

The reverse migration decision and occupational outcomes:
A Self- Determination Theory perspective

Solange Cabral Francisco Goncalves

Dissertation submitted as partial requirement for the conferral of

Master in Human Resources Management

Supervisor:

Mestre Alzira Duarte, ISCTE Business School, Department of Human Resources
and Organizational Behaviour

September 2018

The reverse migration decision and occupational outcomes: A Self-Determination Theory perspective

Solange Cabral Francisco Goncalves

Dissertation submitted as partial requirement for the conferral of

Master in Human Resources Management

Supervisor:

Mestre Alzira Duarte, ISCTE Business School, Department of Human Resources and Organizational Behaviour

September 2018

Abstract

Return migration has a great impact for all parties involved, considering that motivation greatly shapes the migration and indeed the return migration experience it is beneficial to explore the motivation behind a migration decision and understand how this shapes the processes that follow. This study extends current research in migration by considering the motivation behind the decision in greater depth through the Self-Determination Theory. Semi-structured interview were used to explore motivation in this context and consider how this shaped behavioural and occupational outcomes. Overall, we found that employment opportunities were a greater motivator, and this greatly influenced the preparation undertaken following the migration decision. We also found that while social motivations were not considered when making the decision, the social network was used as a tool for research following the return migration decision.

Keywords

International Migration, Return Migration, Motivation, Job seeking activities

JEL Classifications:

F22 International Migration, O15 Human Resources

Resumo

A migração de retorno tem um grande impacto para todas as partes envolvidas. Considerando que a motivação molda grandemente a migração e, de fato, a experiência de migração de retorno; explorar a motivação por trás de uma decisão de migração e observar como isso molda os processos que se seguem ia beneficiar o nosso entendimento nesta area. Este estudo amplia as pesquisas atuais em migração, considerando a motivação por trás da decisão em maior profundidade através da Teoria da Autodeterminação. Entrevista semi-estruturada foi usada para explorar a motivação neste contexto e considerar como isso moldou os resultados comportamentais e ocupacionais. No geral, descobrimos que as oportunidades de emprego era o motivador maior, e isso influenciou muito a preparação realizada após a decisão de migração. Também descobrimos que, embora as motivações sociais não tenham sido consideradas na tomada de decisão, a rede social foi usada como ferramenta de pesquisa após a decisão de migração de retorno.

Palavras-chave

Migração internacional, Migração de retorno, Motivação, Procura de emprego

Classificação JEL:

F22 Migração internacional, O15 Recursos Humanos

Table of Contents

I Title

II Abstract

III Abstract (Portuguese)

1 Introduction.....	1
2 Literature Review.....	2
2.1 International Migration	2
2.1 Self Determination Theory	10
3 Methodology.....	13
3.1 Approach	13
3.2 Participants and sampling	13
3.3 Materials	15
3.4 Analysis	18
4 Results.....	20
4.1 Initial Migration and decision	20
4.2 Reason behind the decision	21
4.3 Social Influence	23
4.4 Preparation	24
4.5 Reflections	24
4.6 Employment Considerations	27
5 Discussion.....	30
6 Conclusions.....	36
7 References.....	40
8 Annexes.....	44
Annex 1 Interview Guide	44
Annex 2 Demographic Information Form	46
Annex 3 Transcript Coding Extract	47
Appendix 8.3.1 Question Host country	47
Appendix 8.3.2 Question Family / Friends	49
Appendix 8.3.3 Question Employment Search	51

Index of tables

Table 1	Demographic Information about sample	15
Table 2	Summary of the origin, host and decision of interviewees	21

1 Introduction

International migration occurs for a number of reasons and takes on many forms; the perspective on migration has also expanded over the years with considerations being made to the temporary nature of migration (Dustmann and Weiss, 2007). Research that considered return migration identified many factors that contribute to the decision, (King and Christou, 2014). Motivation has been a key discussion point addressed in migration literature and theories, with focus on the motivation behind the decision considered crucial to the migration experience as well as the return. Migration literature, does not however explore the motivation underlying a return migration decision in great depths. Often assumptions are made based on the outward migration motivation or the return migration decision is a theme that emerges when focusing on other aspects of migration (Legido-Quigley *et al.*, 2015).

To address this, the current study produced as part of a Masters in Human Resources Management intends to add to migration literature by focusing on the type of motivation behind a return migration decision, for this, the Self-Determination Theory (Ryan and Deci, 1985) will be used as the framework for investigation. The theory proposes that motivation is on a continuum, the continuum posits motivation from amotivation; a lack of motivation, to internal motivation, a point where a task is undertaken for its own value and merit. By considering motivation in this way when looking at a return migration decision, we can consider migration and its influence in greater depth. The study will consider if motivation type is in any way linked to occupational decisions and outcomes, something that is often discussed within migration literature due to the economic rationale behind migration.

Owing to this, the research will consider the practical implications of applying SDT when considering a reverse migration decision. The study will also go on to consider the themes that emerge when considering migration in this way, and finally, we will consider the impact this has on occupational decisions and outcomes. A qualitative approach was used as it allows for better exploration of the nuances of a migration decision and the subsequent processes undertaken by participants to not only migrate but also occupational processes that followed.

The following section will consider the migration literature both outward and return migration; so that we understand the current perspectives and the existing themes. This will be followed by an additional look at the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) as the underlying framework used to shape the data collection and resulting observations. Section four will cover the design and the methods followed, which will lead onto the results section. Following this the conclusions will be outlined. To end we will consider the limitations of the study and points for consideration in future research.

2. Literature Review

2.1 International Migration

Migration to another country may not be permanent given a host of changes creating an ever-increasing reality of reverse or re-migration. There are many motivating factors for organizations, individuals and social networks that exist. Ultimately many outcomes exist for all parties involved, making migration a high point of discussion at any given moment. A variety of benefits have been acknowledged to both host and home countries. With respect to sending countries the impact on poverty reduction may be significant (Borodak and Piracha, 2011). It has been argued that migration has stimulated a growth of skill and knowledge as a consequence of needs, as well as those intending to migrate preparing themselves for foreign job markets, however failing to actualize the initial migration and benefitting the home country (Ambrosini *et al.*, 2015; Güngör and Tansel, 2014). Negative consequences for home countries have also been highlighted hence the previous trend of referring to migration as “Brain Drain” (Docquier and Rapaport, 2011; Güngör and Tansel, 2014). For those that return, much impact has been acknowledged, including the effects on labour markets through engagement with the workforce, and the impact of remittances (Ambrosini *et al.*, 2015; Borodak and Piracha, 2011; Piracha and Vadean, 2010). Benefits to the host countries have been highlighted as the investment that migrants made, either through formal education or professional experience and the contributions this has had on the labour force. Also noted is reduced costs related to wages offered to migrant workers (Commander *et al.*, (2002). It is important to note that research on migration has not always found positive consequences, (De Coulom and Piracha, 2005; Kupets, 2011; Sun 2013) and some have either found no difference or indeed negative consequences to migration. The literature has highlighted that this is often due to lost social connections, inefficient work experience whilst abroad, or taking work that depreciates skills (Wahba,

2015). Despite this, research has been clear that migration impacts the human capital of an individual as well as the labour markets of both host and country of origin.

When we consider the human resources aspect of migration there is an acknowledgement that occupation is influential or is influenced by the migration decision. This can be through the consideration of employment or educational opportunities, both home and abroad. Migration takes into account a perception of opportunities existing outside in comparison to more local opportunities. Migration has been argued as being the consequence of better returns for human capital acquired in a host country (Borjas and Bratsberg, 1996; Dustmann and Weiss, 2007; Lianos and Pseiridis, 2009; Piracha and Vadeans 2010). This human capital is in reference to increased knowledge, which is either practical through experience or educational via academic performance or qualifications obtained whilst abroad (Dustmann and Glitz, 2011; Kveder and Flahaux, 2013; Piracha and Vadeans, 2010). Martin and Radu (2012) highlighted the prevalence of research finding positive consequences of work experience abroad upon return, also noting the country specific nature of said research. Barcevičius and Žvalianytė (2012) also pointed that work experience abroad was considered of benefit for those whose work matched their qualification. It is important to consider, that this is not a suggestion that returned nationals are necessarily better or that there is a lack of local talent that can fill posts. What has been observed in the literature is that for a number of countries there is a preference for migrant workers over local workers particularly in developing countries, (Ambrosini *et al.*, 2015). In addition, when looking solely at employment of migrant groups, returning migrants are not always the preferred choice (Wahba, 2015). With research in mind, there are numerous implications for human capital when considering migration. Kveder and Flahaux (2013) highlighted that variations in the reasoning behind the return could lead to different consequences upon return i.e. non-participation, retirement as well as re-migration abroad.

Given that it is a high point of contention for political and social discussion, and considering the impact that migration has, it is important to continue research into migration in conjunction with motivating factors. We can also extend the research by looking at outcomes that may occur when considering the motivation behind such a decision.

Migration takes on many forms, it can look like the movement of people seeking refuge, family reunification, and temporary labour among other things, and having a single theory that incorporates the different perspectives has been difficult. Over time the theories have developed and have been more inclusive of different dimensions and have become less rigid. Recent reviews of theories such as those conducted by Cassarino (2004) and King (2012) have created a coherent look at the migration theories and have added to the discourse by providing key perspectives. Namely, the former focusing on the impact of motivation on the migration decision and the outcomes that may occur and the latter considering how we look at migration, whether there is merit in exploring a particular aspect of migration or in true with the nature of migration itself look at it in an interdisciplinary way.

