

Migration and Policies in the European Union: *Highly Skilled Mobility, Free Movement of Labour and Recognition of Diplomas*¹

João Peixoto*

ABSTRACT

This article evaluates the relationship between highly skilled mobility (especially by individuals with university-level degrees) and migration policies. Data from the European Union (EU) and Portugal (in particular) provide the empirical basis of the research.

EU policies regarding the free circulation of individuals which aim to build the “common market” for economic factors (including labour) are reviewed, as are the more specific recognition of diplomas policies for professional and academic purposes, and recent levels of international mobility in both the EU and Portugal.

The article also enumerates the main obstacles that, from a political and legal or social and cultural perspective, explain the low mobility revealed by those figures. Obstacles include the broad denial of citizenship rights; the necessity of assuring a means of sustenance; linguistic and technical exigencies for diploma recognition; the social attributes of work (more explicit in the service sector); and the institutional nature of national skilled labour markets.

The main exception to the low mobility rule – movements of cadres in the internal labour markets of transnational corporations – together with flows in other multinational organizations, are also reviewed. In these, migrations are relatively exempt from political constraints and, significantly, avoid the recognition procedures adopted by the EU. In other words, it seems that the

* Department of Social Sciences, Institute of Economics and Business Administration, Technical University of Lisbon, Portugal.

entry of highly skilled individuals in a transnational corporation, and not their citizenship in a Europe without frontiers, is what enables them to achieve effective mobility.

INTRODUCTION

This article evaluates the relationship between highly skilled mobility, especially by individuals with university-level degrees, and migration policies. Data from the European Union (EU) and Portugal (in particular) provide the empirical basis of the research. The factors explaining highly skilled migration are multiple and largely transcend the policy realm. These include the growing need for highly-skilled workers in contemporary economies; the supply and demand mechanisms occurring at local and national levels; social and political contexts; the degree of economic internationalization, including investments and firms; migration and professional recruitment policies in given countries; and recognition of diploma policies for academic and professional purposes (Salt and Findlay, 1989; Findlay, 1990; Salt, 1992 and 1994; and, more recently, Iredale, 1999; Mahroum, 1999b; Peixoto, 1999b). The impact of policy factors, in particular relating to the EU, over skilled mobility has been subject to very little empirical scrutiny.

The article deals with classical migration flows, i.e. those involving more or less “permanent” stay in another country and with migration policies and recognition of diploma procedures adopted within the EU framework and concerning its citizens. There is a significant mismatch between real migration flows and policy lines designed to regulate them. On the one hand, there is a weak correlation between real EU internal mobility and growth in the formal possibilities for moving on the part of skilled professionals. On the other hand, many highly skilled internal flows occurred before the EU regulations were set, and occur nowadays independently of policy regulations. In other words, a significant part of skilled migration seems to be unrelated to political integration and must therefore be related to other variables. This is not to say that EU policies do not have important effects: growth in foreign investment and student movements have real or potential implications for migrations. But these effects are, to a large extent, indirect, and do not conceal the relative ineffectiveness of policies designed for professional mobility.

A “mixed” methodology was adopted for the research. First, an extensive analysis of general statistical data and other sources was undertaken in order to provide a picture of highly skilled international flows at both EU and Portuguese levels. Two main types of data were collected: statistics by occupation and education, and on skills’ recognition. However, there is a dearth of data on these matters (Salt, 1992; Findlay, 1995). The wider problems concerning migration data collection and measurement of internal EU flows are difficult to

resolve following rules which have eased the circulation of individuals. Analysis of highly skilled movements presents additional problems, including difficulty of obtaining detailed occupation and educational data and the specificity of their flows (frequent temporary movements). Second, in-depth information was sought through contacts with knowledgeable informants and with persons in institutions related to professional mobility in Portugal. Some interviews were conducted with officials in government departments concerned with skills recognition and professional associations. Case studies relating to transnational corporations (TNCs) were also analysed. About 30 such semi-directive interviews were conducted, mainly in 1996 (Peixoto, 1999b). The evidence obtained enables both broad generalizations to be made as well as insights concerning specific migration modalities.

MIGRATION AND RECOGNITION OF DIPLOMAS POLICIES

The study of international migration requires knowledge of political mechanisms that rule the movements of social agents. At present, regulations developed in a common framework within EU countries appear to be decisive in this context as countries have become progressively integrated into a harmonized circulation of individuals and skills. This is important for the entire EU population, given the increase of available means of migration.² It is also crucial for the highly skilled agents.

Regarding general policies, migration permission for EU citizens is very significant. Despite the difficulty of obtaining consensus on migration issues (disagreements concern mainly non-EU citizens), and clauses that (still) prevent total internal freedom of movement, steps taken by the EU have been impressive. In the beginning, intra-EU migration (of EU citizens) was marked by principles fixed in the 1957 Treaty of Rome, which urged a “common market” characterized by “abolition ... of the obstacles to the free circulation of goods and services, persons and capital” (EU, 1995: I) – principles reinforced in the European Single Act and the Maastricht Treaty. Today, possibilities for migration within the Union may be considered high, although it could still be argued that a number of mechanisms (of a political and legal nature) do not lead to complete freedom (Penninx and Muus, 1989; Ardittis, 1990; Soares, 1990; Fielding, 1993; Werner, 1993; Convey and Kupiszewski, 1995; Peixoto, 1996).

Regarding mobility, diploma recognition policies are crucial for enabling migration.³ EU member countries currently maintain a mixed bag of rules in this area. When dealing with countries outside the EU, governments apply norms developed by major international institutions such as the Council of Europe and UNESCO, or support their policies through bilateral or multilateral arrangements. For internal flows (of EU citizens), EU legislation has been extensive. Although reference to credentials as one “obstacle” to free circulation

and construction of a “common market” is limited, in the Treaty of Rome, for self-employed professionals, its scope is broader. If the exercise of a profession is legally subordinated to possession of a qualifying certificate (or diploma) awarded in a member state – i.e. if it is a “regulated profession” – then credentials’ recognition becomes necessary in order to access that member state (CEC, 1994: 5).

Diploma recognition in the EU has been a complex process. Until the late 1980s the Union dealt mainly with recognition for professional purposes (diplomas obtained in one member state allowing the exercise of a profession in another). Throughout that period several localized efforts were witnessed, leading to multiple directives concerning the recognition of skills in particular professions and economic activities. These directives related only to regulated professions and covered the right of establishment and rendering of services (for salaried and non-salaried occupations) and targeted both high level (including higher education qualifications) and other skills. Professional recognition was generally accompanied by attempts to achieve similarity of training and skills. From the mid-1960s onwards, many directives were enacted on particular professions, initially excluding higher education; in the mid-1970s, legislation began to cover high level professions.⁴ Given that the production of these “sectoral” directives was extremely slow, a simplification and generalization procedure was undertaken in the late 1980s leading to a change in construction of the “general” perspective. Instead of case-by-case regulation, a more general guideline was sought and within the framework of generic conditions each regulated profession was endowed with recognition mechanisms. The fundamental criterion was the number of years of higher or post-secondary education (including the technical and professional component of the secondary level) necessary to achieve proficiency in a particular skill (CEC, 1996: 2).⁵

The imbalance registered during the EU’s first few decades between economic and other policy targets (the economic sphere was the only one where European powers existed) is the main reason for the tardy appearance of diploma recognition policies for academic purposes compared with professional credentials. Policy-making in that area began in the 1970s: an experimental educational programme adopted in 1976 contained the first package of measures. Its objectives included increased correspondence between European educational systems (mutual knowledge of educational systems, necessity of “exchange and mobility” of students and teachers and eased procedures for recognition); greater cooperation in the field of higher education (including the “free circulation and mobility of teachers, students and researchers” and better possibilities of “academic recognition of diplomas, periods of study and studies undertaken”); and the collection of documentation and statistics in the field of education (including the creation of information centres about EU educational systems). The launching of most forms of diploma and periods of

study recognition for academic purposes that exist today occurred later, especially during the second half of the 1980s. Among these initiatives, such programmes for student mobility as ERASMUS (now SOCRATES) are the most widely known (CEC, 1994: 13; for further developments, see Pertek, 1992; Adam et al., 1994; Peixoto, 1996).⁶

