"HOMEWARD" BOUND: DETERMINANTS OF RETURN MIGRATION AMONG GERMANY'S ELDERLY IMMIGRANTS

DRAFT PAPER SUBMISSION IN RESPONSE TO CALL FOR PAPERS, 2009 PAA ANNUAL MEETING

Jenjira Yahirun*
Department of Sociology and California Center for Population Research
University of California, Los Angeles
September 22, 2008

Abstract: This paper examines the determinants of return migration as foreign-born individuals approach old age in Germany. Return migration in later life engages a different set of conditions than return migration earlier on, including the framing of return as a possible retirement strategy. Using 22 years of longitudinal data from the German Socioeconomic Panel, this paper investigates how social and economic characteristics of immigrants, as well as those of their spouses, influence decisions to return "home." Preliminary results broadly suggest that immigrants from former guest worker recruitment countries within the European Union are more likely to return than non-E.U. immigrants. In addition, return migrants are "negatively selected" such that those with the least education and weakest attachments to the labor force are more likely to emigrate. For couples, spouse's age, country of origin and to a limited extent, economic resources, shape husband's and wife's odds of return.

*The author gratefully acknowledges Judith Seltzer, Roger Waldinger, Robert Mare and members of the Mare-Seltzer working group for their comments and suggestions.

Introduction

Over the past half century, immigrants have played a key role in the economic development of countries in North America and Western Europe. Facing a shortage of domestic labor and rapid economic growth, Germany in particular recruited a large number of guest workers to fill this gap. Together with ethnic Germans, who immigrated after the end of the Cold War, these foreign-born individuals changed the composition of the country's population. Non-Germans presently constitute 8.9% of the total population; and a rapidly growing share is now over the age of 65 (Destatis 2008; Deutscher Bundestag 2006).[1]

Despite the policy relevance, little is known about the foreign-born elderly in Germany beyond what aggregate statistics describe. In particular, decisions concerning where immigrants choose to spend their later life remain largely unknown. These decisions are consequential for both Germany and immigrants' countries of origin, especially as foreign-born individuals enter old age and potentially increase their reliance on public services. Returning to the country of origin may not be viable for certain immigrants, but may be possible and even preferable for others. A growing body of literature in migration studies is devoted to understanding the social and economic determinants of return migration earlier in the life course (Dustmann 2001; Constant & Massey 2003). Yet we know little about motivates return migration in *later life*. Decisions about return migration are likely to differ in later life when immigrants approach retirement, attachments to the labor force weaken and earnings decrease. In addition, return migration at this life stage is also likely to be permanent.

What determines a return "home" for individuals who spend a significant share of their lives abroad? To answer this question, I focus on the return migration of middle- and old-age foreign-born individuals using data from the German Socio-Economic Panel (GSOEP). I investigate how social and economic resources accrued over the life course affect immigrants' hazard of return. Three sets of determinants of return migration are examined: 1) the context of initial migration such as country of origin and era of immigration, 2) individual characteristics such as economic resources and labor force patterns, and 3) family resources such as couple-level characteristics and the location of children, siblings and parents. I begin by contextualizing German immigration history in the post-war period and discuss how immigrants from different countries vary in their access to economic and social resources. Next, I point to past research on economic resources and their relation to "classical" debates of selection and return migration. I then review the role of family relationships in immigrants' preferences for return. Finally, I describe my data and methods, present preliminary results and discuss next steps.

Immigration to Germany

Germany, like the United States after 1965, witnessed dramatic changes in immigration policy during the post-war period. Three waves of migration came to define this period. In the 1950s and 1960s, West Germany responded to rapid economic expansion by importing unskilled

[1] According to official government context, "Non-German" refers to individuals who do not hold German citizenship. By definition, this term includes a large share of native-born children of immigrants and foreign-born immigrants who have yet to naturalize. "German" on the other hand, refers to all native-born and foreign-born persons who hold German citizenship. This includes ethnic Germans (also known as Aussiedler) who were granted automatic citizenship under the "Right of Return."

labor through a series of bilateral guest-worker recruitment agreements.[2] With the weakening of rotation principles, which exchanged new, untrained foreign workers for trained workers every few years, guest workers remained in Germany longer than their short-term contracts originally stipulated. Official guest worker recruitment ended with the energy crisis in 1973, but spouses and children continued to arrive through family reunification policies. [3]

Between 1973 and 1989, the main path of entry into Germany was through family reunification, asylum and refugee policies. However, the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 and the collapse of the Soviet Union prompted a new wave of migration to Germany. The right to "return," a right guaranteed through German Basic Law, was intended to redress the losses of Nazi victims who had fled Germany during WWII and of those who had suffered retaliation for being German in the aftermath of the war. Thus, the end of the Cold War prompted dramatic and unexpected increases in the number of Jewish immigrants and ethnic Germans, *Aussiedler* or *Spätaussielder,* to Germany.[4] While Jewish immigrants were not granted automatic citizenship upon arrival, *Aussiedler* and *Spätaussielder*, by far the majority of the new arrivals, were given full political, economic and social rights in the new country. Populist reactions to *Aussiedler* and *Spätaussielder's* use of state subsidies generated much public anger, leading to concrete restrictions on immigration for ethnic Germans born after January 1, 1993.

The contrast between these two immigrant groups and the consequences of their varying contexts of reception could not be more obvious. While guest workers were generally expected to return to their countries of origin, *Aussiedler* or *Spätaussielder* had already returned "home." On one hand, guest workers were well integrated into the labor force by virtue of their labor contracts, but their political and social integration was inhibited by expectations of a short-term stay. A lack of clear-cut pathways to citizenship was, and despite reforms in 2000, remains a solid barrier to political and social integration.[5] In contrast, *Aussiedler* and *Spätaussielder* were not economically or socially well-integrated upon arrival despite automatic citizenship rights, which granted them immediate access to the labor market and other social advantages (Joppke

[2] West Germany signed bilateral agreements first with Italy in 1955, then with Spain (1960), Greece (1960), Turkey (1961), Portugal (1964), and the former Yugoslavia (1968) East Germany also signed bilateral agreements with North Vietnam (1968) and other communist countries, although migration flows were not at all comparable to those of West Germany.

[3] Today, guest-worker migration to Germany continues, albeit on a much smaller scale than before. Alongside unskilled labor migration, high-skilled green card programs have also been implemented to attract engineers and those working in the hard sciences.

[4] *Spätaussielder* refer to ethnic Germans from post-Soviet countries who arrived in Germany after 1993 and were born between December 31, 1923 and January 1, 1993 (BMI 2006: 70). The term differentiates this group from earlier *Aussiedler,* who were historically defined as ethnic Germans living abroad and whose immigration to Germany preceded 1993. The term also distinguishes the immigration policies under which *Spätaussielder* arrived, which were stricter than the requirements for earlier arrivals. Jewish immigrants from post-Soviet countries also arrived during this period, but under a different set of conditions. The most fundamental difference was that Jews were not granted automatic citizenship upon arrival. Like other immigrants, their right to naturalize is permitted after eight years of residency (BMI 2006: 51).

[5] Today, citizenship reforms implemented in 2000 leveled the citizenship gap between the two groups, making it easier for long-term residents and children of non-ethnic German immigrants to naturalize. The reform reversed nearly 90 years of policy based on *jus sanguinis*, or blood citizenship laws. Children of immigrants born in Germany are now granted automatic citizenship, provided that one of their parents had established legal residency for at least eight years. However, the new law explicitly rejects dual citizenship and therefore discourages naturalization among many of Germany's elderly immigrants, whose preference to retain their original citizenship may reflect future plans of return and other concerns such as inheritance and property laws in the country of origin (Joppke 2005)

2005). In the United States, previous literature has pointed to the importance of context of reception for immigrants' social and economic integration (Portes & Rumbaut 2002, Reitz 2003). An obvious extension of this logic is that context also matters for decisions to return "home."

