



Did they stay or did they go:

The role of intention behind re-migration behaviour

Andrea Monti and Eleonora Mussino

Did they stay or did they go:

The role of intention behind re-migration behaviour

Andrea Monti and Eleonora Mussino

Stockholm University, Department of Sociology, Demography Unit

Abstract

In terms of re-migration among international migrants, knowledge of how intention relates to actual behaviour remains scarce, as intention and behaviour are largely separated in the literature. In this paper we examine the extent to which intentions might predict actual behaviour, compare their main determinants, and analyse what factors are related to the realization (or not) of re-migration intentions. The data is comprised of a unique linkage of survey data on foreign-born individuals' future mobility intentions, combined with prospective, high-quality register data from Sweden. Our findings show that intention is a poor proxy of re-migration behaviour, especially after a long time at the destination. Whilst social and economic destination country attachments are relevant for explaining both intention and behaviour, origin country ties are mostly related to re-migration intentions. Moreover, we show that realizing intentions of both staying and leaving the destination country is hindered by unemployment and economic difficulties.

Keywords: re-migration intention, re-migration behaviour, country attachments, transnational ties, realization of mobility intentions

Stockholm Research Reports in Demography 2021:5

ISSN 2002-617X

© Andrea Monti, Eleonora Mussino



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Introduction

Within the re-migration literature, including that on return, onward, or circular migration among international migrants, the current knowledge builds on the treatment of international re-migration intention and actual behaviour in two separate bodies of literature. Although common in the field of many other population processes, studies of how intentions relate to actual behaviour are largely absent when it comes to the re-migration of foreign-born residents. As a consequence, knowledge is lacking regarding the extent to which re-migration intentions may predict re-migration behaviour, and whether re-migration intention and behaviour are driven by different or similar determinants when analysed within the same individual. Additionally, less is known about what factors contribute to the realization of re-migration intentions. Considering these research gaps, our aim in this paper is twofold: First, we aim to analyse the predictive power of intentions on re-migration behaviour and to compare the determinants of re-migration intentions and behaviour, following the same individual over time. This includes analysing the relative importance of re-migration intentions for re-migration behaviour, as well as other aspects driving actual re-migration, once intention is controlled for. Doing so, we are able to advance the literature by assessing the assumption, implicitly present in the literature (Di Belgiojoso & Ortensi 2013; Della Puppa & King 2019), that intention and behaviours can be interchanged in studying re-emigration processes. Our analysis builds on previous literature on intended and actual re-migration, respectively, focusing on the effect of economic and sociocultural destination as well as origin country attachments (e.g. Massey & Akresh 2006; Bolognani 2007; De Haas & Fokkema 2011; Anniste & Tammaru 2014; Carling & Pettersen 2014; Bolognani 2016 on studies of intention and Massey & Espinoza 1997; Constant & Massey 2002; 2003; Nekby 2006; Bratsberg et al. 2007; Constant & Zimmermann 2011; 2012; Khulenkasper & Steinhardt 2017; Monti 2020 on studies of behaviour). Second, we aim to investigate which factors contribute to the realization (or not) of stated re-migration intentions, whether the intention is to stay or leave the destination country. Achieving this aim will place this paper in the international and broader literature on the realization of demographic behaviours in general. In addition to the consideration of country attachments, we have taken inspiration from residential mobility research when examining the realization process of mobility intentions, by looking at the occurrence of life events (e.g. Mulder 1993; Mulder & Wagner 1993; Kan 1999; Kulu & Milewski 2007; Kulu 2008; De Groot et al. 2011; Kley 2011).

The data at hand is comprised of a unique combination of survey data on individuals' medium-term future mobility intentions and their destination and origin country attachments, as well as individually matched Swedish high-quality, longitudinal register data following individuals up to eight years after the interview. The population under study are all foreign-born individuals who have lived in Sweden for at least five years. Sweden offers an interesting case due to its relatively large (19.6% of the total registered population in 2019) and heterogeneous foreign-born population (SCB 2020); rising shares of emigration in the past 15 years driven by the re-migration of foreign-born individuals (Monti 2020); and high-quality register data, in this paper combined with survey data, offering an excellent opportunity for research. The distinctive data set allows us to follow up individuals' stated re-migration intentions five years into the future, in order to investigate whether and to what extent they are followed by actual re-migration behaviour. Our findings advance the knowledge on re-migration by incorporating a perspective on migration as a differentiated process. We contribute to the information on its driving factors and shine new light on the conditions under which foreign-born migrants intend and carry out ideas of whether to stay in or emigrate from their new countries of residence.

In following sections, we present previous literature on re-migration intentions and behaviour, respectively, followed by a presentation of existing, yet limited, studies on the realization of re-migration intentions. We then move on to present the setup of this study.

Re-migration intentions

Theories on re-migration intention predominantly relate it to aspects of transnational belonging, as a way for migrants to imagine possible futures and make sense of their migration experiences, as well as to negotiate often multiple national identities (Bolognani 2007; 2016; Barbiano di Belgiojoso 2016; Britain, Della Puppa and King 2019). Although not necessarily a symptom of disengagement with the receiving society (Bolognani 2016), the idea of leaving the receiving country has been interpreted as a reaction to experienced racism and marginalization (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Itzigohn & Giorguli-Saucedo 2002; 2005; Haller & Landolt 2005; Bolognani 2007; Schunck 2014). Stronger social and cultural attachment to the destination country, most commonly measured through contact with non-migrants and language proficiency, are generally found to be negatively associated with return intention (Massey & Akresh 2006; De Haas & Fokkema 2011; Anniste & Tammaru 2014; Carling & Pettersen 2014; Di Saint Pierre et al. 2015; Bilgili & Siegel 2017). In a study by Di Saint Pierre et al. (2015) on Afghani, Iranian, Iraqi, and Somali refugees in the

Netherlands, language proficiency and contact with natives were shown to be related to higher degrees of host country identification and less experienced discrimination, which in turn led to lower likelihoods of wishing to return. Similarly, findings from Massey and Akresh (2006) showed that higher levels of English language proficiency as well as prior and longer durations of stay in the US were related to higher likelihoods of satisfaction with life in the country, which increased permanent settlement intentions.

Obtaining a receiving country citizenship is seen to be linked to a structural integration process and related to lower re-migration intentions, partly as the very application for citizenship is linked to the intention to stay permanently (Massey & Akresh 2006; Anniste & Tammaru 2014). Similarly, property ownership has been found to be negatively associated with re-migration intentions (Massey & Akresh 2006; Anniste & Tammaru 2014; Steiner 2019). Labour market attachment in terms of employment has been found to be either non-significant or positively associated with re-migration intentions (De Haas & Fokkema 2011; Anniste and Tammaru 2014; Carling & Pettersen 2014; Bettin et al. 2018). The positive effect on re-migration intentions is considered to enable individuals to aspire to future re-migration (Bettin et al. 2018).

Maintained ties to the country of origin have repeatedly been found to be related to higher likelihoods of return intentions. Economic investments in the origin country (De Haas & Fokkema 2011) and more contact with family and friends (Bilgili & Siegel 2017) have been found to be related to increasing likelihoods of intending to leave. However, origin country attachments do not necessarily lead to increased re-migration intentions but may rather be an expression of transnational connectedness. For example, remittances sent due to familial obligations or community purposes do not necessarily relate to return intention in the same way as do remittances for individual purposes (De Haas and Fokkema 2011). Shorter return visits may be a substitute for more permanent migration (Lulle 2014), understood as a balancing of belonging in different contexts (Oeppen 2013) or as a transnational strategy for managing one's livelihood and family arrangements (Gonzales-Ferrer et al. 2014). Studies of temporary and permanent return intentions have exemplified the blurred lines between return migration and transnational activity (Carling & Erdal 2014; Bilgili & Siegel 2017). Bilgili and Siegel (2017) found that most individuals in their study were more interested in temporary rather than permanent return. Additionally, the ability to be transnationally mobile after return might also be a requirement for returning in the first place (Flahaux 2015).

The relation between country attachments and return intentions is endogenous by nature. As Carling and Erdal (2014) point out, origin country investments can be motivated by plans to return and can be seen in the light of future re-integration. The intention to return may also lower investments in the receiving country, especially non-monetary ones such as language acquisition (Chabé-Ferret et al. 2017). Studying the relative relations of both receiving and origin country attachment, Carling and Pettersen (2014) indeed found that the highest likelihood of return intentions was in the groups with the lowest levels of sociocultural integration in the host country and, simultaneously, strong origin country attachment.