SKILLED MIGRATION FLOWS WITHIN THE EU

Despite various policies covering intra-EU free circulation and formal recognition of skills, increased internal movement within the Union has not been directly proportional to legislative output; in some cases total migration has been on a downward trend. This may have occurred for two reasons. First, current regulations on free circulation may not allow enough freedom, due to various mobility obstacles still extant in the legal field. Second, some factors in the economic and social domains may have led to a natural decrease of flows, including industrial restructuring which occurred after the 1970s. Modification of European economies led to reduced demand for low-skilled labour in core countries (which made up the bulk of intra-European migration after World War 2); modernization and rising standards of living in countries that were formerly net exporters of labour (e.g. in southern Europe and Ireland); and substitution of manufacturing by service industries where the importance of social skills, including linguistic abilities, may inhibit migratory flows. These factors, when coupled with the worldwide expansion of migrant recruitment areas, including the immigration of low-skilled workers from outside Europe, provide convincing evidence to explain the sharp decrease of intra-EU movement of low-skilled agents and, at best, the growth of some specific flows: cadres of TNCs, highly skilled technicians, students, retirees and tourists (Penninx and Muus, 1989; Ardittis, 1990; Marsden, 1992 and 1994; Werner, 1993; and Findlay, 1995).

Despite the importance of the above-mentioned new migratory groups, their growing numbers do not compensate for the lower numbers of previous types of intra-European migrants. Indeed, migratory exchanges among EU countries are currently low. On the basis of each country's total population, citizens from one member state living or working in another are not at all numerous. Indeed, in the mid-1990s only 5 million of the 370 million EU citizens lived in a different EU country from their own (i.e. less than 1.5 per cent), of which only about 3 million were engaged in economic activity (*The Economist*, 17/2/96; Eurostat and OECD various annual statistics). The main exceptions were Portugal and Ireland, with large groups of native-born migrants (and their offspring) living in the broader European space. But in these cases most migratory flows occurred long before their membership in the (then) European Economic Community or the launching of the "internal market" in 1992.

Concerning skilled flows between EU countries, very few data are available. As Findlay (1995: 134) points out, it is easier to know the number of skilled migrants coming from outside the EU than the internal movements. It appears that a slight increase in internal skilled migration occurred during the 1990s mainly connecting new economic cores, including cities, from the UK, France and Germany. However, there are no sound data available on the direction and magnitude of these flows. Also, few data are available on the recognition of diplomas, although some EU official publications contain certain observations. On the basis of rules for recognition of diplomas for professional purposes (an area where EU jurisdiction is more prevalent) and higher education graduates, the number of Europeans who, in the 1990s, began working in different member states other than their own is very low.

First, considering the sectoral directives, the number of recognitions in 1991 was very small. For example, in the health-related professions, only 205 pharmacists, 1969 medical doctors (1.7 per thousand medical doctors in the EU), 230 veterinary surgeons, 2,588 general care nurses, 253 dentists (1.2 per thousand) and 87 midwives were involved (CEC, 1996: 30). The figure for architects was also very low: about 1,500 professionals found work in Belgium, Spain, France, Netherlands, UK and Portugal between 1987 and 1994 (data obtained from Portuguese authorities). Second, concerning general directives, the number who moved between 1991 and 1994 under the first general directive was around 11,000, the majority being teachers (approximately 5,000) and, to a lesser degree, physiotherapists, engineers (a profession that officials confess is seriously under-appreciated, owing to the salaried status and the academic heterogeneity of graduates in the field), lawyers and accountants. Of these, the largest number (about 6,000) went to one country, the UK, 3,800 being teachers (CEC, 1996: 5; see also “Circulação de trabalhadores na Europa – As teias de uma liberdade”, *Público*, 4/3/96).

The limited influence of EU jurisdiction over skilled internal migratory flows is more evident in relation to the characteristics of migrants. Migration has occurred over a long period (as in the case of teachers and lawyers migrating from Ireland to the UK); frontier movements that reflect regional rather than national integration and include nationals from a receiving country who earned their degrees in another member state (for instance, Greeks holding an engineering diploma who return to Greece (CEC, 1996: 30), or offspring of Portuguese migrants who were educated in France but decided to return to Portugal). Many diploma recognition rules, patiently wrought in recent years, have simply eased movements that would have occurred without them.

Given that available data refer only to regulated professions (and many highly skilled professions are not in this group), it is very difficult to measure migrations in EU countries. Much of the mobility of highly skilled social groups is socially and statistically “invisible” (Salt, 1992), and most flows in

the internal labour markets of TNCs do not undergo recognition processes. In addition, official data usually refer only to mobility of a “permanent” type; intended or real duration of time abroad for a significant period. If short- and medium-term movements are added to these migrations, the number of mobile Europeans would increase substantially. Even so, it is possible to argue that for the majority of the national labour force (including the highly skilled) there is a structural non-existence of specific attraction of other European labour markets (Marsden, 1992). This rigidity is recognized by EU authorities when they complain of the costs of low graduate mobility in European economies and the need to overcome the situation (see CEC, 1994: 4; CEC, 1995a: 27-28; CEC, 1995b: 28 and 37).

SKILLED MIGRATION FLOWS IN PORTUGAL

Portugal is an interesting case within the EU framework for several contrasting reasons. Regarding skilled migratory inflows, a significant number could be expected from its more developed European partners. The proportion of skilled labour is lower in Portugal than in most other EU countries as illustrated by the lower education of its labour force. European professionals may be expected to have entered the country attracted by employment opportunities as a result of local shortage and pushed by unemployment or under-use of their skills in their own countries (Baganha, 1998). One would also expect migratory outflows from Portugal to be considerable as income levels of Portuguese professionals are lower than in other European countries. Again, some contradiction exists. Account has to be taken of the “relative” income and internal social status of these categories in Portugal where, on the whole, the standard of living of Portuguese professionals is no worse than in other European countries. Account should also be taken of the relative saturation of other national labour markets.

Portugal has experienced a consistent entry of professionals from abroad, including corporate cadres and independent professionals; the former mainly from Europe and the latter from Brazil (Table 1, page 54). Around 30 per cent of the foreign labour force may be considered highly skilled. The number has not varied much in recent years, its growth being balanced by an equally persistent inflow of low-skilled labour (Pires, 1993; Baganha, 1998; and Peixoto, 1999b). Regarding intra-EU migration, there has been a significant increase in inward flows since Portuguese membership in 1986, but this does not seem to be directly related to European legislation on skills’ recognition.

Available data on recognition of diplomas are scarce. Technical problems relating to the collection of data may be symptomatic of the insignificance of the flows. In relation to sectoral directives on professional recognition in health professions, data are available only on the entry of veterinary surgeons and

pharmacists. In both cases, the number of European citizens who have requested recognition of their credentials is very low: new enrolments in the respective professional orders, under this legislation, being only 21 and 7, respectively, by 1996. The individuals came mainly from Spain. Although figures are not available for medical doctors, membership of the respective professional order by nationality reveals that the number of foreign, and particularly EU, citizens practising this profession in Portugal is low and does not raise concern among national practitioners. Indeed, foreigners represent only 3 per cent of medical doctors in Portugal, of which more than a third come from the EU. There has nevertheless been a significant growth in recent times in the number of non-nationals. The main external group has been Brazilians. During an interview with the representative of a relevant professional association, we were told that “wages are not attractive” in the country, thus eliminating apprehension over significant immigration from the EU or elsewhere.⁷ Data on architects, also subject to sectoral directives, do not introduce any significant changes to this picture.

