



Report¹

Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration

Authors: Siyka Kovacheva, The New Europe Centre for Regional Studies

In collaboration with:

Wouter Zwysen and Neli Demireva, University of Essex

Jeyhun Alizade, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung

Diego Coletto, Ivana Fellini, Fabio Quassoli and Emilio Reyneri, University of Milano-Bicocca

Maricia Fischer-Souan, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

Dorel Abraham and Octav Marcovici, Center for Urban and Regional Sociology

Plamen Nanov, The New Europe Centre for Regional Studies

¹ This Report has been submitted to the EU Commission as Deliverable D4. 2; The Growth, Equal Opportunities, Migration and Markets (GEMM) project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 649255.

Contents

1	Objectives of the overview	4
2	Descriptive analysis of available statistics	6
2.1	Introduction	6
2.2	Overview of migrants' origin.....	7
2.3	Job search methods	10
2.4	Motivations for migration.....	14
3	Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report UK.....	16
3.1	Job Search in the UK	16
3.2	Patterns of Search among Migrants and Minorities in the UK (with a focus on the highly-skilled migrants).....	17
3.3	Further avenues to explore.....	19
3.4	Data and Methods	19
3.5	References	21
4	Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Germany	23
4.1	Migration Trends.....	23
4.2	Public Discourse on Immigration in Germany	23
4.3	Recruitment of highly-skilled Immigrants.....	24
4.4	Profile of highly-skilled Immigrants	25
4.5	Conclusion: Gaps in the Literature and Suggestions for the Interviews.....	25
4.6	References	26
5	Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Spain..	28
5.1	Introduction	28
5.2	The New Spanish Emigration in Context.....	28
5.3	Dynamics of Emigration	29
5.4	Emigrant Profiles, Destinations and Motivations	30
5.5	Pathways to Employment Abroad	31
5.6	References	33
6	Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Italy ...	36
6.1	1. Introduction: immigration in the political and media debate	36
6.2	Migration trends	37
6.3	The characteristics of immigrants.....	38

6.4	The labour market outcomes of immigrants	39
6.5	Recruitment processes, strategies and actors	40
6.6	References	42
7	Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Bulgaria	45
7.1	Introduction	45
7.2	Migration trends	46
7.3	Public and private recruitment actors	46
7.4	Research into migrants' motivations, resources and preferred methods.....	47
7.5	Conclusions and suggestions for the GEMM interview guides.....	49
7.6	References	49
8	Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Romania	52
8.1	Main issues and interpretations of mainstream media discourses.....	52
8.2	Romanian research on migration abroad	52
8.3	Types of qualitative research	55
8.4	Comments	56
8.5	Themes to be included in the interview guides.....	56
8.6	References	58
9	Conclusions.....	60

1 Objectives of the overview

This report is part of the GEMM research project which aims to study mobility of people within the European Union that lies at the heart of the endeavour to create a single European labour market and a socially integrated prosperous and just society. The overview is an initial step in workpackage 4 aiming to analyse the lived experiences of migration by:

- examining migration experiences as embedded in specific social contexts,
- capturing the dynamic process of mobility: from the multi-layered nature of migration decisions to the diverse economic and social outcomes for individuals and societies,
- highlighting the factors for successful integration of migrants and thus contributing to the project's overall objective to enhance the efficient use of human capital in Europe.

The overview on recruitment methods and individual factors for migration addresses the first two objectives building upon available literature. There will be a second overview that will focus on the institutional factors for successful work and social integration of migrants and how these can foster economic growth in Europe. The whole workpackage has the goal to highlight the individual and contextual factors for the successful integration of migrants and efficient use of human capital in Europe. In survey data, specific experiences of individuals, dependent upon the country context are unlikely to be captured in depth and only a rare glimpse is caught of the multi-layered nature of the migration decision. For this purpose, about 160 in-depth interviews will be conducted with both prospective migrants and migrant interviewees with actual experiences at different stages of job search for employment in labour markets outside their native countries. Migrants' stories that will be collected have three foci: their motives and expectations; formal and informal channels for mobility they use; and opportunities and constraints they meet for their integration in the host country. Additionally, 40 expert interviews will be collected to examine the views of the mediators on the international migration processes in and from their countries and on the recruitment channels and mechanisms used to regulate migration. The analysis of these interviews will concentrate on the practices of the employment agencies (both public and private) in mediating the relationships between prospective migrants and employers and their perceptions about the gaps, failures and solutions for more effective recruitment process.

The overview serves as a background for the fieldwork and analysis of the lived experiences of migration investigating the social context of six European countries: two West European countries as traditionally receiving migrants – Germany and the UK, two Eastern European countries as traditionally sending migrants – Romania and Bulgaria and two countries that are currently both receiving and sending migrants – Spain and Italy. The results of the qualitative data gathered during GEMM research will be presented in a comparative analytical report.

The main objectives of this report are:

- to review available national literature on the topics of recruitment methods and the motivational factors for migration in each of the six participating countries,
- to highlight country specific issues raised in public debates and academic publications,
- to underline the main forms of migration and main groups of migrants studied and the dominant research methodologies used, including gender, ethnicity and skills levels,

- to draw attention to significant gaps in national research of the process of migration,
- to reveal aspects of the process of migration to be included in the interview guides,
- to formulate significant questions to be followed up in the fieldwork and serve as 'hypotheses' in the further analysis of the lived experiences of migration.

The report starts with a descriptive analysis based on the available survey data of the migration flows from and in the six participating countries, the main job search methods applied by various groups of migrants and motivations for migration. It proceeds with 6 country reviews of the public debates and research literature on migration motivation, state and private recruitment channels, individual motivations, resources and preferred methods for migrations. The report ends with underlying significant themes to be included in the interview schedules and the preliminary research questions. The overview and its conclusions will serve as a basis for the fieldwork and analysis within the framework of this workpackage.

The report has been written authored in the following way:

Introduction and Conclusions – Siyka Kovacheva

Chapter 2. Descriptive analysis of available statistics – Wouter Zwysen

Chapter 3. Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report UK - Wouter Zwysen and Neli Demireva, University of Essex

Chapter 4. Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Germany - Jeyhun Alizade, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung

Chapter 5. Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Spain - Maricia Fischer-Souan, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

Chapter 6. Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Italy - Diego Coletto, Ivana Fellini, Fabio Quassoli and Emilio Reyneri, University of Milano-Bicocca

Chapter 7. Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Bulgaria – Siyka Kovacheva and Plamen Nanov, The New Europe Centre for Regional Studies

Chapter 8. Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Romania Dorel Abraham and Octav Marcovici, Center for Urban and Regional Sociology

2 Descriptive analysis of available statistics

2.1 Introduction

This document provides an overview of the composition, job search methods and motivations of migrants in the EU15 plus Norway, specifically focusing on the groups that will be studied in Work Package 4, namely migrants from Romania, Bulgaria, Italy and Spain to Italy, Spain, Germany and the UK.

The paper used three datasets for this description: the European Social Survey (ESS) 2002-2014; the Database on Immigrants in OECD Countries (DIOC) 2005/06 – 2011/12; and the EU Labour Force Survey (LFS) 2005-2014. The DIOC is a combination of census and detailed labour force survey data and provides the most complete picture based on a large sample and with detailed country of origin. It is only available for the year 2005/06 and 2010/11 however. To provide as up-to-date as possible information I make use of the latest wave (2010/11) for the descriptive tables. The ESS provides information on detailed country of birth and most indicators I use here, but it is based on small samples per country. Italy is only present in 2002, 2004 and 2012. The EU LFS has a very large sample as well as detailed information on all indicators, but to maintain confidentiality of the sample the country of birth is aggregated. We can therefore only distinguish between migrants from the 3 latest EU member states (Romania, Bulgaria and Croatia) and those from the EU-15 (including Italy and Spain). Finland and Sweden do not report on the three newest member states but instead group all non-EU15 member states together in the New Member States category. All data is weighted to be representative of the population. The do-file to create the tables is `create_tables_WP4_new.do` and the datasets are created using `tables_WP4_data`. The tables are generally weighted to be representative of the population. Some of the tables also provide statistical tests of the difference in an outcome between migrants and natives and its' significance. This is estimated from a simple binary regression.

Migrants are divided by region of origin into large groupings. Where possible, we divide EU migrants in migrants from Romania, Bulgaria (together with Croatia in one group in the LFS), Spain and Italy (part of EU-15 migrants in the LFS); the 15 older member states (EU-15) and the new member states (EU-11; EU-10 or NMS10). Further we include other West which contains North American countries, the EFTA countries and Oceania, which are highly developed origin countries. Third countries are all other migrants meaning those from Africa, Asia or Central and South America.

2.2 Overview of migrants' origin

The first set of tables (1 through to 3) provide information on the origin and the education of migrants to Italy, Germany, the UK and Spain using the most recent data from the Database on Immigration to the OECD (DIOC). Table 1 shows the estimate of the total number in each group and the percentage that a single group make up out of all migrants to a country in 2010/2011. This shows that Romanian migrants make up a large proportion of all migrants to Spain and Italy (resp. 12 and 16%). In the case of Italy there were more migrants from Romania than from the EU-15. It has to be kept in mind that this is 2010/2011 so Romania and Bulgaria would have only relatively recently joined the EU and their nationals still needed work permits in some European countries such as the UK. Italy and Spain are important countries of origin for migration to the UK (1.8% of migrants are Italian and 1% Spanish compared to 1% Romanian and 0.6% Bulgarian at 44,500). There is more polarization in migration to Germany where Romania and Italy are important sending countries, but there is only a very small (estimated none, but that is likely due to issues with reporting) community of Bulgarians in Germany. Interestingly, all four countries have substantial proportions of EU-15 migrants although this is rather low in Germany (7.5% compared to 15% of all migrants in EU15+Norway being EU-15), but Italy and Spain attracted relatively few migrants from the new member states who joined in 2004.

Table 2 uses the same data to show the distribution over years of stay. It shows how recent the migration from Romania and Bulgaria is as 32-38% of migrants from those countries had been in the country of destination for less than 5 years compared to on average 20.6% of migrants having arrived that recently. 61% of all migrants had been in the country of residence for longer than 10 years with especially Italian migrants being very well established, compared to only around 20% of Bulgarian migrants having been in the country that long. This difference in length of stay is likely to be associated with substantial differences in outcomes.

Table 3 shows the qualifications of migrants. The categories are based on ISCED codes, with low qualifications being at most lower secondary qualifications; middle being upper secondary qualifications or post-secondary non-tertiary and high being tertiary qualifications. On average, migrants tend to be slightly more highly educated than natives (25.4 vs 23.3% with tertiary qualifications for men and 26% vs 20.5% for women), but there is substantial spread among groups. Italian migrants are most likely to have very low qualifications. Romanian migrants were least likely to have high qualifications (13-15%) while the majority of other Western migrants have tertiary qualifications.

Table 1. Size (and percentage of migrants) of origin-group in 2010/2011

	Spain	Italy	UK	Germany	EU15+NO
natives	34,404,120.00	46,646,382.00	43,983,598.00	60,784,552.00	293,270,683.00
Romania	614,555.00 (12.04)	704,383.00 (15.79)	75,454.00 (1.03)	400,850.00 (5.03)	2,069,090.00 (5.02)
Bulgaria	112,010.00 (2.19)	40,410.00 (0.91)	44,520.00 (0.61)	32,081.00 (0.40)	365,833.00 (0.89)
Italy	75,220.00 (1.47)		133,560.00 (1.82)	369,957.00 (4.65)	1,111,886.00 (2.70)
Spain		21,508.00 (0.48)	73,420.00 (1.00)	54,922.00 (0.69)	520,195.00 (1.26)
EU-15	866,465.00 (16.98)	470,098.00 (10.54)	1,112,986.00 (15.20)	613,670.00 (7.71)	6,302,254.00 (15.30)
EU-11	76,830.00 (1.51)	212,951.00 (4.77)	985,539.00 (13.46)	1,602,864.00 (20.13)	3,747,552.00 (9.10)
Other_West	39,565.00 (0.78)	85,142.00 (1.91)	410,321.00 (5.60)	51,638.00 (0.65)	872,725.00 (2.12)
Third_countries	3,316,345.00 (64.98)	2,926,868.00 (65.60)	4,487,994.00 (61.28)	4,836,183.00 (60.74)	26,078,210.00 (63.32)
all_migrants	5,103,510.00 (12.92)	4,461,360.00 (8.73)	7,323,794.00 (14.27)	7,962,165.00 (11.58)	41,182,644.00 (12.31)

Source: DIOC 2010/2011, showing estimated size of origin group and the percentage each group makes up of the total migrant population

Table 2. Average duration of stay by origin-group in 2010/2011

	Men <=5 years	Men 5-10 years	Men 10< years	total	Women <=5 years	Women 5-10 years	Women 10< years	total
Romania	32.12	30.00	37.88	100.00	34.17	30.62	35.21	100.00
Bulgaria	33.58	44.71	21.71	100.00	37.82	41.85	20.33	100.00
Italy	11.30	5.79	82.91	100.00	12.07	5.66	82.27	100.00
Spain	25.80	8.56	65.63	100.00	20.80	9.65	69.55	100.00
EU-15	17.06	12.14	70.80	100.00	13.38	10.28	76.34	100.00
EU-11	29.57	11.07	59.36	100.00	25.86	12.57	61.57	100.00
Other_West	30.40	11.49	58.11	100.00	29.19	11.05	59.76	100.00
Third_countries	18.46	19.52	62.02	100.00	19.57	20.16	60.27	100.00
all migrants	20.63	18.02	61.36	100.00	20.96	18.46	60.58	100.00

Source: DIOC 2010/2011, showing estimated duration of stay for each origin group in the four destination countries

Table 3. Average education by origin-group in 2010/2011

	Men Low qualifications	Men Middle qualifications	Men High qualifications	total	Women Low qualifications	Women Middle qualifications	Women High qualifications	total
natives	35.93	40.78	23.29	100.00	41.38	38.14	20.49	100.00
Romania	35.74	50.83	13.43	100.00	36.54	48.49	14.97	100.00
Bulgaria	33.14	41.28	25.57	100.00	29.86	37.89	32.25	100.00
Italy	48.77	31.26	19.97	100.00	56.84	21.88	21.28	100.00
Spain	29.09	36.67	34.24	100.00	36.75	26.53	36.72	100.00
EU-15	34.73	31.00	34.27	100.00	36.95	31.41	31.63	100.00
EU-11	22.59	49.39	28.02	100.00	28.13	43.62	28.25	100.00
Other_West	14.70	28.49	56.81	100.00	14.21	25.99	59.80	100.00
Third_countrie s	43.59	32.82	23.59	100.00	45.05	30.57	24.38	100.00
all migrants	39.06	35.57	25.37	100.00	40.59	33.42	25.99	100.00

Source: DIOC 2010/2011, showing estimated qualifications in the four destination countries
Low indicates ISCED 0-2; middle isced 3-4 and high isced 5-6

2.3 Job search methods

Table 4 uses the same dataset but provides more detail on the type of labour market outcomes which are experienced by migrants. It shows the average years of residence (based on 5-year intervals) for migrants; the percentage of people who are currently looking for work that have been looking for work for longer than 6 or 12 months; the proportion of respondents who receive some form of employment-related public assistance or benefits; and then the percentage of respondents who changed labour market status from one year to the next and went from being in work to out of work; or from out of work to in work. These averages are weighted. I also show the estimated difference in the sample and the p-value of a t-test of that difference. This p-value indicates whether it is likely that there is a difference in this outcome between a specific group of migrants and natives. If it is lower than 0.05 the difference in the sample is generally thought to be reflecting an actual difference in the population rather than random chance and is called statistically significant.

In line with earlier findings in table 2 migrants from the new member states have generally been in the country of residence less long while migrants from the EU-15 are much more established. Table 4 showed that migrants are less likely to be employed, but here we find that when out of work and looking for new work natives are on average more likely to search for longer than migrants and this difference is statistically significant for both the 6 and 12 months. For women those from the three newest member states tend to periods of searching for work that are slightly longer than those of natives with a non-significant difference for searching longer than 12 months. Whether migrants receive benefits is generally a sensitive point. With these data, we find that migrant men are 1p.p. more likely to receive benefits than natives and this is due to migrants from third countries who are 2p.p. more likely to receive benefits in Germany, Italy, Spain or the UK. This difference is only small given the higher risk of almost all migrant men to be unemployed. The only other significant differences are that migrants from the EU10 and other Western countries are less likely to receive benefits. For women migrants as a whole are actually 0.4p.p. less likely to receive benefits and again only the third country migrants are slightly more likely to receive benefits (0.2p.p.) while migrant women from other groups are less likely to receive benefits.

The final two variables show for men that there is substantially more movement both in and out of work for migrants than for natives. While on average 10% of employed migrant men from the three new member states are out of work the year after; 28% of those who are not working in one year work the next; compared to 5% of natives moving out of work and 18% into work from one year to the next. Female migrants have similarly high mobility out of work, but their differences in terms of going into work are smaller than for men, but still statistically significant. All migrant men are more likely to move from employment to out of work with the exception of those from the EU-10 where the difference is not statistically significant, but migrants from Romania, Bulgaria and Croatia have the highest risk, both for men and women.

