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Abstract

East-West migration had an increase after the enlargement of EU with ten Central and Eastern European countries in May 2004. Despite the increased number of emigrants from Eastern Europe, few studies have been made to explore the effects of migration for the sender country. This study explores qualitatively the “push” and “pull” factors of emigration from Estonia and Poland to Norway, and the effects of emigration for the country of origin. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 16 respondents from Estonia and Poland. Two key respondent interviews with one Estonian and Polish respondent were conducted in addition.

The main “push” factors were low salaries and lack of economical opportunities in the home country. Other factors influencing migration decisions were bad working conditions, lack of worker’s rights and unemployment in the home country. Employment opportunities in the receiving country, having friends in the host country, and looking for an adventure, were “pull” factors mentioned by the respondents. Historical ties between the countries, proximity and easier immigration policies after the enlargement of EU, also influence migration decisions. Increased immigration can have some negative effects for the immigrants – misuse by the employers. This happens through lacking overtime and holiday payment, and bad working conditions.

Lack of workers is one of the effects of migration which can lead to reduction in the economic growth in the home country. There is already a shortage of nurses, doctors and engineers in Estonia and Poland. The dimension of this type of emigration – “brain drain” – is uncertain according to the respondents. Importing workers from other countries can lead to integration problems in the countries of emigration. This is the case in Estonia. Emigration has also some positive effects, called “brain gain”. These effects appear through knowledge and experiences of the returned migrants. Money transfers to the home country, and using the money for locally produced goods and services promotes positively the economy in the home country. Emigration has lead to the decrease in unemployment in Poland. Another positive effect is increase of salaries in the sending countries.

Raised salaries, improved worker’s rights and better social security systems are some of the things that would attract the migrants return, and make the workers stay in the home country.
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1 Introduction

Eastern enlargement of the European Union (EU) has opened the borders for free flow of the labour force. Although some of the old EU member states have restrictions on mass immigration from the new member states, others practice full freedom from day one – the 1st of May 2004.

Even though many of the new eastern European member states have growing economies, the level of salaries is still low compared to other EU member states. That is both a “push” and a “pull” factor for labour migration. The fact that Norway is a member of the EEA (and not the EU) makes the EU regulation about free flow of labour to apply also here. This means that all EU citizens theoretically can find a job in Norway, and work there. Norway is, though, not the most attractive land of immigration for Eastern Europeans.

My first focus in this thesis will be on the “push” and “pull” factors of migration from two Eastern European countries - Estonia and Poland to Norway. People have different reasons for migration. Economical interests are often mentioned to be the most important ones, but some are migrating due to bad working conditions, or just for looking for an adventure.

The second focus is how labour migration affects the development of the sending country according to the respondents themselves. The studies usually investigate the receiving country and discuss possible positive and negative affects for the receiving economy. In this thesis I will focus on the country of emigration. There have been discussions in the Norwegian media about Norway recruiting nurses from the Baltic States and from Poland, and whether it is proper to drain these countries for nurses. The departure of educated labour such as nurses, doctors and engineers, and lack of workers, can lead to a reduction in the economic growth and a lack of human capital in the sender country.

The data collection process included interviews with labour migrants in Norway from Estonia and Poland. In addition, two key respondents were interviewed – one from Estonia and one from Poland. Information from the interviews gave me details from peoples’ experiences in terms of migration.
The findings from the interviews will be discussed in terms of the field related literature. This thesis is qualitative and will focus on the personal stories of the respondents. In order to illustrate the discussion, the phrases from the respondents are presented.

1.1 Objectives of the study

The first objective of this study is to qualitatively investigate the “push” and “pull” factors for labour migrants from Estonia and Poland to Norway.

The second objective of the study is to evaluate how East West labour migration influences the development in the sending countries, based on the views of immigrants.

1.2 Clarification of the terminology and definitions

In this thesis I will use terms like sender country (country of origin/home country/country of emigration) and receiving country (country of destination/host country/country of immigration). These refer respectively to the country that exports labour force and to the country that imports labour force.

With the term push factor, I mean factors that make (force) people to leave their home country; reasons which are directly connected to the situation in the home country. Typical push factors are low salaries, political repression, unemployment, etc.

With the term pull factor, I mean factors that attract people to migrate; reasons that are directly connected to the host country. Typical pull factors are higher salaries and better living standards, social security, and political freedom.

I will also use the terms brain drain, brain gain and brain waste. Brain drain means an outflow of educated people, meaning that the “brains” (highly educated) are leaving the country. With brain gain, I mean the positive outcomes of brain drain, for example the experience and knowledge of educated people who return to their home country. With brain waste I mean people who are educated, but migrate in order to do some simple work abroad (like cleaning).
With the term *remittances*, I mean financial support that migrants send to their family and friends in the home country.

With the term *development*, I mean a process that leads to improved conditions in the country. Economic growth, improved social security system and improved worker rights are examples for development.

### 1.3 Outline of the thesis

The second chapter will present the data gathering method, how the interviews were conducted, and the challenges met during the fieldwork. The third chapter in this thesis will give an overview of the literature related to modern East-West labour migration. It will have a focus on the situation in Norway as a receiving country, and in Estonia and Poland as sending countries. Theories of migration, “brain drain” and how this affects the country of origin will be also introduced in the third chapter. The fourth chapter will present the results and discuss these. This will include the determinants of migration, effects of migration for the home country, and the future perspectives in terms of the home country.

I will refer to the findings from the internet, newspapers and periodicals in the notes, at the bottom of the page. Literature from books, scientific articles and reports are presented in the list of references.
2 Method

In this chapter I will present the background of the thesis and the data collection process. This includes explaining the choice of respondents and the process of interviewing. Finally I will bring out some challenges that occurred during the fieldwork.

2.1 Background of the thesis

The purpose of this thesis is qualitative investigation of the push-pull factors of the labour migrants from Estonia and Poland, and to evaluate how East West labour migration influence the development in the sending countries, based on the views of immigrants.

I found qualitative research method most appropriate, because it explores rather words and values of people and includes the researcher in the process. It answers to questions of how and why, and that is what I need to know in order to reach my objective.

My main interest was migration. The fact that there are already many studies about south north migration and the increasing nature of east west migration where important factors in my decision of topic. There are not many studies about the new EU members and labour migration, especially with focus on the country of origin. It would have been too comprehensive to study all eastern European countries; I chose two of them - Estonia and Poland. The big number of polish workers in Norway was a reason behind choosing Poland as one of the respondent country. My own Estonian background and labour emigration from Estonia were reasons behind choosing Estonia as another respondent country.

2.2 Informants

I had all together 18 informants from Estonia and Poland; two of them were key informants. My plan was to interview ca 20 informants, and I managed to stick to my plan. I decided to interview ca 20 people because it seemed a realistic figure to reach during the limited time of fieldwork. I used snowball sampling in order to get in touch with the informants. Snowball sample is "a non-probability sample in which the researcher makes initial contact with a
small group of people who are relevant to the research topic and then uses these to establish contacts with others” (Bryman, 2004, p. 544). I first asked my family and friends whether they knew anyone from Estonia or Poland who have come to Norway to work. After getting a contact or two, I asked further if they knew anyone that could be a potential interviewee. Sometimes I did not get any new contacts, so I had to search from the internet. I found a homepage of the Estonian-Norwegian association in Norway and contacted them. This turned out to be big step forward, and I got enough Estonian interviewees. I participated also in the café-meetings of this association, and got some contacts from there.

When it comes to the polish interviewees, it didn’t go so smoothly. I had only some contacts and I had to use these in order to get new ones. It was more difficult to get new Polish respondents, and that is also a reason behind the fact that I have eight respondents from Poland and ten from Estonia.

I also had two key informants, one from Estonia and the other from Poland. A key informant is “someone who offers the researcher perceptive information about the social setting, important events and individuals” (Bryman, 2004, p. 540). The Polish key informant has an enterprise in Norway that guides Polish and eastern European immigrants with public formalities and documents in Norway. Her experiences and contacts with Polish people made her a perfect key informant for the group of Polish immigrants. Her firm is giving consultancies including work environment regulations, and for foreign firms establishing in Norwegian market.

The Estonian key informant is an employee in the Estonian Ministry of Social Affairs, section for labour market. She had relevant information about the situation at the Estonian labour market, and about the government’s labour politics.

The key informants are providing with some general information about the situation of emigration, immigration and matters related to this. Both key informants were helpful and concerned about my topic. They were both female.

How did I get the contacts to participate at the interviews? Usually, I got a phone number or an e-mail address to a potential respondent. Then I first explained who I was and from whom I got the phone number or e-mail address. I continued by explaining my study and the need for someone to interview. I also mentioned that the interviewees will remain anonym and that
they are free to say no. If I got an agreement for an interview, then we agreed the meeting. I followed the same procedure while meeting Estonians at the monthly café gathering.

2.3 Conducting interviews

I conducted 16 semi-structured interviews with labour emigrants from Estonia and Poland, and two key informant informant interviews. Semi-structured interview is defined as an interview with "open-ended questions where unexpected and relevant issues are followed up with further questions or probing, and interviewees are typically key individuals, focus groups or mixed groups" (Mikkelsen, 2005, p. 89). This type of interview gave me the flexibility that I needed, and assisted me at the same time with a checklist of topics to be discussed.

The durability of interviews was planned to be between 45 and 60 minutes. But the average durability was 37 minutes in reality. The longest interview lasted 70 minutes and the shortest lasted 20 minutes. The reason behind shorter time of interviews might be that not all respondents were that talkative. Respondents were talkative on average. Some were very talkative, others were less talkative. A few of them seemed to feel a bit uncomfortable during the interview. But I tried hard to secure a comfortable environment in the interviewing situation. Still, it seemed that some respondents might have been wondering about the purpose of the questions and discussions, and about the relevance of that.

Most of the interviews took place in café’s in the centre of Oslo. I had found a cosy place without too loud music in the background. I agreed to meet respondents outside or inside the café at a certain time. I had a “private” corner at the café that was excellent for interviewing. Sometimes I bought a glass of mineral water for me and my respondent, and sometimes the respondents insisted on buying a cup of tea to me. There were no problems for the café that I conducted my interviews there, as long as some of us bought something to drink.

Some of the interviews, including the interviews with the key informants, took place at the office or working place of the respondent. I always let the respondent choose the place to meet, and suggested a café if the respondent didn’t have any suggestions. The offices were even a more informal place to conduct interviews, and the respondents seemed to be more
relaxed. Two respondents invited me even to their home to conduct the interview there. The reason behind that was that it was easier for one of respondents, who was a mother of a seven months old child, to meet me at her home. I interviewed also her sister who lived at the same place. This was a sign of trust, and I felt myself really welcome.

There was one interview that took place outside Oslo, because the respondent worked at that place. It was in a small place in Telemark County. The interview with Estonian key respondent took place in an office of the Estonian Ministry of Social Affairs, in Estonia. I conducted it while I was having the Christmas vacation in Estonia. All other respondents were working and living in the Oslo area.

Most of the interviews took place in the afternoon; mostly after 5 pm. Interviews conducted at the offices and at home were during midday. I was relatively flexible, and let always the respondents decide the time of meeting.

Interviews were more or less conversations in a free form, but I was leading the course of the interview. I started by introducing my work and the interviewee’s rights to anonymity. I also said that they can always refuse to answer a question if they want, and I asked whether it was acceptable to record the interview. All respondents gave me allowance to record the interviews. I used a checklist with themes and some questions, but I followed mostly the respondent’s order of narrating. I tried to be objective and an active listener at the same time. I encouraged respondents to tell their own opinions and experiences. And having a cup of tea or a glass of mineral water to drink was just making the conversation cosier. In the end I thanked the respondents for their time and for the interview. There were also some respondents who expressed a wish to read my thesis when it is finished.

2.3.1 Checklist
Although I knew all the topics and questions after a while by heart, it was still good to have a checklist to follow. It was helping me to stick to the relevant topics and not to loose track. I had five main topics in my checklist (see appendix 1). The first was just some general information about the respondents. The second topic was about immigration to Norway, push-pull factors, challenges, and the meeting with a new culture and language. The third topic had to do with relations to the home country: visits, remittances, plans of return. The
fourth topic dealt with work and work conditions both in the home country and in Norway. The last topic was about the issue of emigration and the effects of it.

These topics covered most of the questions relevant to my study. Sometimes I received more information than expected, but this was just helping me to understand the life situation of the corresponding respondent.

2.3.2 Field notes and transcribing
Although I recorded all my interviews, I was still taking some rough notes. This was in order to ease the transcribing process, and in case of problems with excess noise or emptying battery. The notes appeared to be a big help, because of the background noise that was disturbing in some cases. Taking notes gave the respondents opportunity to take a second thought or say something additional.

I transcribed all 18 interviews. This was a time-consuming and hard work to do. I used five to six hours to transcribe one interview, sometimes even eight hours. The average interview was six computer typed pages long. I appreciate the decision of recording the interviews and transcribing them, because it gives more accuracy of details concerning respondents’ stories.

2.3.3 Language
I conducted the interviews in three different languages: English, Norwegian and Estonian. Interviews with Estonian respondents were in Estonian. Interviews with Polish respondents were in Norwegian or English (three interviews). All the checklists were in three different languages, and so are the transcriptions. I will use some parts of transcripts as illustration, so the non English sections will then be translated into English.

There was usually no misunderstanding due to language with the exception of one Polish respondent who’s English I couldn’t understand.

2.4. Challenges
There were some circumstances that made it sometimes difficult to do fieldwork. First, it was difficult to get in touch with the potential respondents. I sent many e-mails and some of them
were never answered. Some answered “no” at once, while others were interested. This problem disappeared after a while when it came to Estonian respondents. In the end I got more contacts than I had capacity to interview. The problem was existent when it came to Polish respondents. I had difficulties in getting enough Polish respondents.

The next challenge was time. Although people were interested in participating, they were very busy with their jobs and some also with family. I was relatively flexible, but I live in Telemark, and preferred to gather a few interviews before travelling to Oslo. And this made it difficult to find a suitable time for both parts.

It happened also several times that the respondents did not turn up at the agreed time and place. The reason was often that they had forgotten the meeting or had become sick without informing me. This was a challenge because the interviewees do it voluntarily and I cannot keep pressing them too much. So I just had to be humble and accept it all. But after some of these experiences, I started to send reminder messages a day or two before the interview.

Another challenge was noise and music in the background. It happened a few times that the cosy and quiet café I had chosen had an arrangement with DJ and loud music. I was not aware of that, and we just had to continue the interview. It was not a big problem during the interview because I could ask over again if I did not hear anything. It was more problematic during transcribing the interview. It was quite unpleasant to hear this noise through earphone during the whole day of transcribing. But I had my notes and memory to help me, because I used to do the transcription as soon as possible after the interview.

Non talkative respondents were another challenge I met. This appeared especially during the questions of opinion. They did not have any idea or they just did not care much about the issue discussed. I had to ask many follow up- and why-questions to get them to talk more. It seemed to be an interrogation rather than a discussion. But this was at the same time an encouraging experience, and I became more confident after each interview on how to deal with the non talkative respondents.

One other challenge was the use of three different languages. It makes it difficult to compare the results while working with the data and interpreting it. It is especially notable with the interviews in English and Norwegian. None of these languages is a mother tongue for the
respondents, and it was sometimes difficult to understand what they really meant with a phrase. It was not easy to figure out whether they were really trying to say something important, or if it was a kind of joke.
3 Literature review

This chapter gives a brief overview of research related to immigration. First, the overview will be given about immigration to Norway, and about the immigrant sender countries – Estonia and Poland. Then the chapter continues by presenting theories on migration and causes for migration. The chapter continues with a presentation of different views of brain drain, and its causes for the countries origin. Finally, some suggestions for how to deal with emigration will be brought out.