The data obtained referred only to 1993 and 1994 (the directive was transposed into Portuguese law in 1991) and do not include the individual’s nationality, only the “source” of the diplomas held (Table 2, page 55). Nevertheless, the figures confirm the low volume of overall flows. In years covered by the data only 61 persons with European degrees submitted to the legal procedure. Most (18) were from France, suggesting the link to second generation Portuguese migrants in that country (a trend also visible in the case of architects), followed by Spain, UK and the Netherlands (also the case of medical doctors and architects). These data also reveal the nature of “technical obstacles” to recognition: delayed appreciation of requests; distinction between applications “submitted” and “complete” (and the associated delay in appreciation of the former); the likelihood of candidates being subject to tests or a training period; and the chance of refusal. While these relate to different levels of the screening process, Portugal is not, according to the EU, a country that erects more obstacles in this area (CEC, 1996: 8). These difficulties are responsible for the fact that, in 1994, only 28 of the 61 recognition requests were granted a “positive decision”.⁸

Although our data on academic recognition of diplomas covers only 1989 to 1995, and are available only on the basis of national origin and geographical scope, the number of recognitions for academic purposes is substantially greater than for professional effects (Table 3, pages 56-57). For 1995, the year with the most complete information, almost 800 recognition requests were made, including 317 from the EU and 389 from non-European origins. However, despite an upward trend during the period, total recognitions still constitute a very small fraction of higher level diplomas awarded each year in Portugal.

Between 1989 and 1995, diplomas obtained in the EU registered the highest growth rate (in relative and absolute terms), contrasted with a slight decline for

North America (particularly the US) (Table 3). Requests from the EU increased from around 200 to 300 per year; those from North America remained below 100. Among Europeans, the highest volumes and absolute growth figures were for residents of France and the UK which account for more than two-thirds of the degrees obtained in the EU. The highest relative increase occurred for Spain. The proportion of post-graduate degrees (PhDs and Masters) amongst these diplomas is uneven (Table 4, pages 58-59). The majority of diplomas obtained in the UK and the US fall within this category (85 per cent and 65 per cent, respectively, of the diplomas obtained in those countries throughout the period requesting recognition), but France is situated below the EU average (41 per cent) and less-developed countries account for very small numbers.

These data suggest several main trends. While the increase in EU diplomas over recent years may suggest pressure on the Portuguese skilled labour market by EU citizens, this does not correspond with reality. In many cases, recognition of a diploma does not correspond to entry into the national labour market, but relates to post-graduate degrees obtained by a Portuguese person abroad in the framework of his/her professional career (including academic) begun at home. In other cases, it is the result of Portuguese individuals returning after graduation abroad and about to begin working in Portugal. In the field of academic recognition, European integration has brought some signs of change, although Portuguese citizens' demand for EU post-graduate (or graduate) degrees seems to be to the detriment of the US.

The data also suggest skilled immigration of three main groups. First, Portuguese citizens (either academics, professionals or students) who return after obtaining diplomas in another country, mainly the UK, France or the US. Second, offspring of Portuguese emigrants who enter with graduate degrees obtained in countries such as France, Germany, Switzerland or Venezuela. Third, Brazilian citizens who provide the only consistent foreign "pressure" on the skilled national labour market, being the ones who most recurrently apply to recognition of diploma procedures.⁹

Regarding outflows, it is difficult to obtain data on Portuguese citizens (or diplomas) moving within the framework of EU professional and academic recognition rules. Some information "at destination", obtained from government departments, professional associations and academic institutions of other countries concerning EU professional recognition processes, show that the outflow of nationals is probably less than the inflow of foreign professionals. Besides structural factors concerning highly skilled workers in Portugal (which explain a low "push factor"), institutional procedures in other member States may explain the low level of emigration. Among the few cases we encountered, difficulties experienced in recognition of diplomas obtained in Portugal was cited repeatedly.

OBSTACLES TO MIGRATION

Although economic unevenness in levels of employment and income is not a sufficient condition to initiate emigration, it is often a necessary condition for its occurrence. Only with substantial economic imbalance between two geographic points in the EU concerning a particular professional group can a migratory flow take place (Werner, 1993). In the case of highly skilled labour, this type of situation seems to be mostly absent. Concerning employment, a simultaneous shortage and abundance in different countries for a similar professional group does not seem to be so frequent as to initiate emigration. Concerning income, there are certainly significant imbalances (e.g., between some Southern and Northern countries), although the simultaneous consideration of “absolute” and “relative” incomes, including social status, confers some homogeneity on EU graduates. The emigration of Irish graduates to the UK, for instance, seems very specific, because it has benefited from long-established networks and from a similar environment (including linguistic) (King and Shuttleworth, 1995).

Even in the presence of an economic (or other) rationale for moving, significant obstacles still persist regarding EU highly skilled migration. There are two major types: political and legal, which reflect the obstacles that national governments and professional authorities erect against mobility; and social and cultural, which result from structural mechanisms relatively independent of legal output. Political and legal obstacles exist for the mobility of the general population and labour force in the EU regardless of skill level, and for the mobility of the more educated (both regarding mainly “permanent” stays). In the first case, EU policies are not very distinct from the dominant international pattern. In general, all countries place significant emphasis on controlling immigration. Restrictions result from the strong “national” links of migration policies and their anchoring in a tight attribution of citizenship rights. It has thus been argued that migration (distribution of the labour force) is an economic phenomenon openly resistant to globalization (Morris, 1997). When flows of EU citizens between member states are taken into account, the difficulties are inherent. On the one hand, in the need to assure means of sustenance so as not to overburden local welfare mechanisms; in the interdiction of certain areas of public service; and in restriction before problems of public “order”. On the other hand, restrictions result from the denial of certain national citizenship rights, including acquisition of nationality and the right to vote.

Legal obstacles are also present in the field of diploma recognition. The fact that sectoral directives result from a slow equivalencies negotiation process, often accompanied by veritable difficulties in harmonization (due to the number of years of training and to the “university” or “non-university” framework of courses – not to mention unequal quality criteria), suggests

application troubles. Even in consolidated directives, “automatic” recognition is not certain. Some obstacles are occasionally erected which discourage or make mobility difficult. Generally, and independent of the evaluation made about academic merit of qualifications, problems arise regarding linguistic capabilities (for medical doctors, nurses and lawyers); knowledge of the ethics of the profession and professional institutions (more likely for medical doctors and lawyers); the previous establishment authorization (the case of pharmacists); and the need to be accompanied by a local professional (the case of lawyers).

A larger number of difficulties also arise concerning “horizontal” directives, where the “semi-automatic” procedure allows more room for national authorities to manoeuvre. According to the EU, national resistance was initially expressed by the non-transposition of the directive into national law. In this respect, the most serious situations were few, though they were as many as the exemplary ones.¹⁰ Recognition obstacles include refusal to recognize demands; the requirement of a training period or aptitude tests by professional authorities; delays in the evaluation of demands; or the requirement of language abilities (CEC, 1996). Although it may not be entirely evident, our interviews suggested a general “negative attitude” on the part of certain national professional and state authorities towards the European mobility of graduates.¹¹ However, some of the requirements made by national institutions cannot be considered unreasonable, as is typically the case of teachers’ language skills. Furthermore, a real difficulty of harmonizing heterogeneous training all over Europe cannot be denied.

