Factors determining return migration of Goan emigrants

Roy Gomes[1+]
Sarath Chandran[2]

[1]Goa Business School, Goa University and Fr. Agnel College of Arts and Commerce, Pilar Goa, India.
Email: roy.gomes69@gmail.com
[2]Goa Business School, Goa University, India.
Email: sarath@unigoa.ac.in

(+ Corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

Goa is a small, progressive state in India and a former Portuguese colony with a long history of international migration, experiencing return migration in recent periods. The study attempts to locate the significant factors causing the return migration of Goans into the State. The study uses primary data collected from 400 return migrants on twenty-two attributes responsible for their return. An Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is used to determine the factors responsible for return migration and compare them against their socioeconomic attributes. The EFA identifies six factors for return migration, namely, Workplace (W), Personal (P), Job-related (JR), Friends (F), Family (FA), and Facilities (FC). Family, Job-related, and Workplace factors are the main factors causing return migration, and international migration has helped them improve their quality of life and standard of living. The government should take proactive steps to utilize the skills and experience acquired by the return migrants by creating an enabling environment in the State and rehabilitating them based on their motivation to return to their home country. The study is significant for formulating the reintegration and rehabilitation policies for the return migrants who have significantly contributed to the State's economic development.

Contribution/ Originality: The study used Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to identify factors driving the return migration of Goan emigrants and compared how these factors are associated with their socioeconomic characteristics based on the primary data. The identified factors help understand the return migration dynamics and help policymakers take initiatives in host and home countries, thereby reducing premature return migration and fostering a sustainable migration cycle.

1. INTRODUCTION

Goa, a small state on the western coast of India, was a Portuguese colony from 1510 to 1961 and had a long history of international migration. During Portuguese colonization, many Goans migrated to Portugal and its colonies, such as Mozambique and Angola, for education and employment. In the post-liberation period, when it integrated into India, the migration pattern shifted. During the 1970s and 80s, skilled and semi-skilled Goans migrated to Gulf countries, mainly searching for better employment opportunities. During this period, professionals and students also migrated to Western countries like the USA, UK, Canada, and Australia for skilled professional jobs and educational purposes. Many push factors drive international migration from Goa. Migrants were attracted to diverse occupations, such as seafarers, professionals such as doctors, engineers, hospitality industry workers, and domestic workers. While this international migration continued till the recent period, a new phenomenon of return

95

migration is happening in the State, as many individuals who migrated to foreign countries started to return to their home state.

Return migration refers to the voluntary or involuntary act of migrants returning to their place of origin after a period of residence in a different region or country. Return migration is defined as "persons returning to their country of citizenship after having been international migrants (whether short-term or long-term) in another country and who are intending to stay in their own country for at least one year" (UNSD, 1988). In the context of international migration, the movement of persons returning to their country of origin after having moved away from their place of habitual residence and crossed an international border (International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2019). There are different types of return migration, such as voluntary, forced, seasonal, and circular. Voluntary return is the assisted or independent return to the country of origin, transit, or another country based on the voluntary decision of the returnee, whereas the forced return is a migratory movement that, although the drivers can be diverse, involves force, compulsion, or coercion. European Migration Network (2011) defines circular migration as "a repetition of legal migrations by the same person between two or more countries". According to the Global Forum on Migration and Development (2008) circular migration is "the temporary, recurrent movement of people between two or more countries mainly for purposes of work or study". For the purpose of this study, return migrants are defined as those who migrated to another country in search of better prospects and who were engaged in some productive activity in the new country for at least a minimum of five years and returned to their home country to settle permanently.

Return migration is a completion of the migration cycle, and understanding the process has significance at the national, State, and local levels. Studying the return migration provides insights on how migration networks work and how appropriate policies can be formulated on brain drain, reverse migration, and diaspora engagement. There is a constant movement of people in the globalized world where employment and remittances define international relations and how return migrants impact local and national identity, social integration, and cultural exchange between nations. The return migrants bring back capital investment, new skills, and entrepreneurial ventures, all of which significantly affect the host country's economic development. The present study is particularly significant in understanding how return migrants contribute to addressing Goa's aging population problem and revitalizing traditional industries such as tourism and agriculture. The return migrants with high disposable income, skill set, and experiences can start new entrepreneurial ventures and help the local economy. Reintegrating these migrants, assimilating them into the local community, and involving them in community development are important. Identifying factors driving return migration can help the host economies adopt sustainable migration policies and help home countries adopt suitable policies to absorb them productively.

Many theoretical perspectives have been developed over the years to explain the return migration of immigrants to their home country. These include Neoclassical theories (Todaro, 1969) New Economics of Labor Migration (NELM) (Stark & Bloom, 1985) Structural Approach (Cerase, 1974) Social Network Theory (Cassarino, 2004) Transnationalism (Schiller, Basch, & Blanc-Szanton, 1992) Diaspora Theory (Cohen, 1997) Push-pull theory (Lee, 1966) and Circular Migration Theory (Constant & Zimmermann, 2011). Push-pull theory Lee (1966) analyses economic, social, and political factors that push migrants to leave host countries and pull them back to their home countries. This theory looks at the return migration from the host and home country dimensions, covering all important factors; the present study used this theoretical framework to understand the factors responsible for the return of emigrants to Goa. Primary data, consisting of a sample of 400 return migrants who returned from foreign countries to Goa, was collected from across the State for analysis. The sample respondents were identified using a systematic sampling method, and the factor analysis method was used to identify the factors responsible for the return migration. Factor Analysis was identified for the analysis as it reduces multiple interrelated variables that influence return migration into simple factors that are important for policy formulation related to the reintegration

of these returnees into the local economy. In addition, the hypothesis tests were conducted to see whether these factors identified changes across demographic variables and activities undertaken after returning to the home.