3.1 Norway as a receiving country, Estonia and Poland as sending countries

There are 387 000 immigrants in Norway today. Immigrant is defined as a person who has migrated to Norway, or was born in Norway, but has two parents born in a foreign country. Immigrants in Norway come from altogether 200 different countries, and most of them come from the Third World. 68 000 of the immigrants come from Eastern Europe. Data from the statistic bureau show that there has been growth of workers from the new EU countries. The growth was stronger from 2004 to 2005 than the year before. People from Poland and Lithuania were the largest groups representing the new EU countries. Most of the new labour immigrants from Eastern Europe work in the sector of construction.

This thesis is focusing on labour immigrants from two eastern European countries – Estonia and Poland – which both joined the EU on the 1st of May 2004.

Estonia has the smallest population of the new EU countries and the fourth smallest in the whole EU with a population of 1, 3 million. Estonia is an important trading partner for Norway, and there are Norwegian investors in Estonia. Estonia has had the highest economic growth among eastern European countries during the last five years. If the growth rate

---

1 www.ssb.no, accessed 23.03.2007
2 http://www.ssb.no/emner/06/01/kortsys/ The new EU countries mentioned in the thesis are the ones accessed in 2004: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Hungary, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Malta. (The newest members are Romania and Bulgaria which accessed EU in 2007).
remains this high, the level of Estonian welfare is expected to reach the level of western
European countries within a short period of time.

The unemployment rate in Estonia has decreased from 8.2% in May 2006 to 4.2% in
December 2006. Only Denmark and the Netherlands have lower unemployment in the EU.
Some sectors, especially construction and service, have lost workers in competition with
Norway and Finland, and there is a lack of approximately 4000 workers annually.₄ Estonia
has already started importing workers to these sectors from Ukraine, Poland and Russia.

Poland is the biggest of the new EU countries with a population of 38.1 millions.⁵ Poland is
also an important trading partner for Norway, especially in terms of fishing and construction
of ships. Poland was the first country in Central and East Europe to introduce market
economy (in 1989). But the country still has problems with corruption and bureaucracy. The
economic growth in Poland has been slower than in other new member states. The
unemployment rate (in December 2006) in Poland is the highest of the EU – 14%.

3. 2 Theories about and attitudes towards migration

There are several ways of explaining migration. I will introduce three theories of migration
that can explain different aspects in terms of migration.

**THE CLASSICAL THEORY OF LABOUR MIGRATION**

The classical theory of migration is assuming perfect conditions that are absent in the real
world. Some of the conditions are perfect competition, flexible factor prices and perfect
information (Armstrong, Taylor, 2000, p. 141). Migration will happen due to changes in
supply or demand for labour. This can happen because of natural population changes, raising
of the school-leaving age or reduction of the retirement age. Increased demand for labour will
lead to increase in salaries. This leads to wage differentials between to regions, which will
cause migration from the region with lower salaries to the region with higher salaries. This,
again, will cause increased demand for labour and increased salaries in the region with lower
salaries. The migration will continue until the salaries are in balance in both regions. After
that there is no longer incentive for migration (ibid.).

---

⁵ Fafo Østforum, Poland. Accessed 23.03.2007
http://www.fafo.no/Oestforum/Kunnskapsbase/Publikasjoner/Oestforum_publikasjoner/LR-polen.htm
**HUMAN CAPITAL MODEL OF LABOUR MIGRATION**

According to the human capital model, migration will take place due to a wish to maximize the overall income during a life cycle. This will explain why migrants in some cases move to depressed regions - these regions can be high wage regions for some occupants (ibid., p. 154).

**THE JOB SEARCH MODEL**

According to this model, migration is an outcome of search decisions. This means that people will migrate in order to increase their opportunities to get work, or in order to get a certain work offer (ibid.).

**ATTITUDES TOWARDS IMMIGRANTS**

Although migration was generally seen as beneficial for both sending and receiving countries in the 1960s, this trend has changed. Migration helped to solve the problem of unemployment in the sending countries, and promoted the interests of industry and business in the receiving countries. Later, the demand for workers decreased, immigrants started to bring their families and settle down in the receiving countries, and the numbers of illegal immigrants increased. This caused the arising of the negative views to immigration (Drbohlav, 1997, p. 87). The rates of unemployment increased in the receiving countries, and so did the demand for more restrictive migration policies.

The way Poles are viewed in the Norwegian discourse is often as “*being below par, nice but not as good as “we” are*” or as “*a threat to the Norwegian welfare system and way of life*” (Godzimirski, 2005, p. 137).

### 3.3 Reasons for migration

Castles and Miller (2003, p. 19) are presenting push and pull factors for migration. Typical push factors are low living standards, lack of economical opportunities and political repression. Pull factors are demand for labour, available land, good economic opportunities and political freedom.
The existence of welfare gaps is a migratory push factor according to Godzimirski (2005, p.7), and this has made Norway an important land for immigration from Eastern Europe. This is partly due to the wealth gained from the oil revenues. Norway is not a member in EU, but in EEA (European Economic Area), and that makes the regulations about free movement of labour to apply in Norway also (Godzimirski, 2005, p. 62). This makes Norway provide the labour migrants the same rights as local workers.

Okólski (2004, p. 25) claims that an income gap is not a sufficient motivation for migration. “It is rather the pull of continuous excess labour demand in countries offering higher wages, combined with active worker recruitment by employers, that contributes most to actual flows of people from poorer to richer areas”. He adds that the worker recruitment was typical in the 1960s and 70s, and is not causing big flows of labour migrants anymore. Okólski’s argument is similar to the classical theory of migration (chapter 3.2, page 22), where migration is caused due to increased labour demand and salaries in the receiving country.

Although present migration trends are “at least to a certain extent, historically determined” (ibid., p. 26), there are also regional interdependences that are the reason behind migratory flows between for example Germany and Poland.

Armstrong and Taylor (2000, p. 147) are discussing the determinants of migration. The first one is regional wage disparities, meaning that regional wage differences are the main causes for migration. But in real life it is rather different. There are often two income generators in the family which constitutes a solid household income; there are people who migrate due to career opportunities, and external factors like climate and amenity considerations do also play an important role.

The second determinant is employment opportunities. Unemployment is an important factor that encourages the unemployed to migrate. The problem here is that the unemployment rate in a region is not always an indicator of employment opportunities (ibid.). The job search model (chapter 3.2, page 23) is also based on employment opportunities, claiming that getting a work offer, or increasing the opportunities to get a job are reasons for migration.

The third determinant for migration is the costs of migration. It costs to move, it costs to sell a house and to buy a house. In addition to these types of costs, there are also non-pecuniary
costs. These are costs of leaving family and friends, the costs of living in a distant place, and so on. All these factors are important when deciding upon migration. In some cases people value the non-pecuniary costs so highly, that they choose commuting instead of migrating, if possible (ibid.).

The fourth determinants are place preferences. Some migrants prefer to migrate due to beautiful nature and comfortable climate. Others migrate back to the region of origin. The geographical proximity is clearly an important factor while deciding the country of migration. (ibid.)

Slightly different factors for migration are presented by Kaczmarczyk (2004, p. 79). The first one is diversifying risk in the household. When one household member is migrating and others stay behind, this leaves the opportunity to turn back in case of “failure” or bring the family after in case of “luck”. The second factor is income related to others in the region. This means that increasing income differentials in the country is a pro-migratory factor. The last factor Kaczmarczyk mentions, is different kinds of barriers like requirements for work permit, different culture and language. All these factors play an important role in decision making about migration.

The geography, culture and language of a destination country are important factors for migration also according to Kielyte and Kancs (2002, p. 263). This can be seen from the high share of residents from the Baltic States in countries like Germany, Finland, Sweden and Denmark. The Estonian language belongs to the same family of languages as Finnish, and these countries are also close neighbours. Poland and Germany are also close neighbours, and there are considerable minorities of Germans living in Poland. Even though Norway is not a member of the EU, it is still a close country to Estonia, and to some extent also to Poland, in terms of culture and geography.

3.4 About migration from Estonia and Poland

Kaczmarczyk and Okólski (2005, p. 7) are stating that the West is describing the Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries as typical emigration countries. They present three factors for migratory behaviour within the CEE countries: demographic, economical and political
factors. Firstly, there is a large part of the population that will enter in the productivity age in the CEE, meaning that many people are in the working age and are potential migrants. That was also one of the arguments from those who wanted restrictions for migration between the new EU member states and the old ones. But a closer examination shows that there is also a large part of the population that is ageing in the CEE countries, which makes the hypothesis invalid.

Secondly, economic interests are often said to be the most important ones when deciding upon migration. But Kaczmarczyk and Okólski argue that there is a big gap between migration intentions and migration decisions, and that economical factors might as well hinder migration as invite to inflow of foreigners.

Finally, political change like liberalisation of migration policies has played an important role. This includes abolition of exit and entry visas, legal employment opportunities, modification of nationality laws and so on.

3.4.1 Poland
When it comes to emigration from Poland after the Second World War, it was massive – with approximately 140 000 emigrants per year. But it stabilized, and since 1960 emigration has been between 20 and 30 000 emigrants per year. This can be explained by the restrictions from the Polish government (Kaczmarczyk, 2004, p. 66). The studies by Kaczmarczyk estimate Polish employment in western countries at a minimum 150-200 000 annually (ibid.).

Kaczmarczyk compares both survey based studies and model based studies. Model based on studies which calculate the migration potential for Poland, has given varied results, so Kaczmarczyk (2004, p. 74) argues that a model that predicts an outflow of 700 - 900 000 people from Poland to the EU in the next 30 years seems to be realistic. Survey based studies have revealed that one fourth of the polish population implies a migration potential, around
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6 There has been a change in the migration trends. Kaczmarczyk (2004, p. 68) brings out three main differences between nowadays migration and migration earlier – shift from permanent to temporary migration, economics-driven labour migration, and territorial concentration of migrants with reference to sending and receiving regions.
one tenth has a willingness to go abroad for work or settlement, but only one twentieth have taken measures for planning migration (Kaczmarczyk, 2004, p. 76).

Kaczmarczyk (2004, p. 78) is saying that migration from Poland is mostly short-term, and that short-term migrants hold the opportunity to return open and maintain the connections to the homeland. He is also saying that the number of migrants is declining despite the economical gap between Poland and the EU. This can be explained by other factors that are important concerning migration – closeness to the family, relatives and friends, costs of moving, higher expenses in the immigration country (ibid., p. 79).

There are already problems with the supply of skilled workers in Poland. Riemsdijk (2006, p. 19) is referring to the lack of nurses in Poland. She is saying that Polish nurses are overworked, lack security at the job and are poorly paid. There are many recruiting bureaus and advertisements all around to get the nurses to work abroad.

According to the official statistics, there were 11 864 Polish people living in Norway in January 2006. The polish consul believes that up to 120 000 Polish people reside in Norway at the present time. There is also an opinion that the majority of polish workers will return to their home country when the income gap decreases.

### 3.4.2 Estonia

During the Soviet times and until 1990, the mobility in Estonia was restricted. It was difficult to migrate from rural to urban areas, not to speak of migration out of the country. There were many slavish people from other Soviet countries who migrated to Estonia during the Soviet period - between World War two and the 1990s. Many of these people were emigrating after the re-independence of Estonia (in 1991). This, combined with negative natural increase, has led to decreased population (Brunovskis et al. 2003, p. 27).

The Estonian government’s wage policy is liberal, meaning that intervention with active wage policy in the private sector is minimal (Vanags, 2005, p. 22). There is though a limit for a minimal wage and some labour legislation which must be fulfilled. Another big problem for
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7 Data from the Statistics Norway, accessed 13.04.07 on: [http://www.ssb.no/emner/02/01/10/innvbef/tab-2006-05-11-05.html](http://www.ssb.no/emner/02/01/10/innvbef/tab-2006-05-11-05.html)
the labour market in Estonia, is the mismatch between education and labour demand. This causes unemployment and forces people with higher education to take the jobs that require lower education (ibid.).

The wage gap between east and west is one of the factors that lead to emigration from the Baltic States. The difficult times after independence when many lost jobs in the industries that were producing for the Soviet Union, was another factor which influenced migration. There was also high youth unemployment, because it was not beneficial to acquire education because the salaries were low anyway. And since young people make the migration decision more easily, youth unemployment is a factor increasing emigration. One other aspect is the slavish minority living in Estonia. They have been given much attention after 1990s, especially in terms of the strict language and citizenship laws that Estonia adopted in order to protect the national language. This group is a potential emigration group (ibid.).

Brunovskis et al. have studied the intentions to move among people in the Baltic States (2003, p. 31). The results show that most of the people do not desire to move, and those who do, prefer to do it within the country. They have also asked about the reasons for migration, and economical reasons have been mentioned as the most important ones. Family related reasons such as moving together with a spouse, children or parents seem also to play an important role. Finally come study- and exclusion related reasons.

Philips (2004, p. 20) has in her research found out that the economical aspect is the most important reason for migration among Estonians. The second most important factor was the wish to get employment, and then the wish to gain some supplementary skills. When it comes to the obstacles for emigration, the presence of family and friends in the home country is the most important one. Language problems, costs of emigration and insufficient education are among other obstacles for leaving the country (ibid., p. 21). Philips is concluding that there is no threat of mass emigration from Estonia according to the surveys of potential emigration (p. 32).
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8 Simonnes, H. (05. 09. 2006). Polakkene. Article in the Norwegian newspaper Vårt Land
9 Estonia has a strict language and citizenship laws. During the Soviet period, russian was the official language and large groups of russian speaking people immigrated to Estonia. This has put the Estonian language in front of the threat of extinction. The strict language law is in order to get more citizens to learn the language and to fight against the extinction of the language.
According to Brunovskis et al. (2003, p. 23), there were around 13,500 Estonians living in the Nordic countries, most of them living in Finland. Around 400 Estonians lived in Norway at the time of their study. They predicted that this situation would change after the enlargement of EU, after the disappearance of restrictions on immigration. There were 786 Estonians living officially in Norway in January 2006.10

Brunovskis et al. conclude that there will be changes within the migration patterns from the Baltic States. They say that the Nordic countries are not the most preferred destination for migration, and that the small populations of the Baltic States are not causing a numerous migration to Nordic countries (ibid., p. 61). They also predict that the improved economies due to joining the EU will reduce incentives to migration as well as some obstacles like language that are hindering migration (ibid.).

3.5 Migration and development – something in common?

Nyberg-Sørensen et al. (2002, p. 11) are discussing the connection between migration and development. They are presenting the three R’s that explain the links between migration and development: recruitment, remittances and return.

Recruitment is about the reasons for migration, personal motivations and external factors. This can be bad governance, unemployment, low economic growth. Remittances support local household, they can be invested into education and small businesses, and they promote economic growth if the money is used to buy locally produced commodities. Return refers to the end of the migration cycle when migrant is returning home. Money saved and skills acquired can be invested in the home country.

Katseli et al. (2006, p. 21) claim that there are four Eastern European countries whose migrants compose more than 50 per cent of the tertiary educated expatriates in the EU-15. Estonia is one of them. They distinguish four key aspects of migration that affects the development in the sending countries.

For the first, the unskilled labour flows. If the sending country has a high unemployment rate, the emigrated workers can be replaced with unemployed or underemployed, and that is

10 Data from the Statistics Norway, accessed 13.04.07 on: http://www.ssb.no/emner/02/01/10/innvbef/tab-2006-05-11-05.html
beneficial for them and for the emigrants as well. In case of low unemployment rate, the wages must be increased in order to fill the vacancies, but this leads to reduced output in the short run.

Secondly, the “brain drain” – emigration of highly skilled workers. The presence of skilled workers may affect others to acquire education. In the case of brain drain, this effect will not be substantial. Another aspect here is that in many countries, education is paid by the government. So the loss of highly skilled will then lead to reduced human capital and taxes. Emigration of skilled workers can also lead to problems in delivering important services like education and medical care (ibid. p, 34).

