The Effect of Migration on Labor Resources

Constantin ANGHELACHE[1]
Mădălina – Gabriela ANGHEL[2]
Alina – Georgiana SOLOMON[3]

[1]Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania, [1]E-mail: actincon@yahoo.com
[2]"Artifex" University of Bucharest, Romania, [2]E-mail: madalinagabriela_anghel@yahoo.com
[3]"Dimitrie Cantemir" Christian University, Bucharest, Romania, [3]E-mail: alinagsolomon@yahoo.com

Abstract   *International migration is a complex phenomenon that can be detected throughout the history of mankind, manifested in varying degrees of intensity, being generated by welfare and development disparities between different regions of the world (EU, 2008). The realities of the last decades, namely the globalization of the world economy, the intensification of the armed conflicts, as well as the economic-regional integration are the main factors that contributed to the quantitative and qualitative remodeling of the international migration. The issue of international migration is not only an economic subject but also a social, cultural and political one, with multiple implications not only on the country of origin but also on the receiving country. Public authorities are not only concerned with the effects of the intensive migration but also with the costs that this phenomenon entails, which affect both the countries of origin and the recipient countries. International events over the last decades have generated not only the phenomenon of voluntary migration caused by job search or economic reasons, but also by forced migration generated by natural phenomena such as political, religious disasters, persecution, or wars. This generates new challenges for public authorities to find solutions to mitigate the negative effects and potentiate the positive effects of international migration.*

Key words   Migration, population, economic integration, growth factor, migratory movement of the population

1. Introduction

The international financial crisis has been a factor favoring voluntary international migration, with the impact on the labor market being dramatic and causing the rise in unemployment, but also the decrease in the number of jobs due to bankruptcies or the restructuring of the activity of many companies that have tried to make redundancies To the challenges posed by the crisis.

The regional economic integration specific to the European continent is the main factor in the internationalization of the phenomenon of international migration, both to the core countries of the EU - Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy and France, but also to the new member countries (after EU accession, Countries such as Romania and Bulgaria have become attractive for immigrants in Turkey or China). Migration of workers from Eastern European countries to the EU core countries was first determined by geographic proximity, and later, after the accession of these countries to the EU, the migration phenomenon was favored by the right to free movement of persons, a fundamental right of The European Union enshrined in the EU Treaties, which also includes seeking and finding employment in any EU country.

In view of the scale of the international migration phenomenon, which has been favored by a range of economic, social and policy factors, substantial efforts have been made at Member State level by the authorities of the Member States to harmonize their immigration and asylum policies. The phenomenon has been approached gradually as amplification and recording of negative effects. Some progress has been made by launching the Tampere program, the Hague program and, in particular, the Stockholm program. A new concept has emerged, namely migration management.

At the declarative level, the European authorities see the phenomenon of international migration as an inevitable one that can contribute to the economic growth of the European Union in view of the labor market situation and the demographic situation in most EU countries. Despite the efforts of member countries to harmonize national migration policies, progress has not been in line with expectations, which has also been fueled by the emergence of new international financial crises or armed conflicts in different regions. Thus, the European Council adopted the European Pact on Immigration and Asylum in 2008, the main objective being to organize illegal immigration, taking into account the priorities, needs and reception capacities established by each Member State.

2. Literature review

Saiz and Wachter (2011) consider the effects of immigration on urban neighborhoods, they use a geographic diffusion model to study the growth of immigrant density in a neighborhood, Crowder *et al.* (2011) approach a similar topic. Anghel *et al.* (2017), Anghelache *et al.* (2016) evaluate the influence of remittances on economic growth and financial development, while Anghelache *et al.* (2017) analyze the role of remittances in reduction of poverty. De Giorgi and Pellizzari (2009) analyze the migration of welfare within Europe, under the context of EU expansion, the generosity of welfare is found to be a factor that influences migration decisions, Artjoms and King (2012), Dobson (2009), Kennan and Walker (2011), Moretto and Vergalli (2008), approach close topics.

