July 2018
Volume: 15, **No**: 3, pp. 437 – 451
ISSN: 1741-8984
e-ISSN: 1741-8992
www.migrationletters.com

Article History: Received: 28 August 2017 Accepted: 28 May 2018.

CASE STUDY:

Employment of Return Migrants in Turkey: Evidence from the Labour Force Survey

Deniz Yetkin Aker [±]
Ayhan Görmüş [¥]

Abstract

Based on Labour Force Survey data conducted by Turkish Statistical Institute, this study aims at discussing economic integration of return migrants in general and determining whether there are significant differences between return migrants and non-migrants in terms of the effects of demographic factors and work-status nominators on their employment. The study argues that the returnees face far more employment challenges compared to non-migrants. The results of the study suggest that holding a university or postgraduate degree facilitates the employment of returnees to a certain degree. However, lower levels of educational attainment, employment lacking social security and micro-sized establishments pose several challenges.

Keywords: International migration; return migrants; Turkish nationals; Turkish labour market; economic integration.

Introduction

Since the 1940s, immigration has become a main dynamism throughout the world. The volume of migration has grown in traditional migrant-receiving countries such as Canada and Australia and immigrants' home countries have shifted away from Europe toward Asia, Africa, and Latin America (Massey et. al., 1993). In a broad sense, the literature on international migration discusses 'the experiences of individuals leaving their homeland, on the losses involved, and on the complex process of acculturation' (Tannenbaum, 2007).

The return migration, yet, has been rarely studied.[1] It is generally assumed that return migrants come back to their home countries as 'additional human capital'

[±] Deniz Yetkin Aker, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Namık Kemal University, Tekirdağ, Turkey. E-mail: denizyetkin8@gmail.com.
[¥] Ayhan Görmüş, Department of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations, Namık Kemal University, Tekirdağ, Turkey. E-mail: agormus@nku.edu.tr.
Acknowledgement: We acknowledge the permission to use the Turkish Census micro data from Turkish Statistical Institute, Ankara, Turkey.
[1] Beside of political and sociological studies, there are also antropological studies focusing on international migration and return migration. For example, see Jansen.[1] Beside of political and sociological studies, there are also antropological studies focusing on international migration and return migration. As an example see Jansen, Stef, and Staff and Löfving eds. 2009. Struggles for Home. Violence, Hope and the Movement of People. New York: Berghahn Books (focusing on the meaning of home for immigrants). For further studies about international migration, see, for instance, Sirkeci, I. and Yüceşahin, M.M. (2014). Editörden: Türkiye'de

and their remittances provide a means of 'investment in small- and medium-sized businesses in the presence of capital constraints (see OECD, 2008)' (Piracha, 2010: 1141). On the other hand, Barcevicius (2016) argues, even if return immigrants could have better positions in the labour market because of information asymmetry, employers would experience some difficulties to appraise their skills and knowledge. Return migrants are more likely to work in low-skilled jobs (Barcevicius, 2016: 37), or they may experience difficulty reintegrating into the domestic labour market (Kveder and Flahaux, 2013: 223). Thus, it is worth to reveal whether returnees experience some challenges to enter the labour market and stay permanently. To this end, the present paper compares returnees and stayees to see the differences between them in terms of the effects of demographic and work-status factors on the employment.

There are several studies examining the employment and economic integration of return migrants, nevertheless, these studies do not present comparative approaches between return migrants and non-migrants (Kveder and Flahaux, 2013: 225). Various scholars underline, there is a variation in 'the labour market success of return migrants.'[2] Researches should therefore not underestimate such a variation or economic integration of returnees. Besides that, İçduygu (2012) highlights our knowledge of the return migration of Turkish citizens is largely very limited due to the lack of data. This single case study thus offer a comparative approach to find some evidence on economic integration of returnees by using data obtained from Turkish Household Labour Force Survey (HLFS). It mainly focuses on investigating the effects of demographic and work-related factors on the employment of returnees and non-migrants. However, we are unable to discuss the differences between the employment of returnees and non-migrants due to the question gaps in the survey. This resulted in some limitations for the study.

Countries could benefit from international migration (e.g. exchange of culture and experiences). To illustrate, migration could create a better prospect to stimulate economic growth for developing countries, so that countries should facilitate immigration and develop some mechanisms by supporting return migration and standardising recruitment agencies to increase economic growth (Lowell and Findlay, 2001). Nevertheless, return migration could help prompt economic growth if returnees are fully integrated economically. For instance, Turkey could benefit from returnees by improving integration of returnees into the labour market and getting benefit from their experiences abroad. Describing and analysing current situation of returnees in Turkey, the study can help

---

Göç Çalışmaları. GöçDergisi, 1(1):1-10; and Sirkeci, I. and Martin, P.L. (2016). Editorial: The Migration Conference and 13 years of Migration Letters. Migration Letters, 13(3): 329-332.