Sociodemographic characteristics have not been an explicit focus in studies of re-migration intentions, and general results are highly diverse. Higher likelihoods of return intentions are found among both men (Carling & Pettersen 2014; Barbiano di Belgiojoso 2016) and women (Diehl & Liebau 2014; Bettin et al. 2018), parallel to findings of no significant gender effects (De Haas & Fokkema 2011; Anniste & Tammaru 2014). There are also mixed findings regarding the effect of age, whereby higher likelihoods are found to increase with age (Anniste & Tammaru 2014, Bettin et al. 2018), to be higher among both younger and older migrants (Barbiano di Belgiojoso 2016) and conversely to have a reversed u-shape relation (Carling & Pettersen 2014), as well as to have no effect at all (De Haas & Fokkema 2011). In the same way, higher education has been related to return intentions through both increased probabilities (De Haas & Fokkema 2011; Di Saint Pierre et al. 2015), a reversed u-shape relationship (Carling & Pettersen 2014), as well as lower probabilities within the first generation (Bettin et al. 2018) and no effect at all (Anniste & Tammaru 2014; Diehl & Liebau 2014). A common finding, though, is the importance of origin country, partly as this heavily relates to the reason for the initial migration (De Haas & Fokkema 2011; Carling & Pettersen 2014).

Re-migration behaviour

Different to studies of intention, re-migration behaviour has traditionally been regarded as the return migration of economically motivated migrants, explained through economic theories of rational behaviour. From a neoclassical perspective (NE), return is the consequence of a migrant failing to achieve his or her goal of maximizing lifetime earnings through permanent migration (Todaro 1969). Contrasting this view, the New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM) view return mainly as the result of sufficient accumulated financial capital, also originally meant to be brought back to the family in the origin country (Stark & Bloom

1985). Following these leading theories, much of the empirical analysis on re-migration has centred around individual economic achievements and human capital (e.g. Massey et al. 1990; Steiner & Velling 1994; Massey & Espinoza 1997; Constant & Massey 2002; 2003; Massey & Akresh 2006; Constant & Zimmermann 2011; 2012). However, as the literature on re-migration is expanding, increasing focus is additionally being given to social, cultural, and civic receiving and origin country attachments, moving beyond strict economic frameworks and involving more than only economic migrants.

In terms of receiving country attachments, and in line with NE theory, migrants are generally more likely to leave the country of residence if they experience unemployment (Steiner & Velling 1994; Bijwaard et al. 2014), lose a job (Constant & Massey 2002), have no full-time contract (Constant & Massey 2003; Constant & Zimmermann 2011; 2012), experience economic difficulties (Jensen & Pedersen 2007), or are in other ways outside the labour market (Kuhlenkasper & Steinhardt 2017). Similarly, lower re-migration propensities have been found among individuals with accumulated labour market experience (Jensen & Pedersen 2007), host-country-specific job skills (Massey & Espinosa 1997), higher occupational prestige (Constant & Massey 2003), and higher potential earnings (Reagan & Olsen 2000). Additionally, economic investment in the receiving country, such as property ownership, has been found to be negatively associated with re-migration behaviour (Steiner & Velling 1994; Constant & Massey 2002; 2003; Constant & Zimmermann 2012), as has speaking the receiving country's language (Steiner & Velling 1994; Constant & Massey 2003; Constant & Zimmermann 2011; 2012; Saarela & Scott 2017) or having acquired national citizenship (Constant & Massey 2002; 2003; Monti 2020). At the same time, previous studies have established the importance of acquiring citizenship for enabling mobility – e.g., a European citizenship within the European Union and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries (Constant & Zimmermann 2011; Van Liempt 2011; Mas Giralt 2017) – especially among groups first arriving as refugees or from politically and economically unstable countries (Monti 2020).

Partly similar to return intentions, and in line with NELM theory, origin economic investments (in the ownership of homes, businesses, or land) are found to be related to higher return likelihoods (Massey & Espinosa 1997; Massey & Akresh 2006). In some studies, though not all (Massey & Akresh 2006), remittances have also been noted to increase re-migration probabilities (Steiner & Velling 1994, Constant & Massey 2002; 2003). The presence of family and friends in the country of origin has been related to higher actual re-

migration propensities among former guest workers in Germany (Constant & Massey 2002; 2003; Constant and Zimmermann 2011), but also in the case of Senegalese, Ghanaian, and Congolese migrants in Europe, whose children are left in the origin country (Gonzales-Ferrer et al. 2014). Additionally, subjective psychological aspects such as identity and a sense of belonging to the origin country have also been noted to be related to increased likelihoods of re-migration (Van Liempt 2011; Saarela & Scott 2017).

Just like intention, actual re-migration is highly context-specific and tightly linked to the country of origin (Steiner & Velling 1994; Constant & Massey 2002; 2003; Bratsberg et al. 2007; Constant & Zimmerman 2012). Higher re-migration rates have been found among individuals from wealthier and economically stable countries (Massey & Espinosa 1997; Bratsberg et al. 2007; Jensen & Pedersen 2007; Klinthäll 2007) and countries at a shorter physical distance from the receiving country, especially if combined with a policy context of free mobility, as this arguably implies lower migration costs (Reagan & Olsen 2000; Nekby 2006; Bratsberg et al. 2007; Gonzales-Ferrer et al. 2014; Monti 2020). Similarly, restrictive migration policies are related to higher migration costs and lower probabilities, especially if the economic and political conditions in the country of origin are uncertain (Massey & Espinosa 1997; Bratsberg et al. 2007; Klinthäll 2007; Gonzales-Ferrer et al. 2014; Bygnes & Erdal 2017). Compared to economic migrants, lower return propensities are seen among assisted and refugee migrants as well as their accompanying family members (Aydemir & Robinson 2008; Monti 2020).

In terms of sociodemographic characteristics, the highest risk of actual re-migration is found shortly after migration (Constant & Zimmermann 2012; Constant & Massey 2002; Monti 2020) and then decreases with time in the receiving country (Reagan & Olsen 2000; Jensen & Pedersen 2007; Khulenkasper & Steinhardt 2017). In a Swedish study, Monti (2020) showed that this trend is driven by return migration whereas onward migration, which is far less common, instead stays at similar or even slowly increasing levels over time. In studies on former guest workers in Germany, elevated probabilities of re-migration are found towards retirement age (Steiner & Velling 1994; Constant & Massey 2002; Khulenkasper & Steinhardt 2017). Either no (Constant & Massey 2002; 2003) or small gender differences are generally found, with men experiencing slightly higher likelihoods of re-migrating (e.g. Bratsberg et al. 2007; Constant & Zimmermann 2011; Monti 2020). In terms of human capital, higher education levels have been found among repeat migrants compared to those who stay (Nekby 2006; King & Newbold 2007; Aydemir & Robinson 2008; Monti 2020),

sometimes understood as a sensitivity to the lower rates of return to education in the receiving country (Borjas & Bratsberg 1996; Reagan & Olsen 2000; Rooth & Saarela 2007), as well as to lower re-migration rates (Massey & Espinosa 1997; Constant & Zimmermann 2011) or no effects at all – as the selectivity pertains to migrants who would have returned anyway (Constant & Massey 2002; 2003; Gonzales-Ferrer et al. 2014) or for other reasons (Kuhlenkasper & Steinhardt 2017).

As is common within migration in general, married individuals show lower re-migration rates than singles (Massey & Akresh 2006; Constant & Zimmermann 2012; Monti 2020), as do those with children (Massey & Akresh 2006; Kuhlenkasper & Steinhardt 2017) and those with family ties in the receiving country (Massey & Espinosa 1997; Constant & Massey 2002; 2003; Jensen & Pedersen 2007). Divorce has been found to increase re-migration propensities among both family migrants (Bijwaard and Doeselaar 2014) and migrants in general (Monti 2020). Remarriage, on the other hand, has been found to decrease return likelihoods among labour migrants (Bijwaard et al. 2014).

Realizing mobility intentions

Today, re-migration behaviour and intention are examined and treated in largely two separate bodies of literature, with few studies looking at their interconnectedness. Studies of return migration behaviour have shown that return has been cancelled or postponed due to restrictive migration policies (Reyes 2004; Massey et al. 2015) or to family expectations and problems investing savings in the origin country (Hernandez-Carretero & Carling 2012). However, absent from these studies are observations of individual re-migration intentions and their relation to subsequent behaviour. In a study of Senegalese and Congolese migrants in Europe, Flahaux (2015) analysed the re-migration intentions and behaviour of the same individuals. Her findings show that initial return intention, though a strong driver of return behaviour, was complemented and sometimes even outplayed by the importance of the situation in the origin country in terms of security, stability, and job opportunities, causing migrants to repress their re-migration intentions. Additionally, family life at the destination also delayed return in cases in which the intention was to do so. Flahaux's findings offer important insights. However, they are restricted in terms of retrospective data and specific focus on return migration, and have a limited geographical scope.