The current study will not focus on one particular theory of migration so as not to put limitations when considering the various types of migration that may be identified by respondents. When looking at the theory from the perspective of Cassarino (2004) the motivation to migrate greatly influences many of the subsequent decisions including the occupational and behavioural choices that occur. Although the migration theories differ when considering why migration occurs, we can see that differences in the motivating factors shape the outcomes; this is the focus of the study. The current study aims to focus on the reasoning behind the migration decision; specifically, we will consider motivation to return migrate

through a particular perspective and then look at the occupational decisions made. When considering return migration King and Christou (2014) highlighted six main narratives for return, for the purpose of this review these narratives will be considered when looking at migration research. The narratives identified are: Economic rational, return to roots, way of life (life style), family narrative of return, return as escape and return related to life-stage event. In their work King and Christou (2014) also included the narrative of '*Return as escape*' which was specific to their female sample, due to the content described; this has been combined with lifestyle.

As noted in economic theories, financial and occupational needs play a part in the decision to migrate. Mesnard (2004), noted that financial constraints in the home market was mitigated by migration, suggesting individuals could accumulate funds and return to the home country and create own ventures. This was supported by Kveder and Flahaux (2013), who noted the tendency for migration, was due to economic reasons. Dustmann and Weiss, (2007) highlighted that higher purchasing power of host currency is paramount to a return. Borjas and Bratsberg, (1996), considered reverse migration as a function of better financial gains for returnees. However, Pungas *et al.*, (2012) noted that return tendencies were greater for those who worked below their qualifications. Borodak and Piracha, (2011) pointed to the importance that occupational choice of returning migrants has, when considering the contribution that returnees have in home country labour markets and its consequent development. They noted that returnees are more likely to be employed in comparison to non-migrants. Piracha and Vadean's (2010) findings indicate that intention to re-migrate and reasons for the return were influential in determining occupational choice, with those considering permanent residence more likely to work under own account or entrepreneurial endeavours. Within this research, the participants who were self-employed viewed their migration distinctly than those who worked under own

account who viewed it as failed, with entrepreneurs having successfully reaching migration targets. Waged employment has been shown to be the tendency for returnees of developing countries (Ilahi, 1999; McCormick and Wahba, 2001) with a note being made to returnees' ability to seek greater wages. Also evidenced is return migration enhancing occupational mobility, returnees were able to occupy post of higher status/grading, this was dependent on the country that acted as host (Carletto and Kilic (2011). Borodak and Piracha (2011) highlighted that this was due to the influence that returnees had with respect to demanding greater wages.

King and Christou (2014) however felt that, the economic factor was overall not influential in the decision to return to Greece, with a number of their participants forgoing financial and career gains to return. For those that did see an advantage, this was in the context of moving internally within an international organisation with a presence in Greece or taking up academic posts. Bijwaard and Doeselaar (2014) also touched on this, noting that research has focused on the economic gains of reverse migration however; those returning due to family reunifications mitigated the importance on the financial motivation for return decisions. Also vital to return migration is the realization of saving goals (Borjas and Bratsberg, 1996). McKenzie and Salcedo (2009) found with over half of their sample (59%) achieving saving targets was influential in returning decisions. Borodak and Piracha (2011), highlighted that non-participation of returnees in Moldova may also be due to low wages available in home country in comparison to the saving accrued whilst working abroad as well as remittances received from family members still abroad. Despite this, returnees were more likely to be occupied, in comparison to non-migrants. Saved remittances were also a factor for non-participants of those who did not migrate. The research assessing occupational choice has been inconsistent with findings for and against a tendency for returning migrants to be self-employed versus wage

employed. This differences or lack of consistency is likely due to country specific factors for example high taxes in home country which encourages non engagement. Giving the various findings in research regarding a purely financial benefit to a migration decision, it is important to consider other factors.

King and Christou (2014) noted that the theme of returning to roots was considered influential in a decision to return. This theme was based on an emotional connection to the home country. This narrative was noted by the authors as being the most powerful despite being the most abstract. Takenaka (2014) also focused on this area, highlighting the affects that diasporic ethnic bonds has on return migration decisions. What became apparent, despite these bonds and the accompanying nostalgia, the return was not as smooth as hoped and often resulted in remigration due to failure to integrate socially and economically. It is important to note that in this research of Japanese South American Returnees, that although the ethnic bond was important another motivator was the economical one, due to policy changes in Japan affording greater opportunities for those of Japanese descent to return and contribute to the labour market.

Also noted as important to the return decision is the family perspective of return (King and Christou, 2014). Reynolds (2008) sample from Jamaica made reference to family rhetoric on the theme of returning home. Borodak and Piracha (2011) reported that for some the difficulty in being away from family influenced their return decision. Family and lifestyle was reported to have a major impact on return decisions (Gibson and McKenzie, 2011). Kveder and Flahaux (2013) also noted that a small percentage of outward migration was due to family motives. Barcevicius and Zvalianyte (2012) also highlighted that family motives were most important reasons for a return decision along with cultural motives. Legido-Quigley *et al.*, (2015) noted

that family was an important factor when making a return decision, with their respondents not returning, with references being made to having a family in the host country.

Lifestyle differences was also identified as a factor for return migration by King and Christou (2014), they noted that previous time in the home country be it via holidays or brief visits formed a picture of an idyllic lifestyle and reported links between this and returning as an adult. Focus here for returnees was shared family values, pace of life and social warmth. In addition to this, for female returnees from Greece, escaping parental controls in the host country was identified important. Returning home offered them a freedom that would not be available to them under the supervision of parents whilst in host country. Boyle *et al.*, (2008) also touched on gender differences acknowledging the tendency of positive outcomes that household migration has on the man's career, noting that woman had lower likelihood of being employed or having high income if migrating as a couple. King and Christou, 2014, also noted that for their sample, return migration also centred around certain major life events, including transition into higher education, marriage and retirement.

When considering the research and theories it is clear that there are many factors that motivate a migration decision. As noted by Rogers, (1984) motivation for return varies substantially and may also overlap. Acknowledging the importance that motivation has on the outcome of such a drastic change, the current study will consider the motivation qualities that are related to the migration decision. Extending from this, the study will also consider how these qualities interact with occupational decisions undertaken.

2.2 Self Determination Theory

As we consider the importance that motivation has on the migration decision, we will focus on the motivation literature to provide us with the theoretical framework namely, the Self Determination Theory (SDT), as described by Deci and Ryan (1985). This is an established theory supported in a range of contexts and important to this research, cross culturally supported (Gagne *et al.*, 2015). The self determination theory proposes that motivation is intrinsic and not merely external. The theory proposes that even if external motivation occurs there are processes undertaken that transforms this into an internal motivation. There is an internalization of values and regulations transmitted by social cues. This is taken on when one is allowed to consider and support the shared views and controls. This is based on three innate needs: autonomy, competence and relatedness. Motivation is considered along a continuum, with the distinguished subtypes of motivation determined by the varying levels of internalization that exists, (Deci and Ryan, 2000a). Internalization describes how something externally regulated (goal or value driven) is transferred so that it becomes internally regulated. There is also a third category of motivation defined; amotivation, used to describe no presence of motivation. Trembley *et al.*, (2009) noted that the self-determination model considered the quality of motivation focusing on the underscoring reason behind behaviour. This perspective is based on the idea that we have a tendency towards development and are driven by goals. This natural orientation is influenced by external factors such as environmental or social pressures which can act as a source of encouragement or suppression. Variations exist between the level and the orientation of motivation that people possess. To add to this, behaving under different reasons does result in varying outcomes in terms of experiences and performance, something that has been observed in various domains.

For SDT, motivation is considered along a continuum that extends from no motivation at all right through to internal motivation. The continuum starts at *Amotivation*, a lack of motivation which has no form of regulation ascribed to it. As described by the authors (Deci and Ryan, 2000) and reiterated by SDT researchers, such as Gagne *et al.*, (2014): *External regulation* is the subtype of extrinsic motivation that has no internalization. Control is through external means, action is due to reward or the avoidance of a punishment by others. *Introjected regulation* is the subtype that follows with limited internalization. Behaviour is determined by internal means, the ego becomes involved, shame and guilt also play a part. What follows is *Identified regulation* which specifies activities being completed as there is a recognition of its worth or meaning and there is an acceptance of it. This form of internalization is considered volitional. This differs from intrinsic motivation, as the activity is completed for instrumental reasons; it is not being completed for the inherent satisfaction of undertaking the task. Lastly there is *Internal regulation*, which represents the undertaking of an activity for its own merit. As the subtypes have been found to highlight different outcomes in terms of behaviours and attitudes in numerous domains, there is an argument for having a scale that allows for insight into the different subtypes (Gagne *et al.*, 2014).

Considering SDT we understand that there are levels of internalization present, which varies from person to person and for the activity. We are also aware that levels in internalization yields different results, we can draw parallels when considering the migration research, which suggest that there are various motivations for migration and that respective consequences occur as a result of this. The current study will use the theoretical framework set by Ryan and Deci (1985) and apply the SDT in the context of a return migration decision. The current study therefore considers the following questions:

How do the different regulation subtypes shape the way that migration decisions are made?

Did these subtypes have an effect on the processes that followed?

What are the reflective themes that emerge when we consider the return migration decision?

What is the consequence this has on employment decisions?

By considering these questions not only will we explore the motivation behind a return migration decision and how this may shape the occupational outcomes, we can also consider how effective SDT is as a tool in understanding the return migration decision adding another perspective to this research area.

