DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 9921

What is the Value of Foreign Work Experience? Analysing Online CV Data in Slovakia

Lucia Mýtna Kureková
Zuzana Žilinčíková

April 2016

Forschungsinstitut
zur Zukunft der Arbeit
Institute for the Study
of Labor

What is the Value of Foreign Work Experience? Analysing Online CV Data in Slovakia

Lucia Mýtna Kureková
Slovak Governance Institute,
European Centre Vienna, CELSI and IZA

Zuzana Žilinčíková
Slovak Governance Institute
and Masaryk University Brno

Discussion Paper No. 9921
April 2016

IZA

P.O. Box 7240
53072 Bonn
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Fax: +49-228-3894-180
E-mail: iza@iza.org

IZA Discussion Paper No. 9921
April 2016

ABSTRACT

What is the Value of Foreign Work Experience? Analysing Online CV Data in Slovakia*

This paper studies how attractive young returnees are in the labour market and how they behave relative to stayers. We use the online CVs of young people that are posted on the major Slovak job-search portal. The analysis is performed using a set of regression models that investigate attractiveness, salary expectations and positions of interest to returnees in comparison to stayers. We find that the post-accession foreign work experience increases the attractiveness of job candidates, but that attractiveness premium varies depending on the returnee's host country. Returnees are more demanding with respect to their minimum salary expectations and are more likely than stayers to apply for positions advertised abroad. Return migrants are a diverse group - women, graduates, or people returning to economically underperforming regions, continue to face disadvantages with labour market integration.

JEL Classification: F22, J23

Keywords: return migrants, employers, web data, labour market, integration, Slovakia

Corresponding author:

Lucia Mýtna Kureková
Slovak Governance Institute
Štúrova 3
81103 Bratislava
Slovakia
E-mail: kurekova@governance.sk

* The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no. 613256.

1. Introduction

The Eastern enlargement of the European Union was followed by massive East-West migration with the majority of migrants being young and highly educated (Kahanec and Zimmermann, 2010; Kureková, 2011). The impact of post-accession migration on home countries is determined by whether or not the migrants return and, if so, whether they developed human, financial and/or social capital during their time abroad. The literature has been unclear about the degree of return migration to the CEE countries. While some studies argue that no mass return took place during the economic crisis and most migrants opted for a *wait-and-see* strategy (Barcevičius *et al.*, 2012), others have found relatively high return rates for some Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries (Zaiceva and Zimmermann, 2012).

Existing studies document mixed results regarding the labour market integration of returnees. Migration experience might generate important individual-level benefits and give signals to employers about the valuable skill-set that foreign work experience can help to develop. However, many CEE migrants work abroad in jobs that are below their formal level of education (Kahanec and Kureková, 2013; Voitchovsky, 2014), and therefore lack *relevant* work experience. For example, Barcevičius et al. (2012) found that returnees often encountered difficulties in reintegrating successfully due to the gap they have had in their career development, which is particularly true for young people without work experience that relates to their qualifications.

The micro-level impact of youth mobility and return thus remains to be studied. A particular question to investigate is employers' perceptions of foreign work experience as well as the behaviour of returnees in their home country labour market. One reason behind these knowledge gaps is a limited availability of data about return migrants. This encouraged us to investigate new sources of data to study selected aspects of return migration. We analyse the online CV data of young people gathered by a major job portal in Slovakia between January 2011 and June 2014. While online data is not representative, research using such data for the study of labour markets is growing fast (Edelman, 2012; Guzi and Kahanec, 2014; Masso, Eamets and Mõtsmees, 2014; Askitas and Zimmermann, 2015; Kureková, Beblavỳ and Thum-Thysen, 2015; Beblavý, Kureková and Haita, 2016). Some advantages of such data include its large sample sizes and its timeliness. Our data has limitations related mainly to the profile of internet users, who are younger and more educated, relative to the general population. However, due to the focus of our analysis on young returnees (below the age of 35), we consider this to be an advantage.

We use online CVs to reconstruct life histories and identify instances of foreign work experience to measure how this impacts on the attractiveness of job seekers and job changers for firms seeking new employees. We also investigate salary and position expectations of individuals with foreign work experience and map their propensity for further migration. Our analysis deepens knowledge about the labour market integration of Slovak return migrants. Slovakia is a particularly interesting case because it is one of the new accession countries with a high share of post-accession work emigration, which temporarily declined but has since 2014 been on the rise again(Kureková, 2011; Kahanec and Kureková, 2015). Moreover, Slovakia has suffered from a poorly performing labour market, characterised by a high

unemployment rate, high youth unemployment and structural deficiencies, which are further characterised by large regional inequalities (Kureková, 2011). To date, return migration to Slovakia has not been systematically mapped, while there is evidence that return migration rates have been high relative to other CEE economies (Zaiceva and Zimmermann, 2012). It is therefore interesting to map how return migrants are viewed by employers acting in an environment that has relatively abundant workforce and whether young returnees behave in a distinct way to non-migrants, in terms of their salary and position expectations.

2. Literature review

Return migration is a major component of migration flows and has been receiving increasing attention within migration literature. In the context of restricted mobility, most receiving countries design their policy framework with the aim of making migration temporary and circular (Hönekopp and Mattila, 2008; Bastia, 2011). Return migration in the context of intra-EU mobility is particularly interesting, as return is not related to the legal conditions defined by a restrictive migration policy. The role of economic conditions, institutional factors and individual-level factors can be investigated without the intervening factor of migration policy. In this context, an over-simplified conceptualisation of return migration as a failure is unlikely to hold, as migration is likely to be driven by a variety of motives and both migration and return are less definite and more fluid than in more regulated frameworks (Rooth and Saarela, 2007; Dumont and Spielvogel, 2008; Engbersen *et al.*, 2013; Kveder, 2013).

On a theoretical level, it has been established that economic actors self-select into migration and that migrants differ from stayers in observable as well as unobservable characteristics (e.g. age, family status, labour market status, ability, values, risk aversion, etc.). The type of selection and how it compares to stayers or to citizens of the host country depends on the characteristics of the home and host country (Borjas and Bratsberg, 1996; Kureková, 2011; Kveder, 2013; Kahanec and Kureková, 2015).. Similar factors affect the selectivity of returnees (Roy, 1951). Some migration studies contend that return migrants are largely selected from those that are less economically successful: return migration corrects for the failure of initial migration and being unemployed in the host country significantly increases the probability of the migrant returning to their homeland (Pungas *et al.*, 2012). Other studies highlight the positive selection of returnees and their mixed motives for return, reflected in heterogeneous patterns of return across countries and over time (Constant and Massey, 2002; Haas, Fokkema and Fihri, 2015).