Economic Resources, Selection and Return Migration

Context of immigration and economic circumstance are intertwined in the lives of immigrant elderly living in Germany. For these individuals, economic histories are generally characterized by lower levels of earnings, savings and more frequent spells of unemployment than their native-born counterparts (Clark & York 2001). Because return migration can be conceptualized from several perspectives, the effects of such earnings and employment patterns on return migration are not apparent. Human capital theorists posit return migration in two opposing ways. When migration is undertaken as a permanent move, return migrants are those who have failed in the destination country's labor market. Indeed, Borjas and Bratsberg (1994) claim that the direction of selection in return migration is inverse to the selection of the initial move. Thus, if initial immigrants are more "able" than those left behind, the least able immigrants will return. Emigration thus amplifies the initial selection of immigration, whether it is positive or negative. A separate approach conceptualizes initial migration as temporary; migrants move to overcome short-term constraints, achieve a targeted amount of savings, and return is inevitable for all.

Past attempts to adjudicate between these two perspectives focus on migrants from across the life course, most of whom are disproportionately young adults and middle-aged persons. Based on the empirical literature, the likelihood of return migration throughout the life course is greater for immigrants who are less economically successful, at least with respect to earnings, income and homeownership (Jensen & Pedersen 2007: 106; Bellemare 2004; Constant & Massey 2002; Gundel & Peters 2008).[6] Yet the process for older immigrants may differ altogether. In fact, studies from Sweden and Switzerland suggest that elderly immigrants with greater economic resources are more likely to emigrate than those with fewer resources (Klinthäll 2006: Bolzman et al. 2006). A quick summary suggests that return migration is "negatively" selected for younger immigrants and "positively" selected for the elderly, at least with respect to economic resources.

Two findings throw a wrench into this quick reading. First, unemployment and generally unstable employment patterns increase the odds for return among the elderly as well as those at younger life stages (Bolzman et al. 2006; Constant & Massey 2002). One reason may be that economic inactivity decreases feelings of legitimacy in the "host" country, thus encouraging return migration (Bolzman et al. 2006; Sayad 1991). Second, higher education is correlated with emigration for immigrants throughout the life course in Germany and for younger foreign-born individuals living in the United States (Gundel & Peters 2008; Reagan & Olsen 2000). As a more stable indicator of socioeconomic status, how education affects return migration among the foreign-born elderly is still unknown. Thus, any debate of "positive" versus "negative" selection at this life stage is incomplete without a better understanding of how education correlates with return.

[6] One should keep in mind that home-ownership in particular may reflect a commitment to staying in Germany that was decided long before a home was purchased. Thus, home-ownership status may mask a deeper preference for staying, rather than leaving, and may be understood as more than a straightforward investment or a marker of economic status.

A parallel discussion of economic resources in the form of public transfers and government subsidies suggests that immigrants who seek or use state-funded support are less likely to return (Borjas & Bratsberg 1994). This is especially relevant to Germany, where non-naturalized immigrants are eligible for virtually the same public benefits as citizens, including unemployment, housing and disability benefits (Kurthen 1997). Findings from the United States and Denmark suggest that such an effect does exist, although at least in Denmark, gaining access to unemployment benefits requires a high degree of labor market attachment in the first place (Reagan & Olsen 2000; Jensen and Pedersen 2007). In Germany, the existence of a strong social safety net may deter emigration for individuals from countries with relatively poor public services (e.g. Turkey, where public healthcare and old age benefits are limited compared to Germany (Bundesagentur für Arbeit 2007)).

In summary, evidence for the return of "failed" migrants (with respect to earnings, income and other financial investments) at younger life stages and "successful" migrants in later life is not without ambiguity. Employment patterns, education, and the existence and use of public support also matter for return. In addition, the inability to adjudicate between "positively" or negatively" selected older immigrants suggests that factors beyond economic circumstances may also influence decisions to emigrate.

Family Ties and Social Resources

Ties to Germany and connections to the country of origin through family members will likely be important determinants of emigration for the elderly. Four related points concerning return migration can be made here. First, the location of immediate or extended family in the "host" and "home" country may matter for decisions to emigrate. For the foreign-born elderly, those in the "host" country are more likely to be members of the family of procreation; whereas those left behind likely belong to the family of origin. Data from France suggest that the location of family of origin and family of procreation produce opposing migration decisions (de Coulon and Wolff 2006). For example, children's residence in France increases the probability that later-life foreign-born parents prefer to stay. On the other hand, the location of siblings and parents, many of whom do not reside in France, increases the preference to return permanently or to commute "back- and-forth" (de Coulon & Wolff 2006). Studies from Switzerland find that although the location of parents and siblings in the country of origin slightly modifies the preference for return, it is the location of children that matters the most (Bolzman et al. 2006). Immigrant's preference to stay may be linked to expectations of physical and financial care provided by adult children in later life (Ganga 2006). Alternatively, parents may feel the need to stay with their children; providing them and their grandchildren with proximate social support and instrumental care. These types of intergenerational exchange and the potential for such transfers are more feasible when parents reside near adult children (Baldock 2000).

Second, not only does the location of family members matter for return, but the characteristics of these kin will also matter for emigration. For example, individuals intermarried to native-born Germans or other non- co-ethnic immigrants may have intended long ago to stay permanently in Germany. A connection to new family members through marriage may also establish "roots" in the new country; whereas marriage with a co-national more easily encourages return. The birthplace of children and where they are raised may also establish a sense of belonging, with a similar effect of "rooting" the family in Germany.

Third, the potential and actual economic resources exchanged among kin will also shape where immigrants spend their later life. Because older immigrants in Germany generally earn

less and have fewer savings than their native-born counterparts, the family's economic status may rely on more than one family member (Clark & York 2001). Past research that attempts to incorporate household characteristics apply a variety of summary measures, such as household income and household welfare use. Yet earnings, workforce participation and education levels may differ between family members, leading to divergent outcomes depending on couple and family composition. For example, many women who arrived during the guest worker era were wives of men who had arrived before them. While some women did enter the labor force, many did not. For these women, husband's socio-economic characteristics may be important determinants of return migration.

Finally, the incorporation of family into most migration studies depicts individuals embedded in kinship networks that act as social reserves during migration. Families may maximize income to fund migrants directly; they may also diversify risk by sending one member away while others remain behind. While this is a probable scenario for younger individuals who rely on their families of origin, older couples will more likely turn to one another as well as to their children – all members of the family of procreation - before deciding to emigrate. The importance of older couples to one another is indeed born out in the data used here, where 90% of emigrants who reported living with a co-resident spouse in the previous year returned to their country of origin with that same partner (author's calculation). Thus, return migration in later life should be considered a joint, rather than a purely individual process. This adds yet another layer to incorporating 'family' into the migration process. Not only characteristics of couples, but also traits of the union, for example the timing and duration of marriage, and the number of children conceived together, will matter for decisions to return or stay. This knowledge allows for a broader assessment of how family members affect the return migration of older individuals (Klinthäll 2006: 171).

Data and Methods

I use longitudinal data from the public-use files of the German Socio-economic Panel (GSOEP) to investigate how context of migration, economic circumstance and family resources influence the hazard of return in later life. I conduct an analysis using individual-level data as well as couple-level data to gain a more comprehensive picture of the factors that drive emigration. The GSOEP began in 1984 as a study of individuals and private households (Wagner et al. 1993). Since then, annual waves of data were collected. The public-use file used in this analysis contains 22 years of data spanning 1984 to 2006. Two features of the data make it particularly attractive for an analysis of return migration. First, the GSOEP over-sampled non-German households in earlier waves of data collection, which specifically targeted household heads from the former guest worker recruitment countries. Over time, the panel was attentive to changes in migration policies: new samples were added continuously. Second, a specific question regarding migrations abroad is asked in the survey. This is answered by persons who did not leave the household, or by neighbors in the event that an entire household leaves (see Wagner et al. 1993).

I use a discrete-time hazard model with time-varying and time-invariant covariates to examine the likelihood of return migration among foreign-born individuals aged 50 and over. The data were arranged in person-year files and age in this analysis serves as the "clock" from which the hazard of return is based. Entry into the sample requires two conditions. First,

individuals must be foreign-born and have arrived in 1949 or afterwards.[7] Second, individuals must be age 50 or above to enter the sample. I start the analysis then because aggregate statistics show that labor force participation begins to decrease for both native and foreign-born persons at age 50 (Deutscher Bundestag 2006). As the dependent variable, I distinguish between individuals who remain in Germany versus those who migrate abroad. I interpret migration abroad to mean returning to the immigrant's country of origin, which is similar to previous studies of return migration that have used the GSOEP (Constant & Massey 2002; Dustmann 2001). The sample is censored on the right by person-year observations for those who die or drop out of the survey.