In a different study, Van Dalen & Henkens (2013) analysed emigration intention and behaviour among non-migrants in the Netherlands. Intention was argued to be a good

predictor of emigration, as 34% of those stating an intention to leave the country in the near future did so within two years. Additional characteristics, such as personality and dissatisfaction with the public domain in the Netherlands (such as pollution, crime levels, and overall mentality), played a role in driving actual emigration. Among those who intended to leave but actually stayed, poorer health was found to be a main determinant. In a study of German migrants in Switzerland, Steiner (2019) distinguishes between re-migration intentions and plans (though not behaviour), finding that intentions are more related to subjective perceptions and wishful thinking, whereas having concrete re-migration plans was more often based on objective conditions.

In sum, although some studies within the literature on international migration offer ideas of how re-migration intentions and behaviour might interrelate, prospective studies of individual migrants' re-migration intentions and subsequent behaviour are still lacking, and knowledge of what causes migrants to be(in)consistent with their intentions is scarce. Within the residential mobility literature, on the other hand, studies of the links between different stages of the decision-making process have a long tradition, starting with Rossi (1955/1980) and his study on family mobility.

Common to the studies of residential mobility is the repeated finding that mobility intentions are important but not sufficient for explaining actual mobility outcomes. Whilst perceived economic and social opportunities and anticipated life course events are important predictors of considering and planning mobility, economic and social resources, as well as sociodemographic characteristics, are as important for following through (Lu 1998; Fang 2006; Kley & Mulder 2010). Social ties, such as having a larger family, decrease moving behaviour, especially over long distances (Lu 1998; Kley 2011; Coulter 2013;). At the same time, anticipated events like union formation explain the higher mobility realization among singles than among couples (Mulder & Wagner 1993) and are especially relevant for women (Mulder & Wagner 1993; Kley 2011).

Anticipated life events disrupting everyday habits through the dissolution or formation of social ties trigger mobility intentions and behaviour (Kley 2011). Examples of this range from beginning higher education (Mulder 1993), through starting a new job (Kan 1999), to forming a family (Kulu & Milewski 2007; Kulu 2008). Unexpected life events may result in initial intentions being changed, even for those who originally plan to stay. This is what was found in the study by Kan (1999), for example, where family formation had more substantial

effects on the actual mobility of those not planning to move, as those planning to move might have already anticipated this change. Unexpected moves have also been related to individuals with higher income, interpreted as their having more opportunities to move within short periods of time (De Groot et al. 2011).

Bridging the intention and behaviour gap

Only measuring intentions may be an unreliable measure of actual re-migration (Constant and Massey 2002), as individual plans and preferences might change over time (De Haas & Fokkema 2011). Additionally, both expected and unexpected life events may trigger intentions as well as actual behaviour (Mulder 1993; Kan 1999; Kulu & Milewski 2007; Kulu 2008; De Groot et al. 2011; Kley 2011). Only looking at behaviour, on the other hand, misses incorporating previous processes of selection into intending re-migration in the first place (Liebig and Sousa-Poza 2004; Van Dalen and Henkens 2013). As we have seen, previous literature suggests that intention, more than behaviour, reflects an identification process and a way of belonging, whereas actual migration behaviour rather reflects opportunity structures (Caron 2020). At the same time, some studies interpret intentions and actual re-migration without any greater distinction (Di Belgiojoso & Ortensi 2013; Della Puppa & King 2019), which could be motivated by the idea that intentions are often good proxies for behaviour (Van Dalen & Henkens 2013). In this paper, we look more closely at the importance of re-migration intentions for re-migration behaviour, starting by examining the importance of the intention behind re-migration behaviour. In their study on non-migrants, Van Dalen and Henkens (2013) found intention to be a relatively good proxy for actual behaviour. Based on their finding, we hypothesize that this is similar among foreign-born residents, especially if they have already spent a long time at the destination:

1. Intention is a good proxy for determining re-migration behaviour, as large shares of those intending to leave the country of residence do so within the stated time period.

Within the separate bodies of literature on re-migration intentions and behaviour, different aspects are highlighted as main determinants. Whilst the different focus illustrated in previous literature might reflect actual differences between re-migration intention and behaviour, it might also be the result of intention and behaviour being theoretically motivated within different research traditions. Examining intention and behaviour within the same individual, we do not know if the discrepancy stays the same. Additionally, unlike the residential mobility literature, we know less about the drivers of re-migration once intention

is controlled for. By analysing economic and sociocultural residence and origin country attachments in relation to re-migration intentions and behaviour, we compare the respective determinants of re-migration intentions and behaviour. Based on the previous literature, we hypothesize that:

2. Economic attachment to the country of residence is more related to re-migration behaviour, whereas social country of residence attachments as well as origin country ties are more related to re-migration intention.

There is limited knowledge about the realization process of stated re-migration intentions, and previous literature is scarce. Inspired by the residential mobility literature, we examine drivers behind the realization of re-migration intentions, whether they be to stay or leave the destination country, by additionally including the occurrence of important life events, which, anticipated or not, might influence realization behaviours. Based on previous literature on re-migration and behaviour separately, as well as residential mobility literature, we hypothesize that:

3. Realizing the intention to leave the destination country is mainly related to stronger origin country attachments as well as favourable economic conditions in the country of residence.

4. Leaving the country of residence although one's intention was to stay is mainly related to life events triggering mobility.

Data and methods

Our study uses data from a unique set of linked survey and register data. The Swedish Level of Living Survey of Foreign Born (LNU-UFB), conducted by Stockholm University Linnaeus Center for Integration Studies in cooperation with Statistics Sweden in 2010-2012, contains the migrant histories of as well as demographic and socioeconomic information on non-adopted persons born outside Sweden and with no Swedish-born parents, aged 18-75 years (Wadensjö 2013). About a third of the sample came to Sweden before the age of 16. The LNU-UFB was the first large-scale Swedish survey to ask migrants about their social and economic contacts with people outside Sweden and their thoughts on future migration. From its launch, the survey also contained information on family and labour market statuses stemming from national population registers. Register variables have later been updated longitudinally so that we may follow individuals over time from the year of the survey up to

the end of 2018, meaning between six and eight years after the interview. At the end of the study period, all but five individuals, who had no registered death or emigration, were still found in the registers.

The survey sample was drawn from a population frame stratified according to age and country of birth. This was done in order to also secure responses from smaller migrant groups by origin and thus enable comparisons between categories. In the present analysis, the descriptive statistics presented in Table 1 include a post-stratification weight, calibrated with respect to differences in response rates. The weighting enables nationally representative results for the selected study population. In the unweighted models, variables calibrating the weight were used as controls (Carlsson 2010).

Models

The analysis is carried out in two parts. First, to test Hypotheses 1 and 2, we estimate logistic regression models of re-migration intention and behaviour using the information available at the time of the survey, as well as a six-year register follow-up on whether or not re-migration was taking place. Through a first model (Model 1), we estimate re-migration intention (a) and behaviour (b) respectively as two outcomes in separate logistic regressions using similar independent variables. Additionally, behaviour is estimated through one model only including intention (Model 0), and one model in which intention is added to all other covariates (Model 2).

Second, to analyse the process of realization (Hypotheses 3 and 4), we use two different discrete time event history models estimating the likelihoods of emigrating from Sweden among those whose intention was to leave (Model 3) or stay in Sweden (Model 4).

Individuals are at risk from the year of survey, and are censored in cases of experiencing the event or death. The event history approach enables us to utilize the yearly information provided by the registers, allowing for time-varying variables as well as the inclusion of life events occurring after the interview.

All models are run using case-wise deletion, meaning that individuals with missing information in key variables, such as intention to migrate and time since migration, are excluded from the analysis. In total, this leaves us with 3,226 individuals.