The Roy model of selection into return migration generally overlooks the fact that while CEE migrants are often well educated, they are mismatched in host countries and work in jobs below their qualifications. Over-education of migrants has been identified as a key determinant in the return of Estonian migrants working in Finland (Pungas *et al.*, 2012). Similarly, Currie (2007) found that Polish returnees commonly frame their decision to return to Poland within the context of their frustration at the limited labour market progress in the UK. Voitchovsky (2014) argues that the severity of the occupational downgrading of CEE migrants and the related wage penalty stands out relative to other migrant groups in Ireland (and the UK), including third country nationals. It extends to all education levels and is the strongest for workers with higher-secondary and tertiary education (Drinkwater, Eade and

Garapich, 2009; Turner, 2010). At the same time, CEE migrants in the West have been characterised by very high employment which, even in the period of the 2008-2009 economic crisis, exceeded the employment levels of host country nationals (Kahanec and Zimmermann, 2010; Kahanec and Kureková, 2013).

The aspect of selectivity is important because it signals the characteristics of returnees relative to stayers. It is hence likely to affect how firms value returnees, as well as returnees' behaviour in the home labour market. Empirical results for the selectivity of migrants and their labour market outcomes vary across countries and over time (see Table 1 for a summary). First, the majority of studies found that returnees in Central and Eastern Europe are positively selected in terms of education (Hazans and Philips, 2010; Martin and Radu, 2012; Masso, Eamets and Motsmees, 2012; Smoliner *et al.*, 2012; Zaiceva and Zimmermann, 2012; Schroth, 2013). Barcevičius *et al.* (2012) found a negative correlation between skills/education and return, whereas returns were more frequent among migrants with vocational education than a university education. Second, Smoliner et al. (2012) found that returnees are negatively selected with respect to age – on average, return migrants tend to be younger than the non-migrant population and migrants staying abroad. Zaiceva and Zimmermann (2012) found that returnees are on average older. For Slovakia, Masso et al. (2016) found that, relative to stayers, returnees are positively selected by age and more often have Hungarian ethnicity. They are less likely to be married and more likely to work in medium skilled positions, compared to stayers. No differences were found in terms of education relative to migrants or stayers.

Third, several studies document the significant wage premiums of CEE returnees (Iara, 2006; Ambrosini *et al.*, 2011; Martin and Radu, 2012). More specifically, (Iara, 2006) found that young and male migrants from CEE countries earn an average wage premium of 30% in CEE labour markets after return if they had worked in Western Europe, but found no wage premium for those working in other CEE countries. Co, Gang and Yun (2000) found for the performance of returnees to Hungary that migration experience does not bring a wage premium for male returnees, but that women who had returned to Hungary attain about 40% wage premium. They too confirm the effect of the destination country, with a positive premium for working in OECD countries, but not for non-OECD destinations. Tomescu-Dubrow (2015) found that a wage premium exists for those who lived abroad for at least two months, and also a higher probability of becoming an employer. Returnees have a higher probability of unemployment or inactivity (Smoliner *et al.*, 2012), but more educated returnees and older returnees are less likely to be unemployed one year after their return (Martin and Radu, 2012).

Some results regarding the perceptions of returnees by employers in home labour markets are available and are mainly negative, or vary based on skill levels. In their study about Estonia, Masso, Eamets and Mõtsmees (2014) found that home country employers might not like returnees as they have higher wage expectations, and are more likely to go abroad again. Polish returnees face negative attitudes from the general public as well as employers, who perceive them as job-hoppers or failed migrants (Barcevičius *et al.*, 2012; Schroth, 2013). Barcevičius *et al*. (2012) and Schroth (2013) found that while mobility experience of highly skilled returnees was appreciated in home labour markets, this was typically not the case with

low-skilled mobile workers. Some firms employing return migrants appreciate their language skills, technological knowledge, intercultural knowledge and flexibility (Schroth, 2013) and migration experience signals a set of personal characteristics valued in the labour market (self-determination, independence, entrepreneurship) (Kureková, 2011).

Slovakia is rarely selected as a case study for the more focused investigations of return migration, which might be due to data limitations. Among the exceptions are Kahanec and Kureková (2015) who map administrative data to study outflow patterns of returnees from unemployment. They found that the degree to which return migrants enter unemployment registers (or the relative rate of return to unemployment of migrants) differs based on the country of previous employment, but that, on average, return migrants exit the unemployment registry at a faster rate than non-migrants registered with the labour office. Williams and Baláž (2008) employ qualitative methodology to study the learning and knowledge transfer of Slovak doctors with international professional experience. They found that the doctors had an overwhelmingly positive assessment about how their professional experience influenced their work after returning. Williams and Baláž (2005) study three groups of Slovak migrants returning from the UK — professional and managers, students and au pairs — who have been working in very different positions with respect to skill demand. Although the positive benefits following return were found to be the lowest for au-pairs who had been employed in the low-skilled segment, a half of returnees felt that they had improved their status or their income after return, even in cases of short term mobility.

None of the studies about Slovakia have looked at the employers' perspective on returnees, or evaluated whether returnees are distinct in selected aspects of labour market integration. Moreover, the current study is also unique in terms of the data used. So far, only a few studies on return migration in the CEE context used web-based data and most of these were web surveys (Lang *et al.*, 2012; Schroth, 2013). Only Masso, Eamets and Mõtsmees (2014) analysed CV data from the job search portal in Estonia to study occupational mobility. The Profesia job-search portal provides additional information next to the CVs, such as the frequency of views of the profiles by employers, which enables us to study the standing of the returnees in the labour market in a unique way.

