Migration of the Highly Skilled: Can Europe catch up with the US?

Lydia Mechtenberg*
Roland Strausz**

* Technische Universität Berlin, Germany
** Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany

BERLIN

ECONOMIC RISK

SFB 649

Migration of the Highly Skilled:
Can Europe catch up with the US?

Lydia Mechtenberg and Roland Strausz[*]

Technical University Berlin, Humboldt Universität Berlin

October 19, 2009

Abstract

We develop a model to analyze the determinants and effects of an endogenous imperfect transferability of human capital on natives and immigrants. The model reveals that high migration flows and high skill-transferability are mutually interdependent. Moreover, we show that high mobility within a Federation is necessary to attract highly skilled immigrants into the Federation. We study in how far and in what way the European public policy behind the Bologna and the Lisbon Process can contribute to higher mobility in Europe.

Keywords: human capital, migration, transferability, public policy.
JEL–Codes: D61, H77, I28.

1

1 Introduction

We develop a model to analyze the determinants and effects of an imperfect transferability of human capital on talented natives and immigrants within a Federation. The model reveals that imperfect skill-transferability within a Federation both induces and is induced by low mobility of the natives in that Federation. Low mobility leads to an inferior matching between jobs and workers and makes immigration into the Federation less attractive especially for more talented individuals. We use the model to evaluate the Bologna and the Lisbon Process as an effort to increase transferability within Europe. We study in how far these measures can achieve their proclaimed goals of reducing mismatches between jobs and skills and attracting highly skilled immigrants in the global competition for international talent.

The paper's contributions are as follows. We first show how imperfect transferability of human capital limits mobility and how it affects the distribution of talents. Attributing the imperfect transferability to divergent education systems and divergent working cultures provides us with a rationale to endogenize it: high migration flows lead to an internationalization of workplaces and, thereby, induce a harmonization of working cultures, so that human capital becomes more transferable across borders. On the other hand, low migration flows result in imperfect transferability of human capital. Hence, we endogenize the degree of transferability as the outcome of a coordination game between potential migrants. Depending on the coordination, we obtain two possible equilibria: an efficient equilibrium with high migration and a high degree of transferability and an inefficient equilibrium with low migration and a low degree of transferability.

We, subsequently, explain the empirically low intra–European migration rates as the result of a coordination failure that leads to the inefficient equilibrium. We then discuss possible approaches to increase the transferability of human capital, starting from this inefficient equilibrium. We first argue that public policy is able to increase transferability directly by harmonizing education systems - a policy measure that is currently implemented coop-

eratively in most European countries within the framework of the so-called Bologna Process. Second, we show under which conditions such direct targeting of the transferability of human capital will lead to an equilibrium with high migration flows - and under which conditions other measures, i.e. a reduction of direct migration costs, must be implemented. We then identify and compute the local welfare effects of these policies.

We further argue that imperfect transferability of human capital within Europe constitutes a handicap in the global competition of talents. We investigate theoretically how imperfect transferability affects migration decisions of non-European young immigrants, e.g., university students, who may choose between immigration into Europe and immigration into the U.S. Finally, we identify and compute the local welfare effects of such changes in immigrant rates.

The remainder of our paper is organized as follows. The next section puts our model and results in relation to the current European political debate on migration and, in addition, relates them to the economic literature. Section 3 develops the formal model in which we derive our results. In Section 4 we endogenize the transferability of human capital and study how imperfect transferability of human capital affects local migration decisions. Section 5 analyzes the effects of imperfect transferability on global competition for international talents. We relate these results to the Bologona and Lisbon Process in Section 6. Section 7 concludes. Proofs are collected in the Appendix.

2   Political Context and Related Literature

Before the 2004 enlargement, fears about potential detrimental effects of labor migration within Europe were widespread among European politicians in national governments. However, labor migration within Europe remained

low, much lower than in regions of comparable size, like the U.S.[1]

This may be considered good news for opponents to migration who fear a compression of wages in the receiving countries and a brain drain in the sending countries. However, with low migration the potential benefits of a better matching between skills and jobs that are expected from a unified European labor market do not materialize. Thus, as long as Europeans are unable or unwilling to move along with the best jobs, Europe's productivity will remain below its potential.[2]

Moreover, not only migration within Europe, but also skilled immigration into Europe is lower than a growing number of politicians and businessmen believe would be good for Europe's economy.[3] "We are not good enough at attracting highly skilled people," the President of the European Commission, Jose Manuel Barroso, admitted at a press conference.[4] Empirical evidence for this claim abounds. Gleis, Uebelmesser, and Werding (2008) show that the U.S. attracts a considerably higher share of the world's highly skilled labor than European countries like France and Germany, or even the U.K. As replicated in Figure 1, Boeri (2008) confirms this finding. The U.S. attracts about twice as much immigrants with a tertiary degree than Europe (see left panel in Figure 1). Second, immigrants in the EU score considerably lower in all IALS tests, i.e. tests of literacy, than immigrants in New Zealand

---

[1]For empirical studies that prove labor migration within Europe to be persistently low, see e.g. Geis, Uebelmesser, and Werding (2008) and Zaiceva and Zimmermann (2008). For an empirical comparative study showing that labor migration is considerably lower in Europe than in the U.S., see Peri (2005) and (2007).

[2]Fidrmuc (2004) shows for Eastern Europe that the propensity to migrate in reaction to asymmetric regional shocks is low. This indeed suggests (for Eastern Europe) that matching between skills and capital is imperfect. Puhani (2001) shows empirically that it is "extremely unlikely" that labor mobility in Europe works as an adjustment mechanism against asymmetric labor market shocks. Arntz (2005) shows that the unemployed in Germany have a low propensity to migrate in regions with less tight labor markets. By contrast, Borjas, Bronars, and Trejo (1992) show that in the U.S., internal mobility of the Youth is strong and mainly driven by reactions to mismatches between skills and jobs.

[3]See again Peri (2005) and (2007).

[4]Cited from Spiegel online International, Monday, September 14, 2009.

SUCCESS IN ATTRACTING SKILLED MIGRANTS

IALS TEST SCORES: MIGRANT TO NATIVES RATIO

DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE IALS IN GERMANY (LEFT)
AND CANADA (RIGHT)

Figure 1: International Comparisons Skilled Migrants (Source: Bouri 2008).

(see right panel in Figure 1). Third, the distribution of average IALS scores of immigrants in a European country like Germany lies below that of the country's natives; whereas in Canada, immigrants and natives have the same IALS score distribution (see lower panel in Figure 1).

The conjecture suggests itself that these two phenomena - low labor mobility within Europe and low skilled immigration into Europe - are interrelated. If barriers to mobility are still high in Europe, a potential immigrant must take into account her low prospects of insuring herself against asymmetric regional shocks on the European labor market. Thus, she might prefer migration into another region, like Canada or the U.S., where she knows that she will be able to move along with the best jobs.