I fit event history models of return migration without using specific parametric forms, which are robust when no underlying behavioral model is assumed. Using this method, I divide the analysis into three parts. I first examine the determinants of return separately by sex, with previous research suggesting that differential mortality and diverse preferences between genders requires separate analyses (Wilmoth 2001; Boyd 1991; Burr & Mutchler 1992). Following from this, I next ask how spousal characteristics influence the individual's hazard of return. The investigation of spousal characteristics is estimated separately from the husband's and the wife's perspective given that certain characteristics influence men's and women's hazards of return differently. In the husband-anchored analysis, men enter at age 50. Their co-resident wives, however, may enter at any age; wives as well as wife's characteristics vary over time. This means, for example, that even if a husband divorces, he will contribute to the analysis if he re-marries during the period under observation. I include an indicator for whether the individual is remarried to monitor potentially different spousal influences. In the wife-anchored analysis, women enter at age 50. Co-resident husbands, however, may enter at any age and husbands as well as husband's characteristics vary over time.

Finally, I ask how the addition of information concerning parents and siblings left behind affect the hazard of return. This is included as a separate analysis because of data limitations. The collection of data on family members left in the country of origin only began in 1994, with all new entrants to the panel study asked. Unfortunately, previous panel participants were not asked these questions. I plan to conduct this analysis at the individual-level only given the small number of observations available in my sample. However, I will also explore this constraint for the couple-level analysis.

I do not include weights in the analysis because observations are drawn from different samples starting in different years. However, I do control for household-level characteristics from which sample weights were generated. This includes the household's state of residence and number of persons in a household. State of residence is operationalized as a dichotomous variable for individuals living in the most immigrant heavily-populated German states: Berlin and Hamburg (Destatis 2007). In addition, I include a control for the number of person-years missing for individuals who leave and return during the panel.

Measuring the determinants of return migration

Context of Immigration

Indicators of the context surrounding immigration to Germany include immigrant's era of migration and country of origin, both of which are time invariant characteristics of individuals

[7] Although the GSOEP does collect information on immigrants who arrived before 1949, specific data on countries of origin for these persons is sporadically available due to contested borders in Western Europe during the interwar periods and during WWII. I focus on individuals arriving in or after 1949, when German borders and borders for countries in Western Europe were generally less fluid.

and their spouses. For conceptual as well as practical reasons, I divide immigrant's arrival into three periods: 1) 1949-1973 (guest worker migration), 2) 1974 -1989 (family reunification) and 3) 1990-2005 (migration under the "right of return"). Country of origin in this analysis consists of dummy variables marking individuals from the five major source countries of labor immigration: Turkey, Spain, Italy, Greece and the former Yugoslavia, as well as additional categories for migrants from Eastern and Central Europe, Western Europe and all other countries. This variable not only describes the relations between the country of origin and Germany upon immigrants' arrival, but also subtly captures the social and economic characteristics of countries over the life span of the immigrant. For example, immigrants from Spain, Italy and Greece may be more inclined to return "home" given the economic development experienced in these countries over the past 40 years.

Economic Resources

Indicators of individual resources include educational attainment and labor force participation. Observed at age 50, educational attainment is a time invariant proxy for class status, compared to time-varying indicators of income and labor force participation. Education is divided into four categories: having completed less than elementary school, having received an elementary school education, completing vocational or high school (which includes the German *Abitur,* the academic high school diploma*)* and having completed some degree of higher education. I also include a separate indicator for whether the individual received any education (excluding language instruction) in Germany to get at the more qualitative aspect of being educated or trained in the "host" country.

Labor force participation and employment are combined into one variable marking person-years not in the labor force, person-years in the labor force but unemployed, person-years while employed part-time, and person-years while employed full-time. Because individuals may leave their jobs in preparation for retirement and emigration abroad, current labor force participation may not be an accurate indicator of individual work history. This is in fact a limitation of previous research (Constant & Massey 2002; Dustmann 2003; Gundel and Peters 2008) and for this reason, I include the total number of unemployment spells experienced by the individual, as well as the average length of the unemployment spell. The same logic applies to the application of earnings. Yearly individual earnings will be included, but because they are more likely to drop in the event of approaching retirement, when individuals work less, I include a snapshot of average earnings for the duration that the individual is in the sample.

At the household level, time-varying dummy variables are included to indicate whether or not the individual owns or rents her or his current dwelling. A continuous variable for net household monthly income is also included, measured in constant 2002 Euros[8]. Also included at the household level are yearly indicators of total savings located in Germany as well as the total amount of savings in the country of origin; these illustrate immigrants' investments both "here" and "there" and hint at broader intentions of staying or returning. Finally, program participation is also distinguished here as a separate time-varying economic resource. I include dummy variables to mark individuals in households that receive three forms of public support: 1) unemployment benefits, 2) old-age or disability benefits and 3) subsidized housing. These forms of support differ from one another in the stipulations and qualifications needed to access them.

[8] 1 Euro = 1.95583 Deutsche Mark

Family Ties and Social Resources

Measures of the availability and support provided by kin can be conceptually divided into four groups. To capture the location and existence of spouses, I include an indicator of respondent's time-varying marital status. I distinguish between single migrants (including those who never married, are widowed or divorced), migrants who are married with co-resident spouses, and those with absent spouses. If married, I also include a time-varying measure of marital duration as well as a time-varying measure of whether the individual is in a first or higher-order marriage. The second indicators pertain to whether an individual/couple has children born in Germany. For women, this is easily determined using year of migration and available fertility histories. The father's status of German-born children is a less well-defined measure, since fertility histories were only asked of men entering the panel in 2000 or later. Instead, I define men as fathers based on their marital histories and the children recorded in their wives' fertility histories. Third, I include a time-varying dummy variable for remittances sent to family members abroad. This serves as a proxy for additional links to the country of origin even though there are potential drawbacks to the measure. For example, not all immigrants send remittances, given the level of income required to do so. Finally, I include indicators for a limited number of participants with information on family members left in the country of origin. Starting in 1994, the GSOEP asked entering participants information on siblings and parents left behind. I therefore include dummy variables for whether parents or siblings remain in the country of origin in a separate, limited analysis.

Controls

Lastly, I control for health. In this analysis, health is operationalized as a simple time-varying dummy variable distinguishing those satisfied with and unsatisfied with their health. Although less than ideal, this binary measure is the only indicator consistently available across 22 years of data. More sophisticated measures were provided intermittently over this time period.

Preliminary Results

The tables presented below reflect preliminary analyses that do not exploit the full data. In particular, they exclude a number of variables related to economic status and family ties. The results below do not include whether the individual was educated in Germany, or the number and average length of unemployment spells experienced by the individual. Data on the mean earnings and savings behavior of individuals have likewise been excluded. For the final paper, I plan to include these variables, as well as specifications of economic status earlier in the life course. Among family-level variables yet to be included are time-varying measures of marital duration and remarriage, whether or not the individual has children who were born in Germany (the analysis below includes results only for whether or not the individual has children) and remittances sent to family abroad. With regard to context of immigration, a number of individuals have missing values for the initial year of immigration. This is included as a separate category here, but will be taken out in the final paper once the missing data problem has been handled. In addition, results from Step 3 of the analysis, which asks whether the presence of parents and siblings left in the country of origin affects the hazard of return, are not presented below. This step will be added to the final version of the paper as will data from 2006, which were recently released and are not included in the results presented below.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the percentages and means of variables used in the first and second parts of the analysis. Column 1 presents descriptive statistics from the first person-year of all observations in the sample. Column 2 shows means and percentages when all person-years are taken into account. Columns 3 and 4 present descriptive statistics for men's and women's samples separately. In general, Table 1 presents well-known characteristics of the foreign-born elderly in Germany. Immigrants from Eastern and Central Europe constitute the largest share of persons and person-years in the sample. Turkey, however, is the most common country of origin. The majority of observations in the sample are represented by immigrants who entered Germany during the era of guest worker recruitment. Socioeconomic traits from the sample are also in line with Micro-census data and previous studies (Tesch-Römer et al. 2006). In particular, gender differences in labor force participation and educational attainment are evident. Program participation is also substantial, with old-age or disability transfers the most widespread type of public support. Most immigrants spent their years living with co-resident spouses, and the majority of years were spent as a parent.