Foley and Angjellari-Dajci (2015) show that net state in-migration rate can be described as an increasing function depending on median family income or expected median family income and a decreasing function depending on the average cost of living. Ottaviano and Peri (2012) develop on the impact of immigration waves on domestic workers' wages in the United States of America, which is positive and significant. Sorkin (2015) discusses the impact of minimum wage modification on employment and discovers the existence of short-run elasticity. Moreno-Galbisa and Tritah (2016) analyze the impact of immigration within EU labor markets characterized by frictions. Kurmanov *et al.* (2017) examine the role of remittances in the economic context of migrants' households on Central Asian data.

Menz and Caviedes (2010) have presented a complex analysis of labour migration in Europe. Brixiova *et al.* (2009) analyze some characteristic on the new members of EU from the Central Europe; they develop a model for labor relocation. Zaiceva and Zimmermann (2013) are preoccupied with the phenomenon of returning migrants in time of crisis, for the people who migrated as consequence to European Union expansion. Anghelache (2009) has developed on the statistical instruments that can be used in migration analysis. Kaplan and Schulhofer-Wohl (2012) analyze some aspects related to interstate migration; they demonstrate that this indicator has practically a lower value than the one reported. Fairbrother *et al.* (2010) discuss on the influence of job loss by parents on the childrens' health insurance coverage. Beets and Willekens (2009) evaluate the impact of the global economic crisis on the migration, at international level. Jansen and Piermartini (2009) take into account the correlation between the temporary migration and the trade flows. Heilbrunn *et al.* (2010) analyze the patterns regarding barriers to integration into labor market that affect the immigrants. Borjas (2006) takes into account the effect of internal migration and labor market on the immigration phenomenon. Card (2012) develops on the negative wage impact of immigration.

3. Methodology research and data

In the European Union, on the basis of the strategy, directives and decisions taken in the Council of Europe and the European Parliament, the problem of population migration is becoming increasingly acute. In this regard, we can discuss, on the one hand, the number of long-term immigrants arriving in a country in the years under review. On the other hand, it is about emigrating from a state in the same period of time. Comparing immigration with emigration, we consider that a balance of population migration is achieved. The causes of immigration and emigration are determined by a number of factors including: the European Union's Free Movement Directive within the 28 (27) states, which means that for job search, social conditions, studies or other Causes the population of the Member States of the European Union have the right to free movement. Using the European Union's Free Movement Directive, people move from one state to another, primarily from economic, social, but also from other causes, such as mixed marriages that

determine the movement of people from one country to another. Analysis of the migration process (immigration and emigration) has significance from several points of view. Firstly, immigration and emigration can have an effect on labor resources, rising or falling, depending on the meaning of the migratory balance. Secondly, it is about creating social conditions for emigrants so that they benefit from conditions and not least from the job. Immigration has an effect on the level of unemployment in the country considered. Thus, in the case of Romania, in the context in which we speak today of an unemployment level of over 630,000 people, having a long-term emigration of more than 3,000,000 people in other European countries, especially Italy, Spain, Germany, Other states would raise the question of the ability of the national economy to offer jobs to those who emigrated from the country.

On the one hand, emigrants in a country bring additional income that contributes to the growth of gross domestic product or at least to provide better financial conditions for the close descendants or relatives, the friends of those remaining in the country. Here are some points of view that lead us to analyze the trend of long-term emigration in the countries of the European Union. From this point of view, we chose the period 2004-2015 to try to see what is the level of emigrants in the EU member countries. We will refer, above all, to the situation that Romania presents. In 2004, the base year from which we started the survey was 117,236 people in Germany, 700,166 people in Germany, 684,465 people in Spain, 414,880 people in Italy, and 518,097 people in the UK. It should also be remembered that Austria received 122,547 immigrants. We find that in all these countries there has been an upward trend, but in most cases in reasonable terms. Thus, Belgium reaches 146,626 immigrants in 2015, Germany to 1,543,548 immigrants in the same year, Spain 363,869 immigrants, Italy 280,086 immigrants, Austria 166,323 immigrants, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland 631,459 people. By comparison we find that, with few exceptions, the level of emigration in these states has increased. In the case of Romania, immigration data can only be considered from 2008, that is, one year after Romania joined the European Union.