Table 4. Length of stay and job search factors by origin for men

		years of residence	job search >=6m	job search >=12m	receive benefits	transition employment - no work	transition employment - work
native	mean		60.77	46.00	6.84	4.89	17.87
	difference						
	p-value						
	diff						
NMS3	mean	9.44	56.53	39.58	6.74	10.22	27.92
	difference	0.00	-4.24	-6.42	-0.10	5.34	10.05
	p-value		0.01	0.00	0.79	0.00	0.00
EU-15	mean	20.82	53.77	38.50	6.60	6.07	21.16
	difference	0.00	-7.00	-7.50	-0.24	1.19	3.29
	p-value		0.00	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00
EU-10	mean	8.55	44.38	27.45	5.15	4.97	34.37
	difference	0.00	-16.38	-18.55	-1.68	0.08	16.50
	p-value		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.81	0.00
Other West	mean	19.54	47.54	30.78	2.28	4.18	25.27
	difference	0.00	-13.22	-15.22	-4.55	-0.71	7.41
	p-value		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00
Third country	mean	14.12	59.47	42.80	9.07	8.89	21.76
	difference	0.00	-1.29	-3.20	2.23	4.01	3.89
	p-value		0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
all migrants	mean	14.54	57.55	41.01	7.96	8.00	22.82
	difference	0.00	-3.26	-5.05	1.07	3.12	4.98
	p-value		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	diff						

Source: LFS 2005-2014, random 10% sample of natives is used to limit the sample size, showing weighted results for Germany, Italy, Spain and the UK
German LFS data does not have information on country of birth, so nationality is used
shows the average of each variable by origin group, and for migrants the weighted difference and the p-value from an F-test of regression
outcomes are the years of residence in the country, whether the respondent receives benefits or public support
the percentage of current job seekers who have been looking for work longer than 6/12 months; and the percentage that worked last year and does not now and vice versa

Table 5. Length of stay and job search factors by origin for women

		years of residence	job search >=6m	job search >=12m	receive benefits	transition employment - no work	transition employment - work
native	mean		58.10	43.44	5.75	6.03	13.49
	difference						
	p-value						
	diff						
NMS3	mean	9.52	60.63	45.38	4.46	12.39	19.61
	difference	0.00	2.53	1.94	-1.29	6.36	6.12
	p-value		0.05	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00
EU-15	mean	21.09	50.66	37.40	4.07	7.09	15.11
	difference	0.00	-7.44	-6.04	-1.67	1.06	1.62
	p-value		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
EU-10	mean	9.58	47.70	31.41	5.52	8.66	22.82
	difference	0.00	-10.41	-12.02	-0.23	2.63	9.34
	p-value		0.00	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.00
Other West	mean	20.48	43.07	31.54	1.58	7.47	18.37
	difference	0.00	-15.04	-11.90	-4.17	1.44	4.88
	p-value		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Third country	mean	13.40	57.89	41.79	5.99	10.48	12.36
	difference	0.00	-0.22	-1.65	0.24	4.45	-1.12
	p-value		0.76	0.02	0.09	0.00	0.00
all migrants	mean	14.09	56.32	40.75	5.32	9.77	14.22
	difference	0.00	-1.80	-2.73	-0.44	3.74	0.76
	p-value		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	diff						

Source: LFS 2005-2014, random 10% sample of natives is used to limit the sample size, showing weighted results for Germany, Italy, Spain and the UK
German LFS data does not have information on country of birth, so nationality is used
shows the average of each variable by origin group, and for migrants the weighted difference and the p-value from an F-test of regression
outcomes are the years of residence in the country, whether the respondent receives benefits or public support
the percentage of current job seekers who have been looking for work longer than 6/12 months; and the percentage that worked last year and does not now and vice versa

Table 6. Methods of job search by origin

		Men				Women			
		direct methods	personal networks and contacts	adverts	other methods	direct methods	personal networks and contacts	adverts	other methods
native	mean	40.92	51.14	68.95	67.36	37.86	49.29	70.17	63.65
	Diff.								
	p-value								
NMS3	mean	63.78	82.28	66.69	47.05	57.97	81.49	66.28	43.24
	Diff.	22.87	31.14	-2.26	-20.31	20.12	32.20	-3.89	-20.41
	p-value	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
EU-15	mean	42.32	50.60	69.29	60.28	45.47	54.93	72.04	54.77
	Diff.	1.41	-0.53	0.34	-7.08	7.62	5.64	1.87	-8.88
	p-value	0.27	0.69	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.00
EU-10	mean	28.93	44.36	68.46	63.86	28.37	44.08	71.99	60.77
	Diff.	-11.99	-6.78	-0.49	-3.49	-9.48	-5.21	1.82	-2.88
	p-value	0.00	0.00	0.78	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.06
Other West	mean	45.11	47.63	70.46	50.91	41.82	48.30	74.23	47.30
	Diff.	4.19	-3.51	1.50	-16.45	3.96	-0.98	4.06	-16.35
	p-value	0.06	0.12	0.46	0.00	0.06	0.65	0.03	0.00
Third country	mean	49.38	64.27	65.14	61.50	48.93	66.11	64.71	54.71
	Diff.	8.46	13.14	-3.81	-5.85	11.07	16.82	-5.46	-8.94
	p-value	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
all migrants	mean	48.52	62.65	65.94	60.04	47.75	64.44	66.37	53.74
	Diff.	7.82	11.77	-2.90	-7.44	10.03	15.31	-3.72	-9.99
	p-value	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Source: LFS 2005-2014, random 10% sample of natives is used to limit the sample size, showing weighted results for Germany, Italy, Spain and the UK

German LFS data does not have information on country of birth, so nationality is used

shows the average of each variable by origin group, and for migrants the weighted difference and the p-value from a binary regression of the difference with natives

shows the percentage of respondents who use the following method while searching for work: direct application to employer, asking friends, relatives, trade unions etc...; answering or placing advertisements in newspapers/journals; other methods

2.4 Motivations for migration

Table 7 uses the 2008 ad-hoc module of the EU labour force survey to show the main motivation migrants give for moving. The motivations are grouped in six categories: those arriving with the aim of employment who already had a contract upon arrival (so they had a job offer or moved within a company); those that arrived with the goal of finding work; those that arrived to study; migrants seeking international protection; migrants arriving for family reasons; and other reasons.

Generally the largest categories of migrants are employment migrants without work (33% of men and 19.4% of women) and family migrants (23% men and 48% of women). There are differences between groups however with very few EU-migrants arriving for international protection. NMS3 migrants mainly migrate seeking work without a contract ready (69% of men and 45% for female migrants) while EU-15 migrants are almost halfway split between migrating with a contract and moving to seek work. Bulgarian, Croatian and Romanian migrants are also less likely to arrive as student migrants. These different motivations can help explain why these migrants are generally more likely to be active on the labour market.

Table 7. Motivations for migration by origin

		employment with contract	employment without contract	study	international protection	family	other	total
men	NMS3	13.38	68.67	1.20	0.32	13.73	2.69	100.00
	EU-15	24.70	21.12	9.24	0.00	18.24	26.70	100.00
	EU-10	24.76	52.29	9.07	1.12	4.82	7.96	100.00
	Other West	33.61	10.19	8.30	0.00	22.84	25.06	100.00
	Third	13.93	43.93	11.53	4.51	18.96	7.14	100.00
	country							
	all migrants	17.20	32.77	8.43	7.52	22.69	11.39	100.00
women	NMS3	8.73	45.35	3.01	0.17	38.87	3.88	100.00
	EU-15	14.29	11.15	13.96	0.19	36.28	24.13	100.00
	EU-10	14.19	35.96	9.24	0.73	30.30	9.59	100.00
	Other West	10.51	11.18	11.45	0.00	38.83	28.03	100.00
	Third	7.99	26.07	7.32	2.46	48.67	7.49	100.00
	country							
	all migrants	8.82	19.40	6.77	5.57	47.56	11.88	100.00

Source: LFS ad-hoc module 2008 on migration, showing weighted results for Germany, Italy, Spain and the UK

German LFS data does not have information on country of birth, so nationality is used

showing the percentage of respondents who give each reason as their main reason for migration: employment (with and without a contract upon migration) study; family reunification or formation; seeking protection and other reas

3 Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report UK

3.1 Job Search in the UK

Research suggests that unemployed people in Britain rely much more on formal rather than informal methods. In a study of the British labour market, Gregg and Wadsworth (1996) established that state employment agencies ranked within the first three most popular job search techniques of the unemployed, especially the long-term unemployed and people with basic or vocational credentials.

In terms of the characteristics of the applicants using different job search strategies some clear patterns seem to hold. Among the formal methods, state employment agencies or job centres cater for the needs of the less skilled, long-term unemployed, and disadvantaged workers (Granovetter 1995; Gregg and Wadsworth 1996). This might be true particularly of vulnerable groups such as women and minorities. For example, in the period between 1984 and 1994 in the UK, the percentage of successful placements for women found through formal means is much higher than the use of friends and contacts. Furthermore, female benefit claimants were more likely to have found a job through a job centre, whereas male benefit claimants were more likely to have found a job through direct application rather than use of job centre (Gregg and Wadsworth 1996).

In relation to social status, low status individuals are more likely to use contacts than high status ones (Wegener 1991), and people at the onset of their career are much more likely to depend upon contacts (Granovetter 1973, 1995). Overall, many studies find that there is a negative correlation between informal means of job search and age, education and occupational status (Corcoran et al. 1980, Marsden and Hulbert 1988). That is to say, with an increased experience in the labour market, people are more likely to use formal rather than informal contacts (Wegener 1991). According to Granovetter, this is not inconsistent with the fact that white-collar workers accrue more specialized contacts with time (Granovetter 1973, 1995). People in high managerial positions will be simply more successful in using work-related contacts than people with lower social status. Unfortunately, the UK data does not allow distinction between weak and strong ties, which is very important in the micromobility approach.

Another formal method, newspaper advertisements, is correlated with highly educated individuals who have access to geographically larger labour markets. In comparison, less educated people search for jobs more locally through friends or the local labour markets (Böheim and Taylor 2002). This may translate in dependence of recent immigrants with low stocks of human capital on the ethnic economy and the ethnic labour market and reluctance to use a global search method such as newspaper advertisements which perhaps enlist offers away from their ethnic community. Responding to and placing advertisements requires substantial knowledge of the language and institutional norms, which is another reason why this formal method is less often used by migrants.

Methods of job search also differ in their speed of procuring employment. With UK data, informal methods and state employment agencies are found to be the fastest of all job search strategies while newspaper advertisements are the slowest (Roper 1988). In this way of thoughts, migrants, using their sending labour markets as reference, will be less likely to employ the latter technique as they need a quick return of the migration costs and will go with the most reliable and fastest method of job search.

Like the other methods of job search, self-employment is also associated with particular characteristics of the applicants. Researchers argue that among ethnic minority members self-employment is the result of push and pull factors: a response to blocked upward social mobility as well as a manifestation of available '*cultural resources*' (Clark and Drinkwater 2000). Self-employment is usually more common among first generation ethnic minority members and declines in the second generation. This can be partially attributed to age effects: British-born ethnic minority members are younger and self-employment usually rises with age. In addition, higher qualifications are associated with paid-employment rather than self-employment (Clark and Drinkwater 2006). Movement of markets towards more flexible and non-standard employment can change this dynamic, with growing importance of self-employment for second generation members as well.

In summary, people with higher education and social status resort more to formal means of advancement such as private agencies and newspaper advertisements, while people of weaker educational credentials and low status choose informal methods and state employment agencies. Moreover, the evidence suggests that the role of formal methods in the UK context is greater than in the US (Gregg and Wadsworth 1996). The unmatched importance of social resources in the US can be attributed to the lower job tenure, and correspondingly the high level of various work contacts accumulated by employees in their career (De Graaf and Derk Flap 1988). In contrast, the British labour market also classified as unregulated in the Anglo-Saxon model is in general more formalized than the US one (Aoyama and Castells 2002) hence the greater significance of formal resources and institutional support.

3.2 Patterns of Search among Migrants and Minorities in the UK (with a focus on the highly-skilled migrants)

Studies point that we can expect differential effects by ethnic group in Britain. Gregg and Wadsworth (1996) and Böheim and Taylor (2002) registered no effect of ethnicity in the selection corrected models of unemployed respondents.

Dex (1982) ascertained that in terms of first jobs, Black Caribbeans were far more likely to depend on the advice of state employment agencies and career advice offices (71.8 percent); whereas for UK-born Whites the proportions were much more evenly distributed with only 39.6 per cent referring to career offices. Nevertheless, in terms of income, there was no indication that Black Caribbeans who used employment agencies were doing worse than their White peers. Therefore, although Black Caribbeans lacked profitable contacts, they used career offices successfully in overcoming disadvantage (Dex 1982).

Frijters et al. (2003) and Frijters et al. (2005) examined the question of whether immigrants compete effectively for jobs with natives. Significant differences were found between the White ethnic group and the other ethnic minorities. For example, all ethnic groups used social networks to a greater extent than the second-generation ethnic minority members. Black immigrants were the group which used direct application to employers the least among immigrant groups with 7.1 per cent. As for successful attainment of job offers, South Asian immigrants and second generation ethnic minority members were least successful in using job centres and newspaper advertisements. Only 13.4 per cent of South Asian immigrants found a job through employment office and 16.2 through newspaper advertisements in comparison with 19.7 and 23.5 per cent of Whites. These results were based on a sample of the UK Quarterly Labour Force Survey from 1997 until 2001.

Research by Patacchini and Zenou (2008) on the basis of local-authority data from England in the period of 1993-2003 established that especially for ethnic minorities in small areas, the higher the percentage of a given ethnic group living nearby, the higher the employment rate for the aforementioned ethnic group. This effect decreased rapidly with an increasing of travel time between areas (to measure ties of different lengths, the authors created proximity bands based on driving time between areas and the population density within each of the bands was measured) with approximately no significance beyond 90 minutes of travel time. This approach has some shortcomings as the researchers assumed that population density will encompass both the strong and the weak ties of the respondents.

Battu et al. (2004) also used British Labour Force Survey Data from 1998 to 2001 to determine whether ethnic groups in Britain use job search methods with differential success. They noted a high use of informal methods amongst members of the South Asian groups and lower referral to this technique by members of the Black group. Also, informal job searches did not necessarily lead to better outcomes for minority members and were even detrimental to certain ethnic groups such as Pakistanis and Bangladeshis. Battu et al. (2011) find that minorities and ethnic groups in Britain are particularly disadvantaged in terms of using social ties. Particularly, a penalty can be observed for Eastern Europeans and Pakistanis and Bangladeshis.

Giulietti et al (2013) find no effect of years of migration on job search success. Crucially, they establish that contacts are as used among migrants and minorities than among white British, and they are an important referral method among the low educated.

Several studies focus on the success with which ethnic minorities utilize specifically state and private employment agencies in Britain. The aforementioned qualitative study of Career Offices in Britain by Cross et al (1990) found that young Black Caribbeans suspected unfair treatment by the career officers. Another British qualitative study of six firms – a research project commissioned by the British Department of Employment, found that recruitment through informal sources served to reproduce the characteristics of the existent predominantly White and male workforce. In the cases that formal means were involved applicants of ethnic minority origin with very low qualifications were rejected at an early stage (Jewson et al. 1990). Although the study did not compare the utility of formal and informal means directly, it underlined the importance of qualifications and their effect on the productivity of a given job search method – an important point which will be taken into account in this study.

A report by Johnson and Fidler (2006) focused on the 2005 Jobcentre Plus National Customer Satisfaction Survey (CSS). Contact with Jobcentre Plus was more recent for ethnic minority groups than for White British-born customers although there was little variation in terms of the nature of contact, with personal visits being most common for all ethnic groups. Customers across all ethnic minority groups were more likely than white people to visit Jobcentre Plus to search for or enquire about vacancies and/or to attend a discussion with an adviser. Ethnic minority customers in general were, however, more likely than whites to feel that the Jobcentre Plus service had improved over the previous year. Particularly positive responses were received from Black African, Pakistani and Other Asian customers. In fact, overall satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus services was very similar for White and Asian customers. However, Black customers – especially those receiving support – reported lower than average levels of satisfaction.

3.3 Further avenues to explore

We need a more detailed categorization of ethnic groups. Frequently studies distinguish between Black, South Asian and White group as backgrounds specified. However, in the WP, specifically in the British team, the focus is strongly on other West highly skilled migrants, between EU15 and EU13 migrants. There is much variation in the attainment of Pakistanis, Bangladeshis and Indians, and between Black Caribbeans and Black Africans (Heath and Yu 2005). In particular, all the ethnic minority members of the second generation were grouped in one category, which left important differences obscured. Previous research has suggested that the differences in job search between UK-born Asians and Black group members are indeed significant. Indians, for instance, might be more likely to use formal methods as they apply for white-collar jobs, while Black Caribbeans who are competing for manual jobs may avail more of informal contacts (Heath and Yu 2005).

Some of the analyses do not distinguish between private and state employment agencies amassing them in the category of '*institutional methods*'. This can be an important distinction because of the stronger emphasis on equal opportunities legislation in the public sector.

3.4 Data and Methods

The UK team will perform several in-depth interviews with highly skilled other Western migrants. In addition we will analyse data from five quarterly labour Force Survey 2004 to 2016 to establish broad differences between the groups of interest. The *Quarterly Labour Force Survey* (QLFS) has been conducted since 1992, with each sample household retained for five consecutive quarters, and a fifth of the sample replaced each quarter. Around 60 000 households are interviewed each quarter, and the sample consists of approximately 130 000 individuals per quarter with an ethnic minority sample size of around 10 000 households.

Table 1 below shows the different methods of job search that are asked about in the Labour Force Survey. Respondents are asked which methods they are using to look for work when currently out of work and it is possible to choose more than one. They are also asked how they found their current job when currently employed.

Table 1: Job search variables in the Labour Force Survey

All respondents looking for a job	Currently employed respondents
Advertise for jobs in newspapers or journals	
Answer advertisements in newspapers and journals	→ Replying to a job advertisement
Study situations vacant in newspapers or journals	
Visit a Jobcentre/Jobmarket or Training and Employment Agency office	→ Job centre, job market
Visit a Careers office	→ Careers office
Visit a Jobclub	→ Job club
Have your name on the books of a private employment agency	→ Private employment agency
Ask friends, relatives, colleagues or trade unions about jobs	→ Hearing from someone who worked there
Apply directly to employers	→ Direct application
Do anything else to find work	→ Some other way
Wait for the results of an application for a job	
Look for premises and equipment, seek permit, try to get a loan or other financial backing	

Source: Labour Force Survey Questionnaire

3.5 References

- Aoyama, Y. and Castells, M. (2002) "An empirical assessment of the information society: employment and occupational structures of G-7 countries, 1920-2000", *International Labour Review* 141: 123-159
- Battu, H., Seaman, P and Zenou, Y. (2004) Job contact networks and the ethnic minorities, Centre for European Labour Market Research, Discussion Paper: 2004-15
- Battu, Harminder, Paul Seaman, and Yves Zenou. 2011. "Job contact networks and the ethnic minorities." *Labour Economics* 18 (1):48-56
- Böheim, R. and Taylor, M. (2002) "Job search methods, intensity and success in Britain in the 1990s", Working paper No: 0206, Johannes Kepler University of Linz
- Clark, K. and Drinkwater, S. (2000) Pushed out or Pulled In? Self-Employment among Ethnic Minorities in England and Wales. *Labour Economics*, 7, 603-628.
- Clark, K. and Drinkwater, S. (2006) "Changing Patterns of Ethnic Minority Self-Employment in Britain: Evidence from Census Microdata", [IZA Discussion Paper No. 2495](#)
- Cross, M. Wrench, J. and Barnett, S. (1990) "Ethnic minorities and the Careers service: an investigation into processes of assessment and placement", A report for the Department of Employment by the Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, University of Warwick, Research Paper No.73
- Dex, S. (1982) "Discrimination and job search theories for black British young men", *Applied Economics* 14: 533-544
- Giulietti, Corrado, Christian Schluter, and Jackline Wahba. 2013. "With a Lot of Help from my Friends: Social Networks and Immigrants in the UK." *Population, Space and Place* 19 (6):657-70
- Granovetter, M. (1973) "The strength of weak ties", *American Journal of Sociology* 78: 1360-1380
- Granovetter, M. (1974). *Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Granovetter, M. (1995) "Getting a job: a study of contacts and careers", Chicago, Chicago University Press
- Gregg, P. and Wadsworth, J. (1994), *More work in fewer households?* Discussion Paper 72. London: NIESR

Gregg, P. and Wadsworth, J. (1996) "How effective are state employment agencies? Jobcentre use and matching in Britain", *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 58(3), 443-467

Frijters, P., Shields, M.A. and Wheatley Price, S. (2003). 'Immigrant job search in the UK: evidence from panel data', Discussion Paper no. 902, Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor.