Table 1: Overview of studies about return migration in Central and Eastern Europe

Study	Countries	Data	Time period	Method	Findings
Ambrosini et al. (2011)	Romania	Census and National Demographic Survey	2002, 2003	Linear regression of (logged) wage	Wage premium (12–14%) for returnees relative to non-movers; positive selection of returnees in terms of skills
Barcevičius et al. (2012)	Hungary, Latvia, Poland, and Romania	In-depth interviews	2004–2010	Comparative analysis of the interviews	No mass return took place during the economic crisis; returns were motivated mostly by family reasons or by achievement of emigration goals; greater appreciation of highly skilled, but not low-skilled returnees
Co, Gang, and Yun (2000)	Hungary	Hungarian Household Panel Survey	1993–1994	MLE models of earning with double selection	Wage premium to work experience abroad for women (40%), but not for men
Hazans (2008)	Latvia	Representative survey	2006–2007	Two-step procedure for the selections into employment and into reporting earnings, propensity score matching (PSM) for comparing earnings of stayers and returnees	Wage premium for returnees (20% for men, and 6% for women)
Hazans and Philips (2010)	Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia	LFS, national surveys	2002–2008	Descriptive analysis	Returnees are more educated than migrants; post-accession Baltic migration was accompanied by brain waste – large proportion of

					overqualified migrants
Iara (2006)	Central and Eastern European countries	Youth Eurobarometer	2003	Endogenous switching regression analysis of standard wage	Wage premium to Western European work experience for young males (30% to stayer's earnings); the premium is greater for better educated returnees
Kahanec and Kureková (2014)	Slovakia	LFS, administrative data	2004–2012	Relative rate of return into unemployment, descriptive analysis	Returnees that are more educated, younger and working in more skilled occupations have higher chance to leave unemployment registry
Lang et al. (2012)	Austria, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia	Web survey	2011–2012	Descriptive analysis	Return of migrants depend on qualification, experiences in the host country and motives of staying/leaving; return is usually successful and easy; return is less driven by economic reasons than private and social motives
Masso, Eamets, and Motsmees (2014)	Estonia	Data from online job search portal	2000–2009	Probit model for return migration and occupational mobility	Returnees, during their work abroad work in lower-skilled occupations for which are overqualified; no positive effect of temporary migration on upward occupational mobility and negative effect for females

Masso et al. 2016	Estonia and Slovakia	LFS, administrative data, web data, web survey, interviews	2008-2015	Descriptive analysis, regression analyses, structured comparison	Returnees significantly differ in their profiles from migrants and stayers; they face higher risk of short-term unemployment, but typically reintegrate smoothly; returnees as well as employers value foreign work experience positively
Radu and Martin (2012)	Central and Eastern European countries	LFS, ESS	2001–2007	Descriptive analysis, interval regression and probit regression for wage analysis, multinomial regression of occupational choices	Wage premium for returnees (10–45%); returnees are less likely to participate in labour market upon return; returnees are more likely to choose self-employment and experience unemployment the first year after return when not adjusting for the unobserved heterogeneity of return migrants and regional effects
Schroth (2013)	Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland and Slovenia	web survey, business survey, focus groups	2012	multiple methods	Returnees are relatively well educated; returnees are more likely to be managers and professionals than stayers; the majority of recent returnees are in an economically active age and employed in service sector

Smoliner et al. (2012)	Austria, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland and Slovenia	LFS	2005–2008	Descriptive analysis	Returnees tend to be younger compared to stayers and migrants and better educated compared to stayers; returnees have a higher probability to be unemployed than stayers
Tomescu-Dubrow (2015)	Poland	Polish Panel Survey POLPAN	1988–2008	Linear regression for (logged) wage; logistic regression (acquiring employer status)	Living abroad meant significant increase in wage and increased probability of becoming employer
Williams and Baláž (2005)	Slovakia	Semi-structured interviews	Unspecified	Analysis of the interviews	Among au-pairs, professionals and student migrants the gains in terms of formal qualifications, skills and financial capital are limited; the gains are higher in social skills and informal human capital
Williams and Baláž (2008)	Slovakia	In-depth interviews	2006	Thematic analysis	International mobility of Slovak doctors was connected to substantial gains in knowledge and many transferred the knowledge to their colleagues
Zaiceva and Zimmermann (2012)	Central and Eastern European countries	European Social Survey, Eurobarometer, LSF	2008–2010	Descriptive analysis, probit regression	No evidence of mass-return during the crisis, but slowdown in overall immigration; returnees are more likely to be better educated, males, single, older and without children compared to migrants

3. Data and descriptive statistics

We work with online CVs gathered using a major job portal in Slovakia — Profesia.sk. Profesia is a market leader in Slovakia and covers about 80% of the market (Beblavý, Kureková and Haita, 2016). We reconstruct the life histories of individuals who have posted their CV and analyse the population of CVs gathered on the portal from January 2011 until June 2014. The sample is restricted to those aged 16-35 years, so as to focus on young returnees only. This equalled over 260,000 resumes, which is about 85% of all CVs held by the portal in that period.

Job seekers create their CVs online by filling in the required information on a predefined platform. Resumes include information about the individual's education and training history, their gender, and their (self-declared) skills — including their IT, administrative and language abilities, which are marked by the level of proficiency. We also have information about the positions to which the candidate has applied and where that position is advertised, as well as their expected minimum salary (minimum-maximum range). Candidates often applied for multiple positions and these could have been advertised in several regions in the country as well as abroad. Lastly, we have information about the number of CV views by employers or recruiters. On the basis of this data, we are able to derive a set of new variables, such as studying abroad, being a graduate, number of positions applied for, work experience (measured as years since graduation), and whether the candidate is applying for a position to which s/he is overqualified. We processed the work history variable to develop a code that identifies whether the individuals have a working experience abroad and from which country. From this information we created a key variable of interest, a dummy variable indicating whether an individual has foreign work experience that we use as an independent variable across different models that we estimate.

Looking at online CVs and the demand for different profiles positions our research in *medias res* of job matching. Furthermore, other research shows that the internet and online job portals are a key tool for job search among young returnees in Slovakia (Masso *et al.*, 2016). Online data helps us to map a specific labour market segment of job seekers as well as job changers. We can work with life-history data that is not readily available. We are able to use a much larger sample size, compared to representative sources of data and have information about labour supply (job candidates) as well as labour demand (through views on each CV).