Methodically, our main contribution is to endogenize the transferability of human capital by modeling it as an outcome of a coordination game between potential migrants.[5] Thus, the current paper is the first to bridge the gap

---

[5]To our knowledge, there are no other fully microfounded models of migration with en-

between the literature that looks at migration as a coordination game with complementarities and the literature that investigates the effects of imperfect transferability of human capital. Contributions to the first-mentioned stream of literature are, for instance, Hendricks (2001), Giannetti (2003), and Stark (2004) who all model complementarities of the productivity of migrants similarly. Hendricks (2001) assumes that an individual's earnings increase in the average level of the productivity of its ethnic group. In the model of Giannetti (2003), an individual's skill premium increases in the average level of productivity of the location where he works; and Stark (2004) assumes that an individual's productivity increases in the average human capital of the economy.

Complementarities between migrants are different in our framework, because we do not assume a direct effect of any individual migrant on the productivity of the labor force in his destination country. Instead, we model migration as a critical mass game: A sufficiently high flow of high-skilled migration can internationalize work-places in the destination country such that human capital acquired in the source country becomes more transferable across the border.

Our paper is further related to the literature on transferability of human capital. This literature started with Roy's seminal paper on the self–selection of migrants (Roy (1951)). Borjas (1994) formalizes Roy's ideas, while Borjas, Bronars, and Trejo (1992) find empirical support. Subsequent work is mostly empirical. For instance, Chiswick (1978) finds that schooling has a lower effect on earnings of immigrants and partly interprets this finding as support for imperfect skill–transferability. Duleep and Regets (2002) also find empirical support for the hypothesis of declining transferability of human capital for immigrants in the U.S. Thus, imperfect transferability of human capital has become an empirical fact. Yet, despite its empirical importance, little is

---

dogenous skill-transferability. In an important theoretical and empirical study, Duleep and Regets (1999) endogenize skill-transferability. But the model is not fully microfounded, and migration is not described as a coordination problem.

known about the determinants of skill–transferability and most work treats it as a black box. With respect to this literature, a contribution of our paper is, therefore, to go beyond a straightforward comparative statics analysis in the degree of skill–transferability and address the actual determinants of imperfect transferability such as differences in working cultures.

3   The Model

Consider a federation that consists of two countries. In each country there are individuals of mass one, who, in period $t = 1$, each enrol in higher education at their home university. The acquired human capital from higher education is one times the individual's talent $\theta \in [0,1]$. The two countries are symmetric; they do not differ in educational quality or the distribution of talents. In particular, we assume that, in each country, talent θ is uniformly distributed over the interval $[0,1]$. We refer to individuals with a higher education as graduates.

Apart from talent, a graduate's productivity y_i depends on the state of the economy in the country where she works. A country has either a normal or a booming economy. If the graduate i stays in her country of birth, and if the economy there is normal, her productivity equals her human capital, i.e. $y_i = \theta_i$. By contrast, if the graduate's country of birth has a booming economy, her productivity there is enhanced by a positive regional shock, i.e. $y_i = \theta_i(1+\pi)$, with $\pi \in (0,1)$. The parameter $\pi \in (0,1)$ represents the positive economic shock and more talented graduates benefit proportionally more from a booming economy. The assumption $\pi < 1$ guarantees that the graduate's benefits from education, θ_i, are more important than the productivity gain $\theta_i \pi < \theta_i$ from favorable economic conditions. In this sense, education is a more important determinant of productivity than a country's economic conditions.

Each graduate decides, in period $t = 2$, in which of the two countries she wants to work. Graduates observe the countries' economic conditions when

they make their decision. Differences in economic conditions, therefore, drive migration incentives. To keep our analysis tractable, we assume that exactly one country has a booming economy, whilst the other country has a normal economy. We denote the booming country by H and the other country by L. Before graduates complete their education, it is, however, not known which of the two countries will have the booming economy in period $t = 2$. In particular, we assume that, in $t = 1$, the two countries are equally likely to obtain a booming economy. From the perspective of period $t = 1$, both countries are, therefore, fully symmetric and an individual is indifferent about where to obtain her education.

If a graduate decides to migrate, she incurs a fixed migration cost $c > 0$. This cost captures the migrant's relocation expenses and other burdens. In addition to the fixed costs c, a migrant also loses a part of her human capital from education. In particular, we assume that a graduate θ_i who migrates from country L to country H has a productivity $\theta_i(\alpha + \pi)$. The *transferability* parameter $\alpha < 1$ captures the idea that an education is more valuable in the acquired than in a foreign country. This assumption captures a stylized fact reported by a large part of the migration literature. Moreover, it seems especially appropriate in the European context, where part of the education is country-specific and countries differ in languages and working cultures. The transferability parameter α plays a crucial role in our analysis. We endogenize it in Section 4 and argue that it captures in a reduced form the main target of the Bologna and Lisbon process. Note that when $\alpha + \pi < 1$, the loss of human capital offsets any gain from migrating to a booming economy. For this reason, we restrict attention to $\alpha + \pi > 1$.

We abstract from unemployment among graduates; in each country a firm employs all the graduates on a country's labor market so that they can always realize their full productivity. A graduate appropriates a fixed share γ of her productivity; the remaining part is appropriated as a positive externality by non–academic natives of the country where the graduate works. Because non–academics are passive, we do not model them explicitly. Yet, our welfare

Figure 2: The Timeline

analysis fully counts the positive externality from a graduate on the non–academics in the country where the graduate works.

Figure 2 describes the sequence of events. First, talented individuals are born and their individual talents realized. Second, individuals study in their native country and acquire their human capital from higher education. Third, nature determines which country has the better economy. Fourth, graduates decide whether or not to expend a cost c and lose a share $(1-\alpha)$ of their higher education to migrate into the neighboring country. Finally, graduates work and the productivity of a given graduate is shared between herself and the non–academics in the country in which she works.

4 Intra–Federal Mobility

We first focus on intra–federal mobility and study the migration decision of the natives in the countries H and L. First consider a graduate with talent θ_i from country H. She obtains a payoff $\gamma\theta_i(1+\pi)$ if she remains in country H and obtains the payoff $\gamma\theta_i\alpha - c$ if she migrates to country L. Hence, a graduate from the high productivity country has no incentive to migrate and, therefore, there is no migration from H to L.