Variables

Intending to migrate stems from the survey question ‘Do you think you will be living in Sweden in five years?’ and includes the answer categories Yes and No. We have chosen to use the term intention as the question comprises both aspects of aspiration and ability (Carling 2002; Carling 2014; Carling and Schewel 2018), summarized in a self-rated likelihood estimation of emigration. The question does not consider the desire to leave Sweden or the intention to leave Sweden ‘someday’ in the long-term future; nor is it asking for a plan for or preparation of an emigration close in time, i.e. within a year, which would imply more concrete actions (see Steiner 2019). As has been pointed out by Carling and Schewel (2018), staying and leaving are not equal projects. However, the question could be understood from a continuous aspect (Carling 2002; 2014), and hence, only those with the clear intention to leave will be likely to answer no to the question of staying (Carling 2014). A similar approach to this matter has been used by Diehl & Liebau (2014), for example.

The outcome variable of actual emigration behaviour stems from the emigration registers, whereby all Swedish residents who intend to live away from Sweden for at least one year are required to de-register.

In the logistic regression models, all independent variables are measured at the time of interview. Country of residence attachment is measured partly through economic aspects, such as: labour market status, reflecting the activity the last week before interview; having experienced economic difficulties stemming from the survey question ‘In the past 12 months have you had difficulty meeting your current expenses for food, rent, bills etc?’; and owning one’s accommodations or not, measured as a dummy. From the registers we have additional information on Swedish citizenship. Country of residence attachment is further measured through sociocultural aspects captured by the survey, such as Swedish proficiency, measured through self-rated abilities to speak and read, and having one’s best friend living in Sweden.

Origin country attachment is represented by sending remittances or not, and the number of return visits since arriving in Sweden, or alternatively the past ten years if one has been in Sweden more than ten years. The origin country is regarded as the main country of residence until the age of 16, or alternatively the country of birth. Other sociodemographic characteristics include age, gender, time since first immigration, residential region, civil status, having a child living in the household, and highest level of education as declared by the respondent at the time of the interview.

As for the discrete time event history models, similar variables are included as in the logistic regressions, measured as time constant (at interview), with the exception of Swedish citizenship, age, and time since migration, which are measured as time-varying variables, utilizing the yearly information from the register follow-up. Additionally, time-varying variables are added reflecting whether or not the respondent experienced any of the following events after the year of interview: civil status change, childbirth (or adoption), illness resulting in Sick leave, or unemployment. As we lack register information on variables in the year of eventual emigration or death, all register variables (except emigration) are lagged variables from the previous year. Additionally, the variable reflecting childbirth allows this to have happened in any of the two previous years, and unemployment in any of the three previous years, as more narrow time periods would lead to too few events, fully predicting the outcome. Table A 1 in the Appendix provides an overview of all independent variables included throughout the models by intention and behaviour.

Limitation and robustness check

In order to capture the integration processes in Sweden, the surveyed study population is limited to individuals who had been permanent residents of Sweden since January 1, 2005 at the latest, meaning for at least five years at the time of the survey. Hence, we are able to study the effects of receiving and origin country attachment among long-term migrants. Whilst this indeed allows us to analyse migrants with accumulated Swedish experiences based on which they express their future mobility intentions, our findings might not reflect the general overall re-migration process as most migrants returning or moving onwards do so during the first five years (Monti 2020). In terms of re-migration, the average time in Sweden should be considered a very long time, resulting in lower shares of individuals actually emigrating. Hence, as a robustness check, the first part of the analysis is modelled within a subsample of individuals with a maximum of eight years in Sweden since migration, the lowest possible time limit given the sample size of the data. From the results of the robustness check, we can see the ways our results are specifically marked by the study population's long stay in Sweden, and the extent to which these may be impacted by also including short stayers.

Results

The role of intention in determining behaviour

Within the studied population, almost 96% declared their intention was to stay in Sweden given a five-year time horizon. Four per cent said their intention was to leave Sweden. Of the individuals intending to leave, 10% had done so within the study period. Three per cent of the individuals saying their intention was to stay left anyway (Table 1). The study population could thus be described as a highly stable residing population, partly reflecting the long time they have already spent in Sweden, with less than 1% realizing an intention to leave the country of residence.

From our logistic regressions estimating re-migration behaviour up to six years after the interview, we see that having an intention to leave Sweden increases the odds of actual re-migration more than five times (Model 0, Table A 2), and almost four times if we also include other covariates (Model 2, Table A 2). In terms of effect size, intention is thus the main determinant of re-migration behaviour. At the same time, estimating the re-migration behaviour with intention alone explains only a minor share of the total variance in re-migration behaviour, with a pseudo R² of less than 4% (Model 0, Table A 2). In sum, these results indicate that re-migration intentions, although they are the main determinant, are a poor proxy for re-migration behaviour (H1).

Table 1. Percentage of re-migration behaviour by re-migration intention

Intention	Behaviour		Total	Total N - sample	Total N - reference population
	Stayed	Left			
Stay	0.97	0.03	1.00	3 045	553 994
Leave	0.90	0.10	1.00	181	25 255
Total	0.97	0.03	1.00	3 226	579 249

Table 2. Associations between destination and origin country attachment and re-migration intention and behaviour. The table shows the results from three different logistic regression models – one of intention and two of behaviour – including and excluding intention. Control variables included in all models are: country of birth, years since migration, gender, age at interview, education, residential area, civil status, and the presence of at least one child in the household. Number of observations in each model: 3,226 individuals. Full models in Table A 2.

Full sample		Intention	Behaviour (w/o intention)	Behaviour (with intention)
		Model 1a	Model 1b	Model 2
Residence country attachments	Intention (ref: Stay)			
	Leave			+ ***
	Labour market status (ref: Work)			
	Unemployed	+	+ **	+ **
	Outside LM	+ *	+	
	Economic difficulties (ref: No)			
	Yes	+ ***	+ **	+ *
	Tenure (ref: Renting)			
	Owning	- ***		
	Swedish citizenship* (ref: No)			
	Yes	- **	- ***	- ***
	Swedish proficiency (ref: Not fluent)			
Origin country attachments	Fluent	+	+	+
	Best friend in Sweden (ref: No)			
	Yes	- ***	- **	- **
	Remittances (ref: No)			
	Yes	+ ***	+	+
	Return visits (ref: No one)			
	1-5 visits	+		
	>5 visits	+ ***	+	+

+ means a positive, - means a negative, association
No symbol represents a (close to) null association
Asterisks refer to p-values: ***<=0.001, **<=0.05, *<=0.10

Table 2 shows the associations of different country attachments with the likelihoods of re-migration intention and behaviour, all stemming from the logistic regression models (fully presented in Table A 2). Overall, the aspects of country attachments show similar associations with re-migration intention as with behaviour, at least in terms of direction. Being unemployed or experiencing economic difficulties is related to an increase in intending to and actually leaving Sweden, while holding Swedish citizenship and having one's best friend living in Sweden are related to lower likelihoods of both. The similarities related to

economic and social attachments in Sweden contradict our second hypothesis, in which these factors were thought to be more related to either intention or behaviour, respectively.

However, in support of the hypothesis, home acquisition, which has a decreasing effect on intention, shows no significant effect in relation to behaviour, possibly as it reflects economic capital which also enables long-distance moves. Additionally, origin country ties show significant increasing likelihoods in terms of intending re-migration, with similar but insignificant results in terms of actual behaviour. This supports the idea that transnational relations are primarily related to return intentions, but may have little to do with actually leaving the country of residence.

Comparing the odd ratios of the model of behaviour with or without including intention (Table 2) indicates that the odds ratios in terms of destination and host country attachments are close to identical. Hence, not accessing the variable of intention would not necessarily lead to bias, stemming from the exclusion of intention as a control variable, when analysing country attachments and their relation to re-migration behaviour.

Realizing re-migration intentions

To test Hypotheses 3 and 4, we follow individual realization processes over time. The main results from the discrete event history models estimating the risks of leaving the destination country are presented in Table 3 (fully presented in Table A 2), among both those with the intention to leave (Model 3) and those with the intention to stay (Model 4). Results from both models reveal that the main factor related to realizing both stated intentions is the presence of children in the household. Among those with the intention to stay, having at least one child in the household reduces the likelihood of emigrating by a factor of nearly six. This is expected, as the presence of family members generally decreases mobility (Lu 1998; Kley 2011; Coulter 2013). Additionally, having at least one child doubles (albeit not significantly) the likelihood of realizing the intention to leave.

Table 3. Associations between destination and origin country attachments, life events, sociodemographic characteristics, and re-migration intention and behaviour. The table shows the results from two discrete time event history models, fully presented in Table A 2.