The paper is divided into six sections. A brief introduction is provided at the beginning, covering the backdrop, research problem objectives, and methodological approaches. The Literature review of the relevant studies and identification of the research gap follows this. The third section provided the data and methods used in the study to explore the research questions. This is followed by the core of the analysis, which identified factors using an explorative factor analysis and related hypothesis test. The fifth section discusses the Results obtained from the analysis and highlights the reasons and the factors responsible for return migration. The concluding section provides the broad lesson drawn from the study and suggestions for policymakers to ensure that the contribution of these productive return migrants is absorbed for the development of the local economy.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW ON RETURN MIGRATION

2.1. Theoretical Reviews

Many theoretical expositions detail the return migration phenomenon. Neoclassical theories Todaro (1969) view return as a malfunction of the original migration, and presuppose that migrants return due to the mistake and miscalculation of their aspirations, disappointment, or complete let-down by the host nation. It can be due to misjudged migration costs and benefits (King, 2022) unsuccessful integration at the destination (Hein De Haas, Fokkema, & Fihri, 2015) +factors like relative prices, consumption preferences, and human capital accumulation (Dustmann & Weiss, 2007). These theories focused more on the failure angle of the return migrants rather than the actual factors responsible for their return.

New Economics of Labor Migration (NELM) sees return as a logical outcome of a planned strategy and views migration as a household decision to diversify risks and overcome market constraints (Stark & Bloom, 1985). Structural Approach Cerase (1974) focuses on how economic and social contexts in home countries shape return experiences and emphasizes the importance of "situational and contextual factors". Transnationalism Schiller et al. (1992) suggest migrants maintain links with both home and host countries, and return is part of a circular system of social and economic relationships. Social Network theory Cassarino (2004) emphasizes the role of social capital and networks in facilitating return, and it focuses on how migrants use social ties for successful reintegration. Diaspora theory Cohen (1997) explores how ethnic communities abroad maintain connections with homelands, and the return can be motivated by a desire to reconnect with ancestral roots. Push-pull theory Lee (1966) analyses factors that push migrants to leave host countries and pull them back to their home countries. It considers economic, social, and political factors in both locations. Human Capital theory Dustmann and Weiss (2007) focuses on how skills and knowledge acquired abroad influence return decisions. Return can be motivated by the desire to use newly acquired skills in the home country. Circular Migration theory Constant and Zimmermann (2011) view migration as a continuous movement between origin and destination, and return is seen as part of an ongoing process rather than a one-time event. These theories focus predominantly on economic factors, neglecting important social, cultural, and psychological motivations; transnational practices and identities; and overemphasizing voluntary return.

2.2. Empirical Reviews

Empirical substantiation of theoretical explanations of return migration was attempted by many scholars in the literature. Carling, Mortensen, and Wu (2011) conducted a systematic bibliography on return migration to develop the conceptual framework, theoretical background, and hypotheses for their research. Dustmann and Weiss (2007) studied optimal migration duration and showed that return migration is influenced by human capital accumulation, differences in purchasing power between host and home countries, and complementarities between consumption and location. Cassarino emphasized preparedness and resource mobilization as crucial factors in successful return migration (Cassarino, 2004). Socio-cultural and economic integration were explored by Hein De Haas and Fokkema

(2011) who said socio-cultural integration negatively influences return intentions, while economic integration has varying effects depending on the migrant group. Wahba (2015) showed that return migrants are often positively selected based on education and skills, and tend to perform better economically upon return (Wahba, 2015).

Gmelch (1980) identified economic factors, family and personal considerations, and patriotism/nostalgia as primary motivators for return migration, whereas Zhao (2002) identified human capital investment, savings accumulation, and family factors as major determinants of return migration decisions. A study on second-generation return migration showed that identity, belonging, and idealized notions of the ancestral homeland play crucial roles in second-generation return migration (King & Christou, 2010). Makina (2012) identified six factors, namely the reason for migrating, the number of dependents supported in the home country, the level of education, economic activity in the host country, the level of income, and the duration of stay in the host country, as statistically significant determinants of the return migration intentions.

A study by Carling and Pettersen (2014) found that return intentions vary systematically by gender, age, and migration history, and religious attainment and religiosity have a significant, independent effect on return intentions. Cobb-Clark and Stillman (2013) estimated a negative relationship between immigrants' retirement status and the aggregate return migration rate of their fellow citizens, and this link is strongest for immigrants near the retirement age. Migrants who are satisfied with their jobs and residences have significantly and substantially lower return intention probabilities than migrants who are dissatisfied with their jobs and/or residences (Waldorf, 1995). Income uncertainty in the host country increases the probability of return migration, especially for migrants from poorer countries (Bijwaard & Wahba, 2014). The entrepreneurial activities of return migrants, as looked into by Issifu (2018) showed that only finance appears to be a key impediment, with a direct relationship with returnees' entrepreneurial activities.

Batista and Cestari (2016) found that the social network at home seems to be the most important determinant of the migrant's intention to return home within five to ten years. In their study, Naveeda, Bhattib, and Ullahc (2017) observed that integration failure causes return migration and utilizes the potential (human capital and savings, etc.) of return migrants by providing them with employment and investment facilities for generating economic growth in the home country. Some studies looked into country-specific studies on return migration. Return intentions of immigrants in Norway showed that integration, transnational ties, and life cycle factors all play significant roles in shaping return intentions (Carling & Pettersen, 2014). A study on German guest workers showed that attachment to the host country's labour market reduces the likelihood of return, while connections to the origin country increase it (Constant & Massey, 2002). Though all the above studies focused on the reasons for return migration, they have not looked at all the pull and push factors of return migration comprehensively. The important factors, such as difficulties faced by the emigrants abroad, workplace conditions, and the network relationship with host communities, could have provided valid reasons and arguments for their return.

Many empirical studies attempted to identify attributes influencing return migration to the home country. Identifying these attributes is important to identify tangible factors in the case of Goan return migration. Ruben, Van Houte, and Davids (2009) identified pre- and post-return assistance, individual and family characteristics, position in the migration cycle, and living circumstances in the host country, enabling re-embedding for sustainable return as factors driving return migration. Employment is the main motive of migration abroad, and if it is in a situation of unemployment, it will force the migrant to return home (Bijwaard & Wahba, 2014). Health status is another major consideration for return migration. Handlos, Petersen, Bygbjerg, and Norredam (2018) found that disease prevalence and demographic characteristics, such as age and health status, are key determinants of return migration. Pulling factors in the home origin and pushing factors in displacement influence return decisions (Serrano, 2008). Gittins, Lang, and Sass (2015) identified factors determining return migration, including acquiring social capital abroad, re-configuring organizational human capital at home, and driving Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) internalization.