Our data also has limitations related mainly to the profile of internet users who are typically younger and more educated, relative to the general population. Among Profesia visitors, over 42% are under 30 years of age, about 30% of visitors have attained tertiary education and close to half have secondary education with *maturita* (a school leaving certificate) (AIM Monitor, 2014). To understand the biases of our data, we compared general samples in our data and the LFS data (Table 2). Importantly, we find an unbiased gender and age composition of online data, compared to the representative sample collected by LFS. However, the online sample is more educated, containing a higher share of those with university education and a lower share of those with low and- medium education. We also find that the main host countries of returnees in both online and LFS data are, by and large,

similar (Table 3). The UK, Czech Republic, Hungary, Italy, Austria and Germany feature among the top return destinations in both sources of data.

We find important differences in the structure of returnees identified through these different data sources. First, returnees in the online data are on average older and significantly more educated at the high end. At the same time, a larger share of returnees identified through the online portal only have a primary-level education. We believe that these differences might arise from the method of data collection. First, LFS is known to underestimate migrants and returnees as it gathers data on the level of households and underestimates small, economically independent units (Bahna, 2012; Kahanec and Kureková, 2015). Second, the online data is likely to overestimate the well educated job seekers and job changers who are less likely to rely on public employment services and more extensively use the internet as a means for job searching. Third, online data captures returnees who might have worked abroad a longer time ago, while the LFS only captures recent migrants and returnees who are economically non-independent units. This is reflected in the sheer numbers of the returnees we are able to capture with online data and with LFS methodology. Based on online data, we find that one in five persons (19%) has worked abroad, out of whom nearly a fifth had more than one period of work experience abroad. LFS is only able to capture a very small number of returnees: 3.3 % of the total sample are migrants and 0.3 % are return migrants.

Already on the descriptive level, there seems to be important differences between young people with foreign work experience and those without it (Table 2). Returnees have more views than non-returnees, they expect a higher minimum salary, have more experience, have attended additional training more frequently and more often worked during their studies. More than a quarter of returnees studied abroad, compared to only about 14% of non-returnees.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics and comparison to Labour Force Survey data

	Online CVs			LFS	
	Returnees	**Non-returnees**	**Total**	**Returnees 15–34**	**Total 15–34**
Female	48.9	50.2	49.9	36.3	48.2
Age 15(16)–24*	31.8	53.9	49.8	39.7	50
25–34	68.2	46.1	50.3	60.3	50
Low-educated (ISCED 0, 1, 2)	14.8	19.5	18.6	2.9	25.9
Middle-educated(ISCED 3, 4)	48.6	51.9	51.2	89.7	59.2
High-educated (ISCED 5, 6)	36.6	28.7	30.2	7.4	14.8
Views	6.4	4.1	4.5		
Expected minimum salary (€)**	738	628	649		
Work experience (years since graduation)	5.4	3.9	4.2		
Further education/training	40.4	26.6	29.2		
Working while studying	47.3	41.5	42.8		
Study abroad	26.7	14.3	16.6		

Note 1: *Lower age limit for online CV data is 16, for SK-LFS data 15.
Note 2: For comparative reasons the descriptive analysis is based on individuals aged 15 to 34 years. **Cut off points 10 - 9999 for minimum salary was applied.
Note 3: The SK-LFS sample includes all respondent interviewed between the years 2008–2013 in at least 2 waves of the survey. Returnees are defined as individuals working abroad at least in one wave before the last observation (in which they are observed in the home country). For methodology see Masso *et al.* (2016).

Table 3: Top ten host countries

	Profesia	**N**	**Percent**	**LFS**	**N**	**Percent**
1	UK	11 322	18.8	CZ	59	28.9
2	CZ	10 210	16.9	UK	43	21.1
3	IT	4 042	6.7	HU	19	9.3
4	Other	4 021	6.7	AT	18	8.8
5	BE	3 874	6.4	IT	14	6.9
6	GR	3 222	5.3	DE	11	5.4
7	US	3 139	5.2	Other	8	3.9
8	DE	2 873	4.8	NL	6	2.9
9	IE	2 595	4.3	EU -unspecified	6	2.9
10	AT	2 169	3.6	CH	5	2.5
	Total returnees	60 345	100	Total returnees	329	100
	Share returnees on total		19 %	Share returnees on total		0.3

Note: Other: Profesia = unidentified countries; LFS = non EU

4. Methodology and models

We conduct the analysis with four dependent variables: views, desired minimum salary, position level, and location where the position is advertised. Unfortunately, we do not know whether a specific candidate was hired for the position of interest, and therefore can only use a proxy for the attractiveness – the number of views by firms and recruiters.

We test whether people with work experience abroad (dummy variable) are in greater demand (views), what their wage expectations are (salary), what level of position they apply for (position) and whether people with foreign experience might be more likely to respond to vacancies advertised in foreign labour markets (position located abroad). Our key variable of interest is work experience abroad, that we operationalise in two ways: a) time since return, and b) destinations of work abroad. Each of these variables includes no migration experience as a value that we used as a reference category in the analysis.

Different estimation techniques are used depending on the character of the dependent variable. We estimated an OLS regression measuring determinants of views (M1 and M2) and desired (log) minimum salary (M3 and M4). To measure whether returnees demonstrated different preferences for position level (high, medium, low-skilled), we estimated multinomial logistic regression (M5). To estimate the effect of overseas work experience on the likelihood of an applicant applying for a position advertised abroad, we run a logistic regression (M6).

The structure of the models across different dependent variables is identical. The models are specified as:

$$Y = \alpha X + \beta W + \delta Z + \mu$$

where vector α includes individual level characteristics: time since return (M1, M3, M5, M6), destination of migration (M2, M4), gender, education level, age, professional and language skills, education abroad, additional qualifications, experience (years since graduation), being graduate; vector β includes controls related to the position in which a particular candidate expressed his/her interest: position of interest (except M5), number of positions of interest (except M5), location of position (except M6), and whether a candidate was overeducated for a given position, i.e. mismatch of skills and position of interest (except M5), and expected minimum salary (M1, M2); and vector δ includes year dummies. The error term is measured by μ.

All estimations include clustered standard errors, as one individual could have applied for several positions and we therefore correct for non-independence of observations clustered at the level of the individual. [1] In the OLS analysis of views and expected salaries, we estimate two variations of models: M1/M3 test time since return and M2/M4 estimate the effect of the destination of migration. Position-related control variables and salary expectations can signal certain preferences of a job candidate that recruiters/employers see when searching the database of CVs. All these variables can drive the interest of employers in a candidate and we need a control for them in order to estimate the net effect of migration experience on the attractiveness of a CV and on expected wage in a given position.