Frijters, P., Shields, M.A. and Wheatley-Price, S. (2005) "Job search methods and their success: a comparison of immigrants and natives in the U.K.", *The Economic Journal* 115 (November): F359-F376

Jewson, N. Mason, D., Waters, S. and Harvey, J. (1990) "Ethnic minorities and employment practice – a study of six organizations", Department of Sociology, University of Leicester, Research paper No.76

Johnson, S. and Fidler, Y. (2005) "Job centre Plus customer satisfaction: ethnic minority booster survey 2005", Department of Work and Pensions, www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5/rrs-index.asp

4 Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Germany

4.1 Migration Trends

After 1945, (West) Germany experienced multiple waves of immigration. The first migration movement consisted of German prisoners of WW-II, displaced ethnic Germans from Central Europe and people from the East occupation zone. These groups partly filled certain labor gaps which emerged during the economic boom of the 1950s. To fully meet the increasing demand in construction and industry, Germany initiated a temporary labor recruitment program. Young unskilled workers, initially from Southern Europe, later primarily from Turkey, were recruited as so-called *Gastarbeiter* (“guest workers”). As the term already indicates, the plan was to recruit the guest workers for a fixed amount of time. After the end of their contract, they were to return to their home country and be replaced by other workers. However, when the recruitment ban came to place in 1973, a lot of migrant workers stayed in Germany and had the possibility for family reunification. During the period of the *Gastarbeiterprogramm* (1950s-1973), about 14 million labor migrants came to Germany (Aksakal & Schmidt-Verkerk, 2014).

After 1973, immigrants to Germany were primarily skilled labor migrants, family members of “guest workers”, refugees/asylum seekers and students. This immigration wave was lower in terms of quantity compared to the previous migration movements. The next large influx of immigrants happened around 1990 when millions of ethnic Germans from the Soviet Union arrived to Germany and during the Yugoslavian War in the 1990s when a large number of people applied for asylum. From the middle of the 1990s on², immigration flows to Germany were relatively low (Aksakal & Schmidt-Verkerk, 2014).

4.2 Public Discourse on Immigration in Germany

The public discourse on immigration in Germany in the first years after WW-II was shaped by the perception of the German people as a “national community” and the predominantly ethnic German immigrants in that period were considered to be a part of that community. The public debate about the economically driven immigration from the 1950s until 1973, in contrast, was led by the idea that migration should lead to an economic benefit for Germany. However, the cultural distance between the economic migrants from Southern Europe or Turkey and the native population was also a topic of discussion (Bauder, 2007).

Economic as well as cultural considerations remained relevant throughout the 1980s, the 1990s, and the first years of the new century. Mass immigration of ethnic Germans from the former Soviet Union and the arrival of many refugees in the beginning of the 1990s brought the question of cultural belonging and cultural distance back on the map. However, there was also a shift in public opinion around the year 2000 in which the idea of the economic necessity of immigration revived and more and more citizens as well as politicians acknowledged Germany’s status as an immigration country. The launch of the “green card” in 2000 fell into that period. The green card made it possible for IT-specialists from abroad to settle in Germany. Since then, the public discourse on immigration moved between two narratives: on the one

² until the most recent influx of refugees

hand, an emphasis of the economic benefits of immigration, on the other hand, an identification of immigration as a threat to the national identity of Germany (Bauder, 2007).

4.3 Recruitment of highly-skilled Immigrants

According to the OECD (2013), Germany is one of the countries with the lowest barriers for the immigration of skilled workers. However, the relative number of highly-skilled immigrants is low compared to countries such as Australia or Canada. Although the application for a work permit is inexpensive and the procedure rather fast, German employers seem to be reluctant to recruit foreign workers. The OECD lists a lack of transparency and a negative reputation of the German application system as possible reasons for this (OECD, 2013).

Highly-skilled specialists were exempt from the recruitment ban in 1973. Furthermore, the immigration of IT-specialists was fostered since 2000 when the green card was introduced. Until 2004 (when this practice was discontinued), Germany issued 17,000 of such work permits to qualified applicants who found an employer. The green card entailed the possibility of a permanent residence for the receivers. Green card holders came primarily from India, China, Romania, Poland and other Central European countries (Kogan, 2010).

However, the preferential treatment of specialists is not limited to the IT-sector. Academics and researchers, managers from business and industry as well as self-employed immigrants (when their business is of economic interest for Germany) are granted work permits (Kogan, 2010). The EU blue card was introduced in Germany in 2012 with the objective to make the country more attractive for well-educated foreigners. Requirements for obtaining a blue card are:

- „a German or an accredited foreign or a university degree that is comparable to a German one“
- „a working contract with a gross annual compensation of at least €49.600 (4.134 Euros per month), a contract in the so-called shortage occupation (scientists, mathematics, engineers, doctors and IT-skilled workers) with the amount of €38.688 (3.224 Euros per month)“ (Verein für soziales Leben e.V., 2016a).

Furthermore, foreign graduates of a German university have the right to a settlement permit after two years of employment when they work in a field related to their degree and can prove that they possess the necessary German skills, among other things. Lastly, highly qualified persons without a blue card can be immediately granted a settlement permit when they have a “specific job offer”. They do not have to prove a minimal income. However, they must be able to cover living expenses by their own (Verein für soziales Leben e.V., 2016).

As the OECD (2013) notes, there has not really been an initiative for active recruitment of highly-skilled workers. Employers are mostly on their own to attract potential employees from abroad. This is identified as one of the reasons why immigration of highly-skilled migrants is still relatively underdeveloped in Germany. Small and medium-sized enterprises do not have the resources for an active recruitment policy. One exception for this lack of recruitment initiatives is the Federal Employment Agency’s involvement in the European job-search platform EURES. ZAV, which is the foreign branch of the Employment Agency, is almost exclusively active in EU-countries (OECD, 2013).

Another exception is the website “Make it in Germany”, which was launched in 2012 by the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology, the Federal Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs and the Federal

Employment Agency. Its objective is to convince highly-skilled foreigners to take up an employment in Germany. Besides providing information about the formal requirements for immigration and working as well as the German culture, prospective immigrants can find the addresses and other contact information of German institutions in proximity to them (OECD, 2013).

Constant and Rinne (2013) found that, compared to other instruments, recruitment of foreign workers is relatively unimportant for German firms. To provide small- and medium-sized enterprises with more information about the legal framework and the procedure, the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology started an online platform (<http://www.kofa.de/handlungsempfehlungen/fachkraefte-finden/im-ausland>). Potential recruitment channels, public and private, are also listed there.

Results from a survey conducted by Bahrke et al. (2011) suggest that personal contact is the most successful recruitment channel, followed by online job boards and the company website. Compared to large companies, small- and medium-sized enterprises are relatively unsuccessful in their recruitment efforts. Furthermore, private recruitment agencies are less important for firms than public recruitment services (Constant & Rinne, 2013).

4.4 Profile of highly-skilled Immigrants

Compared to other advanced democracies, the number of immigrants from third-countries (i.e. non-EU) remains on a rather modest level in Germany. Most highly-skilled immigrants come from EU-countries. A recent development is the immigration of well-educated youth from Southern European countries which are affected by recession (Constant & Rinne, 2013).

Mahmood and Schömann (2002) investigated the determinants of migration decision in sending countries. They conducted a survey among 1,500 IT-Graduates in Pakistan. The empirical findings of their study indicate that socio-economic considerations are more important for prospective migrants than cultural aspects. The respondents ranked better career options, higher income and a better living standard higher than social networks or racial tolerance.

It can be assumed that ethnic networks play a significant role in the migration process, including the search of appropriate employment opportunities. However, there is a lack of data to fully test this assumption (Constant & Rinne, 2013).

Looking at the situation of immigrants after their arrival in Germany, Constant and Massey (2003) find a high degree of occupational segmentation between immigrants and natives, in the initial stage of finding the first employment and over time. However, this relationship might not apply to highly-skilled immigrants who come to Germany after obtaining a concrete job offer. Interestingly, in a study using event history analysis, Constant and Massey (2002) show that high occupational prestige significantly reduces the odds of returning to the home-country.

4.5 Conclusion: Gaps in the Literature and Suggestions for the Interviews

In general, there is not much research on immigration of specialists to Germany. Many studies which investigate the determinants of immigration and the situation of immigrants focus on low-skilled

immigrants. In particular, there is a lack of research on the socioeconomic and sociocultural situation of highly-skilled labor migrants after they arrived to Germany. This may be due to a lack of available data. Here, the interviews could provide a first qualitative insight. Since the migrants which are the focus of the interviews in Germany primarily come for economic reasons, it would be interesting to know how they perceive their sociocultural integration into the German society. This could shed some light on the question whether economic integration is a sufficient condition for cultural integration. Potential topics related to that are the development of social networks, the extent to which ethnic ties within Germany play a role in the migrant's life, and their perception of ethnic/racial tolerance in the German society.

There are also not many studies which examine the recruitment process from the perspective of the migrants. Often, the lack of support from the government is discussed from the perspective of the employers. The interviews provide the possibility to find out more about how the immigrants were recruited, to what extent they used existing social/ethnic networks for this and as how supportive they perceived the German state during the recruitment process.

Another gap in the literature concerns the usage of private recruitment actors. In the case that there will also be expert interviews in Germany, they could provide a possibility to find out more about that recruitment channel. It is unclear from the literature who these actors are (private persons or firms), how they work, how professionalized they are and how their relationship with public recruitment channels looks like.

4.6 References

- Aksakal, M. & Schmidt-Verkerk, K. (2014). New migration trends in Germany: Characteristics, actors, policies. *Comcad Working Papers*, 128.
- Bahrke, M., Demary, M., Lichtblau, K. & Schleiermacher, T. (2011). Internationalisierung und Fachkräftesicherung: Eine Studie im Auftrag des Verbandes der Metall- und Elektroindustrie Baden-Württemberg e.V. Köln und Stuttgart: Südwestmetall.
- Bauder, H. (2007). Media discourse and the new German immigration law. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(1). 95-112.
- Constant, A. F. & Massey, D. S. (2002). Self-selection, earnings, and out-migration: A longitudinal study of immigrants to Germany. *IZA Discussion Paper*, 672.
- Constant, A. F. & Massey, D. S. (2003). Labor market segmentation and the earnings of German guestworkers. *IZA Discussion Paper*, 774.
- Constant, A. F. & Rinne, U. (2013). Labour market information for migrants and employers: The case of Germany. *IZA Research Report*, 50.
- Kogan, I. (2010). New immigrants – old disadvantage patterns? Labour market integration of recent immigrants into Germany. *International Migration*, 49(1). 91-117.
- Mahmood, T. & Schömann, K. (2002). The decision to migrate: A simultaneous decision making approach. *WZB Discussion Paper*.

OECD (2013). Recruiting immigrant workers: Germany 2013. (Downloaded September 19, 2016 from http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/recruiting-immigrant-workers-germany_9789264189034-en).

Verein für soziales Leben e.V. (2016a). Blue card for Germany. (Downloaded September 19, 2016 from <http://www.bluecard-eu.de/eu-blue-card-germany/>).

Verein für soziales Leben e.V. (2016b). Which legal requirements apply for a permanent stay in Germany? (Downloaded September 19, 2016 from <http://www.immigration-2-germany.com/residence-title/permanent-stay.html>).

5 Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Spain

5.1 Introduction

Since the 2008 global economic crisis, the south-north migration route within Europe has gained significance as people from the most impacted parts of the EU moved to countries such as Germany, the United Kingdom and Scandinavia. Although official statistics estimate that 225,000 people left the Spanish territory between 2008 and 2012, González-Ferrer (2013) provides evidence that the number is more likely around 700,000 for that period.³ The economic collapse is generally thought to be the underlying cause of this new south-north migration flow, while the more established phenomenon of east-west European migration has been attributed to the EU's eastern enlargements. However, there is increasing evidence that emigration from Spain is motivated by more than purely economic factors (Bygnes 2015, González Enríquez and Martínez Romera 2014, Herrera Ceballos 2014, Triandafyllidou and Gropas 2014). Though the post-2008 south-north mobility remains relatively understudied to date, these researchers suggest that emigrants have in mind not only better working conditions but also other quality of life considerations in their mobility and settlement decision-making processes.

5.2 The New Spanish Emigration in Context

Following rates of 26% general and 55% youth unemployment, the accumulation of unpaid mortgages and surges in home-evictions across the country, the economic collapse rapidly became a social and political crisis marked by increasing social inequality, severe austerity measures and widespread cross-country mobilizations against political corruption, (Bygnes 2015). The 'Indignados' or 15-M movement most famously captured this national mood, elements of which were later channeled in the creation of the Podemos political party. Both Podemos and another new (centre-right) party, Ciudadanos, have formed effective challenges to Spain's bi-partisan system and are often held responsible for the current political stale-mate and non-governability of the country which could head into a third general election by the end of 2016 in the space of a single year.

Spain, where 38% of 25-54 year olds are university educated (Eurostat 2015), has one of the most highly segmented labour markets in the EU (with the highest share of temporary contracts in Europe). 1/3 of the Spanish labour-force is subject to precarious fixed-term contracts (Bygnes and Erdal 2016, Polavieja 2003). Although strong labour market segmentation was a reality in Spain well before the crisis, economic recession hit those on temporary contracts the hardest, producing a very rapid increase in the unemployment rate amongst the least protected employees (particularly young people and immigrants). Immigrants (both from Eastern European and non-EU countries) who had been attracted to Spain's booming economy and large demand for low-skilled workers in the 2000 – 2007 period were concentrated in the most precarious sectors (construction, food preparation and serving, domestic work) (Rodríguez-Planas and Nollenberger 2014). Spain's immigration boom at the turn of the new millennium increased the number of residents on the territory by 720,000 on average per year from 2002 - 2008 (González-Ferrer 2013) (a total of over 4 million people through the period),⁴ making Spain the top immigration receiver of the EU during those years (Martínez Abascal 2014). Interestingly, the immigrant cohort that arrived

³ Gonzalez-Ferrer (2013) compares the discrepancies between Spanish national statistics on emigration with German and British statistics on arrival of Spaniards to the 2 countries (among the top 6 destinations of Spanish emigrants 2008 – 2012). The sudden growth in intensity of emigration from Spain has surpassed the growth of post-crisis emigration in other Southern EU countries.

⁴ Compared to total net migration between 2002-2008 in France (1 million people), Germany (0.5 million), United Kingdom (1 million) and Italy (2 million) (Martínez Abascal 2014).

between 2000- 2003 were in employment at a rate of 56% in 2000, which rose to 70% over the 2 subsequent years, figures which exceeded the rate of employment of the native population by 5 to 10 points for the same period (Rodríguez-Planas and Nollenberg 2014). Though the economic slowdown affected employment rates of native Spaniards, losses among immigrants were considerably larger so that by 2009 the proportion of Spanish-born in employment was higher than that of immigrants (Rodríguez-Planas and Nollenberg 2014). Our inquiry into the profiles of Spanish emigrants or potential emigrants and the pathways they take to find work abroad should therefore take into account these multiple trends – the high education rate of Spanish youth, the challenges of navigating a segmented labour market in which access to secure and unlimited contracts is restricted, as well as economic, political and social crises that have most strongly affected youth and immigrants.

5.3 Dynamics of Emigration

By 2011, more people were leaving than entering Spain and it should be stressed that the majority of these departures were made by foreigners (non-Spanish nationals) moving to a new destination or back to their country of origin (González-Ferrer 2013).⁵ The departure of Spanish citizens, specifically (both Spanish-born and naturalized), is more difficult to estimate as emigration numbers are based directly or indirectly on municipality residence registries, which can only be updated if emigrants register with Spanish consulates (González-Ferrer 2013).⁶

As González-Ferrer points out, there have been attempts by the Spanish government and some commentators to minimize the gravity of the emigration situation by highlighting its potentially temporary or even seasonal nature as well as the fact that much of it is on account of ‘foreigners’ or recently naturalized Spaniards leaving the country. We share her view that both temporary emigration and emigration of non-nationals and ‘new Spaniards’ are note-worthy as they reflect the devastation left by the crisis as well as losses in human capital and successfully integrated members of Spanish society (González-Ferrer 2013).

As discussed above, the Spanish official statistics have significantly underestimated the numbers of Spaniards abroad in the years after the crisis, the real numbers likely being over 700,000 between 2008 and 2012 rather than 225,000. Though we know that many people who left Spain were non-Spanish nationals (often lower-skilled migrants who benefitted from the pre-crisis economic boom and were hardest hit by the recession), there is a dearth of statistics on qualification levels of Spanish emigrants. Nevertheless, given the high rates of tertiary education in Spain, coupled with the fact that the probability to emigrate rises with education levels, it is reasonable to assume that most Spaniards travelling the south-north migration route are highly qualified (González-Ferrer 2013).