Thirdly, the return of emigrants is an important aspect of migration. Migrants may return because of a change in the political situation or economical prospects in the home country. Some return because they have always planned to return, some because emigration appeared to be unsuccessful (ibid. p, 40). Some returned migrants are starting with small enterprises of their own.

The fourth important aspect of migration is remittances. Remittances are private inflow of money that promotes growth through a multiplier effect on consumption and investment. In addition, they can improve the situation within the migrant’s family economically, and encourage acquisition of education (ibid. p, 57).

Katseli et al. (2006, p. 42) are adding that diasporas living in the receiving country have further important role besides remittances. They promote trade between these two countries by having access to information in both countries. Their desire for the home produced products is increasing the export of these commodities.

3.6 “Brain drain” and “brain gain”

Ishumi (1982, p. 14) has been studying “brain drain” from Africa, called south-north migration, and is bringing out four reasons for “brain drain”. The first is the mismatch between training and technological structure in the sending country. This has to do with young trainees who have scholarships to participate in training programs abroad. The lack of
employment opportunities at home and fear of non-recognition of qualifications are among the most important reasons that makes highly educated people stay abroad.

The second cause for brain drain is the income differences between the countries. Here, they are thinking about the highly skilled persons who either stay abroad after a trainee program, or for persons who decide to leave their home country in order to increase their income opportunities. The difference between desired and obtained gains is so huge, and this makes people look for employment opportunities in countries where they could get a higher remuneration.

The third cause for brain drain is the working conditions. This has to do with bad transport facilities, teaching and learning resources, opportunities to conduct research, and so on.

The fourth cause for brain drain is political insecurity. Things like civil wars, lack of personal freedom and liberties and religious persecution are making life difficult, and skilled citizens decide for emigration as a solution for better living conditions (ibid.).

Ardittis (1992, p. 81) is expressing his concern over the flow of expertise from East to West that can lead to a “brain drain” effect. He is describing the flows of professionals and skilled workers in the 1990s, and he also refers to the ageing population in West that increases the need for skilled workers.

Further, Ardittis is anxious about the vicious circle that might have emerged due to the professionals already emigrated (1992, p. 91). Qualified workers will return only when the technological gap with the West is bridged. At the same time highly skilled workers would contribute towards diminishing the gap through technological innovations.

Ardittis (ibid.) is describing a programme called TOKTEN (“Transfer of Knowledge Through Expatriate Nationals”) with the goal to get the professionals return to their countries of origin as consultants on local development projects. Poland is one of the countries that have joined the programme. This programme is a way of “gaining from the brains drained”. There are also programmes that support permanent return of expatriates.
There are two measures that can reduce or prevent East-West skilled migration (ibid., p. 92). First, training of eastern European students in the western European countries on the condition that they must return, is one way of dealing with the issue. Economic cooperation and trade with western countries can also lead to a diminished number of emigrants, as history has shown. The reason is that external trade of domestic products and services, especially in labour-intensive sectors, can prevent emigration of human capital.

Usher (1977, p. 1009) is discussing the cost of education in terms of migration. When education is subsidized by a country, the emigration of an educated person will be a social cost without any gain. It also leads the country to increase the amount of education provided, if the proportion of educated people is to be the preserved. So, the cost of education is an important factor in terms of brain drain, and Usher concludes by saying that less developed countries lose and more developed countries gain from migration.

Adams (2003) has found out that there is a close relationship between brain drain, geographical proximity to labour-receiving countries and the size of population in the labour-exporting countries. He states that lightly populated countries that stand close to labour receiving countries suffer most from brain drain.

The study by Haque and Kim (1994, p. 23) has shown that “brain drain” reduces the growth rate of human capital in the country of emigration, and that leads to reduction in the per capita growth in the country. This happens because those with higher learning abilities will emigrate, while those with fewer abilities will stay home. This is again explained by the costs of migration. Since it costs to migrate, those who have higher income prospects would prefer to leave, because they have usually higher learning abilities. At the same time, those with fewer skills cannot earn enough to compensate the costs of migration, and that makes them stay at home (ibid., p. 12). Since “human capital is the engine to growth” (ibid., p. 18), the emigration of educated workers will lead to decrease in growth.

Although the last findings could apply in some cases, this is not the case in Norway. According to a study by Barth and Røed (2003, p. 84), there is not a large difference between the incomes of highly qualified workers and less qualified workers in Norway. Highly qualified labour is relatively cheap (in Norway) compared to other EU countries. So, the brain
drain in terms of highly qualified labour from Eastern Europe to Norway would not be a threat in that case.

Ilahi (1999, p. 184) found out that migrants who have returned and have high savings are likely to start with self-employment rather than wage employment. He studied Pakistani return migrants, and found out that the main reason for starting with self-employment was that they had savings necessary to investments and start-up. The main constraint that prevents small business development, is credit constraints, and this problem is absent in the cases of returning migrants with solid savings.

Lien and Wang (2003) demonstrate that “brain drain” remains a likely outcome of emigration for the country of origin. They mean that foreign language skill that may have some effect on the productivity of work. If a person has a tight budget, then some human capital acquisitions (education) must be replaced with language skill acquisition, which leads to a reduction in the human capital investment. And that is a negative effect for the source country.

Mountford (1997, p. 288) claims that human capital is an important element for economic growth, and that depends on households’ decision to acquire education. The possibility of higher wages through emigration can motivate to acquisition of education, and therefore promote the growth. If this effect is stronger than the direct effects of emigration then brain drain can lead to growth in the source country.

Godzimirski (2005, p. 104) presents two groups of Polish workers in Norway: nurses and seasonal workers. The background for the nurse migration was a lack of nurses in Norway that led to recruitment of nurses from the Baltic States and Poland. There were surprisingly few nurses who migrated considering the high payment. This can be explained by the relatively high costs of living in Norway, compared to other countries. Another explanation, according to Godzimirski, could have been the difficulties in the licensing of the Polish nurses, because Norway has quite restrictive regulations. There was also a debate ongoing in Norway about the issue of brain drain when it comes to medical personnel. This was brought out in order to promote a rise of nurse’s salaries instead of recruiting nurses from abroad (ibid.).
3.6.1 Temporary migration
Sometimes the migration is only temporary, meaning that the migrants plan to work abroad for a certain period of time. In this case, there will be no brain drain because migrants plan to return. The likely outcome of temporary migration is rather brain gain, as discussed in the previous chapter. Werner (1996, p. 5) is presenting a term temporary migration, and is describing how this type of migration can be beneficial for the country of origin. There are two conditions for temporary migration, according to him, the first one is that the immigrants must have a work permit for only a limited time, and the second is that immigration cannot be a step for permanent settlement in a host country.

One way of benefiting from temporary migration, according to Werner, is to use it in order to alleviate a tight situation in the labour market. If there is high unemployment, temporary work abroad not only saves a person from unemployment, but also reduces unemployment in the home country. Another aspect is acquiring skills and know-how. If migrant returns home, the knowledge and abilities can be useful for the home country. The knowledge of a foreign language as well, can be a big plus. Remittances are another important aspect of temporary migration. If this money is used to invest or to buy goods and services in the homeland, then it will have a positive effect on the domestic economy. One more important aspect concerning temporary migration is that this gives the country of origin control of the outflows. Bilateral agreements with a host country is one way of doing it. This gives the country of origin an opportunity to secure the treatment of its workers, and gives some ideas concerned the qualifications of the migrants.

All these factors contribute to the restructuring and development processes in the country of origin (ibid., p. 8). But these also depend on the length of the migration and the type of job. A temporary contract can be extended in some cases. And the firms are not always interested in training a person who will leave after a year or so.

3.6.2 Brain waste
Schiff (2006, p. 210) is using the term “brain waste”, meaning that highly educated persons take lower status jobs or jobs irrelevant to their qualifications.
Schiff is showing that the brain gain effect might be smaller than expected (ibid., p. 220). He refers to the aspect of brain waste, which leads to no gain. There is a large amount of non-skilled emigrants, and their emigration has no impact on the acquisition of education in the home country. The benefits from increased education are also questionable, since not all might complete it. The number of migrants is uncertain, and the host country’s migration policy might not be known (ibid.).

**3.7 Effects of migration**

Armstrong and Taylor (2000, p. 162) are stressing the importance of distinguishing the effects of migration for migrants and the effects of migration on regional economic differentials. They bring out the beneficial gains of migration for migrants, but mention that in some cases migration can cause some losses. There are always travelling costs, and some migrants even borrow money to cover the expenses.

When it comes to the effects of migration, the country of origin might have problems in attracting investments for regeneration, and could at the same time improve the prospects of the receiving country (ibid.). Another aspect is that the “inflow of migrants into prosperous regions will have a cumulative expansionary effect on output, employment and incomes, while having the opposite effect in the sender regions” (ibid.). This means that the migrants will buy locally produced goods and services and by that stimulate local economy in the receiving country. This again leads to increased output, incomes and employment.

A big problem that has arisen, is that some parents from Poland have been dumping their children in the orphanages while emigrating themselves in order to find a better life in the West. This topic has lately been discussed in Norwegian newspapers.

Immigration from Eastern Europe is not only affecting the countries of origin but also the receiving countries. Big flows of job seekers and wage dumping are just some issues related to migration (Dølvik, Eldring, 2005, p. 5). There have been cases where immigrant workers only get a percentage of the pay that is usual in Norway. There have also been discussions about the issue of rules and regulations for the foreign firms that are working on projects in
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Norway with their own labour force. So far, the rules of the sender country have been applied with some few requirements from the host country (ibid.).

Otsmann\textsuperscript{12} is discussing some positive and negative effects of emigration for Estonia. Labour shortage within certain sectors (health, construction, and transportation), “brain drain” and “brain waste” are the negative effects. Return migration, wage increases in some sectors and less unemployment among young people are the positive effects of emigration for the home country. The wages in Estonia have increased due to the demand for export products and the impact of wages from other European countries.\textsuperscript{13}

Giza (1998, p. 106) is presenting some consequences of migration for households in the country of origin. The consequences are economical improvement of the household, increasing “human capital” level in terms of new skills from abroad, and increased social status. Economical benefits for the household can either be material things like a car, or investments in future income - as founding an enterprise. The study made among Polish people confirms that most of the migrants’ families are receiving some kind of assistance, whether it is money or non-pecuniary assistance.

Human capital is benefiting the household in terms of new skills that can be a help in finding a better job, or in terms of educating children. Social status of a household relative to other households can be increased due to factors mentioned above.

Giza (1998, p. 107) also mentions the consequences of emigration for the community. Firstly, there could arise economical benefits of migration. Investments in local enterprises can affect the local labour and capital market positively, leading to increased employment. According to the study made in Poland, the remittances were not very large. The reasons for that could be the short stay abroad, or the fact that most migrants are not the heads of the households.

Secondly, migration may affect local culture (ibid.). Migrants who come back with new habits and patterns of consumption, may influence the local culture. This could also change peoples’ attitudes towards foreign countries and foreigners, as migrants themselves have

\textsuperscript{12} www.sm.ee, accessed 23.03.2007
experienced being a foreigner. The study shows that migratory experience makes people less tolerant towards foreigners, but more positive towards temporary labour immigration, and return to home country.

Thirdly, social networks can be affected (ibid.). Migration can either strengthen or weaken patriotism and attitudes towards the home country. The study shows that the majority of migrants are building and maintaining networks at home.

3.8 Remittances as a “development aid”

Lucas and Stark (1985) are discussing the motivations to remit. They present three theories of remittance. The first one is based on pure altruism, meaning that the migrant gains utility from the utility of those left home. The second one is based on pure self interest, meaning that the migrant hopes to get the inheritance, or wants to assure a careful maintenance of assets at home, or that the migrant is planning to return. The third theory is a combination of altruism and self interest. This means that remitting is mutually beneficial for the migrant and the family.

Galor and Stark (1990, p. 467) are claiming that if migrants have plans of returning to home country, they save more than natives. Merkle and Zimmermann (1991, p. 78) agree with this point of view, and explain this by the life-cycle theory of consumption which is saying that if people expect lower future income, then they save more in order to “smooth their consumption path over the life-cycle”. They made a study within immigrants in Germany which is showing that parts of the remittances are saved or invested in the home country, while the rest goes to support the families. They also found that those who have close relatives (spouse or children) in the home country and those who own real estate remit more than others.

Remittances seem to be an important tool for development for the country of origin, because immigrants send huge amounts of money to their home countries, mostly developing countries (Carling, 2004, p. 53). There have been long articles in Norwegian newspapers about immigrants who send milliards of crones to their homeland. The sum that migrants in
Norway send to their poor home countries is as much as the double of the sum that these countries get as financial aid.\textsuperscript{14} This shows the importance of remittances.

MacMillen (1982, in Drinkwater et al., 2003, p. 22) is mentioning some negative effects if remittances are used only for consumption, and not for investment purposes. Increase in the price level and imports, an overvalued exchange rate and a dependence on remittances are some of the possible negative consequences.

3.9 Solutions to labour migration and brain drain

Martineau et al. (2004, p. 5) have studied “brain drain” among health professionals. They are suggesting that action should be taken both on the global level, in the country of origin and in the country of destination. They mention the importance of information about the migration related issues, and recommend dialogue between the countries. When it comes to the countries of origin, they have the responsibility of attracting workers and improving working conditions, as well as encouraging people to return after a stay abroad. Receiving countries have the responsibility of following the correct practices in terms of recruitment, but also increase recruitment of health professionals among the native citizens. Providing developing assistance to the countries of origin is also one way of supporting them (ibid., p. 8).

The Estonian Ministry of Social Affairs has a proposal for five policy responses to meet the problems connected to labour emigration\textsuperscript{15}: Improving working conditions and work security, motivation for return migration, motivating health personnel to stay and work in the home country, and informing people about the conditions of working abroad.

Baláz et al. (2004, p. 22) are presenting some policy options suggested by the respondents of their study. The two most suggested measures were providing jobs to highly skilled and attracting foreign investors. Cheaper mortgages, increased wages and investment in research infrastructure were among the less mentioned options.

Philips et al. (2002) are claiming that there should not be any restrictions on emigration from Estonia. The reason behind that opinion is that most people wish to work abroad for a short

\textsuperscript{14} Fonn, G. O. (12. 09. 2006) \textit{Sender milliarder hjem}. Article in the newspaper Vårt Land.
period of time in order to increase their income and assure their future. This will increase the
domestic consumption. Another reason is that people who have gained experience and skills
abroad, and return, are valuable for Estonia, and this should be supported. Finally, if young
unemployed graduates find a job abroad, this is both beneficial for them in terms of experience, and for the home country in terms of reduced spending on unemployment assistance.

Most of the medical personnel who desire to work abroad are considering short term
employment in the neighbouring countries.\textsuperscript{16} Suggestions to meet the problem of shortage among medical personnel are among others of increasing the number of educated people and increasing wages. Improving the working conditions is also an important factor, and workers imported from other countries have also been mentioned to reduce the shortage.

\textbf{3.10 The future prospects}

Kielyte and Kancs (2002, p. 276) are stating that migration will create winners – Western
European receiving countries, and losers – the Baltic sending countries. The loss of human
capital can lead to negative consequences as “brain drain” if the emigrants are highly
educated. This is also a reason for having restrictions on the free movement of labour from
the new EU member states.

Traser (2006, p. 35) is positive about the future for the Baltic States, and is saying that the
free movement of the labour force will benefit them in the long run. She reasons this by
return migration and the benefits of that.

Carling (2005, p. 2) is bringing out that if wealthier countries experience economic growth,
emigration will decline. He is explaining this by the case of southern European countries that
got over being countries of immigration instead of emigration. This could be a future
prospect for Estonia and Poland in some years, if not decades.