Behaviour			
		Subsample with intention to <i>leave</i> Model 3	Subsample with intention to <i>stay</i> Model 4
Residence country attachments	Labour market status (ref: Work)		
	Unemployed	+	+
	Outside LM	- **	
	Economic difficulties (ref: No)		
	Yes	-	+ ***
	House ownership (ref: No)		
	Yes	-	+
	Swedish citizenship_a (ref: No)		
	Yes	- ***	-
	Swedish proficiency (ref: Not fluent)		
Origin country attachments	Fluent	+	
	Best friend in Sweden (ref: No)		
	Yes	-	- *
	Remittances (ref: No)		
	Yes	-	+
	Return visits (ref: No one)		
	1-5 visits	-	
	>5 visits	-	+
	Country of birth (ref: Nordic)		
	EU15+	- ***	- *
Sociodemographic controls	Eastern Europe	-	- ***
	Middle East/Northern Africa	+	- *
	Subsaharan Africa	-	-
	Asia		- **
	Latin America	+	-
	Years since migration_a		- ***
	Gender (ref: Man)		
	Woman	+	
	Age at interview_a		-
	Education (ref: Primary)		
Events happening after interview	Secondary		+
	Post-secondary	+	+
	Residential region (ref: Stockholm)		
	Västra Götaland	+ *	+
	Skåne	+ ***	+
	Other	+ **	
	Civil status (ref: Never married)		
	Married	- *	+
	Divorced or widowed	-	+ *
	Child in household (ref: No)		
Events happening after interview	Yes	+	- ***
	Civil status change_a (ref: No)		
	Yes (previous year)	+	
	Childbirth_a (ref: No)		
	Yes (previous two years)		+
	Sick leave_a (ref: No)		
	Yes (previous year)	-	-
Events happening after interview	Unemployment_a (ref: No)		
	Yes (previous three years)	- **	+ **

_a =time varying

+ means a positive, - means a negative, association

No symbol represents a (close to) null association

Asterisks refer to p-values: ***<=0.001, **<=0.05, *<=0.10

Mainly related to not realizing re-migration intentions is experiencing unemployment after the interview. This lowers the likelihood of emigration among those with the intention to leave and, correspondingly, increases that among those with the intention to stay. Whilst the effect is stronger for those intending to leave, likely because more financial resources are required to move than to stay, the result is significant among both groups. Similar results are found in relation to having experienced economic difficulties already at the time of stating future re-migration intentions. Other factors related to behavioural inconsistency are owning one's accommodations and sending remittances. Whilst house ownership in Sweden could be seen as a marker of economic integration, and perhaps also of an intention to stay in the country for at least some time – explaining the reduced likelihood of emigration among those with the intention to leave – it is additionally an economic resource in cases in which the intention is changed, explaining the slight increase in odds ratios among those with the intention to stay. Similarly, whilst remittances do not necessarily reflect an intention to leave but rather the maintained links to family and friends, it might additionally enable, or even be a preparation for, a prospective international move. Being married or divorced is additionally related to lower odds ratios of emigration among those with the intention to leave, and higher among those intending to stay. Whilst this result is less surprising among those with the intention to leave, it is interesting that it also applies to those with the intention to stay.

Another factor related to not realizing the intention to leave is being outside the labour market, with no corresponding effect among those intending to stay. Yet another is holding Swedish citizenship, as it – parallel to the stated intention to leave – symbolizes an integration process and long-term intention to remain in the country (Massey & Akresh 2006; Anniste & Tammaru 2014). Compared to Nordic-born migrants, being born within the EU15+ countries (also including Canada, the USA, Australia, and New Zealand) is moreover related to staying in Sweden although having stated an intention to leave. Contrasting our third hypothesis, origin country attachments in terms of remittances and return visits show no positive associations with realizing the intention to re-migrate from Sweden. Return visits even show negative associations (albeit insignificant), with about four times less probability of leaving. Possessing fluent Swedish skills, having a post-secondary education, not living in the capital region of Stockholm, and being a woman all relate to the realization of re-migration intentions, as does experiencing a civil status change after the interview. These results, with the exception of residential region, are all non-significant, and might be explained by the low number of observations included in the model.

Other factors related to the realization of staying in Sweden – i.e., lowering the likelihood of emigrating among those with the intention to stay – include having one’s best friend living in Sweden and having spent more time in the country since first immigration, which is expected in both cases. Compared to other Nordic countries, being born in any other country is related to higher likelihoods of realizing the intention to stay in Sweden. The decreasing likelihood of re-migration is noted especially among individuals born in Eastern Europe, Asia, and the Middle East/North Africa, regions related to relatively lower re-migration levels in general (Monti 2020).

Robustness check

The results of this study are marked by the sample’s long-term residence in Sweden. To illuminate the direction in which results would change given a more recent migrant population, we ran the model of intention and behaviour for a subsample of individuals with a maximum stay in Sweden of eight years. Firstly, whilst the constant of intending to re-migrate is similar in the subsample as in the full sample, the constant of actually re-migrating is higher in the subsample. This overall higher probability of actual re-migration among migrants with less time spent in Sweden is expected, and is also reflected in the realization of re-migration intentions. Within the subsample, 24% of those intending to leave left within six years, and 9% of those with the intention to stay left anyway. In terms of intention, the results from the model among the subsample show pronounced and similar results as for the full sample (Table A 3). When looking at the model of behaviour the results are also similar as within the full sample, albeit with some exceptions. Being outside the labour market, owning one’s home, having acquired fluent Swedish skills, and sending remittances are all related to decreased likelihoods of re-migrating, whilst in the full sample these aspects were related to a small positive or zero association. These pronounced and somewhat different results imply that, within the subsample of more recent migrants in Sweden, there are greater differences in the associations between country attachments and re-migration intentions and behaviour, respectively, than in the full sample. For example, whilst remittances are found to significantly increase the likelihood of intending to re-migrate, they are also found to be related to decreased likelihoods of re-migration behaviour.

Conclusive discussion

This paper has aimed to shed new light on the differentiated process behind re-migration, by linking and comparing individual re-migration intentions with subsequent behaviour. Taking

off from insights from previous literature on country attachments and their respective relations to intention and behaviour, as well as the importance of life events within the residential mobility literature, we have been able to analyse the relative importance of re-migration intentions and behaviour, comparing their determinants and examining factors related to the realization and repression of re-migration intentions.

Our results show that re-migration intention is the main determinant behind re-migration behaviour. At the same time, it is not sufficient for explaining the variance in re-migration behaviour, and a vast majority of those stating re-migration intentions do not realize their intention within the stated time period, especially if they have spent more time in the destination country. Hence, different to Van Dalen and Henkens' study (2013) of non-migrants in the Netherlands, intention could not be considered a good proxy for re-migration behaviour among long-term foreign-born residents.

Supporting the differentiated focus within previous re-migration literature, in which intention is primarily seen in relation to aspects of transnational belonging, and behaviour in relation to economic attachments in the destination country (Caron 2020), we show that origin country ties are indeed more strongly related to intention rather than behaviour, and even more so among more recent migrants. However, we also show the importance of expanding traditional economic frameworks of re-migration behaviour to emphasize social attachments to the destination country. Likewise, our results stress how not only behaviour but also intentions are related to the experience of economic difficulties at the destination, in line with literature suggesting that intentions are triggered by marginalization (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Itzigohn & Giorguli-Saucedo 2002; 2005; Haller & Landolt 2005; Bolognani 2007; Schunck 2014). Moreover, showing the accuracy of previous literature, we find that not including an intention to study re-migration behaviour does not necessarily lead to bias in terms of other determinants.

In terms of realizing the intention to leave or stay in the country of residence, this paper has shown that having children in the household generally relates to the realization of re-migration intentions, possibly through the generally increased need for life planning and thinking ahead. The main factors found for not realizing re-migration intentions, whether to leave or to stay, are future experiences of unemployment and previous economic difficulties. This result is similar to that found in previous studies of residential mobility (Lu 1998; Fang 2006; Kley & Mulder 2010), and involves the result of either the postponement, change, or

abandonment of intentions. In this study, it is found that origin country attachment does not increase the probabilities of realizing the intention to move; rather, our results suggest the opposite. Possible reasons for the lack of relationship might be the fact that transnational activities in themselves might be ways of balancing one's being and belonging across geographical space (Bilgili & Siegel 2017; Oeppen 2013; Carling & Erdal 2014), for example as in the findings by Lulle (2014), whereby return visits were interpreted as substitutes for more permanent moves. Moreover, transnational activities, such as remittances, might be motivated by maintained social ties and obligations (De Haas & Fokkema 2011) rather than preparing for a return, especially given the long time already spent in the country of residence.