Table 1. Total number of long-term immigrants arriving into the reporting country during the reference year

Geo\time	2004	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014	2015
EU (28 countries)	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Euro area (19 countries)	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Belgium	117236	137699	:	135281	129477	123158	146626
Bulgaria	:	:	:	:	14103	26615	25223
Czech Republic	53453	68183	108267	48317	34337	29897	29602
Denmark	49860	56750	57357	52236	54409	68388	78492
Germany	780175	661855	682146	404055	592175	884893	1543848
Estonia	1097	2234	3671	2810	2639	3904	15413
Ireland	78075	139434	82592	52339	54439	67401	76888
Greece	66871	63094	66529	60462	58200	59013	64446
Spain	684561	840844	599075	360705	304053	305454	342114
France	:	301544	296608	307111	327431	339902	363869
Croatia	18383	14978	16883	8846	8959	10638	11706
Italy	414880	279714	534712	458856	350772	277631	280078
Cyprus	9003	13077	21060	20206	17476	9154	15183
Latvia	4844	8212	4678	4011	13303	10365	9479
Lithuania	5553	7745	9297	5213	19843	24294	22130
Luxembourg	12872	14352	17758	16962	20478	22332	23803
Hungary	24298	25732	37652	25519	33702	54581	58344
Malta	:	3889	6043	4275	7111	8946	12831
Netherlands	94019	101150	143516	126776	124566	145323	166872
Austria	122547	98535	73772	70978	91557	116262	166323
Poland	9495	10802	15275	155131	217546	222275	218147
Portugal	21093	22741	29718	27575	14606	19516	29896
Romania	:	:	138929	149885	167266	136035	132795

Geo\time	2004	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014	2015
Slovenia	10171	20016	30693	15416	15022	13846	15420
Slovakia	4460	5589	17820	13770	5419	5357	6997
Finland	20333	22451	29114	25636	31278	31507	28746
Sweden	62028	95750	101171	98801	103059	126966	134240
United Kingdom	518097	529008	590242	590950	498040	631991	631452
Iceland	5350	9832	10288	3948	4960	5368	5635
Liechtenstein	:	:	578	591	671	615	657
Norway	36482	45776	58123	69214	69908	66903	60816
Switzerland	120188	127586	184297	161778	149051	156282	153627

: = not available; b = break in time series; p = provisional; e=estimated.

Source of data: Eurostat

Immigration in Romania over the past eight years has been steadily rising: 138,929 emigrants in 2008, somewhat lower in 2009 (135,844), 149,885 emigrants in 2010, 147,685 emigrants in 2011, 167,966 emigrants in 2012, 153,646 emigrants In 2013, followed by a decrease, respectively 136,035 emigrants in 2014 and 132,795 emigrants in 2015. For 2016, data are not yet available. What do these data show in the next table for the comparable period for Romania, 2008-2015? It turns out that there is an immigration-migration exchange from each state to the other states of a reasonable number of citizens. A deeper analysis should put forward the immigration figures compared to the unemployment rate. Here we find some paradox. Countries like Spain with quite high unemployment, more than 2.5 million unemployed receive a large number of citizens, members of another state. It is a question of finding out what is the Spanish State's effort in this case to create and secure jobs for immigrants and also meet the requirements of the immigrant population.

If we look at this picture, we see that these figures have to be considered as inflows each year as suggested by Eurostat statistics and then we will get a clearer picture of the number of migrants from other countries in a country considered in the analysis. In this context we can talk about two trends or two situations as an effect. First of all, immigration ensures the entry into the country of persons with specializations and qualifications required in that state. On the other hand, it also means the efforts they are making on that state. Last but not least, the comparison of the wage level that is granted to immigrants compared to the salaries of the citizens of their own country. We refer in particular to job placements in the tertiary sector in each country.