\textsuperscript{15} \url{www.sm.ee} , accessed 23.03.2007
\textsuperscript{16} Võrk, A. (2004). Eesti õdede migratsioonikavatsused (Estonian nurses’ migration intentions), accessed
23.03.2007 \url{http://www.praxis.ee/data/AVorkettekanneTlhodele15092004.pdf}
3.11 My use of the literature

The literature review has introduced different findings in terms of migration. There are different opinions when it comes to the factors of migration – some authors mean that the economical factors are most important, while others claim the labour demand in the receiving country to be an important factor. “Brain drain” is also perceived from different perspectives – it can be both negative and positive (brain gain) for the home country. There are different opinions when it comes to the predicted migration from Estonia and Poland.

I will use this literature to discuss the findings from the interviews. The findings will in some cases confirm the findings from literature. In other cases, some new aspects will be brought out.
4 Results and discussion

This chapter will give an overview of the research findings, and discuss these results in connection with relevant literature presented in chapter two. The chapter starts with an overview of general characteristics of the respondents. Next part will introduce and discuss the push and pull factors of labour migration. The chapter continues with the discussion and findings about migratory effects for the country of origin. The last part of this chapter will focus on future perspectives of labour emigration in terms of the home country.

In order to assure the anonymity for the respondents, their names are changed. The lines from respondents are presented in their original form, meaning that they are not necessarily grammatically corrected. The lines from English speaking respondents are not corrected, but I add some clarifications in the brackets in order to make the phrases understandable. Lines from Norwegian and Estonian speaking respondents are translated into English. I try to pass on as original meaning as possible, this makes the language sometimes weird. In these cases, the phrase in the original language is written in the notes.

4.1. General characteristics of respondents

There were 16 interviews conducted with emigrants from Poland and Estonia. In addition two interviews were done with key respondents, one from Estonia and the other from Poland. Nine of respondents were from Estonia and seven were from Poland. The gender division was six men and ten women. The key respondents were both female. Since the key respondent interviews only give some general information about the sender countries, I will in the following refer to the other 16 interviewees as 100 percent of the respondents.

The respondents were asked about the size of their place of origin. Only two of sixteen respondents came from places with less than 1000 inhabitants. The rest came from places with more than 10 000 and less than 1 million inhabitants. This could indicate that people living in urban areas are usually more mobile, and people from rural areas are less mobile. The two respondents who originated from smaller places came from a settlement respectively with 500 and 800 inhabitants.
The average age of the respondents was 36 years. The youngest respondent was 23 years old, and the eldest was 57. There were five over 40 years, and the rest were under 40 years. Various studies have shown (Vanags, 2005, p.22) that young people make the migration decision more easily. Marek from Poland considered himself already quite old when I asked him about the age: “(...) thirty-two, unfortunately, the time goes fast, you know (...)” (my translation). It is difficult to say who is old and who is not, because people experience it differently. I would say that all who manage to migrate and find themselves a job in a foreign country could be counted as young. Janne from Estonia was one of the oldest respondents: “(...) even the thing that I was so old and started studying...in the beginning I thought that I was too old and that this will disturb me, or that everybody was looking at me. But the good thing was that there were even older people at the school, over 60 years. And here it is a totally different attitude - Norwegians are much more tolerant (...)” (my translation).

When it comes to the marital status of the respondents, ten of them were single, divorced or widows. Five of them had either spouses and/or family in the home country, while one had family in Norway. Studies have shown (Philips, 2004, p. 20) that family related reasons are often obstacles for migrating. Andres from Estonia who is married and has the family at home was saying: “(...) the family was first against it, but they have understood that after me working here for a while that it gives them much more opportunities to feel themselves as humans (...)” (my translation). Slask from Poland is also married and has a wife and children at home, but this was not a hinder for migrating, on the contrary – it encouraged him: “(...) my wife decided (for me) to come to Norway (...)”.

Twelve respondents had a higher education, three had vocational education and only one had secondary school education. The education fields were construction, teaching, nursing, engineering, economics, music, designing, mathematics and childcare. Massive emigration of highly skilled workers - “brain drain” – can have negative consequences on the development of the country of origin. Merle has a PHD in mathematics and explains the situation of the graduates in this field: “(...) I think there are enough of them, but there is no usage of them. The only use is that they become lecturers at the universities and further, become professors. There is no technology or science or production that would have use of mathematicians in Estonia (...)” (my translation).
The length of the respondents’ stay in Norway varied between five months and 30 years, and the average length of stay was five and a half years. There was one respondent who had stayed in Norway for 30 years, and three for ten years, but the rest had been in Norway just around one to four years. I was presuming that those who have been in Norway longer are less likely to return than those who only have been here for short time of period, since those who have lived here for a while will develop their network of friends, association to the place they live, and so on. But I got answers that overrode my presumption. Merle from Estonia, who has been here for two and a half years, is answering to the question about plans of return: “(...) No, I like living here. I haven’t thought so far away, that I never will return. But to begin with, I like it here (...)” (my translation).

4.2 Push and pull factors of migration

Migration is a difficult decision, and is often a combination of several factors. Typical “push” and “pull” factors are presented by Castles and Miller in the chapter 3.3 on page 23. Push factors are associated with the country of origin; they are often negative factors that “push” people to emigrate. Pull factors are associated with the country of destination – some positive factors that “pull” people from other countries and regions. This chapter will introduce and discuss several push and pull factors that were mentioned by the respondents.

4.2.1 Economical factors

Economical factors can be both “push” – in terms of low wages and low living standards in the home country, and “pull” – in terms of high wages and better living standards in the host country. Most of the respondents claimed the economic factors to be the reason for migration. Agnes, a lady from Estonia, said at once: “Well, we all come here for money...” (my translation). Ewa from Poland, who came to Norway as a refugee 30 years ago, also had economical motives for migrating: “(...) there were economical reasons, we did not have a house, we were newly married and had to live with his (husband’s) parents. We thought that it will be easier to move to the West since I had some family here (...)” (my translation). Kerli is a young single mother from Estonia who came to Norway in order to earn money: “(...) now I came here just for work. Because, yes, I had to pay back a larger sum of money to the Estonian tax office. I thought that it will take too much time to earn this money in Estonia, so I thought that I will come here and work and pay it back. And then I would see what is going to
Margus is a young Estonian construction worker and explains his reason for coming to Norway by saying: “(…) one thing was the break-up with my girlfriend and another was, of course, money. The main reason why I came here was to establish my own home (in Estonia) and…I don’t want to pay back a loan to Hansapank (a bank in Estonia) for the next 40-50 years for a nice house… it is easier to live here 5 years and then take up a smaller loan (…)” (my translation).

Marek from Poland explains his economically difficult situation in Poland: “(…) it was money, it was less than nothing. I can tell you, because I earned less than 3000 Norwegian crones in Poland. It is also cheap in Poland, but not that cheap. It was difficult to travel on nice holiday with this salary. And I like so much travelling and cycling and skiing. So, the problem was how to afford all that (…)” (my translation).

The phrases illustrate that many respondents consider the economical reasons to be important in terms of migration. Although this thesis has a qualitative character, these findings confirm the findings by Philips (2004, p. 20) – that the economical reasons is the motivation factor number one in terms of migration.

Janne is a nurse from Estonia and had to work with more than a full time job in order to manage economically: “(…) I work on one full time position in Norway, and that is enough, I manage with this. But nurses in Estonia work in one and a half jobs in order to get a salary of 8000 (Estonian crones)17. A person should work in one full time position and get normally paid for that, not one and a half position. For one full time position you get a salary of 4000 (Estonian crones). But we did also so that we worked for 24 hours, and went to another place and worked for 24 hours, and went to third place and worked for 24 hours. This is nonsense, isn’t it? (…)” (my translation).

Thomas is explaining why his brother left Poland: “(…) my younger brother worked… he had actually a very good position in Poland – he distributed the aid from the EU, he is a lawyer, and has studied administration. For the first he meant that the job was very demanding, and that is good, but the salary he received was not especially high (…)” (my translation).

17 One Estonian crone is equal to ca. 0,5 Norwegian crones.
Godzimirski (2005, p. 7) is arguing that wage differential is an important migratory push factor. I can agree with that, because the post-Soviet period has been a kind of trial for the Eastern European countries. The transition to market economy and huge changes have been hard for people to cope with. The prices are increasing, but the wages lag behind, and some people hardly manage to survive. Paul from Estonia is describing this situation: “(...) you go to work in the morning in order to survive, but not to “live”. Rich people can “live” (...)” (my translation).\(^{18}\)

But on the other hand, money is not everything, sometimes it is a life situation or a family matter that makes people move. Audra from Poland means that the economical factors are not the most important ones: “(...) it’s not about the money, you know, it is not just about the money. Because if you have higher salary in Norway, also apartment is much more expensive, food is much more expensive (...)”. Okólski (2004, p. 25) claims also that the income gap is not a sufficient reason for migration.

Economical matters are not the only factors that influence the migration decision. Almost half of the respondents had more than one reason for migration, bad working conditions was one of them.

**4.2.2 Working conditions and worker’s rights in the home country**

Bad working conditions or lack of workers rights are some of the migratory “push” factors mentioned by the respondents. The findings from literature have brought out bad working conditions as a migratory push factor in Africa (Ishumi, 1982, p. 14). Andres, who has family in Estonia, was not satisfied with the treatment he got from his employer: “(...) In Estonia there is unfortunately a mentality that a worker is not a human, and employers promise often more than they fulfil. And this is the reason why I suddenly finished my carrier in Estonia, because I got tired of the fact that employers claim for maximum results, but on the payday they say that there is no money (...)” (my translation). He is dissatisfied with the mentality among employers in Estonia, and refers to the employers’ attempts to save money at the expense of workers security: “(...) these construction companies don’t want to pay official wages. That makes the workers feel insecure. If something should happen, then the worker or

---

18 Phrase in the original language: “(...) sa lähed selleks, ütleme hommikul tõöle, et noh… hinge sees hoida. Aga et elada, see pole midagi… Rikkad elavad jah (...)”
his family wouldn’t get any compensation, because the employer is saving money on taxes and doesn’t give the worker any security, not to mention health insurance. These are the main reasons why many good Estonian construction workers have come to work in Scandinavia (…)” (my translation).

Marek from Poland is also referring to the negative working environment within the construction field: “(…) working environment, yes. It is completely different here in Norway, there is no hassle. One has to do the job, of course, but the communication is different. There is proper communication (in Norway), but in Poland it is only hassle. It is hopeless in Poland. It is not “can you do, please”, but rather “you must do”. So, it is hopeless. Then you start stressing… working environment, it is very important. When I meet my friends in Norway, then I see that they don’t earn very much money, but the working environment makes them enjoy it here (…)” (my translation).

Paul is a young construction worker from Estonia, and he describes the differences between working conditions in Norway and Estonia: “(…) it is not possible to compare. It starts to improve in Estonia… safety technique and security. But here it is 100 percent… Young men fall from the roofs in Estonia like old apples. There are no helmets, no proper boots… and no security belts either. The security control is also very weak (…)” (my translation).

It seems like most of the construction workers have experienced problems concerning worker’s rights and working conditions. There is one respondent engaged within music who mentions long working days as a negative thing with working in Poland. Tomas is an organ player from Poland and has been in Norway about ten years. He has not been organ player in Poland, but he is well aware of the working conditions for organists in there: “(…) organ players get in Poland… I cannot say it is a fixed salary, because the priest decides how much you get. And it is much harder work there than here, in a way that you have three-four services every day plus funerals, that is a lot, plus weddings. Only on Sunday you have six-seven services and you start at six o’clock (…)” (my translation).

19 Phrase in the original language: “(…) Siin ei anna võrreldagi. Eestis hakkab ka nagu vaikselt siiapoole tulema… sest see ohutustehnika ja koik see turvalisus. Siin on see ju 100%. Eestis kukuvad ju noored mehed katuselt pots ja pots nagu vanad õunad alla. Ei ole kiivreid, ei ole mingeid korralikke saapaid ja… ei turvarihmasid ega mitte midagi. See tööohutuse järelvalve on ka väga nõrk (…)”
Tax politics for small and medium sized enterprises in the home country is closely connected to worker’s rights. Enterprises have big tax burdens, and they are trying to avoid them by employing less people and exploiting them maximally. Marek from Poland is explaining the situation: “(...) by employing a man, a firm must pay double as much as he (the employee) is going to get (...) so it costs a lot, therefore it is better to let a man work 12 to 13 hours instead of employing another one, because then you have to pay taxes (...) theoretically they have to pay extra for overtime, but it doesn’t happen (...)” (my translation).

Andres from Estonia is referring to the better worker rights in the North as one of the migratory pull factors: “(...) then I had enough of the promise-makers and suddenly made a 180 degree turn, and started looking towards Scandinavia. I knew that if someone promises you something (in Scandinavia) then it also happens (...)” (my translation).20

The Polish key informant has been working with Polish people who came to Norway. She has heard Polish workers’ stories, and is familiar with the situation in the home country. She also refers to weak worker’s rights and to the poor social security system in Poland: “(...) there are many who complain now, the social security system and the situation for the unemployed, and their rights... Norway has the best regulations, but it is not like that in Poland. Those without a job are not economically secure, as here in Norway. It is not much (money) they get in Norway either, but there is at least someone who cares. It is not like that in Poland. And when it comes to sick-leave and overtime payment, then there is a hole... they work ten to twelve hours without overtime payment, not even for weekend work. Employees do not have such strong rights as in Norway (...)” (my translation).

Working conditions and rights are important if employers want to make employees enjoy the work and not to quit. Could someone in Norway imagine working more than four-five hours extra without extra payment? Or working for a salary that is not enough to cover living expenses? Certainly not. The workers unions would fight for these things. A construction job where you must pay for your own boots and security measures doesn’t sound very attractive either. Or a job that doesn’t assure you health security?

20 Phrase in the original language: “(...) Ja siis mul tõeliselt sai… niõelda sealsetest lubajatest villand ja ma pöörasin kohe järsult 180 kraadi ringi ja hakkasin vaatama Skandinaavia poole. Ma teadsin, et siin kui inimene midagi lubab siis see asi siin ka toimib (...)”
We can ask why there are weak worker’s rights in Estonia and Poland. The reason could be the leftovers from Soviet time. Under the Soviet Union, everybody had a job, whether they were really working or playing cards. A sudden change in the market economy was tough. The Soviet mentality was still there, but the new rules and regulations demanded different attitudes. Changes among attitudes take time, and so does the development of worker’s unions and worker’s rights. That makes good working conditions in the west a “pull” factor, and bad working conditions in the east a “push” factor for migration.

4.2.3 Employment opportunities
Economical aspects and working conditions are important migratory factors. But there are more of them. Unemployment in the country of origin or good employment prospects in the country of destination are respectively a migratory “push” and “pull” factor (Armstrong and Taylor, 2000, p. 147). On the one hand, people who are unemployed in the home country might start thinking about finding work abroad. On the other hand, demand for labour in a receiving country (Norway) will attract workers to migrate. So, the labour demand in the country of destination is an important “pull” factor.

Some of the respondents mention that they received a job offer from Norway, and that is the main reason why they are here. Tomas from Poland is explaining: “(...) it was because I received a job offer, but I did not have to move, it wasn’t that I had to come here for work. It is not that (...)” (my translation).

Thomas is also mentioning that the high unemployment rate is a reason behind the large number of emigrants from Poland: “(...) many travel because they don’t have a job in Poland. The unemployment rate was quite high when Poland joined the EU, around 19% (...)” (my translation).