[2] Some of them are Hazans and Philips, 2011; Martin and Radu, 2012; Raul, Masso, and Motsmees, 2014, see in Barcevicius op. cit., p. 35.

Turkish policymakers to find better strategies for encouraging return migration and integrating returnees economically.

The following section is part of the literature review that discusses previous studies on return migration in general and more specifically return migration in Turkey. Subsequently, "the Methods" section presents descriptive and logistic regression analysis and interprets key findings and the results. Thereafter, preliminary conclusions and some important policy implications are discussed.

Literature Review

The literature on international migration discusses and explains the reasons for return migration mostly basing on various propositions driven by migration theories, such as the neoclassical approach to international migration. In the same vein, several empirical studies generally seek to identify reasons for returning to the homeland[3]. Some scholars aimed at creating a model to explain 'migrations as decisions that respond to where human capital could be acquired more efficiently, and where the return to human capital was highest' (Dustmann et. al., 2011) In a German case study, Kırdar used 2000 version of the German Socio-Economic Panel (GSOEP) data and focuses on 'an oversampled group of immigrants from five Mediterranean countries, of which three were EU member states (Greece, Italy and Spain) and two were not (Turkey and ex-Yugoslavia)' (Kırdar, 2009: 420). He analyses reasons for return by testing 'the savings accumulation conjecture' and 'the effect of retirement situation on the labour market' (Kırdar, 2009: 420).

Occupations of returnees (whether they are skilled or non-skilled (Hunt, 2004)), and identity and belonging ('how older women migrants create their notions of "home" in relation to memory and nostalgia, as well as gender' (Zulueta, 2016)) are among the issues related to return migration. Given that it might be hard for returnees to reintegrate into the labour market in their home countries (Kveder and Flahaux, 2013: 223), it is more important to focus on the issue of economic integration of returnees.

Martin and Radu, for instance, examines returnees' economic integration and argue that they more likely opt for self-employment rather than dependent employment upon return and they generally spend their first years in their home countries as unemployed. (Martin and Radu, 2012). Some scholars underlined that 'the labour market success of return migrants did vary a lot, with some finding well-paid jobs and (or) creating their own businesses while others had to rely on their savings or social welfare to meet their life-costs.'[4]

---

[3] As an example, see C. Dustmann, 'Return migration, wage differential, and the optimal migration duration', *European Economic Review* migration duration', *European Economic Review* 47, 2003, pp. 353–369.

[4]Some of them are Hazans and Philips 2011; Martin and Radu, 2012; Raul, Masso, and Motsmees, 2014, see in Barcevicius op. cit., p. 35.

Similarly, Barcevicius (2016) explores the success of return migrants in Lithuanian labour market to see whether their previous experiences were recognised and useful. Following the analysis of a small-scale survey and interview data collected in Lithuania, Barcevicius' study revealed that most of the high-skilled returnees could find jobs easily enough. Most returnees anticipate they will run their own businesses in the home country in the future. His study suggests that experience gained abroad helps them to smoothly integrate into the labour market. Although it is not much applicable for high-skilled return migrants, Barcevicius' study showed that employers (with low percentages) preferred local experience in Lithuania. This finding supports the idea that 'most of the employers are distrustful of skills and knowledge gained in immigration, for a number of reasons as listed elsewhere.'[5] Unlike this inquiry, his study however discusses only high-skilled return migrants and investigates factors 'that sometimes helped them to get a job and sometimes hindered their integration into the labour market' (Barcevicius, 2016; 35).

Likewise, several studies deal with demographic variables in relation to economic integration. For instance, in Finland case study, scholars conducted a comparative analysis of the employment of returnees in 1999 and 2004. In their study, they compared people who migrated in different years and examined the employment of returnees in terms of their age, education and socioeconomic status. Ultimately, 'the 1999 group consists of individuals who were older and less educated, were more likely to have children and to be male than those who lived abroad in 2004 group' (Koikkalainen et. al., 2016; 52). The study also illustrated that the employment of returnees does not worsen because of international migration. In particular, recent migrants (2004) 'who left Finland moved to a wider variety of countries and were younger than former migrants (1999) and had a better socio-economic status.' Also, they were employed by high-paying jobs and had lower unemployment rates than their peers in the national labour market (Koikkalainen et. al., 2016; 63). Similar to Finland case study, this inquiry tries to investigate the effects of demographic variables such as age and education on the employment of returnees in Turkey; yet it compares stayees with returness as well.