9

In contrast, a graduate i from country L obtains the payoff $\gamma\theta_i$ if she remains in L, whereas migrating to country H yields her a payoff $\gamma\theta_i(\alpha + \pi) - c$. Hence, a graduate from country L with talent θ_i migrates exactly when[6]

$$\theta_i \geq \hat{\theta}(\alpha) \equiv \min\left\{\frac{c}{\gamma\left[\pi - (1 - \alpha)\right]}, 1\right\}.$$

Let $\bar{\alpha} \equiv 1 - \pi + c/\gamma$ so that $\hat{\theta}(\alpha)$ is smaller than 1 only if $\alpha > \bar{\alpha}$. Then, we obtain the following result:

Lemma 1 *For $\alpha \leq \overline{\alpha}$, no migration occurs. For $\alpha > \overline{\alpha}$, only graduates with talent $\theta_i \in [\hat{\theta}(\alpha), 1]$ migrate from L into H.*

The comparative statics are intuitive: The flow of migration increases in the bargaining power of the labor force, γ, in the size of the economic shock π, and decreases with the direct costs of migration, c. Because c is independent of talent, it is the highly talented graduates who migrate, whereas the less talented graduates remain in their home country.

Moreover, Lemma 1 reveals two effects of the imperfect transferability of human capital $\alpha < 1$. First, there is less migration than in a situation in which human capital is fully transferable across borders: $\hat{\theta}(\alpha) < \hat{\theta}(1)$. Consequently, the overall surplus generated on the labor market of the federation is lower with $\alpha < 1$ than it would have been with $\alpha = 1$. The reason is that, for $\alpha < 1$, the matching of jobs to graduates is inefficient. Second, low transferability α amplifies the effect that migrants are the more talented graduates.[7]

---

[6]By assumption $\pi + \alpha > 1$

[7]As Chiswick (2000) points out, favorable self-selection of migrants occurs in any model in which (1) there are out-of-pocket costs of migration, and (2) earnings (in any country) increase in ability.

4.1 Coordinating Migration

The proportional loss of human capital associated with migration, $(1 - \alpha)$, represents an inefficiency from the diversity in national education systems, working cultures, and languages within Europe. The literature hitherto treats this loss as exogenous. By contrast, we extend our model so as to view the transferability parameter α as a policy variable that is endogenous in two ways. First, it depends on the comparability and the universal curriculum of higher education systems. Second and probably more importantly, the parameter depends on the diversity in working cultures and languages spoken on the job. These differences become smaller when the workforce becomes more internationalized. The underlying idea is that firms adapt their working culture to highly skilled migrants if they come in large numbers. For instance, it may become unnecessary for a highly skilled migrant to learn the native language of her destination country before realizing her full potential at work, since the firm where she starts working might switch to English as a focal language when its labor force becomes more international.

Due to this effect, mobility and the degree of transferability are interdependent and self–enforcing: The more graduates ignore national borders and move along with the more productive jobs, the more firms and workers find it attractive to harmonize working cultures and switch to a common international language. This then facilitates migration between these countries, because human capital will become more easily transferable across borders. Hence, internationalization increases with migration, which, in its turn, increases with internationalization.

We model the outcome from this self–enforcing process as follows. Let m denote the share of European migrants from the low productivity country L to the high productivity country H. We assume that if m is larger than some cut-off value $\bar{m} \in (0, 1)$, then a harmonization of working cultures and languages in countries 1 and 2 occurs. We take the extreme that, if $m \geq \bar{m}$, diversity between working cultures and languages spoken on the job disappears completely so that human capital becomes fully transferable

across borders. Formally,

$$\alpha(m) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } m \geq \bar{m} \\ \alpha_0 & \text{if } m < \bar{m}. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

Consequently, migration becomes a coordination game between graduates. In order to investigate the outcomes of the coordination game, define

$$\hat{\alpha} \equiv \frac{c}{\gamma(1 - \bar{m})} + 1 - \pi.$$

We have $\hat{\alpha} \in (\overline{\alpha}, 1)$ exactly when $\bar{m} < 1 - c/(\gamma\pi)$. Moreover, let m^* and α^* denote the equilibrium share of migrants and the equilibrium share of post-migration human capital, respectively. The following proposition characterizes the equilibrium outcomes of the coordination game.

Proposition 1 *i) For $\hat{\alpha} > 1$, the equilibrium outcome m^* is unique. In particular, $\alpha^* = \alpha_0$, and $m^* = 0$ if $\alpha_0 \leq \bar{\alpha}$ and $m^* = 1 - c/[\gamma(\alpha_0 + \pi - 1)]$ if $\alpha_0 > \bar{\alpha}$. ii) For $\hat{\alpha} \leq 1$ and $\alpha_0 \leq \bar{\alpha}$, there exists an equilibrium outcome $m^* = 1 - c/(\gamma\pi) > \bar{m}$ and $\alpha^* = 1$, and an additional equilibrium outcome $m^* = 0$ and $\alpha^* = \alpha_0$. iii) For $\hat{\alpha} \leq 1$ and $\alpha_0 > \bar{\alpha}$, there exists an equilibrium outcome $m^* = 1 - c/(\gamma\pi) > \bar{m}$ and $\alpha^* = 1$ and, for $\alpha_0 < \hat{\alpha}$, an additional equilibrium outcome $m^* = 1 - c/[\gamma(\alpha_0 + \pi - 1)]$ and $\alpha^* = \alpha_0$.*

Figure 3 illustrates the different equilibria and their relation to the transferability variable α for the two cases $\hat{\alpha} > 1$ and $\hat{\alpha} \leq 1$. For a thorough understanding of how the intensity of (anticipated) international migration and the transferability of human capital across borders influence each other, it is helpful to investigate in more detail the qualitative differences between the multiple migration equilibria.

First observe that the outcomes can be ordered according to the Pareto-criterion. The *high–migration equilibrium* $m^* = 1 - c/(\gamma\pi) > \bar{m}$ and $\alpha^* = 1$ is Pareto dominant, because it allows for migration without any loss of human

Figure 3: Mobility equilibria

capital. In the high–migration equilibrium, graduates expect migration to be intensive enough to harmonize working cultures and to raise the transferability of human capital α to 1. Accordingly, graduates expect no loss of their human capital from migration into the better economy, thereby, collectively rationalizing their expectations.

When graduates have pessimistic expectations, *low–migration equilibria* obtain that are Pareto inferior. Such expectations can even lead to the total absence of migration. If graduates expect that not enough of their fellow–graduates migrate into the better economy and that, therefore, working culture in the country with the better economy will not be international, they anticipate a loss of human capital $(1 - \alpha_0)$ from migration. With such a loss, the less talented graduates prefer to stay in their home country, thereby, justifying the initial expectation that not enough graduates migrate. This coordination failure may explain the empirically consistently low intra–European migration rates as compared to the US. They indicate that Europe is trapped in an inefficient low–migration equilibrium.