Table 2. Total number of long-term emigrant leaving from the reporting country during the reference year

Geo\time	2004	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014	2015
Belgium	83895	88163	:	66013	93600	94573	89794
Bulgaria	:	:	:	:	16615	28727	29470
Czech Republic	34818	33463	51478	61069	46106	28468	25684
Denmark	45017	46786	38356	41456	43663	44426	44625
Germany	697632	639064	737889	252456	240001	324221	347162
Estonia	2927	5527	4406	5294	6321	4637	13003
Ireland	28675	44409	65934	78099	89436	80912	77128
Greece	38041	38368	43044	62041	124694	106804	109351
Spain	55092	142296	288432	403377	446606	400430	343875
France	:	189403	239796	269531	255922	294082	297969
Croatia	6812	7692	10638	13017	12877	20858	29651
Italy	49910	58407	80947	78771	106216	136328	146955
Cyprus	1913	2778	4474	4293	18105	24154	17183
Latvia	20167	17019	27045	39651	25163	19017	20119
Lithuania	37691	32390	25750	83157	41100	36621	44533
Luxembourg	8480	9001	10058	9302	10442	11283	12644

Geo\time	2004	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014	2015
Hungary	3820	4314	9591	13365	22880	42213	43225
Malta	:	3835	3719	4201	4005	5907	8655
Netherlands	75049	91028	90067	95970	110431	112900	112330
Austria	71721	74432	51563	51651	51812	53491	56689
Poland	18877	46936	30140	218126	275603	268299	258837
Portugal	6757	5600	20357	23760	51958	49572	40377
Romania	:	:	302796	197985	170186	172871	194718
Slovenia	8269	13749	12109	15937	14378	14336	14913
Slovakia	1586	1735	4857	4447	2003	3644	3870
Finland	13656	12107	13657	11905	13845	15486	16305
Sweden	36586	44908	45294	48853	51747	51237	55830
United Kingdom	310389	369470	427207	339306	321217	319086	299183
Iceland	4820	4577	9144	5459	4758	4052	4046
Liechtenstein	:	:	490	428	439	476	468
Norway	23271	22053	12976	25835	22693	29308	29173
Switzerland	79726	88218	86130	96839	103881	111103	116631

: = not available; b=break in time series; p=provisional; e=estimated.

Source of data: Eurostat

With regard to long-term emigration from each EU country, we find for the same time that in some cases they were higher than immigration, and in other cases they were inferior. For example, in 2004 697,632 people migrated from Germany, 55,090 people from Spain, 49,910 people from the Netherlands, 75,049 people, Austria 71,271 people, the United Kingdom 310,389 people and Switzerland 79,786 people. The trend was somewhat constant, and it is clear from the comparison with the 2015 figures for emigration.

In the case of Germany, after 2008 there was a number with a significant decrease in the number of emigrants, which in 2015 reached 347,162 persons. In Greece, the number of emigrants increased to 109,531 in 2015, in Spain an upward trend has been observed with some syncope, reaching in 2015 over 43,875 people, France has a total emigration of 297,969 people; Italy reaches 146,955 emigrants, the figure of Higher in 2004 and up to the date of 2015. In the Netherlands, the figure reaches 121330, in Poland 258,137 people, in the UK 299,180 people. This is a trend that is somewhat different from one country to another. In the case of Romania, again the comparable period is likely to be analyzed after 2007, i.e. starting with 2008 when Romania became a member of the European Union. Thus, in 2008 we recorded 329,726 emigrants, 246,626 emigrants in 2009, 197,985 emigrants in 2010, 195,551 emigrants in 2011, 170,186 emigrants in 2012 and 131,755 in 2013.

We note that from 2008 to 2013 inclusive, the number of emigrants has fallen. It should be explained that the moderation of emigration was also due to the effects of the post-2008 crisis, which had effects determined by the way in which the economic and financial crisis affected each of the European Union states. Starting in 2014, the population began to grow reaching 201,000 people in 2016 (provisional figure). Another aspect that we have recalled is the level of unemployment registered in the member countries.

Thus, in 2002, the base year of comparison for the total of the European Union was 20,318,200 unemployed reaching 20,913,200 in 2016, with fluctuations. During these 15 years there is an increase and decrease but it was more alarming in 2013, the year with the highest unemployment rate of 26.116.500 people. This is the situation of the European Union comprising all 28 states. The European Union Member States recorded different figures. Thus, Belgium registered 300,800 unemployed in 2002, reaching a fluctuating trend of 389,600 unemployed in 2015. Germany registered 3,062,000 unemployed in 2012, reaching a peak of 4,570,800 unemployed in 2005, after which the unemployment level recovered reaching In 2008 to 1,770,600 unemployed. Spain has a very particular situation, with 2,100,300 unemployed in 2002, a number that has grown in the coming years, and from 2005 to 2009 there has been a downward trend. After 2008, a very accelerated rise in the number of unemployed starts in 2008 to 2,593,900

unemployed, 5,881,000 unemployed in 2012, 6,051,100 unemployed in 2013, after which a slight decrease process begins which brings the level The unemployed in Spain to 4,441,200 in 2016.