Large-scale brain drain due to migration and the building up of skilled human capital after return migration are the subjects of many empirical studies. Large-scale migration of skilled people from developing nations results in brain drain and creates a shortage of skilled people in these countries (Catia Batista, Lacuesta, & Vicente, 2012; Beine, Docquier, & Oden-Defoort, 2011). International migration helps improve skills, employability, and entrepreneurship, and through their return home, the host nations can take advantage of this brain gain for economic development (El-Mallakh & Wahba, 2016). The age of the migrant has a strong influence on their intention to return to their home locations (Jenjira, 2014). The likelihood of return migration is significantly lower for those whose prime motive is related to living conditions and salary abroad, and people's ties and connections to Estonia do not play a significant role in actually returning to Estonia (Toomistu, Lauren, Annist, & Murakas, 2024). Structural integration in destination does not significantly affect return intentions (Hein De Haas et al., 2015). Social, personal, economic, and policy factors were among the major drivers of return migration, but social and personal drivers were found to be the major motivating factors of decisions to return compared to policy and economic issues in sub-Saharan and African regions (Weldemariam, Ayanlade, Borderon, & Möslinger, 2023). The attributes identified through these studies helped identify twenty two attributes used in the Explorative Factor Analysis to identify the factors.

2.3. Research Gap

The literature review on return migration showed that studies were conducted for different nationalities across the countries, but there are very few studies conducted at the sub-national level to identify the factors leading to the return of Migrants. Also, Goa has a long history of migration, and not much has been studied on the various push and pull factors leading to the return of emigrants to the State. The Factor Analysis approach was not found to be used in the literature, and this makes the present study unique compared with other approaches to studying return migration dynamics. All the dimensions of push and pull, like workplace characteristics, personal attributes, job-related issues, and factors such as friends, family, and facilities available in the host countries, have not been studied adequately, which makes the present study important. How each identified factor influences the return migration adds value to the current study, which was sparsely found in the literature.

3. DATA AND METHODS

The study used both descriptive and analytical approaches to study the objective. A systematic sampling method is used to select the respondents. Goa has two districts, namely North and South, each with six talukas. Five villages from each taluka were identified, and for coastal talukas, three coastal and two non-coastal villages were selected for the study. Six persons were chosen from each village based on the information provided by the village panchayat office. A total of thirty respondents were interviewed from each taluka, which constituted 360 respondents. As coastal talukas contribute more to international migration, an additional 40 sample responses were included to get an adequate number of 400 sample respondents.

A structured interview schedule is used to collect the data. A structured questionnaire was designed to collect the primary data. The data collection instrument has three parts; the first part contains questions on the socioeconomic characteristics of the migrants to understand their background, the second part ascertains information on the various pull factors responsible for migration into the host country, and the last part covers questions on the reasons for the return migration to the home country. Based on the literature review, twenty-two variables responsible for return migration were identified, broadly classified into work-related, job-related, personal, family, friends, and facilities in the host country. The measured variables included in the schedule are 'to start a business', 'friends network', 'no medical facilities', 'harassment from the boss', 'tired of work', 'stress at work', 'to change jobs', 'discrimination at the workplace', 'to re-migrate', 'more working hours', 'unfriendly workers', 'low salary', 'low savings', 'poor living conditions', 'health issues', 'food issues', 'being homesick', and 'parent's health'.

The study used primary data from across the State for analysis. Four hundred return migrants who returned to Goa were collected for the study. In the study, a return migrant is one who migrated to another country in search of better prospects and who was engaged in some productive activity in the new country for at least a minimum of five years and returned to his home country.

An Explorative Factor Analysis (EFA) method is used to identify the factors responsible for the return migration of Goans. Factor Analysis is an ideal statistical tool to analyze the underlying factors driving return migration, as it identifies latent variables that explain the correlations among observed variables. Return migration decisions can be influenced by a range of interconnected factors which may not be directly observable. By applying Factor Analysis, researchers can reduce the dimensionality of the data, uncovering key factors or patterns that might explain the complex decision-making process behind return migration, leading to more focused and interpretable results for policy or academic purposes. The hypothesis tests were conducted to see whether the factors identified changes across demographic variables and activities undertaken after returning to the home state using t-tests and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) software was used to analyze the results.

4. ANALYSIS – PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

The profiles of the respondents show some interesting characteristics of these migrant categories. Table 1 shows that most return migrants are male (89%), and a small minority are female (44 respondents or 11%). This disproportionate representation is because the majority of the migrants from the State were male members taking the responsibility of seeking jobs abroad, unlike the female gender, who gives priority to family care.

Table 1. Socioeconomic profile of respondents.

Attribute	Category	No. of respondents	Percent
Gender	Male	356	89
	Female	44	11
	Total	400	100
Age	41-45	56	14
	46-50	246	61.5
	51-55	98	24.5
	Total	400	100
Marital status	Married	384	96
	Unmarried	16	4
	Total	400	100
Educational qualifications	Graduate	134	33.5
	HSSC	122	30.5
	SSC	144	36
	Total	400	100
Business after return	Restaurant	114	28.5
	Grocery	89	22.3
	Catering	143	35.8
	Beautician	7	1.8
	No business	47	11.6
	Total	400	100
Family members	Three	47	11.8
	Four	104	26
	Five	150	37.5
	Six	49	12.20
	Seven	50	12.5
	Total	400	100

Most of the return migrants are in the middle-aged group, with the highest percentage being in the age category of 46–50. This is followed by the age groups 51-55 and 41-45. The age structure of the return migrants showed that, as senior citizens, they would like to return to their roots for settlement. Most of the respondents are married (96-%), and they are educated with Secondary School Certificate (SSC) (36%), Higher Secondary School Certificate (HSSC) (30.5%), and Graduation (33.5%) qualifications. Many return migrants take up business activities after returning (88.4%), and only 11.6% are not involved in any business activities. Important business activities undertaken by the migrants include Restaurants (28.5%), Grocery (22.3%), catering (35.8%), and beauticians (1.8%).