The image of the university-educated 25-34 year old faced with a complete lack of professional horizons forced to leave Spain has infused national discourse and feeds into negative characterizations of the new Spanish emigration as equivalent to ‘brain drain’. The 2015 Spanish box-office hit film “Perdiendo el Norte” (a play on words that means “Losing your way” and simultaneously can be interpreted as referring to a Northern destination) about 2 university-educated Spaniards with no career prospects who move to Berlin

⁵ Although foreigners in Spain represent only about 12% of the population, by 2012, 83% of the inverted migration flows (net migration was now in negative numbers) was due to non-Spanish nationals leaving the Spanish territory (162,000 people) (González-Ferrer 2013).

⁶ Many emigrants are dissuaded from registering at their Spanish consulates abroad for several reasons, some of which are that such action results in removal from the Spanish national registry which implies the loss of one’s family doctor (General Practitioner) and loss of municipal election rights in Spain, among others. The relative ease with which Spanish emigrants can become ‘free movers’ within the EU and are guaranteed residence and working rights in other EU countries further reduces incentives for consulate registration (González-Ferrer 2013).

in pursuit of a ‘German El Dorado’ is an illustration of the prominence of this theme in the current Spanish imaginary. It is certainly true that Spanish emigration has risen sharply in the wake of the crisis and that many high-skilled Spaniards feel pushed to ‘vote with their feet’ (Triandafyllidou and Gropas 2014). However, the negative perceptions related to emigration (e.g. ‘Spain’s lost generation’ or ‘the loss of Spain’s best and brightest’) should be put into some context. It is likely that public alarm around post-crisis emigration has as much to do with the economic and political circumstances as with certain traits of Spanish society and culture, namely, that the Spanish population became relatively immobile following the 1970s transition to democracy.⁷ In other words, the new high-qualified Spanish emigration is quite remarkable from a national historical perspective and may be less so from a comparative international one.⁸ Despite a seemingly alarming 48% of Spaniards in 2012 who reported they would be willing to move to another country (Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas 2012) (compared to 30% of Swedes and 35% of Germans in similar studies), only 17% of these admitted to actually having reflected on the possibility in the last 12 months (González-Ferrer 2012). While our aim is neither to dismiss the potentially negative consequences of the over-representation of high-skilled Spaniards in the new emigration trend nor to deny the existence of any ‘brain drain’, awareness of the historical and international context surrounding the issue helps paint a more complete picture of the new emigration trend.

5.4 Emigrant Profiles, Destinations and Motivations

Emigration from Spain has tended to be dominated by the 24-35 year-old population. What is notable about the post-crisis years, however, is that emigration rates among this young group have remained relatively stable, while they have quadrupled for the 35-44 age group throughout the recession (González-Ferrer 2013). In other words, more and more people in their mid-30s to mid-40s are part of the new emigration trend, although younger Spaniards still represent around 40-50% of emigrants (González-Ferrer 2013). With reductions in the number of 18-24 year old emigrants throughout the crisis, it is reasonable to assume that student migration has decreased and that labour migration is on the rise (given the change in the age-group composition indicated above as well as González-Ferrer’s observation that the crisis years have witnessed an increase in men emigrating compared to women). Between 2008 and 2012 the top destinations for Spanish emigrants were the United Kingdom, France and Germany (together representing 30% of all Spanish consular registrations), the United States, Argentina and Ecuador.⁹ As noted at the outset of the discussion, though emigration rates from all crisis-stricken European countries like Greece, Portugal or Italy have been on the rise, the intensity of the growth in the Spanish case surpasses the others, specifically where the United Kingdom as a destination is concerned. The increasing significance of the Spain-United Kingdom migration route closely follows the evolution of the economic crisis. Spain went from being the 14th highest labour emigrant sender to the UK in 2010, to occupying 6th place in 2011, 5th place in 2012 and 2nd place by 2013 (after Poland) (González-Ferrer 2013).

⁷ Though millions of Spaniards settled in different European countries throughout the 1960s and 70s, the Spanish population has become remarkably sedentary (displaying little geographic mobility even *within* the country). Commentators attribute this to the strong local attachments of Spaniards in which family and friendship ties are deterrents to geographic mobility. (González Enríquez 2013).

⁸ Comparative evidence of emigration rates of high-qualified individuals shows that Spain ranks considerably low on the ‘brain drain’ scale compared to other OECD countries. As the Database on Immigration to OECD countries and non-OECD countries shows, the 2.8% emigration rate among high-qualified Spaniards during 2010 - 2011 pales in comparison to the 9% of their counterparts from Germany, 11.5% from the United Kingdom, 7.5% from Italy, 8.7% from Greece and 27.3% from Ireland (OECD 2015).

⁹ Of all the top destination countries, the only one to have witnessed a decrease between 2008 and 2012 was the USA, while Spanish emigration to the other 5 destination countries increased over the period. Note that the majority of departures to Ecuador during the recession were actually ‘returns’ undertaken by Ecuadorian immigrants who had become naturalized Spanish citizens.

Results from a large-scale online survey of Southern European and Irish high-skilled migrants reinforce the Spain-specific information presented above. Over 3 months in 2013, Triandafyllidou and Gropas (2014) collected 6,750 valid answers from Greek, Spanish, Italian, Irish and Portuguese respondents regarding the push and pull factors that led them to migrate and their extent of integration in the labour market of the society of destination. In tandem with González-Ferrer's analysis of the distinctiveness of the new post-crisis migration, results from the online survey underscore the over-representation of men (64% of respondents) as well as the large proportion of the 30s to mid-40s age category filling the ranks of Southern European emigrants (92% of respondents are under the age of 45, 48% of which are between 31 and 45 and 44% are under 30). The study also sheds more light on just what kind of high-skilled migrants they are. Respondents were mainly professionals in the healthcare, banking and education sectors, corporate transferees, students and researchers and academics.¹⁰

An interesting finding of this survey has to do with the motivations for migration and 'push' factors. Contrary to popular wisdom, it appears that the majority of Southern European emigrants are not being driven away by their inability to find employment or by purely economic considerations. On average, 60% of respondents **had been employed** during the 6 months prior to migration (51% for Spaniards). Instead of focusing exclusively on unemployment and the recession, respondents more often pointed to the limited opportunities for professional advancement and expressed dissatisfaction with the corruption, lack of meritocracy and the amount of nepotism in their country of origin compared to the country of destination (Triandafyllidou and Gropas 2014). These findings suggest that high-skilled individuals from the crisis-stricken European countries consider non-economic dimensions in their decision to migrate.

In a similar vein, Bygnes' study of high-skilled Spaniards in Norway emphasizes the reluctance of many emigrants to frame their migration motivations in terms of the economic crisis when interviewed on the subject (Bygnes 2015). She accounts for the emigrants' avoidance of economic themes by pointing to their social class (they were less affected by the recession) and by their attempts to distinguish themselves from negative stereotypes of the 'typical Spanish migrant' in Norway (described as 'loud', working in a low-skill job and socializing only with other Spanish emigrants). Through her use of Emile Durkheim's concept of *anomie*, which refers to the breakdown of collective purpose and ideals within society, Bygnes captures some of the non-economic dimensions of Spanish post-2008 emigration and illustrates the significance of societal dimensions in migration decision-making processes. She also underscores the 'boundary work' that emigrants perform in order to give meaning to their experiences and distinguish themselves from people they consider as of a lower status. Discontentment with Spanish society also came up as a theme among the Spanish respondents of the Southern European e-survey. Somewhat akin to Bygnes' reference to societal 'anomie', a recurrent set of responses regarding reasons for migration in the e-survey had to do with dissatisfaction with "the lack of civility in Spain, as well as disorganization and apathy" (González Enríquez and Martínez Romera 2014). Nearly 60% of respondents stated their reason for leaving Spain was to "look for a better life for me and/or my family" (González Enríquez and Martínez Romera 2014). This response category grouped together migration motivations such as dissatisfaction with the political situation of the country and perceived poor quality of life and lack of future in the country (González Enríquez and Martínez Romera 2014).

5.5 Pathways to Employment Abroad

As mentioned throughout this overview, there is a lack of concrete and accurate information on the characteristics and scope of the new Spanish emigration, as many authors must piece together both

¹⁰ 88% hold university degrees, 60% of which are at the graduate level (masters or PhD) and their academic backgrounds are mainly in economics, business, engineering, maths and natural sciences, IT and computer sciences and to a lesser extent in the humanities and social sciences as well as medicine.

quantitative and qualitative data from different sources in order to shed some light on the phenomenon. Again, researchers tend to agree that among the Spanish-born emigrants, most of them are high-qualified. However, they remain a relatively 'invisible' group, since most countries do not have registries of their qualified professionals residing abroad or working for foreign institutions or businesses (Herrera Ceballos 2014). The Triandafyllidou and Gropas study of Southern European high-skilled migrants detailed above helps get a clearer view of the sectors in which these professionals are concentrated as well as clues as to how they found work abroad. For example, the fact that a portion of these migrants are in fact corporate transferees indicates that some of them are spared the difficulties of having to actively search for a job in the foreign country.

For others, a major channel for recruitment and information on intra-EU labour mobility may be the EURES network. EURES is a network of the public employment services of the European Economic Area and is accessible via the European Commission's EU mobility internet portal and, in the Spanish case, through both the state and regional Spanish public employment services websites. Specifically, within the EURES framework, Spain has established a network of 'Puentes de Colaboración Permanente' (PCPs) ('Bridges of Permanent Collaboration') with other European Economic Area countries. Spain's PCPs are divided into different country groups, including partnerships with Germany (the first and most developed of the partnerships), the Nordic countries, a single group for France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg and Switzerland and another 'mixed group' for other countries. Through these country and area-specific PCP agreements, the Spanish EURES network aims at increasing access to the European labour market for high-skilled Spanish workers by marketing their capabilities to European countries with a higher demand for skilled labour. On-going examples of the effectiveness of these country and area-specific agreements with Spain include Scandinavian companies such as Volvo and Aker Solutions who regularly hire Spanish engineers through their PCPs (EURES 2013).

Between 2012 and 2013, 255,224 employment seekers used the services of Spain's EURES advisors (a sharp increase compared to the 5,000 users recorded in 2008) (EURES 2013). Not only are job-seekers using this portal more than at the beginning of the economic crisis, but employers, specifically German, Nordic and Dutch firms are increasingly connecting with the Spanish EURES network with employment opportunities. For the period between June 2012 and May 2013, of the 3,157 vacancies advertised through the EURES Spain portal as well as Spain's PCCs with other countries, the majority were targeted at engineers (26%) nurses (14%), low-skill manual workers (12%) and flight attendants (8%). In terms of the actual hiring trends for the same period (i.e., which of these 3,157 vacancies resulted in jobs for applicants), 1,764 Spanish residents found employment in other countries through the network. The occupations that resulted in the most hirings were nursing (31%), engineering (15%) and restaurant service (10%). These 1,764 new job opportunities were overwhelmingly concentrated in Germany (40%), followed by Norway (11%), the United Kingdom (11%) and France (9%). The vacancies advertised, hiring patterns observed and main destinations arrived at through the EURES portal for the 2012-2013 period demonstrate that users of the web portal tend to be highly-skilled, although the high level of recruitment of waiters (10% of all recruitments through the website) may suggest that it attracts a significant number of lower-skilled job-seekers and/or that a number of people with tertiary education in Spain accept work as waiters in other countries).¹¹

A report published by Adecco and the Spanish employment portal Infoempleo echoes these findings regarding employment opportunities outside of Spain. It notes that for the year 2015, vacancies advertised

¹¹ This would reinforce González Enríquez and Martínez Romera's findings that some of the difficulties faced by Spanish emigrants in their country of residence include problems with recognition of their degree and qualifications (15% of e-survey respondents) as well as being over-qualified for their job (over 20% of respondents).

through Spanish employment services for jobs abroad increased by 5.2% compared to 2014. The sectors with the highest demand for Spanish workers in other countries were general consulting, real estate, and new technologies. 98% of these job offers required professional training or a university or graduate degree and the most highly demanded educational profiles were software engineering, industrial engineering and nursing (Adecco-infoempleo). With respect to less qualified Spanish potential migrants, the EURES portal draws our attention to a pilot project that has been launched between the Spanish and German employment ministries called the DUAL Professional Training in Germany programme, dubbed 'the job of my life,' which, within the next few years will combine vocational training programmes for 5,000 unemployed Spanish youth with an employment contract (EURES 2013).

Neither the Spanish EURES report nor other sources we have investigated on the question of recruitment methods shed much light on the overall significance of this tool in the working transitions of Spanish migrants and potential migrants relative to other methods of job-seeking. However, once we begin field work on the Spanish case of emigration, we will be able to further probe the salience of both the EURES portal and official country and area-specific agreements with Spain such as the PCP network as well as non-official job-search methods. As we approach this question, it seems useful to keep in mind one characteristic of the Spanish labour market that might or might not influence Spaniards' methods of looking for work outside of their country. We have discussed Spain's highly segmented labour market, which creates significant barriers between those with secure contracts and those with precarious working conditions (Polavieja 2003). Through the e-survey of Southern European migrants and González Enríquez and Martínez Romera's analysis of Spain-specific responses, we know that this labour-market segmentation is a source of dissatisfaction for Spanish emigrants since one of the recurring motivations for migration cited is lack of meritocracy, job insecurity and precarious working conditions in Spain. Lack of meritocracy is not only a reality that excludes numerous workers from achieving job stability, but it also likely conditions the ways in which Spaniards with tertiary education understand the process of job-seeking and evaluate the chances of successfully finding work using one method over another.

Specifically, Spanish job-seekers, though they often criticize the lack of meritocracy they perceive in their country of origin, have nonetheless been socialized in an environment in which who one knows and how well connected one's family is has an impact on quality of employment and career prospects (or at least this is the general consensus in Spain). For example, a study of recent university graduates' employability and most successful methods for finding work (in Spain) upon graduation reveals that 37% of recent graduates found work through personal contacts. 31% were hired as a result of non-network-mediated (direct) contact with employers, while 29% became employed thanks to an intermediary agency or service (18% through online job portals and 11% through public employment services). (Álvarez 2013). While similar trends may be characteristic of other national job markets, it is nonetheless important to stress that perceptions of nepotism and lack of meritocracy run strong throughout Spanish society. It will be interesting to probe to what extent these perceptions influence job-seeking strategies of Spaniards abroad, especially since migrants and potential migrants likely have fewer connections outside of their country of origin. As a result, emigrants might have an idealized vision of the destination country as much more meritocratic than Spain and consequently invest less time in cultivating personal contacts and social networks. In sum, our interview guides should reflect some of the specificities of the Spanish emigration context and post-crisis labour market and society discussed in this report as well as the more 'universal' themes that are relevant to the migration experience.

5.6 References

Adecco-infoempleo. 2015. *Informe Infoempleo Adecco: Oferta de empleo en el extranjero*. Accessed 12/9/2016. <http://www.infoempleo.com/informe-infoempleo-adecco/>

- Álvarez, P. 2016. "La mayoría de los titulados tira de sus conocidos para encontrar empleo." *El País*, 12/02/2016. Accessed 15/9/2016.
http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2016/02/11/actualidad/1455218559_014190.html
- Bygnes, S. 2015. "Are they leaving because of the crisis? The Sociological significance of *Anomie* as a motivation for migration." *Sociology*. doi: 10.1177/0038038515589300
- Bygnes, S. and M.B. Erdal. 2016. "Liquid migration, grounded lives: considerations about future mobility and settlement among Polish and Spanish migrants in Norway." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Available Open Access. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2016.1211004>
- Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas. 2012. *Barómetro de febrero, Avance de resultados. Estudio nº 2.932*. http://datos.cis.es/pdf/Es2932mar_A.pdf
- EURES. 2013. *Informe de actividades de la red EURES España*. Periodo Junio 2012-Mayo 2013.
- Eurostat. 2015. "Share of the population by level of educational attainment, by selected age groups and country, 2015 (%)." Accessed 9/9/2016. [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/File:Share_of_the_population_by_level_of_educational_attainment,_by_selected_age_groups_and_country,_2015_\(%25\).png](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/File:Share_of_the_population_by_level_of_educational_attainment,_by_selected_age_groups_and_country,_2015_(%25).png)
- González Enríquez, C. 2013. "Los nuevos emigrantes españoles." *El País*, 9/10/2013. Accessed 9/9/2016. http://elpais.com/elpais/2013/10/09/opinion/1381317179_264625.html
- González Enríquez, C. and J.P. Martínez Romera. 2014. *Country Focus: Migration of Spanish nationals during the crisis*. Elcano Royal Institute.
- González-Ferrer, A. 2012. "Se van los Españoles? Sí. Y deberíamos preocuparnos." *Eldiario.es* 8/10/2012. Accessed 9/9/2016. http://www.eldiario.es/piedrasdepapel/crisis-emigracion_6_55704437.html
- González-Ferrer, A. 2013. *La nueva emigración española. Lo que sabemos y lo que no*. Zoom Político. Laboratorio Alternativas.
- Herrera Ceballos, M.J. 2014. "Migración cualificada de trabajadores de España al extranjero." Barcelona Centre for International Affairs.
http://www.cidob.org/es/articulos/anuario_de_la_inmigracion_en_espana/2014/migracion_cualificada_de_profesionales_de_espana_al_extranjero
- Martínez Abascal, E. 2014. "Datos de inmigración y emigración antes y después de la crisis." *IESE Business School, University of Navarra*. 29/01/2014. Accessed 8/9/2016.
<http://blog.iese.edu/martinezabascal/2014/01/29/datos-de-inmigracion-y-emigracion-antes-y-despues-de-la-crisis/>
- OECD. 2015. *Connecting with Emigrants. A Global profile of diasporas*. OECD Publishing, Paris.
http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/social-issues-migration-health/connecting-with-emigrants_9789264239845-en#page180
- Polavieja, J.G. 2003. "Temporary Contracts and Labour Market Segmentation in Spain: An Employment-rent Approach." *European Sociological Review* 19 (5):501-517.

Rodríguez-Planas, N. and Natalia Nollenberger. 2014. "A Precarious Position. The Labor market integration of new immigrants in Spain." Migration Policy Institute and International Labour Organization.

Triandafyllidou, A. and R. Gropas. 2014. "Voting with their feet: Highly Skilled Emigrants from Southern Europe." *American Behavioral Scientist* 58 (12): 1614-1633.

Triandafyllidou, A. and R. Gropas. 2014. *Survey Report. Emigrating in times of crisis. Highlights and new data from an e-survey on high-skilled emigrants from Southern Europe and Ireland*. Global Governance Programme, European University Institute.