3 Methodology

3.1 Approach

The current study is exploratory, designed to apply the SDT in the context of a return migration decision, an area not previously covered through this perspective. The purpose is to explore the return migration decision and the underlying motivations behind the decision. Going on from this we will look at how the motivation quality may have shaped the occupational outcomes of the respondents. The study uses the Semi Structured Interview (SSI) for data collection as a means to explore participants' perspective on their return migration decision and also the employment considerations made. The interview was opted in direct reflection on the open questions the study addresses, the study is focused on themes that emerge as well as how this shapes processes that follow, the approach is better suited to meet the aims (Fidel, 1993) and is consistent with previous research that has looked at international migration decisions, (King and Christou, 2004; Legido-Quigley *et al.*, 2015) as well as motivation research (Lloyd and Little, 2010; Lochner *et al.*, 2012).

3.2 Participants and Sampling

This study used non probability sampling, the sample was not representative and entirely of convenience through direct contact and snowball recruitment. The sample was purposive given that only adults that have migrated for a minimum of 12 months were contacted to participate. Participants were recruited throughout April and May to take part in the study. The recruitment of participants was conducted as follows, to start information about the study was passed on through social media direct communication (private message, messenger) and direct face to face communication with people in investigators social network who were also asked to pass on details to people in their own social network. At this time the investigators contact details were provided for potential participants to use. Due to low response, participants were then

recruited directly via phone, text messages, messenger, and via email. Participants were also asked to indicate how they would like to be interviewed, four options were given: face to face, video conferencing, phone or email. Follow up emails and messages were sent to those that indicated interest and provided contact details but did not set up a time for interview. Three follow up messages were sent to each non-respondent in total, this was to ensure that there was a level of consistency between those that were known to the investigator and those through extended social networks. It was important that it was clear to all those contacted, that their participation was voluntary and that this would not have a consequence on their relationship with the investigator so this consistency was key. Interviews were scheduled and conducted over the course of four months June-September 2017. Participants were emailed an informed consent form and asked to reply and provide demographic information as confirmation they consented to the study.

Of those initially contacted to participate a total of 14 provided their contact details to schedule an interview. Informed consent forms were sent to all, of which seven responded. All others received a message as the first reminder. There was a second follow up message sent, of which an additional four respondents completed the consent forms and scheduled interviews. Email addresses and requests to participate were received from another two respondents, one of which completed the consent form and scheduled an interview. From the referrals of other participants two indicated interest to the investigator and consent forms were sent out. One of which was returned. To summarise, of the 18 informed consent forms sent, 13 respondents provided demographic information and agreed to be interviewed. Following the mentioned prompts a total number of 9 were interviewed, four of which were male and five female. Their ages varied from 24 - 61, with the average age being 36. Of those interviewed three were currently in host

countries and made the decision to stay, two were in host countries and made the decision to return, 4 were in home countries having returned.

So that we have an understanding of the make-up of the sample demographic information was collected, and is outlined in table 2.

Participant ID	Age	Education level	Employment	Marital Status	Dependents	Nationality
F1	36	Masters	Customer Service	Single	None	French
F2	29	Diploma	Media Freelancer	Single	None	Argentinean
F3	24	University Diploma	Team Coordinator	Single	None	Portuguese
F4	42	Secondary	Customer Service	Partnership	None	Portuguese
F5	40	Bachelor	Administrator	Divorced	None	Brazilian
M1	29	Bachelor	Engineer	Married	2	Angolan
M2	36	Bachelor	Key Accounts Manager	Single	None	Angolan
M3	29	Doctorate	Student	Single	None	Brazilian
M4	61	Degree	Social Worker	Married	3	Angolan

Table 1 Demographic information about sample

3.3 Materials

Demographic data was collected using the online service Google Forms, this product was deemed appropriate to create and share the informed consent form and the demographic

information as it allowed for both to be sent out to individuals directly and for responses to be collected and stored through the sites encrypted servers.

The interviews were semi-structured with a guide produced, with topics based on themes that emerged from migration literature and a SDT scale. The guide was prepared to provide probes for the 3 potential scenarios: those who had completed a return migration, those in host country who had decided to return and those in host country who had decided to stay. It was designed based on topics that emerged from migration literature and an SDT based scale.

The scale used as a source of inspiration for the current study is the Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (Gagne *et al.*, 2014), designed for analysis of work motivation, this scale has been translated to various languages and validated cross culturally. By using the scale to inspire the interview structure and not produce a straight adaptation of the scale from one context to another allowed for us to fully gain an understanding of participants decision making process and the impact that this had on subsequent behaviours and choices, by only adapting the scale there is the risk of limiting respondents responses, through an interview respondents are allowed to be forthcoming with their own reflections and experiences.

Decision was reinforced by research that also supported the use of qualitative methods when assessing motivation, (Lochner *et al.*, 2012) as well as research methods that included the use of interview as the first step of creating a questionnaire for research looking at the motivation in a different context (Vansteenkiste *et al.*, 2004). The wording allowed for those currently in host country to consider what they currently do or what they would intend to do. For those that have already returned, the wording allowed for reflective responses on what they did and what was taken into consideration in preparation for the return.

As mentioned, the interview was structured with SDT in mind and the guide produced is outlined in Appendix 1. The interview session was structured as follows:

The start of the interview session is a general introduction with a brief about the study, a reminder of the terms of the informed consent and how the information would be used. We begin to explore the topic through basic questions and a clarification of the interviewees' current situation. It is at this point where we assess amotivation (whether there is a motivation to return or not). This was followed by questions that addressed the duration of the stay and when they started to consider a return migration.

Questions that addressed research undertaken and preparation for the return came after. Here we started to include prompts that dealt with external motivation such as material influence and social regulation. Following this, there were prompts that were specific to introjected regulation and identified regulation. Participants were prompted to give an insight into their feelings regarding the move. The point was to gain as much about the personal significance of the return. Respondents were also asked to share about their occupational choices, what they were currently doing, what they considering doing in the home country. Finally, respondents were given the opportunity to share anything else about their decision to migrate, preparation or any aspects of the process. The interview closed with the interviewee being thanked and with information about what followed, essentially them receiving a transcript for review. A debrief was also provided. Interviewees were also given the opportunity to ask questions regarding the interview

The majority of the questions used were open, to illicit as much information that participants volunteered about their views and perspective on their migration decision and how they came to that decision. The questions were also used to gather information on employment seeking behaviours. Additional questions were only used to clarify a point made or to expand on an answer. Email interviews were conducted in an asynchronous way as outlined by Meho (2006), with the number of exchanges outlined to participants prior to the start of the questions so they were aware of the number of exchanges that would occur at the time when making a decision to consent to the interviews. Interviews that were conducted in person, over the phone or via video conferencing were recorded to assure accuracy when transcribed. To record the interviews for the purpose of transcribing two mobile applications were used, the first being the Voice Recorder, on the Samsung Galaxy Ace 4, the other being AudioRec on Samsung SM-T530.

3.4 Analysis

All interviews were transcribed verbatim, they were then reviewed and edited for clarity and the removal of repeated utterances and conversational fillers. All of the transcripts were then sent to participants for a confirmation that the transcripts were accurate. The email interview responses were put together in the form of a transcript and also sent back to respondent. Seven of the participants agreed that the transcript were accurate and no edits were made, two participants provided an edited transcript. The transcripts provided were reviewed and there were no great changes made, with only minor amendments highlighted by participants. One respondent corrected the names of cities mentioned and also edited a response where there were repeated utterances within the phrasing, this was done for clarity. The other participant who proposed an edit did so to clarify statements made.

Following confirmation of the transcripts, the transcripts were reviewed for familiarity with the material. Content analysis was carried out as described by Bengtsson (2016), transcripts with sections that were in direct response to questions highlighted. Sections that were of interest were also highlighted. Transcripts were reviewed again with the sections and phrases previously highlighted being allocated a theme. This was repeated for all transcripts. As the study design is inductive, the list of themes was created from the transcripts and following this all transcripts were once again reviewed and were cross referenced with the list of themes. The themes were reviewed, and then categories identified. Appendix 3 presents the coding steps undertaken with a condensed extract.

The paper applies the SDT to the context of a return migration decision the first focus is looking at the impact that a motivation type has on a return migration decision. We then go on to consider the themes that emerge when considering reflections of a migration decision. We also consider how motivation feeds into the job search activities and occupational decisions taken. We will consider the themes that emerge in line with the following areas: initial migration, return migration decision and employment considerations. The themes that emerged include impact on family, contribution and defining where is home. We will conclude with the final thoughts on respondents' experience.

4 Results

4.1 Initial Migration and Return Decision

We will start by considering the initial migration experience and then the return migration decision. When we considered the motivation for initial migration, this varied, with the sample indicating a number of reasons for their outward migration and their initial decision to stay in the host countries. For those who moved to the British Isles (n=7) the most referenced reasoning was employment opportunities and employment variety, this was highlighted by a third of the respondents. What followed was language; this was in relation to improving and continuous development of English language skills. Two of the respondents were children when the initial move was made, and the migration was a decision undertaken by family, one respondent (M2) noted that this was due to the perception of better opportunities abroad. Like the other two respondents who moved from Angola, M2 also mentioned the effects of the civil war being a reason for migrating out specifically the socio-political climate, instability and lack of safety. Two interviewees migrated to Portugal, each with distinct reasons, one was due to continuing with higher education, and the other was due to family commitments.

When considering the return migration decision n=3 decided to remain in the host country, n=2 had decided to return and n=4 had already completed return migrations. Table 3 presents the country of origin, host country and decisions undertaken by respondents.