The legal obstacles to intra-European mobility created by labour markets are either so strong that they resist major political openings, or the perception of potential problems leads national governments to set up legal restrictions, with the intention of protecting sections of the population or labour market interests. There are several reasons for the relative immobility of labour, particularly in the field of highly skilled occupations. As Marsden (1992: 3) stresses, “... labour is generally less mobile than merchandises or capital”. Whilst human resources face major difficulties in moving, the ease of dislocation of goods, services and capital gives them a particular spatial freedom and capacity for inter-linking spaces. The spatial logic of labour certainly depends on the skills involved. The literature on migration selectivity (Peixoto, 1999b) shows that the close link to local and spatially well defined labour markets is more related to low skill than to the highly-skilled jobs.

A deeper analysis of the functioning of labour markets, including the nature of “professions” and “skills”, clearly identifies obstacles (social and cultural) to highly skilled mobility. Regarding professions, attainment of professional autonomy, including the acquisition of a “name” and an institutional apparatus, is a slow process of social construction, involving prolonged negotiation and conflict (Boltanski, 1982). Since these processes usually take place at the

national level, institutional resistance to mobility may emerge whenever the entry of external specialists may cause disruption. The creation of some international professional “alliances” in this area, including a recent link between “university engineers” in the EU (Peixoto, 1996: 15), results precisely from the perception of institutional differences. As for skills, the focus must be on the “institutional structures” of labour markets. According to Marsden (1994), the process of diploma recognition, as usually understood by national authorities, deals mainly with the “technical contents” of skills, when there is a concurrent need to consider the “method” (or institutional context) of its production. Thus, it is possible that workers who achieve certain skill levels during their careers do not view in a good light the entrance of foreign personnel endowed with diplomas in their respective occupations but without experience of a concrete organization.

In the same area of national resistance to mobility we encounter some social and cultural attributes of labour. The existence of different norms, habits and languages in the internal space of the EU does constitute a limit to migrations. These attributes can be decisive regarding economic activities. The fact that services are less likely to receive labour migrants than manufacturing has already been stressed (Marsden, 1992). The need to “communicate with clients”, which characterizes so many services, requires social and linguistic skills which were not necessary for migrants in the period following World War 2. Regarding higher skilled occupations, the presence of a lingua franca such as English is current in many professions and the similarity of social and cultural practices among these agents has become common. Nevertheless, there is still a need to perform interpersonal tasks. Relationship with the local environment is evident in activities such as teaching, medicine (and health services) and legal consultancy. Even for apparently more “utilitarian” tasks – such as the managerial activity – some “local” singularities are increasingly being invoked: contact with clients in commercial activity is often cited; and the difficulties of relationship between managers and employees from diverse cultures have also been stressed. The replacement of managers from headquarters by local managers, a process occurring in many subsidiaries of TNCs, also reveals the important role that area knowledge (stimulated by local “social capital”) plays in the achievement of good company performance (Peixoto, 1999b).

ORGANIZATIONAL MOBILITY AND “INFORMAL” RECOGNITION

One of the main modalities of highly skilled migration in the contemporary world is transfers in the internal labour markets of TNCs (Salt and Findlay, 1989; Findlay, 1990; Appleyard, 1991; Salt, 1992 and 1994; Peixoto, 1999b and forthcoming), as well as those occurring within the framework of inter-

national organizations such as European and global non-firm institutions. These movements are presently on the rise. The specific modalities that they assume seem to be complex. Regarding firm-specific flows, a strong correlation exists between international assignments and foreign investment, as well as between business travel and international trade. The swing between long, medium and short-term stays leads to difficulties in measuring individual “migrations”. Global economic inter-linkage, and particularly EU integration, are doubtless associated with these kind of flows. A significant part of skilled intra-EU migration and many of the inflows noted above for Portugal (Table 1) seem to correspond to them. However, the increase in corporate migration seems not to be so high as the capital flows with which it is associated (Boyle et al., 1994; Findlay, 1995; Peixoto, 1999a).

Transfers in these types of transnational organizations present a significant specificity vis-à-vis other forms of dislocation. In line with the perspective developed in this article, the most important point is their largely independent status concerning diploma recognition rules. This occurs mainly because the entrance of labour into the internal labour markets of transnational firms and organizations usually takes place via the national markets of headquarters or subsidiaries, and eliminates the need for international recognition. Since the labour contract is undertaken in a national framework, the rules (academic or professional) of the original country are used. In the internal market of the firm or organization, international mobility occurs later through the most appropriate channels (careers) and is not submitted to European (or other) mechanisms for recognition. It is the organization that “recognizes” skills and also benefits from its common institutional framework. Hence, these organizations have tended to behave with some indifference towards official regulations (Werner, 1993: 91). The recognition that occurs is thus of an “informal” type, being absent from official statistics. In other words, international organizations represent a separate mechanism facilitating professional migration.¹²

The relative independence of organizational flows from direct and indirect migration policies is visible at another level. Obstacles to migration usually include the requirement of entry visas and residence permits for foreign citizens. Given the political tolerance of the majority of countries towards access of TNCs’ cadres (independently of their geographical origin – EU or other), such restrictions are often relaxed. Permissiveness towards these migrants results from a number of reasons: the cadres often accompany foreign capital investments (which are actively sought by national governments); are endowed with relatively rare skills; and do not cause “social” problems. Even if the opening to skilled organizational migrants is never complete, since there is still rigidity resulting from general administrative procedures (Keely, 1998), besides exclusion from broader norms of citizenship, the group retains a privileged status in comparison with other migrants. Acceptance of this panorama would seem to imply that it is the entry of graduate cadres in a

TNC, and not their citizenship in a Europe without frontiers, that enables them to achieve effective mobility.

It is therefore likely that firms and other transnational organizations are separated from debate on migratory policies and, in a stricter sense, from quarrels over diplomas. The small relevance attributed to legal rules in these areas, or even the ignorance thereof by a large group of organizations, confirms this judgement. In a set of TNCs operating in and from Portugal where we researched highly skilled movements, almost all firms agreed on the irrelevance of political initiatives (particularly EU initiatives) facilitating mobility. The arguments put forward by companies (interviews with human resources managers) were varied. Most answers were very simple: “we have been doing it (free circulation) for a very long time”; “we’re doing as we have always done”; “we have gained neither more nor less”; “it’s a side issue”; and the influence of policies over mobility is “zero” or “nil”. Other answers were more elaborate (“significant internationalization does not result from EU but from the pressure of the world economy”), and support the idea that business, and not governmental policy, is mainly responsible for highly skilled flows. In interviews, some distinction was also made between the policy of open borders and diploma recognition procedures: the former was sometimes referred to as having eased bureaucratic procedures, while the latter were perceived as nearly irrelevant.¹³

The potential fluidity of cadres is even more evident when we consider that, besides “permanent” or long-term migration, new forms of mobility are arising which include the multiplication of medium- and short-term stays (including business travels), the enlargement of living spaces and the development of “virtual mobility” (distant contacts engendered by new information technologies) (Salt and Ford, 1993; Salt, 1994; Peixoto, 1999b). In most cases, these types of mobility are relatively independent of migration and diploma rules drawn up by European nation-states. Indeed, a large amount of current legislation refers to the control of classical migration movements (involving long or, at most, medium-term stays) and not more recent ones. The “invisibility” and “informality” of highly skilled migrations thus have a double origin: on the one hand, many of the rules applying to the majority of migrants (e.g., recognition of diplomas in the case of TNCs’ cadres) are not often applicable to them; on the other hand, they are endowed with a speed or virtuality of movement that places them well out of reach of traditional rules and control.