There are relatively few studies comparing return migrants with non-migrants to figure out whether there is a difference between "being in a host country for a while and staying always at home" in the labour market. In Kveder and Flahaux's Dakar case study (2013), for instance, scholars aimed at 'finding some evidence on the labour market conditions of Senegalese returned migrants in the region of Dakar, the capital city'. Likewise this inquiry, they set up models with several control variables such as gender, education and marital status for

[5] See Parutis, 2014; Zvalionyte, 2014, in Barcevicius op. cit., p. 39

returnees and non-migrants. Their study demonstrated that it was easy for better-educated individuals to access high-skilled jobs, as well as for individuals with no education to become self-employed. The study found that having a formal educational attainment abroad did not help to find high-skill jobs. Thus, the study shows that 'the predominant type of business activity does not require high levels of (formal) human capital' (Kveder and Flahaux, 2013; 230).

International Migration and Return Migrants in Turkey

Turkey is accepted as a both sending and receiving country. For the last twenty years, migration flows from Turkey have reduced, however, Turkey is still regarded as one of 'the world's leading migrant-sending countries, with about 6% of its population abroad' (İçduygu, 2012; 30). A large-scale emigration from Turkey to several countries -such as Australia, Western European Countries and countries in the Middle East- has been experienced for the last 50 years (İçduygu, 2012; 11-12). Considering the economic migration, as Icduygu, Sirkeci and Muradoglu (2001) claim, "…the flow of Turkish workers to Western European countries began in the early 1960s, gathered momentum in the mid-1960s, expanded dramatically in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and ceased in the 1970s". More recently, for instance in 2011, almost 4 million Turkish immigrants started to live in European Countries, nearly 250 thousand Turkish people immigrated to Canada and the United States and almost 200 thousand people moved to Australia, the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), as well as the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Around 50% of immigrants returned to Turkey (İçduygu, 2012; 11-12). However, only a limited number of studies examining return immigrants discuss the reasons for the return migration decisions.

For instance, Sirkeci, Cohen and Yazgan' (2012) work on return migration of Turks and Kurds, posit that 'the growth of the Turkish economy and increases in social freedoms support an increase in immigration to Turkey.' İçduygu (2012) examined the return migration to Turkey and he described the movement as a constant movement between the host countries and Turkey. People migrated in these years spent a part of their year in Turkey and the rest of their year in their host country. This is because they do not want to cut their contacts with the social security systems, their houses and their relatives in Turkey and abroad (İçduygu, 2102; 20).

In another study on Turkish male returnees from Germany[6], scholars argue that reasons of the respondents for return are not only purely rational, but also emotional and related to values (Razum et. al., 2005; 732). Furthermore, Biffl

[6] For a detailed analysis of Turkish migrants returning from Germany, see, for instance, Sirkeci, I. and Zeyneloglu, S. (2014). Abwanderungaus Deutschland in die Türkei: Eine Trend wendeim Migrations geschehen? [Migration from Germany to Turkey: reversal of fortunes]. In: Alscher, S. &Krienbriek, A. (eds.) Abwanderung von Türkeistämmigen: Werverlässt Deutschland und warum?. Germany: BAMF, pp. 30-85.

(2013) postulated that the decision for the Turkish return migrants was generally related to 'the fast economic growth and shortages of skilled labour in Turkey.' In their study, Şenyürekli and Menjivar (2012) aimed to analyse the potential for 'return migration rather than the actual migration process.' They made interviews with Turkish immigrants in the USA to investigate the decision-making dynamics behind their returning to Turkey. Bilgili and Siegel (2014) concluded that highly skilled migrants are often called back to Turkey. On the other hand, Sunata (2014) analysed reverse brain drain and the effects of social networks on it. She carried out interviews with eleven Turkish participants to find out the reasons why Turks migrate to Germany, social network effects during their stay in Germany, and family network effects on the perception to return migration.

Nevertheless, neither of these studies gives much detail about their economic reintegration or employment in Turkey with empirical data. This study draws on economic reintegration and employment of return migrants using a comparative approach. The following section discusses survey results and provides preliminary conclusions.