	Origin	Host	Decision
F1	Surinam	United Kingdom	Return
F2	Argentina	United Kingdom	Returned
F3	Mozambique	United Kingdom	Returned
F4	Portuguese	United Kingdom	Stay
F5	Brazil	United States	Stay
M1	Angola	Ireland	Returned
M2	Angola	United Kingdom	Returned
M3	Brazil	Portugal	Return
M4	Angola	United Kingdom	Stay

Table 2 Summary of the origin, host and decision of interviewees

4.2 Reason behind the decision

When we consider the reasoning behind the migration decision, irrespective of the decision made, employment was the most discussed factor. It was noted as a motivator, with two of the three interviewees who decided to remain in their respective host countries acknowledged that their decision was due to the employment opportunities currently available to them with references made to their continued professional development (F4 and F5). One respondent (F4) noted that staying and the employment stability offered meant that they could help support family members back home as and when needed. It is important to note that this respondent previously returned to their home country following two years in the United Kingdom, and when they were unable to secure a job in their home country, re migrated. The other respondent who decided to stay (M4) gave their reasons as being primarily due to the socio-political climate in their home country:

“the decision is based on the situation, the instability of the country, maybe if time goes and the situation gives me more confidence that stability comes, then maybe I can decide to go”.

For the respondents who decided to return the reasoning behind the decision was as follows; employment status and opportunities was an important motivator for one (F1) who identified the job uncertainty faced due to organisational change with current employer. Comments were also made with respect to the quality of life while in the host country, noting that a balance was needed between working and enjoying life. The other interviewee (M3) noted that the inspiration for his return to contribute towards the growth of his region through a social project that he has planned and developed along with his family which he hopes to continue upon returning:

“I want to work with the communities there, helping some communities to improve their perspective of social control, aspects like economy, local education”.

Of the four who had already returned; for half of the subgroup a lack of job satisfaction and career prospects in their desired areas was a motivator for the return (F2 and M2). M2 added, that he felt that returning was the only option to be taken:

“I was in such a depressive state due to lack of self-realisation and poor prospects”.

One respondent (M1) highlighted missing country, culture and family. For F3 the return decision was something that was completely unplanned, and it came about naturally having been in Portugal for a break. The respondent described that the trip was taken due to an uncertainty of the university course initiated:

“I thought I am going to take a break ... I decided to come for a holiday and see how it would work out, just to clear my mind ... then I thought while I am here, might as well and apply for a job and I got one straight away”.

4.3 Social Influence

With respect to social influence as a motivator, family perspective and the influence that this has had on the decision, all respondents were clear that the opinions of family and friends was not considered when making the decision. One third of respondents (F1, F2 and F3) opted to not discuss their decision with family at all and only with friends, their decision to do this was to not to give false hope as there was uncertainty about the move and the possibility of there being changes to the plan. In the case of one interviewee (F5) the decision was taken so as not to worry family about travelling and settling in a new country alone. Three of the respondents were met with mixed responses (F4, M1, M2) with some happy about the return and others more sceptical not just about the timing of the return but the integration. For another participant (F2) family and friends were very supportive and excited by the return however she noted that this was not a source of motivation as the move was primarily due to job dissatisfaction and limited prospects. What she and others found (n=3) was that family and friends were a source of information when weighing up options and researching their home country in preparation for the return. F2 did add that family support would always be an advantage when returning; noting that even if faced with limited job prospects in the home country, being in the presence of family would mitigate that. With one interviewee (M3), there is much discussion with family and while there is support and encouragement for the return, this has no influence on the decision to return, because there is a feeling of continuous interaction and communication with

family virtually and there is an understanding between him and his family the time spent abroad are steps needed in preparation to return and realise long term objectives.

4.4 Preparation

We can see the impact that both of these motivators had on the subsequent preparation for the return and the effort put into it, the most reported activity was looking for work, all but three respondents (F3, F4 and M4) included this. There were varying levels of preparation for the migration decision taken, with 1 respondent (F5) indicating that more could have been done in preparation and identified the support of those she met through her church groups as helping bridge the gap. Others (M2) felt that they had put great effort in preparation for the return including going to other countries for recruitment events. F2 added that they also prepared for the physical move itself account for their belongings being transported and M1 included preparing psychologically. This was described as starting to reach out to family so that there was more familiarity, using the internet to be up to date with trends and the local news. It is important to note that this respondent cited missing family (along with country and culture) as one of his motivators for the return decision.

4.5 Reflections

With respect to the feelings expressed there was great variation between the sample; there were feelings of hope from a number of respondents (n=4), with most hoping to stay in their respective host country (F1, F4 and F5) and one (M3) to return. Uncertainty about the future was something that was present throughout the responses provided by these four interviewees, this was due to upcoming external changes. For F1 and F3 this was brought on by the departure

of Britain from the European Union, F1 is also facing changes at current employer, M3 is unsure of securing a job and having to relocate and for F5 a decision on being granted right to remain in the host country. Two of the respondents (M1 and M2) highlighted their anxiety about the return however; M1 did also reflect that there was also a sense of excitement due to personal growth and was curious of others response to him given the time they have had apart. When previous visits were mentioned M2, noted that this played a part in the decision to return, as the limited time spent in the home country as a holiday meant there was a curiosity to get to know the home country. Although five of the participants stated they visited the home country, no one else felt any such impact. Another theme that emerged was that of contribution, when discussing their decision 4 respondents referred to the how they could contribute to their country of origin (one of these being M4 who has decided to stay however works in home country). Respondent F4 who decided to remain discussed this in reference to their current employer and acknowledging that this was reinforced by the positive feedback received by employers.

One aspect of migration that was reflected on the most was 'missing family'; this was acknowledged in eight interviews. When addressing emotional reflections on migration, F2 noted that: *"I wouldn't say excitement ... just the thought of being near family was the nicest thing"*.

M3 reflected there was an impact on both him and family due to the distance, but there was also a great effort to maintain communication and their focus on the long term plan helps with this. F3 stated:

"it didn't really hit me until 4 or 5 months, that I was not with my family".

Through this acknowledging that the period following the initial move back was not a challenge, and saw it as touristic as there was much to do and see, but after this period there was a longing for returning to the United Kingdom, and specifically “home” where immediate family were located.

The concept of home was a factor reflected on in six of the interviews. Making reference to where immediate family were located, M4 noted the United Kingdom as his home country as opposed to his birth country. F4 further stated she felt more at home in her host country, acknowledging roots in her country of origin, but describing herself as a “cultural refugee” due to feeling more comfortable in the United Kingdom in comparison to Portugal. It is important that for both of the interviewees mentioned, their stay in the United Kingdom has spanned around 20 years. For those who have dual citizenship and do not find themselves currently in their country of birth or citizens, they made distinctions between the countries acknowledging both as home but reflecting on why one would be considered home over the other, for example citing cultural differences (F1) aspects of familiarity and lost social connections (F5). Two respondents (F4 and M3) while acknowledging their home countries, touched on the idea of feeling at home everywhere, both reflect not only on feeling at home and having a global perspective, but on their openness to move again to other countries should the need arise.

Three of the respondents noted that migration to host country was not something that was permanent. F2 and F3 initially migrated out due to further studies highlighting that the intention was always to return. Participant F3 reflected that there is always a desire to return home, adding that their own journey was intended to be short:

“originally it was like one month ticket and one year or two ... then you feel at home”.

The other side of this perspective was also experienced by F3, the return not being permanent:

“within two weeks I knew I couldn’t go back and live there, it is so difficult”.

Of the experience, what stood out were the limited opportunities in their home country, and the employment processes were not ones that were agreed with, so a decision was made to re-migrate back to a host country. M2 also saw their return as temporary, the move was seen as a way to develop professionally and build on savings. Also of interest was M4, who despite being employed in home country and working primarily from there, does not see this as a return journey, when discussing return migration, he reiterated that this is not something that he would do due to the instability of the country and was clear that his living and working there was simply the case of working in the home country.

4.6 Employment considerations

For five of the sample (F2, F4, F5, M2 and M3), comparisons were made between local job markets and that of home country. For 2 (F2 and M2) there was an awareness of lack of local opportunities in desired professional area. Three participants considered only one job market, not as a comparison as they had already decided to move (F1, M1) or in the case of F3 who had already returned, and wanted to see what was available. M4 did not consider the job opportunities available.

Four of the sample, (F1, F4, M1 and M3) highlighted an understanding on their human capital and reflected on the return they expected. F1 acknowledged their language skills and

experience would allow for greater returns when in home country. F4 expected that the skills gained overseas would be advantageous once back in their home country, a thought shared by M3, who has made plans for the immediate future to gain as much experience before returning. M1 also acknowledged this, noting that the jobs considered were in direct relation to his studies; nothing else was considered due to his area of studies being highly sought after.

When looking at the jobs considered, for all those interviewed four focused on jobs that were in line with their current experience and areas of study (F1, F5, M3 and M4). The roles they undertook complimented their studies and they only focused on jobs in line with this. Of these four, one (F1) noted that they were also looking to set up their own business venture in a different area and if things progressed as intended they would transition into this new area completely. Of the other participants, two noted that they considered and preferred roles in their area of studies, however were open to other opportunities in line with their experience in a different area if it meant employment (F2 and M2). One interviewee (F3) focused only on roles related to work experience and the other (F4) was entirely flexible and open to all job opportunities. M1 only considered roles that were related to his area of study. All of the respondents who returned and wanted to work in a particular area reported they are currently working in their preferred area.

