

Minutes from the OECD Focus Group on Human Mobility

Budapest 6-7th April, 2000

The following countries were present in Budapest:

| | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Czech Republic | Jaromír Gottvald, Milan Simek |
| France | Daniel Martinelli |
| Hungary | Elisbeth Viszt |
| Italy | Sveva Avveduto |
| Norway | Anders Ekeland |
| Sweden | Adrian Ratkic |
| US | Mark Regets |

In addition there were representatives from the Hungarian statistical office and various research institutions. A list of presentations is at the end of this document.

Main aims

There were two main purposes of the Budapest meeting:

- To advance the scientific work, that is in contrast to the Paris meeting in December, not only talk about plans and schedules, but to have some substantial discussions.
- To give an opportunity to those who did not make it to the Paris meeting to get to know the group.

The first goal, to advance work, that is to force our selves to start to work now, instead of late May, was successful.

The second goal – to get those that signalled their interests before the Paris meeting, but due to various constrains could not make it to Paris in December – was a bit less successful. New in Budapest was Italy and US. We would have liked to see Spain, Germany, and Greece in Budapest and hope to do so in Rome. The other participants from Paris that were not present had said so well in advance – and that is of course quit OK.

In addition I had hoped that we should have had the opportunity to discuss the "position paper", but since I did not manage to write – or get somebody else in the group to write a draft we postponed that discussion to the Rome meeting. The same goes for the "discussion paper", that is the document from Svend Remoe, giving an overview of the aims, tasks and probably results of the work of the three focus groups. (Cf. the documents and e-mails in connection to the Budapest meeting).

Main conclusion from the presentations

I will not try to summarise the individual presentations, and since this is work in rapid progress, in very different stages of completion I have not thought it wise to circulate everything. Below is a brief overview

Domestic mobility - labour force survey and special surveys

Czech Republic and Hungary had very interesting presentations using the LFS, clearly showing:

- a) that they can be used
- b) they could be developed to give even better results
- c) that there are still unresolved problems with dataquality
- d) that there is still much work to be done to get reliable comparative results

Anna Marie Inzelt, IKU, presented a special survey with very interesting results on mobility in an economy in transition, the questionnaire is translated to English.

Those who are interested in the presentations should take contact with

Jaromir Gottvald, Jaromir.Gottvald@vsb.cz

Elisabeth Viszt, ger1@gki.hu (for all Hungarian papers)

International mobility

There were several presentations on various aspects from US, Hungary, France, Italy and Czech Rep. There are two main issues here:

- a) Since lack of good data is a chronic problem, one has to be very creative and use existing sources to the maximum (work/residence/trade permits), tax statistics etc.
- b) We have to try to develop both a pictures of the flows – is it gain/drain or circulation? But just as important is to discuss how the benefits/costs are distributed in the short and long run. Especially in most countries relation to the US the main pole of attraction for international HRST mobility.

In connection to the data problems, most countries have better statistics on those coming in than those leaving, but since that goes for everybody, collecting data on the bilateral streams would be very interesting. Everybody should do that to the Rome meeting – then we can study the consistency of these data.

It was also clear that there are different types of international mobility – one is individual “spontaneous” mobility – the other is more or less organised mobility, both for students and researchers – and the relation between these two types of mobility

For the individual presentations contact:

mregets@nsf.gov, Mark Regets, US

gerl@gki.hu, Elisabeht Viszt, for the Hungarian presentations,cf. agenda

martinelli@cereq.fr, Daniel Martinelli, France
avveduto@www.isrds.rm.cnr.it, Sveva Avveduto, Italy

Milan.Simek@vsb.cz

Register data

Adrian Ratkic presented the Swedish work on firm demography. This is a subject that is generally important – what is a new firm – how do we handle splits and mergers from a mobility point of view. Similar work has been done in Denmark and Finland. The essential point is to define the firm as a stable group of persons (i.e. employees). If they do not change – then it is the same firm regardless of changes in ownership, location or other changes in the identification number done by the statistical authorities. Very important for avoiding false conclusions/starting points in SME – policy.

adrian.ratkic@nutek.se

Anders Ekeland presented 10-years mobility rates on age and education. Main result is that mobility for those that stay in the work force from one year to another is pro-cyclical, that is mobility increases in good times and decreases in bad times. For groups with very low probability becoming unemployed, the mobility rate is not influenced by the business cycle.

Contact: anders.ekeland@step.no

List of presentations:

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Marc Regets | Foreign S&T personell in the US - an overview of data and main results |
| Annamária Inzelt | First attempts to measure knowledge flow through mobility in Hungary |
| Jaromir Gottwald/Milan Simecka | Czech mobility research – methods and results |
| Adrian Ratkic | Firm demography: Some Swiedish Experiences |
| Sveva Avveduto | Internationalisation of Research Training, Survey of Italian Ph.Data sources |
| Daniel Martinelli | Doctors - their transition from education to work - the first three years |
| Judit Juhász | International migration in Hungary - main trends and methods of measuring |
| Anders Ekeland | Mobility rates over a decade – preliminary results |
| Erzsébet Lindner and Elisabeht Viszt | Measuring labour mobility in Hungary (statistics and pilot studies) |
| Péter Galasi | A survey of mobility of high education graduates |