6 Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Italy

6.1 1. Introduction: immigration in the political and media debate

Foreign immigration in the Italian political and media debate has been treated since the very beginning using the metaphor as a tidal wave of poor and desperate people fleeing poverty and warfare, and besieging the EU borders (de Haas 2008: 1305). The “tidal wave” took very early a disturbing connotation as Italian politician and media very early started speaking about “massive invasion” and “plague” to describe the phenomenon (Maneri 1998). A fundamental role in such a discursive framework has been played by the figure of “clandestine”, “irregular”, “illegal” or “undocumented” immigrants. Over 25 years the treatment of illegal immigration and the need to control the Italian border have been the two themes that have dominated the Italian debate: in mid-nineties the guest star were economic migrants from Albanians, while now are refugees from Syria, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Somalia and Nigeria.

Another important image in the dominant political and media discourses concerns immigration as a “threat” for the Italian citizens on both a physical and symbolic level. Immigrants – from North Africa, Albania, Romania, South America and above all from “Islamic” countries - are supposed, on the one hand, to undermine personal security, thanks to their involvement in crime activities, and, on the other hand, to pose a serious cultural threat, thanks to their strong cultural identities and their allegedly unwillingness to integrate in the Italian civic culture (Dal Lago 1999; Geddes 2008; Maneri 1998).

On the contrary, the economic role of foreign workers has generally been downplayed and left in the background (Colombo & Sciortino 2004). Although in recent years Italy has received large numbers of migrants compared to other western European countries and is still attracting new migrants, the public discourse continues to ignore the fact that many of them are long-term residents and have been playing an important role in the Italian labour market. On the contrary, Italian anti-immigrant positions have also been supported by arguments concerning protecting jobs and eliminating abuses of welfare benefits (Clough Marinaro and Walston 2010).

Overall, foreign immigration in Italy has been highly politicized and has been a crucial topic on the electoral and political agenda. Immigration flows, the need to control irregular immigration, a very closed relationship between irregular immigrants and public safety, together with a widespread refuse of multiculturalism have been at the core of both local and national political debate and electoral campaigns.

Similarly, to what happened in other European countries, the extreme right, notably the Lega Nord, put immigration at the centre of the political agenda and defined the terms of the debate under the heading of populist slogans linking immigration to criminality and social unrest in order to gain voter support (Biorcio 2010; Rydgren 2008). Using Zincone’s typology (Zincone 2006: 351–2), these actors can be said to have taken a mixture of repressive-legalitarian (stressing the need to combat illegal immigration and strictly control legal immigration) and identitarian positions (expressing concern about the threat to national and cultural identity posed by immigration).”

On the other hand, the centre-left and the Catholic parties, together with pro-immigrant associations, have tended to support humanitarian positions, focusing on the need to respect the human dignity of immigrants, provide welfare services and promote their social integration. Apart

from this difference, centre-right and centre-left parties agree on some general interpretations concerning immigration: firstly, they share in common with some key economic actors (employer associations) a functionalist interpretation of foreign immigration as necessary in terms of labour market shortages (Bigot & Fella 2008: 306); secondly, they both put much stronger emphasis on legality and control policies (immigration policies) than on integration ones (immigrants' policies). As Zincone (2006: 348) suggests, "Although policy paradigms diverge, at least in the case of the major parties in the two political alliances, they agree on one point: they condemn clandestine and illegal immigration, and both coalitions have adopted special measures to combat it".

Noteworthy is the absence of a strong radical pro-immigration stance in the Italian political discourse. Indeed, only a tiny minority from the extreme left, e.g. Rifondazione Comunista, have attempted to redirect the debate and the representation of migrants in terms of integration and socio-cultural issues (Maneri 1998; Riva, Colombo, Montali 2008).

To conclude, up to now immigration has been mostly framed either as a problem or as a threat and a negative representation of migrants has been persistently fostered in political and media discourses preventing immigrants' inclusion on a social, economic.

6.2 Migration trends

For almost a century, Italy was one of the leading emigration countries in Europe, and only in the second half of the 1970s it began to receive minor flows from North Africa and Eastern Europe. Sizeable migration inflows started since the second half of the 80s and skyrocketed since mid-90s so that Italy became the European country that received the largest number of immigrants in the last thirty years, after Spain (Strozza, Corradi and Vitiello 2012). With the crisis, unsurprisingly, new inflows collapsed, but unlike in Spain and Ireland, however the outflows remained low (Ponzo, Finotelli, Malehoris *et al.* 2015), so that the volume of foreign citizens continued to grow and the settlement process of immigrants already living in the country went on.

According to the most recent estimates (ISMU 2016), the size of the foreign population at present amounts to 5.8 million people, accounting for 9% of the total population. Of these, 5 million are regularly residents in an Italian town, while around 400 thousand live legally in Italy, but are not residents (not recorded in the Population Register) and other 400 thousand are unauthorized. The percentage of foreign citizens, which in 1990 was less than 1.5%, in a few years has therefore almost reached the level of European countries with a much longer history of immigration, although in these countries many people of foreign background are not included in the statistics because they have acquired the citizenship of the country they live in, while in Italy, also because of one of the most restrictive legislation, the naturalization process is still backward and only since 2013 acquisitions of citizenship have acquired a certain consistency.

However, account must be taken that those who come from developed countries and behave in the labour market like Italians are few and that among recent immigrants there are very few elderly and young people not in working age. Therefore, if we consider only those coming from undeveloped countries, usually defined as those with strong migratory pressure, the proportion of immigrants in the labor force attains nearly 11%, the same level, if not higher than that of European countries with a longer immigration story (in the Centre-North, where immigrants are concentrated, they get to 15%). The speed with which Italy reached these levels may help explain part of the placement characteristics of immigrants in the labor market.

With the worsening of the crisis, however, as Spain and Greece, Italy has returned to be also a country of emigration. The new immigrants are young people highly educated and often coming from northern regions, so what they seek above all in Germany and Britain is not just any job, but

skilled jobs that could meet the expectations formed in their training and who could not find in the Italian labor market, very stingy of these job opportunities and often marred by cronyism and familistic values. Unluckily the research on this topic is still very poor.

6.3 The characteristics of immigrants

Excluding those few irregular and seasonal, at present immigrants in their working age coming from less developed countries are well settled, at least from a legal point of view, because more than 15% has acquired the Italian citizenship, 25% holds a European citizenship and more than 50% of those coming from a non-EU country has a long-term residence permit. However, at the starting of the migratory inflows the vast majority of immigrants entered Italy without a permit authorizing them to settle and to work. It was estimated that two thirds of immigrants living in Italy in 2004 had spent some time without a proper residence permit, which they got afterwards through to one of the seven amnesties or thanks to the quota system of entry for workers from non-EU countries (actually devoted to regularized immigrants already living in the country).

Unauthorized entry and inclusion in the underground economy were the characteristics that affected the first phase of the new immigration also in other countries of Southern Europe, but only a small part of those unauthorized immigrants really entered Italy illegally. According to estimates of the Ministry of Interior, among immigrants living in the early 2000s (before the enlargement of the European Union to Eastern European countries) only 10% were landed on the southern Italian beaches, while 15% had used forged documents and 75% were *overstayers*, who entered Italy holding a short-term visa (mostly for tourism) and then settled beyond the deadline as they had found “unregistered jobs”. On the other hand, at least until 2014 Italy received very few asylum seekers, contrary to the countries of central and northern Europe, where the percentage of refugees on the population was from 3 to 8 times that of Italy.

The unauthorized entry (amnesties concerned more than 2 million 500 thousand immigrants) and the subsequent off the books occupation spread the view that these migrations were just escaping from countries affected by economic or political crisis and that, contrary to the past, were not also fed by a “labour demand” from the countries of arrival, forgetting that even an underground economy can attract immigrants. In a framework of closed borders in Western European countries, who could cross them could not get a regular job, and if they had not found shelter in the underground economy, would soon be forced to return home. The wide possibility of working in an economy that does not require any documents, promoted unauthorized entry of economic migrants who knew the different realities of the perspective countries of arrival. Not surprisingly, the countries that received more unauthorised immigrants have been those of southern Europe, where underground economy is historically well rooted. In these countries the informal economy, far from being an effect of unauthorized immigration, has been its reason, but it also played a latent function. In fact, since the authorized entries were not sufficient to meet the demand for immigrant labor, the unregistered labor market played the latent function to attract and accommodate immigrants who, once regularized, could fill the job vacancies in regular economy.

In Italy migration inflows are highly fragmented due to the high number of countries of origin (more than 160), many of whom are far apart and have never had any political or cultural relation with Italy. Italy has neither an important colonial heritage, nor special relations with any undeveloped country (but Albania). Recently there was a reduction in the fragmentation, but not thanks to immigrant groups entered first. The presence of Tunisians, Senegalese, Egyptians and former Yugoslavs, which made up most of the first arrivals, has grown little, while exploded that of immigrants coming from Eastern European countries: Romania, Albania, Ukraine, Poland and Moldova, which currently make up over 40% of immigrants. In particular, in 2015 over 20% of

immigrants are Romanian, followed by Albanians (10%) and Moroccans (9%). Among the first arrivals, the only ones who have retained a prominent place are Moroccans, Filipinos and Chinese. This change in the composition of migratory inflows can be explained both with the introduction of entry visas for citizens of North African and African countries and with the EU enlargement process. But one should not forget the growing demand for immigrant women, who, almost saturated the Philippine supply, has sought new sources of female labor available to work for households, finding them in the countries of Eastern Europe. As for those who arrive from distant continents, from China and India to Central and South America, the globalization of migration flows now also invested Italy, which in the past sent its emigrants everywhere.

As in all new immigration countries, migrants from developing countries are concentrated in people of working age: in fact, over 85% of them are prime age people (compared with just over 55% of Italians), while minors do not reach 10% (compared with nearly 20% of Italians) and seniors over 64 years neither 4% (compared to nearly a quarter of Italians).

Women are a little more than half, a percentage higher than that in almost all the Western European countries, but the differences between national groups are important. Very few are the groups where there is a gender balance (Albanian, Chinese, ex-Yugoslavs), while some groups are heavily masculinized (North African, Indian, Senegalese, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis) and other highly feminized (all countries of Eastern Europe and Latin America, the Philippines). The presence of many groups where a gender prevails indicates a week frequency of family reunification despite several years of entry into Italy and then the spread of temporary migration projects, even in the medium-long term. In addition, the net female prevalence in some groups confirms the spread of a not new phenomenon even for movements over long distances, but so far minor: that of women who migrate alone for work. This can be attributed not only to a demand effect (the strong demand for domestic and care labour by households), but also to a supply effect: the ability to migrate for women of Eastern Europe, long accustomed to a work role and a great independence, and the contradictory process of modernization of some Catholic countries so to emancipatory motifs are flanked burdensome obligations to the family, who see emigrants as a “source of money” to improve the standard of parents, brothers and husbands.

As regards education, Italy is the Western European country that received the least educated immigrants: among active immigrants, graduates are just over 10% and those holding a higher-secondary education not even a third. However, those education attainments are still lower than those of the Italian work force, which are the lowest in Europe. By contrast, the most educated European countries (such as Britain and Ireland) are also those that receive the most educated immigrants. The reason for such a close relation between the levels of education of immigrants and those of natives is the economic and social fabric of the host country: when highly skilled occupations prevail, the demand for labor pushes younger natives to achieve higher levels of education as well as attracts more highly educated immigrants. In contrast, as in Italy, when poorly skilled occupations prevail, the demand for labor does not push young natives to achieve higher levels of education as well as attracts more poorly educated immigrants

Finally, a very large part of immigrants is living in the more developed Center-North regions, where the demand for foreign labour is higher.

6.4 The labour market outcomes of immigrants

The incorporation of immigrants in the Italian labour market is characterised by a peculiar trade-off between unemployment and the quality of jobs. Immigrants are hardly disadvantaged in

comparison to Italians as regards the risk of unemployment, but, in contrast, they are highly disfavoured as regards the socio-professional status of their jobs (Reyneri and Fullin 2011).

As regards women, the gap between the unemployment rate of immigrants and that of natives fluctuates around 5 percentage points, also during the crisis. As regards men, the unemployment gap was even negative till 2007 and afterwards increased till near 6 percentage points in 2013, but immediately after the small economic recovery went back to a bit over 4 points. And the gaps should be even lower if we take into account people not looking for a job, but willing to work, who are a great many among Italians, but are very few among immigrants. Moreover, if immigrants have a higher probability of losing jobs than Italians (as they hold a bit more fixed term jobs, but they work much more in small firms and for households, which can fire workers very easily), they have also a higher probability of finding a new job (as they are less supported by unemployment benefits and more prone to accept whichever job).

In contrast, in spite of their low educational qualification, immigrants in Italy are hugely under-skilled, as they almost excluded from medium-highly skilled non-manual jobs and bounded in poorest manual ones. In 2015 immigrants are a bit less than 12% of people in employment, but they are over 35% of workers holding elementary occupations and about 15% of those working as skilled and semi-skilled blue-collar and service and sale workers. In particular, over 40% of women are working as housekeepers and caregivers for households and nearly 40% of men are working as skilled blue-collar, who in the Italian small firms are generally dirty, dangerous and demanding. The crisis emphasised this incorporation of immigrants in the lowest segments of the Italian labour market, whose size did not decrease as the fall of the employment affected much more the highly skilled jobs. This is the reason why the unemployment rate of immigrants did not skyrocket and their returns remained quite low.

6.5 Recruitment processes, strategies and actors

Quota system is the principal mean of regulating labor migration in Italy from non EU countries (these limits are defined by decree, the so-called *decreto flussi*). In order to work in Italy, Italian authorities require non-EU nationals to obtain a specific authorization, that is a work permit (*nulla osta al lavoro*). Every year a limited number of work permits is established (basically it is the so-called *quota* system). Consequently, working visas are issued under the *quota* system and a pre-determined number of visas are set down in the decree. Notwithstanding this legal framework, various studies have shown that in Italy, as well as in most of European countries, migrants usually came without a job offer and a work permit (Oecd, 2016). Several analyses highlighted critical aspects of the *quota* system and unwanted effects of its implementation (Ambrosini, 2011, 2013a, 2014; Colombo, 2012, 2013; Semi, 2004; Barbagli, Colombo and Sciortino, 2004; Colombo and Piro, 2012).

In Italy employers can use various formal channels to recruit migrant workers: basically, public employment offices and private employment agencies. Since 1990s job placement and employment services changed their nature, structure and functions. A number of legislative interventions promoted changes basically based on both the decentralization of functions to regional and local authorities (for the public services) and de-monopolization of employment services, with the opening to private actors. However, empirical evidences have showed the official recruitment channels are generally little used. Informal channels seem to prevail, especially family or friends' ties and 'word of mouth' practices.

For these reason, also in Italy various studies on migrants' networks have been developed in recent years. They analyzed the main features of migrants' network, their segmentation, their

effects on the local labor markets and the different functions and means that social capital can have in matching labor demand and supply (Ambrosini, 2008; Decimo and Sciortino, 2006).

More specifically, at national level, there are not any studies on the recruitment channels: the attention is more focused on how workers (migrants or not) look for a job and find it. From this point of view, the informal channels are more used than the formal ones. In 2015 more than 40% of job-seekers have found a job through family or friends' ties; around 4% using websites and newspapers/magazines specialized on job-offers; 20% of job-seekers sent their CVs to employers; around 7% through direct contacts with the employers; around 6% through private employment agencies and 3% through public employment offices (Reyneri, forthcoming).

With regard to the recruitment practices of migrant workers who work in Italy, knowledge and information are partial and segmented, in terms of sectors, professions, geographical areas and migrants' countries of origin. At the same time, there is a lack of studies on the recruitment process that concern Italian prospective migrants.

Most of studies were conducted at micro-level, using interviews and ethnographical research tools. In general, they focused the attention on individual factors for migration, lived-experiences of migrant workers, social and individual vulnerabilities and institutional constraints. Low-skilled workers and irregular workers are more studied, especially in the agriculture, manufacturing and service sector, as well as in care work. We mention below some of the most recent empirical studies on this topic.

One of the most recent studies on migrant workers and the recruitment procedures refers to seasonal workers employed in hotels and restaurants sector, and specifically in the Rimini province, one of the most touristic area in Italy (Iannuzzi and Sacchetto, 2015). They analyzed the role of the private employment agencies, especially in recruiting seasonal and temporary workers. With regard to the migrant workers employed in the hotels located in the Rimini, the study pointed out that the main recruitment agencies are located in Moldavia (in the Cluj-Napoca area). They used different channels to recruit workers (websites, word of mouth, fliers) and provided services of recruitment, selection and transfer of workers to the workplaces. These employment agencies developed two paths to recruit migrant workers: (1) they hire workers with a Romanian employment contract (in this case Romanian workers are employed in the Rimini province's hotels as posted workers); or (2) they act as intermediary between Italian employers and Romanian workers. Moreover, the study highlighted that the employment agencies' owners are former workers or, more often, former hotels' owners who know very well the Italian and Romanian labor legislations (on this topic see also Gambino and Sacchetto, 2007). According to the authors, daily practices done by employment agencies and employers have contributed to the creation of a specific niche of local labor market, which is characterized by bad working conditions and high levels of alienation (on this topic see also Andrijasevic and Sacchetto, 2016; Pijpers, 2010).

The role of private employment agencies in recruiting migrant workers has also been analyzed by Luciano, Di Monaco and Allasino (2007). They focused the attention on metalworking firms in the Piedmont region. In this case, private employment agencies and social ties were the main channels used by employers in order to do formal and informal pre-selection procedures and recruitment. In many cases migrant workers already employed in a firm assumed the role of 'warrantor', providing the employers with information and suggestions on migrant workers to be hired. At the same time, they suggested to migrant workers belonging to the same networks to apply for a job directly to the employers. Moreover, the study pointed out how the observed recruitment procedures has encouraged some stereotyped social representations of ethnic groups of workers, on which some indirect forms of discrimination are based.

In the Veneto region Sacchetto and Vianello (2013) have recently analyzed the effects of economic crisis on Moroccan and Romanian workers. In this context, even if the ethnic group to which workers belong remains an important channel for the recruitment of migrant workers, the authors emphasized the increasing role of private employment agencies.