The attractiveness of a CV could, in theory, be affected by other factors than foreign work experience, for example how well the CV has been made or some occupational effects. The

first point is not an issue as the CV format is predefined by the portal and thus CVs differ in content, but not in format. The second issue we partly control for in the statistical analysis by controlling for the level of position (high, medium, low).

5. Results

Results of the analyses are presented in Table 4. Looking at the factors influencing the number of views a CV receives (M1 and M2), we found that migration experience significantly impacts on the attractiveness of a job candidate. This is especially so if the candidate gained his/her work experience abroad within the past 5–9 years, but recent returnees also enjoy an attractiveness premium among potential employers. However, if work experience abroad took place 10 or more years ago, no premium exists. Likewise, we found that relative to lack of migration experience, having worked abroad in selected destinations improves the attractiveness of one's profile. The premium countries include the Czech Republic, the US and Canada, Italy, Ireland and the UK, as well as the other EU15 countries and 'other countries'[2]. This effect is a net of individual characteristics, skills and professional and educational history, as well as the characteristics of position in which a candidate expressed an interest.

We also confirm some general trends in the Slovak labour market (gender disadvantage, education and experience premium) and document niche expertise (IT skills, German language). Females are less attractive to employers, while people with upper-secondary, and especially university education, are more attractive. The attractiveness of a CV rises with age, and the level of skills whereby especially expert-level knowledge of IT and German provide a significant attractiveness premium. Knowledge of Russian or Spanish language does not increase attractiveness in the Slovak labour market. Third, additional qualifications and work experience improve attractiveness, which is confirmed by the negative effect of being a graduate on the number of views. Candidates who apply for high-skilled positions are more attractive. Applying for a position below one's qualifications leads to the lowered interest of potential employers. Looking for a position in the non-Western regions of Slovakia, or abroad, decreases attractiveness. Perhaps surprisingly, a higher expected salary increases the attractiveness of job candidate. Importantly, candidates applying for positions in disadvantaged regions of Slovakia — the Eastern and Central parts — also receive fewer views by employers. This confirms that regional disparities make the chances of the integration of returnees across different locations uneven.

With respect to minimum salaries (M3 and M4), job candidates with foreign work experience have higher wage expectations if their work experience is less than 10 years old. With the exception of work in the Czech Republic, returnees have higher salary expectations if they worked in: 'other countries' (11%), Austria and Germany (8%), the US, Canada and Italy (4%) and the other EU15 countries (2%). The expected salary of females is 16% lower than that of males. Salary expectations rise with education level, age and skill level. Candidates anticipate higher wages if they have studied abroad and extended their qualifications. Each year of extra experience increases the expectation of a higher wage by 0.3%. On average, graduates request a 5% lower wage. Salary expectations are lower if candidates apply for a

position below their qualification level and also for those located in regions with fewer labour market opportunities, i.e. outside Bratislava.

Results of the key variable of interest for the applied position level are dubious (M5). Recent returnees are less likely to apply for a medium-level position than for a low-skilled position relative to non-migrants; while having worked abroad a longer time ago (5–9 years) does not affect preferences for position level. However, we found that migration experience had a significant effect on the likelihood to respond to a position advertised abroad (M6) — returnees are 40% and 20% more likely to apply for an overseas position if they have returned recently (0–4 years), or some time ago (5–9 years), respectively. We found this effect when controlling for all other characteristics, including knowledge of foreign languages, age, or education, which are likely to shape migration preferences.

In sum, we found that having work experience from abroad increases the attractiveness of job candidates, especially if they have returned within the last 10 years, i.e. gained migration experience in the post-accession period. The attractiveness premium, however, varies depending on the destination country of the migrant, which is likely to be associated with the type of employment that different host countries can offer, or the degree to which the migrant must climb up the occupational ladder abroad, that we cannot control for. Returnees are also more demanding with respect to minimum salary expectations. The effect of migration experience on the level of position they seek is unclear, but returnees are more ready to apply for positions advertised abroad than stayers, suggesting possibilities for re-emigration and circular patterns of mobility.

[1] Candidates often expressed interest in multiple positions across different regions, which multiplied our observation otherwise identical in other parameters. We therefore used clustered standard errors to correct for non-independence of errors in this situation. Given a high number of clusters, we find this technique appropriate (Cameron and Miller, 2015).

[2] "Other EU15 countries" are EU15 countries not presented separately in Table 4. "Other countries" are all non-European except US and Canada.

Table 4: Regression results

Dependent variable	**Views**		**Log minimum salary**		**Position level**		**Position located abroad**
Model	**OLS with clustered SE**		**OLS with clustered SE**		**Multinomial logistic regression with clustered SE, odd ratios (low-skilled ref.)**		**Probabilistic regression (logit) with clustered SE, odd ratios**
	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5		M6
Time since return ***not abroad (ref)***					**Medium skilled**	**High skilled**	
0-4 years from return	0.359**		0.020***		0.956***	0.901***	1.403***
5-9 years from return	1.720***		0.031***		0.98	0.969	1.197***
10-20 years from return	0.015		0.002		1.015	1.042	1.11
Destination of migration ***Not abroad (ref)***							
EU 15 [+]		0.405*		0.023***			
Other European [++]		0.622		0.014			
European, non EU		-0.327		0.01			
US, Canada		0.850*		0.041***			
Other countries [+++]		0.947*		0.111***			
AT		0.335		0.088***			
DE		0.129		0.089***			
IE+UK		0.456*		0.003			
IT		0.726*		0.036***			
CZ		0.900***		-0.033***			
Gender							
female	-1.172***	-1.170***	-0.167***	-0.167***	1.162***	0.713***	0.683***
Education ***primary (ref)***							