In terms of job search activities, five of the participants acknowledged that their approach was the same when considering jobs in host and home country. What was common was using websites; the most used were sites that announced jobs from various companies as opposed to direct application through a company website. For those who were searching in home country, the sites were often ones that were recommended by family and friends, including friends who

had previously returned to the home country as was the case for M1. Although the same activities were undertaken, one participant (F4) added they also had to go through the job centre and sign on as unemployed which was something she was not pleased with:

“first you had to register through the job centre, which was something that I really did not want to do, as I was quite young and full of vitality, I never wanted to register as unemployed. I wanted to do something I wanted to work”.

Three participants noted differences, two (M3 and M4) stated that as they already had a career in their home country, when it came to seeking employment they could rely on their social connections. M3 acknowledged this was something he could not do when looking for employment in host country and described the process of building his CV in a social way in the host country:

“I am trying to develop all of this, building some kind of network ... I have a community online for investigators or researchers in communication sciences and now we are sharing activities, that we are producing and every time I am going to conferences they see me and the community is always sharing”.

M4 specified that for him it was a case of contacting his former employer who was happy for him to return. M2 described the use of agencies specialising in finding educated and experienced migrants for posts in Africa. This process included uploading of a C.V for screening and being invited to forums and career events for interviews.

5 Discussion

The study outlined implemented the SDT theory in research looking at a return migration decision. The aim of considering migration under this perspective was to have a more in depth of look at the motivation behind a migration decision, this was considered important due to the research in migration and theories on migration highlighting the importance of motivation to migrate on its outcomes (Kveder and Flahuax, 2013; Cassarino, 2004). When we consider the impact that the different motivation types have on the reverse migration decision we can see that one of the most mentioned motivations was employment, and that this directly shaped the preparation undertaken by respondents, with most of the sample undertaking research on work options, benchmarking their potential salaries and actively looking for work. This is in line with previous research that has considered the economic influence of a migration decision. As noted by researchers including Piracha and Vadeans (2010), the human capital of the respondents was something that was considered, with a number acknowledging that skills gained in host country would secure them either better employment or financial reward in their home countries, which is similar to what Veder and Flahaux (2013) acknowledged. When we consider the motivation and the effects on employment decisions we can see, certain patterns emerge from the results. From our sample we see that for most, employment opportunities is a big motivator for the decision, regardless of the decision made (to stay, return and for those who did return). What we can also see in those that returned, the main preparation undertaken was to at least look at the job market and if possible secure a job, often this was initiated while in the host country. They put effort in seeking as much information as possible including using their social network as source of information. For those returning to developing countries, the reasoning was clear, poor infrastructure and wishing to secure a job, something which is in line with research looking at return decisions to developing countries (Ilahi, 1999; Mccomick and Wahbi, 2001). Also of note, all of the participants who had a preference for working in a

particular area, reported they were working in their preferred areas. In terms of the type of jobs considered, the sample were very clear about the jobs that they wished to undertake and some went on to even suggest specific roles that they were willing to undertake. Only two respondents were flexible, one of which was due to being in the host country for a short duration and wishing to settle. While employment was a key motivator, it is important to note that it was not seen as exclusively as an economic motivator, while some of the sample acknowledge the financial impact of employments and the rewards they could associate with having a particular employment, it was not always a financial payoff for the respondents. Employment was something that was also internalized by our sample, something which too is supported in research looking at work motivation.

With respect to social regulators, specifically the influence of family and friends this was not considered a motivator, with the majority of respondents not considering the family input when making a decision; some respondents went as far as to not discuss their decision with their families at all. What is important to note is that friends were seen by some as a source of information for the return, and helped prepare and provide insight into local job markets. Migration literature, often finds that family acts as a motivator for a research decision (Borodak and Piracha, 2011; King and Christou, 2014; Reynolds, 2008) especially given the impact that the migration decision has on family. While the impact was acknowledged by the respondents, for the current sample, the decision was one that was mainly taken without family input or opinion in mind. It is a possibility that for the current sample, given that the main motivator was employment, family influence may not have been considered due to the economic support that respondents could provide to family. Migration research has often mentioned the important that savings and remittances has on the migration decision given the impact this has in supporting family among others (Byron and Condon, 2012; Easterly and Nyarko, 2008;

McKenzie and Salcedo, 2009; Takenaka, 2014). One would not be amiss to consider that although not explicitly stated by all, this may have something to play with the decision. It is also important to note that the majority of respondents also do not have children and are not married (2 were married and had children), we are aware through research conducted by Legido-Quigley *et al.*, (2015) among others that this also impacts the migration decision.

With respect to introjected, identified and integrated regulation the picture is a lot less clear. While we can see that there are aspects of the return migration decision which has been internalised, however, making concrete distinctions on exactly where on the continuum respondents lie is difficult. While there were expressions of feelings of contribution, excitement and positive feelings about the decision and experience, distinguishing between the roles these regulations played in the decision was difficult as they were not mentioned in the context of being motivators. There was recognition of these feelings being involved, with only two clearly defining this as motivators, none of the other participants outright mentioned any of these as motivators, or suggested that they were anything other than a reaction to the situation. The closest acknowledgment that we had was contribution, which given the context would be considered as identified regulation (relates to finding worth and meaning, Ryan and Deci, 2000), this was mentioned in the context of being able to contribute, as well as a feeling of currently contributing. Internal regulation such as excitement and a curiosity was mentioned overall in passing, so it was not as a motivator but mainly a reaction to the situation. The other thing to remember is that the return migration decision was for the majority of the sample something that was linked greatly to employment; while employment has external benefits not all of the responses suggested that employment was purely externally motivated. This being the case making a clear distinction between the internal regulators is difficult given the influence that employment and the regulators involved in this area played on the decision. It

would be beneficial to extend the work done in current research to further assess the internalization in this context, it would be important to assess SDT in both the migration decision and on the biggest motivator such as employment, to account for overarching influence. The interview style being open resulted in themes and phrases that can be considered in the future when assessing migration motivation under the perspective of SDT, using the current output would mean that we can consider themes that are more relevant to this area and creating or adapting a scale that could better consider the different motivation domains.

When we consider the themes that emerged, they included ones that have been previously seen in other research such as employment opportunities and career progression; as well as others not seen such as independent decision making and uncertainty of decision. As noted by Rogers, (1984) the reasoning behind the decision varies, and like the research that has come before which looks at return migration, they interact. What was different in this study in comparison to others, was that there was limited social influence to the return decision. While respondents did recognise that they missed family or reflected on the impact that distance had on the family, the decision was not taken with family in mind. There were a number of those interviewed who did not even engage family in discussion regarding their decision. It would be beneficial to look into this further; as the sample size is small, it is not clear whether this is simply an effect of that.

When looking at the themes a thing to note is the concept of home, throughout the study this theme emerged naturally given the nature of the topic at hand, and contrary to migration literature that typically defines home (be it explicitly as country of birth or by focusing on migrants to and from a specific country) a decision was made by the researcher to not define home. By not having a fixed definition, the respondents were allowed to define where they

thought their home country was, and as noted there was clearly a difference in both the migration decision and motivation factors when distinctions were made between the different home countries. Given that migration can involve stops in multiple destinations and therefore multiple places can be considered as a home country, it would be of interesting to see if these differences between job seeking strategies would be observed on a larger scale.

One thing that was clear in a number of interviews was the level of uncertainty regarding their decision, while they were fixed with respect to the employment that was under consideration, what was more inconsistent was the actual decision to migrate. As noted, there were external factors that some of the interviewees were entirely dependent on, for example change in regulations because of Great Britain leaving the European Union and not being granted the right to remain. This meant despite their decision, there could be instances in the future where there would be forced migration either to their home country or to another country altogether, it would be of interest to see how this would shape the continued preparation and ultimately employment options considered under these circumstances and how this would vary with current attitudes and job seeking behaviours.

As well as continuing to explore migration through a perspective like SDT, what would be a natural step further for studies that consider motivation in a migration decision, is to follow participants in the long run, not only to see whether the participants intentions had played out, but to also see how this occurs. In this study we were able to allow for those who had completed a return journey to reflect back on their experience and preparation, but the area would benefit from following participants through the varying stages. Although this comes with its own limitations; one of the advantages, would be that we could have greater insight into the processes undertaken after a decision is made and can look at the outcomes that come about as

a result of this, and then see how this is impacted by other factors and the adaptation that follows.

When considering the current study, what stands out is the sample size even considering that qualitative research does not often entail the same numbers that is found in a quantitative study, the sample size is limited. Although effort was made to secure more participants, the sample was purely of convenience stemming from social contacts and referrals. It was important that participants were allowed to make a decision on whether or not they wished to take part, and despite the prompts given to those who did respond and indicate not only interest but also initially consented and completed demographic information, their decision to no longer engage with the study was respected. What would be beneficial in the future is to expand on the pool of potential participants, by communicating with local organisations that have engagement with migrants. They would be able to recommend the best ways to reach a greater range of potential respondents and would also diversify the respondents, which would allow for much richer analysis.

6 Conclusion

The current study intended to add to the literature on reverse migration by seeing migration decisions under a different perspective. The study considered the practical application of using SDT in the context of a reverse migration decision, the themes that emerged as a result of this application were considered and to conclude, the occupational impact was pondered. The Self-determination Theory frames behaviour in a way that accounts for the intrinsic and extrinsic processes behind it. Not exclusively as binary forces that influences behaviour, SDT considers how internalised a particular area is and from that we can consider its influence. While the theory has been applied in a number of areas including education, health behaviours and even in occupational settings, by applying SDT in the context of a return migration decision we were able to shift the perspective of migration studies by considering motivation in such a particular way; by considering the emerging themes and consequently explore the impact on occupational outcomes. The themes that emerged by looking at the return migration decision in this way included the influence of employment, independent decision making, the use of social network as research on employment opportunities and the concept of home. We also can make inferences about the internalisation of the migration decision for this sample.