Methods

Data

As part of the research, HLFS data set is collected from Turkish Statistical Institute (TSI). HLFS is the largest survey and data resource from labour supply-side on the basis of characteristics of the labour market. In 2014, the survey form with 105 questionnaires was filled out by 393,822 respondents.

The approach is based on the standard definition of employment in HLFS. The methodology of the study is mainly based on analysing the different effects of the demographic profile and the work-status nominators on the employment of return migrant and non-migrants, using binary logistic models. For the analysis, the definition of return migrants and non-migrants are taken from the answers to the question 'Have you lived abroad for 12 months and more by now?', as it is compatible with the return migrant definition of International Migration Law. In this respect, those who reply the question as 'yes' are recoded into return migrants, those who reply as 'no' are recoded into non-migrants. In the sample, 1,229 of the respondents' answers have been recoded as return migrants in employment, while 107,058 of respondents' answers are being recoded as non-migrants in employment

Dependent Variable

Our dependent variable, employment, is derived from the question 'Have you ever worked in a job to get an income in cash or kind in reference week?'[7]. In this regard, those who reply the question as 'yes' are recoded into the employment.

Independent Variables

The models in this study involve five main categories as possible predictors: Turkish National Employment Strategy alongside many studies highlight that youth and people aged 50 and over face several challenges in entering the Turkish labour market. Additionally, there are significant inequalities against females in terms of labour force participation (71.3 %for male, 30.3 % for female in 2014), employment (64.8 % for male, 26.7 %for female in 2014) and unemployment (9 % for male, 11.9 % for female in 2014) rates (TSI, 2014).[8] The first demographic variable, age bands, are recoded into four brackets: 15-29, 30-39, 40-49 and 50-64. Young adults (25-29) are incorporated into youth (15-24) due to small sample size. Another demographic variable, gender, is driven from respondents' self-reports to control the effect of gender differences on the employment of returnees and non-migrants.

Furthermore, education is a considerable indicator reflecting people's positions at work. In this study, education is divided into four main categories: university and postgraduate, vocational or technical high school, general high school and under high school. 'No qualification' is executed due to small sample size. Education refers to the highest qualification attained and is used to shed more light on the impact of education status on the employment (Cam, 2014).

In the literature, the contractual status and stability of employment are identified as the fundamental dimensions of job quality. The contractual status and stability of employment aim at controlling the decomposition points of employment: full-time or part-time, permanent or temporary for advanced economies and formal or informal for developing economies (Torres: 2012). These variables in the study have been used to measure flexibility and informality of employment on the basis of the respondents' self-reports to examine the quality of jobs done by returnees and non-migrants.

Finally, the category of workplace characteristics includes establishment size and the employment in public or private sectors. Establishment sizes refer to the number of employees in the workplace. The number of employees in the

---

[7] The requested micro data from Turkish Statistical Institute see <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/ UstMenu .do?metod=bilgiTalebi> (Last access on 1 September 2016).

[8] This is because women are forced into leaving the labour market either after getting married or giving a birth or they never enter the labour market due to socio-cultural reasons for opposing women's participation in working life. Therefore, it is worth to examine these demographic factors affecting the employment of returnees.

workplace is recoded into three bands: micro-sized (≤10), small-sized (11-49) medium and large-sized (≥50) establishments. The second variable is drawn from respondents' self-reports to search public or private sector dimensions of employment for return migrant and non-migrants.

Analytical Technique

Logistic regression used is beneficial to model binary outcomes and predicts the probability of several phenomena. The dependent dichotomous variable is whether respondents work to get a wage income. The binary response is yes/no. Logistic models predict the possibility of employment for return migrants and non-migrants.

In table 2, independent variables have been added stepwise to separate and joint logistic regression models in sequential blocks. The blocks in Table 2 are divided into five broader categories of independent variables considered. In Model I, the demographic variables have been used and afterwards, education has been incorporated into Model II, the informal employment into Model III, the workplace characteristics into Model IV and the flexible work into Model V, respectively. Neither the order of variables within the blocks nor that of blocks within the models makes a statistically significant difference in the results.

Descriptive Results

In Table 1 below, chi-square test results of the analysis have been presented for return migrants and non-migrants.

Referring to the demographic profile, there is a significant relationship between the male return migrants and non-migrants in the 40-49 age band in terms of employment. In this regard, 65.3% of the return migrants in 40-49 age band are significantly more likely to be employed, as opposed to non-migrants (57.8%); and half of the male return migrants (50.9%) are significantly less likely to work, as opposed to men stayees (63.2%).