secondary school student	0.106	0.111	-0.069***	-0.070***	1.083***	1.299***	0.893*
lower secondary	-0.394**	-0.398**	0.065***	0.065***	1.130***	1.121***	0.993
upper secondary	1.197***	1.200***	0.137***	0.136***	1.461***	2.472***	0.753***
university student	0.057	0.065	0.022	0.021	1.349***	2.527***	0.525***
higher professional education	0.269	0.278	0.144***	0.142***	1.469***	2.666***	0.768***
BA	1.033***	1.046***	0.215***	0.213***	1.967***	5.345***	0.615***
MA	2.086***	2.098***	0.353***	0.352***	3.803***	15.200***	0.608***
PhD	0.012	0.053	0.395***	0.394***	4.716***	24.732***	0.649***
Age ***16-20 (ref)***							
21-25	0.764***	0.750***	0.091***	0.092***	1.102***	1.274***	0.920***
26-30	2.310***	2.325***	0.212***	0.213***	1.284***	1.711***	0.866***
31-35	2.075***	2.086***	0.296***	0.295***	1.348***	2.012***	0.818***
Administrative skills ***none (ref)***							
basic	1.119***	1.128***	-0.014***	-0.014***	1.102***	1.086***	0.848***
advanced	1.483***	1.486***	0.013***	0.013***	1.397***	1.387***	0.756***
expert	1.419***	1.426***	0.032***	0.032***	1.648***	1.617***	0.716***
IT user skills ***none (ref)***							
basic	0.112	0.116	-0.034***	-0.034***	0.964***	1.133***	0.744***
advanced	0.872***	0.877***	0	0	1.093***	1.645***	0.656***
expert	1.108***	1.108***	-0.005	-0.004	1.070***	1.766***	0.662***
IT administrative skills ***none (ref)***							
basic	1.138***	1.147***	0.003	0.003	1.147***	1.299***	0.973
advanced	0.978**	0.972**	0.064***	0.063***	1.186***	1.520***	1.057*
expert	3.940**	3.928**	0.161***	0.160***	1.315***	2.043***	1.209***

IT programmer skills *none (ref)*							
basic	1.070***	1.066***	-0.008	-0.008	1.049***	1.233***	1.00
advanced	1.532***	1.533***	0.029***	0.030***	1.071***	1.600***	0.994
expert	3.460***	3.454***	0.158***	0.158***	0.992	2.219***	1.102*
English **none (ref)**							
basic	0.606***	0.612***	0.026***	0.026***	1.111***	1.176***	1.093***
intermediate	0.910***	0.919***	0.039***	0.039***	1.190***	1.328***	1.125***
advanced	2.499***	2.510***	0.105***	0.104***	1.330***	1.630***	1.231***
expert	1.834***	1.794***	0.212***	0.209***	1.679***	2.303***	1.384***
native	0.285	0.263	0.198***	0.190***	1.419***	1.795***	1.788***
German *none (ref)*							
basic	0.630***	0.629***	0.022***	0.022***	1.006	1.009	1.241***
intermediate	0.905***	0.909***	0.034***	0.032***	1.035***	1.052***	1.457***
advanced	2.896***	2.916***	0.112***	0.104***	1.127***	1.193***	1.988***
expert	4.516***	4.511***	0.225***	0.212***	1.594***	1.734***	2.329***
native	0.818	0.802	0.177***	0.170***	1.167	1.287*	2.158***
Russian *none (ref)*							
basic	0.648***	0.647***	-0.003	-0.004	0.949***	0.941***	1.164***
intermediate	0.467	0.46	-0.007	-0.006	0.964	0.951*	1.294***
advanced	-0.629	-0.618	0.003	0.005	1.003	0.961	1.395***
expert	-0.873	-0.805	-0.055	-0.049	0.873	0.711*	1.234*
native	-1.390***	-1.335**	0.064*	0.064*	1.121	1.187	1.613***
Spanish *none (ref)*							

basic	0.739*	0.745*	0.003	0.002	0.934***	0.864***	1.222***
intermediate	0.653	0.659	0.026	0.024	0.963	0.833***	1.214***
advanced	0.375	0.402	0.051**	0.046**	1.039	0.912	1.345***
expert	0.988	0.961	0.093**	0.091*	1.262*	1.131	1.372**
native	-1.73	-1.801	0.106	0.097	1.347	1.211	1.461**
Other language ***none (ref)***							
basic	0.16	0.162	-0.015**	-0.016**	0.970**	0.932***	1.180***
intermediate	0.497**	0.499**	-0.018***	-0.017**	0.927***	0.893***	1.316***
advanced	0.330**	0.323**	0	0	0.954***	0.942***	1.354***
expert	0.162	0.155	0.025***	0.024***	0.975	0.99	1.617***
Education abroad	0.16	0.125	0.018***	0.017***	1.028***	1.077***	1.313***
Additional qualifications	0.793***	0.797***	0.035***	0.034***	1.044***	1.090***	1.110***
Experience (in years)	0.069***	0.072***	0.003***	0.003***	0.996***	1.004*	0.994***
Graduate	-0.804***	-0.791***	-0.050***	-0.050***	0.956***	1.005	0.839***
Position of interest ***low (ref)***							
mid	-0.074	-0.073	0.046***	0.046***			0.873***
high	0.205***	0.205***	0.101***	0.100***			0.768***
Number of positions of interest	0.010***	0.010***	-0.000***	-0.000***			1.003***
Mismatch ͻ ***not overeducated (ref)***							
overqualified among middle educated	-0.406***	-0.405***	0.007**	0.007*			1.133***
overqualified among high educated	-0.511***	-0.507***	-0.061***	-0.061***			0.878***
Location of position ***Bratislavský (ref)***							
Banskobystrický	-0.470***	-0.461***	-0.186***	-0.185***	0.865***	0.793***	
Žilinský	-0.162*	-0.162*	-0.156***	-0.155***	0.893***	0.877***	

Trenčiansky	0.258**	0.262**	-0.122***	-0.121***	0.920***	0.942***	
Trnavský	0.541***	0.540***	-0.061***	-0.060***	0.971***	1.009	
Nitriansky	0.237***	0.242***	-0.124***	-0.124***	0.916***	0.907***	
Prešovský	-0.526***	-0.519***	-0.226***	-0.225***	0.821***	0.749***	
Košický	-1.068***	-1.060***	-0.207***	-0.206***	0.865***	0.785***	
Not specified	-2.499***	-2.502***	-0.018***	-0.017***	0.869***	0.872***	
abroad	-1.717***	-1.724***	0.082***	0.082***	0.725***	0.654***	
minimum salary (log)	1.803***	1.808***					
Year (ref. 2011)							
2012	-0.031	-0.022	0.018***	0.018***	0.968***	0.933***	1.205***
2013	-1.193***	-1.174***	0.021***	0.020***	0.941***	0.894***	1.250***
2014	-0.931***	-0.905***	0.020***	0.019***	0.935***	0.892***	1.175***
Constant	-11.321***	-11.393***	6.042***	6.043***	1.229***	0.417***	0.222***
R squared	0.1207	0.1204	0.328	0.3296	0.0756		0.0589
N	677,207	677,207	677,207	677,207	1075642		1075642

6. Note 1: Significance: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.
7. Note 2: ͻ: Overqualified among medium educated was defined by a combination of ISCED 3 or 4 and ISCO 9; over-qualification among highly-educated was defined by ISCED 5 or 6 and ISCO higher than 3.
8. Note 3: +: all EU15 not presented separately; ++: all other European countries but EU15 and CZ; +++: all other countries accept Europe, US and Canada.