When looking at the overall findings, we can see that the migration decision itself has been internalised, there is a clear tone set by the respondents that their reason for return is not purely external. Respondents have given insight into the feelings surrounding the move, and what they hope to gain by the move and although the financial benefits were clear for some, there were also mentions of more internal regulators such as feelings of contribution towards their home country, a sense of curiosity about the move and the experience of returning. Given its importance as a motivator, it would be prudent to also mention that employment was also not

exclusively externally regulated. While for some there were mentions of financial gain, it is clear that aspects of employment were also internalised. With respect to occupational choices, respondents were very much aware of their human capital. Not only did they reflect on what they had to offer but they also had an idea on its value. There was a focus on seeking employment congruent with experience and or studies, and mentions of employment outside of this were due to circumstance. What would be beneficial when looking in this area in the future is to further assess the level of internalisation of both the migration decision and the employment decision, giving us an exact indication on where on the continuum both lie and then seeing how they interact with each other and the subsequent preparation taken. The research on motivation is clear; the more internalized the better the outcome or the tendency to undertake an activity well, by having an idea on the internalization of such a decision can help with forecasting not only in the local sense for projecting by talent sourcing and management but also consider the impact on wider trends or catalysts where there is a potential for mass migration.

It was clear that the motivation behind the move influenced the preparation that was undertaken and the things that participants considered after making a migration decision. We can see that in terms of preparation for the move, employment was the biggest focus be it comparing job markets, setting wage expectations and also securing work, this appears intuitive given the part that employment played on the migration decision. What was also of great interest with this is the use of social networks to inform employment options and decisions and how it fed into the preparation. As an external regulator, social network was not as influential on the migration decision unlike previous research, however, for the respondents' social network proved invaluable as a resource for planning and preparation for the move. Given the rise in the use of social media particularly the part it plays in recruitment, we cannot be surprised by its use in

the context of the study, what we can consider is how this can be harnessed by companies when sourcing talent globally. It would be beneficial to explore the information that was sought through social network and its comparison to what is available, through websites. Through this companies can consider the information that they make available in the public domain and make comparisons with not only what is being fed back to candidates informally but what they should be putting forward directly as part of their internal branding.

While we were able to apply SDT to the migration decision and have insight on themes under this perspective, making distinctions between the different subtypes was difficult, in particular when we consider the internal regulators. While the questions grouping mirrored the work of other researchers that apply SDT when assessing motivators, by using semi structured interview the aim was to allow respondents the opportunity to reflect freely on all aspects considered when making a migration decision. The approach taken limited how the findings could be considered with another sample and indeed other migration contexts in mind. Future consideration in working research would benefit in continuing to explore a migration decision using SDT could start by expanding the current research by continuing to work within the qualitative realm as part of item design, conducting interviews and or undertaking focus groups to not only diversify the sample, but see the themes that come about. The potential there is to allow the themes to guide the items used for the scale and to also separate the combined regulators often found in SDT based research. From there, the focus would be to design and test an SDT based migration scale on a larger sample size. This would allow for a greater distinction between the different motivation domains as items will relate specifically for a particular regulator found within the SDT continuum. By further analysing the impact of the motivation regulations we could have a greater understanding on the interactions between the

motivation subtypes and the migration decision, we can then be in a better position to then explore the occupational choices and outcomes on the migrant.

The project was designed to apply SDT in migration, by considering this perspective we hoped to gain a greater understanding on what motivated a migration decision and how the motivator shapes the preparation undertaken. We also wanted to see the impact this has on occupational outcomes. For the respondents, we can see that the motivator behind the decision greatly shaped the preparation that followed, and this also impacted the occupational choices. There was internalisation of the migration decision as well as the main motivator. Future research in this area can continue to develop SDT based tools to have a greater understanding of the motivation behind a migration decision. It would be beneficial to continue this initially through qualitative means, with a larger sample so we can generate relevant items that can later be tested as an assessment tool. This is important as we find that the motivation behind the migration decision greatly influences the preparation undertaken, this is also important considering the diverse consequences migration has overall.

7 References

- Amabile, T. M., Hill, K. G., Hennessey, B.A. & Tighe, E.M. 1994 *The work preference inventory: Assessing intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. Vol 66. No. 5 950 – 967.
- Ambrosini, J. W., Myr, K., Peri, Giovanni, P. & Radu, D. 2015. *The selection of migrants and returnees in Romania. Evidence and long-run implications*. Economics of Transition. Volume 23(4) , 753–793. DOI: 10.1111/ecot.12077.
- Barcevičius, E. & Žvalionytė, D. 2012, as cited in Zaiceva, A. & Zimmermann, K. F. 2012. Returning Home at Times of Trouble? Return Migration of EU Enlargement Migrants during the Crisis. Discussion paper series. IZA DP No. 7111
- Bengtsson, M. 2016. How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. Nursing Plus Open 2. 8-14.
- Bijwaard, G.E. & Doeselaar, S. 2014. *The impact of changes in the marital status on return migration of family migrants*. J Popul Econ (2014) 27:961–997. Springer. DOI 10.1007/s00148-013-0495-3.
- Borjas, G., & Bratsberg, B. (1996). *Who leaves? The out-migration of the foreign-born*. Review of Economics Statistics, 78(1), 165–176.
- Borodak, D. & Piracha, M (2011) *Occupational choice of return migrants in Moldova*. Eastern European Economics, 49 (4). pp. 24-46. ISSN 0012–8775. E-ISSN 1557-9298.
- Boyle, P.J., Kulu, H., Cooke, T., Gayle, V. & Mulder, C.H. 2008. Moving and union dissolution. Demography. Vol 45:209–222.
- Byron, M. & Condon, S. 2012. *A comparative study of Caribbean return migration from Britain and France: Towards a context-dependent explanation*. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers Vol. 21, No. 1 (1996), pp. 91-104.
- Cassarino, J. 2004. *Theorising return migration: The conceptual approach to return migrants revisited*. International Journal on Multicultural Societies (IJMS), Vol. 6, No. 2, 2004: 253 -279. ISSN 1817-4574, www.unesco.org/shs/ijms/vol6/issue2/art4.
- Carletto, C. & Kilic T. (2011), “*Moving Up the Ladder? The Impact of Migration Experience on Occupational Mobility in Albania*”. Journal of Development Studies, Vol.47, No. 6, pp. 846–869.
- Commander, S., Kangasniemi, M. & Winters, L. A. 2002. The brain drain: Curse or boon? A survey of the literature. Baldwin, R. E & Winters, L. A. (Ed) *Challenges to Globalization: Analyzing the Economics*. 235 - 278. University of Chicago Press
URL: <http://www.nber.org/chapters/c9540>.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R.M. 1985. *The general causality orientation scale: Self-determination in personality*. Journal of research personality. Vol 19. 109-134.

- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. 2000. *The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour*. Psychological Inquiry. Vol.11 No. 4. 227-268
- De Coulon, A., & Piracha, M. (2005). *Self-selection and the performance of return migrants: The source country perspective*. Journal of Population Economics, 18(4), 779–807.
- Docquier, F. & Rapaport, H. 2011. *Globalization, brain drain and development*. IZA Discussion Paper Series. Paper No, 5590.
- Dustmann C, Glitz A (2011) Migration and education. In: Hanushek EA, Machin S, Woessmann L (eds) Handbook of the economics of education. North-Holland, Amsterdam Volume 4, pp 327–439.
- Easterly, W. and Nyarko, Y. 2008. Is the brain drain good for Africa? Brookings Global Economy and Development. Working Paper 19. March .
- Fidel, R. 1993. *Qualitative methods in information retrieval research*. Library and information Science Research. Vol 15 No. 3, 219-247.
- Gagne, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Crevier-Braud, L., Broeck, A., Aspel, A., Bellerose, J., Benabour, C., Chemolli, E., Guntert, S., Halvari, H., Indiyastuti, D., Johnson, P., Molstand, M., Naudin, M., Nda, A., Olafsen, A., Roussel, P., Wang, Z. & Westbye, C. 2014, *The multidimensional work motivation scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries*. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology.
- Gibson, J. & McKenzie, D. 2011. *The microeconomic determinants of emigration and return migration of the best and brightest: evidence from the Pacific*. J Dev Econ 95:18–29.
- Güngör, N. D. & Tansel, A. 2012. *Brain drain from Turkey: Return intentions of skilled migrants*. International Migration. Vol 52 (5) 2014. ISSN 020-7985. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Ilahi, N. 1999. *Return migration and occupational change*. Review of Development Economics. Vol. 3, No. 2. June 170-186.
- KING, R. (2000) *Generalizations from the history of return migration, in Return Migration: journey of hope and despair?* , ed. B. Ghosh, International Organization for Migration/United Nations, Geneva.
- King, R. 2012. Geography and migration studies: Retrospect and prospect. Population Space and Place. Vol. 18 . No. 2. P 134-153
- King, R. & Christou, A. 2014. *Second-generation “return” to Greece: New dynamics of transnationalism and integration*. International Migration. Vol.52 (6) ISSN 0020-7985 John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Kupets, O. (2011). *Brain gain or brain waste? The performance of return labor migrants in the Ukrainian labor market*. Economics Education and Research Consortium Working Paper No 11/06E.