As Table 1 illustrates, with respect to education, there are significant differences between skilled return migrants and skilled stayees with a university or postgraduate degree and a high school degree ($p<.001$) in terms of employment. 32.3% of skilled return migrants with a university or postgraduate degree are significantly less likely to be employed, compared to non-migrants (39.9%). Likewise, 41.9% of return migrants with a general high school degree are significantly less likely to be employed, as opposed to non-migrants (51.1%). Apparently, having a higher educational attainment does not guarantee to get an employment for returnees in Turkish labour market conditions.

Table 1. Employment rates and chi-square results

		Returnees		Non-migrants	
		N[a]	%[b]	N[a]	%[b.c]
Age Bands	15-29	124	50.2	23,614	41.9**
	30-39	316	64.5	33,974	60.1*
	40-49	421	65.3	30,128	57.8***
	50-64	303	34	17,234	30.7*
Gender	Female	309	26	31,750	24.9
	Male	920	50.9	75,308	63.2***
Education	University or postgraduate	412	32.3	46,506	39.9***
	Voc. or tech. high school	105	33.5	10,592	41.3**
	General high school	137	41,9	9,580	51.1***
	Under high school	549	63.1	33,950	66.5*
Formal or Informal	Informal employment	273	21	27,754	24.9***
Flexible Work	Part-time work	90	6,9	11,010	9,9***
	Temporary work	90	9	7,996	9.4
Establishment size	≤10 workplace	531	40.8	51,176	45.8***
	11-49 workplace	288	22.1	24,964	22.4
	50 + workplace	482	37	35,494	31.8***
Public or Private	Employment in private sectors	928	71.8	82.870	75.1**

Source: Authors' analysis from Turkish Household LFS, 2014
a Sample size is weighted and grossed out.
b Distributions as (column) % of all in each category.
c Chi-square results are for the gap between returnees and non-migrants in each line: *p< .05, **p< .01,***p< .001

From the point of informal employment and flexible work, there is a significant relationship between returnees and non-migrants in terms of informal employment and part-time working (p<.001). The proportion of returnees who work informally (21%) is significantly lower than stayees (24.9%). Similarly, return migrants (6.9%) are significantly less likely to be employed in part-time jobs, compared to non-migrants (9.9%). These figures imply that returnees are far less likely to face poor employment conditions than stayees.

Finally, as for workplace characteristics, the figures display that there is a significant relationship between returnees and non-migrants in terms of employment in micro-sized as well as middle and large-sized establishments (p<.001). Although 40.8% of return migrants are significantly less likely to be employed by micro-sized enterprises, compared to non-migrants (45.8%), the proportion of return migrants (37%) are significantly more likely to work in middle and large-sized establishments, as opposed to non-migrants (31.8%). Admittedly, there is not any significant difference between returnees and non-migrants in terms of employment in private sectors, however, 71.8% of returnees are less likely to be employed by private sectors, as opposed to non-migrants (75.1%).

Overall, these figures display that returnees face more challenges to get a job in Turkish labour market than non-migrants with a varying degree of influence across the benchmarks used in Table 1.

Logistic Regression Models

In Table 2, both separate and joint logistic regression models are presented to predict the influences of independent variables on the employment for returnees and non-migrants. Reference categories are defined in the last category of bivariate analysis for each predictor variable.

Model 1 includes only demographic factors and indicates that the age bands and gender have significant influences on the employment of non-migrants ($p<.001$). However, the model did not find significant differences between reference category (50-64 age band) and the other age bands to explain the likelihood of employment for returnees. The likelihood of employment in the 15-29 age band, for example, is significantly one and a half times higher for non-migrants ($OR=1.50$, $p<.001$), compared to the reference category. Gender is a strong predictor for non-migrants ($p<.001$), while being a weaker predictor for returnees ($p<.05$). It means that female demonstrates a significantly lower likelihood of employment for non-migrant ($OR = 0.46$, $p<0.001$), as opposed to male.

Model 2 aims to integrate the educational attainments into the analysis. Education has a strong effect on the employment for non-migrants ($p<.001$), while having a weaker impact for returnees ($p<.05$). In Table 2 below, as the educational attainment rises up for non-migrants, the likelihood of employment increases in a linear mode. University or postgraduate degrees, for instance, present significantly more than four times higher likelihood of employment for non-migrants ($OR = 4.17$, $p<0.001$), compared to under high-school degrees. The likelihood of employment for skilled returnees with a university or postgraduate degree ($OR = 2.71$, $p<0.05$), for example, is more than two times higher than returnees with a degree under high-school. The figure means that a university or postgraduate degree makes employment opportunities strengthen for returnees in a certain degree. Essentially, this result confirms Kveder and Flahaux's study (2013) reported that it was easy for better-educated returnees to access high-skilled jobs.