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics from the person-year files used to estimate the hazard of return migration among married respondents with co-resident spouses. Column 1 shows means and percentages from the husband's point of view, where wives and wives' characteristics are time-varying. Column 2 presents similar descriptive statistics from the wife's point of view, where husbands and husbands' characteristics are time-varying. Means and percentages follow a similar pattern of that in Table 1. From the perspective of the husband, the majority of observations in the sample are represented by men who arrived during the era of guest-worker recruitment. The majority of their wives also arrived during this era, but a substantial share also arrived between 1973 and 1989. Column 2 presents similar statistics when wives serve as the anchor and husband's characteristics are time-varying. We see that from the wife's perspective, the majority of observations include spouses who were better educated than their wives and who were more likely to work full-time than wives.

Multivariate Analysis

Part 1: Analysis of Men's and Women's sample

In the first part of the analysis, I estimate models separately by sex.[9] Tables 3 and 4 present estimates for men and women, respectively. For both men and women, Model 1 includes variables related to the context surrounding individual immigration to Germany and Model 2 presents the remaining substantive variables that also control for sample design.

For men, Model 1 suggests that men from Western Europe are less likely to emigrate than Turkish men. Yet after accounting for other variables in Model 2, this difference becomes statistically insignificant (Table 3). The magnitude of the coefficient, however, changes only slightly: in both models Western European men were less likely to return to their countries of origin than Turkish men.

[9] In an analysis not shown here, I conducted a simple pooled model predicting return as a function of sex and migration-related characteristics. Sex was not statistically significant, and as presented in Model 2, remains statistically insignificant once all other variables were added to the model. Age, however, appears to play an important role in the timing of return migration. Compared to those aged 51, immigrants between the ages of 61 to 69 are between two to three times as likely to return, all else held equal. Because age serves as the "clock" in this analysis of return migration, I separately included an interaction term between sex and age; this term was statistically significant (not shown here). This analysis suggests that models stratified by sex are warranted.

I observed a different pattern among women (Table 4). Being from Western Europe was positively and significantly associated with return migration once socioeconomic and demographic characteristics were added to the model, compared to Turkish women. In a separate analysis (results not shown), I found that Western European women were more likely than were their male counterparts to return to their country of origin (not shown here).

Four important findings emerge from the full models presented in tables 3 and 4. First, immigrants from former European guest worker countries were generally more likely to return than were Turkish immigrants. This was true in both the men's and women's samples (although the coefficient for Italian men was not significant). In both samples, the odds of return migration for immigrants from eastern and central Europe, who consist mostly of ethnic Germans, are low compared to Turkish immigrants. When compared to one another, Greek and Italian women are more likely to return than their male counterparts even after holding constant other variables in the model (not shown here).

Second, results from the separate-sex analysis provide general evidence for a "negative" selection of elderly return migrants based on education, household income and labor force participation. For men, there is a monotonic decrease in the odds of return with increasing levels of education. For women, a non-linear pattern existed, with the odds of return migration the greatest for women with elementary school and higher education (although the coefficient on the latter is not significant); women with vocational education had the lowest odds of return migration. In general, these results contrast previous findings that return migrants at younger ages are more likely to be highly educated (Reagan & Olsen 2000). For both men and women, individuals with strong attachments to the labor force were less likely than were individuals not in the labor force to return migrate. Not surprisingly, owning a home also deterred return migration compared to those living in rental units.

Third, there is little evidence for Borjas' "welfare magnet"/welfare deterrent hypothesis based on results from this step of the analysis. For men and women, the receipt of old age/disability payments was not a statistically significant predictor of return. Although receiving subsidized housing payments did reduce the odds of emigration for men, the parameter estimate was not significant for women (there was, however, no significant difference by sex, the test of which is not shown here). Finally, in an odd reversal of Borjas' hypothesis, receiving unemployment benefits actually increases the odds of return migration for both men and women. Here, the odds of emigration are more than 1.6 times greater for men and 1.7 times greater for women. This occurs even after unemployment status is controlled.[10]

Fourth, family ties to children and spouses are also significant predictors of return migration. For both men and women, the odds of return migration are half as large for parents compared to non-parents. However, married persons are more likely to emigrate than individuals who are widowed, single or divorced. This finding is inconsistent with de Coulon and Wolff's conclusion that marital status is not a significant predictor of return migration in later life (2006: 25).

[10] The correlation between being unemployed status and unemployment benefits in a pooled sample of both men and women was .38, which was low enough to warrant keeping the indicator for unemployed benefits in the model. Another analysis, not shown here, investigated the change in the coefficient for unemployment status once the indicator for unemployment benefits was removed from the model. In the model without the unemployment benefits indicator, the coefficient for unemployment increased in magnitude and significance, although significance levels were still not acceptable at any minimum threshold. This suggests that unemployment status and unemployment benefits may pick up different types of disadvantage.

Part 2: Husbands' and Wives' Analysis with Spousal Characteristics

In Table 5, I present results from the second step of the analysis. The three left-hand columns present results from the husband's perspective and the three right-hand columns show results from the wife's point of view. The model includes time-varying covariates of spouse's labor force participation and educational attainment in addition to respondent's own socioeconomic characteristics.[11] It also includes dichotomous variables indicating differences between couples in country of origin, health status and age.

Three important points result from this step of the analysis. First, the inclusion of spouse's country of origin added an important component to the model. For husbands and wives with German-born spouses, the odds of return were drastically reduced compared to couples with the same country of origin.

Second, spousal economic characteristics slightly modified the odds of return for husbands, but surprisingly had little effect on wives. By adding wife's education, husband's own education was no longer a statistically significant predictor of return migration. Wife's education, however, mattered such that men with wives who had received a vocational or elementary school education were less likely to return than wives with less than an elementary school education. Contrary to my expectations, the joint effects of husband's labor force participation and education were not significant predictors of wife's emigration. I carried out separate analyses to test whether wife's characteristics significantly differed from the effects of husband's traits. Results indicate that they do not (not shown here). Overall, evidence for the "negative" selection of return migration based on men's and women's own characteristics was not greatly modified by the addition of spousal traits.

Third, the difference in couple's age was a significant predictor of return for wives, but not for husbands. From the wife's point of view, wives whose husbands were at least five years older were twice more likely to emigrate than women whose husbands were closer to their own age or younger than themselves. The age difference between spouses was measured as a dichotomous variable when husbands were at least five years older than wives. Other measures of age differences produced similar results (not shown here).

In a separate analysis not presented here, the couple-level sample was restricted to men and women with only foreign-born spouses who had reached age 50 during the period under observation. Estimates from the same models suggest that women's odds of return are significantly reduced by her husband's full-time labor force status and high educational attainment when both husband and wife are immigrants and are close in age. Thus, the effects of expanding the sample to younger spouses and German-born spouses hint at the possibility of different mechanisms at work for foreign-born similarly-aged couples, compared to a sample that includes native-born, younger spouses.

Preliminary Discussion

Based on this limited analysis, my results suggest that theories of return migration in earlier life stages may not accurately predict emigration in later life. In addition, the story of what determines return migration differs depending on whether characteristics of the individual or the couple are examined. At the individual level, economic resources were significant, but in

[11] Education is constant for all individuals in the analysis. However, because wives and wife's characteristics are time-varying for in the husband-anchored sample (the same goes for the wife-anchored sample, where husbands and husband's characteristics vary over time), references to time-varying educational attainment, country of origin, era of migration or any other time invariant variable refers to the time-varying characteristic of spouses.

unexpected ways. The results generally suggest that return migrants are "negatively" selected on the basis of education and labor force attachment. Later-life immigrants who return to their countries of origin are generally less educated and have weaker attachments to the labor force than their well-educated, full-time working counterparts. This is true for men and women even after taking into account the effects of country of origin, era of migration, demographic factors and family ties. These findings conflict with previous results suggesting that middle and upper-class immigrants are more likely to express a preference for return and to return once they have reached retirement (Tesch-Römer et al. 2006; Klinthäll 2006; Bolzman et al. 2006). The results suggest that immigrants who have more successfully assimilated into the German labor market and have established credentials that allow for gainful employment in Germany are more likely to stay. Similarly, those who have managed to purchase homes in Germany are less likely to return than non-homeowners. Given the expense and infrequency of homeownership in Germany, immigrants who own homes may also be an exceptional group of people (Atterhög 2005).