6. Conclusion and implications

The EU accession of Slovakia in 2004 resulted in the massive labour migration of young and well educated people to the countries that liberalised their labour markets and has continued since then at a relatively high level. To date, the phenomenon of return migration in Slovakia has not been mapped and there are many questions about post-return labour market integration patterns, perceptions of employers of foreign work experience and returnees' salary and position expectations.

In this paper we analysed online CVs to reconstruct the work histories of job candidates and to measure how attractive people with a foreign working record are, and whether they differ from stayers in their labour market behaviour.

We found that having work experience from abroad increases the attractiveness of those job candidates that have done so in the period following Slovakia's EU accession. Relative to those with no migration experience, returnees are more valued by firms, controlling for factors such as the level of education, skills, experience, or the skill level of the vacancy. While Slovak migrants frequently worked abroad on positions below their level of qualifications, this does not seem to affect the perceptions of employers negatively. However, the attractiveness premium varies depending on the host country of the migrant. We are unable to investigate what the factors are in determining this, but we hypothesise that it might be associated with the type of employment that different host countries can offer. Importantly, we found no attractiveness premium for the job candidates that apply for a position to which they are mismatched (over-educated). This possibly serves as a signal to employers of difficulty to find a job and might deter them from considering such job candidates.

We found that returnees are more demanding with respect to salary expectations, which might make matching more difficult in the lower skilled, lower paid segment of the labour market and exert pressure on national wages. Returnees are more willing to apply for positions abroad than stayers, suggesting possibilities for re-emigration and circular patterns of mobility. In sum, foreign work experience changes the expectations of returnees with respect to wages and widens their perspective on the location of future work.

Our results also document some apparent inequalities in the labour market, which highlight the fact that not all returnees are on equal footing. Gender and low education continue to produce systemic disadvantages. Returnees to localities with a lower number of employment opportunities are likely to face difficulties in their labour market reintegration. This opens space for targeted support to select groups of returnees. Facilitating the acceleration of the labour market integration of young returnees will enable them to fully realise their competencies, and so provide benefits for the home country economy.

Our study used online CV data to analyse aspects of return migration for which representative data is typically not available. While online data has biases, they allow working with large sample sizes and give access to relatively up-to-date information. In our case, online data captured individuals that are overlooked in representative datasets, due to data collection methods and criteria. We would therefore like to advocate further usage of online data in the study of labour migration and return.

References

AIM Monitor (2014) 'Výskum sociodemografie návštevníkov internetu v Slovenskej Republike'. IAB Slovakia, Mediaresearch & Gemius.

Ambrosini, J. W., Mayr, K., Peri, G. and Radu, D. (2011) *The Selection of Migrants and Returnees: Evidence from Romania and Implications*. Working Paper 16912. National Bureau of Economic Research. Available at: http://www.nber.org/papers/w16912 (Accessed: 16 October 2012).

Askitas, N. and Zimmermann, K. (2015) 'The internet as a data source for advancement in social sciences', *International Journal of Manpower*, 36(1), pp. 2–12.

Bahna, M. (2012) 'Intra-EU migration from Slovakia', *European Societies*, pp. 1–20. doi: 10.1080/14616696.2012.707669.

Barcevičius, E., Iglicka, K., Repečkaitė, D. and Žvalionytė, D. (2012) *Labour mobility within the EU: The impact of return migration*. EUROFOUND. Available at: http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/htmlfiles/ef1243.htm (Accessed: 27 June 2014).

Bastia, T. (2011) 'Should I stay or should I go? Return migration in times of crises', *Journal of International Development*, 23(4), pp. 583–595. doi: 10.1002/jid.1794.

Beblavý, M., Kureková, L. M. and Haita, C. (2016) 'The surprisingly exclusive nature of medium- and low-skilled jobs: Evidence from a Slovak job portal', *Personnel Review*, 45(2), pp. 255 – 273.

Borjas, G. J. and Bratsberg, B. (1996) 'Who leaves? The outmigration of the foreign-born', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 78, pp. 165–176.

Cameron, A. C. and Miller, D. L. (2015) 'A practitioner's guide to cluster-robust inference', *Journal of Human Resources*, 50(2), pp. 317–372.

Co, C., Gang, I. N. and Yun, M.-S. (2000) 'Returns to returning', *Journal of Population Economics*, 13(1), pp. 57–79.

Constant, A. and Massey, D. S. (2002) 'Return Migration by German Guestworkers: Neoclassical versus New Economic Theories', *International Migration*, 40(4), pp. 5–38. doi: 10.1111/1468-2435.00204.

Currie, S. (2007) 'De-Skilled and Devalued: The Labour Market Experience of Polish Migrants in the UK Following EU Enlargement', *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, 23(1), pp. 83–116.

Drinkwater, S., Eade, J. and Garapich, M. (2009) 'Poles apart? EU enlargement and the labour market outcomes of immigrants in the United Kingdom', *International Migration*, 47(1), pp. 161–190.

Dumont, J.-C. and Spielvogel, G. (2008) *Return migration: A new perspective*. International Migration Outlook, Annual Report. OECD, pp. 162–222.

Edelman, B. (2012) 'Using Internet Data for Economic Research', *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26(2), pp. 189–206. doi: 10.2307/41495310.

Engbersen, G., Leerkes, A., Grabowska-Lusinska, I., Snel, E. and Burgers, J. (2013) 'On the Differential Attachments of Migrants from Central and Eastern Europe: A Typology of Labour Migration', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39(6), pp. 959–981. doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2013.765663.

