims statement on statistical data, the statistician expert seems to be right: “reverse migration”, return migration, delay to occur.

The labor market in Romania is not overpopulated with a new generation of unemployed coming from return migration, in addition to the generation of unemployed produced by the national crisis in Romania. Such overpopulation through massive return migration at a number of nearly three millions of Romanians working abroad would have created an unbearable social pressure at the national level (Soros Foundation, 2011).

The return of the Romanians is a recent phenomenon, already occurs differently depending on gender, age, skills, social and economic capital transferable in the community of origin. For understanding the behavior of return of migrants and sustainability projects for reintegration in the country of origin is important a historical analysis of the phenomenon of migration of that community. Romania is still a country with a recent history of emigration, in contrast to other countries where there are such studies (Vlase, 2011).

The highest values of emigration (recorded) in Romania were between 1990-1995 and in particular in the 1990-1991. The first wave of emigrants from 1990-1995 had an ethnic character, most emigrants were from villages and towns with a high proportion of ethnic minorities. A massive migration occurred among the Saxons and Jews and lower among the Hungarian population. For example, the Saxons in Braşov and Sibiu emigrated to Germany, Hungarians from Harghita, Covasna and Mureş in

Hungary, and Jews in Israel. Ethnic emigration was so the first wave of migration from Romania, which had begun even before 1989 and which continued for several years after the revolution, with those who do not managed to leave. Since 1995 started the second wave of emigration and now the new forms of emigration are: emigration through mobility scholarships for students, emigration of labor, emigration affairs, the export of "brain drain" and migration to other former Communist countries for which there was no need of visas. Students begin to migrate through the mobility programmers offered by Soros Foundation, Fulbright, IREX or through individual applications to colleges in the U.S., and after graduation some of them decide not to return to Romania. On the other hand, many faculties and U.S. companies are interested in students or graduates with good results in terms of technical and thus begins the export of "brains". In 1995, one can observe an increase in the number of arrivals up to 25765 but after this year, there has been a decrease in the value continuing until 8154 immigrants in 2002.

In 2002, begins the third wave of emigration, the number of emigrants grow again until 14197 in 2006 and working abroad becomes a mass phenomenon with a rate of migration between 10-30%. Initially, in the first stage, departures were conducted overwhelmingly by men (88%), subsequently the process goes in the direction of establishing a gender ratio, so after 2001, departures of men compared with those of women are 55% and 45% respectively. After the first wave of emigration was triggered foreign labor migration, which has the largest share of all forms of emigration, its direction is variable over time depending on the facilities or the obstacles raised by the various Western States that were presented as potential receiving countries. How migration has encountered restrictions on the part of Western countries, this phenomenon has grown more and more to the informal side. Only through the year 2002 Romanian immigrants begin to break into the labour market legally. According to data provided by the National Institute of statistics of Romania permanent emigration had the following trails

- in the first phase, 1990-1995, the main destinations where Romanians have emigrated permanently are Italy, Hungary, Austria and the USA followed;
- in the second stage, from 1996 to 2001, the main destinations where Romanians have emigrated permanently are Italy, USA, Canada, followed by France, Israel, Hungary;
- in the third stage, 2002-2007, main destinations where Romanians have emigrated are Canada, Germany followed by Italy and the USA.

According to the study conducted by the Open Society Foundation "Temporary dwelling abroad" in November 2006, the directions of emigration for work abroad, temporary emigration, has changed over time and were given the following trails. In the early 1990s, Israel and Turkey were the main centers of attraction to work. Italy, Germany and Hungary were second rank destinations. Nearly one-fifth of the total departures for work during the period 1990-1995 were to Israel. Subsequently, in 1996-2001, Italy becomes leader of the Romanians who want to work abroad. Israel passes on second place in the order of preference in that period. In the third period, beginning with 2002, the hierarchy is changing again. Maximum attraction is towards Italy and Spain. Departures (not departees) to Italy, at that time, holding a share of

50%. For Spain, the departure was 25%. Romanian roads to look for work in the world (especially Europe) are going to focus to a small number of countries, not linear, but after a phase of expansion of search:

- in the first phase, 1990-1995, there were five destinations with over 7% share of the total departures-Israel, Turkey, Italy, Hungary and Germany;
- in stage two, 1996-2002, to the five countries from the first stage plus Canada and Spain. Exploration extends to the farthest to the European continent and to America;
- in the third phase, starting in 2002, there is a massive concentration of temporary migration for work in Spain and Italy.