Certain types of program participation predict whether migrants stay or leave Germany. In particular, having someone in the household who receives unemployment benefits significantly increases the odds of return for individuals across all samples. Three explanations help clarify this apparent anomaly. For European Union (E.U.) immigrants, unemployment benefits can officially be transferred to other E.U. countries for a period of up to three months (Botschaft BRD Madrid 2006). Although some might consider the transferability of unemployment benefits an incentive to emigrate, the short-term nature of this arrangement is less likely to be a major factor in deciding whether or not older immigrants return "home." Rather, a separate explanation is that individuals who receive unemployment benefits are those who are the most economically disadvantaged from the start. Once individuals no longer qualify for unemployment benefits, either because of age limits or other programmatic requirements, other sources of income may be insufficient to remain in Germany. Another explanation is that older immigrants leave the labor force as part of a broader retirement strategy. Return migration is the next step towards fulfilling retirement plans. Here, evidence for Borjas' "welfare magnets" finds little support based on this preliminary analysis. To fully flesh out the findings that weak labor force attachment and unemployment subsidies increase the odds of migration, the full version of this paper will further exploit the longitudinal structure of the data to investigate how individual labor force histories also affect return migration. I will include the number and average length of unemployment spells experienced by the individual as well as variables on the mean earnings and savings behavior of individuals. I also plan to include further indicators of economic status earlier in the life course.

Furthermore, it is clear from the analysis that certain immigrant groups are more likely to return than others. Specifically, men and women from almost all former E.U. guest worker countries, including Greece and Spain, as well as immigrants from the non-E.U. former Yugoslavia, are more likely to return than immigrants from Turkey. One reason may be that economic conditions in Greece, Spain, and some parts of the former Yugoslavia (e.g., Slovenia) have drastically improved since the time these men and women immigrated to Germany. E.U. membership and the permeability of borders within the E.U., compared to Turkey, might encourage return migrations for older persons from Greece and Spain. On the other hand, ethnic Germans from central and Eastern Europe rarely leave. These results hint at the importance of context of reception. Whereas *Aussiedler and Spätaussielder* were politically integrated from the

start, for example through automatic citizenship rights, guest workers may be more likely to leave because they were deprived of these rights during their initial stay in Germany.

Finally, family ties also count. The results presented here suggest that married persons with co-resident spouses are more likely to emigrate than widowed persons. This conflicts with Klinthäll's finding that widowed men, at least, are more likely to emigrate than their married counterparts (2006). Parenthood significantly decreases the odds of return across all samples.

The analysis of married couples sheds some light on the ways in which spouse's characteristics shape immigrant's return. First, having a German-born spouse reduces the odds of return by more than 50% for foreign-born men and women. Possible explanations for this include the norm of joint migration, which is inherently more difficult if one spouse is not from the country of origin. Second, men and women who have integrated into German society through intermarriage may have made decisions long before middle age to remain in Germany. Third, those who intermarry may have developed more ties to Germany (through new family members, etc.) than those with spouses from their own country of origin.

Adding in the effects of spouse's socioeconomic traits slightly modifies results from the separate-sex analysis. For husbands, their own education no longer significantly affected the odds of return; but wives with more than an elementary school education did reduce his odds of return. For wives, contrary to expectation, none of her husband's socioeconomic characteristics significantly affected her odds of return. Finally, the effect of spouse's age also differed for men and women. Women's odds of migration increase when husbands are at least five years older than wives; but wife's age mattered little for husband's odds of return.

Next Steps

The third step of the multivariate analysis will explore how decisions to return are affected by family ties to parents and siblings left in the country of origin. Results will shed light on the potentially conflicting effects of obligations towards members of the family of origin, who remain in the sending community, and members of the family of procreation, who live in Germany. Second, the addition of individual labor histories and other socioeconomic variables will offer clarification on the "negative/positive" selection hypothesis. The additions of these components to the model are already well underway. The final paper will provide a comprehensive first look at the correlates of return migration for later-life foreign born individuals living in Germany. By doing so, this paper not only contributes to the limited knowledge available on individuals who age outside their country of origin, but also provides a framework for discussing return migration that is relevant to both countries that send and receive migrants.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for First Person-Year and All Person-Years: Foreign-born Person-Years Aged 50 and Older by Sex

	First Person-Year	All Person-Years	All Male Person-Years	All Female Person-Years
Immigrant Status				
Country of Origin (%)				
Turkey	18.19	19.90	21.29	18.26
Yugoslavia	10.45	10.29	10.64	9.88
Greece	10.49	11.87	12.49	11.14
Italy	11.07	12.31	14.15	10.16
Spain	7.12	6.25	6.74	5.68
Other Eastern/Central European	29.51	29.63	25.67	34.25
Western Europe	5.64	4.24	4.39	4.08
Other	7.53	5.51	4.64	6.54
Era of Migration (%)				
1949-1973	59.79	67.92	75.39	10.42
1974-1989	15.1	13.15	8.86	12.21
1990-2005	11.15	9.00	7.78	59.19
Missing	13.95	9.93	7.97	18.18
Socio-economic Status				
Education (%)				
Less than Elementary	24.73	23.00	18.26	28.55
General Elemantary	27.04	29.94	25.06	35.66
Vocational/Vocational plus Abitur	32.84	33.45	40.21	25.54
Higher Education	15.39	13.61	16.48	10.25
Labor Force/Employment (%)				
Out of labor force	30.95	45.35	34.65	57.86
Unemployed	8.97	9.70	11.86	7.17
Part-time	8.77	8.00	3.42	13.36
Full-time	51.32	36.95	50.07	21.61
Natural log of Monthly Household Income**	7.18	7.25	7.30	7.20
	(1.63)	(1.36)	(1.34)	(1.40)
Homeowner (%)	21.40	22.69	21.87	23.66
Program Participation				
HH Receive Unemployed Benefits (%)	10.16	10.49	11.20	9.66
HH Receive Disability/Old Age pension (%)	20.25	41.57	37.36	46.51
Receive Subsidized Housing (%)	15.23	15.68	15.47	15.92
Family Characteristics				
Marital Status (%)				
Single, Widowed, Divorced	13.74	15.47	9.20	22.81
Married, Spouse not present	4.69	3.46	4.96	1.71
Married, Spouse present	81.56	81.06	85.84	75.47
Parent (%)	77.37	82.53	77.28	88.66
Demographic Characteristics				
Sex (%)				
Male	52.35	53.91	-	-
Female	47.65	46.09	-	-
Satisfied Health (%)	81.03	79.56	81.15	77.72
Age**	54.64	59.48	59.17	59.85
	(7.24)	(7.78)	(7.26)	(8.34)
Controls				
Number of missing years**	0.09	0.22	0.23	0.21
	(0.54)	(0.70)	(0.70)	(0.70)
Number of persons in household**	3.15	2.85	2.97	1.48
	(1.56)	(1.52)	(1.55)	(2.72)
Bundesland (%)				
Berlin/Hamburg	4.45	4.09	4.23	3.95
Other	95.55	95.91	95.77	96.05
Sample Size (N)	2,430	20,005	10,785	9,220