- Kveder, C. L. M., & Flahaux, M. 2013. *Returning to Dakar: A mixed methods analysis of the role of migration experience for occupational Status*. World Development Vol. 45, pp. 223–238.
- Legido-Quigley, H., Saliba, V. & McKee, M. 2015. *Exploring the experiences of EU qualified doctors working in the United Kingdom: A qualitative study*. Health Policy. 119. 494-502.
- Lianos, T., & A. Pseiridis. 2009. *On-the-job skills and earnings of returned migrants*. International Migration, DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2435.2009.00558.x.
- Lloyd, K. & Little, D.E. 2010. Self-determination theory as a framework for understanding women’s psychological well-being outcomes from leisure-time physical activity. Leisure sciences. 32. 369-385. ISSM: 0149-0400 / 1521-0588.
- Lochner, L., Wieser, H. & Mischo-Kelling, M. 2012. *A qualitative study of the intrinsic motivation of physicians and other health professionals to teach*. International Journal of Medical Education. 3. 209-215. ISSN:2042-6372.
- Malka, A. & Chatman, J.A. 2003. *Intrinsic and extrinsic work orientations as moderators of the effect of annual income on subjective well-being: A longitudinal study*. PSPB, Vol. 29 No. 6, June 2003 737-746.
- Martin, R, & Radu, D. 2012. *Return migration: The experience of eastern Europe*. *International Migration*. Vol. 50 (6) ISSN 0020-7985.
- McCormick B, Wahba J (2001) Overseas work experience, savings and entrepreneurship amongst returnees to LDCs. Scot J Pol Econ 48(2):164–178.
- McKenzie, D. & Salcedo, A. 2009. *Japanese-Brazilians and the future of Brazilian migration to Japan*. *International Migration*. Vol. 52 (2) 2014. John Wiley & Sons Ltd. ISSN 0020-7985.
- Meho, L. I. 2006. *E-mail interviewing in qualitative research: A methodological discussion*. Journal of the American society for information science and technology. Vol 57. No 10. 1284-1295.
- Mesnard A. 2004. *Temporary migration and capital market imperfections*. Oxford Economic Papers. Vol 56(2). 242–262.
- Piracha, M., and Vadean, F. 2010. *Return migration and occupational choice: Evidence from Albania*, World Development Vol. 38, No. 8, pp. 1141–1155.
- Reynolds, T. 2008 *Ties that bind: families, social capital and second-generation return migration*. Sussex Centre for Migration Research Working Paper 46, Brighton.
- Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. 2000. *Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well being*. American Psychologist. P68 -78
- Ryan, R. & Deci, E. L. 2000a. *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: classic definitions and new directions*. Contemporary Educational Psychology. 25. 54-67

Sun, W. (2013). *The productivity of return migrants: the case of China's "Sea Turtles"*. IZA Journal of Migration, Vol. 2, Issue 5, pp. 1–19.

Takenaka, A. 2014. *The rise and fall of diasporic bonds in Japanese-Peruvian "return" migration*. International Migration. Vol. 52 (6) p100 – 112. ISSN 0020-7985. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Trembley, M., Blanchard, C., Taylor, S., Pelletier, L. & Villeneuve, M. 2009. *Work extrinsic and intrinsic motivation scale: Its value for organizational psychology research*, Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, Vol. 41, No. 4, 213 – 226.

Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., De Witte, Sigfried., De Witte, H. & Deci, E. L. 2004. *The "why" and "why not" of job search behaviour: Their relation to searching, unemployment experience and well being*. European Journal of Social Psychology. Vol. 34. 345-363.

Wahba, J. 2015. *Selection, selection, selection: the impact of return migration*. Journal Popular Economics (2015) 28:535–563. Published online: 29 January 2015.

8 Annexes

8.1 Appendix 1 Interview Guide

General Questions

- What was the reason for you moving to ... [host country]?
- How long were you living there?
- How long ago did you return?

Motivation behind decision (Elicit response on motivation)

- What was behind your decision to return / stay?
- What was the greatest influence behind your decision [to move]?
- Why did you put that effort in returning?
- Was there anything in particular that made you consider returning/staying?

Decision and Processes (Impact of motivation and follow up behaviours)

- How long did you take to make the decision to return?
- Did the decision change over time?
- How did you prepare for the return?
- Why did you consider this?

Social Regulation (External Motivation)

- Did you speak to family and friends about your decision to return?
- What was their take on you returning?
- Did you consider this information when you decided to return?

Previous experience or knowledge (Elicit Different motivations and impact)

- While living abroad did you visit your home country at all?
- Did your experience whilst travelling have any bearing on your decision?

Personal reflections

- Was there anything that you found of interest when you were making your decision to return? (Internal)
- Was there anything that you found exciting about preparing for the return? (Internal)

Elicit responses on emotions for either Introjected or internal

- How did you feel about the decision?

- How did you feel about your preparation for return?
- Tell me how you felt when you were returning?

Occupational Choices

- When did you look for employment?
- Did you ever look for employment in x country?
- How did you look for employment?
- What kind of work were you looking for?
- Was the work related to your previous experience or your studies?
- Did how you look for work change over time?
- Did the types of jobs you were looking for change over time?
- Did this differ with the way that you looked for work when you were seeking employment in your host country?
- What kind of work were you doing there?

8.2 Appendix 2 Demographic information Collected

Age:

Gender:

Marital Status:

Children / Dependents:

Nationality:

Second Nationality (If applicable):

Education level:

Occupational Status:

Occupation:

Main language Spoken:

Second Language Spoken :

Current country of residence:

Years spent in current country of residence:

Which country (or countries) are your immediate family residents?

(Parents, children, grand children, siblings)

Which country (or countries) are your extended family residents?

(aunts, uncles, cousins, grand-parents)

Please indicate if you are:

Currently in home country following return migration

Currently in host country and wishes to stay

Currently in host country and do not wish to return

8.3 Appendix 3 Transcript Coding Extract

Appendix 8.3.1 Question: Why did you move to (Host Country)?

	Condensed excerpt	First analysis	Category	Theme
F1	<p>I came here just for the language first</p> <p>I was doing translations a lot and during my studies I did not get the chance to go somewhere where people speak the language</p> <p>I wanted to be somewhere where people could speak English so that is why I came here</p> <p>Then I got a job, I spent I think 2 years, nearly 2 years working with the previous job and then I got this job and I been here since.</p> <p>But my main point was to improve the language skills.</p>	<p>Migrated due to language</p> <p>Irrelevant (Relates to when the move took place)</p> <p>England was selected because people spoke the language</p> <p>Stayed due to work.</p> <p>Migrated due to language skills development</p>	<p>Language skills</p> <p>Host country selection</p> <p>Occupational opportunity</p> <p>Language skills</p>	<p>Language skills as a motivation for outward migration</p> <p>Job opportunity the reason for remaining in host country</p>
F2	<p>well actually first I moved to Spain, so I spent six months there, I moved out of Argentina specifically to go to Spain.</p> <p>Because I wanted to study, a career area I couldn't study here.</p> <p>And then, yeah I couldn't get a job in Spain so I moved to London.</p>	<p>Migrated to more than 1 host</p> <p>Spain selected due to study options</p> <p>Moved from one host to another for work</p>	<p>Multiple stop migration</p> <p>Host country selection</p> <p>Occupational opportunity / Multiple stop migration</p>	<p>Multi – stop trajectory</p> <p>Education opportunity as a motivation for outward migration</p> <p>Job opportunity the reason for remigration</p>
F3	<p>I was born in Mozambique, when I was about 4 moved to Portugal for a year and then after that, basically Portugal because Portugal colonized Mozambique,</p> <p>and then left Portugal went to London stayed in London for a year and then moved to Southport</p>	<p>Migrated as young child, not independent decision</p> <p>Migrated to more than 1 host</p>	<p>Child migration</p> <p>Multiple stop migration</p>	<p>Child migration</p> <p>Multi-stop trajectory</p>

F4	<p>so 23 years in the UK looking for a better opportunity and mainly I wanted to use my skills with languages and develop myself</p> <p>I thought I could go to university because I was 18 and I thought I was too young</p> <p>and I thought it was easier to come out for one year originally it was like one month ticket and one year or two improve my English</p> <p>and then you feel at home here you know and I just went from job to job and I enjoyed that, there was an availability of different jobs</p>	<p>England selected for language skills</p> <p>Irrelevant (Reflection on own personal development)</p> <p>Short term stay intended for language</p> <p>Felt at home in host</p> <p>Stayed due to work</p>	<p>Host country selection</p> <p>Temporary migration</p> <p>Home</p> <p>Occupation opportunity</p>	<p>Language skills selected as a motivation for outward migration</p> <p>Migration not permanent</p> <p>Concept of Home</p> <p>Job opportunity the reason for remaining in host</p>
F5	<p>I went to Portugal, I started to think about going to Portugal because my ex-husband is from there, and we met each other in Brazil and because his dad lived there and he was alone his mother had died and we decided to move to Portugal and in 2006 we moved to live in Portugal,</p> <p>and of course six years after we got divorced and I was thinking of staying in Portugal but the job situation was not good for me and I decided to try and come to the United States because then I met another person at the time</p>	<p>Portugal due to family commitments</p> <p>Relationship influence</p> <p>Low perception of local market</p> <p>Moved from 1 host to another for work</p>	<p>Host country selection</p> <p>Multiple stop migration</p> <p>Host country selection</p> <p>Occupational opportunity</p>	<p>Social network as a motivation for outward migration</p> <p>Multi-stop trajectory</p> <p>Job opportunity reasons for remigration</p> <p>Social network as a motivation for remigration</p>
M1	<p>one of the things was the political situation in Angola in that time, so Angola was in war for a number of years, due to that situation I had to migrate to another country. Look for better opportunities and a safer place that I could live, me and my family.</p>	<p>Migration for safety</p>	<p>Host Country selection</p>	<p>Outward migration to avoid conflict</p>
M2	<p>the reason in moving to the UK initially was that coming from an underdeveloped country we grew up with the perception that travelling to a country which is considered a first World you are automatically met</p>	<p>Perception of benefit for moving to host country</p>	<p>Host country selection</p>	<p>Outward migration due to better opportunities</p>

	with favourable circumstances and better education, just as the political climate in Angola was getting tense with opposing parties battling out for the ruler ship of Angola I was granted an opportunity from my immediate family to move into the UK in 1992, in which I fully embraced without the slightest hesitation.	Migration due to political climate Family support / Child migration	Host country selection	Outward migration to avoid conflict Social network support for outward migration
M3	yeah I am here in Portugal since 2009, you now, I came back for study that is right	Portugal selected due to study options	Host country selection	Education opportunity as a motivation for outward migration
M4	first I came on holiday, but the war stayed so long in Angola so I decided to stay for a while, because the war prolonged for quite a long time and I didn't want to get involved, that is why I decided to remain here	Short term stay intended for leisure Remained for safety	Host country selection	Outward migration to avoid conflict