4.1. Factor Analysis

The factor analysis method is used to understand which factors were responsible for their decision to return. From the literature survey, twenty-two variables were identified to use in the factor analysis to determine important factors responsible for the return migration of emigrants into the State of Goa. Hair Jr, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1998) suggest that a general rule is that there should be at least five observations for each independent variable.

This ratio is also advocated by Bryant and Yarnold (1995) and Costello and Osborne (2005). The present study fulfils this criterion by taking a sample size of 400.

To look into the suitability of the data collected for factor analysis, tests such as the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity are performed. The KMO index ranges from 0 to 1, with 0.50 considered suitable for factor analysis, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity should be significant ($p<.05$) for factor analysis to be suitable (Hair Jr et al., 1998; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The strength of the sampling adequacy is examined from the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value, which is 0.892, implying that the sample is large enough to proceed with factor analysis. The Bartlett test was found to be significant (p-value 0.000).

The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) method of factor extraction is used in the study as it is commonly used in factor analysis.

Many factor extraction criteria are available in the literature, including Kaiser's criteria (eigenvalue > 1 rule), the Scree test, the Cumulative percent of variance extracted, and parallel analysis. Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1995) point out that most factor analysts use multiple criteria to extract factors. In the case of Cumulative percentage of variance (criterion), the explained variance is commonly as low as 50–60% in the humanities (Hair et al., 1995; Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003).

Orthogonal Varimax rotation, first developed by Thompson (2004) is the most common rotational technique used in factor analysis, producing uncorrelated factor structures (Costello & Osborne, 2005). The rotated component matrix suggests a six-component solution (Table 2). The twenty-two items fit into six components. All items have factor loadings above 0.5. No cross-loadings were noticed, and hence, the results retained six constructs. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation for twenty-two items. The results depict that the PCA procedure has extracted six components with eigenvalues greater than 1.0, with the total variance explained for all six components to be 71.31% of the total variance, surpassing the suggested sixty percent threshold for the construct's validity.

The six components explained 71.31% of the total variance, where Component 1 contributed 23.50%, Component 2 - 13.16%, Component 3 - 12.78%, Component 4 - 7.76%, Component 5 - 7.69-, and Component 6 contributed 6.41. Table 2 depicts the final Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) with the twenty-two items and their factor loadings.

Table 2. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA).

Rotated component matrixᵃ							
Sub-construct	Item statement	Component					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
F1: Workplace	Discrimination	0.821					
	Harass boss	0.776					
	Stress at work	0.574					
	Unfriend workers	0.626					
	Tired of work	0.683					
	More work hrs	0.596					
	Low salary	0.782					
	Low savings	0.738					
F2: Personal	Start business		0.511				
	Change job		0.733				
	Poor living conditions		0.807				
	Health		0.786				
	Food		0.566				
F3: Job related	Retired			0.825			
	Exp contract			0.793			
	Terminated			0.802			
	Unemployed			0.821			
F4: Friends	Friends network				0.896		
	Re migrate				0.861		
F5: Family	Homesick					0.742	
	Parent health					0.695	
F6: Facilities	No med facilities						0.672
Extraction method: Principal component analysis.							
Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser normalizations							

Note: a. Rotation converged in 10 iterations.

4.2. Reliability Analysis

Table 3 shows the estimates for reliability underlying the reasons for return migration. The highest Cronbach's Alpha reliability index is 0.91, and the average of the six items is 0.6673, suggesting that the items are highly reliable and acceptable and are an excellent measure of the constructs.

Table 3. Reliability analysis.

Sub-constructs	No. of items	Cronbach's alpha
F1: Workplace	08	0.914
F2: Personal	05	0.821
F3: Job related	04	0.793
F4: Friends	02	0.613
F5: Family	02	0.588
F6: Facilities	01	0.275
Total	22	0.6673

An Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed on the twenty-two variables and was loaded under six factors. These factors influence the decision of return migrants. These six factors accounted for 71.92% of the total variance. Factors are named based on their common characteristics. Table 4 provides the factor loadings from the analysis.

F1: The Workplace consists of eight variables, which are about the place of work. Variables such as 'Discrimination', 'Harassment from Boss', 'Stress at Work', 'Unfriendly Workers', 'Tired of Work', 'More Work

Hours', and 'Low salary', 'Low savings' are loaded into this factor. 'F2: Personal', is the second factor derived in the study and is loaded with five variables: 'Start own business', 'Change job', 'Poor living conditions', 'Health issues', 'Food issues.' This factor reflects the personal aspects of the return migrants. F3: Job-related aspects reflect the attributes related to the job, like 'Retired', 'Expiry of Contract', 'Terminated', and 'Unemployed', that speak about the job-specific aspects of the return migrants.

Table 4. Factor analysis.

Measure items	Alpha	Initial eigenvalue	Variance explained %
F1: Workplace	0.914		
Discrimination	0.821		
Harassment from boss	0.766		
Stress at work	0.574		
Unfriendly workers	0.626	8.085	36.750
Tired of work	0.683		
More work hours	0.596		
Low salary	0.782		
Low savings	0.738		
F2: Personal	0.821		
Start own business	0.511		
Change job	0.733	2.227	10.121
Poor living conditions	0.807		
Health issues	0.786		
Food issues	0.566		
F3: Job-related	0.793		
Retired	0.825		
Expiry of contract	0.793.	1.775	8.067
Terminated	0.802		
Unemployed	0.821		
F4: Friends	0.613		
Friends network	0.896	1.228	
Re-Migrate	0.861		5.582
F5: Family	0.588		
Homesick	0.742	1.034	4.699
Parent health	0.695		
F6: Facilities	0.275	1.341	6.096
No medical facilities	0.672		
KMO sample adequacy		0.892	
Chi-square		7487.804	
df		325	
Bartlett's test of sphericity		0.000	

F4: Friends is the fourth factor, which is defined by variables such as 'Friends Network' and 'Re-Migrate' that have a relation with the people associated with the return migrant. Even though the 5th and the 6th factors, namely F5: Family and F6: Facilities, have a poor alpha value (George & Mallery, 1999) it is considered for further statistical analysis, taking into consideration their impact on this research output.

5. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

Factor 1: (Work Place) with a high Cronbach Alpha (0.914) has high reliability, indicating strong internal consistency among the workplace-related variables. It explains a substantial portion of the variance (36.750%), suggesting that workplace-related factors significantly influence the return migration decisions of emigrants. Workplace conditions, such as job dissatisfaction, lack of career progression, or hostile working environments, consistently drive migrants to return home. This is consistent with the results of previous studies. A study by Carling (2004) highlights that migrants often return back home when they encounter limited career growth

opportunities or dissatisfaction with the work environment in the host country. This is particularly common in lower-skilled jobs where migrants feel they have limited upward mobility. Another study by Cassarino (2004) emphasizes that economic instability in the host country, such as job loss or wage cuts, can prompt return migration, particularly when living costs exceed the perceived benefits of staying abroad.

Factor 2: (Personal) also exhibits a high reliability (alpha = 0.821) and explains 10.121% of the variance, suggesting that personal factors significantly affect return migration decisions. The result is consistent with studies that have found that personal responsibilities play a crucial role in influencing the return migration decision. King (2000) found that personal and family obligations are one of the strongest determinants of return migration among Southern Europeans, including those from Italy, Greece, and Portugal. Returnees often cite the need to care for elderly parents or reintegrate with their immediate family. Another study by Gmelch (1980) notes that the role of personal circumstances, such as marriage or the education of children, heavily influences the decision of many migrants to return to their home countries.

Factor 3 (Job Related) has a good reliability score (alpha = 0.793) and explains 8.067% of the variance, suggesting that job-related factors, particularly in terms of job stability and satisfaction, significantly affect return migration decisions. The result is consistent with Dustmann and Weiss (2007) who state that many migrants return when they perceive that their savings are sufficient to establish a better quality of life in their home country or when their job status in the host country becomes precarious. Another study by De Haas (2005) argues that migrants who fail to achieve their economic goals abroad, particularly in cases of unemployment or job mismatch, often opt to return, where their human capital might be better utilized or more valued.

Factor 4 Friends (alpha = 0.613) explains 5.582% of the variance, suggesting that job-related factors affect return migration decisions. Friends and social networks in both the host and home countries shape the migrant's decision-making process. A strong connection with one's home community can foster the desire to return, while weak social networks in the host country can accelerate the decision. A study by Levitt (2001) highlights the role of transnational social networks in the return migration decision-making process, strong ties to home communities provide emotional and logistical support, encouraging migrants to return. Another study by Waldorf (1995) suggests that individuals who maintain strong cultural and social ties with their home country are more likely to return than those fully integrated into the host country.

Factor 5 Family (Alpha = 0.588) explains 4.699% of the variance, suggesting that job-related factors affect return migration decisions. This shows that family responsibilities also influence the decision to return to care for ageing parents, reunite with children, or address other pressing family matters. This finding is consistent with King (2000) who found that family obligations are one of the strongest determinants of return migration among Southern Europeans, including those from Italy, Greece, and Portugal. Gmelch (1980) noted that the responsibilities in the family, such as marriage or the education of children, heavily influence the decision of many migrants to return to their home countries.

Factor 6 Facilities (Alpha = 0.275) explains 6.096% of the variance, suggesting that facilities abroad, especially medical and health-related concerns, particularly aging and the need for familial care, have been increasingly identified as significant factors prompting return migration. King and Christou (2010) showed how health and well-being concerns among aging migrants, particularly among retirees, drive the decision to return. Migrants may seek to return to more familiar healthcare systems or family support networks. Gupta and Ferguson (1992) found that many migrants express concern about healthcare in their host country, citing costs and accessibility, which leads them to return home where they feel more secure.

The findings of the study align well with the broader body of research on return migration. The workplace-related factors, personal circumstances, job status, social networks, and health issues all echo the experiences of other migrant communities, especially in Southern Europe and Latin America. Workplace-related factors are corroborated by studies focusing on the economic downturns in host countries, such as Carling (2004) research on

career dissatisfaction among lower-skilled workers. Personal Circumstances and Family obligations are consistently recognized in migration literature, as highlighted by King (2000) and Gmelch (1980) where family reunification or caregiving plays a crucial role in return decisions. Job Status and economic precarity are key themes in Dustmann and Weiss (2007) work, where financial objectives shape the timing of return migration. Social Networks and the emotional pull of the home country are central to Levitt (2001) findings, emphasizing how migrants with strong home ties are more likely to return. Health Concerns are prevalent in studies like King and Christou (2010) where aging migrants prioritize health care in familiar environments. The study reflects a broader global pattern, where a combination of workplace dissatisfaction, personal and familial responsibilities, job status, social networks, and health concerns drives the decision to return home. These findings are consistent with a growing body of research that highlights the nuanced and multifaceted nature of return migration.

5.1. Extent of Factors of Return Migration and Ranking Using One Sample T-Test

To understand the relative importance of six factors identified in the study, namely Workplace, Personal, Job-related, Friends, Family, and Facilities, a one-sample t-test is conducted on the mean value of the factor loadings with the mean value of the Likert scale, i.e., three. The following hypothesis is set to understand the effect of these factors, and the result is shown below.

$H_{0.1a}$: *The various factors that affect the return of migrants are at the average level.*

Table 5. One sample t-test measuring return migration.

SI no.	Factors behind return migration	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean difference	T value	P value	Rank based on mean
1	F1: Workplace	4.002	0.406	1.002	50.269	0.000*	3
2	F2: Personal	3.996	0.361	0.996	55.718	0.000*	4
3	F3: Job-related	4.022	0.558	1.022	39.031	0.000*	2
4	F4: Friends	3.755	1.212	0.755	12.408	0.000*	6
5	F5: Family	4.270	0.600	1.270	46.895	0.000*	1
6	F6: Facilities	3.920	0.421	0.920	43.862	0.000*	5

Note: * denotes significance at 5% level.