This can be confirmed by the findings from OECD (2004, p. 251), claiming that the unemployment rate in Poland was 19.9 percent in the year 2002. But the unemployment rate in Poland has decreased to 14 percent in the end of 2006, as presented in chapter 3.1 on page 23. The change in the unemployment rate could obviously have something to do with the enlargement of the EU, and the increased emigration due to that. A similar situation has also happened in Estonia - the unemployment has gone down to 4 percent, as presented in chapter 3.1 page 23. The reason for that is the emigration of workers to Western countries. On the one
hand, it is good to have low unemployment rates - the country has to pay less social support for unemployed, and the unemployed themselves gain benefits from working. On the other hand, if too many workers migrate, then there will be a lack of workers in the country of origin. This issue will gain further attention in chapter 4.3.1.

Audra is an interior designer from Poland, and she is bringing out another aspect in terms of employment in the home country - difficulties in finding the right job in the right place: “(...) the jobs interesting for me can just be in large cities, and life in large cities in Poland is quite difficult, with transport for example. It is a different life there, and it is more rush, more stress. I am not sure if I am ready for that (…)”. She finds that the place of living is very important when it comes to choosing a job.

4.2.4 Family reasons and social networks
There were two respondents who had the family as the main motivation for migration. Moving together with a spouse or children is an important migratory factor (Brunovskis, 2003, p. 31). Urzula comes from Poland, and has lived in Norway ten years. She answers the question about the main reason for migrating: “(...) it is love. That is the way it started a long time ago. That is why I came (…)” (my translation).

Merle from Estonia has the same reason for migrating: “(...) simply, to be together with my husband. Well, we had to live somewhere, so the decision was then between Estonia and Norway (…)” (my translation).

The family as an important factor for migration finds support by the Estonian key informant, who is saying that the family related reasons for migration are even more important than the employment related reasons.

But being together with the family or a spouse can also be a hinder for migration. The Polish key informant says: “(...) there are many Polish people working in Norway, but very few who have moved with the whole family. Only five to ten percent of the Polish people who come to Norway bring their families along (...) it is not so easy to move with the children and family, there will be huge consequences for many (…)” (my translation).
Andres from Estonia has not brought his family to Norway, but he is saying that it was after a long consideration: “(...) the family was first against it, but after I have been working here for a while, they understood that it gives them much more opportunities to feel themselves as humans (...)” (my translation).

Friends is also an important factor influencing the migratory decision. If someone has already migrated, then it is easier for a friend to come after. Friends, who have already migrated, can also help finding a job. Mari is a young girl from Estonia who came to Norway to work as a baby-sitter. She had a friend helping her to find a job: “(...) I had an acquaintance working here, a friend... she wasn’t a friend actually, but she was a girlfriend of my friend, and she helped me to come here. I let her know that I was looking for job, and then she called me and said that the family will contact me (...)” (my translation).

Ewa came to Norway as a refugee thirty years ago. She had a Norwegian mother, and two sisters living in Norway, but she herself grew up with her Polish father and a stepmother in Poland. She did not know that she had any family in Norway in the beginning, but she found it out some time in the teenagers. After being married, Ewa and her husband decided to escape to Norway. They had some economical interests connected to the migration decision (see page 43), but the fact that Ewa had some family living in Norway was also a “pull” factor.

Janne is an Estonian lady who has been in Norway for three years. She is a widow, and has neither husband nor children living in Estonia. She has one grown up child living in Norway. The fact that one of her children lives in Norway, can be seen as a “pull” factor and the fact that she has nobody waiting for her in Estonia, maybe as a “push” factor. She also has some friends living in Norway: “(...) but maybe one reason is that I have developed some connections already and have friends, and because my child lives here (...)” (my translation).

Tomas from Poland also mentions friendship as one factor affecting his migration decision: “(...) when I was visiting my friend in Norway, he was actually my teacher (...) he asked me if I was interested in coming here if there was an opportunity. I said that I would think about it when I was finished with my education. And then I received an offer (...)” (my translation).
Margus from Estonia had also some acquaintances in Norway: “(...) I had a plan to go abroad, but I weighed both Finland and Norway. I had friends and a place to stay in both countries (...)” (my translation).

So family, friends or other connections are important factors for migration. They can both encourage migration and hinder it.

**4.2.5 Looking for adventures**

Looking for adventure is a reason for migration. It is not a clear “push” or “pull” factor, but maybe a “push” in terms of a bit boring life in the home country, and “pull” in terms of opportunities and challenges one can meet abroad. Slask from Poland is explaining his motivations for migration: “(...) most important one is actually, I don’t know, me and my wife, we like to, you know, have a lot of adventures in life, travel a lot. This is the main reason (...)”.

Liisa from Estonia came to Norway as a baby-sitter. She had not been travelling a lot, and was interested to “see the world”: “(...) the main reason was to do something else and take the time off. I had studied for five years and had not been anywhere before, and then one opportunity to see the world opened, after graduating. The good thing was that the family (she worked for) travelled a lot. We travelled to the United States for a month and to France for another month, after being in Norway just for three days. So, one of the conditions for me coming here was the opportunity to see something (...)” (my translation).

Tomas from Poland is mentioning curiosity for the country and for the culture as one of the reasons to migrate. He wanted to experience something new and have an adventure.

People travel a lot nowadays. A new exciting travel destination is just a flight away. But some people choose rather a short or a long term residence in another country as a means to learn about the culture, in stead of being a tourist. This is a possibility. Armstrong and Taylor (2000, p 147) mention that a nice place and climate can be an important factor for migrating. They also say that geographical proximity plays an important role in terms of choosing a country of migration. This will be discussed in the next section.
4.2.6 Historical ties between the countries, and the proximity

The geography, culture and language are factors that are important when people choose the country of destination (Kielyte and Kancs, 2002, p. 263). This explains the large number of Estonians in Finland. Estonian and Finnish languages belong to the same group of language, and are quite similar (not as similar as Norwegian and Swedish). Estonia and Finland are also neighbouring countries, only the Gulf of Finland is separating them (about 80 km’s distance). It is quite understandable, then, why almost 10 000 Estonians live in Finland (Brunovskis 2003, p. 23). The same pattern, except for the language similarity, applies for Poland and Germany. Germany is the major destination country for Polish emigrants (Kaczmarczyk, 2004, p. 74). These two countries have long historical ties. There are both German minorities living in Poland and Polish minorities living in Germany.

Norway is not the major immigration country either for Estonia or for Poland. But it is estimated that around 120 000 Polish citizens live or work in Norway, as presented in chapter 3.4.1 on page 27. The number of Estonians is much smaller, around 800 people, according to Statistics Norway. Respondents have different opinions/experiences in terms of their meeting with the Norwegian culture, and the similarities between Norwegian and home culture. Some of them consider Norwegian culture and people rather different compared to the home country.

Marek from Poland is describing the differences between Norwegian and Polish culture: “(...) of course they are different! A short description is that in Poland, we are...or, I meet you on the street, we chat a bit, and it is no problem to invite you home, right? Then you can have everything I have got at home – from refrigerator and things like that. Maybe it sounds a bit strange, but that’s the way it is. When you visit me, then you are my guest and the most important person, right? You get everything. But Norwegians are very... it is easy to get help when you stand on the street and need some help to find a way and things like that. But other things like becoming a friend or things like that, then it is a long way to go. Right? Just don’t cross the border, right! (...)” (my translation).

Audra is from Poland and has been in Norway just five months. But she already has some experience with Norwegian food and people: “(...) maybe the traditional Norwegian food is

---

21 Data from the Statistics Norway, accessed 13.04.07 on: [http://www.ssb.no/emner/02/01/10/innvbeftab-2006-05-11-05.html](http://www.ssb.no/emner/02/01/10/innvbeftab-2006-05-11-05.html)
not the best in the world (...) I feel that the relationships with the people, they are different here... so I can say that with somebody I can get really close, can be my real friend, with Norwegian people... it is ok, but I don’t think I can get really close relations (...) what is amazing for me is that somebody can grill alone... or going to “hytte” (the cottage) alone. Cool! (...)”.

Agnes from Estonia is describing Norwegians as cold and unconcerned: “(...) people are, let’s say... sometimes it seems that they are very gracious... but at the same time very cold and unconcerned, I mean that the society is closed... nobody is accepting you as a friend... I mean that they are very self-centred. I would say that Estonians are more open, much more open (...)” (my translation).

Other respondents find similar characteristics between Norwegian culture and the culture in the home country. Liisa from Estonia is saying totally the opposite to Agnes: “(...) I think that Norwegian and Estonian cultures are quite similar. When Norwegians are considered to be very cold people, then Estonians are often even colder. I think it is often very difficult to get to know them (Norwegians), but if you already know them, then you get friends for life. In my opinion, these two cultures are quite similar (...)” (my translation).

Mari is a baby-sitter from Estonia and has only positive experience with Norwegians: “(...) I have got a really good impression, I don’t know, I have met really lovely people who are very helpful and trusted me from the first day, and things like that. It was amazing for me, because I thought it is unbelievable that a person can trust you like that, give you the keys and everything. That was unbelievable (...)” (my translation).

It seems that the respondents have different opinions in terms of the culture in Norway compared to the culture in their homelands. Although there are many more Polish people in Norway than Estonians, it is rather because of the big Polish population and unemployment than the very close cultural ties. Even if the cultures are not considered very similar according to some of respondents, the distance between the sending countries and receiving countries in physical and cultural distance is not that large.
4.2.7 Immigration policies and language knowledge

Immigration has been a solution to meet the lack of labour in the West. But after a while, immigrants started to bring their families and settled down in the destination countries. This led to more strict immigration policies (Drbohlav, 1997, p. 87). Change in the requirements for the working permits can be an important factor influencing migration. The freedom of movement for labour now applies for Estonia and Poland, after having joined the EU. This also means that it is easier to find a job abroad. The free movement of the factors (labour, capital, etc) also applies in Norway, since Norway is a member of the EEA.

Although migration policy is not directly a “pull” factor, it is a factor that influences the migration decision. This has also been mentioned by the respondents. Merle from Estonia explains the effects of joining the EU: “(...) it is easier to find job, and people have the same opportunities, and rights to work here (in Norway). Waiting for a work permit took four months, before joining the EU. It was more difficult to get it. But now, if you have the right experiences and skills, and if you are the right person, then they will offer you a job despite the fact that you are an immigrant (...)” (my translation).

Margus from Estonia is also explaining that the rules are more open now, and that has increased emigration: “(...) the change was that now you don’t have to apply for a visa or work permit... in some countries... and that has lead to an increase in emigration. I think it is because people are more open and are not stuck behind the borders anymore... you can also work over the border (...)” (my translation).

Marek from Poland has noticed increased emigration after the EU enlargement: “(...) yes, it was like a boom! It was very difficult to find a job before. Now, you can just travel where you want, if you find someone who can give you a job. It was so easy, that many decided to leave the country (...) the first week after the 1st of May 2004...there were some hundred buses that travelled to London, England, for example (...)” (my translation).

It is positive for receiving countries’ economy and welfare if they can balance their lack of labour with labour immigrants, and it is positive for migrants if they can increase their income. But the immigrants have been taken advantage of by their employers in some cases. One of the respondents has also experienced exploitation by employers - employers may want to save the costs at the expense of labour migrants that neither understand the language nor
the welfare system in Norway. Margus from Estonia had some problems after arrival to Norway: “(...) it was the first company I worked with and (...) I did not get any holiday pay and things like that. This was problematic (...)

The Polish key informant has met many people who have come to Norway, and knows many stories. She was participating in the Fafo Østforum in September 2006, and had a presentation about misuse of labour immigrants. I will use one of her stories to illustrate the issue.

A young Polish man came to Norway to work in a big company. There were many other Polish people working there, so the language was not a problem, even though the employer was a Norwegian. The work permit was organised, but he had never seen any other documents. They worked hard, long days and weekends. They had bad living conditions and no working contract. After a while he found out that there are rights for holiday pay, and health care... He looked for a tax office in order to find out how much tax he pays, but he was told that this is written on his tax card. He had never seen his documents, and never heard about the rights, because his post was addressed as c/o employer. He contacted the company Polish Connection, where he came with his many questions. 22

This man had trusted his employer, but the employer was taking an advantage of that. Easier regulations for migration and increased movement of labour also generate people who want to benefit from immigrants. So, in some cases, immigration can lead to troubles and difficulties. Why? One reason is that immigrants are not aware of the tax- and social security systems in the country of destination. Some of them are used to work in bad working conditions, and overtime without any extra payment (see pages 45 and 46). And the welfare regulation is something they may not even know about.

Another reason could be the language difficulties. Most official letters and documents are in the local language – Norwegian, and people who do not speak the language, risk loosing the benefits that are offered. Although many immigrants manage with their English, the knowledge of the local language is still important. It seems that most of my respondents are aware of the importance of learning Norwegian, and half of them speak Norwegian fluently. 22

This is my own short summary of one of the stories presented. The presentation is available at: www.fafo.no/Oestforum/260906/polish_connection.pdf
Tomas from Poland took a Norwegian course and does now speak fluent Norwegian. Knowing the language is important in his opinion, although it was hard to learn it: “(...) some things were a bit difficult, but I think it went quite well. If you want to learn... then you learn it. I think that the most important thing is to know the language... if you have to work here (...)” (my translation).

Andres from Estonia is using English, but has plans of learning Norwegian: “(...) of course language is a thing number one. English is important when you are a foreigner and Norwegian is strongly recommended in order to get better contact with locals (...) so I plan to learn it this year (...)” (my translation).

Alicija from Poland has not learned Norwegian, and she is the only respondent who has no plans of learning it either: “(...) so I started learning English because I did not know I was staying in Norway, I did not even think about it. I already knew some English, and knew that I could speak it after half a year. But Norwegian I still don’t speak after 10 years (...)

These examples illustrate the attitudes among immigrants when it comes to learning the local language. Knowing the local language helps avoid the problems connected to misuse of workers. But learning the language is not always easy, because of the long working days and things like that. Tomas from Poland knows some people who work within construction, and explains why they do not learn the language: “(...) if I ask, for example, why they don’t learn the language... no, he doesn’t learn it because he doesn’t have time, because Norwegian classes go from eight to twelve, or from twelve to four o’clock, but he works until six o’clock. And this is one reason among many, many different. Some won’t learn it because they live so close to each other, Polish people, so they use only the Polish language (...)” (my translation).

Although language is not a direct push or pull factor for migration, it is still an important issue in terms of migration.
4.3 Effects of emigration for the country of origin

People have been migrating in the old days, whether it is between different parts within a country, or between different countries. As long as the number of migrants is low, there are no problems. But migration of masses will affect both the receiving and the sending countries. In this thesis the effects for the sending country are in focus. This chapter will introduce and discuss the findings concerning “brain drain”, “brain waste” and “brain gain”. The chapter continues with the issue of remittances. The last section will be about the other effects of migration.

4.3.1 “Brain drain”
“Brain drain” is an outflow of skilled workers. For a long time, the South-North migration and “brain drain” from the Third World has been in the focus. East-West migration was restricted during the Soviet period, and there was not any valid information available in terms of the “real” migratory flows. After the fall of the iron curtain in the end of 1990s, the borders are open, and people in the East are more mobile. This, and the enlargement of the EU with ten more CEE countries, brings up brain drain from the Eastern European countries on the agenda. Emigration of the brightest and most skilled can have negative impacts on the country’s further development. Both Estonia and Poland are industrialized countries and have growing economies, but the brain drain can ruin the positive progress for these countries.

The Polish key informant mentions the risk of loosing highly qualified workers, but is not worried about brain drain: “(...) I think about the skilled workers who leave Poland, especially the scarce occupations like doctors, or others who are difficult to find. If they travel abroad in order to find better paid jobs, this is a real loss for Poland (...) there is not yet a threat that the Polish labour market will be drained for skilled workers, because most of them travel for short periods of time and come back (...) for example a doctor gets a contract and works abroad for three-four years, and returns (...)” (my translation).