**Standard deviation in parenthesis

Source: GSOEP, 95% Public Use File, 1984-2005

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Couples: Foreign-born Person-Years Aged 50 and Older by Sex	Husband's Person-Years	Wife's Person-Years
Respondent's Immigrant Status		
Country of Origin (%)		
Turkey	21.78	20.58
Yugoslavia	10.37	8.80
Greece	13.43	13.01
Italy	13.58	9.46
Spain	6.11	6.01
Other Eastern/Central European	25.48	31.97
Western Europe	4.60	4.33
Other	4.64	5.84
Era of Migration (%)		
1949-1973	75.23	59.99
1974-1989	8.64	18.58
1990-2005	7.99	10.30
Missing	8.13	11.13
Spouse's Immigrant Status		
Country of Origin (%)		
German	14.65	15.49
Turkey	21.23	20.66
Yugoslavia	9.35	8.74
Greece	12.68	12.91
Italy	9.90	9.36
Spain	5.16	5.74
Other Eastern/Central European	21.94	22.39
Western Europe	1.57	1.74
Other	3.52	2.96
Era of Migration (%)		
German born	14.65	15.49
1949-1973	52.60	63.34
1974-1989	17.98	7.31
1990-2005	8.79	8.74
Missing	5.98	5.12
Respondent's Socio-economic Status		
Education (%)		
Less than Elementary	17.71	29.31
General Elemantary	25.84	34.50
Vocational/Vocational plus Abitur	39.46	26.50
Higher Education	16.99	9.69
Labor Force/Employment (%)		
Out of labor force	34.82	56.34
Unemployed	11.97	7.16
Part-time	3.24	14.77
Full-time	49.98	21.73
Spouse's Socio-economic Status		
Education (%)		
Less than Elementary	27.88	17.59
General Elemantary	34.36	23.99
Vocational/Vocational plus Abitur	28.23	42.18
Higher Education	9.52	16.25
Labor Force/Employment (%)		
Out of labor force	50.45	42.13
Unemployed	6.93	11.36
Part-time	16.35	3.47
Full-time	26.28	43.04

continued from Table 2

Household Economic Characteristics		
Natural log of Monthly Household Income**	7.36	7.33
	(1.33)	(1.33)
Homeowner (%)	23.65	24.94
HH Receive Unemployed Benefits (%)	11.81	11.43
HH Receive Disability/Old Age pension (%)	38.13	46.16
Receive Subsidized Housing (%)	15.22	15.11
Parent (%)	90.50	90.32
Respondent's Demographic Characteristics		
Satisfied Health (%)	81.40	79.21
Age**	58.98	58.34
	(6.93)	(6.83)
Spouse's Demographic Characteristics		
Satisfied Health (%)	81.16	80.97
Age**	54.96	60.43
	(8.51)	(7.58)
Controls		
Number of missing years**	0.22	0.20
	(0.71)	(0.74)
Number of persons in household**	3.18	2.97
	(1.49)	(1.43)
Bundesland (%)		
Berlin/Hamburg	3.91	3.62
Other	96.09	96.38
Sample Size (N)	**9,210**	**6,954**

**Standard deviation in parenthesis

Source: GSOEP, 95% Public Use File, 1984-2005

Table 3: Odds Ratios of Return Migration between 1984 and 2005, Foreign-Born Men Aged 50 and Older (N=9,513 person-years)

	Model 1			Model 2 (Full model)		
	e^{β}	z-score	p	e^{β}	z-score	p
Migration History						
Country (base=Turkey)						
Yugoslavia	1.221	0.850	0.398	1.558	1.730	0.084
Greece	1.803	2.890	0.004	1.603	2.160	0.031
Italy	1.000	0.000	0.999	1.077	0.300	0.762
Spain	2.960	5.020	0.000	3.208	4.900	0.000
Central & Eastern Europe	0.147	-5.220	0.000	0.185	-4.200	0.000
Western Europe	0.338	-2.020	0.043	0.623	-0.840	0.402
Other	0.161	-2.780	0.005	0.214	-2.280	0.023
Era of Migration (base=1949-1973)						
1974-1989	1.338	0.840	0.399	1.593	1.290	0.197
1990-2005	3.114	2.730	0.006	2.839	2.370	0.018
Missing	1.024	0.070	0.941	0.911	-0.270	0.784
Socio-economic Status						
Education at age 50 (base=less than elementary school)						
Elementary				0.812	-1.130	0.259
Vocational or High School				0.580	-2.860	0.004
Higher Education				0.366	-3.100	0.002
Employment Status (base=not in labor force)						
Unemployed				1.014	0.050	0.961
Part-time employed				0.952	-0.120	0.905
Full-time employed				0.551	-2.290	0.022
Natural log of Household Income				0.883	-2.720	0.006
Home-ownership (base=no ownership)				0.485	-2.750	0.006
Program Participation						
HH Receive Unemployed Benefits				1.583	2.090	0.036
HH Receive Disability/Old Age pension (base=no benefit)				0.826	-0.820	0.414
Receive Subsidized Housing (base=not subsidized)				0.552	-2.480	0.013
Family Characteristics						
Marital Status (base: Widowed/Single/Div)						
Married, spouse present				4.903	4.620	0.000
Married, spouse not present				2.615	2.710	0.007
Parent (base= not parent)				0.424	-3.780	0.000
Demographic Characteristics						
Satisfied Health (base=dissatisfied with health)				0.908	-0.560	0.573
Age (base=age 51)						
52				0.405	-1.670	0.094
53				0.656	-0.900	0.367
54				0.666	-0.870	0.386
55				0.929	-0.170	0.865
56				1.028	0.070	0.947
57				0.511	-1.310	0.190
58				0.405	-1.660	0.097
59				0.482	-1.420	0.157
60				0.834	-0.400	0.686
61				2.757	2.700	0.007
62				1.498	0.930	0.350
63				3.196	2.930	0.003
64				2.893	2.540	0.011
65				2.987	2.590	0.010
66				3.256	2.660	0.008
67				1.416	0.600	0.550
68				2.357	1.550	0.121
69				1.830	0.960	0.336
70+				1.785	1.340	0.181
Controls						
Number of missing years				0.731	-1.560	0.119
Number of persons in household				0.991	-0.170	0.868
Berlin/Hamburg (base=Other State)				0.754	-0.730	0.464
Log Liklihood		-1004.929			-885.234	
Sample Size (N)		**9,513**			**9,513**	

Source: GSOEP, Public Use File, 1984-2005

Table 4: Odds Ratios of Return Migration between 1984 and 2005, Foreign-Born Women Aged 50 and Older (N= 8,062 person-years)

	Model 1			Model 2 (Full model)		
	e^{β}	z-score	p	e^{β}	z-score	p
Migration History						
Country (base=Turkey)						
Yugoslavia	1.995	2.410	0.016	2.364	2.780	0.006
Greece	3.562	4.880	0.000	4.084	5.130	0.000
Italy	2.258	2.910	0.004	2.937	3.600	0.000
Spain	4.444	5.220	0.000	4.580	4.920	0.000
Central & Eastern Europe	0.134	-4.650	0.000	0.197	-3.520	0.000
Western Europe	1.320	0.630	0.527	3.667	2.730	0.006
Other	0.177	-2.310	0.021	0.269	-1.690	0.090
Era of Migration (base=1949-1973)						
1974-1989	1.516	1.810	0.070	1.826	2.410	0.016
1990-2005	2.412	2.130	0.034	2.216	1.830	0.068
Missing	1.173	0.580	0.564	1.254	0.770	0.439
Socio-economic Status						
Education at age 50 (base=less than elementary school)						
Elementary				0.617	-2.560	0.010
Vocational or High School				0.340	-3.720	0.000
Higher Education				0.655	-1.090	0.274
Employment Status (base=not in labor force)						
Unemployed				0.938	-0.210	0.836
Part-time employed				0.617	-1.600	0.110
Full-time employed				0.645	-1.790	0.074
Natural log of Household Income				0.896	-2.190	0.028
Home-ownership (base=no ownership)				0.280	-3.800	0.000
Program Participation						
HH Receive Unemployed Benefits				1.739	2.320	0.020
HH Receive Disability/Old Age pension (base=no benefit)				1.070	0.350	0.723
Receive Subsidized Housing (base=not subsidized)				0.660	-1.570	0.116
Family Characteristics						
Marital Status (base: Widowed/Single/Div)						
Married, spouse present				2.545	2.040	0.042
Married, spouse not present				1.582	1.880	0.060
Parent (base= not parent)				0.426	-3.400	0.001
Demographic Characteristics						
Satisfied Health (base=dissatisfied with health)				1.044	0.240	0.812
Age (base=age 51)						
52				1.994	1.350	0.177
53				1.234	0.370	0.710
54				0.557	-0.820	0.414
55				1.852	1.170	0.243
56				1.829	1.120	0.263
57				3.107	2.280	0.023
58				1.742	1.000	0.317
59				2.220	1.500	0.134
60				2.475	1.730	0.084
61				3.224	2.260	0.024
62				4.170	2.730	0.006
63				3.845	2.490	0.013
64				3.937	2.440	0.015
65				3.272	1.930	0.053
66				4.154	2.310	0.021
67				5.720	2.890	0.004
68				0.811	-0.190	0.850
69				5.619	2.640	0.008
70+				2.154	1.420	0.157
Controls						
Number of missing years				0.891	-0.530	0.598
Number of persons in household				0.943	-0.940	0.346
Berlin/Hamburg (base=Other State)				1.356	0.850	0.395
Log Liklihood		-765.146			-705.208	
Sample Size (N)		**8,062**			**8,062**	