The one-sample t-test results indicate that all six factors have a mean significantly different from the neutral value of 3, as evidenced by their respective t-values and p-values ($p < 0.05$ for all factors). The null hypothesis is rejected for all factors at a 5% level of significance, and the p-value is less than 0.05, as there is a statistically significant difference between the mean value of all factors affecting the return migration and the average value of 3. Table 5 shows that the mean score of Factor -5, "Family," has the highest rank as the main factor influencing emigrants to return to their hometown.

The other factors, such as "Job-related," "Workplace," "Personal," "Facilities," and "Friends," follow the subsequent ranks as the factors influencing return migration. This confirms that these factors are significant influencers of return migration. The analysis demonstrates that family emerges as the most critical factor, while social connections with friends, though significant, are less influential than other factors. Understanding these motivations can help formulate policies and create environments that support returnees. By finding solutions to these problems, policymakers can create more supportive environments that encourage returnees to contribute positively to their communities.

5.2. ANOVA Test

The people who returned to Goa undertook different business activities such as 'Restaurants,' 'Grocery,' 'Catering,' and 'Beautician' or remained 'idle', doing none of the business activities. In order to comprehend the

factors for return migration, which varied across business activities undertaken by the emigrants, an ANOVA test was performed, and the following hypothesis was formulated to test the relationship.

H_o: *Motivational factors remained the same across return migrants who undertook different business activities.*

Table 6. Results of the ANOVA test between return migration factors and type of business.

Factors behind return migration	Type of business					F value	P value
	Restaurant	Grocery	Catering	Beautician	None		
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)		
F1: Workplace	3.998 (0.372)	3.975 (0.419)	3.992 (0.396)	4.000 (0.000)	4.086 (0.483)	0.990	0.496
F2: Personal	3.986 (0.315)	3.984 (0.408)	3.990 (0.344)	4.000 (0.000)	4.044 (0.437)	0.473	0.757
F3: Job-related	3.975 (0.586)	4.035 (0.577)	4.037 (0.533)	4.177 (0.122)	4.057 (0.549)	0.725	0.580
F4: Friends	4.030 (0.953)	3.900 (1.058)	3.620 (1.336)	4.355 (0.532)	3.120 (1.404)	6.629	0.000
F5: Family	4.245 (0.526)	4.225 (0.661)	4.285 (0.631)	4.346 (0.136)	4.320 (0.547)	0.982	0.418
F6: Facilities	3.900 (0.398)	3.930 (0.421)	3.950 (0.417)	4.000 (0.000)	3.850 (0.510)	0.632	0.640

Table 6 shows that the null hypothesis is rejected only in the case of "Friends" as the factor for returning to Goa ($p < 0.05$), and in all other factors, the null hypothesis failed to get rejected as the p-value is more than 0.05. The factor Workplace (F1) does not change among return migrants engaged in different business activities. This means workplace conditions are inducing the migrants to return, and they are open to taking business activities based on the opportunities available to them. Similarly, business activities undertaken by the return migrants do not change for those who return for Personal reasons. These migrants return home on personal grounds, such as family connections, cultural ties, or personal fulfillment, that appear to be similarly significant regardless of the type of business the returnee is involved in after their return. Business activities undertaken by the returnees do not change among those whose primary reasons to return are ─"Job Related" (F3), "Family" (F5), or "Facilities" (F6). Return migration due to "Job-related" (F3) factor is due to reasons such as job satisfaction, career opportunities, job security, or work conditions, while those who are returning for Family (F5) are due to reasons such as the desire to be closer to family members, fulfil family responsibilities, or address family needs. Those who are returning on the grounds of "Facilities" (F6) are doing so for reasons such as infrastructure, equipment, or working conditions, and it is not significantly different among those engaged in different economic activities.

There are significant differences in the economic activities undertaken by return migrants, whose primary reason for return is for the Friends (F4). These people give importance to friendship and social networks, which can influence the type of economic activities undertaken by these people. Their close association with friends helps them identify business activities where they have expertise and are in a position to help them. For instance, skilled business activities that demand skill sets, such as restaurants and beautician services, require guidance and support, compared with less skilled activities, such as grocery stores and Catering.

While general policies can be designed to support return migrants uniformly, specific interventions that focus on enhancing social connections might be more relevant for certain business types.

6. CONCLUSION AND POLICY SUGGESTIONS

6.1. Conclusions

It can be inferred from the study that respondents migrated abroad for employment purposes, to earn more income, and to improve their living standards. They had migrated on the postulation of earning and saving more

from higher remunerations offered in foreign countries to create substantial deposit funds, which would help when they returned to start their entrepreneurial activities. As seen in the study revealed, several factors influenced return migration for Goan emigrants, such as stressful working conditions, stress and discrimination at work, low incomes, and health issues of self and families back home. Their incomes were below their expectations, and they could not save, remit, or improve their living standards. Health issues due to extreme climatic conditions, long separation from the family, emotional support to children, and homesickness felt by them were the significant reasons to return. It is also seen from this study that some return to start entrepreneurial activities and give back to the economy.

The findings of this study have several policy implications. It can be seen from the study that family ties influence return migration, and policies need to be focused on improving family reunification and providing incentives for family integration. Job-related factors also play a decisive role in the decision to return. Policymakers must zero in on improving job avenues, building a favorable work environment, and announcing incentives for businesses to engage returnees. Prominent avenues where returnees could contribute include vocational training programs, job placement services, and entrepreneurship support. Returnees will be motivated if a safe, inclusive, and supportive workplace environment is ensured. Policies should include progressive labor laws, excellent work-life balance, and a constructive organizational culture. Policies need to ensure and enhance the overall quality of life, such as better healthcare, recreational facilities, and community services that could make the State more attractive to returnees. Access to essential facilities, such as public services, infrastructure, and amenities, is indispensable for return migration. The focus should be on infrastructure expansion, such as transportation, healthcare, and education, which could improve the living standards and encourage more individuals to return. Entrepreneurial activities need to be enhanced for return migrants by offering various incentives such as career counselling, affordable finance, skill training, and mutual recognition of qualifications and standards with foreign entities. Return migration needs to be perceived by the government in a very encouraging way, and policies need to be formulated keeping in view the larger interests of the nation to catch the attention of the citizens to the homeland, thereby contributing in many productive ways, tapping their skills and experience acquired abroad.