Emigration will – in many cases – lead to a lack of workers in the home country, and this can affect the local economy through the decrease in the economic growth. The lack of workers is mostly sectored, existing within construction and health.  

The Polish key informant mentioned the lack of construction workers and medical professionals in Poland: “(...) already now it is difficult to find a skilled man to rehabilitate an apartment in the big cities in Poland, there are long waiting queues and higher prices than before. Many have travelled abroad to find a job, also doctors and engineers (...)” (my translation).

Marek from Poland is an engineer and has noticed the lack of engineers in the home country: “(...) there are many of them who are away – either in Norway or in Ireland or England. Many, many have decided to leave. So, it has been a big problem the last year (...)” (my translation).

The Estonian key respondent is an employee in the Ministry of Social Affairs, and she mentions the threat of brain drain in Estonia: “(...) people who are going to do unskilled work tend to do it in the short-term, and those who are going to do highly qualified work, like doctors and engineers... their emigration tends to be more long-termed. And that makes the threat of brain drain real (...)” (my translation).

Haque and Kim (1994, p. 23) argue that brain drain leads to a reduction in the growth of the economy in the country of origin, because those with higher learning abilities will emigrate and those with lower will stay behind. It can be understood that those who migrate are the best in their field, because migrants are required to document their skills and experiences, and those with the best scores get the jobs. Another aspect is that migrants must learn a new language, and they are expected to adapt to the rules, regulations and the culture of the receiving society. These are challenges that might be too big for people with less learning abilities.

Merle from Estonia has a similar opinion – that more talented leave, and those who are lazy and unwilling to work, stay: “(...) those who are not able to do proper work, they stay in Estonia, those who are good in their field and talented, and are interested in their field, they go out for better opportunities. And those who are lazy and unwilling to do the work, stay
behind (...) I think that the quality of work suffers because of that. The quality of services... despite the fact that prices increase, the quality decreases (...)” (my translation).  

Godzimirski (2005, p. 104) claims that Norway has practiced an active recruitment of nurses from Poland and the Baltic States, and that could have promoted brain drain from these countries. Since there were only few nurses who migrated, then the brain drain cannot be severe. Janne is a nurse from Estonia, and she is claiming that there is a lack of nurses in Estonia: “(...) there is a shortage of 400 nurses in Tallinn (capital of Estonia) (...) I cannot imagine the overall situation in Estonia, I think that there is a lack of 2000 nurses or so (...)” (my translation).

This shortage must not necessarily refer to the fact that many nurses have migrated. This can also be a result of very low salaries, and the fact that many nurses find another job with a higher payment.

The Polish key informant is not saying anything specific about nurses, but more generally about skilled workers: “(...) it is not yet a threat that the Polish labour market will be drained for skilled workers, because most of the migrants travel for short periods and return (...)” (my translation). But the findings from Riemsdijk (2006, p. 19) are referring to a lack of nurses also in Poland.

Andres from Estonia feels that the home country looses a lot by loosing him: “(...) I think it would be more important for me to share my experiences and knowledge with young people in Estonia, than here (...) that is the reason why Estonia is missing a lot through me. One thing is the economical side, but I think that the side of morality and experience is much more important at the moment (...)” (my translation).

Janne from Estonia feels that her leave has no effect on the development in the home country: “(...) I am so small a particle that this will not affect Estonia. But the fact that there is a lack of 400 nurses will affect (Estonia) (...)” (my translation). 

---

24 Phrase in the original language: “(...) need kes ei ole suutelised korralikult tööd tegema, et need jäävad Eestisse. Paremad inimesed kes on tublid oma erialal ja nad on edasipüüjjad ja nad on huvitatud oma erialast, need lähevad välja parematele jahimaadele. Ja siis need, kes ei viitsi tööd teha, kellel ei ole tahtmist, need jäävad siis Eestisse (...) ma arvan, et töö kvaliteet kannatab selle all. See teenuse kvaliteet, vaatamata sellele, et hinnad tõusevad aga kvaliteet langeb (...)”.

25 Phrase in the original language: “(...) mina olen nii pisikene mutrikene, et see nüüd küll Eestit ei mõjuta. Aga muidugi see, et 400 õde puudu on, see küll mõjutab (...)
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Andres and Janne have different opinions in terms of migration and its’ effects for the home country. It would be strange to say that a person is personally responsible for the problems in the home country. But that is the way Andres feels. On the one hand I could agree with Janne - one person does not make a difference. On the other hand, a group, or ten, or a hundred, or thousand persons makes a difference.

Paul from Estonia expresses his concern about the lack of workers: “(...) in Estonia, it is a big problem, there are no more construction workers, and everyone has left. You can get one from the street if you want (...)” (my translation). Lack of labour force may push employers to employ incompetent and inexperienced workers, and this can lead to a decrease in quality and further a decline in the economic growth.

Another aspect in terms of brain drain is the cost of education. Usher (1977, p. 1009) is claiming that emigration will be a social cost for the home country if education is for free. The higher education is mostly free in both Estonia and Poland, so the aspect of social cost is real. Tomas from Poland is expressing his concern about emigrants who are educated at the cost of Poland: “(...) some people notice that it starts to be unhealthy that Poland is educating people, but they travel to another country (...) if most of the highly educated people will emigrate, and will not return, then you will miss something. You educate people and hope that they will work there (...)” (my translation).

The existence of “brain drain” seems to be in question, some claim that there is a lack of professionals while others are more relaxed and only refer to the threat of “brain drain”. The fact that most of the respondents themselves had a higher education can indicate to “brain drain”, but some of them would have hardly found an education related job in the home country (see the line from Merle who has a PHD in mathematics, chapter 4.1, page 42). Outflow of educated people can be “brain drain” in a way, but if the home country has no use of these “brains” anyway, then it can be argued whether it really is a “brain drain”.

4.3.2 “Brain waste”
“Brain waste” appears if educated people take jobs that do not require any specific qualifications. By working within an irrelevant field in terms of qualifications, the skills and
knowledge acquired can expire, or be forgotten. Schiff (2006, p. 210) is arguing that “brain waste” leads to no gain for the home country. The Estonian key respondent is also expressing her concern about the “brain waste” rather than “brain drain”: “(...) now it is quite common that educated people, especially young people, travel abroad in order to do simple work like in hotels and restaurants and things like that. If you do this type of work too long, there is a danger that you lose the competence in your field. Because without supplementary training, it will be difficult to find an educationally related work after having returned. This is not a “brain drain”, but “brain waste”, because the potential is not used either at home or abroad, they would rather do some simple work since it is beneficial in the short term (...)” (my translation).

But is “brain waste” really the case, or are there other things that make people take the simpler jobs? Marek from Poland has to do simpler work than his education allows him to do: “(...) I am actually a construction engineer (...) and I work in the construction sector, but I have to do simpler work than engineers usually do (...) but we’ll see, maybe next year I can use the opportunity to work as an engineer” (my translation). Marek is not doing simpler work voluntarily. He did not say the reason for doing this work, but it could be probably because of the problems of acknowledging his certificates or because the employers are not convinced about his working experience. One reason can also be the insufficient knowledge of language, although this was not the case with Marek. Janne from Estonia points out that the language difficulties is the reason that she is working in a “lower degree”: “(...) I worked as a nurse in the hospital (in Norway), but now I am nurse’s assistant, but I am doing the same work as nurses. Just because of the language (...)” (my translation).

Audra from Poland has a master’s degree in design, but she works as a cleaning lady in Norway. This is not because she wants to earn some easy money, but because she is in the process of learning the language and finding a proper job: “(...) I am a “vaskedame” (cleaner). Because I was having a problem with language when I was working... because I came here, started to work in the office, and I couldn’t manage with language. So, I decided to learn a little bit more, and give me a chance to have a work and profile which I would like to have. Because before language you can work in the kitchen, like waitress or... if you learn more language it could be easier (...)
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Even though “brain waste” can be an issue in some cases, it seems that the respondents do simpler work involuntarily and temporarily.

4.3.3 “Brain gain”
It is a normal understanding that “brain drain” has negative effects on the country of origin, as discussed in the chapter 4.3.1. Mountford (1997, p. 288) claims that the possibility for higher wages through emigration can motivate people in the source country to acquire education. If this effect is bigger than other effects from “brain drain”, like loss of knowledge through valuable labour force, this can lead to a growth in the source economy. The fact that more people get higher education due to motivation to emigrate does not mean that all of them emigrate. Although if motivation for acquiring higher education is higher payment in another country, people can still change their mind, get married and establish a family, and so on. This means that the outcome can be more people with higher education, relative to the amount of emigrants.

Another important aspect concerning “brain gain” is return migration and the benefits of that. Werner (1996, p. 5) refers to the knowledge and abilities acquired that will be useful for the home country when the migrant returns. This can be either working skills, language skills, or skills of communication. Respondents had different opinions in terms of return. About half of them had plans of return.

Mari is a young babysitter from Estonia, and she has been thinking about returning: “(…) Yes, I have been thinking about it, it attracts a lot to go to Estonia, in a way. I have even been thinking about next summer, maybe, but I haven’t decided yet” (my translation).

Kerli is a nurse’s assistant from Estonia and has plans to return: “(…) yes! They all (friends and family) wait for me to come home. When I told them that I will go back (to Norway) after Christmas, then it was a total crisis (…)” (my translation).

The Estonian key respondent brings out some positive effects of return migration: “(…) maybe the temporary stay abroad, additional training and acquiring the skills helps to develop the qualifications. When they come back, they are very valuable labour force for us (…)” (my translation).
The other half of respondents is unsure about return, or has decided to stay in Norway. I will bring out some of their phrases. Urzula is an interior consultant from Poland who has been living in Norway about ten years. She has a seven months old baby (at the time of interviews), and has no plans to return: “(...) why not to go back to Poland? Because I know that it is much more difficult to live in Poland. Also with a child, for example, it is impossible to manage, to pay for an apartment and everything (...)” (my translation).

Merle from Estonia doesn’t have any plans to return either: “(...) I like to live here, I haven’t thought that I will never return, but to begin with, yes, I like it here (...) Simply, living here gives such an economic security which is a positive thing that actually holds on me. It gives opportunity to rest and travel, and to visit Estonia several times a year (...)” (my translation).

Tomas has been in Norway for ten years, and feels himself home: “(...) when I am travelling to Poland to visit my family, then after three, four days I want to go back to Norway. It is not that I don’t enjoy myself in Poland, it is not that, but my home is here now. This is the way I feel (...)” (my translation).

Ewa has been living in Norway for thirty years and has her grown up children living in Norway. She doesn’t have plans for return anymore: “(...) there was a period, but not anymore. It was when my parents were old, and then I had a period where I thought that my children can manage and I can return. But now when they are dead (parents), my children are here and I want to help my grandchildren. It would be meaningless to return to Poland (...)” (my translation).

Werner (1996, p. 5) is talking about temporary migration, and refers to the gains from that. He explains temporary migration like this. The working contract is for a limited time, and the work is not a step for permanent settlement in the host country. The freedom of movement liberates the new EU member citizens from certain restrictions, but there are still some who plan to work abroad only temporary.

Andres comes from Estonia and works in Norway as a construction worker. He has an open time perspective on his return: “(...) I think that the return to Estonia can happen in five years time, not before (...) and then I will see what happens. But, you can always return to...
Estonia – the unwillingness is not an obstacle for me to go back, it depends on the situation (…)” (my translation).

Whether migration is temporary or permanent can be influenced by many factors. Even if someone only decides to work abroad for a while, he or she might start liking the host country more than the country of origin and decide to stay. The opposite can also be a case – negative experiences or obstacles can make a permanent migrant to return. Meeting a future spouse in a host country or in the country of origin can also influence the decision of return.

Liisa is from Estonia and came to Norway only temporarily. Now she is unsure about the return, because she is married with a non Estonian citizen, and it is difficult for him to find work in Estonia: “(…) yes, we have been talking about it. I have always been dreaming about a job in the Ministry of External Affairs (in Estonia) (…) If I had been alone, then it would have been an easier decision. But since we are many, then this must be taken into consideration. My husband is working in the field of construction, and then he must learn Estonian and Russian, and that is not so easy (…)” (my translation).

Ardittis (1992, p. 91) presents a program called TOKTEN that helps professionals to return to their home country as development consultants. Poland is participating is this program. The purpose of the program is to gain from the situation of “brain drain”, by using the knowledge and skills of the skilled migrants who return.

Katseli (2006, p. 21) is mentioning another important gain from migration – diasporas – groups of people from a certain country who live abroad. Since they have access to information in both the receiving and the sending countries, they are good promoters of trade. Their desire for home produced goods can also to a certain extent promote the production and trade in the home country. But there is one more aspect in terms of gaining from the migration – remittances.

4.3.4 Remittances
Remittances are money transfers from the migrants in the host country to their family and friends in the home country. Giza (1998, p. 106) is saying that most of the migrant families in Poland receive some kind of assistance from the migrants. This is in terms of money transfers
or presents, but also investments in the enterprises in the home country. Investing is affecting
the local economy positively by creating employment and profit opportunities.

According to the Polish key informant, most of the migrants support their families at home:
“(…) they send money to Poland. They live here as cheaply as possible and don’t buy any
nice apartments, only rent, and very cheaply. They bring their own food from Poland and
send the money back. The money is worth more in Poland than here, and the family can build
a house or invest in something. Or they simply have a better life (…)” (my translation).

Some of the respondents support their family and friends financially. Alicija from Poland
supports her family: “(…) I have a mother in Poland, she is sick. My brother is a lifeguard;
he is working from morning to evening. He doesn’t have very much money; he has two
children, so I support him as well. I support as much as I can (…)”.

Andres from Estonia functions as the head of the family and supports the family totally, but
he has also been thinking about investing: “(…) since they predict a big economical decline
for the coming years, then I do not yet have any plans for investment at the moment. But I
think that, one day, if I have so much disposable money that I must invest it, then the real
estate in Estonia is a good place to invest (…)” (my translation).

Others bring presents or do not support at all. Liisa from Estonia brings presents while
visiting the home country: “(…) I don’t support economically, but always when I am visiting
then I have quite big presents to both brothers and parents. But I don’t transfer any money
(…)” (my translation).

Merle from Estonia does not support anyone in the home country and has no plans of
investing either: “(…) nothing, no relations (economical). I visit family and friends, yes (…)”
(my translation). The reason for not supporting family could be that the migrant is not the
head of the family or that the stay abroad is short-termed (Giza, 1998, p. 107), but this is not
the case for Merle.

Another aspect is that when the migrants visit home country, they use their money for locally
produced goods and services, and this positively affects the local economy. All of the
migrants visit the home country once in a while, though it varies from every second week to once a year.

The Estonian key respondent refers to the positive effects of the migrants’ use of money in the home country: “(...) these people who work abroad bring some of their money to Estonia, and this promotes the economic growth (...)” (my translation).

Andres from Estonia is using most of his earnings at home: “(...) Estonia gets the money earned by me, not Estonia, but the economy. I use most of the money I earn here in Estonia (...)” (my translation).

The help from the migrants is not always desired - pride can be an obstacle. People want to show that they can manage themselves and receiving some money or help from abroad touches their pride. Ewa from Poland experienced this with her brother: “(...) I have to be careful now, because I have tried to give (support) to my brother but he took offence. So, there has to be a balance, one has to know whether help is wanted and to what extent. I don’t do it with my brother anymore, I apologised and said it was well meant (...)” (my translation).

4.3.6 Other effects of migration

Migration can have further effects on the home country. Reducing the situation of high unemployment is one of them. Tomas from Poland is certain that the emigration from Poland benefits the country: “(...) I think it is positive. Let us thank those who left and made the unemployment going down. The Polish economy has also won, because they do not have to pay the unemployment benefits (...)” (my translation).