CONCLUSION

The mismatch between “policies” and “realities” is a fact long known in migration theory. The coexistence of policies of control and continuous immigration is usual in many contexts, either by means of family reunion (and

associated strategies) or by irregular access and residence in the country. The opposite situation, wherein a stimulus or reduction of obstacles to migration coexists with a prolonged slowing down of flows, has occurred over recent decades in the EU. Whenever enlargements were made, most developed countries expressed fears of immigration and often demanded special transitory clauses. Ever since the first EU enlargement, and the next membership of Portugal and Spain, such fears have proven to be unfounded (Penninx and Muus, 1989). Indeed, the majority of current communities of intra-European migrants moved before their respective countries' membership in the Union. There is similar evidence regarding highly skilled mobility. Despite the time-consuming legislative output vis-à-vis removal of most credentials restrictions, highly skilled migrants are not moving in large numbers to other EU countries, and the majority of flows occur outside official rules.

The particularities of highly skilled labour markets deserve specific reflection. First, the classic imbalance between employment and income levels that, by the push-pull mechanism, is said to induce much contemporary migration, does not seem to be widespread in the EU at this skill level. Second, the political and legal obstacles to highly skilled mobility remain significant. In the EU space, we still find some governmental resistance to the application of European legislation, invocation of varied requirements for professional and academic recognition, and, more broadly, resistance of specific professional groups to possible external "competition". Third, obstacles of a social and cultural type impose themselves upon the voluntarism of agents. From this standpoint, the importance of social skills, including linguistic capabilities and possession of social (often local) capital, and the national character of professions and skills' construction, eliminates a great deal of migration potential. For these reasons, the multiplication of favourable legislation is not directly proportional to an increase in movements.

It is meaningful that the greatest increase of highly skilled flows in recent years has probably occurred in the absence of corresponding legislation. This is mainly the case of the various cadre (and other top professionals) movements in the framework of transnational firms and organizations. The fact that policy attitude to organizational migration is more generous, as agents do not just represent themselves but also the organization to which they belong, is a prime explanation for the movements. From this perspective, the costs and benefits of flows cannot be read with the same criteria that apply to "individual" migrants – beyond the fact that many stays are only temporary (even when they last for some years). The second explanation results from the relative "informality" of skill recognition in the (international) internal labour markets of organizations. Diploma recognition occurs in the original national space of the agents, and migration is facilitated since it proceeds within the same transnational institution (which implicitly "recognizes" employee diplomas when they are transferred to new posts).

We do not suggest that there is no relationship between EU legislation and highly skilled movements. Indeed, the restructuring of European economic space may lead to a change in localization criteria and national (and regional) specialization that acts directly on agents' migration. Such restructuring may contribute to new directions of skilled movements, targeting central locations or upper social ranks. On the other hand, the subjective perception of the "ease" of movement may change some organizational and individual strategies, leading to a strengthening of intra-European movements. More intense contacts, both economic and non-economic, between EU populations may cause migrations. The outcome of these is probably a progressive integration of habits and "social" aspects of work. In this regard, student mobility schemes, such as ERASMUS and SOCRATES, may have a pivotal role and act as potential catalysts for professional exchanges at a later stage.

The role of student mobility in highly skilled migration has already been stressed (among others by Mahroum, 1999a and 1999b). The group presents an increasing volume amongst skilled movements, considering overall world or intra-EU movements. Although still outside the labour market, students have a direct connection with the field, insofar as they are rapidly approaching economic activity and are recipients of professional skills. An indirect connection results from their eventual change of attitude towards mobility (due to integration in different social and cultural environments), besides contribution to increased academic compatibility of diplomas. Periods of study abroad may also be linked to supra-national social mobility strategies, as noted for Italy by D'Alessandro (1992) and also occurring in Portugal. In this regard, the existence of an intra-European "hierarchy" of university-level institutions may already be a reality, and this creates a progressive "mixture" (although socially unequal) of European professionals.¹⁴ As happens with many aspects of European integration, future scenarios indicate a deep potential for change, but achievement remains as uncertain as the day-to-day steps taken by the Union.

NOTES

1. This article results from a research project titled, "Migration of Highly Skilled Workers in Portugal", undertaken by the author at the Institute of Economics and Business Administration (ISEG), Technical University of Lisbon, Portugal. We are grateful for project support provided by the Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT, formerly JNICT) and the DGOT (Ministry of Territorial Planning), which provided a grant for the entire project (PDGT/QRH/392/94). We also acknowledge the support of ISEG, especially the Department of Social Sciences (Sociology Section) and the Research Centre on Economic Sociology and the Sociology of Organizations (SOCIUS). We extend our gratitude to João Ferrão and J. M. Carvalho Ferreira, whose advice was crucial throughout the

research process, and to Maria Ioannis Baganha, Ilona Kovács, John Salt, Vítor Corado Simões, Rafael Marques and António Goucha Soares, among others, for the help they provided at particular stages during the project. The comments of two anonymous referees on a previous version of this article should also be acknowledged. Finally, we should mention John B. Cherry, who was responsible for the translation of the article. Concerning all, the usual disclaimer applies.

2. Free circulation between EU countries allows more possibilities for emigration, return migration or regular alternation between two spaces.
3. Diploma recognition policies may be integrated into a broad framework of migration policies. As Convey and Kupiszewski (1995: 954-958) note, the direct and indirect policies relative to migrations are multiple: we may count among them the policies for diploma recognition, social security, health and ethnic minorities.
4. The first directives of this latter type were published in 1975; the last ones, not considering occasional modifications, date from 1985. The seven “sectoral systems” of diploma recognition, still in place, refer to six health professions: medical doctors, nurses responsible for general care, midwives, dentists, veterinary surgeons and pharmacists; and architects. These directives constitute the basis of what is commonly designated as the “automatic recognition” of diplomas.
5. The first directive prepared from this perspective referred to tertiary-level skills: the 89/48/CEE Directive, dated 21 December 1988, or “general system” of higher education diploma recognition, that sanctions professional skills of at least three years duration. According to it, in some cases recognition is not “automatic”. With the aim of controlling “professional expertise”, professional authorities in the receiving country (the “competent authorities”, which must be defined by each country) may require, besides the diploma, confirmation of professional experience, an adaptation period or aptitude tests (the rules being established by each member-state). These mechanisms, which allow the designation of this system as “semi-automatic recognition”, are activated whenever the diploma only partially corresponds to national evaluation criteria (see Pertek, 1992).
6. Contrary to the case of recognition for professional purposes, extant legislation for academic purposes in EU countries usually refers to both EU and non-EU countries, and the “competent authorities” for recognition are the universities and other institutions of higher education. In practice, there is a connection between the processes of academic and professional recognition. This occurs whenever authorities in a given profession require (in the case of “semi-automatic” recognition and in non-EU citizens) the academic equivalence of diplomas.
7. Health professions are one of the main areas where a shortage of Portuguese professionals has been occurring, thus creating an opportunity for immigration. This happens with medical doctors (mainly in peripheral regions), medical dentists and nurses. Regarding EU citizens, few movements have until now been registered. However, consideration of temporary (medium-term) stays leads to a broader picture of professional exchanges. On the one hand, the availability of training positions for specialists, contrasting to their shortage in another member state, allows a growing number of medical doctors, especially Spaniards, to enter the country under the recognition directives (see “A invasão dos médicos espanhóis”, *Expresso*, 23/11/96). On the other hand, immigration of some Spanish medical doctors occurs in frontier zones (e.g., from Galicia to Northern Portugal), due to local surpluses in Spain and shortages in Portuguese peripheral areas. In both cases, the intention seems to be a quick return to the home country.