Various studies analyzed migrant workers in the domestic work and especially the caregiver' work (Ambrosini, 2013b; Catanzaro and Colombo, 2009). Spanò and Zaccaria (2003) described lived-experiences of Polish and Ukrainian caregivers employed in Naples area. With regard to the recruitment process, they pointed out the crucial role of Polish and Ukrainian women who have worked for some years as caregivers in Naples. They became the principal agent able to recruit women in Poland and Ukraine and to support the new migrants during the first months in Italy. The study highlighted the importance of social ties and the use ICT (mobiles, PCs) in activating networks and sharing information.

Also Mazzacurati (2005) focused her attention on caregivers, and specifically on Moldavian and Ukrainian women employed in families located in the Padua area (North of Italy). The study stressed the importance of informal channels of recruitment, as the role of Catholic Church. In particular, in this case Catholic Church provided informal employment brokerage activities and services to prospective migrants in Moldavia and Ukraine.

A number of empirical studies analyzed the role of migrant workers in agricultural sector. Also in this case the focus was basically on low-skilled and irregular workers and on the different forms of organization of these workers. Informal recruiters of day laborers manage the recruitment process in many agricultural areas in the South and in the North of Italy. Azzeruoli and Perrotta (2015) described some practices developed by informal recruiters in two specific situations: the milkers from Panjab (India) who work in many farmsteads in the Pianura Padana area (North of Italy), and the day laborers from Burkina Faso (Africa) who work in the fields located in Apulia and Basilicata (South of Italy). In both cases the informal recruiters belonged to the same ethnic groups (Panjabian and Burkinabé) and they had close relations with the employers. They had a crucial role in defining the recruitment process as well as the living and working conditions of migrant workers. In these cases, the solidarity embedded in social ties was functional to increase the business of informal recruiters. More generally, the ethnic business in the receiving country seemed to offer short-term opportunities for many migrant workers, but might act as a trap in the longer run for most part of them.

To conclude, there is poor attention to the process of recruitment. At micro-level, there are some studies on migrant workers in Italy, who work in specific sectors, geographical areas, or in specific professions. Whereas, as already said, there are not any studies on recruitment for Italian prospective migrants. This partial overview has shown the need to improve the knowledge on the role and the perceptions of the public and private employment agencies, which seem to have acquired more importance in the recent years. At the same time, it is needed to improve our understanding on two categories of workers almost neglected by the literature: the high-skilled migrant workers who work in Italy, and the Italian highly educated migrants and prospective migrants.

6.6 References

Ambrosini M. (2008). *Un'altra globalizzazione*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Ambrosini M. (2013a). Immigration in Italy: Between Economic Acceptance and Political Rejection. In *Journal of international migration and integration*, 14, pp. 175-194.

- Ambrosini M. (2013b). *Immigrazione irregolare e welfare invisibile. Il lavoro di cura attraverso le frontiere*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Ambrosini M. (2014). Fighting discrimination and exclusion: Civil society and immigration policies in Italy. In *Migration Letters*, Vol. 10(3), pp. 313 – 323.
- Ambrosini M., Triandafyllidou A. (2011). Irregular Immigration Control in Italy and Greece: Strong Fencing and Weak Gate-keeping serving the Labour Market. In *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 13, pp. 251–273.
- Andrijasevic R., Sacchetto D. (2016). Disappearing workers: Foxconn in Europe and the changing role of temporary work agencies. In *Work, Employment and Society*, online version February 2016 (doi: 10.1177/0950017015622918).
- Azzeruoli V., Perrotta D. (2015). L'intermediazione informale di manodopera nelle champagne italiane: caporali burkinabé in Puglia e in Basilicata e mediatori Panjabi in pianura padana. In *Sociologia del lavoro*, 139, pp. 83-94.
- Barbagli M., Colombo A., Sciortino G. (2004)(eds.). *I sommersi e i sanati*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Bertolani B. (2003). Capitale sociale e intermediazione etnica: il caso degli indiani Punjabi inseriti in agricoltura in provincial di Reggio Emilia. In *Sociologia del lavoro*, 91, pp. 92-102.
- Catanzaro R., Colombo A.D. (2009). *Badanti & Co. Il lavoro domestico straniero in Italia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Colombo A.D. (2012). *Fuori controllo? Miti e realtà dell'immigrazione in Italia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Colombo A.D. (2013). Foreigners and immigrants in Italy's penal and administrative detention systems. In *European Journal of Criminology*, 10, pp. 746-759.
- Colombo A.D., Piro V. (2012). Regolari ma in scadenza: rilasci e rinnovi dei permessi di soggiorno. In *Il Mulino*, 61, pp. 170-178.
- Decimo F., Sciortino G. (2006)(eds.). *Reti migranti*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Gambino F., Sacchetto D. (2007)(eds.). *Un arcipelago produttivo. Migranti e imprenditori tra Italia e Romania*. Roma: Carocci.
- Iannuzzi F.E., Sacchetto D. (2015). *Lavoro gravemente sfruttato e strategie di affrancamento. Il caso del settore turistico della riviera romagnola*. Paper presented at the Espanet Conference, 17-19 September.
- ISMU (2016). *Ventunesimo Rapporto sulle migrazioni 2015*, Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Luciano A., Di Monaco R., Allasino E. (2007). Immigrati in fabbrica. Una ricerca sul lavoro operaio nelle imprese metalmeccaniche piemontesi. In *Mondi Migranti*, 1, pp. 139-169.
- Mazzacurati C. (2005). Dal blat alla vendita del lavoro. Come sono cambiate colf e badanti ucraine e moldave a Padova. In Caponio T., Colombo A. (eds.). *Migrazioni globali, integrazioni locali*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Perrotta D. (2014). Vecchi e nuovi mediatori. Storia, geografia e etnografia del caporalato in agricoltura. In *Meridiana*, 79, pp. 193-220.
- Pijpers R. (2010). International Employment Agencies and Migrant Flexiwork in an Enlarged European Union. In *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(7), pp. 1079-1097.
- Ponzo I., Finotelli C., Malheiros J, Fonseca M.L., Salis E, "Is the Economic Crisis in Southern Europe Turning Into a Migrant Integration Crisis?", in *Politiche Sociali*, 1/2015, pp. 59-88

- Reyneri E. (forthcoming). *Sociologia del lavoro*. Nuova edizione. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Fullin, G. and Reyneri, E. (2011) 'Low unemployment and bad jobs for new immigrants in Italy', *International Migration*, vol. 49/1: 118-47.
- Sacchetto D., Vianello F.A. (2013). *Navigando a vista*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Semi G. (2004). L'ordinaria frenesia. Il processo di regolarizzazione visto dal basso. In Barbagli M., Colombo A., Sciortino G. (eds.). *I sommersi e i sanati*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Spanò A., Zaccaria A.M. (2003). Il mercato delle collaborazioni domestiche a Napoli: il caso delle ucraine e delle polacche. In La Rosa M., Zanfrini L. (eds.). *Percorsi migratori tra reti etniche, istituzioni e mercato del lavoro*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Zhang C., Lilie N. (2015). Industrial Citizenship, Cosmopolitanism and European Integration. In *European Journal of Social Theory*, 18(1), pp. 93-111.

7 Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Bulgaria

7.1 Introduction

Emigration has had a prominent presence in public debates in Bulgaria ever since the regime change in 1989 when the state borders opened and Bulgarian citizens obtained the right to free movement together with many other human rights that had been suppressed during the communist regime). However, the discussions in the media have focused not on human rights but on the consequences of emigration for the country's development and these are largely viewed in a negative light. The dominant discourse has been and still is demographic and emigration is seen as contributing to the depopulation of the country (Mirchev, 2009; Belcheva, 2011; Minchev, 2016; Aleksiev et al, 2016). Among the economic costs most featured are labor shortages in certain sectors, such as medical care and software specialists, a process of the ageing of the workforce and its de-qualification because of emigrants' concentration in low-skilled jobs in the receiving labor market (Beleva and Dimitrov, 2016). Other consequences of emigration that are discussed in the media are the 'brain drain' reducing the quality of the country's development in economy, culture, research and education and even 'the moral decline' which affects mostly the emigrants' children left behind to the care of grandparents (Mirchev, 2007; Beleva and Dimitrov, 2016)¹². Research, particularly from an economic perspective, provides some arguments for the positive evaluation of emigration and the public debate has also centered on remittances coming into the country from Bulgarian emigrants in the West (OSI, 2010; Misheva, 2015; Beleva and Dimitrov, 2016). Still, their impact is somewhat devalued because the transfers go mainly for subsistence of family members at home and not for investment in business (Stanchev, 2005; Kostadinova, 2007). From a political perspective emigration is weighted to lean toward the negative side of the equation because of the 'Hirschman effect' on reducing the 'voice' or as Krastev puts it (2015), it is easier to go to Germany than to change Bulgaria into a country like Germany.

In the public debate much weaker are the voices exposing positive social consequences of emigration: gaining skills and raising the quality of human capital (Kostadinova, 2007), broadening minds and enriching identities (Zeleva and Draganova, 2015). Another line of discussion in the media highlights the constructive contribution that Bulgarian emigrants make to Western economies (Andreev, 2015; Boev, 2015). A debate on the national policy for support to the Bulgarian Diaspora abroad was initiated in 2012 by the vice president Popova which is currently overshadowed by the new media focus on the influx of refugees in Bulgaria and the EU that is gaining public attention since 2013.

The commentators do not agree on the composition of the emigration flow – whether it is mostly the young people or the middle aged who are leaving the country or, whether the dominant group are the highly educated or the low qualified¹³. What researchers and media agree upon is that the country lacks reliable statistical data on the emigration flows (Kostadinova, 2007; OSI, 2010; Krasteva et al, 2011; Zahariev, 2016). Different institutions provide different estimates which makes it difficult not only to assess the consequences but also to understand the process itself, starting with people's motivations for leaving, choosing destinations and methods of relocation.

¹² However, there is no explicit 'care drain' discourse as in other countries in Eastern Europe (See Tyldum, 2015).

¹³ While there is a lack of a national system for registration and study of mobility, international data bases on migration including Bulgaria do exist and are subjected to statistical analysis in GEMM.

7.2 Migration trends

The process of migration is situated in particular social time and space rendering specific features to the migration flows. The rate, the motivations, the pathways and the individual characteristics of the migrants are grounded in both the sending and receiving context. In the 1990s there was a high emigration flow from Bulgaria. It was linked to the economic difficulties in the first decade of transition from the centrally planned to a market economy characterized by privatization and closure of many state owned enterprises, an economic crisis and a steep rise of unemployment. While the country opened its state borders for those wishing to leave in a shift from maximum control to a liberal emigration policy (Krasteva, 2013), the borders of the EU countries remained largely closed and the Bulgarian citizens needed visas to obtain permission even for short-term tourist travel. This first emigration wave used mostly informal channels of migration and their integration in the receiving labor market was mainly in the form of illegal work. The key sectors incorporating migrants were hospitality, cleaning, construction and trade (OSI, 2010).

After 2000 with the improvement of the economic prospects in Bulgaria and despite the dropping of visa requirements for Bulgarians in 2001 the emigration wave started to decline and migration became mostly temporary in comparison with the previous stage when many young people left the country for good (Stanchev, 2005; Atoyan et al, 2016). The composition diversified increasing the shares of skilled migrants and of middle aged women (OSI, 2011). A significant group became Bulgarian students who sought undergraduate and post-graduate degrees in Western universities and many stayed after that in more or less qualified jobs (OSI, 2010; Minchev et al, 2012). The economic crisis of 2008 did not lead to the expected mass return of emigrants but rather slowed down the emigration flows from Bulgaria (Krasteva, 2010).

The present post-2014 stage started with another policy change when the last EU countries, including the UK, lifted the restrictions to the internal market for Bulgarians and Romanians. It is marked with a new increase in the emigration flow. It is the changes in this period which GEMM project will study.

7.3 Public and private recruitment actors

Bulgaria is still a country that predominantly sends emigrants abroad although the stream of immigrants is rising gradually. Still, there are more state agencies and departments that regulate the incoming movement than the outgoing one (OSI, 2010; Krasteva et al, 2011). Thus the Directorate of Migration in the Department of Interior, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs deal predominantly with immigrants and the regulation of their entry, work and social integration. The Employment Agency and the State Agency for Bulgarians Abroad are the two public institutions that are mainly responsible to provide support to Bulgarians wishing to work abroad and who have already done so. A third important state actor are the Labour and Social Policy Offices at the diplomatic missions of Republic Bulgaria in the EU countries with the largest Bulgarian communities which started to emerge in 2006 and in 2016 there are 8 such offices including the four receiving countries in GEMM. They provide information and support on legal regulations in the field of employment and social rights but not on job openings. There have been two National Strategies for migration in the period 2008-2015 and 2011-2020 and they are both directed towards recruiting Bulgarians living abroad to come back and work in Bulgaria (OSI, 2010).

The Employment Agency provides information and mediation for those searching for work abroad. It organizes various campaigns such as Work Abroad Fairs in different cities in the country. It is responsible for signing and implementing bilateral agreements with foreign governments, regional authorities and private employers. The EURES network has offices in all Regional Employment Agencies in Bulgaria to provide the necessary support, information and space to potential emigrants to publicize their CVs. Emigrants' numbers

having used EURES however remain largely insignificant (Krasteva et al, 2011). Bi-lateral agreements are the most preferred form by both the officers in the Agency and the potential emigrants (Stanchev, 2007). However, there are some critical evaluations of these as they often increase the inequality of opportunity between migrant groups through selective and hierarchical immigration policies (Blitz, 2014). The agreements with the German government for example privilege young emigrants (18-35) with vocational qualifications and are based on a 'guest-worker logic' (Krasteva et al, 2011) for a short-term migration (up to 2 years). Agreements with Spain are for three different categories: permanent and seasonal workers and trainees. In countries such as the UK, Italy and France the numbers set in the inter-governmental agreements are very small – a few hundred per year.

Among the mediating actors there are also non-state public networks, such as the Bulgarian-German Information Network for Labour Mobility and Social Security Rights (between the Syndicate 'Podkrepa' and the Arbeit und Leben Foundation, Hamburg). Private mediating agencies are also active in the field of recruitment of potential emigrants. It is the responsibility of the Employment Agency to register them and maintain the list. Private recruiting agencies in Bulgaria have the following geography for job offers: the Czech Republic, Denmark, UK, Cyprus and the USA. Stanchev (2005) observes that besides the about 120 licensed labor mediators for employment abroad, there are agencies not licensed officially. Unregistered agencies usually recruit people for low qualified jobs and no decent working and living conditions. Most of the people who do agree to go abroad and choose such agencies are low-skilled, unqualified workers who do not have the knowledge or the funds to research and check the legal status of these agencies. Many Internet sites also offer work placements under the heading 'Directly from Employer' and recruit care workers.

Mihailov et al (2007) have done a representative survey among Bulgarian population asking the potential migrants for their preferred channel for emigration. Less than a quarter would reply on an intermediary company and less than 5% on the inter-state agreements. Dominant was the 'family model' – reliance on the support of family members and networks of friends. Other researchers speak about family social capital which is particularly crucial for the undocumented migrants (Markova, 2006; Ivanova, 2010). The ethnic businesses in the receiving country offer short-term opportunities but might act as a trap in the longer run (Bloch and McKay 2015). Sometimes even single individuals can act as a major actor facilitating migration in terms of travel, housing and job search (Ivanova, 2010).

7.4 Research into migrants' motivations, resources and preferred methods

Most studies on emigration are conducted on the micro level and aim at the examining the individual factors for migration. There are a few calls for applying a network analysis in order to understand the processes of decision making as embedded in social relations in the family and both sending and receiving communities (Minchev et al, 2012; Misheva, 2015). The latter approach targets not so much individual factors but focus on Bulgarian Diasporas abroad. The first approach however, does not neglect the significance of the social ties for making the move and integrating in the foreign labor market. Both approaches use a combination of small scale surveys and qualitative interviews.

When examining the individual factors for migrations the studies follow the push and pull factors theory. The high wage differentials between Bulgaria and most of the Western European countries are the leading explanation (Bobeva et al, 1996; Kostadinova, 2007; OSI, 2010). Experiences or prospects of unemployment usually come next, as well as delays in the payment of wages, inability to pay back loans and wider economic insecurity (Stanchev, 2005; Minchev, 2012). Nevertheless, most analysts underline that it is not only economic factors that explain migration. Among other factors research has found out are the failings of the social security system in Bulgaria: the lack of order and stability, insufficient means to cover expenses for

health care or education of family members (OSI, 2010; Krasteva et al, 2011). Better opportunities for training and skills development, unbiased and enhanced career prospects, better quality of life are the pull factors coming up in surveys and interviews (Krasteva, 2013; Stanchev, 2005).

The above studies have also established that the individual resources mobilized in the process of migration, particularly in the first stage, are migrants' high motivation, education, entreprenuring spirit, and family and friendship ties. These resources however are not equally distributed among the groups of potential and actual migrants. In what follows we will delineate some of the specific groups and the preferred methods they use in the process of emigration. Of course the pathways chosen and the sources of support depend not only on the individual resources but also on the institutional factors which change overtime.

Bulgarian scientists have been the target of one of the first and highly influential studies in the field (Bobeva et al, 1996). Based on desk research, expert interviews and a survey of potential emigrants the project found out that it was a rather privileged group among the academics that had left the country or were contemplating emigration – midcareer, with doctoral degrees, mostly in technological and natural sciences, working in applied research institutes, living in the capital Sofia with experience from international projects and fellowships abroad. The gender distribution was almost equal. Their preferred channels for mobility were direct application and participation in competitions and they made use of their contacts with colleagues and institutions abroad.

Other categories of highly skilled migrants are under researched. Bulgarian students abroad is one such group – from 1% in the 90s their share in the total number of Bulgarian students has risen to 10% at the time of the accession of the country to the EU (OSI, 2010). Besides studying in European universities, many young people who are enrolled in Bulgarian universities get involved in temporary and seasonal migration during the summer holidays, engaged mostly in agricultural work. Krasteva (2013) describes the highly skilled migrants as 'eurostars', led by desire for professional development and making full use of their right to mobility. This study however has not focused on a particular group among the highly skilled.