In a low–migration equilibrium, both the intensity of migration and the human capital that migrants lose depend on the magnitude of α_0. The higher α_0, the more human capital can be transferred across borders, and the more

intensive migration becomes. Consequently, the migration equilibria with $\alpha^* = \alpha_0$ can be ranked according to the magnitude of α_0. The equilibria with higher $\alpha^* = \alpha_0$ Pareto–dominate the others.

The parameter α_0 represents two things. First, a high α_0 stands for low diversity in national working cultures and languages spoken on the job. For instance, a German graduate finds it easier to realize the full potential of her acquired human capital in Austria than in France. Second, α_0 represents the degree to which a given national higher education system provides human capital that is transferable into the labor market of the other country. For instance, a diploma as provided from German universities before the implementation of the Bologna Process was unknown to employers in other European countries, and graduates with a diploma have not been appreciated much in European countries other than Germany. Thus, prior to the Bologna Process, migration of a small number of graduates from Germany to, for instance, England was characterized by a low α_0. Consequently, α_0 rises, when, in line with the Bologna process, Europe harmonizes university degrees.[8]

4.2 Welfare Effect of Migrants

In this subsection we identify the different welfare effects of raising the transferability of human capital from α_0 to 1. We show that the social welfare of country H and the federation as a whole increases, while the effect on the welfare of country L is ambiguous.

First consider the welfare in the booming country H. Because the natives of the booming country do not migrate, each talent $\theta \in [0, 1]$ contributes $\theta(1 + \pi)$ to their country's welfare. In addition, country H captures a share $1 - \gamma$ from the migrants with talent $\theta \in (\hat{\theta}(\alpha_0), 1]$ from country L. Overall

---

[8]In Section 6, we will explicitly address the Bologna Process as a political attempt to increase intra-European migration.

welfare in country H is, therefore,

$$W^H(\alpha^*) = \int_0^1 \theta\,(1+\pi)\,d\theta + \int_{\widehat{\theta}(\alpha^*)}^1 (1-\gamma)\,\theta\,(\alpha^*+\pi)\,d\theta. \tag{2}$$

A low transferability of human capital reduces the accumulated positive externalities produced by migrants on country H. We may use expression (2) to compute the welfare gain from raising the transferability from α_0 to 1:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta W_m^H &= W^H(1) - W^H(\alpha_0) \\
&= (1-\gamma)\left[\int_{\widehat{\theta}(1)}^{\widehat{\theta}(\alpha_1)} \theta\,(1+\pi)\,d\theta + \int_{\widehat{\theta}(\alpha_1)}^1 \theta\,(1-\alpha_1)\,d\theta\right] > 0. \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

The sign of expression (3) is unambiguously positive; country H gains when the transferability of human capital becomes perfect. The two integrals in (3) reveal a welfare gain from two different sources. First, imperfect transferability of human capital keeps medium talented migrants born in country L away from the labor market in H. It leads to an inefficient matching of graduates and jobs. The first integral in (3) represents the gain in improving the matching when the transferability of human capital becomes perfect. Second, highly talented migrants from country L, who migrate regardless of the migration inefficiency $1-\alpha_0$, are more productive in H without the migration inefficiency. The second integral in (3) expresses this welfare gain.

Next consider the welfare effects on country L. After finishing their education, only the graduates with talents below $\widehat{\theta}(\alpha^*)$ remain in L. These immobile graduates contribute their full productivity to country L's welfare. The more talented graduates $\theta > \widehat{\theta}(\alpha^*)$ migrate into country H, and these mobile graduates contribute only a fraction γ of their productivity to the country's social welfare. Country L's welfare is therefore

$$W_m^L(\alpha^*) = \int_0^{\widehat{\theta}(\alpha^*)} \theta\,d\theta + \int_{\widehat{\theta}(\alpha^*)}^1 (\gamma\theta(\alpha^*+\pi) - c)\,d\theta. \tag{4}$$

15

It follows that an increase in the transferability of human capital from α_0 to 1 increases country L's welfare by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta W_m^L &= W_m^L(1) - W_m^L(\alpha_0) \\
&= -\int_{\widehat{\theta}(1)}^{\widehat{\theta}(\alpha_0)} (1-\gamma)\theta d\theta + \int_{\widehat{\theta}(1)}^{\widehat{\theta}(\alpha_0)} (\gamma\theta\pi - c)d\theta + \int_{\widehat{\theta}(\alpha_0)}^{1} \gamma\theta(1-\alpha_0)d\theta \quad (5)
\end{aligned}
$$

Expression (5) shows that an elimination of the inefficiencies in the transferability of human capital has positive and negative effects on country L. Its sign is therefore ambiguous. The first integral in the expression demonstrates the negative effect that a higher transferability increases the outflow of graduates from country L. Because the country loses a share $1 - \gamma$ of the productivity of migrants, this impacts country L's welfare negatively. Yet, graduates migrate because it raises their personal welfare and this has a positive effect on country L's social welfare. The second integral captures the change in personal welfare of graduates who become mobile when the transferability of human capital is 1 rather than α_0. Finally, the third integral captures the change in welfare from those graduates who migrate regardless of the imperfect transferability; their utility is larger with perfect transferability and this benefits country L.

Considering the overall welfare effects confirms the intuition that an elimination of the migration inefficiency raises overall welfare in Federation 1:

$$
\Delta W^1 = \Delta W_m^H + \Delta W_m^L = \int_{\widehat{\theta}(1)}^{\hat{\theta}(\alpha_0)} (\theta\pi - c)d\theta + \int_{\hat{\theta}(\alpha_0)}^{1} \theta(1-\alpha_0)d\theta < 0.
$$

The expression is unambiguously positive, because $\theta\pi > \gamma\theta\pi > c$ for all $\theta \in (\hat{\theta}(\alpha_0), \hat{\theta}(1))$. The first integral represents the federation's welfare gain from a better matching of jobs and graduates. The second integral represents the welfare gain from mobile graduates, who, with perfect transferability, do no longer have their human capital diminished.

Given that the two countries are symmetric ex ante, they both expect a positive gain from high mobility and, therefore, have a strict incentive in period 1 to eliminate any migration inefficiency.

16

5   Global Competition for Talent

Empirically, not only migration of highly skilled *within* Europe is low as compared with the US, but also immigration of highly skilled *into* Europe. Because of shrinking populations and increased globalized competition, European politicians increasingly speak out in favor of highly skilled immigration.[9] The Bologna and the Lisbon Process are build on this opinion and aim at making Europe more attractive for talents from non–European countries.

In this section we investigate the idea that the low intra– and inter–European migration rates are interrelated, because low transferability of human capital deters inter–European migration. The reasoning is straightforward: If it is more costly to transfer acquired human capital within Europe than within the US, then insurance against locally unfavorable economic conditions is more costly in Europe. This translates into a preference for the US and leads to low rates of inter–European migration.[10]

We extend our model to study immigration from a third part of the world, e.g. Asia, into two federations, Federation 1 and Federation 2. Federation 1 represents Europe and Federation 2 represents the US. In order to focus on the above argument, we assume that Federation 2 is identical to Federation 1 except that in Federation 2, human capital is fully transferable across borders.