8. Outstanding among the different professions submitted for recognition (data not presented in the Table) are engineers: they were responsible for nearly half the requests (29 individuals). Given the heterogeneity of engineering training in Europe (including “university” and “non-university” degrees), it is not surprising to find that the largest number of “negative decisions” already taken are from within this profession.
9. Regarding regulated professions, the most difficult case of recognition until now was that of Brazilian dentists, which constitutes an important fraction of skilled Brazilian immigration. Since professional authorities in Portugal did not recognize (until 1999) the qualifications of many of these professionals, arguing on the basis of European recognition directives, many of them were obliged since the 1980s to practice their profession “informally”. This situation led to an institutional (and diplomatic) conflict between Portugal and some sectors of Brazilian society. This was due to the traditional ease of migration (and migrants’ integration) between the two countries.
10. It is meaningful that some of political and institutional exponents of the EU have been included in this case. The fact that Belgium (where many EU offices are located and where many of its civil servants and families live) delayed the transposition of the first general directive meant that it was difficult for a “foreigner” (namely EU national) to work and to teach in the official educational system (“European Union – Is the single market working?”, *The Economist*, 17/2/96).
11. According to some governmental and professional officials whom we contacted, the placement of obstacles to circulation may even become a question of “principle”: the fear, although unrealistic, of mobility may lead to the unleashing of protectionist measures, sometimes clearly out of line with the legal framework. Given such obstacles, discouragement of the migrants is more likely than their appeal to courts of justice, which often support citizens’ views on this issue.
12. However, the degree of independence of internal labour markets and official regulations is limited. We must first consider the fact that many of the top jobs in TNCs are not “regulated professions”. This is often the case with managers, consultants and auditors, who would not need to submit, even in “independent” moves, to professional recognition directives. Second, “illegality” may arise when, for example, the signature of a project requires the local accreditation of professionals. In such cases, some organizations are able to get around the problems by assigning, for example, local professionals to formal tasks (while foreign personnel perform the real activity).
13. In the field of diploma recognition some particularities were detected. Whenever the rules were known from the interviewees, comments were straightforward: ideas such as “what counts is the *curriculum vitae* (that expatriates) present at headquarters” (or other location); or “I don’t care if they (foreign engineers in Portugal) are registered with the Order of Engineers” – illustrates the usual positions. We were told that legislation “was not relevant” or “we have nothing to do with that”. It seemed that most interviewees really did not know the regulations in this area – and this, by itself, is symptomatic of almost irrelevance of these policies. However, the significance of diploma recognition legislation was occasionally admitted. This was the case of expatriate circulation in a firm where some regulated professions existed, namely some that required a formal “signature” for given tasks (at that company, however, local professionals were charged with “formal” attributions). As for recruitment in the external labour market, legislation

may be important when, for example, a job candidate with a foreign degree appears. But, even in this case, “informal” procedures are common: in one of the firms surveyed, it was admitted that, whenever such a situation occurs, they request the company’s branch office in the country in question to review the diploma – and the idea of requesting “formal” recognition from Portuguese institutions is not even considered.

14. It must be noted that a privileged status of EU student mobility between worldwide movements of this kind is far from being a reality. As Mahroum (1999a) argues, the majority of the scientific “centres of excellence” are seen nowadays as situated in the US, and they exert attraction both over EU and non-EU students and academics. The possibility of a net loss of highly-skilled individuals from Europe to the US is real, as well as the incapacity to attract (and integrate) non-European talents prevents an eventual replacement by the EU.

REFERENCES

- Adam, S., et al.
 1994 *Estudo sobre Reconhecimento dos Diplomas para Efeitos Académicos e para Efeitos Profissionais: Interação ao Serviço de um Espaço Europeu da Educação, da Formação e das Profissões*, Brussels.
- Appleyard, R.T.
 1991 *International Migration: Challenge for the Nineties*, International Organization for Migration, Geneva.
- Ardittis, S.
 1990 “Labour migration and the single European market: a synthetic and prospective note”, *International Sociology*, 5(4): 461-474.
- Baganha, M.I.
 1998 “Immigrant involvement in the informal economy: the Portuguese case”, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 24(2): 367-385.
- Boltanski, L.
 1982 *Les Cadres, la Formation d’un Groupe Social*, Ed. Minuit, Paris.
- Boyle, M., et al.
 1994 “French investment and skill transfer in the United Kingdom”, in W.T.S. Gould, and A.M. Findlay (Eds), *Population Migration and the Changing World Order*, John Wiley and Sons, Chichester: 47-65.
- Commission of the European Communities (CEC)
 1994 *Comunicação da Comissão sobre o Reconhecimento dos Diplomas para Fins Académicos e para Fins Profissionais*, COM (94) 596 final, Brussels.
 1995a *Green Paper on Innovation*, Brussels.
 1995b *Skills for a Competitive and Cohesive Europe – A Human Resources Outlook for the 1990s*, Brussels.
 1996 *Relatório ao Parlamento Europeu e ao Conselho sobre o Estado da Aplicação do Sistema Geral de Reconhecimento de Diplomas do Ensino Superior*, COM(96) 46 final, Brussels.

- Convey, A., and M. Kupiszewski
 1995 "Keeping up with Schengen: migration and policy in the European Union", *International Migration Review*, 29(4): 939-963.
- D'Alessandro, V.
 1992 "I titoli di studio superiori e la loro spendibilità nella nascente Europa: specificità, limiti e nuove prospettive per l'Italia", *Sociologia del Lavoro*, 47-48: 45-55.
- European Union (EU)
 1995 *Compilação dos Tratados*, 2 vols, Brussels.
- Eurostat
 Annual *Demographic Statistics*.
- Fielding, A.J.
 1993 "Migration, institutions and politics: the evolution of European migration policies", in R. King (Ed.), *Mass Migrations in Europe: The Legacy and the Future*, Belhaven Press, London: 40-62.
- Findlay, A.M.
 1990 "A migration channels approach to the study of high level manpower movements: a theoretical perspective", *International Migration*, 28(1): 15-24.
 1995 "The future of skill exchanges within the European Union", in R. Hall, and P. White (Eds), *Europe's Population – Towards the Next Century*, UCL Press, London: 130-141.
- Instituto Nacional de Estatística (INE)
 Annual *Estatísticas Demográficas* (<http://infoline.ine.pt>).
- Iredale, R.
 1999 "The need to import skilled personnel: factors favouring and hindering its international mobility", *International Migration*, 37(1): 89-123.
- Keely, C.B.
 1998 *Globalization and Human Resource Management: Nonimmigrant Visa Strategies and Behavior of U.S. Firms*, Center for Migration Studies, New York.
- King, R., and I. Shuttleworth
 1995 "The emigration and employment of Irish graduates: the export of high-quality labour from the periphery of Europe", *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 2(1): 21-40.
- Mahroum, S.
 1999a "Competing for the highly skilled: Europe in perspective", *Science and Public Policy*, 26(1): 17-25.
 1999b "Highly skilled globetrotters: the international migration of human capital", in OECD, *Mobilising Human Resources for Innovation – OECD Workshop on Science and Technology Labour Markets, 17 May 1999*, in (http://www.ocde.org/dsti/sti/s_t/inte/prod/human_resources.htm).
- Marsden, D.
 1992 "European integration and the integration of European labour markets", *Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations*, 6(1): 3-35.
 1994 "Qualification et intégration du marché de travail européen", in Europe Sociale, *Intégration Européenne et Marché de l'Emploi*, Supplément 1/94, Commission Européenne, Brussels: 85-121.