6.2. Lessons from the Study

The study on the factors influencing the return migration of Goan emigrants provides valuable insights into the broader patterns of return migration. It offers lessons that can be applied to similar contexts globally. Understanding the dynamics of return migration is critical for policymakers, employers, and communities both in host countries and countries of origin. Based on the study, some important lessons can be learned as actionable recommendations that can improve the reintegration of return migrants and create a more sustainable migration cycle. It is revealed from the study that immigrants may feel undervalued or unable to advance in their careers, prompting their decision to return home. Unfavorable workplace conditions, including lack of career progression, job insecurity, and poor health facilities, are significant drivers of return migration. Supportive work environments, opportunities for career advancement, and better workplace health facilities encourage skilled migrants to stay longer or permanently settle in the host countries. Most emigrants maintain strong family connections with their family members, and disturbances in the family make them return home. In this regard, policymakers in host countries can promote migration policies such as flexible visa arrangements, family reunification programs, cultural programmes, and psychological and social support to absorb the family pressures that otherwise could lead to premature return migration.

Job insecurity is a critical factor that decides the duration of stay in the host country. Employment policies of the host countries in terms of long-term contracts, skill development programs, pathways to permanent residency, and job security enhance the sense of belonging and reduce the likelihood of return migration. Emigrants wish to maintain strong social and community networks in their home country and the host countries, and employers can

promote social integration programs that promote cross-cultural exchanges, help migrants establish stronger connections in their host communities, and reduce the feeling of alienation. Availability, access, and affordability of health facilities at the workplace are significant factors that force migrants to return, particularly among aging migrants. Proactive policies providing comprehensive health insurance, workplace health programs for specific needs, and targeted healthcare support for aging migrants can delay or prevent premature return migration.

6.3. Recommendations of the Study

Based on the lessons learned from the study, the following recommendations can be made to improve migration outcomes, both for host countries and countries of origin:

1. Improved Workplace Conditions for Migrants: Improved workplace conditions include career development programs, language training, and upward mobility; healthcare facilities at workplaces; and incentives for adopting migrant-friendly workplaces.

2. Develop Flexible Immigration and Family Reunification Policies: Provide flexible visa policies, family reunification programs, and other support services like counselling and childcare programs that facilitate constant interaction with the family.

3. Invest in Social Integration and Cultural Exchange Programs: Facilitate better social integration through cultural programs, community centers, and language acquisition support. Also, promoting cross-cultural training for employers and local communities can help reduce discrimination and cultural barriers, making migrants feel more accepted and valued.

4. Improve Access to Health Services: Employers and governments should collaborate to provide comprehensive healthcare plans that address the specific needs of migrant workers, including mental health services, preventive care, and access to specialists.

5. Formulating Reintegration Programs. In locations such as Goa, which receive large numbers of return migrants, proper reintegration policies should be formulated for the assimilation with the home community. These include (i) career counselling and re-skilling programs to ensure returnees can re-enter the job market, (ii) access to financial products such as business loans to encourage entrepreneurship among returnees, and (iii) social and psychological support services to help returnees adjust to life back home and navigate any potential reverse culture shock. Also, the state governments should provide incentives for highly skilled return migrants, such as tax breaks or subsidies for starting businesses, which can stimulate economic growth in the home country.

6. Tap the expertise of the Diaspora for Economic Development: Return migrants who acquired valuable skills abroad should be encouraged to share their knowledge upon returning home. Governments can create platforms for such knowledge transfer and establish diaspora networks that keep returnees engaged with both their home and host countries.

The return migration of Goan emigrants provides a useful lens through which to understand broader trends in global migration.

The factors identified in the study—workplace conditions, personal circumstances, job status, social networks, and health concerns—are relevant for the migrant community across the globe. By addressing these factors through targeted policies, host countries can enhance the well-being of migrants, while countries of origin can benefit from their international exposure. Through comprehensive workplace, social, and health reforms, countries can create environments where migrants thrive, thereby reducing premature return migration and fostering a sustainable migration cycle.

REFERENCES

Batista, C., & Cestari, F. (2016). *Migrant intentions to return: The role of migrant social networks*. Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Nova School of Business and Economics, NOVAFRICA. No. wp1602.

Batista, C., Lacuesta, A., & Vicente, P. C. (2012). Testing the 'brain gain'hypothesis: Micro evidence from Cape Verde. *Journal of Development Economics, 97*(1), 32-45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2011.01.005

Beine, M., Docquier, F., & Oden-Defoort, C. (2011). A panel data analysis of the brain gain. *World Development, 39*(4), 523-532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2010.03.009

Bijwaard, G. E., & Wahba, J. (2014). Do high-income or low-income immigrants leave faster? *Journal of Development Economics, 108*, 54-68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2014.01.006

Bryant, F. B., & Yarnold, P. R. (1995). Principal-components analysis and exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. In L.G. Grimm, P.R. Yarnold (Eds.), Reading and understanding multivariate statistics. In (pp. 99–136). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Carling, J. (2004). The migration process: Prospects and problems of return migration. *Journal of International Migration and Integration, 5*(2), 125–149.

Carling, J., Mortensen, E. B., & Wu, J. (2011). *A systematic bibliography on return migration, PRIO paper*. Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo.

Carling, J., & Pettersen, S. V. (2014). Return migration intentions in the integration–transnationalism matrix. *International Migration, 52*(6), 13-30. https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12161

Cassarino, J. P. (2004). Theorising return migration: The conceptual approach to return migrants revisited. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies, 6*(2), 253–279.

Cerase, F. P. (1974). Expectations and reality: A case study of return migration from the United States to Southern Italy. *International Migration Review, 8*(2), 245-262. https://doi.org/10.2307/3002783

Cobb-Clark, D. A., & Stillman, S. (2013). Return migration and the age profile of retirement among immigrants. *IZA Journal of Migration, 2*, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-9039-2-20

Cohen, R. (1997). *Global diasporas: An introduction*. Seattle: UCL Press.