Whilst contributing to underexplored aspects of re-migration, some limitations have to be considered when evaluating our results. Firstly, in this study we have not known which destination either the intention or actual re-migration behaviour refers to. Thus, whilst most previous theories refer to return migration intentions and behaviour, this study includes both return and onward migration. Secondly, although they are generally of very high quality, population registers do run the risk of not capturing all emigrations, and although these individuals are eventually de-registered, the timing of emigration might be delayed. Whilst there are methods for accounting for this bias, in this study we did not have access to enough information to constructively do so (Monti et al. 2020). On the other hand, as the studied population in this paper is relatively well-established, with longer times spent in the destination country and general lower emigration levels, this bias is assumed to be very low.

Despite these limitations, this paper brings together a so-far divided body of literature on re-migration, building on a unique set of individual, prospective data, allowing for both subjective and objective information on economic and social destination and origin country attachments. The results suggest that, although they have more similarities than is traditionally acknowledged, re-migration intentions and behaviour are not interchangeable in the study of the re-emigration process, partly because the predictability of behaviour based on intention is low, and partly due to the different associations with origin country attachments. Additionally, by showing how economic conditions in the destination country relate to decreased likelihoods of realizing re-migration intentions, this paper adds to the incipient study of re-migration as a differentiated process, connecting re-migration to the broader field of realization within demographic processes. Future research should continue this task, for example by looking more closely at the most recent migrants.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful for financial support from the Swedish Research Council for Health, Working life and Welfare (FORTE), grant numbers: 2016-07105 and 2018-00310. The article also benefited from comments at Andrea Monti's final seminar in November 2020, at the Sociology Department, Stockholm University.

References

- Anniste, K., and T. Tammaru. 2014. Ethnic differences in integration levels and return migration intentions: A study of Estonian migrants in Finland, *Demographic Research* 30: 377-412.
- Aydemir, A., and C. Robinson. 2008. Global labour markets, return, and onward migration, *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie* 41(4): 1285-1311.
- Di Belgiojoso, E. B. 2016. Intentions on desired length of stay among immigrants in Italy, *Genus* 72(1): 1.
- Bettin, G., E. Cela, and T. Fokkema. 2018. Return intentions over the life course: Evidence on the effects of life events from a longitudinal sample of first-and second-generation Turkish migrants in Germany, *Demographic Research* 39: 1009-1038.
- Bijwaard, G. E., and S. Van Doeselaar. 2014. The impact of changes in the marital status on return migration of family migrants, *Journal of Population Economics* 27(4): 961-997.
- Bijwaard, G. E., C. Schluter, and J. Wahba. 2014. The impact of labor market dynamics on the return migration of immigrants, *Review of Economics and Statistics* 96(3): 483-494.
- Bilgili, Ö., and M. Siegel. 2017. To return permanently or to return temporarily? Explaining migrants' intentions, *Migration and Development* 6(1): 14-32.
- Borjas, G. J., and B. Bratsberg. 1996. Who Leaves. The Outmigration of the Foreign Born, *Review of Economics and Statistics* 78: 165-176.
- Borjas, G. J. 1989. Immigrant and emigrant earnings: a longitudinal study, *Economic inquiry* 27(1): 21-37.
- Bratsberg, B., O. Raaum, and K. Sørli. 2007. Foreign-born Migration to and from Norway. *International Migration, Economic Development and Policy*, pp. 259-291.
- Della Puppa, F., R. King. 2019. The new 'twice migrants': motivations, experiences and disillusionments of Italian-Bangladeshis relocating to London, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45(11): 1936-1952.
- Bygnes, S., and M. B. Erdal. 2017. Liquid migration, grounded lives: considerations about future mobility and settlement among Polish and Spanish migrants in Norway, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 43(1): 102-118.
- Carling, J., and S. V. Pettersen. 2014. Return migration intentions in the integration-transnationalism matrix, *International Migration* 52(6): 13-30.
- Carling, J., and K. Schewel. 2018. Revisiting aspiration and ability in international migration, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44(6): 945-963.
- Carling, J. 2002. Migration in the age of involuntary immobility: Theoretical reflections and Cape Verdean experiences, *Journal of ethnic and migration studies* 28(1): 5-42.

- Carling, J. 2014. The role of aspirations in migration. Paper presented at Determinants of International Migration, International Migration Institute, University of Oxford.
- Carling, J., and M. B. Erdal. 2014. Return migration and transnationalism: how are the two connected?, *International migration* 52(6): 2-12.
- Carlsson, F. 2010. Kalibreringsrapport, UFB-LNU. Statistics Sweden.
- Caron, L. 2020. An Intergenerational Perspective on (Re) Migration: Return and Onward Mobility Intentions across Immigrant Generations, *International Migration Review* 54(3): 820-852.
- Chabé-Ferret, B., J. Machado, and J. Wahba. 2018. Remigration intentions and migrants' behavior, *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 68: 56-72.
- Constant, A., and D. S. Massey. 2002. Return migration by German guestworkers: Neoclassical versus new economic theories, *International migration* 40(4): 5-38.
- Constant, A., and D. S. Massey. 2003. Self-selection, earnings, and out-migration: A longitudinal study of immigrants to Germany, *Journal of population Economics* 16(4): 631-653.
- Constant, A. F., and K. F. Zimmermann. 2011. Circular and repeat migration: counts of exits and years away from the host country, *Population Research and Policy Review* 30(4): 495-515.
- Constant, A. F. 2020. Time-Space Dynamics of Return and Circular Migration. *Handbook of Labor, Human Resources and Population Economics*, pp. 1-40.
- Coulter, R. 2013. Wishful thinking and the abandonment of moving desires over the life course, *Environment and Planning A* 45(8): 1944-1962.
- Coulter, R., M. Van Ham, and P. Feijten. 2011. A longitudinal analysis of moving desires, expectations and actual moving behaviour, *Environment and Planning A* 43(11): 2742-2760.
- De Groot, C., C. H. Mulder, C. H., M. Das, and D. Manting. 2011. Life events and the gap between intention to move and actual mobility, *Environment and planning A* 43(1): 48-66.
- De Haas, H., and T. Fokkema. 2011. The effects of integration and transnational ties on international return migration intentions, *Demographic research* 25: 755-782.
- Di Belgiojoso, E. B., and L.E. Ortensi. 2013. Should I stay or should I go? The case of Italy. *Rivista Italiana di Economia, Demografia e Statistica* 67(3/4): 31-38.
- Di Saint Pierre, F., B. Martinovic, and T. De Vroome. 2015. Return wishes of refugees in the Netherlands: The role of integration, host national identification and perceived discrimination, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41(11): 1836-1857.
- Diehl, C., and E. Liebau. 2015. Turning back to Turkey—Or Turning the Back on Germany?: Remigration Intentions and Behavior of Turkish Immigrants in Germany between 1984 and 2011, *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 44(1): 22-41.
- Fang, Y. 2006. Residential Satisfaction, Moving Intention and Moving Behaviours: A Study of Redeveloped Neighbourhoods in Inner-City Beijing, *Housing Studies* 21(5): 671-694.
- Flahaux, M. L. 2015. Intention et réalisation de migration de retour au Sénégal et en République démocratique du Congo, *Population* 70(1): 103-133.
- González-Ferrer, A., P. Baizán, C. Beauchemin, E. Kraus, B. Schoumaker, and R. Black. 2014. Distance, transnational arrangements, and return decisions of Senegalese, Ghanaian, and Congolese migrants, *International Migration Review* 48(4): 939-971.