But it can be argued whether emigration is a solution for unemployment. It depends on the qualifications of the unemployed. If unemployed are badly educated, then their emigration will not have any serious effect for the home country (in cases with high unemployment), as long as there are people enough to take work where education is not required. But emigration of highly skilled workers – “brain drain” (discussed in the chapter 4.3.1) – can lead to negative effects such as a decline in the economic growth. The state looses also in terms of the education they paid for, and in terms of lost tax income. It costs for a country to educate its citizens, and education is mostly for free both in Estonia and Poland. If educated people
decide to leave the country, the country looses benefits that were invested in their education. This is not an issue if emigration is temporary or short termed, but on the other hand, it is a serious loss if the emigration is permanent.

The emigration of unskilled labour can also affect the development in the home country. Katseli et al. (2006, p. 21) is claiming that in terms of high unemployment will emigrated workers be replaced with unemployed, and that is beneficial for the emigrants and the unemployed people.

Another aspect is that the lack of workers leads to an import of workers from non EU countries, and an increase in foreign labour can lead to problems of integration. This is especially the case for Estonia, since already 40% of the population is Russian speaking. Estonia has had a strict language politic, and many of the present Russian speakers will not learn the Estonian language. Further problems can occur if more workers are imported from Russian speaking countries. Estonia has already started importing workers, as mentioned in chapter 3.1 on page 22. The respondents are also concerned about the future in Estonia if the amount of foreign labour who does not speak the local language will increase.

Merle from Estonia is sceptical about the foreign labour: “(...) the foreign labour comes in, and then the same problem arises – again incapable in the language. And then the communication and the culture disappear (...) as I remember, Estonians do not have good attitudes towards (immigrants)... Estonians are relatively racialist (...)” (my translation).

Agnes from Estonia is worried about the future of the country and the language: “(...) there are actually so few Estonians, so things should be reconsidered in order to preserve the country and the language (...)” (my translation).

The Estonian key respondent also mentions the effects of using foreign labour for the Estonian culture, but is saying that there will be some restrictions in terms of the number of labour migrants: “(...) we have and will maintain a certain quota, a restriction, that fixes the number of them (labour migrants). It is possible that this (the quota) will be raised, today it is 0.05% of the population (…) it could be raised to 0.1% for example, but this is not sure (…) the Estonian population is not very tolerant of foreigners, as some surveys show. So it must
be taken into account that the issue of discrimination might be an important one” (my translation).

The danger of extinction of the language and culture is problematic for Estonia, but probably not for Poland. Poland has a population of 38 millions compared to the Estonian 1.3 million, and Polish is widely spoken. Although there might not be threats in terms of the language or integration, Tomas from Poland mentions that also Poland imports labour from other non EU countries: “(...) there is a lack of people (labour) in Poland, and we have to import them from Ukraine, Belarus and Russia, so it is like a circle. It is the same as Norwegians travelling to Sweden for shopping, the Swedish travel to Denmark, the Danish travel to Germany, the Germans travel to Poland, the Polish travel to Ukraine, and the Ukrainians have no other country to travel to... That is the same as for the labour situation – Poles travel to West and North, and there will be a need to replace these people (...)” (my translation).

Another aspect in terms of emigration is that it can break up the families. If one of the spouses works abroad and is away from the family for long periods, this can lead to problems at home. People miss each other, and get frustrated, and this starts the conflicts. Paul from Estonia is worried: “(...) the only bad thing is that the families separate and get divorced (...)” (my translation).26

On the other hand, being apart from one another can also support the relationship. Margus from Estonia is arguing against Paul’s statement: “(...) I think that being two weeks here and one at home, or maximally three here and one week home, or something like that, three here and two at home... if a husband and a wife get bored with each other... while being home and seeing each other all the time, then there will be trivial nagging. But being apart long periods makes life different. Whether the commuting is beneficial for a relationship... it depends on the person (...)” (my translation).27

Another issue mentioned by Ewa from Poland, is the class differences due to return migrants and/or remittances. She is worried that the remittances help certain groups of people to

26 Phrase in the original language: “(...) ainuke paha lugu on see, et pered lähevad laiali ja lahku (...)

27 Phrase in the original language: “(...) ma arvan, et kui keegi siin kaks nädalat koha peal ja nädala kodus olla, või maksimaalselt kolm siin olla ja nädal aega kodus või midagi sellist, et kolm siin kaks kodus... kui mees ja naine tüütavad omavahel kodus koguaeg ära, kui iga päev teda näed siis koguaeg selline tühine näägutamine
become “rich”, and that makes class differences even stronger: “(...) there will be an inflow of capital, but I don’t know whether this helps Poland. There will be larger class differences then, this develops the over class... it will be more usual with higher education, and that makes the under class suppressed. They will never manage to follow up those who have earned (money, abroad) during a year, compared to the salaries earned in Poland. I don’t think it is right that they earn limitless amounts without thinking about the consequences, I think there will be political unrest because of that (...)” (my translation).

Finally, emigration can lead to increased salaries in the home country. The classical theory of migration (Armstrong et al., 2000, p. 141) assumes that migration will continue as long as the salaries between two countries are balanced. Although this is a theory, the real life has shown that there has already been increase in salaries. Merle from Estonia claims that the salaries for construction workers are already quite high: “(...) construction workers, I have heard, the hourly wage for them (construction workers) is already so high that there is no reason to emigrate. My brother is building a house, and he said that they ask for hourly wage exactly as much as in Sweden or in Finland, plus the thing that they can stay home with their families (...)” (my translation).

All these different effects influence the development in Estonia and Poland. Some of them are more positive, while others can affect the development in these countries negatively. The future of Estonia and Poland in terms of migration will be discussed in the next chapter.

4.4 Future perspectives

What will the future be like in the Eastern European countries? According to Brunovskis et al. (2003, p. 61), improved economies in the Baltic States will reduce incentives to migrate. Kaczmarczyk (2004, p. 78) is referring to the declining number of migrants in Poland, and to the short term nature of emigration. But what do the respondents say about it? How do they perceive the emigration, and what would possibly make them return to their home countries? This chapter will discuss the motivations to return, and the suggestions concerning the problems caused by emigration.
4.4.1 Motivations to return

I posed respondents with a question about what changes in the home country would make them return. I got a number of different answers, although the economical reasons were mentioned most of all. Slask from Poland refers to the economical factors and working conditions as “pull” factors in terms of return: “(...) maybe better salaries, better culture of work. I mean by that treating workers, employees. Because, the connections are not really so good, actually. Polish people complain about it. The atmosphere is not as good as people wish (...)”.

Agnes from Estonia mentions better salaries as the main motivation factor: “(...) I don’t have anything against Estonia, I could really go back. Economically and in every way, Estonia is so progressive, and it goes so well in Estonia... so I don’t have anything against it, I could go back even tomorrow. But the things with the salaries are as they are, you know (...)” (my translation).

Another aspect is the worker’s rights and political situation. The Polish key informant mentions security in terms of work, family considerations and failure to integrate as the motivations to return among Polish people: “(...) they must have some really good jobs and much more stable situation in Poland, or security. Security about not loosing this good job after a year (...) many have decided to return because of the family. It can be difficult for children to adapt (in the new country). If only one family member has a job, and not the other, then this can be a reason for return. And the thing with integration into society, if people after some years are still not integrated, and feel themselves excluded... social networks are very important, even though Polish people hold together a lot(...)” (my translation).

Andres from Estonia mentions the political situation and the valuing of the workers as motivations to return: “(...) if the regime in Estonia would improve, and the workers be appreciated, then I think that I would return to Estonia, because someone must do some normal work there as well. Or at least pass on the experience to the younger generation (...)” (my translation).

suhetele... see sõltub inimesest (...).
For others were material benefits less important, while meeting people and having open relationships with them mattered a lot. Margus is a young construction worker from Estonia, and knows exactly what could make him return: “(...) but if I after a while met a woman, maybe, then this would be a reason to return to Estonia (...)” (my translation).

Tomas from Poland wants people in Poland to be more open: “(...) maybe... if Poland could... if people could be more open towards new things... and that they could see things from both sides, not only one side. So it is a cultural question (...)” (my translation).

Merle from Estonia also wants the people to be changed: “(...) if the culture of communication between Estonians could change. The Norwegian culture and the culture of communication suits me very well. And this peaceful life style, like an eternal student who is enjoying a beer in a café somewhere in Tartu (a University town in Estonia) with other students, and just lives and exists. No struggling (...)” (my translation).28

The decision to return is a personal choice, and depends on the life situation of each and every one. I cannot really argue with the motivation factors of the respondents, they are personal and unique. But some of the factors mentioned would be interesting for policy makers to know. Better working conditions, better salaries and appreciating workers (workers rights) are issues that concern the respondents.

4.4.2 Suggestions concerning the problems due to emigration

When it comes to the worker’s rights, the Estonian key respondent argues that the Estonian State is quite liberal, and all is in the hands of the employers how to hold on to workers, except for education and health sectors. But I still think that the state must support establishing worker’s unions in the private sectors, so that not only employers take responsibility for the worker’s rights, rights for overtime payment, vacation, and security at work. There seems to be too little control and regulations according to respondents (chapter 4.2.2), and these things must be given further attention. The Polish key informant mentions the worker’s rights as an important factor in terms of emigration from Poland: “(...) better

---

28 Phrase in the original language: “(...) kui eestlaste omavaheline suhtluskultuur muutuks. Mulle sobib õudsalt, mulle meeldib see Norra kultuur, ja see omavaheline suhtluskultuur mulle meeldib, mulle istub see. Ja selline rahulik elustiil, see on selline igavene tudengi elu kes naudib kusagil Tartu kohvikus õlut kursakaaslastega ja lihtsalt elab ja on. Et ei ole mingit sellist rabelemist (...)”. 
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worker’s rights. It is not that they don’t have any rights. Still there is no one who defends people. There are strong worker’s unions in Norway, and strong worker’s rights. There is very little of that in Poland (…) and to treat people with respect (…)” (my translation).

When it comes to better salaries, this is to a certain extent out of the state’s control, but not in the health sector. As already discussed earlier (chapter 4.3.6, page 69), some improvements have been made. But in reality, it will be impossible to raise the salaries as much as needed to stop the migration flows, due to limited resources. The state budget is limited and so are the budgets of private entrepreneurs. Some increase is possible, but not too much in the short term. Earlier enlargements of EU have shown that salaries in poorer member states tend to equalize with the average salaries in the EU (Carling, 2005, p. 2), but it will take time. It may even take a decade. So, it is a long term process.

Education politics is also one way of meeting the lack of labour force. If a state supports studies that are related to construction or other sectors that experience lack of workers, then the shortage will be met in the future. But it can be argued whether it is interesting for a typical “sending country” to prioritize education in these sectors, because they don’t have any guarantee that also the newly educated people will not emigrate. Agnes from Estonia suggests that more people should acquire vocational education in order to meet the lack of workers: “(...) they have started to propagate learning for a speciality (job). How many educated people we have who do not work within their own field, because there is no work... this relationship is wrong, in my opinion. In reality, many more young people should study for a speciality in order to get a job. If you are there with a meaningless higher education paper, you don’t have anything to do, and become a seller in a grocery, then this is nonsense (...)” (my translation). 29

Another important factor in terms of labour migration is social benefits. Things like family allowance, mother’s salary, and start capital for young families do play an important role. Merle mentions some social benefits that would influence the migration decision among young people: “(...) Estonia must invent new things... not things, but preferences, like the

---

29 Phrase in the original language: “(...) see on alles nüüd viimased aastad minu meeles kui on hakatud seda propageerima, et õppige eriala, eks. Et kui palju meil on tegelikult neid kõrgharidusega inimesi kes ei tööta ju oma erialal, ja… kuna lihtsalt ju ei ole tööd ju… see suhe on minu meeles küll täiesti vale. Tegelikult peaks palju rohkem noori minema eriala õppima, et tõesti töökoht saada… kui seda, et lihtsalt oled seal oma mõttetu
mothers salary, for example. This has a positive effect on all young families, this is positive. The state must think all the time how to give new opportunities... like a loan for a young family, or... that people could have opportunities, the same opportunities as people in other countries (West) have (...)” (my translation). After living in Norway for a while and experiencing different social benefits, it is easier for people to notice the drawbacks in the home country. Even if those things were not so important factors in the emigration process, they have become more important. But providing social benefits is closely related to economical growth in a country, and it is the same with the raised salaries. So, again, it is a long term process.

The Estonian key respondent mentions importing foreign workers and some other alternatives as a solution for labour shortage: “(...) it has to be thought about how to import foreign labour. One possibility that I already mentioned is that we have quite a lot of unemployed people, and people who are looking for work. Or people who, for some reasons, are not active or are not interested in working, although they are capable of doing it. So, they should get some attention, and they should be brought on the labour market. Unused potential is also among the handicapped, and we do not use part time or commuting opportunities. So, there should be room to discuss how these people could work more, for example young mothers who maybe would like to work part time, but there are no opportunities for that. So this can be better (...)” (my translation).

Use of foreign labour can cause further problems for the country in terms of integration, as discussed in chapter 4.3.6. Alternatives to use foreign labour, as the Estonian key respondent mentioned, are employing and schooling unemployed, using half time workers, handicapped, and long distance workers (commuters). But training these groups of people is also costly, so it is difficult to estimate which solution is most effective concerning the problems that arise due to emigration.
5 Conclusion

This thesis has studied emigration from Estonia and Poland with a qualitative approach. The focus has been on the push-pull factors of migration, and on the effects of emigration for the home country.

The economical factors seem most important in terms of migration decision for the objects of my study. They complain about low salaries, and some want to earn money in order to build a house in the home country. Others want to travel and have a good life - all that consumes money. But economical factors are not the only ones, some consider these less important. Bad working conditions and lack of workers rights are crucial factors. Lack of overtime payment, long working days, no health insurance and no security at work are just some of the “push” factors in terms of migration. Negative attitudes among employers and inadequate respect are also mentioned as negative factors in the home country. At the same time, the social security system, good workers rights and high level security are mentioned as migratory “pull” factors making Norway attractive for labour migration.

Unemployment in the home country and employment opportunities in the receiving country, are other important factors for migration. Family and social networks are mentioned as determinants for migration. Moving together with a spouse or migrating due to friendship networks is not rare. But having family in the home country can also be a hinder for migration.

Some people are looking for adventure, and working a few years in a foreign country seems to be an attractive solution. Historical ties and proximity between the countries is a factor influencing the choice of the migration country. That explains the large number of Estonian migrants in Finland, and Polish migrants in Germany. Norway is a country with a close distance from Estonia and Poland, and the countries do to some extent have cultural similarities. Easier immigration policies after the enlargement of the EU are also promoting working abroad. This makes it easier to find a job, get a work permit and so on. But this also brings out people, and businesses that want to take advantage of the foreign labour, who cannot speak the language and do not know the social system. Lack of holiday payment,
overtime payment and bad working conditions are some ways of misuse used by employers in Norway. That makes it even more important to learn the local language.

Labour migration has several ways of affecting the sending country. One issue is the “brain drain” – emigration of educated employees. Although the dimension of the “brain drain” problem can be discussed, it has already been noticed by the lack of nurses, doctors and engineers in Estonia and Poland. Another effect of migration is “brain waste” – educated people migrate in order to earn easy money by taking “simple” jobs. This was not the case among any of the respondents. Some of them were still working with jobs on a “lower degree”, but the reason was rather lack of sufficient language skills or the employer’s discredit towards the employee.

There are also positive effects of labour migration – some call it “brain gain”. If educated migrants return to their home country with the baggage of knowledge and experience, they can be a valuable labour force for the country and promote development. Another positive factor in terms of migration is remittances or money transfers. Some migrants have family in the home country, and they support it financially. Others bring big presents while visiting the home country. Being at home and using money for locally produced commodities, buying apartments or renovating, is also promoting the local economy.