Source: GSOEP, Public Use File, 1984-2005

Table 5: Couple-Level Analysis: Odds Ratios of Return Migration between 1984 and 2005, Husband's and Wife's Perspectives

	Men			Women		
	e^{β}	z-score	p	e^{β}	z-score	p
Respondent's Migration History						
Country of Origin (base=Turkey)						
Yugoslavia	2.926	3.340	0.001	3.272	3.160	0.002
Greece	2.657	3.670	0.000	4.909	5.080	0.000
Italy	1.654	1.660	0.097	3.043	3.100	0.002
Spain	4.833	5.240	0.000	6.832	5.280	0.000
Other Eastern/Central European	0.285	-2.720	0.006	0.454	-1.560	0.120
Western Europe and Other	0.630	-0.810	0.419	2.461	1.610	0.108
Era of Migration (base=1949-1973)						
1974-1989	2.158	1.830	0.068	1.564	1.480	0.139
1990-2005	2.505	1.850	0.065	0.967	-0.060	0.950
Missing	1.005	0.010	0.989	1.270	0.650	0.514
Spouse's Migration History						
Spouse's Country of origin (base=matched)						
Different country of origin if spouse is migrant	0.375	-1.330	0.185	1.814	0.760	0.446
German-born spouse	0.461	-1.810	0.070	0.145	-1.830	0.067
Respondent's Socio-economic Status						
Education at age 50 (base= LT elementary school)						
Elementary	1.063	0.250	0.801	0.655	-1.740	0.081
Vocational or High School	0.759	-1.100	0.271	0.280	-3.350	0.001
Higher Education	0.586	-1.340	0.179	0.974	-0.050	0.957
Employment Status (base=not in labor force)						
Unemployed	0.922	-0.260	0.798	1.039	0.120	0.906
Part-time employed	0.640	-0.820	0.411	0.556	-1.660	0.096
Full-time employed	0.500	-2.300	0.021	0.492	-2.410	0.016
Spouse's Socio-economic Status						
Education at age 50 (base= LT elementary school)						
Elementary	0.692	-1.680	0.093	1.052	0.200	0.845
Vocational or High School	0.482	-2.530	0.012	0.734	-1.140	0.253
Higher Education	0.680	-0.850	0.397	0.617	-1.060	0.288
Employment Status (base=not in labor force)						
Unemployed	1.164	0.520	0.603	0.554	-1.610	0.108
Part-time employed	0.775	-0.870	0.386	0.398	-1.220	0.223
Full-time employed	0.790	-0.980	0.327	0.619	-1.550	0.120
Household Economic Characteristics						
Natural log of Monthly Household Income	0.863	-2.820	0.005	0.853	-2.680	0.007
Homeowner	0.472	-2.510	0.012	0.238	-3.570	0.000
HH Receives Unemployed Benefits	1.660	2.010	0.045	2.015	2.540	0.011
HH Receives Disability/Old Age pension	0.894	-0.430	0.671	0.877	-0.460	0.647
HH Receives Subsidized Housing	0.681	-1.470	0.142	0.852	-0.570	0.569
Parent (base= not parent)	0.356	-3.860	0.000	0.510	-2.210	0.027
Respondent's Demographic Characteristics						
Satisfied Health (base=dissatisfied with health)	0.962	-0.190	0.853	1.097	0.420	0.672
Age (base=age 51)						
52	0.239	-1.790	0.073	2.045	1.360	0.173
53	1.039	0.070	0.941	1.164	0.260	0.797
54	0.442	-1.190	0.235	0.602	-0.700	0.482
55	0.805	-0.390	0.695	1.540	0.770	0.440
56	1.047	0.090	0.929	1.597	0.830	0.405
57	0.484	-1.160	0.247	2.777	1.980	0.048
58	0.337	-1.570	0.115	0.873	-0.200	0.839
59	0.678	-0.690	0.488	2.039	1.270	0.202
60	0.696	-0.640	0.523	1.777	1.000	0.317
61	2.263	1.760	0.079	2.276	1.440	0.149
62	1.679	1.030	0.304	3.683	2.300	0.021
63	2.513	1.880	0.059	3.402	2.060	0.039
64	3.182	2.350	0.019	3.567	2.070	0.039
65	3.681	2.630	0.008	2.754	1.520	0.128
66	2.346	1.520	0.128	3.504	1.850	0.064
67	1.352	0.450	0.653	6.001	2.720	0.007
68	2.614	1.580	0.115	1.032	0.030	0.978
69	0.996	0.000	0.996	6.206	2.490	0.013
70+	1.791	1.130	0.257	2.021	1.080	0.280

continued from Table 5

Spouse's Demographic Characteristics						
Husband 5 years or more older than wife	1.047	0.250	0.803	2.032	3.170	0.002
Satisfied Health	0.951	-0.250	0.805	0.790	-1.040	0.299
Controls						
Number of missing years	0.781	-1.040	0.299	1.070	0.270	0.786
Number of persons in household	0.973	-0.400	0.687	0.931	-0.990	0.322
Berlin/Hamburg (base=Other)	0.650	-0.880	0.379	1.067	0.140	0.890
Log Liklihood		-661.756			-529.587	
Sample Size (N)		**8,131**			**6,054**	

Source: GSOEP, Public Use File, 1984-2005

SOURCES

Akhtar, Salman and Lois Wonsun Choi. 2004. "When Evening Falls: The Immigrant's Encounter with Middle and Old Age." *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 64(2): 183-191.

Atterhög, Mikael. 2005. "Importance of government policies for homeownership rates: An international survey and analysis." *Working Paper 54, School of Architecture and the Built Environment.* Stockholm: Royal Institute of Technology.

Baldock, Cora Vellekoop. 2000. "Migrants and Their Parents: Caregiving from a Distance." Journal of Family Issues. 21: 205-224.

Bellemare, C. 2004. "Identification and Estimation of Economic Models of Outmigration using Panel Attrition." CentER: Tilburg University. ISSN 0924-7815.

Bolzman, Claudio, Rosita Fibbi, Marie Vial. 2006. "What To Do After Retirement? Elderly Migrants and the Question of Return." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies.* 32(8): 1359-1375.

Borjas, G.J. 1987. "Self-Selection and the Earnings of Immigrants." *American Economic Review.* 77: 531-53.

Borjas, G. and Bernt Bratsberg. 1996. "Who Leaves? The Outmigration of the Foreign-Born." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*. 78(1): 165-76.

Botschaft der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. 2006. "Merkblatt zum Bezug von Arbeitslosengeld im Ausland." Madrid. Available online at: http://www.madrid.diplo.de/Vertretung/madrid/de/04/Download__Formulare__04/D__Datei__arbeitslosengeld,property=Daten.pdf.

Bovenkerk, F. 1974. *The Sociology of Return Migration: A Bibliographical Essay.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Boyd, Monica. 1991 Immigration and living arrangements: Elderly women in Canada. *International Migration Review.* 25: 4-27.

Brettell, Caroline and James Hollified. 2007. *Migration Theory: Debating Across Disciplines*. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge

Bundesagentur für Arbeit (BAR). 2007. "Mobil in Europa: Informationen für Rückkehrer." Berlin. Available online at: http://www.ba-auslandsvermittlung.de/lang_de/nn_269522/DE/Home/Arbeitnehmer/Rueckkehrer/rueckkehrer-knoten.html__nnn=true.

Bundesmimisterium des Innern (BMI). 2006. *Zuwanderungsrecht und Zuwanderungspolitik.* Berlin. Available online at:

http://www.bmi.bund.de/Internet/Content/Common/Anlagen/Broschueren/2005/Zuwanderungspolitik__und__Zuwanderungsrecht__de,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/Zuwanderungspolitik_und_Zuwanderungsrecht_de.pdf

Burr, J.A. and J.E. Mutchler. 1992. "The living arrangements of unmarried elderly Hispanic females." *Demography.* 29: 93-112.