- Jensen, P., and P. J. Pedersen. 2007. To stay or not to stay? Out-migration of immigrants from Denmark, *International Migration* 45(5): 87-113.
- Kan, K. 1999. Expected and unexpected residential mobility, *Journal of urban economics* 45(1): 72-96.
- King, K. M., and K. B. Newbold. 2007. Onward emigration to the United States by Canadian immigrants between 1995 and 2000, *International Migration Review* 41(4): 909-929.
- Kley, S. A., and C. H. Mulder. 2010. Considering, planning, and realizing migration in early adulthood. The influence of life-course events and perceived opportunities on leaving the city in Germany, *Journal of housing and the built environment* 25(1): 73-94.
- Kley, S. 2011. Explaining the stages of migration within a life-course framework, *European sociological review* 27(4): 469-486.
- Klinthäll, M. 2007. Refugee return migration: return migration from Sweden to Chile, Iran and Poland 1973–1996, *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20(4): 579-598.
- Kuhlenkasper, T., and M. F. Steinhardt. 2017. Who leaves and when? Selective outmigration of immigrants from Germany, *Economic Systems* 41(4): 610-621.
- Kulu, H., and N. Milewski. 2007. Family change and migration in the life course: An introduction, *Demographic research* 17: 567-590.
- Kulu, H. 2008. Fertility and spatial mobility in the life course: evidence from Austria, *Environment and planning A* 40(3): 632-652.
- Liebig, T., and A. Sousa-Poza. 2004. Migration, self-selection and income inequality: an international analysis, *Kyklos* 57(1): 125-146.
- Lu, M. 1998. Analyzing migration decisionmaking: Relationships between residential satisfaction, mobility intentions, and moving behavior, *Environment and Planning A* 30(8): 1473-1495.
- Lulle, A. 2014. “Spaces of encounter–displacement: contemporary labour migrants’ return visits to Latvia”, *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 96(2): 127–140.
- Mas Giralt, R. 2017. Onward migration as a coping strategy? Latin Americans moving from Spain to the UK post-2008, *Population, Space and Place* 23(3): e2017.
- Massey, D. S., and I. R. Akresh. 2006. Immigrant intentions and mobility in a global economy: The attitudes and behavior of recently arrived US immigrants, *Social Science Quarterly* 87(5): 954-971.
- Massey, D. S., R. Alarcón, J. Durand, and H. González. 1990. *Return to Aztlan: The social process of international migration from western Mexico* (Vol. 1). Univ of California Press.
- Massey, D. S., J. Durand, and K. A. Pren. 2015. Border enforcement and return migration by documented and undocumented Mexicans, *Journal of ethnic and migration studies* 41(7): 1015-1040.
- Massey, D. S., and K. E. Espinosa. 1997. What's driving Mexico-US migration? A theoretical, empirical, and policy analysis. *American journal of sociology*, 102(4): 939-999.
- Monti, A. 2020. Re-emigration of foreign-born residents from Sweden: 1990–2015, *Population, Space and Place* 26(2): e2285.
- Mulder, C. H., and M. Wagner. 1993. Migration and marriage in the life course: a method for studying synchronized events, *European Journal of Population* 9(1): 55-76.
- Mulder, C. H. 1993. *Migration dynamics: A life course approach*. Amsterdam Thesis.
- Nekby, L. 2006. The emigration of immigrants, return vs onward migration: evidence from Sweden, *Journal of Population Economics* 19(2): 197-226.

- Oeppen, C. (2013). A stranger at 'home': interactions between transnational return visits and integration for Afghan-American professionals, *Global Networks* 13(2): 261-278.
- Reagan, P. B., and R. J. Olsen. 2000. You can go home again: Evidence from longitudinal data, *Demography* 37(3): 339-350.
- Reyes, B. 2004. US immigration policy and the duration of undocumented trips. *Crossing the border: Research from the Mexican migration project*, 299-321.
- Rooth, D. O., and J. Saarela. 2007. Selection in migration and return migration: Evidence from micro data, *Economics letters* 94(1): 90-95.
- Rossi, Peter H. [1955] 1980. *Why Families Move*. Free Press.
- Stark, O., and D. E. Bloom. 1985. The new economics of labor migration, *The American Economic review* 75(2): 173-178.
- Steiner, V., and J. Velling. 1994. Re-migration behavior and expected duration of stay of guest workers in Germany. In *The economic consequences of immigration to Germany* (pp. 101-119). Physica, Heidelberg.
- Steiner, I. 2019. Settlement or mobility? Immigrants' re-migration decision-making process in a high-income country setting, *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 20(1): 223-245.
- Todaro, M. P. 1969. A model of labor migration and urban unemployment in less developed countries, *The American economic review* 59(1): 138-148.
- Van Dalen, H. P., and K. Henkens. 2013. Explaining emigration intentions and behaviour in the Netherlands, 2005–10, *Population Studies* 67(2): 225-241.
- Van Liempt, I. 2011. 'And then one day they all moved to Leicester': the relocation of Somalis from the Netherlands to the UK explained, *Population, Space and Place* 17(3): 254-26.

Appendix

Table A 1. Descriptive statistics of independent variables by intention and behaviour.

	Intention		Stay	Stay	Leave	Leave	Total
	Behaviour (within 6 years of interview)		Stayed	Left	Left	Stayed	Total
Residence country attachments	Labour market	Work	63.2	58.5	62.5	54.1	62.6
		Unemployed	7.0	15.9	8.3	10.8	7.4
		Outside LM	26.3	22.0	20.8	31.9	26.4
		Missing	3.5	3.7	8.3	3.2	3.6
	Economic difficulties	No	82.4	68.3	79.2	67.5	81.3
		Yes	17.6	31.7	20.8	32.5	18.7
	Tenure	Not owning	51.5	59.8	66.7	73.9	52.9
		Owning	48.5	40.2	33.3	26.1	47.1
	Citizenship	No	21.4	46.3	62.5	26.1	22.6
		Yes	78.6	53.7	37.5	73.9	77.4
	Swedish proficiency	Not fluent	21.9	22.0	8.3	17.2	21.6
		Fluent	78.1	78.1	91.7	82.8	78.4
Best friend	No	29.6	37.8	37.5	29.9	29.9	
	Yes	70.4	62.2	62.5	70.1	70.1	
Origin country attachments	Remittances	No	89.5	90.2	83.3	86.6	89.3
		Yes	10.5	9.8	16.7	13.4	10.7
	Return visits	No one	16.3	14.6	12.5	14.7	16.2
		1-5 visits	42.9	32.9	33.3	40.8	42.5
		>5 visits	40.8	52.4	54.2	44.6	41.4
Controls	Country of origin	Nordic	16.3	28.1	37.5	13.4	16.7
		EU15+	16.2	18.3	8.3	19.1	16.3
		Eastern Europe	15.0	8.5	4.2	11.5	14.6
		Mid. E. / N. Africa	12.9	11.0	12.5	15.3	13.0
		Subsaharan Africa	11.2	11.0	4.2	12.1	11.2
		Asia	13.3	9.8	12.5	14.0	13.2
		Latin America	15.2	13.4	20.8	14.7	15.1
		Time since migration (continous)	24.9	16.8	18.9	21.5	24.5
		Mean (Std. Err.)	(13.2)	(10.8)	(10.6)	(11.9)	(13.1)
	Gender	Male	48.1	47.6	37.5	50.3	48.1
		Female	51.9	52.4	62.5	49.7	51.9
	Age at interview (continous)		45.9	37.2	35.6	37.3	45.2
			Mean (Std. Err.)	(16.4)	(14.2)	(14.7)	(16.0)
	Education	Elementary	17.6	11.0	12.5	24.8	17.8
		Secondary	40.4	45.1	25.0	40.1	40.4
		Post-secondary	38.7	39.0	54.2	31.9	38.5
		Missing	3.3	4.9	8.3	3.2	3.4
	County	Stockholm	30.3	23.2	20.8	30.6	30.1
		Västra götaland	18.1	24.4	16.7	23.6	18.5
		Skåne	14.3	17.1	25.0	12.7	14.4
		Other	37.3	35.4	37.5	33.1	37.0
	Civil status	Never married	31.1	42.7	62.5	51.0	32.6
		Married	49.1	37.8	33.3	32.5	47.9
		Divorced/Widowed	19.8	19.5	4.2	16.6	19.6
	Child	No	59.1	73.2	66.7	68.2	60.0
		Yes	40.9	26.8	33.3	31.9	40.0
	Events occurring after interview	Civil status after interview	No	85.1	90.2	91.7	81.5
Yes			15.0	9.8	8.3	18.5	14.9
Childbirth		No	87.3	86.6	87.5	82.2	87.0
		Yes	12.7	13.4	12.5	17.8	13.0
Sick leave		No	66.4	87.8	87.5	61.2	66.8
		Yes	33.6	12.2	12.5	38.9	33.2
Unemployment		No	76.4	68.3	95.8	51.0	75.1
		Yes	23.6	31.7	4.2	49.0	24.9
Total %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Total N, sample		2 963	82	24	157	3 226	

Table A 2. Logistic and discrete time event history models on the likelihoods of re-migration intention and behaviour.