---

[9]See, for instance, page 45 of Kok (2003), the 2003 report of the European Employment Taskforce. There, the following policy suggestion is made: "Labour migration has to be managed more effectively if it is to be an effective response to labour market needs and in order to achieve better integration. While priority must be given to using the existing labour reserves in the EU, carefully managed immigration could help prevent imbalances in the European labour force, both in terms of age and of skills structure."

[10]European Politicians seem to be aware of this. For instance, Kok (2003) suggests: "The procedures for admission of workers from third countries should be made simpler, quicker and more transparent. Mobility from one Member State to another by third country nationals already legally present in one Member State should also be facilitated." These are not completely empty words: In 2009, the European Parliament has decided to introduce the Blue Card which will legally allow immigrants to work and migrate within the European Union as long as they stay employed.

In particular, each federation consists of two countries, each with mass 1 of individuals with talent θ uniformly distributed over $[0, 1]$. The individual θ_i first studies at a university in her home country and, thereby, acquires human capital θ_i. After observing the economic conditions, she then has to decide where to work and realize her human capital. As in Federation 1, exactly one country in Federation 2 has a positive economic shock $\pi > 0$, whereas the other country in Federation 2 does not. Each country is equally likely to have the booming economy. There is no unemployment among graduates; a firm in each of the two countries enables each graduate to realize her productivity. A graduate appropriates the same share γ of this productivity as in Federation 1, while the remaining part accrues to the country where the individual works. When a graduate migrates within Federation 2, she incurs a fixed cost $c > 0$. The only, but crucial difference between Federation 1 and 2 is that when a graduate migrates she does not lose any human capital: $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \equiv 1$.

Let H_2 denote the country in Federation 2 with the highly productive economy and L_2 the country with the worse economy. Then, a graduate i from H_2 earns $\gamma\theta_i(1 + \pi)$ in her home country H_2 and $\gamma\theta_i - c$ in the other country L_2. Consequently, all natives from H_2 remain in their home country, where their productivity is higher. In contrast, a graduate i from L_2 earns $\gamma\theta_i(1+\pi)-c$ in country H_2 and $\gamma\theta_i$ in her home country L_2. Hence, migration into H_2 is beneficial to i if and only if

$$\gamma\theta_i\pi > c.$$

We assume that the cost of migration is low enough, $c < \gamma\pi$, so that always exist some highly talented individuals from L_2 for whom migration is profitable. In particular, individuals from country L_2 migrate into country H_2 exactly when

$$\theta_i > \hat{\theta}(1) = \frac{c}{\gamma\pi}.$$

Now consider *immigrants* from some third country C. Because we focus on student immigration, we assume that no university is stationed in

C. Therefore, individuals in C must obtain their human capital either in Federation 1 or Federation 2. Empirically, a large share of graduates from developing countries who obtained their degree in Europe or the US remain in the developed part of the world. Accordingly, we assume that immigrants do not return to country C but stay in the federation where they acquired their human capital. Hence, we also abstract from migration between federations.

Immigrants from C differ in two dimensions. First, just as the citizens of the two federations they differ in talent $\theta \in [0, 1]$. Second, immigrants differ in their subjective preferences for a specific federation. In particular, let $\delta \in [-1, 1]$ express the additional utility that an immigrant obtains from migrating to Federation 1 rather than Federation 2. Hence, if $\delta_i > 0$, then a specific immigrant i has, all other things equal, a preference for Federation 1. For $\delta_i < 0$, immigrant i has a preference for Federation 2. We assume that (θ, δ) are uniformly distributed over the rectangle $[0, 1] \times [-1, 1]$ with mass μ.

5.1 Immigration Decisions

An immigrant who, after selecting Federation 1, happens to end up in the country with the worse economy will migrate if and only if her talent θ exceeds $\hat{\theta}(\alpha_1)$. Thus, an immigrant with $\theta \geq \hat{\theta}(\alpha_1)$ always ends up working in the high productive country, either because she was lucky to pick the booming country from the start or because she, after finishing her education, moved to the highly productive country. From an ex ante perspective, these two possibilities are equally likely and, therefore, the mobile immigrant expects a payoff from moving to Federation 1 of

$$V_1^{mi} = \gamma\theta(1 + \pi)/2 + (\gamma\theta(\alpha_1 + \pi) - c)/2 + \delta_i.$$

By contrast, an immigrant $\theta \leq \hat{\theta}(\alpha_1)$ who has selected Federation 1 finds that migration into the neighboring country is unattractive. This immobile immigrant, therefore, is equally likely to end up working in country L or H. Hence, an immobile immigrant i expects a payoff from moving to Federation

$$V_1^{ii} = \gamma\theta(1+\pi)/2 + \gamma\theta/2 + \delta_i.$$

Instead, an immigrant who decides to immigrate to Federation 2, ends up working in the highly productive country whenever her talent exceeds $\hat{\theta}(1)$. Therefore, this mobile immigrant expects a payoff from immigrating into Federation 2 of

$$V_2^{mi} = \gamma\theta(1+\pi)/2 + (\gamma\theta(1+\pi) - c)/2.$$

By contrast, an immigrant with a talent of only $\theta < \hat{\theta}(1)$ remains immobile in Federation 2 and, therefore, expects a payoff from moving to Federation 2 of

$$V_2^{ii} = \gamma\theta(1+\pi)/2 + \gamma\theta/2.$$

Comparing the payoffs for the different types of immigrants, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 2 *An immigrant with characteristics (θ, δ) decides to move to Federation 1 if i) $\theta \in [0, \hat{\theta}(\alpha_1)]$ and $\delta > 0$, or if ii) $\theta \in (\hat{\theta}(1), \hat{\theta}(\alpha_1)]$ and $\delta > (\gamma\theta\pi - c)/2$, or if iii) $\theta \in (\hat{\theta}(\alpha_1), 1]$ and $\delta > \gamma\theta(1-\alpha_1)/2$.*

Figure 4 illustrates the Proposition's results. Immigrants with $\delta > 0$ have an inherent preference for Federation 1, whereas immigrants with $\delta < 0$ have a preference for Federation 2. The proposition shows that immigrants with low skills $\theta \leq \hat{\theta}(1)$ decide in line with their inherent preferences. The reason is that, independent of the federation they live in, these immigrants are immobile after their graduation. Therefore, the difference in transferability of human capital between the two federations does not play a role.