Table 3. The evolution of unemployment (1000)

GEO/TIME	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014	2015	2016
European Union (28 countries)	20.318,2	21.081,1	19.178,8	16.660,1	22.738,8	25.094,5	24.814,8	22.880,9	20.913,2
European Union (27 countries)	20.048,7	20.830,6	18.980,1	16.495,0	22.516,6	24.797,6	24.487,5	22.575,0	20.673,4
European Union (15 countries)	13.551,1	14.817,7	14.261,0	13.412,4	17.916,3	20.220,0	20.387,7	19.013,5	17.717,9
Euro area (19 countries)	12.727,5	13.940,5	12.819,9	11.789,8	15.905,6	18.014,9	18.640,5	17.450,1	16.232,6
Euro area (18 countries)	12.515,0	13.769,6	12.732,2	11.701,5	15.635,2	17.818,1	18.482,5	17.316,1	16.116,5
Euro area (17 countries)	12.362,4	13.642,2	12.654,3	11.613,0	15.429,3	17.663,0	18.374,8	17.217,9	16.021,1
Belgium	300,8	329,4	383,2	333,4	405,9	369,0	423,3	421,8	389,6
Bulgaria	619,3	406,4	305,7	199,7	352,3	410,3	384,5	305,1	247,2
Czech Republic	357,2	418,8	371,7	229,8	383,5	366,8	323,6	268,0	211,4
Denmark	122,4	150,5	113,8	101,4	218,3	218,8	191,5	180,9	187,1
Germany	3.362,0	4.261,1	4.245,4	3.136,0	2.845,0	2.224,4	2.089,9	1.949,6	1.770,6
Estonia	65,6	69,0	41,0	37,8	113,9	68,5	49,6	42,3	46,7
Ireland	77,6	86,3	94,4	145,5	302,7	316,0	242,9	203,6	173,1
Greece	474,5	507,0	448,2	387,9	639,4	1.195,1	1.274,4	1.197,0	1.130,9
Spain	2.103,3	2.247,6	1.840,9	2.595,9	4.640,1	5.811,0	5.610,4	5.056,0	4.481,2
France	2.276,5	2.404,7	2.320,7	1.970,5	2.504,9	2.677,4	3.032,6	3.053,7	2.970,3
Croatia	269,5	250,5	198,7	165,1	222,2	296,9	327,3	305,9	239,7
Italy	2.206,4	1.913,3	1.654,3	1.664,3	2.055,7	2.691,0	3.236,0	3.033,3	3.012,0
Cyprus	10,8	15,2	17,0	14,5	26,4	51,5	69,5	62,8	54,9
Latvia	152,6	127,4	78,0	88,5	205,8	155,1	107,6	98,2	95,3
Lithuania	212,5	170,9	87,7	88,3	270,4	196,8	158,0	134,0	116,2
Luxembourg	5,1	10,2	9,7	10,8	10,1	12,8	15,3	18,4	17,5
Hungary	229,8	241,2	318,2	326,3	469,4	473,2	343,3	307,8	234,6
Malta	11,0	11,5	11,0	10,1	12,0	11,5	11,2	10,6	9,5
Netherlands	214,3	394,8	335,7	243,0	389,9	515,8	659,7	613,8	538,5
Austria	187,0	223,4	211,7	172,0	203,4	208,9	244,9	251,8	270,0
Poland	3.432,4	3.224,6	2.344,3	1.210,7	1.650,2	1.749,2	1.566,8	1.304,3	1.063,4
Portugal	243,3	341,9	420,6	418,0	591,2	835,7	726,0	646,5	573,0
Romania	862,1	776,5	728,4	575,5	651,7	627,2	628,7	623,9	529,9
Slovenia	58,1	60,5	60,8	45,5	75,4	89,6	98,1	90,3	79,6
Slovakia	486,3	491,0	355,4	255,7	389,2	378,0	358,9	314,4	266,8
Finland	280,0	275,5	204,4	172,1	224,3	206,8	232,1	252,1	236,8
Sweden	227,2	309,2	336,8	305,4	426,2	403,6	412,4	388,3	369,0
United Kingdom	1.470,9	1.362,9	1.641,4	1.756,2	2.459,4	2.533,5	1.996,4	1.746,6	1.598,3
Iceland	4,8	6,6	4,9	5,4	13,6	10,7	9,1	7,6	5,8
Norway	96,1	101,1	82,8	65,8	91,3	83,3	94,8	118,5	129,5
Switzerland	119,4	178,6	168,8	146,6	203,8	192,6	215,5	219,3	226,8
Macedonia	:	:	321,2	310,4	300,4	292,5	268,8	248,9	225,0
Turkey	:	:	1.951,6	2.279,1	2.695,7	2.202,1	2.842,8	3.035,4	3.308,4