- Morris, L.
1997 "Globalization, migration and the nation-state: the path to a post-national Europe?", *British Journal of Sociology*, 48(2): 192-209.
- OECD
Annual *SOPEMI – Système d'Observation Permanente des Migrations*.
- Peixoto, J.
1996 "Livro circulação e reconhecimento de diplomas – Políticas e realidades na União Europeia", *SOCIUS Working Papers*, 6/96, ISEG/UTL, Lisbon.
1999a "International firms, national managers: the obstacles to migration of highly skilled labour in transnational corporations", *SOCIUS Working Papers*, 4/99, ISEG/UTL, Lisbon.
1999b *A Mobilidade Internacional dos Quadros – Migrações Internacionais, Quadros e Empresas Transnacionais em Portugal*, Celta Editora, Oeiras.
"The international mobility of highly skilled workers in transnational corporations: the macro and micro factors of the organizational migration of cadres", in *International Migration Review*, (forthcoming).
- Penninx, R., and P. Muus
1989 "No limits for migration after 1992? The lessons of the past and a reconnaissance of the future", *International Migration*, 27(3): 373-388.
- Pertek, J. (Ed.)
1992 *General Recognition of Diplomas and Free Movement of Professionals*, European Institute of Public Administration, Maastricht.
- Pires, R.P.
1993 "Immigration in Portugal: a typology", in M.B. Rocha-Trindade (Ed.), *Recent Migration Trends in Europe*, Universidade Aberta/Instituto de Estudos para o Desenvolvimento, Lisbon: 179-194.
- Salt, J.
1992 "Migration processes among the highly skilled in Europe", *International Migration Review*, 26(2): 484-505.
1994 "International movements of highly skilled labour", Working Party on Migration, OECD, Paris.
- Salt, J., and A.M. Findlay
1989 "International migration of highly-skilled manpower: theoretical and developmental issues", in R.T. Appleyard (Ed.), *The Impact of International Migration on Developing Countries*, OECD, Paris: 159-180.
- Salt, J., and R. Ford
1993 "Skilled international migration in Europe: the shape of things to come?", in R. King (Ed.), *Mass Migrations in Europe: The Legacy and the Future*, Belhaven Press, London: 293-309.
- Soares, A.G.
1990 *A Livre Circulação de Pessoas na Europa Comunitária: Alargamento Jurisprudencial do Conceito*, Fragmentos, Lisbon.
- Werner, H.
1993 "Mouvements migratoires dans la perspective du Marché Unique Européen", in OECD, *Migrations Internationales: Le Tournant*, OECD, Paris: 87-95.

TABLE 1
 PORTUGAL: LEGAL FOREIGNERS, BY OCCUPATION AND NATIONALITY,
 1991-1998

Occupation	1991		1998		Variation 1991-1998
	Total	Per cent	Total	Per cent	
Professional, managerial and technical (a)	17,766	32.3	26,819	30.3	9,053
European Union (b)	8,539	15.5	13,954	15.7	5,415
Brazil	2,744	5.0	4,862	5.5	2,118
Other	6,483	11.8	8,003	9.0	1,520
Other occupations	37,173	67.7	61,786	69.7	24,613
Total	54,939	100.0	88,605	100.0	33,666

(a) Includes "scientific, technical and independent professions" and "managers and cadres".

(b) Includes EU/12 in 1986 and EU/15 in 1998.

Source: Calculations by the author, based on INE, *Estatísticas Demográficas*.

TABLE 2a
 PORTUGAL: RECOGNITION OF DIPLOMAS FOR PROFESSIONAL PURPOSES
 UNDER THE EU GENERAL DIRECTIVE
 (DIRECTIVE 89/48/CEE), 1993-1994

Nationality of diploma	Submitted applications		Complete applications	
	Total a	Per cent	Total b	Per cent (b/a)
Belgium	4	6.6	4	100.0
Denmark	2	3.3	2	100.0
France	18	29.5	11	61.1
Germany	7	11.5	6	85.7
Greece				
Ireland	1	1.6	1	100.0
Italy	1	1.6	1	100.0
Luxembourg				
Netherlands	9	14.8	9	100.0
Spain	10	16.4	7	70.0
United Kingdom	9	14.8	7	77.8
Total	61	100.0	48	78.7

Source: Calculations by the author, based on data from the Ministry of Education, Department of Higher Education, Portugal.

TABLE 2b
 PORTUGAL: RECOGNITION OF DIPLOMAS FOR PROFESSIONAL PURPOSES
 UNDER THE EU GENERAL DIRECTIVE
 (DIRECTIVE 89/48/CEE), 1993-1994

Nationality of diploma	Positive decisions					Negative decisions		Claims
	Total c	Per cent (c/a)	Immediate	Test	Training	d	Per cent (d/a)	
Belgium	3	75.0	3			1	25.0	
Denmark	1	50.0	1					
France	5	27.8	4		1	2	11.1	
Germany	4	57.1	3		1	1	14.3	
Greece								
Ireland								
Italy								
Luxembourg						6		
Netherlands	2	22.2			2		66.7	4
Spain	5	50.0	3		2			
United Kingdom	8	88.9	7	1				
Total	28	45.9	21	1	6	10	16.4	4

Source: Calculations by the author, based on data from the Ministry of Education, Department of Higher Education, Portugal.

TABLE 3a
 PORTUGAL: RECOGNITION OF DIPLOMAS FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES
 (DECREE-LAW 283/83) – REQUEST AND POSITIVE ANSWERS,
 BY NATIONALITY OF DIPLOMAS, 1989-1995(a)

Nationality of diploma	Requests						Total 1989- 1995
	1989-1991 Total	Annual average	1992	1993	1994	1995	
Europe							
EU/12	627	209	241	263	257	317	1,705
Belgium	35	12	15	7	11	10	78
Denmark	3	1	0	1	2	3	9
France	257	86	97	94	88	123	659
Germany	38	13	19	20	16	19	112
Greece	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Ireland	1	0	1	0	2	0	4
Italy	30	10	12	14	14	16	86
Luxembourg							
Netherlands	22	7	6	5	10	14	57
Spain	33	11	22	33	27	40	155
United Kingdom	207	69	69	88	87	92	543
Other Europe	179	60	19	17	12	73	300
Other (non-Europe)	289	96	-	-	-	389	678
Africa	-	-	-	-	-	85	85
Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	173	173
Canada	54	18	-	-	-	16	70
US	235	78	-	-	-	67	302
Other	-	-	-	-	-	48	48
Total	1,095	365	260	280	269	779	2,683

(a) Includes "equivalences" and "recognitions" of foreign higher education diplomas.

Source: Calculations by the author, based on data from the Ministry of Education, Department of Higher Education, Portugal.

TABLE 3b
 PORTUGAL: RECOGNITION OF DIPLOMAS FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES
 (DECREE-LAW 283/83) – REQUEST AND POSITIVE ANSWERS,
 BY NATIONALITY OF DIPLOMAS, 1989-1995(a)

Nationality of diploma	Positive answers						
	1989-1991		1992	1993	1994	1995	Total 1989-1995
	Total	Annual average					
Europe							
EU/12	345	115	156	151	105	124	881
Belgium	20	7	10	4	4	5	43
Denmark	3	1	0	0	0	1	4
France	132	44	47	47	29	45	300
Germany	17	6	14	9	6	8	54
Greece	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Ireland	1	0	0	0	2	0	3
Italy	19	6	12	12	11	8	62
Luxembourg							
Netherlands	13	4	4	4	6	2	29
Spain	14	5	17	24	12	19	86
United Kingdom	126	42	52	50	35	36	299
Other Europe	80	27	12	8	4	29	133
Other (non-Europe)	137	46	-	-	-	151	288
Africa	-	-	-	-	-	32	32
Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	65	65
Canada	20	7	-	-	-	2	22
US	117	39	-	-	-	34	151
Other	-	-	-	-	-	18	18
Total	562	187	168	159	109	304	1,302

(a) Includes "equivalences" and "recognitions" of foreign higher education diplomas.

Source: Calculations by the author, based on data from the Ministry of Education, Department of Higher Education, Portugal.