Guzi, M. and Kahanec, M. (2014) *WageIndicator Living Wages Methodological Note*. Amsterdam: Wageindicator Foundation. Available at: http://www.wageindicator.org/documents/publicationslist/publications-2014/141110-Living-Wage-Method_FINAL.pdf (Accessed: 20 July 2015).

Haas, H. de, Fokkema, T. and Fihri, M. F. (2015) 'Return Migration as Failure or Success?', *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 16(2), pp. 415–429. doi: 10.1007/s12134-014-0344-6.

Hazans, M. and Philips, K. (2010) 'The post-enlargement migration experience in the Baltic labor markets', in Kahanec, M. and Zimmermann, K. F. (eds) *EU labor markets after post-enlargement migration*. Berlin - Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 255–304. Available at: http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-02242-5_10 (Accessed: 21 May 2014).

Hönekopp, E. and Mattila, H. (eds) (2008) *Permanent or circular migration?* Budapest: IOM. Available at: http://202.173.4.113/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/published_docs/books/Permanent_circular_migration.pdf (Accessed: 18 September 2012).

Iara, A. (2006) 'Skill Diffusion in Temporary Migration? Returns to Western European Working Experience in the EU Accession Countries', *Returns to Western European Working Experience in the EU Accession Countries (March 2006). Centro Studi Luca d'Agliano Development Studies Working Paper*, (210). Available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=918037 (Accessed: 18 October 2012).

Kahanec, M. and Kureková, L. (2013) 'European Union Expansion and Migration', *The Encyclopedia of Global Human Migration*. 1st Edition. Edited by I. Ness. Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.

Kahanec, M. and Kureková, L. M. (2015) 'Did post-enlargement labor mobility help the EU to adjust during the Great Recession? The case of Slovakia', in Kahanec, M. and Zimmermann, K. F. (eds) *Labor migration, EU enlargement, and the Great Recession*. Springer.

Kahanec, M. and Zimmermann, K. F. (2010) 'Migration in an enlarged EU: A challenging solution?', *Five Years of an Enlarged EU*, pp. 63–94.

Kureková, L. (2011) *From Job Search to Skill Search: Political Economy of Labor Migration in Central and Eastern Europe*. PhD. Dissertation. Central European University.

Kureková, L. M., Beblavỳ, M. and Thum-Thysen, A. (2015) 'Using online vacancies and web surveys to analyse the labour market: a methodological inquiry', *IZA Journal of Labor Economics*, 4(1), pp. 1–20.

Kveder, C. L. M. (2013) 'Temporary Migration: A Review of the literature'. INED. Available at: http://ideas.repec.org/p/idg/wpaper/188.html (Accessed: 27 June 2014).

Lang, T., Hämmerling, Keil, J., Nadler, R., Schmidt, A., Haunstein and Smoliner, S. (2012) *Re-Turn Migrant Survey Report: The Migrants' Potential and Expectations*. Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography (IfL), p. 81. Available at: http://www.iom.cz/files/323_Migrant-Survey-Report.PDF (Accessed: 23 June 2014).

Martin, R. and Radu, D. (2012) 'Return Migration: The Experience of Eastern Europe1', *International Migration*, 50(6), pp. 109–128. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2435.2012.00762.x.

Masso, J., Eamets, R. and Motsmees, P. (2012) 'Return migrants and occupational mobility: evidence from Estonia'. University of Tartu.

Masso, J., Eamets, R. and Mõtsmees, P. (2014) 'Temporary migrants and occupational mobility: evidence from the case of Estonia', *International Journal of Manpower*, 35(6), pp. 753–775. doi: 10.1108/IJM-06-2013-0138.

Masso, J., Kureková, L. M., Tverdostup, M. and Žilinčíková, Z. (2016) *Return migration patterns of young return migrants after the crises in the CEE countries: Estonia and Slovakia, , STYLE-WP 6.1. CROME, University of Brighton, Brighton.* STYLE Working Papers WP 6.1. Brighton: CROME, University of Brighton.

Pungas, E., Toomet, O., Tammaru, T. and Anniste, K. (2012) *Are Better Educated Migrants Returning? Evidence from Multi-Dimensional Education Data*. Norface Research Programme on Migration, Department of Economics, University College London. Available at: http://www.mtk.ut.ee/orb.aw/class=file/action=preview/id=1067215/Education_return_migration_2011-09-05.pdf (Accessed: 16 October 2012).

Rooth, D.-O. and Saarela, J. (2007) 'Selection in migration and return migration: Evidence from micro data', *Economics letters*, 94(1), pp. 90–95.

Roy, A. D. (1951) 'Some thoughts on the distribution of earnings', *Oxford economic papers*, 3(2), pp. 135–146.

Schroth, J. (2013) *International Comparative Working Paper 'Barriers for Successful Capitalization on Returning Migrants'*. Prague Office: IOM. Available at: http://www.re-migrants.eu/download/International%20Comparative%20Working%20Paper%20on%20Barriers.PDF (Accessed: 24 June 2014).

Smoliner, S., Förschner, M., Hochgerner, J. and Nová, J. (2012) 'Comparative Report on Re-Migration Trends in Central Europe', *Re-Turn, Centre for Social Innovation, Vienna*, p. 81.

Tomescu-Dubrow, I. (2015) 'International Experience and Labour Market Success: Analysing Panel Data from Poland', *Polish Sociological Review*, (191), p. 259.

Turner, T. (2010) 'The jobs immigrants do: issues of displacement and marginalisation in the Irish labour market', *Work, Employment & Society*, 24(2), pp. 318–336. doi: 10.1177/0950017010362148.

Voitchovsky, S. (2014) 'Occupational downgrading and wages of New Member States immigrants to Ireland', *International Migration Review*, (48), pp. 500–537. doi: 10.1111/imre.12089.

Williams, A. M. and Baláž, V. (2005) 'What Human Capital, Which Migrants? Returned Skilled Migration to Slovakia From the UK', *International Migration Review*, 39(2), pp. 439–468. doi: 10.2307/27645504.

Williams, A. M. and Baláž, V. (2008) 'International return mobility, learning and knowledge transfer: A case study of Slovak doctors', *Social Science & Medicine*, 67(11), pp. 1924–1933. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.09.003.

Zaiceva, A. and Zimmermann, K. F. (2012) *Returning home at times of trouble? Return migration of EU enlargement migrants during the crisis*. Discussion Paper Series, Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit. Available at: http://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/69473 (Accessed: 22 May 2014).