Many research projects in Bulgaria are devoted to low-skilled migrants. Markova (Markova, 2006; Markova and Sarris, 2002) has interviewed Bulgarians living in Spain, Greece, and the UK and Ivanova (2010) in Italy. In a survey conducted among Bulgarian immigrants living in the area around Madrid in Spain Markova (2006) found out that "relatives already in Spain" or "friends already in Spain" were pointed out as the main reasons for immigration to Spain. She calls this 'family migration model' – one of the spouses coming to Spain first, finding work and trying to legalize their status and then other family members joining them. She explains the use of this type of recruitment channel by the irregular status of the bulk of the migrants – possessing neither residence nor work permit and quite often staying after the period of their tourist visas. Linked to this model was the fact that the companies in which the immigrants worked for were owned and/or managed by legalized Bulgarians. Many of these first employers of undocumented Bulgarian workers offered low payment and excessive working hours. Markova (2006) points at the fact that 80% of the immigrants had found their entry job through relatives and friends and additional 60% of those who had changed jobs in the receiving country had found their new occupation through the same channel. Longer periods of stay in Greece and Spain encouraged self-employment among immigrants. Data from the UK also confirm that entrepreneurship is popular among new migrants particularly among those from Eastern Europe as the self-employed are exempt from passing through the complicated procedure for applying for a work-permit (Demireva, 2011). Ivanova's research (2010) among women - 'badante' in Toscana region found out that social contacts were the main resource for the group of informal entrepreneurs. Women in care work were highly motivated saving money and sent them home with three main purposes: covering loans, house repairs, and purchase of cars.

A survey conducted by Stanchev (2005) established the following dominant profile of the Bulgarian emigrant after 2000: a woman in her 40's with higher education, married but living alone in the host country, performing low-skilled work, sending up to 40% of her income back in Bulgaria. The study also showed that the existence of informal migrants' networks and relatives for many potential migrants is the main factor for the choice of the destination country and some 80% of his sample reported to have found their first job through relatives or Bulgarian friends and acquaintances. Another specific group of Bulgarian emigrants based on ethnicity are the Roma. In a comparative study Tarnovchi (2012) found that they largely reproduced the patterns typical for the whole population of the sending country with one specific – instead of individual migration the Roma followed the pattern of family chains. Roma migrants rely mostly on family and relatives for the move and in the job search (Belcheva, 2011). Typical for Bulgarian Roma is the circular migration (OSI, 2011) – two thirds of the sample had stayed abroad less than 6 months and more than a half were migrant returnees.

7.5 Conclusions and suggestions for the GEMM interview guides

Emigration from Bulgaria since the 1990s has been a widely discussed and researched topic. Studies have focused on the push and pull factors for leaving the country, the role of family and other networks in shaping decisions and facilitating the move, and migrants' experiences from the job search in the receiving country. The complex and collaborative process of recruitment has merited less attention. This overview has shown significant gaps in academic literature: the agency of the emigrants in all stages of the process, their competencies for coping with difficulties and abilities for innovation, the intricate relationship between migrant motivations and behaviors have been overshadowed by a focus on structural factors. Significant categories among migrants have remained largely invisible, highly skilled migrants in particular. Different subgroups among them might not only use different strategies and mobilize different resources but also different recruitment channels and different forms of social capital. The perspectives of the recruitment actors themselves, whether state or private, formal or informal, similarly remain hidden.

GEMM research will attempt to bridge these gaps by developing a sample design which will include migrants from the sectors that are experiencing labor shortages such as medical doctors and nurses, software programmers and accountants taking into consideration variations in the level of experience, age and gender. The interviews will focus on the complex subjective motivation of migrants, their negotiations with the members of the immediate and extended families, the rationale behind the choice of migration channels and destinations and the impact of changes in legislation and economic developments both at home and abroad. We will also try to capture the agency and innovation potential of migrants in their search and coping behavior. The sampling of the experts to be interviewed in the project will also aim at achieving a diversity of the type of agencies, programs and forms of agreements they manage, and at uncovering their individual preferences and evaluations of the programs' outcomes.

7.6 References

Aleksiev, Y., D. Panov, V. Bozkov 2016 'Youth Emigration and Demographic Consequences', *Twenty-Four Hours*, 21.04.2016.

Andreev, A. 2015 'How many Bulgarians work in Germany?', *Dnevnik*, 25.08.2015.

Atoyan, R; L. Christiansen, A. Dizioli, C. Ebeke, N. Ilahi, A. Ilyina, G. Mehrez, H. Qu, F. Raei, A. Rhee, D. Zakharova 2016 Emigration and Its Economic Impact on Eastern Europe. IMF SDN/16/07.

- Belcheva, M. 2011 'Demographic processes and population development', in A. Atanasov (ed.) *Population in Bulgaria at the Beginning of the XXI Century – State and Trends*. Sofia: Academic Publ. House 'Prof. M. Drinov': 48-80.
- Beleva, I. and M. Dimitrov 2016. *Yearly Report of the Institute for Economic Research*. Sofia: Gorex Press.
- Blitz, B. 2014 *Migration and Freedom. Mobility, Citizenship and Exclusion*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Bloch, A. and S. McKay 2015 'Employment, Social Networks and Undocumented Migrants: The Employer Perspective', *Sociology* 49(1): 38-55.
- Bobeva, D; I, Chalakov, Y. Markov 1996 *Migration, European Integration and Brain Drain from Bulgaria*. Sofia: Centre for the Study of Democracy.
- Boev, B. 2015 'How many are the Bulgarians in the UK?', *Dnevnik*, 1.09.2015.
- Demireva, N. 2011 'New Migrants in the UK: Employment Patterns and Occupational Attainment', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 37(4):637-655.
- Ivanova, D. 2010 'The Case of Varshetz in the "economy of suffering" – women's migration from North-West Bulgaria to Italy', in Open Society Institute (OSI) 2010 *Trends in Trans-Border Migration of the Labour Force and the Free Movement of People – Effects on Bulgaria*. Sofia: OSI, 162-.
- Kostadinova, S. 2007 'Bulgarian Emigrants – more benefits than losses for Bulgaria', Sofia: Institute for Market Economy, http://ime.bg/pdf_docs/Migration_Svetla.doc, accessed 24 August 2016.
- Krastev, I. 2015 The UK profits from the Brain Drain from Eastern Europe, *Dnevnik*, 25.03.2015
- Krasteva, A, 2010 Migration and Employment in South-East Europe, conference paper <https://annakrasteva.wordpress.com/2010/11/13/migration-labor-see/>, accessed on 24 August 2016.
- Krasteva A. 2013 Bulgarian migration profile, blog post, <https://annakrasteva.wordpress.com/2013/03/21/bulgarian-migration-profile/>, accessed 24 August 2016.
- Krasteva, A.; I. Otova and E. Stajkova 2011 'Temporary and Circular Migration in Bulgaria: data, policies, perspectives' http://eprints.nbu.bg/689/1/Bg_report_Circular_Migration_2004-2009_Bg_NBU.pdf, accessed 24 August 2016.
- Mancheva, M. and A. Nonchev 2015 *Assessing the Integration of Vulnerable Groups in Ten EU Member States*. Sofia Center for the Study of Democracy.
- Markova, E. 2006 'The Performance of Bulgarian Undocumented and Legalised Immigrants in the Spanish Labour Market', Sussex Migration Working Paper no. 31, Sussex Centre for Migration Research.
- Markova, E. and Sarris, A. 2002 'Earnings performance of Bulgarian illegal and legalised immigrants in Greece'. Athens: University of Athens, School of Law, Economics and Political Science, Discussion Paper 2002/32.
- Michajlov, D. 2007 Family Models and Migration. Sofia: ASA, <http://www.asa.bg/index.php?pages=Surveys&id=102>, accessed on 25 August 2016.
- Minchev, V. 2016 'Emigrants send money but we start feeling labor shortages', *Standard*, 7.06.2016.
- Minchev, V., E. Markova, M. Misheva, I. Zaharieva, I. Hristova-Balkanska, V. Boshnakov. Y. Kalchev 2012 *Bulgarian Emigration: theories, policies, empirical studies*. Sofia: IKOPIS.
- Mirchev, M. 2007 The Continuing Brain Drain. http://www.assa-m.com/ppechat_st38.php, accessed 24 August 2016.

- Mirchev, M. 2009 *Social Dynamics and Civilizational Restratisation. Reproduction of Population, Human Capital and Labour Resources in Bulgaria*. Sofia: M-8-M.
- Misheva, M. 2015 Network Approach to the Analysis of Migration Processes, Proceedings of the University of World Economics, Vol. 2, 363-394. http://research.unwe.bg/uploads/ResearchPapers/Research%20Papers_vol2_2015_No9_M%20Misheva.pdf, accessed on 25 August 2016.
- Open Society Institute (OSI) 2010 *Trends in Trans-Border Migration of the Labor Force and the Free Movement of People – Effects on Bulgaria*. Sofia: OSI, http://osi.bg/downloads/File/OSI_Report_Migration_2010_MEW.pdf, accessed 25 August 2016.
- OSI 2011 Bulgarian Labor Migration: Is there a reason for the restrictions in the EU?, at http://www.osf.bg/cyeds/downloads/Bg_trudova_migracia_BG_FINAL.pdf, accessed 25 August 2016.
- Stanchev, K (ed.) 2005 *Bulgarian Migration: Incentives and Constellations*. Sofia: Open Society Institute.
- Tarnovschi, D. 2012 *Roma from Romania, Bulgaria, Italy and Spain between Social Inclusion and Migration*. Bucharest: Soros Foundation Romania.
- Tyldum, G. 2015 'Motherhood, Agency and Sacrifice in Narratives on Female Migration for Care Work', *Sociology* 49(1): 56-71.
- Zahariev, B. 2016 'What and how many Bulgarians Leave?', *Twenty-Four Hours*, 5.01.2016.
- Zeleva, R. and M. Draganova 2015 'Women in Migration – Multiplicity of Identities', in R. Stoilova, K. Petkova and S. Koleva (eds.) *Knowledge as a Value, Knowledge as a Vocation*. Sofia: East-West, 365-382.

8 Overview of recruitment methods and individual factors for migration. Country report Romania

8.1 Main issues and interpretations of mainstream media discourses

The main discourses about the Romanian migrants working abroad are focused on:

- The image of the Romanian migrants;
- The profile of the Romanian migrants;
- The impact of migration on Romanian migrants' families left behind and the sending communities.

The image of the Romanian migrants is the main issue debated in the media "literature". A specific study based on content analysis on two national daily newspapers show that the press "defines" *diaspora* from a comparative perspective pointing out the positive (idealized) characters against negative characters. (Camelia Beciu, 2012).

On the one hand, the press talks about "heroes", the people who saved lives (from drowning, from injuries) and worked hard to gain a new social position like entrepreneurs (for instance the owners of shops) or entered the political life, mainly at the level of local government in the destination communities. It's about the success stories. On the other hand, the press shows the negative image of the Romanian migrants focusing on the criminal way of life based on violence, murders, robberies, prostitutions, begging, human trafficking. The negative image dominates regardless whether the Romanian migrants are the perpetrators of the crimes or victims. From negative perspectives the best situation is to name the Romanian migrants is to name them as a "strawberries pickers" or "stranger" taking the information from the media of the destination countries.

The image of Romania migrants is related to the image of Romania and the press is shows its worry about the country brand.

Regarding the profile of the Romanian migrants worth mentioning that less than 10% of the press articles provide data or statistics about the current state of this category of population. These types of articles were provided mainly by sociologists. (Augustin Abraham and Ionela Sufaru, 2009; Adriana Dancu, Mihaela Orban, Ionut Bageac, 2015).

It's about the number and channels of migration, the profile of Romanian migrants and their way of life in the countries of destination 38% of the articles on migrants show them engaging in prostitution and medicancy followed by constructions, housekeeping and agriculture (Stefania Matei, 2001).

The impact of the migration is analyzed mainly from the following perspectives: the brain drain phenomenon, mainly of the doctors and students, the problem of the children left behind (mainly the problems they face in schools, social integration etc.), the consequences of the remittances and the investments the migrants, mainly the returnees, made in sending communities etc.

8.2 Romanian research on migration abroad

Research on migration for working abroad became significant in Romania after the accession of the country to the EU, especially after the year 2000. While in the first years after the fall of communism, countries like Israel, Turkey and Hungary were top destination countries for Romanian migrants, at the level of the year 2000, according to the National Institute for Statistics Census of 2002, the top destination countries shifted

to Germany, Italy, Hungary, Spain and Turkey. After 2000, the top destination countries appeared to be Italy, Spain, Germany, United Kingdom and France.

Significant academic research has been conducted in Romania after the year 2000.

From theoretical perspectives, the migration process was approached by research, mainly from the theoretical paradigms which aim to explain the determinants of migration to work abroad, on the integration of migrants in host communities and the impact of migration on the country of origin. For a broader perspective on the theories on migration, see Constantinescu M. 2002).

More or less explicit, researchers used theories such as the “push-pull” paradigm of „neoclassical economics”, which focused on the role of income and variations in the proportion of demand-offer of working force on the job market, the analysis on the role of remittances and the impact of migration on the communities of origin.

Practically, in Romanian scientific research, migration is approached on two levels: national and local, respectively representative surveys at a national level and regional/community level (locality level).

From the point of view of conducted research categories, one can identify two types of research: on the one hand, quantitative research (surveys) regarding the situation in the localities of origin and quantitative research (surveys) regarding the situation of migrants in their destination countries. On the other hand, there is qualitative research regarding the situation of specific population groups of migrants: youth (in the UK, for example), women, doctors, vulnerable groups such as Roma etc.

In lack of official statistical data on migrants, the migration phenomenon is studied from the perspective of emigration, for which there is available data in the yearbook demographic reports of the National Institute for Statistics. However, the official proportion of those who leave annually and change their formal residence is much lower, even insignificant, when compared to the millions of migrants who leave the country to work abroad.

Types of results based on quantitative research

Quantitative estimations based on opinion polls conducted at the level of Romania and other destination countries.

Research on representative samples of population at the level of Romania which aim to estimate the volumes of those who left the country from their households to work abroad show that, at the level of years 2008-2010 (the dates of the surveys), over 2,500,000 people were out of the country for work (meaning 20-25% of the total number of households in the country), with an average of 1.5 persons per household in those households which had at least one member working abroad. To these we add over 500,000 people who no longer had (owned or rented) a household in Romania, which shows that the level of Romanians who left to work abroad was of 3-3.5 million (with their families/children included) (Abraham A. and Sufaru I., 2009). Practically, 20-25% of households had at least one of their members out of the country to work abroad. Moreover, approximately 20% of Romanians over 18 years old, thus respondents to the survey, have left the country, for shorter or longer periods of time, to work abroad, which confirms the circulatory feature of the migration for work (CURS 2013).

Other more recent surveys (2014) consider that 46% of households in Romania have at least one person out of the country for work. This means that there are over 4 million Romanians living abroad. (Dancu A.,

Orban M., Bageac I., 2015). The determination of the volumes of Romanian migrants working abroad in EU countries remains an open problem, with increases and declines. What is certain is the circulatory feature of this migration. (Stănculescu M.S. and Stoiciu V. 2012).

Profile of migrants who work abroad

In general, leaving migrants represent an active population, with lower education and income, most of which are married and have children. So, more or less, most migrants represent a socially vulnerable population.

According to surveys carried out (by CURS, Metromedia Transilvania etc.) in the metropolitan areas of Madrid and Rome, the average age of Romanian migrants working abroad was of 34-37 years old, men representing 56% and women 44% of the surveyed population. The level of education was relatively low, the majority having high school and pre-high school education. However, 8-10% of the interviewed migrants graduated from university (Monica A., 2006). The majority of migrants from Spain and Italy come from rural areas of Romania.

Reasons for migration (based on surveys among migrants)

As it comes out of sociological research in Romania, the main motivations of Romanians who leave the country to work in the EU area can be explained by the "push – pull" model.

Rejection factors are predominantly negative and refer to low levels of income, occupations with a low level of qualification, lack of resources to secure the future of their own children and families etc.

Attraction factors are predominantly positive and refer to higher income (compared to those earned in the country of origin), more diversified opportunities to find a job, increase of chances to secure a better standard of living for their children and families etc.

Recruitment practices/strategies or how Romanians migrated for working abroad

On the whole, four channels of migration are used: social networks, employment agencies recruiting migrant workers (both private and public), direct contact with individuals or institutions from the destinations countries and ad-hoc solutions, some of whom at the edge of the Law.

The studies show that the decision to migrate is not made at random. The decision to migrate is in advanced planned and prepared, usually with the help of the networks. Prospective migrants usually have friends, members of the family, casual acquaintances or acquaintances from within the religious networks that promise them a sure-thing job, offer them temporarily shelters and, sometimes, lend them money. Three-thirds of the migrants do this preparation. Nevertheless, around one-third of those leaving to work overseas do nothing beforehand to prepare for the departure or they succeed to secure some money, at the most.

The social networks or the migration networks have been used (as recruitment practice) by the majority of the Romanian migrants and it seems that the relation with these networks strengthen once the migrants reached the destination countries. At the same time, the migrants stay in contact with the origin communities. The recruitment is thus based on a migration networks chain where friends are helping friends, relatives are helping relatives, individuals from the same community are helping their fellow countrymen, people with some religious orientation, especially Adventism, Baptism and Pentecostalism branches, are helping people with same religious beliefs and those with some ethnic background are helping the fellows sharing same ethnic background. (Șerban M. and Voicu B. 2010). This type of social capital is used in the socialization process at the destination yet the contact with the origin community remains, while a kind of cross-border relationships is shaped.

The recruitment procedure of migrants through the employment agencies, public or private, weights little in the overall number of migrants, though it seems to increase lately. This dimension requires, however, in-depth research, being quite neglected up to date.

Lastly, there is a recruitment practice at the edge of the Law based on which some migrants succeed to gather working teams at the destination recruiting, on the short-term basis, usually for 2-3 weeks or for few months, workers to replace (shift) existing employees developing thus their working capacity for some ad-hoc projects.

To sum up, students' mobility and the decision of some of them to remain for work in the destination countries amplifies the migration for work phenomenon, specifically among those highly educated.

Migrants integration at the work place

The way of living (living conditions) of the migrants in the destination countries has been quantitatively surveyed based on opinion polls conducted mainly in Spain and Italy. Data regarding occupation change (either beneath one's qualifications or high occupations), housing, leisure time spending and the role of networking based on friendship relations, participation in activities organized by religion communities, family relations, flow and role of the remittances etc. already exist.