Table 1. Romanian emigrants who have established domicile abroad, by sex

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Total	14197	8830	8739	10211	7906	18307
Male	5341	3088	3069	3768	2917	8527
Female	8856	5742	5670	6443	4989	9780

Source: The National Commission of statistics, *Statistical Yearbook of Romania, 2012*, p.76-78

Table 2. Romanian emigrants after the country of destination, which have established domicile abroad

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Total	14197	8830	8739	10211	7906	18307
By country of destination						
Australia	125	83	82	128	81	112
Austria	581	313	345	421	569	1089
Belgium	59	34	35	70	46	129
Canada	1655	1787	1738	2045	858	967
France	529	372	431	576	405	663
Germany	3110	1902	1788	1938	1399	2014
Greece	134	72	85	124	133	160
Jordan	26	21	23	21	16	139
Israel	128	57	50	111	62	2857
Italy	3393	1401	1098	984	844	1906
United Kingdom	227	71	130	211	264	251
The Republic of Moldova	112	149	189	217	349	254
Spain	330	138	238	547	882	3352
USA.	1982	1535	1591	1793	1086	1350
Hungary	900	266	354	331	266	514
Other countries	906	629	562	694	646	2550

Source: The National Commission of statistics, *Statistical Yearbook of Romania, 2012*, p.76-78

After testing the life and working conditions from multiple destinations, Romanians decide in particular to two Latin speaking countries, Italy and Spain. The changes between the stages are not only in the field of migration. The volume of departures changes also.

Current developments and the characteristics of the phenomenon of migration for employment after entering the EU on 1 January 2007, provides an opportunity to discuss a fourth wave of Romanian migration in good measure as migration for work. This wave of migration for employment has as a feature for mobility of professionals in the context of economic and financial crisis, which seems to set the migration of highly skilled and qualified personnel for the job.

The analyses show that Romania's accession to the EU did not bring, at first, changes within the phenomenon of migration. Initially, only 11 Member States opened borders for labor migration altogether, while others imposed various types of temporary restrictions (between 2-7 years). At this point, a number of 15 countries recognize the right of Romanian migrants to work in the labor market, given that we know that, for a period of three years, the number of workers with legal right to work in the labor market of the countries of the EU has grown from 1.2 million (in mid-2007) to 2.5-2.7 million workers with legal right in June-July 2010. The period 2008-2010 generated in Romania concerns and discussions of public policy related to return migration – economic and financial crisis being intended as a cause of such circulatory phenomenon.

Is recognized in the scientific literature the beneficial impact over the countries of origin of the return of skilled migrants – with work experience, skills, savings and contacts accumulated abroad. If the return of migrants cannot be easily influenced, such decisions depending on the existence of professional opportunities, the quality of institutions, infrastructures and, last but not least, family situation, then the temporary return of migrants can be encouraged through specific policies and programmers (Berlinschi & Clipa, 2012).

3. CONCLUSION

It was noted that migrants in the EU when they lose their job, they are more inclined to return to their countries of origin. This comeback is mostly temporary, strategy aimed at returning migrants in the destination country in case of economic opportunities and the emergence of a labor market recovery. On the other hand, migrants from outside the EU prefer to remain in countries of destination, even if they lose their jobs. This decision is due to the difficulties of obtaining visas or work permits, administrative barriers, costs and lack of alternatives related to re-entry in the host country. In addition, it adds the often high travel costs, the fact that the survival of the remaining family home depends on the money sent by the migrant or the total lack of horizon in the country of origin, where the crisis puts even more trouble (Stoiciu, 2011).

It is known that, after a period spent working abroad, migrants can reach all or part of the objectives of the migration and then the propensity to returns higher. It is quite possible that in fact we are dealing with a temporary comeback. Also, should be

taken into account the hypothesis according to which the crisis may be more tolerable in countries of destination than in the countries of origin in circumstances where neither locally nor at the country level there are no targeted measures aimed at facilitating the return and the Romanians leave to work abroad, in the context of the lack of public policies that are supported by these and Romania does not have a strategy regarding labor migration/mobility of labor within the European area and to capture the benefits of migration and to maximize the impact that migration has in the development of communities of origin of the migrants, we consider that further consideration will prevail in the decision to return to Romania.

This category of migrants – affected by the crisis, but without the necessary resources to return to Romania-and whose return is most often temporary and which is prone to a variety of cyclical migration, oscillating between the host country and the country of origin is different, also temporary, comeback is returning to Romania for the period in which the migrant is receiving unemployment allowance in the destination country. This range enables a migrant to try their luck in Romania and to test the local labor market and to cover their costs of living from the unemployment money. The chances of returning to the country of destination after expiry of the period of unemployment benefits are reduced if the former migrant manages to find a satisfactory job in Romania. As a rule, however, migrants who get in unemployment or who lose work prefer to combine the livelihood of unemployment welfare with illegal work or temporary jobs.