Appendix 8.3.2 Question: Did you speak to family/friends about your decision to return?

For F2 the question was worded differently as she had already mentioned speaking to family and friends in preparation for the return so was asked, Did you speak to them about your decision to return? To clarify the impact on the decision.

	Condensed excerpt	First analysis	Category	Theme
F1	No, no, its only mine, because I don't want to say it and then when it comes the time I have changed my mind because I have something here or someone here you know	Own decision Did not wish to communicate change	Social motivation	Independent decision
F2	Oh well, as soon as I told them something like that, they were extremely happy and were like oh my god yes come back, there is plenty of jobs come back it will be great. yes you should return.	Family supportive of decision Job opportunities reinforced	Social motivation Job opportunity	Family support Job opportunity a motivation for return migration
F3	well it was more like a holiday thing so I was like, Mm I am going on holiday, because my grandmother has a house here as well, so I was going on holiday came here and stayed so it was more, okay I am staying, what	No family involvement on decision Infrastructure in place Decision was without forethought	Social motivation Preparation Preparation	Independent decision. Accommodation in place Impulsive

	you mean you are staying, I am staying.			
F4	<p>Oh yes, you always end up, because it is kind of your dreams and you talk definitely with your close relatives and your close friends and um yes,</p> <p>and some people say yeah just try it and some people say yeah you are crazy there is nothing there for you.</p> <p>You know. No I wouldn't get influenced by other peoples decisions, its mainly , if I would find a job and go back to Portugal I think I would try to fit in but I still don't know if I would like the way things are handled at the job.</p> <p>I have not had that many experience back home, I will be very honest , I just worked when I was a student from the age of 14 in my holidays which was like a freelance always so its not like I have done serious job in Portugal. Lets be very straight about that.</p>	<p>Discussion with family takes place</p> <p>Mixed feedback about returning.</p> <p>Input did not influence decision</p> <p>Job opportunity considered more</p> <p>Doubt over work environment</p> <p>Irrelevant (Type of work done at home)</p>	<p>Social motivation</p> <p>Social motivation</p> <p>Social motivation</p> <p>Job opportunity</p> <p>Work environment</p>	<p>Family discussion</p> <p>Family input</p> <p>Independent decision</p> <p>Job opportunity as a motivation for return Impact of workplace environment</p>
F5	<p>Only friends, I didn't speak with my parents or family because at this time I was trying to avoid making them feel worried about coming to the united states, because all of the political situation was not good time to come, I just told my family when I was here, and when I was with somebody else from the church's, everything was okay and I took some picture and I send my mother and I told her I am not in Portugal anymore, I am in the united states and this way I told my parent I am not living in Portugal anymore</p>	<p>Discussion with friends takes place No discussion with family</p> <p>Did not wish to worry family</p> <p>Family informed after the move</p>	<p>Social motivation</p> <p>Impact on family</p> <p>Social motivation</p>	<p>Friend discussion</p> <p>No family input on the decision</p> <p>Emotional toll on family considered</p> <p>Independent decision</p>
M1	<p>it was not easy, I was criticized by a lot of friends and even some family, I can say, to come back home after a few years, some of them they told me it was not a good time, I should give it some more few years, because, and then some of them said it was a good time to come around, you haven't seen your family for long time and it is always good to be home, so there were differences, some people have different opinions of that but basically at the end of the day I had to make my own decision, so that was the one, to come back home.</p>	<p>Discussion with family and friends takes place</p> <p>Mixed feedback Question of timing</p> <p>Emotional toll on family being separated</p> <p>Own decision has to be made</p>	<p>Social motivation</p> <p>Social motivation</p> <p>Impact on family</p> <p>Social motivation</p>	<p>Family / Friend discussion</p> <p>Family input</p> <p>Toll on family considered</p> <p>Independent decision</p>

M2	Families and friends were mainly supportive because most shared the same ideals, going back to my home country and landing a good job was the perfect case scenario, to add my sister funded my travelling ticket.	Family supportive Shared ideals Financial support	Social motivation Preparation	Family discussion / Family input Return flights paid
M3	Yeah, especially you know, when I said to my mum about my project of future in 2012 when I was doing this master she said well let's do this step by step. What I mean what I realise that it means when she said this we are all going to suffer somehow because we are going to be separated but it's not going to be forever you know we are going to stay together, talking to each other by the new technologies ...	Discussion with family before initial migration Migration a process as part of bigger plan Emotional toll Migration not permanent	Social motivation Migration not permanent Impact on family	Family discussion Migration intended as temporary Toll on family
M4	some people know my close relatives and friends know my decision	Awareness of decision but no input	Social motivation	Independent decision

Appendix 8.3.3 Question: How did you look for employment?

*F3 and F5 although did not explicitly state this during the recorded interviews, completed job searches online.

	Condensed excerpt	First analysis	Category	Theme
F1	I mainly put my CV on like a website like Indeed, where companies can see your CV and they contact you. Or sometimes I can also look for a job with the title, and apply directly, but mainly I just put my CV on different websites.	Internet based search CV database Apply directly	Employment seeking strategies	Web based searches
F2	yeah, I started searching the web, websites and stuff like that also to know get an idea of what the pay should look like, I had lost track of that stuff	Internet based searches Pay benchmarking	Employment seeking strategies	Web based searches Employment information
F3	N/A			
F4	ok, 'cause I was at the time working in hotel reception, I looked at hotel reception jobs, switchboards, anything that would be with the experience that I had back then it was very low paid, very very low, I know I did not have probably all the skills but I had a lot experience already, I had like nearly five years experience so I thought going back still young you I was 23 I thought	Jobs in line with experience Pay comparison Self awareness on own experience and how this would be received by job market	Type of jobs sought	Jobs congruent with experience Employment information Reflection on job market

	<p>wow that could be a window of opportunity out there but I couldn't come across that,</p> <p>and then there was lots of jobs with retail but doing sales sale and more sales I looked around shopping centre and with shopping centres there was advertisement we need employees here we need employees there so I applied and gave my CV in person tried to look for the contact name for the person I would expect a call from most of them didn't even call back</p> <p>and I did look in the job centre like I mentioned but I didn't feel that was, I didn't get any interview after 2 weeks</p> <p>I think was disappointed, I was very young and impatient I guess (laugh) and I knew coming back to the UK was like so easy to get a new job any time and get my skills recognized start working straight away and go back to active.</p>	<p>Direct applications in person with CV in store</p> <p>Job centre</p> <p>Perception of more opportunities</p>	<p>Employment seeking strategies</p> <p>Employment seeking strategies</p> <p>Migration to host</p>	<p>Direct applications</p> <p>Application through third party (social organisation)</p> <p>Return home not permanent</p> <p>Remigration</p>
F5	N/A			
M1	<p>actually I was looking for internet, talked to a few friends um some of them had been to Angola already, so they gave me websites so I can search for jobs. That was the main things I was looking for</p>	<p>Internet</p> <p>Social Network</p>	<p>Employment Seeking strategies</p>	<p>Internet</p> <p>Site Referrals</p>
M2	<p>I was literally talking to anyone and everyone I thought could help,</p> <p>then I thought that other initiatives had to be employed so I started purchase the local papers on a daily basis and then off to an Internet cafe where I sent my application by email to roles which matched my skill set, only after a year and few months I had a breakthrough and landed my first job in Angola in 2014.</p>	<p>Social Network</p> <p>Advert in publications / Newspapers</p> <p>Online searches</p>	<p>Employment seeking strategies</p> <p>Employment seeking strategies</p>	<p>Site Referrals</p> <p>Ad response</p> <p>Internet searches</p>
M3	<p>I am going to start to send my curriculum in the end of this year to signal that I am here and I am doing this networks. With the other students, with other professors, that I am publishing papers, that I am trying to show my investigation, try to develop the scientific area.</p>	<p>Direct application via CV</p> <p>Networking</p> <p>Publishing</p>	<p>Employment Seeking strategies</p>	<p>Direct</p> <p>Networking</p> <p>Reputation – through work</p>

M4	well ... I didn't need to look for it, because when I came from Angola I had already employment there so I made my approach to my former employers and I returned to there	Previous employer	Employment Seeking strategies	Direct
----	--	-------------------	-------------------------------	--------