Labour emigration also reduces unemployment. This is especially the case in Poland, where the unemployment rate is quite high. Lack of labour force in the home country can lead to labour import of workers from the non-EU members which could lead to integration problems. This is the case in Estonia where 40 percent are first, second and third generation citizens from countries with different culture, and have Russian as mother tongue. It is considered a threat to Estonian language and culture, if new workers are imported from Russian speaking countries.

Labour emigration can break up families, if one family member lives in the receiving country. But being apart from the family and visiting them frequently can also strengthen the relationship – then the spouses won’t get bored of each other.

An important effect of migration is increased salaries in the home country. Lack of workers leads to a positive pressure on salaries. In the field of construction, the salaries are already
quite high in Estonia and Poland. The equalisation of salaries in Estonia and Poland with the salaries in the old EU member states is a long term process, and will most likely take some decades.

When it comes to the future of Estonia and Poland, several things could be done in order to strengthen the development in these countries. Raised salaries and improved worker’s rights are important factors that can make workers stay in the home country, and attract migrant’s return. Better social security system and social benefits could improve the situation for young families, and motivate people to stay and work in the home country. And the educational flow must be revised in order to produce the necessary amount of workers for the sectors that experience lack of workers.

Low salaries and economically difficult situation in the home country and good economical perspectives in the host country were important factors for migration. These findings confirm the findings from literature, claiming that economical factors are a migratory motivation factor number one. The findings about lack of workers in the health and construction sectors in Estonia and Poland confirm also similar findings from literature.

This thesis has discussed the issue of labour migration from Eastern Europe, presented some labour migrants’ own experiences about what the important factors for migration are, and what the possible effects of it for the country of origin are. The emphasis is given to the individual stories and opinions of emigrants themselves. As Janne from Estonia said: “(...) I am so small a particle that this will not affect Estonia (...)” (my translation). These small particles can give us a glance into the world of migration, and exactly this bottom-up perspective has been my task with this thesis.
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Appendices

Appendix 1

Checklist for the interviews on labour immigration

Thank You again for meeting up for interview!
My name is Ave Mølster and I come from Estonia. I am studying at the University at Ås (UMB-University of Life Sciences). (I am doing my masters in developing studies). My thesis is about labour emigration from Eastern Europe to Norway. I will have interviews with people from Estonia and Poland. I will ask the interviewees about their patterns of migration, work, and relations with home country. Everything said at the interview is confidential and will be used in the study/research purposes only.
Is it okay if I record the interview? (Then I can concentrate more during the interview and it is not so easy to miss out Your points)
Do You have any questions before we start?

TURN ON THE RECORDER!!!!

1. General information
   A. Country and place (rural or urban) of origin
   B. Age
   C. Marital status
   D. Number of family members staying in Norway, if any then who?
   E. Education
   F. Work experience

2. Information about migration
   A. The length of stay in Norway
   B. How was the departure decided? (how did u decide to leave) (long planned/quick decision)
   C. Any constraints in leaving home country and starting up in Norway?
   D. Did you have to inform some officials about your leave? Whom? (migration office, municipality, etc)
   E. Knowledge of Norwegian/ the length of learning/ reasons for not learning
   F. Norwegian culture/different from your own?
   G. Reasons for immigration
      ➢ Job
      ➢ Higher income
      ➢ Welfare society
      ➢ Conflicts at home
      ➢ Family/personal reasons
      ➢ Additional income for the family
      ➢ Looking for adventure
3. Interaction with home country
   A. Amount of visits to home country per year, if any
   B. Relations with home country
      ➢ Family/financial support?
      ➢ Visiting during holidays – holiday tourism
      ➢ Investments
      ➢ Other
   C. What about your relations with your friends? (as good as before/weakened)
   D. Plans of returning home country, why/why not/if yes, when?
   E. Which changes in your home country would make you to return
      ➢ Increased salaries
      ➢ Better living conditions
      ➢ Other

4. Work
   A. Type of work at home/in Norway
   B. Salary at home, in Norway – if bigger, how many times
   C. Workers with your occupation, are there many/is there lack?
   D. Any constraints with your work at home
      ➢ Low salary
      ➢ Work is not appreciated/not popular
      ➢ Too hard work
      ➢ Lack of motivation
      ➢ Colleagues
      ➢ Work conditions

5. Effects of emigration
   A. Do you know many that emigrate from your country/can you estimate the number of
      emigrants from your country?
   B. Is there a difference in migration patterns after 1st May 2004 (joining EU)? Why?
   C. Can labour emigration be a threat for your country?
   D. How does your government perceive the emigration of labour force, positive/negative?
   E. Who benefits most of you working in Norway, Norway/yourself/your country?
   F. What are the impacts of your emigration for your country?

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR TIME!!!
Appendix 2

Temaliste for intervjuer

Takk skal du ha for at du fant tid til å møte opp!!
Har du noen spørsmål før vi begynner?

SKRU PÅ DIKTAFONEN!

1. Generell informasjon
   A. Opprinnelsesland og sted (land eller by)
   B. Alder
   C. Sivilstand
   D. Antall familiemedlemmer i Norge, hvis det er noen, hvem?
   E. Utdannelse
   F. Arbeiderfaring

2. Informasjon om innvandringen
   A. Lengde av opphold i Norge
   B. Hvordan var reisen bestemt? (lenge før/rask bestemmelse)
   C. Var det noen restriksjoner (problemer) i forhold til å reise bort og starte opp i Norge?
   D. Måtte du informere noen tjenestemenn om din utreise? Hvem? (migrasjonsbyrå, kommune, politi osv.)
   E. Kunnskap i norsk språk/ lengde av studietid/ grunner for ikke å beherske
   F. Norsk kultur/forskjellig fra din egen?
   G. Grunner for innvandring
      ➢ Jobb
      ➢ Høyere inntekt
      ➢ Velferdssamfunn
      ➢ Konflikter hjemme
      ➢ Familie/personlige grunner
      ➢ Ekstra inntekter for familie
      ➢ Eventyrlyst
      ➢ Studiene
      ➢ Annet
3. Relasjoner med hjemlandet
   A. Antall besøk per år, hvis noen
   B. Relasjonene med hjemlandet
      ➢ Familie/økonomisk støtte?
      ➢ Feriebesøk – ferieturisme
      ➢ Investeringer
      ➢ Annet
   C. Har du fortsatt gode relasjoner med vennene dine? (er de blitt svakere)
   D. Planer om tilbakekomst, hvorfor/hvorfor ikke/hvis ja, når?
   E. Hvilke forandringer i hjemlandet kunne eventuelt få deg til å vende tilbake
      ➢ Høyere inntekter
      ➢ Bedre livsvilkår
      ➢ Annet

4. Arbeid
   A. Type av arbeid hjemme/i Norge
   B. Lønnen hjemme/i Norge – hvis høyere, hvor mange ganger?
   C. Arbeidere med ditt yrke, er det mange av dem/ er det mangel?
   D. Problematikk knyttet til ditt arbeid hjemme
      ➢ Lav lønn
      ➢ Arbeidet er ikke verdifylt/ikke populært
      ➢ For tungt arbeid
      ➢ Mangel av motivasjon
      ➢ Kolleger
      ➢ Arbeidsvilkår

5. Virkning av emigrasjon
   A. Kjenner du mange som har emigrert (utvandret) fra hjemlandet ditt/kan du vurdere antall emigranter fra hjemlandet ditt?
   B. Er det noen forskjeller i migrasjonsmønsteret etter den 1. mai 2004 (innlemmelse i EU)? Hvorfor?
   C. Kan utvandring av arbeidskraft være negativ for landet ditt?
   D. Hvordan ser regjeringen i ditt hjemland på arbeidsutvandringen? (positivt/negativt/er ikke interessert?)
   E. Hvem har etter din mening størst fordel av ditt arbeid i Norge? (Norge/deg selv og din familie i Norge/din familie i hjemlandet/ditt land?)
   F. Hvilken betydning har din utvandring for ditt hjemland?

TUSEN TAKK SKAL DU HA!
Appendix 3

Intervjuu teemade nimekiri

Suur tänu, et leidsite aega minuga kohtumiseks!
Minu nimi on Ave Mølster ja ma õpin UMBs (Univeristy for Life Sciences) Ás’is. Minu magistritöö on teemal tööjõu väljaränne ida Euroopast Norrasse. Mul on plaanis küsitelda inimesi Eestist ja Poolast seoses nende tööga ja suhetega kodumaaga. Kõik informatsioon ja andmed intervjuu käigust on konfidentsiaalsed ja isiku anonüümsus on tagatud. Kas ma tohin intervjuu linti võtta? (Siis saan ma kontsentreeruda vestlusele ja ei pea märkmete võtmisega aega kulutama).
Kas teil on küsimusi enne kui me alustame?

LÜLITA DIKTOFON SISSE!

1. Üldine informatsioon
   A. Päritolu maa ja koht (linn või maakoht)
   B. Vanus
   C. Perekonnaseis
   D. Norras kaasas olevate perekonnaliikmete arv, kui üldse on kedagi, siis kes?
   E. Haridus
   F. Töökogemus

2. Informatsioon rände kohta
   A. Kui kaua on Norras oldud?
   B. Kuidas oli ärasõit plaanitud? (ammu aega tagasi/kiire otsus)
   C. Kas Eestist lahkimisel ja Norras sisse seadmisel oli ka piiranguid?
   D. Kas sa pidid oma lahkimisest ka mõnda (riigi)ametnikku teavitama? Keda?
      (migratsiooniamet, omavalitsus, haigekassa, pensionifond)
   E. Norra keele oskus/õppimise aeg/põhjused keele mitte omandamiseks
   F. Norra kultuur/erinevused oma kultuurist?
   G. Põhjused emigreerumiseks
      ➢ Töö
      ➢ Suurem sissetulek
      ➢ Heaolu ühiskond
      ➢ Konfliktid kodus
      ➢ Perekondlikud/isiklikud põhjused
      ➢ Lisa sissetuleku teenimine perele
      ➢ Seiklushimu
      ➢ Õpingud
      ➢ Muud põhjused
3. Kontakt kodumaaga
   A. Kodumaa külastuskordade arv aasta jooksul, kui on üldse
   B. Suhted kodumaaga
      ➢ Pere/majanduslik toetamine?
      ➢ Külalastime puhkuse ajal – „puhkuse turism”
      ➢ Investeeringud
      ➢ Muud kontaktid
   C. Kas suhted sõpradega on säilinud või hakkavad nõrgaks jääma?
   D. Kodumaale tagasipöördumise plaanid, miks/miks mitte/kui jah, siis millal?
   E. Millised muutused kodumaal mõjutaksid sinu tagasi pöördumist
      ➢ Suuremad palgad
      ➢ Paremad elamistingimused
      ➢ Muud tegurid

4. Töö
   A. Töövaldkond( amet) kodumaal /Norras
   B. Palk kodumaal, Norras – kui suurem, siis mitu korda
   C. Tööolukord samas töövaldkonnas, kas on palju tööösi/ või on puudus?
   D. Kas kodus töötmisel oli takistusi/probleeme
      ➢ Madal palk
      ➢ Töö ei olnud hinnatud/ebapopulaarne
      ➢ Liiga raske töö
      ➢ Motivatsiooni puudumine
      ➢ Kolleegid
      ➢ Töötingimused

5. Rände tagajärjed
   A. Kui paljud lähevad välismaale tööle, elama/kui suur on nende inimeste arv kes lahkuvad?
   B. Kas peale 1.maid 2004 (Euroopa Liiduga liitumine) on olnud muutusi väljarände suhtes? Miks?
   C. Kas tööalane väljaränne Eestist võib riigile mingil moel kahjulik olla?
   D. Mis on sinu riigi arvamus tööjõu väljarände suhtes? Positiivne või negatiivne?
   E. Kes saab köige rohkem sinu Norras töötamisest kasu, Norra riik/sina ise/sinu kodumaa?
   F. Kuidas (millisel moel) mõjutab sinu Norrasse tulek sinu riiki?

AITÄH TEILE!
Appendix 4

Key informant interview

Thank You again for meeting up for interview!
My name is Ave Mølster and I come from Estonia. I am studying at the University at Ås (UMB-University of Life Sciences). (I am doing my masters in developing studies). My thesis is about labour emigration from Eastern Europe to Norway. I will have interviews with people from Estonia and Poland. I will ask the interviewees about their patterns of migration, work, and relations with home country. This interview will be for gathering some additional information from the “field experts”.

Is it okay if I record the interview? (Then I can concentrate more during the interview and it is not so easy to miss out Your points)
Do You have any questions before we start?

TURN ON THE RECORDER!!!!

1. What are the main reasons for emigrating from your country?
   A. Job
   B. Higher income
   C. Welfare society
   D. Conflicts at home
   E. Family/personal reasons
   F. Additional income for the family
   G. Looking for adventure
   H. Studies
   I. Other

2. Is the emigration of skilled workers seen as a threat for your country’s development?
   How? Is there a brain drain?

3. How many people are emigrating temporarily, permanently or seasonally? Which type of emigration is less preferable for your county, in which ways?

4. What is your country doing to deal with the emigrating labour force?
   A. Policies towards emigration
B. Restrictions for emigration
C. Supporting emigration

5. In which ways do the migrants keep contact with the home country, if at all?
   A. Remittances
   B. Visiting during holidays
   C. Investing
   D. Other

6. In which ways are emigrants benefiting/suppressing your country’s development?

7. What would in your opinion be the best solution for dealing with emigration?

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR TIME!!!
Appendix 5

Intervjuu võtmeisikuga

Suur tänu, et leidsite aega minuga kohtumiseks!
Minu nimi on Ave Mølster ja ma õpin UMBs (Univeristy for Life Sciences) Ås’sis. Minu magistritöö on teemal tööjõu väljaränne ida Euroopast Norrasse. Mul on plaanis kättesada inimesi Eestist ja Poolast seoses nende tööga ja suhetega kodumaaga. Intervjuu võtmeisikuga võimaldab saada ülevaadet väljarändest ja sellega seonduvatest probleemidest eksperdi vaatenurgast. Kas ma tohib intervjuu linti võtta? (Siis saan ma keskenduda vestlusele ja ei pea märkmete võtmisega aega kulutama).
Kas teil on küsimusi enne kui me alustame?

LÜLITA DIKTOFON SISSE!

8. Mis on Eestist väljarände põhilised põhjused?
   A. Töö
   B. Suurem sissetulek
   C. Heaoluühiskond
   D. Konfliktid kodus
   E. Pere/isiklikud põhjused
   F. Lisa sissetuleku teenimine perele
   G. Seiklushimu
   H. Õpingud
   I. Muud põhjused

9. Kas (haritud) tööjõu väljaränne on Eesti riigi arvates oht riigi edasisele arengule? Kuidas? Kas Eestist toimub „ajude äravool“?

10. Kui paljud lahkuvad ajutiselt, alaliselt, hooajati? Millist väljarände tüüpi eelistab Eesti riik kõige vähem, miks?

11. Millisel viisil hoiavad rändurid kontakti oma kodumaaga, kui üldse hoiavad kontakti?
    A. Raha ülekanded
    B. Eesti külalastamine puhkuse ajal
    C. Investeeringud
    D. Muud võimalused
12. Mida võtab Eesti riik ette tööjõu väljarände suhtes?
   A. Poliitilised otsused väljarände suhtes
   B. Väljarände piiramine
   C. Väljarände soodustamine

13. Millisel viisil toovad väljarändajad kasu/kahju oma riigi arengule?

7. Kuidas mõjutab väljaränn Eesti riigi arengut?

8. Milline oleks Teie arvates parim lahendus väljarände suhtes?

AITÄH TEILE!