Italy with an unemployment rate of 2,206,400 in 2012, follows a downward trend until 2008, and from 2009, the increase in the number of unemployed reaches 3,236,000 unemployed in 2014 and 3,012 .000 in 2016. The United Kingdom had a somewhat steady course with 1,047,900 unemployed in 2012, with rises and decreases that stabilize the unemployment rate to 1,598,300 in 2016. In the case of Romania, we notice that unemployment in 2002 was 862,800 unemployed, with decreases and Slight increases that lead to a slight stabilization of the number of the unemployed to 529,900 in 2016. The level of unemployment analyzed separately does not say too many things, but if we compare the migration balance or even emigration and emigration with the registered unemployment level, we will could draw conclusions about the effect of emigrations and immigration on the stabilization of the unemployment rate figure. From the presentation of Romania's case of the three series of data (emigration, immigration and unemployment rate) we will draw conclusions that are easily released, of a correlation that can exist between the three indicators.

The example provided by Romania's analysis is similar and can be used in any other Member State of the European Union or for the European Union as a whole. To indicate the existence of the correlation and the intensity between the three indicators, we can use the simple or multiple linear regression, considering that the level of unemployment depends directly on the increase of immigration and indirectly on the increase of emigration. By calculating the migration balance, we can establish the correlation between these indicators that aggregate the economic effects and the level of unemployment. It is evident from the graphical representation that there is a correlation between the three indicators, but in order to establish the existence, meaning and intensity of the correlation, we will use the simple linear regression model in the three cases and the correlated effect of the three indicators that constitute factorial variables In the number of unemployed who become the resultant variable. The regression equations are of the form:

$$Y = a + bx + \varepsilon \tag{1}$$
$$Y = a_0 + a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_{3} + \varepsilon \, ,$$

Where:

X_1 = emigration;
X_2 = immigration;
X_3 = migration balance.

By testing and solving the equations resulting from the regression function we obtain the values of the parameters a_0, a_1, a_2 and a_3 associated to each variable x_i. The residual variance ε quantifies the effects of other factors not taken into account in this analysis.

4. Conclusions

The decision of migrants to choose a particular country is based on certain economic and non-economic incentives that shape the supply of labor that is directed to a particular destination country. The country-specific immigration policy functions as a modeling worker on the demand for immigrants and labor. Geographical distance, common border, linguistic and cultural similarities, colonial relations between countries, the high share of the young population in the country of origin, the level of development of the host country or the effects of the Network (the existence of strong communities in the host country Of immigrants from the same country of origin) are the main factors that have a determining effect on international migration. The economic immigration policy must be adapted to the level of each Member State in the light of labor market realities and in particular by attracting highly qualified workers, receiving students and researchers and moving them within the Union and encouraging temporary migration or circular.