The reflections of education increased the influence of gender and the 15-29 age band for both returnees and non-migrants on the analysis while eradicating the significance of gender for returnees.

Table 2. Employment of returnees and non-migrants

	Odds Ratios for Returnees					Odds Ratios for Non-migrants				
	Model I	**Model II**	**Model III**	**Model IV**	**Model V**	**Model I**	**Model II**	**Model III**	**Model IV**	**Model V**
Demographic Profiles										
Age Bands						***	***	***	***	**
15-29	6.45	8.70*	9.55*	8.14	7.98	1.50***	1.60***	1.66***	1.25**	1.21*
30-39	0.62	0.77	0.86	0.81	0.82	1.07	1.17*	1.25**	1.03	1..03
40-49	0.72	0.82	0.90	0.97	0.99	1.28**	1.24**	1.32***	1.24**	1.24**
50-64	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Gender (Female)	0.49*	0.59	0.54	0.59	0.59	0.46***	0.55***	0.54***	0.55***	0.56***
Education		*		*	*		***	***	***	***
University or postgrad.		2.71*	2.16	1.22	1.05		4.17***	3.51***	1.56***	1.45***
Voc. or tech. high school		1.71	1.59	0.97	0.93		3.06***	2.87***	1.72***	1.66***
General high school		4.81*	4.44*	3.23	3.17		2.02***	1.93***	1.24*	1.19*
Under high school		I	I	I	I		I	I	I	I
Informal employment			4.09	4.60	3.71			2.87***	1.72***	1.48**
Workplace characteristics										
Establishment size				*	*				***	***
≤10				0.35**	0.34**				1.71***	1.68***
11-49				0.53	0.52				0.83***	0.84***
50 +				I	I				I	I
Private Sectors				3.74***	3.82***				2.90***	2.86***
Flexible Work										
Part-time work					1.74					0.60***
Temporary work					3.11					3.37***
Δ df	5	8	8	8	8	5	8	8	8	8
-2 LLR	421.5	409.3	406.7	387.7	385.7	15326.9	14663.3	14594.1	14167.5	14094.5
Δ -2 LLR		12.2	2.6	19	2		663.6	69.2	426.6	73
Significance *of* Δ -2 LLR		*	*	*			*	*	**	*

Source: Authors'analysis from Turkish Household LFS, 2014. Significance of difference from the reference category: *p< .05, **p< .01, ***p< .001

Model 3 incorporates informal employment, one of the most substantial employment problems in Turkey, into the analysis. Informal employment is a strong predictor for non-migrants. The likelihood of informal employment is significantly more than two times higher for non-migrants (OR=2.87, p<0.001), while being more than four times higher for returnees (OR=4.09) than formal employment. This result partly supports Gmelch's study (1980) reported that return migrants faced relatively more difficulties to get a job or even if they get a job, they are forced to accept lower wages and poor working conditions.

Joining the informal employment into the analysis strengthened the effects of age bands for both returnees and stayees while weakening the effects of education.

Model 4 brings in workplace characteristics to the analysis. Establishment size has a strong impact on the employment for stayees ($p<.001$) whilst creating a weak effect for returnees ($p<.05$). In this regard, micro-sized establishments illustrate a lower likelihood of employment for returnees (OR=0.35, $p<.01$), compared to medium and large-sized establishments, while displaying a significantly higher likelihood of employment for stayees (OR=1.71, $p<.001$). Referring to Table 2, as establishment size grows up for returnees, the likelihood of employment increases from bottom to up. From the employment point in private sector of view, it is a strong predictor for both returnees and stayees ($p<.001$). In this context, private sectors highlight significantly more than three times higher likelihood of employment for returnees (OR=3.74, $p<.001$), compared to public sectors, while displaying significantly almost three times higher likelihood of employment for stayees (OR=2.90, $p<.001$).

Incorporating workplace characteristics into the analysis weakened the impacts of age bands, education and informal employment on the model.