TABLE 4a
 PORTUGAL: RECOGNITION OF DIPLOMAS FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES
 (DECREE-LAW 283/83) – PERCENTAGE OF POST-GRADUATE DEGREES
 (PhDs AND MASTERS) AMONGST TOTAL REQUESTS AND POSITIVE
 ANSWERS, BY NATIONALITY OF DIPLOMAS, 1989-1995(a)

Nationality of diploma	Post-graduate degrees – per cent of total requests					Total 1989- 1995
	1989- 1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	
Europe						
EU/12	56.9	49.4	51.0	55.36	53.6	54.1
Belgium	62.9	46.7	42.9	63.6	40.0	55.1
Denmark	66.7		0.0	50.0	66.7	55.6
France	47.5	34.0	34.0	36.4	39.8	40.7
Germany	42.1	36.8	40.0	31.3	42.1	39.3
Greece	0.0		0.0			0.0
Ireland	0.0	0.0		100.0		50.0
Italy	13.3	25.0	21.4	14.3	25.0	18.6
Luxembourg						
Netherlands	27.3	50.0	80.0	40.0	28.6	36.8
Spain	42.4	31.8	33.3	44.4	47.5	40.6
United Kingdom	82.6	85.5	83.0	88.5	87.0	84.7
Other Europe	10.6	26.3	41.2	33.3	15.1	15.3
Other (non-Europe)	55.7	-	-		18.5	34.4
Africa	-	-	-	-	2.4	2.4
Brazil	-	-	-	-	8.7	8.7
Canada	13.0	-	-	-	31.3	17.1
US	65.5	-	-	-	64.2	65.2
Other	-	-	-	-	14.6	14.6
Total	49.0	47.7	50.4	54.3	32.5	44.8

(a) Includes "equivalences" and "recognitions".

Source: Calculations by the author, based on data from the Ministry of Education, Department of Higher Education, Portugal.

TABLE 4b
 PORTUGAL: RECOGNITION OF DIPLOMAS FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES
 (DECREE-LAW 283/83) – PERCENTAGE OF POST-GRADUATE DEGREES
 (PhDS AND MASTERS) AMONGST TOTAL REQUESTS AND POSITIVE
 ANSWERS, BY NATIONALITY OF DIPLOMAS, 1989-1995(a)

Nationality of diploma	Post-graduate degrees – per cent of total positive answers					
	1989-1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	Total 1989-1995
Europe						
EU/12	65.2	57.7	57.0	51.4	45.2	58.0
Belgium	65.0	50.0	75.0	50.0	20.0	55.8
Denmark	66.7				100.0	75.0
France	53.0	34.0	44.7	34.5	26.7	43.0
Germany	47.1	50.0	44.4	33.3	37.5	44.4
Greece			0.0			0.0
Ireland	0.0			100.0		66.7
Italy	15.8	25.0	16.7	9.1	37.5	19.4
Luxembourg						
Netherlands	30.8	75.0	100.0	33.3	50.0	48.3
Spain	42.9	35.3	29.2	33.3	15.8	30.2
United Kingdom	94.4	96.2	90.0	88.6	88.9	92.6
Other Europe	11.3	41.7	50.0	50.0	10.3	17.3
Other (non-Europe)	70.1	-	-	-	21.2	44.4
Africa	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0
Brazil	-	-	-	-	4.6	4.6
Canada	20.0	-	-	-	50.0	22.7
US	78.6	-	-	-	73.5	77.5
Other	-	-	-	-	16.7	16.7
Total	58.7	56.5	56.6	51.4	29.9	50.8

(a) Includes "equivalences" and "recognitions".

Source: Calculations by the author, based on data from the Ministry of Education, Department of Higher Education, Portugal.

LA MIGRATION ET LES POLITIQUES MIGRATOIRES AU SEIN
DE L'UNION EUROPEENNE: MOBILITE DE MAIN-D'OEUVRE
HAUTEMENT SPECIALISEE, LIBRE CIRCULATION
DES TRAVAILLEURS ET RECONNAISSANCE DES DIPLOMES

Cet article évalue les liens entre la mobilité de main-d'œuvre hautement spécialisée, et particulièrement des diplômés universitaires, et les politiques migratoires. Les données fournies par l'Union européenne et le Portugal en particulier constituent la base empirique.

Les politiques de l'Union européenne en ce qui concerne la libre circulation des personnes qui visent à constituer le "marché commun" de facteurs économiques (en ce compris la main-d'œuvre) sont ici passées en revue, en même temps que les politiques plus particulières de reconnaissance des diplômes tant dans le cadre professionnel qu'au niveau de l'université. L'auteur y examine également les niveaux récents de mobilité internationale à la fois au sein de l'UE et au Portugal.

L'article énumère les principaux obstacles qui expliquent, dans une perspective politique et juridique ou sociale et culturelle, le faible niveau de mobilité que révèlent les chiffres. Parmi ces obstacles, il faut citer le déni largement pratiqué des droits de citoyenneté, la nécessité de gagner de quoi vivre, les exigences linguistiques et techniques en matière de reconnaissance des diplômes, les attributs sociaux du travail (plus explicites dans le secteur des services) et le caractère institutionnel des marchés nationaux de la main-d'œuvre qualifiée.

La principale exception à cette règle de la faible mobilité – les mouvements de cadres sur les marchés internes du travail des grandes sociétés transnationales – en même temps que les flux constatés dans d'autres organisations multinationales, sont également passés en revue dans l'article. On y voit que les migrations sont relativement exemptes de contraintes politiques et – ce qui est significatif – qu'elles évitent les procédures de reconnaissance adoptées par l'UE. En d'autres termes, il semble que l'entrée de personnel très qualifié dans une société transnationale, et non l'appartenance de ce personnel à une Europe sans frontières, est ce qui lui permet d'être véritablement mobile.

MIGRACIÓN Y POLÍTICAS EN LA UNIÓN EUROPEA:
MOVILIDAD DE TRABAJADORES ALTAMENTE CALIFICADOS,
LIBRE CIRCULACIÓN DE MANO DE OBRA
Y RECONOCIMIENTO DE TÍTULOS

Este artículo analiza la relación entre la movilidad de trabajadores altamente calificados, en especial de personas con títulos universitarios, y las políticas migratorias. Los datos proporcionados por la Unión Europea (UE), y especialmente por Portugal, conforman el fundamento empírico.

Se revisan las políticas de la UE referentes a la libre circulación de personas, dirigidas a la construcción del “mercado común” de los factores económicos (incluida la mano de obra) son revisadas, así como las políticas específicas de reconocimiento de títulos, con fines académicos y profesionales. También se revisan los niveles actuales de movilidad internacional tanto en la UE como en Portugal.

El artículo enumera también los principales obstáculos que, desde el punto de vista político y jurídico o social y cultural, explican la poca movilidad que reflejan esas cifras. Entre estos obstáculos se incluye una denegación general de los derechos de ciudadanía, la necesidad de acreditar medios de subsistencia, exigencias lingüísticas y técnicas para el reconocimiento de títulos, las características sociales del trabajo a realizar (más evidentes en el sector de los servicios), y la naturaleza institucional de los mercados nacionales para los trabajadores calificados autóctonos.

Se examina también la principal excepción a la regla general de la poca movilidad – los desplazamientos de ejecutivos en los mercados laborales internos de las empresas transnacionales – así como los movimientos en otras organizaciones multinacionales. En éstas, las migraciones están relativamente exentas de restricciones políticas y, en muchos casos, de los procedimientos de reconocimiento adoptados por la UE. Dicho de otra forma, parece que la entrada de personas altamente calificadas en una empresa transnacional, y no su ciudadanía de una Europa sin fronteras, es lo que les permite alcanzar una movilidad efectiva.