In contrast, the difference in transferability of human capital affect immigration decisions for immigrants with an intermediate talent $\theta \in (\hat{\theta}(1), \hat{\theta}(\alpha_1)]$. These immigrants are mobile within Federation 2, but are immobile within Federation 1 when the transferability of human capital is $\alpha_1 < 1$. For these immigrants, Federation 2 has therefore an advantage over Federation 1. As

Figure 4: Decision of immigrants

illustrated by area II in Figure 4, this advantage may outweigh an inherent preference for Federation 1.

Finally, immigrants with a high talent $\theta \in (\hat{\theta}(\alpha_0), 1]$ are mobile both in Federation 1 and 2, despite a limited transferability of human capital in Federation 1. These highly talented immigrants regard the low transferability α_1 as a disadvantage of Federation 1 that skews their preference towards Federation 2. Thus, the more talented they are, the less of them move to Federation 1. Area IV illustrates these types of immigrants.

Figure 4 confirms the idea that due to low transferability of human capital within Federation 1, Federation 1 has less immigrants than Federation 2. Yet, the proposition also reveals that the loss of graduates affects the talent composition in the Federation. Federation 1 loses out on the most talented graduates. If one accepts the assumption that Europe is better represented by Federation 1 and the U.S. by Federation 2, then this result is in accordance with the empirical facts.

21

5.2 Welfare Effects of Immigrants

Figure 4 is helpful in guiding our computations concerning the welfare effects of an imperfect transferability of human capital. It shows that we may distinguish four different types of immigrants whom the transferability inefficiency $\alpha_1 < 1$ affects differently.

First, Area I represents the immigrants who decide in favor of Federation 1 despite a low transferability but decide against migrating to country H if they happen to end up in country L. With a perfect transferability of human capital, these immigrants would migrate within the federation and, thereby, raise their productivity by a factor π. Because the federation appropriates a share of $1 - \gamma$ of their productivity, an immigrant in Area I of type θ_i raises the federation's social welfare by

$$\Delta E_I(\theta_i) = (1 - \gamma)\theta_i\pi.$$

The relative proportion of immigrants of type θ_i in Area I is

$$M_I(\theta_i) = \int_{(\gamma\theta_i\pi-c)/2}^{1} 1/4 d\delta = (2 - \gamma\theta_i\pi + c)/8.$$

so that the welfare effect over Area I is

$$\Delta W_I = \int_{\hat{\theta}(1)}^{\hat{\theta}(\alpha_1)} M_I(\theta)\Delta E_I(\theta)d\theta.$$

Area II represents those immigrants who, due to the reduced transferability, move to Federation 2 rather than Federation 1. With a perfect transferability of human capital, these immigrants move to Federation 1 and all end up working in country H. Consequently, an immigrant in Area II of type θ_i raises the federation's social welfare by

$$\Delta E_{II}(\theta_i) = (1 - \gamma)\theta_i(1 + \pi).$$

The relative proportion of immigrants of type θ_i in Area II is

$$M_{II}(\theta_i) = \int_{0}^{(\gamma\theta_i\pi-c)/2} 1/2 d\delta = (\gamma\theta_i\pi - c)/4$$

so that the welfare effect over Area II is

$$\Delta W_{II} = \int_{\hat{\theta}(1)}^{\hat{\theta}(\alpha_1)} M_{II}(\theta) \Delta E_{II}(\theta) d\theta.$$

Area III represents those immigrants who decide to move to Federation 1. If these immigrants are unlucky and happen to end up in country L, they, subsequently, migrate to country H. An efficient transferability of human capital, therefore, raises the productivity of these immigrants by a factor $(1 - \alpha_1)$. As a result, an immigrant in Area III of type θ_i raises the federation's social welfare by

$$\Delta E_{III}(\theta_i) = (1 - \gamma)\theta_i(1 - \alpha_1).$$

The relative proportion of immigrants of type θ_i in Area III is

$$M_{III}(\theta_i) = \int_{\gamma\theta_i(1-\alpha_1)/2}^{1} 1/2 d\delta = (2 - \gamma\theta_i(1 - \alpha_1))/4$$

so that the welfare effect over Area III is

$$\Delta W_{III} = \int_{\hat{\theta}(\alpha_1)}^{1} M_{III}(\theta) \Delta E_{III}(\theta) d\theta.$$

Area IV represents those immigrants who, due to the migration inefficiency in Federation 1, decide to move to Federation 2. Without the inefficiency, they choose Federation 1 and, either by luck or subsequent migration, end up working in country H. An immigrant in Area IV of type θ_i raises the federation's social welfare by

$$\Delta E_{IV}(\theta_i) = (1 - \gamma)\theta_i(1 + \pi).$$

The relative proportion of immigrants of type θ_i in Area IV is

$$M_{IV}(\theta_i) = \int_{0}^{\gamma\theta_i(1-\alpha_1)/2} 1/2 d\delta = \gamma\theta_i(1 - \alpha_1)/4$$

so that the welfare effect over Area IV is

$$\Delta W_{IV} = \int_{\hat{\theta}(\alpha_1)}^{1} M_{IV}(\theta) \Delta E_{IV}(\theta) d\theta.$$

23

The overall welfare effects of immigrants on Federation 1 are

$$\Delta W^1 = \mu(\Delta W_I + \Delta W_{II} + \Delta W_{III} + \Delta W_{IV}) > 0, \tag{6}$$

where μ is the mass of immigrants. It is unambiguously positive, because each ΔE is positive.

6   The Bologna and the Lisbon Process

The Bologna and the Lisbon Process are coordinated political attempts to increase mobility in Europe. The declared aims of these measures are to reduce mismatches between jobs and talents and to attract highly skilled immigrants. These two aims are meant to boost productivity in Europe and allow Europe to attain its full potential.

In our model, mobility in Federation 1 can be raised by two different approaches, given that the graduates themselves fail to coordinate on the high migration equilibrium. First, transferability of human capital, α_0, could be enhanced. Second, migration costs c could be lowered for migrants.

The Bologna Process is best understood as an attempt to increase transferability of human capital α_0 by reducing the diversity of higher education systems. In a harmonized education system firms are better able to judge the value of a foreign university degree, which increases the quality of matching between jobs and graduates.[11]

The Lisbon Process should be understood in a wider sense. It encompasses all measures that increase labor mobility and immigration of students

---

[11]Accordingly, the official Bologna Website 2007-2010 says: "The purpose of recognition is to make it possible for learners to use their qualifications from one education system in another education system (or country) without losing the real value of those qualifications.

The main international legal text that aims to further the fair recognition of qualifications is the Council of Europe/UNESCO Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region (Lisbon Recognition Convention)." See http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/ActionLines/recognition.htm

and workers whose skills are needed in Europe. Accordingly, the European Commission suggests both policies that make human capital more transferable and policies that reduce other migration costs. For instance, in a 2008 report, it says: "The Commission recommends that Member States develop integration and social inclusion policies for mobile workers and their families, using existing EU measures and tools, e.g. on cultural, linguistic and schooling policies and on anti-discrimination and skills recognition."[12] Thus, in the present context, the Lisbon Process can be understood as a bundle of soft policy measures that contribute to both increasing α_0 and decreasing c.