Regarding the differences between workers of EU migrants/and those outside the EU, in the case of the first category there is the inclination to return to their countries of origin when they lose their job, this comeback has mainly temporary a nature, the strategy for the return of migrants, in the country of destination in case of arising of economic opportunities or a comeback of the labor market. Representatives of the second group prefer to remain in countries of destination, even if they lose their jobs, this decision is motivated by difficulties in obtaining visas or work permits and other administrative barriers related to re-entry into the host country, the high costs of travel and the inability to earn a living for themselves and their families back in their country where the crisis is even more serious.

REFERENCES:

- [1]. Ailenei, D. (coord.) *The diminution of inequalities – a prerequisite for the economic and social cohesion*, research project PN II, phase 3, p. 35
- [2]. Beine, M.; Docquier, F.; Rapoport, H. (2006) *Measuring International Skilled Migration: New Estimates Controlling for Age of Entry*, World Bank Research Report
- [3]. Berlinschi, R.; Clipa, V. (2012) *Migrations, remittances and development: a few ideas in the recent literature and recommendations in the case of the Republic of Moldova*, no. 1(24), March
- [4]. Birks, I.S.; Sinclair, C.A. (2009) *International Migration and development*, I.L.O. , Geneva
- [5]. Buziernescu, R.; Nanu, R.; Spulbar, C. (2009) *Methods and estimation models of underground economy*, Anale, Seria Științe Economice, Timișoara

- [6]. **David, M.** (2008) *The underground economy and money laundering - criminological study*, Pro Universitaria Press
- [7]. **Faini, R.** (2002) *Migration, remittances and growth*, www.wider.unu.edu/conference
- [8]. **Hara, A.** (2006) *Skill Difusión by Temporary Migration? Returns to Western European Working Experience in the EU Accession Countries*, Institute of Economics, Hungarian Academy of Science, <http://econ.core.hu/doc/dp/dp/mtdp0607.pdf>
- [9]. **Horvath, I.** (2011) *Colonists, workers and opportunists*, Dilema veche, no. 254, <http://www.dilemaveche.ro/sectiune/tema-saptamanii/articol/>
- [10]. **Niessen, J.; Schiebel, Y.** (2004) *Handbook on Integration for policy-makers and practitioners*, European Communities
- [11]. **Mănăilă, I.** *Decent work for the Romanians in the European Union. Legal work or moonlighting?* Project developed by the National Association of Human Resources Specialists
- [12]. **Page, J.; Plaza, S.** (2005) *Migration and Economic Development: A Review of Global Evidence*, *Human Movement Science*, Springer Publishers
- [13]. **Pîrvu, R.** (2011) *The Link Between Migration and Economic Development*, Proceedings Bulletin USAVM Horticulture, 68
- [14]. **Pisică, S.; Vasile, V.; Voineagu, V.** (2012) *The labor market between formal and informal*, Expert Press
- [15]. **Ratha, D.** (2003) *Workers' remittances: An important and stable source of external finance*, Global Development Finance Report, World Bank, Washington D.C
- [16]. **Stark, O.** (2005) *The new economics of the brain drain: Mapping the gains*, World Economics no.6
- [17]. **Stoiciu, V.** (coord) (2011) *The impact of the crisis on labour migration in Romania*, Bucharest, p.15
- [18]. **Vlase, I.** (2011) *Romanians' back migration from Italy. Case study*, in Vultur, Vrancea County, "Quality of life", Journal, XXII, no. 2, p. 155-176
- [19]. **CIVIS, IASCI** (2010) *Consolidating the link between migration and development in Moldova*, Chişinău
- [20]. **European Union: Council of the European Union** (1999) *Presidency Conclusions, Tampere European Council*, 15-16 October, www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3ef2d2264.html
- [21]. **IOM** (2011), *World Migration Report*, p. 18
- [22]. **Soros Foundation** (2010), Romania, studies: Migration and development; Policies and institutions in the international migration; The effects of migration: children staying home; temporary living abroad
- [23]. **Soros Foundation** (2011) *The forth wave. Brain migration via Romania-Occident*, p. 46
- [24]. *Communication of the Commission on Undeclared Work*, European Commission, Bruseseles, COM (98), 219
- [25]. http://www.aiel.it/bacheca/SASSARI/papers/martin_radu.pdf, p. 8
- [26]. <http://www.fes.ro/common/pdf/Impactul%20crizei.pdf>, p.70-76