Constant, A., & Massey, D. S. (2002). Return migration by German guestworkers: Neoclassical versus new economic theories. *International Migration, 40*(4), 5-38. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2435.00204

Constant, A. F., & Zimmermann, K. F. (2011). Circular and repeat migration: Counts of exits and years away from the host country. *Population Research and Policy Review, 30*, 495-515. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-010-9198-6

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 10*(7), 1-9.

De Haas, H. (2005). International migration, remittances, and development: Myths and facts. *Third World Quarterly, 26*(8), 1269-1284. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590500336757

De Haas, H., & Fokkema, T. (2011). The effects of integration and transnational ties on international return migration intentions. *Demographic Research, 25*, 755-782. https://doi.org/10.4054/demres.2011.25.24

De Haas, H., Fokkema, T., & Fihri, M. F. (2015). Return migration as failure or success? *Journal of International Migration and Integration, 16*(2), 415-429. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-014-0344-6

Dustmann, C., & Weiss, Y. (2007). Return migration: Theory and empirical evidence from the UK. *British Journal of Industrial Relations, 45*(2), 236-256. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8543.2007.00613.x

El-Mallakh, N., & Wahba, J. (2016). *Upward or downward: Occupational mobility and return migration (Working Paper No. 1010).* Retrieved from Economic Research Forum:

European Migration Network. (2011). *Temporary and circular migration: Empirical evidence, current policy practice and future options in EU Member States.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (1999). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn& Bacon.

Gittins, T., Lang, R., & Sass, M. (2015). The effect of return migration driven social capital on SME internationalisation: A comparative case study of IT sector entrepreneurs in Central and Eastern Europe. *Review of Managerial Science, 9*, 385-409. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-014-0161-5

Global Forum on Migration and Development, G. (2008). *Report of the first meeting of the global forum on migration and development, Belgium.* Brussels: Bruylant.

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

Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1992). Beyond 'culture': Space, identity, and the politics of difference. *Cultural Anthropology, 7*(1), 6-23. https://doi.org/10.1525/can.1992.7.1.02a00020

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis with readings* (4th ed.): Prentice Hall. https://archive.org/details/multivariatedata0000unse_d9x9.

Hair Jr, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R., & Black, W. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (4th ed.). London: Prentice-Hall.

Handlos, L. N., Petersen, J. H., Bygbjerg, I. C., & Norredam, M. (2018). Role of disease and demographic factors as determinants of return migration: A nationwide register-based cohort study. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 46*(2), 221-228. https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494817731008

International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2019). *World migration report 2020.* Retrieved from https://publications.iom.int/books/world-migration-report-2020

Issifu, I. (2018). Empirical investigation of impediments to returnees' entrepreneurship in Ghana: An application of structural equation modelling. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 9*(1), 155-170. https://doi.org/10.2478/mjss-2018-0015

Jenjira, K. (2014). *Take me "home": Determinants of return migration among germany's elderly immigrants.* Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1rp64439

King, R. (2000). *Generalizations from the history of return migration.* In B. Ghosh (Ed.), Return migration: Journey of hope or despair? (pp. 7–55). Geneva: International Organization for Migration

King, R. (2022). Exploring the return migration and development nexus in handbook of return migration. In (pp. 314-330). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

King, R., & Christou, A. (2010). Cultural geographies of counter-diasporic migration: The second generation returns 'home. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 36*(8), 1195-1217.

Lee, E. S. (1966). A theory of migration. *Demography, 3*(1), 47–57.

Levitt, P. (2001). Transnational migration: Taking stock and future directions. *Global Networks 1*(3), 195-216. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0374.00013

Makina, D. (2012). Determinants of return migration intentions: Evidence from Zimbabwean migrants living in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa, 29*(3), 365-378. https://doi.org/10.1080/0376835x.2012.706034

Naveeda, T. A., Bhattib, A. A., & Ullahc, S. (2017). Determinants of return migration: A case study of return from Greece. *The Pakistan Journal of Social Issues, 8*(1), 32-48.

Pett, M. A., Lackey, N. R., & Sullivan, J. J. (2003). *Making sense of factor analysis: The use of factor analysis for instrument development in health care research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ruben, R., Van Houte, M., & Davids, T. (2009). What determines the embeddedness of forced-return migrants? Rethinking the role of pre-and post-return assistance 1. *International Migration Review, 43*(4), 908-937. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2009.00789.x

Schiller, N. G., Basch, L., & Blanc-Szanton, C. (1992). Transnationalism: A new analytic framework for understanding migration. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 645*(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1992.tb33484.x

Serrano, I. (2008). Understanding the dynamics of return. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees, 25*(1), 27-34.

Stark, O., & Bloom, D. E. (1985). The new economics of labor migration. *The American Economic Review, 75*(2), 173-178.

Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics.* Boston: Pearson Education.

Thompson, B. (2004). *Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis: Understanding concepts and applications.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Todaro, M. P. (1969). A model of labor migration and urban unemployment in less developed countries. *The American Economic Review, 59*(1), 138-148.

Toomistu, T., Lauren, A., Annist, A., & Murakas, R. (2024). Determinants of return migration of Estonian young adults in transnational mobility. *Migration Studies, 12*(1), 42-67. https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnad033

UNSD. (1988). *United nations recommendations on statistics of international migration.* Statistical Papers Series No. 58.

Wahba, J. (2015). Selection, selection, selection: The impact of return migration. *Journal of Population Economics, 28*, 535-563. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-015-0541-4

Waldorf, B. (1995). Determinants of international return migration intentions. *The Professional Geographer, 47*(2), 125-136. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0033-0124.1995.125_x.x

Weldemariam, L. F., Ayanlade, A., Borderon, M., & Möslinger, K. (2023). Dynamics and factors influencing return migration to Sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review. *Heliyon, 9*(8), e18791. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e18791

Zhao, Y. (2002). Causes and consequences of return migration: Recent evidence from China. *Journal of Comparative Economics, 30*(2), 376-394. https://doi.org/10.1006/jcec.2002.1781