	Logistic regression models								Discrete time event			
	Full sample								history models			
									Intending to leave		Intending to stay	
	Intention		Behaviour						Behaviour			
Model 1a		Model 0		Model 1b		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		
OR	p-val	OR	p-val	OR	p-val	OR	p-val	OR	p-val	OR	p-val	
Intention (ref: Stay)												
Leave			5.52	0.00			3.82	0.00				
Labour market status (ref: Work)												
Unemployed	1.26	0.40			1.94	0.04	1.94	0.04	1.27	0.81	1.53	0.22
Outside LM	1.42	0.08			1.15	0.61	1.07	0.81	0.19	0.05	1.10	0.74
Missing	1.05	0.91			1.15	0.78	1.15	0.78	5.22	0.10	0.77	0.67
Economic difficulties (ref: No)												
Yes	1.84	0.00			1.69	0.03	1.60	0.06	0.60	0.46	1.88	0.01
House ownership (ref: No)												
Yes	0.55	0.00			0.99	0.97	1.05	0.86	0.57	0.37	1.30	0.33
Swedish citizenship* (ref: No)												
Yes	0.66	0.05			0.42	0.00	0.44	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.74	0.27
Swedish proficiency (ref: Not fluent)												
Fluent	1.27	0.34			1.20	0.56	1.17	0.62	2.99	0.19	0.97	0.93
Best friend in Sweden (ref: No)												
Yes	0.62	0.01			0.57	0.02	0.61	0.04	0.64	0.48	0.65	0.08
Remittances (ref: No)												
Yes	1.96	0.01			1.29	0.45	1.15	0.69	0.81	0.77	1.26	0.50
Return visits (ref: No one)												
1-5 visits	1.34	0.24			1.02	0.95	0.98	0.96	0.59	0.54	0.97	0.93
>5 visits	2.24	0.00			1.35	0.44	1.19	0.66	0.62	0.64	1.29	0.52
Country of birth (ref: Nordic)												
EU15+	1.20	0.52			0.40	0.01	0.38	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.54	0.06
Eastern Europe	0.76	0.42			0.30	0.01	0.30	0.01	0.21	0.26	0.28	0.00
Middle East/Northern Africa	1.68	0.13			0.65	0.34	0.57	0.22	3.00	0.35	0.43	0.08
Subsaharan Africa	1.51	0.26			0.57	0.25	0.52	0.17	0.64	0.75	0.52	0.18
Asia	1.46	0.25			0.45	0.06	0.40	0.03	0.98	0.98	0.35	0.02
Latin America	1.48	0.23			0.81	0.61	0.73	0.44	3.04	0.23	0.56	0.18
Years since migration*												
	1.02	0.04			0.96	0.01	0.96	0.01	1.01	0.79	0.96	0.00
Gender (ref: Man)												
Woman	1.08	0.63			1.08	0.71	1.05	0.82	2.68	0.11	1.00	0.99
Age at interview*												
	0.96	0.00			0.98	0.03	0.98	0.10	1.02	0.58	0.98	0.14
Education (ref: Primary)												
Secondary	0.74	0.16			1.77	0.10	1.79	0.10	1.00	1.00	1.69	0.14
Post-secondary	0.96	0.86			2.24	0.03	2.26	0.03	2.49	0.30	1.82	0.11
Missing	0.78	0.58			1.74	0.30	1.71	0.33	1.85	0.63	1.34	0.63
Residential region (ref: Stockholm)												
Västra Götaland	1.27	0.28			1.54	0.16	1.54	0.17	4.84	0.06	1.40	0.28
Skåne	1.07	0.79			1.72	0.10	1.71	0.11	11.34	0.01	1.29	0.45
Other	0.91	0.63			1.17	0.57	1.21	0.50	6.49	0.02	1.01	0.97
Civil status (ref: Never married)												
Married	0.78	0.27			1.26	0.43	1.31	0.36	0.26	0.10	1.33	0.34
Divorced or widowed	0.86	0.59			1.33	0.44	1.39	0.37	0.12	0.13	1.79	0.10
Child in household (ref: No)												
Yes	0.85	0.40			0.43	0.00	0.43	0.00	2.08	0.39	0.42	0.00

Table A 2. Continuation.

Events happening after interview

Civil status change* (ref: No)													
Yes (previous year)									4.23	0.21	1.02	0.97	
Childbirth* (ref: No)													
Yes (previous two years)									1.13	0.91	1.58	0.27	
Sick leave* (ref: No)													
Yes (previous year)									0.66	0.61	0.76	0.46	
Unemployment* (ref: No)													
Yes (previous three years)									0.09	0.03	1.75	0.03	
Constant	0.16	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.25	0.05	0.19	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.00	
No. of individuals		3 226		3 226		3 226		3 226		181		3 045	
No. of person years										1 341		23 953	
Pseudo R2		0.08		0.04		0.13		0.15		0.25		0.08	
LL		-637.97		-448.10		-404.81		-394.28		-93.69		-556.25	
AIC		1335.94		900.20		869.62		850.56		255.37		1180.51	
BIC		1518.31		912.36		1051.99		1039.01		432.21		1455.36	

*Time constant at interview in logistic models; time varying in discrete event history models

Table A 3. Logistic models on the likelihoods of re-migration intention and behaviour, using a subsample of individuals with maximum 8 years at the destination.

	Robustness checks							
	Max 8 years in Sweden							
	Intention		Behaviour					
	Model R1		Model R0	Model R1	Model R2			
	OR	p-val	OR	p-val	OR	p-val	OR	p-val
Intention (ref: Stay)								
Leave			2.50	0.13			3.31	0.16
Labour market status (ref: Work)								
Unemployed	2.00	0.40			2.46	0.21	2.07	0.31
Outside LM	3.09	0.11			0.66	0.62	0.56	0.50
Missing	1.20	0.88			0.55	0.64	0.64	0.73
Economic difficulties (ref: No)								
Yes	1.69	0.43			2.87	0.11	2.80	0.12
House ownership (ref: No)								
Yes	0.64	0.51			0.49	0.31	0.52	0.36
Swedish citizenship* (ref: No)								
Yes	0.30	0.05			0.59	0.42	0.70	0.61
Swedish proficiency (ref: Not fluent)								
Fluent	2.89	0.10			0.39	0.15	0.34	0.11
Best friend in Sweden (ref: No)								
Yes	0.29	0.05			0.62	0.43	0.69	0.55
Remittances (ref: No)								
Yes	7.86	0.01			0.53	0.52	0.41	0.38
Return visits (ref: No one)								
1-5 visits	2.03	0.44			1.08	0.92	1.14	0.86
>5 visits	4.82	0.14			1.11	0.93	1.02	0.99

Table A 3. Continuation.

Country of birth (ref: Nordic)								
EU15+	4.57	0.08			0.04	0.01	0.03	0.01
Eastern Europe	0.28	0.38			0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03
Middle East/Northern Africa	6.55	0.15			0.25	0.31	0.20	0.23
Subsaharan Africa	5.03	0.19			0.26	0.25	0.22	0.20
Asia	1.53	0.70			0.23	0.19	0.18	0.13
Latin America	10.89	0.05			0.18	0.25	0.12	0.17
Years since migration*								
	0.83	0.61			0.63	0.22	0.62	0.21
Gender (ref: Man)								
Woman	1.45	0.50			0.78	0.67	0.70	0.53
Age at interview*								
	0.92	0.04			0.98	0.59	0.99	0.64
Education (ref: Primary)								
Secondary	1.58	0.61			1.14	0.87	0.99	0.99
Post-secondary	0.63	0.64			1.30	0.75	1.21	0.82
Missing	1.44	0.72			0.90	0.91	0.63	0.66
Residential region (ref: Stockholm)								
Västra Götaland	1.89	0.43			0.42	0.41	0.41	0.39
Skåne	4.38	0.08			3.74	0.15	3.33	0.18
Other	0.96	0.96			1.36	0.70	1.32	0.73
Civil status (ref: Never married)								
Married	1.11	0.87			1.16	0.85	1.26	0.77
Divorced or widowed	0.64	0.67			0.50	0.52	0.63	0.68
Child in household (ref: No)								
Yes	0.93	0.90			1.20	0.79	1.15	0.84
Constant	0.20	0.58	0.08	0.00	30.68	0.26	40.78	0.23
No. of individuals		267		267		267		267
Pseudo R2		0.24		0.01		0.23		0.24
LL		-61.05		-74.98		-58.62		-57.67
AIC		182.10		153.96		177.24		177.34
BIC		289.72		161.13		284.85		288.55

Stockholm Research Reports in Demography
Stockholm University,
106 91 Stockholm,
Sweden
www.su.se | info@su.se | ISSN 2002-617X



Stockholm
University

Demography Unit