Model 5 integrates flexible work into the analysis. Therefore, all independent variables for the analysis have been put into Model 5. It proves that flexible work variables have strong effects on the employment for non-migrants ($p<.001$), while generating no significance for returnees. As shown in Table 2, Model 5 suggests that although part-time working illustrates a significantly lower likelihood of employment for non-migrants (OR=0.60, $p<.001$), as opposed to full-time working; temporary work presents a significantly higher likelihood of employment for non-migrants (OR=3.37, $p<.001$), compared to permanent work . Admittedly, the likelihoods of part-time and temporary work are higher for returnees (in turn OR=1.74 and OR=3.11), compared to their reference categories, however, these differences are not significant statistically. The reason for higher temporary work is that this question in the survey also covers working types such as seasonal working, daily working and occasional working contracted or uncontracted which are seen prevalently in Turkey.

Including flexible work into the analysis, flexible work effect reduced the impact of the 15-29 age band, education, informal employment and establishment size on the analysis for both returnees and stayees. However, the reflection of flexible work strengthened the influence of private sector for returnees, while weakening the effect of private sector for stayees.

Conclusions

To contribute studies on the employment, the study intended to explore the effects of the demographic factors and work-status nominators on the employment of return migrants and non-migrants. The logistic regression models revealed several significant differences between returnees and non-migrants in terms of the impact of the demographic and work-status factors on the employment.

This study suggests that return migrants face a series of employment challenges compared to non-migrants in terms of education, informal employment and flexible working. The study originally found that higher educational attainments made their employment possibilities increased. Admittedly, the influence of education on the employment is more ambiguous for return migrants, however, skilled return migrants with a university or postgraduate have partly more advantage than other education groups. Also, youth returnees in the 15-29 age band get higher employment opportunities than the other age bands. Moreover, returnees are far more affected by informal work, which is a work type lacking social security than stayees. Besides, return migrants are more likely to get employment opportunities in medium and large-sized entrepreneurs and private sectors, while micro-sized entrepreneurs and public sectors are offering fewer employment prospects for them.

It is supposed that these results will be guidance for policy-makers to improve several policies related to returnees in Turkey. For this reason, if Turkey could facilitate immigration and reintegration by including several mechanisms, such as supporting return migration and standardizing recruitment agencies, economic integration of return migrants in Turkey could be improved. Therefore, as Lowell and Findley suggested, developing countries like Turkey would benefit far more from international migration.

As for employment problems of returnees in Turkey, there is not any specific active or passive employment program intended for return migrants. Firstly, in terms of passive employment policy, in accordance with the Unemployment Insurance Law no. 4447, citizens can be benefited from unemployment allowances for certain times on the condition of a certain number of insured-working days[9]. However, return migrants could not be benefitted from unemployment allowance. It means that return migrants could not benefit from unemployment allowance due not to be eligible for the condition of a certain number of insured-working days. In addition, theoretically, as the time spent unemployed lengthens for returnees, the possibility of getting a job reduces day by day. Secondly, there is not any specific active employment program that

[9] 600 days insured-working for 120 days allowance, 900 days insured-working for 240 days allowance, 1080 days insured-working for 300 days allowance

could facilitate or accelerate social integration and employability of return migrants, such as training and retraining programs as well as reintegration programs run by formal labour market agencies. Because of these problems, necessary measures should be taken by policy-makers in terms active and passive employment policy.

Finally, we suggest for further research on employment conditions of returnees and stayees in Turkey. A more comprehensive analysis can be performed if TUIK extends the content of the HLFS by adding some questions such as reasons for migration and return and their tenure abroad.

References

Barcevicius, E. (2016). "How Successful are Highly Qualified Return Migrants in the Lithuanian Labour Market?". *International Migration,* 54 (3): 35-47.

Biffl, G. (2013). "The Role of Migration in Economic Relations between Europe and Turkey". *European Review*, 21(3): 372–381.

Bilgili, Ö and Siegel, M. (2014). "Policy Perspectives of Turkey Towards Return Migration: From Permissive Indifference to Selective Difference". *Migration Letters*, 11 (2): 218 – 228.

Cam, S. (2014). "Non-unionized Migrant Workers in Britain: Evidence from The Labour Force Survey for a Triple-challenge Model". *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 35(3): 531–556.

Cassarino J. P.(2004)."Theorizing Return Migration: The Conceptual Approach to Return Migrants Revisited". *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 6 (2):253 - 279.

Dustmann, C., Fadlon, I. and Weiss, Y. (2011). "Return Migration, Human Capital Accumulation and the Brain Drain". *Journal of Development Economics*, 95: 58–67.

Gmelch, G. (1980). "Return Migration". *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 9: 135-159.