However, as can be seen from Figure 3, targeting α_0 makes sense only if $\widehat{\alpha} < 1$. This is because only then, the high-migration equilibrium exists at all. Thus, only for $\widehat{\alpha} < 1$ the high-migration equilibrium can be made unique by increasing α_0 above $\widehat{\alpha}$. If, by contrast, the starting point of policy is a low-migration equilibrium with $\widehat{\alpha} > 1$, the only possibility of reaching the high-migration equilibrium is to lower c until $\widehat{\alpha} < 1$. Intuitively, if migration costs c outweigh the effect of the positive shock on income, $\gamma\pi$, then it is not sufficient to target the transferability of human capital. Instead, one first has to enhance the relative importance of the positive economic shock by lowering direct migration costs.

A policy of increasing α_0 can have two alternative effects. On the one hand, it can contribute to increasing migration in a low migration equilibrium, without being sufficient to establish the high migration equilibrium. This happens as long as, for given c, α_0 remains below $\widehat{\alpha}$. By contrast, if the policies implemented in the course of the Bologna and the Lisbon Process are sufficient to establish α_0 above $\widehat{\alpha}$, then they will induce the high migration equilibrium.

Finally, an important practical consideration is that the Bologna and the Lisbon Process are both voluntary, cooperative policies. Participating countries must, therefore, each have an individual incentive to implement the respective policies, i.e., each of the countries has to expect an increase in

[12]See page 14 of COM (2008).

welfare from supporting the Bologna and the Lisbon Process. Our analysis shows that this is guaranteed only *ex ante*, i.e., prior to the realization of the economic shock. This is so because only the overall *expected* change in welfare from switching to the high migration equilibrium is unambiguously positive for both of the countries.

This observation suggests a stronger support for long term policies than short term ones. Hence, reforms targeted at the education system might be easier to implement cooperatively than reforms that affect current labor mobility. In the context of our model, this means that increasing α_0 can be achieved cooperatively, whereas it is more difficult to agree about decreasing c by, for example, directly subsidizing migration.

7 Conclusion

We show that low transferability of human capital thwarts internal migration of talented graduates. This leads to two types of inefficiencies: First, an inefficient matching of graduates and jobs occurs and, as a result, graduates do not attain their full productive potential. Second, low transferability creates a handicap in the global competition for international talents. Interpreting the Lisbon and Bologna Process as means to increase the transferability of human capital, we show how they may help to increase mobility and make Europe a more attractive destination for especially the more talented individuals.

In order to focus on the imperfect transferability of human capital, we considered a highly stylized model of migration. In particular, we assumed that all countries and federations are symmetric except for the transferability of human capital. This abstraction allows us to identify clearly the effects of imperfect transferability. Clearly, countries and federations do not only differ in the transferability of human capital but also in many other dimensions. Indeed, popular debate attributes differences in (im)migration rates of higher educated between Europe and the US to higher educational quality

and higher wages in the US. From this perspective, our contribution is to point to a third possible cause: less transferable human capital between the countries within Europe than between the states in the US.

8 Appendix

Proof of Lemma 1: Follows directly from the body text.   Q.E.D.

Proof of Proposition 1: We first determine the conditions under which the different equilibrium outcomes $m^* \in [0,1]$ exist:

i) An equilibrium with $m^* = 0$ and $\alpha^* = \alpha_0$ exists exactly when for $\alpha^* = \alpha_0$, the highest talented graduate $\theta_i = 1$ has no strict incentive to migrate. Thus, $m^* = 0$ and $\alpha^* = \alpha_0$ exactly when $\gamma \geq \gamma(\alpha_0 + \pi) - c$, i.e. if and only if $\alpha_0 \leq \bar{\alpha}$.

ii) An equilibrium with $m^* \in (0, \bar{m})$ and $\alpha^* = \alpha_0$ exists exactly when the graduate with talent $\theta_i = 1 - m^*$ is, with $\alpha^* = \alpha_0$, indifferent between migrating or not. This is because then, all $\theta > 1 - m^*$ have a strict incentive to migrate and all $\theta < 1 - m^*$ have a strict incentive not to migrate. Indifference of type $\theta = 1 - m^*$ obtains exactly when $\gamma(1 - m^*)$ equals $\gamma(1 - m^*)(\alpha_0 + \pi) - c$, which is equivalent to

$$m^* = 1 - \frac{c}{\gamma(\alpha_0 + \pi - 1)}.$$

Hence, the equilibrium exists exactly when $1 - \frac{c}{\gamma(\alpha_0 + \pi - 1)}$ is larger than zero and smaller than $\bar{m}$, which is equivalent to $\alpha_0 \in (\bar{\alpha}, \hat{\alpha})$.

iii) An equilibrium with $m^* \in (\bar{m}, 1)$ and $\alpha^* = 1$ exists exactly when the graduate with talent $\theta_i = 1 - m^*$ is, for $\alpha^* = 1$, indifferent between migrating or not. For $\alpha^* = 1$, indifference of type $\theta = 1 - m^*$ obtains exactly when $\gamma(1 - m^*)$ equals $\gamma(1 - m^*)(1 + \pi) - c$, which is equivalent to $m^* = 1 - c/(\gamma\pi)$. Because $1 - c/(\gamma\pi) > \bar{m}$ is equivalent to $\hat{\alpha} < 1$, this equilibrium exists exactly when $\hat{\alpha} < 1$.

iv) An equilibrium with $m^* = 1$ exists only if the graduate with talent $\theta_i = 0$ has, with $\alpha^* = 1$, a weak incentive to migrate. But this requires

27

$c \leq 0$, which is a contradiction to the assumptions of the model. Therefore, an equilibrium with $m^* = 1$ does not exist. Q.E.D.