Migration impact on country of origin

Besides the immediate and direct effect of migration, meaning income and remittances spent in the destination country or sent in the country of origin, based on some surveys conducted in Romania, the desire of building a house and/or start-up a business in Romania with the income gained comes secondly leading to a development of the entrepreneurial behavior. Most of the Romanian migrants want to return into the country of origin and many of them have already returned to Romania. Nevertheless, in a foreseeable period of time one-fifth of the Romanian migrants do not want to return, they opt rather for a permanent migration. Overall, migration consequences are rather positive. (Dumitru S. 2010).

8.3 Types of qualitative research

As per specific literature, the researches or the qualitative approaches on migration have been focused on various categories of migrants. The main categories of Romanian public surveyed on migration behavior are females, young people and doctors.

For instance, women's migration for working abroad has been approached by case studies. The focus has been on analyzing the increased flow of the women that have been migrated in the last decade, their specific motivation, ways/practices of migration, behavior, types of occupations, succeeding strategies. (Bîrsan, M. 2008)

In what the migration of young people concerns, a case study conducted among young Romanians in London seems to be relevant. It is focused on cross-border social ties of this population, mainly on the piratical issues of cross-borders and socialization between „here” and „there” and on the ethnicity maintained by transcriptional connections. (Morosanu L. 2012)

Migration of the doctors, approached by semi-structured interviews, focused on doctors' motivation to go overseas for work for at least one year and was mainly conducted when they returned to the country of origin. The main reason being „the doctors desire to specialize professionally under high-performance working conditions in western countries” the research unveiled. (Teodorescu C. 2011).

8.4 Comments

There are some methodological aspects regarding the interview guides implementation and the analysis of the collected qualitative data.

On the one hand in the selection of the interviewees one should take into account the particular situation of the country (the case of Romania).

We agreed that the methodology suggested by the Project coordinator regarding the selection should be based on settled socio-demographic criteria (age, skill levels and sectors). However, since the rural population of Romania is 45% and the percent of migrants to work abroad from these areas is over 50% of the total Romanian migrants who work abroad, we think that the selection of the prospective migrants should be made from a City Career Fair by RDS and from other two rural communities (for instance from those who used to send migrants to work in Italy and Spain). These respondents could be selected by CURS field interviewers from settled communities or from job fairs.

The selection of the managers and staff of recruitment agencies (experts) we suggest to be made from the five main agencies, 3 state agencies and 2 private agencies.

Thus, two semi-structured interviews could be conducted in each selected unit.

The interviewees will be identified and interviewed by CURS' experts included in the Project.

The Romanian migrants from abroad, in settled countries from EU will be selected by CURS experts and trained interviewers, using "snowball" method as was agreed at Oxford meeting.

On the other hand there are some theoretical issues regarding the limits of the qualitative research of the migration. The main issue regards the need to do a correlated analysis between the qualitative data collected in this prospect and quantitative data about the process of migration which can be found in statistics and formal surveys results (where available). This analysis can be made by asking the migrants the questions by which could be assessed some statistical trends regarding motivations, channels of recruitment, the impact of migration and the future of the migrants. The findings from WP2 would also be useful in this regard.

Besides, qualitative research should explain some aspects which are not assessed by quantitative research such as the increasing role of Recruitment agencies and the feminization of the migration.

8.5 Themes to be included in the interview guides

A. For migrants

Motivation:

- personal meaning of migration (positive changes in their lives associated with migration);
- self-assessment of their chances to achieve those expected positive changes.

Decision making process:

- History of the decision to emigrate; preparatory actions, if any; (including life stories)
- Individual or collective (within core family, extended family, involving friends/peers, agencies);
- Sources of information used;
- Support factors relied upon;

- Selection of destination country/area;
- Option for short-term, circulatory, long-term, or permanent migration;
- Options regarding involvement of family members;
- Self-assessment of the own knowledge of the labour market environment in the destination country/area;
- Self-assessment of the own knowledge of the social environment in the destination country/area (social rules, customs, attitude towards immigrants, ethnical sensitivities, etc.);
- Estimated outcomes of migration (in terms of income, career advancement, social status, education and career opportunities for children);
- Main worries associated with migration.

Environment of departure:

- Professional career aims for her/himself, for her/his spouse, and for her/his children;
- Self-perceived chances to achieve the aimed professional career in the home country; main constraints;
- Self-assessment of the level of monthly income (individual and per household) required for a decent living in the home country;
- Self-assessment of social climate in her/his neighbourhood (social ties, mutual esteem, community support, education opportunities, leisure opportunities, social and cultural events, collective traditions etc.);
- Levels of trust in local, regional and national authorities;
- Self-assessment of the development perspective at local, regional and national levels in the home country;
- Conditions that would have changed their decision to emigrate (renounce, shorten planned duration, not involving family members, etc.);
- Main reasons for migrating (push factors).

Lived experience in the destination country:

- Gaps between expectations and actual experiences;
- Levels of incorporation – working according to the level of their skills;
- Any limitation of professional advancement due to social ties used for emigration (reproduction of professional statuses within immigrant communities); (including life stories)
- Climate of reception (community support, public support schemes, housing, access to education, leisure opportunities, public and media discourses regarding the immigrants, etc.);
- Perceptions of discrimination; (including life stories)
- Feelings of exclusion or belonging. (including life stories)

Plans for the future (including for family members):

- In the destination country;
- In the home country;
- In another country.

B. For managers and staff of recruitment agencies

Background information:

- Date (year?) of incorporation;
- Legal form;
- Public or private;
- Independent or subsidiary (of whom?);

- Whether it was established since the beginning as employment/labor mediation company or this area of activity was added afterwards (when?); in the last case, what were the initial main areas of activity;
- In case the employment/labor mediation activity was added afterwards, what had been the main reasons for doing so;
- In case the employment/labor mediation activity was added afterwards, have they had specialized personnel for this activity, provided existing personnel with additional training, or have employed new specialized personnel;
- Which are the other main areas of activity of the organization;
- Participation in networks and/or consortia with other employment agencies, with employers/employers' associations, with NGOs and/or public agencies (details);
- Activity so far (quantitative and qualitative aspects).

Recruitment policy:

- Target group(s);
- Area(s) of recruitment;
- Methods of recruitment (direct and indirect; formal and informal);
- Countries of destination for migrants;
- Recruitment messages (advantages from using the organisation's services).

Business as usual:

- Services offered to prospective migrants (packages or separate or both; standardized or individualized or both);
- Services offered to prospective employers;
- Communication with beneficiaries (channels; continued or only until departure/employment);
- Any assistance with work permits, residence permits, visas, other formalities in the destination country);
- Follow-up policy, if any;
- Private versus public employment agencies (perceived advantages and disadvantages);
- Social networks versus employment agencies (perceived advantages and disadvantages);
- Whether and to what extent former beneficiary migrants re-apply to the services of the agency;
- Whether and to what extent former migrants having not benefited from their services apply to the services of the agency for subsequent migration;
- Feedback from the beneficiaries (including those who had previously migrated without their support), if any (details)

Factors that influence the performance of employment agencies:

- Legislative;
- Institutional;
- Other (formal or informal).

8.6 References

Abraham A. and Sufaru I., 2009, 3 milioane de romani la munca in strainatate, in Jurnalul National Nov 30th 2009 [<http://jurnalul.ro/special-jurnalul/3-milioane-de-romani-la-munca-in-strainatate-528860.html>]

Alexandru Monica. 2006. Între România și Italia: traiectorii migratoare, în Societatea Reală nr. 4)

- Beciu C. 2012, DIASPORA ȘI EXPERIENȚA TRANSNAȚIONALĂ. PRACTICI, „Revista Română de Sociologie”, serie nouă, anul XXIII, nr. 1–2, p. 49–66, București, 2012
- Bîrsan M. 2008, WOMEN'S MIGRATION FROM AN EASTERN EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE. THE CASE OF ROMANIAN WOMEN MIGRANTS IN NORTHERN (THE NETHERLANDS, DENMARK), AND SOUTHERN COUNTRIES (GREECE, SPAIN), Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai. Studia Europaea 53. 1 (2008): 91-115
- Constantinescu M. 2002, Theories of international migration, Romanian Sociology Journal, no. 3-4/2002
- CURS, D. Abraham, coord., 2013, Study on the identity and socio-cultural integration of working migrants in the metropolitan areas of Spain and Italy, in Sociologia Azi no. 1
- Dancu A., Orban M., Bageac I. 2015, Romania din afara Romaniei. Sinteze. 8/13, 2015
- Dumitru S. 2010, Modernising Romanian society through temporary work abroad, 2010, <http://store.wondershare.com/shop/buy/buy-pdf-splitter.html>
- Matei S. 2001, “Media and migration. Layers of knowledge in Romanian written press. Journal of Comparative Research in Anthropology and Sociology vol. 2, no. 2, 2001
- Morosanu L. 2012, Between Fragmented Ties and ‘Soul Friendships’: The Cross-Border Social Connections of Young Romanians in London, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, DOI:10.1080/1369183X.2013.733858
- Stănculescu M.S. and Stoiciu V. 2012, Impactul crizei economice asupra migrației forței de muncă din România, București : Paideia, 2012
- Șerban M. and Voicu B. 2010, In or outside the migration networks: A matter of time?, Revue d'études comparatives Est-Ouest, 2010, vol. 41, n° 4, pp. XXXX
- Teodorescu C. 2011, Migrația medicilor români: Un studiu calitativ asupra percepțiilor medicilor care au profesat în străinătate, Sfera Politicii nr. 12 (166) / 2011

9 Conclusions

Based on assessment of national literature on migration, this overview gives a broad picture of mobility from and to the six countries participating in this part of the GEMM project. The quantitative data from previous surveys demonstrate the significance of the process of mobility within Europe. Eastern European migration is directed mostly toward Southern Europe, with Romanian migrants comprising 16% of all migrants in Italy and 12% of those in Spain. As coming from a less populous country Bulgarian migrants do not comprise a major group in any of the four receiving countries in our study reaching 2% among the migrants only in Spain. Most migrants from Eastern Europe make the move with the motive to look for a job but without having a contract. Southern European migrants also form sizeable groups in Germany and the UK with Italians making 5% of all migrants in Germany and 2% in the UK, and Spaniards reaching 1% in the UK and less than that in Germany. Migrants from Western countries are more likely to answer adverts, and those from Eastern Europe tend to rely more on their social networks which require less knowledge of the institutions and languages in the hosting countries. Migrants from Bulgaria and Romania are by far most likely to be economic migrants without a contract upon arrival. Migrants from Spain and Italy tend to arrive in the UK and Germany more often as students.

The country reports highlight the presence of the issue of migration in the public debates in each of the six countries. In the countries which attracts migrants from Europe and beyond such as the UK and Germany the public discourse on immigration often shifts between two narratives: on the one hand, an emphasis of the economic benefits of immigration, on the other hand, an identification of immigration as a threat to the national identity and social security systems, the latter particularly in the UK. The 'Brexit' vote dramatically changed the prospects of migrants in the UK raising insecurity. In those countries there are many studies of the job search methods of various groups of migrants and the role of recruitment agencies. They highlight the fact that the channels of migration and methods for job search used by migrants strongly depend on their qualifications. Official agencies, direct contacts with employers and advertisements are preferred by highly qualified migrants, personal contacts with relatives and friends are mostly used by low-qualified migrants. The studies however do not allow a detailed categorization of ethnic groups among migrants, as well as do not distinguish among public and private recruitment agencies. GEMM research in Germany and the UK will include the interviewing of twelve Spanish and twelve Italian migrants, eight Romanian and eight Bulgarian migrants and eight not-EU migrants (from the USA and China) in each of the two receiving countries reaching a sample of 48 migrants in each of the two host countries.

Foreign immigration to Spain and Italy has been a traditional topic in media debates and academic research. After the economic crisis in 2008 resulting in a high general and particularly youth unemployment, the emigration of highly skilled Spaniards and Italians became a new focus of public debates in the two countries. Most investigations still concentrate on immigration and the job search factors of immigrants while recruitment channels rarely become an object of research. Low-skilled workers and irregular workers are more studied, especially in the agriculture, manufacturing and service sector, as well as in care work. The motivation of Spanish and Italian job seekers abroad and the channels of mobility are generally under researched. GEMM study in each of the two countries envisions the interviewing of ten prospective migrants, ten experts from recruiting agencies and eight Romanian and eight Bulgarian migrants. In additions twelve Spanish and twelve Italian migrants will be interviewed in Germany and the UK each.

The themes of the 'brain drain' and migrants' contributions to the receiving countries dominate the discussions in the two Eastern European countries followed by the role of remittances from the migrants to

their own families and the impact of migration on migrants' families left behind and the sending communities. Official statistical data on emigration is missing or unreliable. A dominant paradigm in existing empirical research is the 'push and pull' factors for mobility. Potential emigration is by far more studied than the motivation of people who have already made the move to the foreign country. Less attention is paid to motivation for the choice of the specific destination country, the practical preparation steps, as well as the first steps of adaptation in the new context. Information about recruiting agencies and informal channels of migration is scarce. Studies rely on a combination of questionnaires and in-depth interviews and target mostly low qualified migrants based on snow ball samples. The two GEMM teams will interview ten prospective migrants and ten experts in recruiting agencies in their home countries and eight migrants in each of the four EU member countries (UK, Germany, Spain and Italy).

The overview of national literature on recruitment methods and individual factors for mobility presented in this report allows a more nuanced approach to the study of mobility embedding it in the specific context of concrete sending and receiving countries. The interviews should provide understanding of the importance of social context for migrant motivations and forms of behavior – economic, political and cultural differences between the countries and rural-urban differences within the countries. On this basis we expect to provide policy relevant comparisons between Eastern European and Southern European migrants to Western Europe.

Recruitment channels have been studied unequally in the six countries and there is a gap in our knowledge about the perspective of migrants on the recruitment process, their views about the forms of support they need and the forms of support they have actually received by the various mediators in the process. Surveys show that public agencies are used by a minority of migrants. Actors such as private agencies and recruiting individuals remain invisible. Aspects that the interviews should highlight are the procedures and practices to manage mobility of human capital by different types of agencies in addition to the documentary analysis, the role of ethnic and religious communities as mediators of mobility, the use of ICT in activating networks and sharing information, the significance of contacts and communication with friends and relatives at home and the arrangements of caring responsibilities.

The country overviews emphasize as well the importance to study the motivations and lived experiences of highly skilled migrants in Europe. Besides indication about the economic impact of mobility, the qualitative data will provide insights into the quality of work and quality of life of migrants and their families. Previous research has focused predominantly on low-skilled migrants while the socio-economic and cultural situation of highly skilled migrants has been neglected. Interview data will allow to examine whether they experience prejudice and distrust preventing them to realize their individual aspirations in work and social integration. Other parts of GEMM project such as the recruitment experiment will seek an answer to the question about ethnic discrimination from the perspective of employers. Gender impacts all phases of the process of migration and requires a special attention on further analysis. Another aspect that only our workpackage can reveal is whether mobility fosters the formation of European identity, a sense of belonging to a wider community increasing the legitimation of the Union project.

In conclusion, the questions to pursue in the fieldwork and further analysis are:

- **what** are the individual factors which influence migrants' motivations and choices at all stages of migration: from the initial consideration of making the move, through the stages of preparation, travel, adaptation and then integration in the new context? Our focus will be on gender and skill levels. We expect that women and men might have different aspirations and strategies to achieve them linked not only to different qualifications and skills but also to their family situations and

responsibilities. Highly skilled migrants will be motivated more by better career prospects in the foreign country than low skilled migrants for whom economic difficulties in the home country will be the leading push factor. We expect differences due to the particular crosscutting points between individual life stage in which mobility is experienced and the political and economic changes in the sending and receiving countries. Another axis for comparison will be the motivations, the choices of destination, the processes of decision making and negotiations between Southern and Eastern European migrants.

- **why** do different groups of migrants use different channels of migration? Our main research attention will focus on the role of social ties in mobility. We expect that they are important for both highly skilled and low-skilled migrants but the two groups mobilize different forms of social capital in carrying out their mobility projects and labour market integration with those with less resources relying more on strong ties while those with high resources using wider range of weak ties. Highly skilled migrants will be more likely to use formal recruitment methods This is due to highly skilled migrants having a better understanding of the receiving society (the language, culture, employment practices), and a better understanding of their job field (opportunities for career progression, salary expectations). In comparison, low skilled migrants will search for jobs more locally, using social networks and informal methods either through friends, or family. We expect that the self-employed migrants will rely on their social network to find employment, rather than seek help from private recruitment agencies. Here again we expect to follow gender differences in informal contacts' creating and use. Younger migrants will be more likely to be familiar and comfortable with searching jobs via recruitment agencies. This is due to their exposure to recruitment channels at University such as careers fairs, international student organizations, internships. Migrants in the first generation will rely much more on social ties rather than on formal channels of recruitment to find a job in the UK. Formal channels of recruitment can be important to initiate the migration process especially for non-EU migrants.
- **How** does the interplay between policy objectives of various programs and actors and the mobility agents' choices and behaviours materialize in the context of the different contexts of sending and receiving countries? The fieldwork will compare the official policies and actual practices of private and public recruiting agencies, and the perceptions and social representations of European mobility by the experts trying to manage the process of recruitment. On this basis, we will explore how people choose between them or ignore them or use them inefficiently. Employment agencies are expected to be important in helping migrants integrate in the receiving society more quickly than migrants would be able to do on their own. Finding jobs through social ties can minimize unemployment duration. The jobs provided, however, will be lower in social status. The chosen channel of employment will also depend on the migrant's family situation and extent of their networks. The amount of time that the migrant is planning to stay in the country will also impact upon the preferred channel of employment. Those who are interested in a short-term stay in the importing country will use their social network in order to find employment, compared to migrants who plan a long-term stay. The successful integration in the new society however will depend on widening the initial ethnic based networks into more diverse set of contacts.

These research questions will guide our data collection and analysis and we envisage that the outcomes will have significant policy implications. We will provide policy makers with a fuller, in-depth understanding of how different groups of migrants make their choices of destination countries, channels of mobility and job search methods. The explanation of the multi-layered process of migration motivation will highlight the

internal problems of the sending countries which policy makers are supposed to address. Finally, we expect to specify important deficits and good practices in managing mobility of different types of recruiting agencies and broader policies of regulations of intra-European mobility. Based on this the project will offer ideas to policy makers, employers and employees about the efficient use of human capital based on the evaluations of this efficiency by experts in recruiting agencies and by migrants themselves as the main stakeholders in mobility policies.