Chiswick, Barry. 2007. "Are Immigrants Favorably Self-Selected?" in *Migration Theory: Debating Across Disciplines*. Eds. Caroline Brettell and James Hollified. New York: Routledge.

Clark, Robert and Anne York. 2001. "Economic Status of Older German Immigrants." *Viertelsjahrheft zur Wirtschaftsforschung.* 70 (1): 166-171.

Clyne, Michael G**.** 1981. Second language attrition and first language reversion among elderly bilinguals in Australia. *In Sprachkontakt als Ursache von Veränderungen der Sprach- und Bewußtseinsstruktur*. Eds. M. Meid & K. Heller. Innsbruck: Institut fhür Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Innsbruck.

Constant, Amelie and Douglas Massey. 2002. "Return Migration by German Guestworkers: Neoclassical versus New Economic Theories." *International Migration.* 40 (4): 5–38.

Constant, Amelie and Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2004. "Circular Movements and Time Away from the Host Country." *CEPR Discussion Paper No. 4228*. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=509721

Curran, Sara R, and Estela Rivero-Fuentes. 2003. Engendering Migrant Networks: The Case of Mexican Migration. *Demography*. Volume 40(2):289-307.

De Coulon, Augustin and François-Charles Wolff. 2006. "The Location of Immigrants at Retirement: Stay/Return or 'Va-et-Vient'?" *IZA Discussion Paper No. 2224*.

Destatis. 2008. "Ausländerzahl in Deutschland geringfüfig zurückgegangen." *Pressmitteilung Nr. 059.* Statistisches Bundesamt Deutschland.

Destatis. 2007. "Area and population – Foreign Population." Available at: http://www.statistik-portal.de/Statistik-Portal/en/en_jb01_jahrtab2.asp.

Deutscher Bundestag. 2006. *Fünfter Bericht zur Lage der älteren Generation in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Potenziale des Alters in Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft - Der Beitrag älterer Menschen zum Zusammenhalt der Generationen*. Available online at: http://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/PeriodischerBericht/Berichte-der-Bundesregierung/2006/07/Anlagen/2006-07-05-fuenfter-altenbericht,property=publicationFile.pdf

Dietzel-Papakyriakou, M. 2005. “Potentiale ältere Migranten und Migrantinnen.” *Zeitschrift für Gerontologie und Geriatrie.* Band 38 (6): 396-406.

Dustmann, Christian. 2003. “Children and return migration.” *Journal of Population Economics.* 16: 815-830.

Dustmann, Christian and Oliver Kirchkamp. 2002. "The optimal migration duration and activity choice after re-migration." *Journal of Development Economics*. 67(2): 351-372

Fix, Michael and Jeffery Passel. 1999. “Trends in Noncitizens’ and Citizens’ Use of Public Benefits Following Welfare Reform: 1994-97.” *Urban Institute.* Washington, DC.

Frisch, Max. 1990. “Überfremdung I” in *Schweiz als Heimat? Versuche über 50 Jahre.* Frankfurt am Main : Suhrkamp Verlag.

Fussell, Elizabeth, and Douglas S. Massey. 2004. Limits to the Cumulative Causation of Migration: International Migration from Urban Mexico. *Demography* 41(1):151-171.

Ganga, Deianira. 2006. “From Potential Returnees into Settlers: Nottingham’s Older Italians.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies.* 32(8): 1395-1413.

Glick, Jennifer E. 2000. “Nativity, Duration of Residence in the United States and the Life Course Pattern of Extended Family Living Arrangements in the United States.” Population Research and Policy Review. 19(2):179-198.

Glick, Jennifer E. and Jennifer Van Hook. 2002.“Parents' Coresidence with Adult Children: Can Immigration Explain Race and Ethnic Variation?” Journal of Marriage and Family. 64(1): 240-53.

Gundel, Sebastian and H. Peters. 2008. “*What Determines the Duration of Stay of Immigrants in Germany?”* SOEP Working Papers 79.

Jensen, Peter and Peder Pedersen. 2007. “To Stay or Not to Stay? Out-Migration of Immigrants from Denmark.” IOM. 45(5): 88-112.

Joppke, Christian. 2005. Selecting by Origin: Ethnic Migration in the Liberal State. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Joppke, Christian. 1998. “Why Liberal States Accept Unwanted Immigration.” *World Politics*. 50.2: 266-293.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. 1988. “Bargaining with Patriarchy.” *Gender and Society.* 2(3): 274–90.

Katz, R., S.O. Daatland, A. Lowenstein, et al. 2003. “Family Norms and Preferences in Intergenerational Relations: A Comparative Perspective.” In *Global Ageing and Challenges to Families.* Ed. Vern Bengston and Ariela Lowenstein. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Kirdar, Murat. 2005. “Return Migration and Saving Behavior of Foreign Workers in Germany.” *ERC Working Papers No. 0506*. Economic Research Center, Middle East Technical University.

Klinthäll, Martin. 2006. “Retirement Return Migration from Sweden.” *International Migration.* 44 (2): 154-180.

Kurthen, Hermann. 1997. “Immigration and the Welfare State in Comparison: Differences in the Incorporation of Immigrant Minorities in Germany and the United States.” *International Migration Review*. 31(3): 721-731

LaLonde, Robert and Robert Topel. 1997. “Economic Impact of International Migration and the Economic Performance of Migrants.” *Handbook of Population and Family Economics.* Ed. Mark Rosenzweig and Oded Stark. Amsterdam: Elsever Science B.V.

Landler, Mark. 2007. “After Lifetime in Germany, Turks Still Alone and Torn.” New York Times. Online Edition.

Massey, Douglas S, Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino, J. EdwardTaylor. 1999. *Worlds in Motion.* Oxford: Oxford UP.

Mincer, Jacob. 1978. “Family Migration Decisions.” *The Journal of Political Economy.*86(5): 749-773.

Motomura, Hiroshi. 2006. "We Asked for Workers, but Families Came: Time, Law, and the Family in Immigration and Citizenship.” Virginia Journal of Social Policy and the Law. Vol. 17.

Portes, Alejandro and Ruben Rumbaut. 2002. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation.* Berkeley: UC Press.

Reagan, Patricia and Randall Olsen. 2000. “You Can Go Home Again: Evidence from Longitudinal Data.” *Demography.* 37(3): 339-350.

Reher, Davis. 1998. “Family Ties in Western Europe: Persistent Contrasts”, *Population and Development Review,* XXIV, 203-234.

Reitz, Jeffery. 2003. “Host Societies and the Reception of Immigrants: Research Themes, Emerging Theories, and Methodological Issues.” In *Host Societies and the Reception of Immigrants.* Ed. Jeffrey Reitz. La Jolla, CA: Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, UCSD.

Rogers A, and J. Raymer. 2001. “Immigration and the Regional Demographics of the Elderly Population in the United States.” The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences. 56: S44-S55.

Sander, Monika. 2007. "Return Migration and the 'Healthy Immigrant Effect." SOEPpaper No. 60. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1096456

Sayad, A. 1991. *Immigration ou les Paradoxes de l'Altérité*. Brussels: De Boeck-Wetmael.

Tesch-Römer, C., Heribert Engstler, Susanne Wurm. 2006. *Altwerden in Deutschland. Sozialer Wandel und individuelle Entwicklung in der zweiten Lebenshälfte*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Wagner, Gert., R. Burkhauser, F. Behringer. 1993. "The English Language Public Use File of the German Socio-Economic Panel Study." *Journal of Human Resources.* 28: 429-433.

Warnes, Anthony M. and Allan Williams. 2006. "Older Migrants in Europe." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies.* 32(8): 1257-1281.

Wilmoth, Janet. 2001. "Living Arrangements Among Older Immigrants in the United States." *The Gerontologist.* 41(2): 228-238.

Zolberg, Aristide. 1999. "Matters of State: Theorizing Immigration Policy." In *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience.*" Ed. C. Hirschman, C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz, and J. De Wind. New York: Russell Sage. Pp 71-93.