References

1. Anghel, M. G., Niță, G. & Badiu, A. (2017). Impact of Remittances on Financial Development and Economic Growth. *Romanian Statistical Review, Supplement*, 1, 106-112.
2. Anghelache, C., Pârțachi, I., Anghel, M. G. & Niță, G. (2017). Remittances, a factor for poverty reduction. *Romanian Statistical Review Supplement*, 5, 59-66.
3. Anghelache, C., Niță, G. & Badiu, A. (2016). Migrants remittances – an important and stable source of external funds, in the economic development of a country. *Romanian Statistical Review, Supplement*, 12, 83-90.
4. Anghelache, C. (2009). Statistical possibilities for the analysis of migration. *Metalurgia International,* XIV (14), Special Issue, 155-156.
5. Artjoms I. & King, R. (2012). Family Migration Capital and Migration Intentions. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 33 (1), 118–129.
6. Beets, G. & Willekens, F. (2009). *The global economic crisis and international migration: An uncertain outlook*. Vienna Yearbook of Population Research, 19-37.

7. Borjas, G. (2006). Native Internal Migration and the Labor Market Impact of Immigration. *Journal of Human Resources*, 41 (2), 221-258.

8. Brixiova, Z., Wenli, L. & Yousef, T. (2009). Skill shortages and labour market outcomes in Central Europe. *Economic Systems*, 33, 45-59.

9. Card, D. (2012). *Comment: The elusive search for negative wage impacts of immigration*. Journal of the European Economic Association*, 10 (1), 211–215.

10. Crowder, K., Hall, M. & Tolnay, S. (2011). Neighborhood Immigration and Native Outmigration. *American Sociological Review*, 76 (1), 25-48.

11. De Giorgi, G. & Pellizzari, M. (2009). Welfare migration in Europe. *Labour Economics*, 16, 353-363.

12. Dobson, J. R. (2009). Labour mobility and Migration within the EU Following the 2004 Central and Eastern European Enlargement. *Employee Relations*, 31, 121-138.

13. Fairbrother, G. L., Carle, A. C., Cassedy, A. & Newacheck, P. W. (2010). The impact of parental job loss on children's health insurance coverage. *Health Affairs*, 29 (7), 1343-1349.

14. Foley, M. & Angjellari-Dajci, F. (2015). Net Migration Determinants. *Journal of Regional Analysis and Policy*, 45 (1), 30-35.

15. Heilbrunn, S., Kushnirovich, N. & Zeltzer-Zubida, A. (2010). Barriers to immigrants' integration into the labour market: Modes and coping. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34, 244-252.

16. Jansen, M. & Piermartini, R. (2009). Temporary migration and bilateral trade flows. *The World Economy*, 32 (5), 735-753.

17. Kaplan, G. & Schulhofer-Wohl, S. (2012). Interstate Migration Has Fallen Less Than You Think: Consequences of Hot Deck Imputation in the Current Population Survey. *Demography, Springer*, 49 (3), August, 1061-1074.

18. Kennan, J. & J. R. Walker (2011). The effect of expected income on individual migration decisions. *Econometrica*, 79 (1), 211–251.

19. Kurmanov, N. et al (2017). Labour Migration and Remittances: Strategy for Survival or Development?. *International Journal of Economics and Financial*, 7 (1), 334-339.

20. Menz, G., Caviedes, A. (2010). *Labour migration in Europe*, Publishing House Palgrave Macmillan.

21. Moreno-Galbisa, E. & Tritah, A. (2016). The effects of immigration in frictional labor markets: Theory and empirical evidence from EU countries. *European Economic Review*, 84, 76–98.

22. Moretto, M., Vergalli, S. (2008). Migration dynamics. *Journal of Economics*, 93 (3), 223–265.

23. Ottaviano, G. I. P. & Peri, G. (2012). Rethinking the effect of immigration on wages. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 10 (1), 152–197.

24. Roman, M. & Vasilescu, M.D. (2016). Explaining the Migration Intentions Of Romanian Youth: Are Teenegers Different?. *Romanian Statistical Review*, 4, 69-86.

25. Saiz, A. & Wachter, S. (2011). Immigration and the Neighborhood. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 3 (2), 169-188.

26. Sorkin, I. (2015). Are there long-run effects of the minimum wage*?. Review of economic dynamics*, 18 (2), 306–333.

27. Zaiceva, A. & Zimmermann, K.F. (2013). *Returning Home at Times of Trouble? Return Migration of EU Enlargement Migrants during the Crisis*. Center for Economic Research, Working Paper, 89, February.