Hunt, J. (2004). "Are migrants more skilled than non-migrants? Repeat, Return, and Same-employer Migrants". *Canadian Journal of Economics / Revue Canadienned' Economique*, 37 (4): 830-849.

İçduygu, A, Sirkeci, İ. and Muradoğlu, G. (2001). "Socio-Economic Development and International Migration: A Turkish Study*". International Migration*, 39 (4): 39-61.

İçduygu, A. (2012). "50 Years After the Labour Recruitment Agreement with Germany: The Consequences of Emigration for Turkey". *Perceptions*, 17 (2): 11-36.

Jansen, Stef, and Staff an Löfving eds. 2009. Struggles for Home. Violence, Hope and the Movement of People. New York: Berghahn Books.

Kırdar, M. G. (2009). "Labour market outcomes, savingsaccumulation, andreturnmigration". *LabourEconomics,* 16: 418–428.

Koikkalainen, S., Linnakangas, R. And Suikkanen, A. (2016)" Does International Migration Pay Off? The Labor Market Situation of Finnish Return Migrants Based on Longitudinal Register Data,".*Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 6 (4): 49-66.

Kveder, C.L.M. and Flahaux, M.L. (2013)."Returning to Dakar: A Mixed Methods Analysis of the Role of Migration Experience for Occupational Status". *World Development*, 45: 223–238.

Lowell, B. L. and Findlay, M. (2001). "Migration of highly skilled persons from developing countries: impact and policy responses" *Draft Synthesis Report of Project INT/01/M09/UKM: Skilled Labour Migration (The 'Brain Drain') from Developing Countries: Analysis of Impacts and Policy Issues*, Geneva, UK: ILO.

Martin, R. and Radu, D. (2012). "Return Migration: The Experience of Eastern Europe". *International Migration*, 50 (6): 109-127.

Massey, D. S., ArangoJ., Hugo G., Kouaouci A., Pellegrino A., and Taylor J. E. (1993). "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal". *Population and Development Review*, 19 (3): 431–466.

Piracha, M. (2010). "Return Migration and Occupational Choice: Evidence from Albania". *World Development,* 38 (8): 1141–1155.

Razum, O., Sahin-Hodoglugil, N.N. and Polit, K. (2005). "Health, Wealth or Family Ties? Why Turkish Work Migrants Return from Germany".*Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31 (4): 719-739.

Sirkeci, I, Cohen J. and Yazgan P. (2012). "Türk Göç Kültürü: Türkiye ile Almanya Arasında Göç Hareketleri, Sosyo-Ekonomik Kalkınma ve Çatışma" (Turkish Culture of Migration: Flows between Turkey and Germany, Socio Economic Development and Conflict). *Migration Letters*, 9 (4): 373-386.

Sirkeci, I. and Yüceşahin, M.M. (2014). "Editörden: Türkiye'de Göç Çalışmaları." *Göç Dergisi*, 1(1):1-10.

Sirkeci, I. and Zeyneloglu, S. (2014). Abwanderungaus Deutschland in die Türkei: EineTrendwendeim Migrationsgeschehen?. In: Alscher, S. &Krienbriek, A. (eds.) Abwanderung von Türkeistämmigen: Werverlässt Deutschland und warum?. Germany: BAMF, pp. 30-85.

Sirkeci, I. and Martin, P.L. (2016). "Editorial: The Migration Conference and 13 years of Migration Letters."*Migration Letters*, 13(3): 329-332.

Sunata, U. (2014). "The Role of Social Networks on Reverse Brain Migration: Migration Experience and Perceptions of Turkish Engineer Returnees from Germany". *Turkish Psychological Articles,* 17(34): 97-100.

Şenyürekli, A. R. and Menjivar, C. (2012). "Turkish Immigrants' Hopes and Fears around Return Migration". *International Migration*, 50 (1): 3-19.

Tannenbaum, M. (2007). "Back and Forth: Immigrants' Stories of Migration and Return". *International Migration,* 45 (5): 147-174.

Turkish Statistical Institute (TSI). (2014), Turkish Household Labour Force Survey Micro Data Set.

Turkish Statistical Institute (TSI). (2014), Statistical Tables and Dynamic Search, Labour Force Statistics, (http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1007 Accessed on 19.11.2017).

Torres, R. (2012). ILO World of Work Report 2012: Better Jobs for a Better Economy, International Labour Office, International Institute for Labour Studies, Geneva

Zulueta, J. (2016). "Memory, Nostalgia and the Creation of "Home": a Returnee Woman's Journey". *Migration Letters,* 14 (2): 263-272.