Proof of Proposition 2: Note that $\hat{\theta}(1) \leq \hat{\theta}(\alpha_1)$ for any $\alpha_1 \in [0,1]$. We therefore have three types of immigrants to consider:

i) An immigrant with talent $\theta \in [0, \hat{\theta}(1)]$ expects a payoff V_1^{ii} from moving to Federation 1 and V_2^{ii} from moving federation to 2. She, therefore, decides in favor of Federation 1 exactly when $V_1^{ii} \geq V_2^{ii}$. Thus, she moves into Federation 1 if and only if $\delta \geq 0$.

ii) An immigrant with talent $\theta \in (\hat{\theta}(1), \hat{\theta}(\alpha_1)]$ expects a payoff V_1^{ii} from moving into Federation 1 and a payoff V_2^{mi} from moving into Federation 2. She, therefore, decides in favor of Federation 1 exactly when $V_1^{ii} \geq V_2^{mi}$, i.e. if and only if $\delta > (\gamma\theta\pi - c)/2$.

iii) An immigrant with talent $\theta \in (\hat{\theta}(\alpha_1), 1]$ expects a payoff V_1^{mi} from moving to Federation 1 and V_2^{mi} from moving to Federation 2. Thus, she decides in favor of Federation 1 exactly when $V_1^{mi} \geq V_2^{mi}$, i.e. if and only if $\delta > \gamma\theta(1 - \alpha_1)/2$. This third case is relevant if and only if $\hat{\theta}(\alpha_1) < 1$, that is, if and only if $\alpha_1 > c/\gamma - \pi + 1$. Q.E.D.

References

1. Melanie Arntz (2005): The geographical mobility of unemployed workers. Evidence from West Germany. ZEW Discussion Paper No. 05-34.

2. Tito Boeri (2008): Brain Gain: A European Approach. Introduction to Panel 2. CESifo Forum 9, 3, 30-33.

3. George J. Borjas, Stephen G. Bronars, and Stephen J. Trejo (1992): Self-selection and internal migration in the United States. Journal of Urban Economics 32, 2, 159-85.

4. George J. Borjas (1994): The Economics of Immigration. Journal of Economic Literature 32, 4, 1667-1717.

5. Barry R. Chiswick (1978): The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-born Men. The Journal of Political Economy 86, 5, 897-921.

6. Barry R. Chiswick (2000): Are Immigrants Favorably Self-Selected? An Economic Analysis. In: C. Brettel / J. Hollifield (eds.), Migration Theory, New York, 61-76 / 2nd ed., 2008, 63-82.

7. Commission of the European Communities (2008): The impact of free movement of workers in the context of EU enlargement. (COM (2008)) Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0765:FIN:

8. Harriet O. Duleep and Mark C. Regets (1999): Immigrants and Human-Capital Investment. The American Economic Review 89, 2 (Papers and Proceedings), 186-191.

9. Harriet O. Duleep and Mark C. Regets (2002): The Elusive Concept of Immigrant Quality: Evidence from 1970 to 1990. IZA Discussion Paper No. 631.

10. Jan Fidrmuc (2004): Migration and Regional Adjustment to Asymmetric Shocks in Transition Economies. Journal of Comparative Economics 32 (2), 230-247.

11. Wido Geis, Sile Uebelmesser, and Martin Werding (2008): Why go to France or Germany, if you could as well go to the UK or the US? Selective Features of Immigration to four major OECD Countries. CESifo Working Paper No. 2427.

12. Mariassunta Giannetti (2003): On the mechanics of migration decisions: skill complementarities and endogeneous price differentials. Journal of Development Economics 41, 329-349.

13. Lutz Hendricks (2001): The Economic Performance of Immigrants: A Theory of Assortative Matching. International Economic Review 42, 2, 417-449.

14. Wim Kok (2004): Facing the Challenge. The Lisbon strategy for growth and employment. Report of the European Communities. Available at: http://europa.eu.int/comm/lisbon_strategy/index_en.html.

15. Giovanni Peri (2005): Skills and Talent of Immigrants: A Comparison between the European Union and the United States. WP 050304, University of California.

16. Giovanni Peri (2007): International Migrations: Some comparisons and Lessons for the EU. In: The European Economy in an American Mirror, ed. by B. Eichengreen, M. Landesmann and D. Stiefel, Routledge, Taylor and Francis, Oxford UK.

17. Patrick A. Puhani (2001): Labour Mobility - An Adjustment Mechanism in Euroland? Empirical Evidence for Western Germany, France, and Italy. German Economic Review 2, 127-140.

18. A. D. Roy (1951): Some Thoughts on the Distribution of Earnings. Oxford Economic Papers 3, 2, 135-146.

19. Oded Stark (2004): Rethinking the Brain Drain. World Development 32,1, 15-22.

20. Anzelika Zaiceva and Klaus F. Zimmermann (2008): Scale, diversity, and determinants of labor migration in Europe. Oxford Review of Economic Policy 24, 3, 427-451.

SFB 649 Discussion Paper Series 2009

001 "Implied Market Price of Weather Risk" by Wolfgang Härdle and Brenda López Cabrera, January 2009.

002 "On the Systemic Nature of Weather Risk" by Guenther Filler, Martin Odening, Ostap Okhrin and Wei Xu, January 2009.

003 "Localized Realized Volatility Modelling" by Ying Chen, Wolfgang Karl Härdle and Uta Pigorsch, January 2009.

004 "New recipes for estimating default intensities" by Alexander Baranovski, Carsten von Lieres and André Wilch, January 2009.

005 "Panel Cointegration Testing in the Presence of a Time Trend" by Bernd Droge and Deniz Dilan Karaman Örsal, January 2009.

006 "Regulatory Risk under Optimal Incentive Regulation" by Roland Strausz, January 2009.

007 "Combination of multivariate volatility forecasts" by Alessandra Amendola and Giuseppe Storti, January 2009.

008 "Mortality modeling: Lee-Carter and the macroeconomy" by Katja Hanewald, January 2009.

009 "Stochastic Population Forecast for Germany and its Consequence for the German Pension System" by Wolfgang Härdle and Alena Mysickova, February 2009.

010 "A Microeconomic Explanation of the EPK Paradox" by Wolfgang Härdle, Volker Krätschmer and Rouslan Moro, February 2009.

011 "Defending Against Speculative Attacks" by Tijmen Daniëls, Henk Jager and Franc Klaassen, February 2009.

012 "On the Existence of the Moments of the Asymptotic Trace Statistic" by Deniz Dilan Karaman Örsal and Bernd Droge, February 2009.

013 "CDO Pricing with Copulae" by Barbara Choros, Wolfgang Härdle and Ostap Okhrin, March 2009.

014 "Properties of Hierarchical Archimedean Copulas" by Ostap Okhrin, Yarema Okhrin and Wolfgang Schmid, March 2009.

015 "Stochastic Mortality, Macroeconomic Risks, and Life Insurer Solvency" by Katja Hanewald, Thomas Post and Helmut Gründl, March 2009.

016 "Men, Women, and the Ballot Woman Suffrage in the United States" by Sebastian Braun and Michael Kvasnicka, March 2009.

017 "The Importance of Two-Sided Heterogeneity for the Cyclicality of Labour Market Dynamics" by Ronald Bachmann and Peggy David, March 2009.

018 "Transparency through Financial Claims with Fingerprints – A Free Market Mechanism for Preventing Mortgage Securitization Induced Financial Crises" by Helmut Gründl and Thomas Post, March 2009.

019 "A Joint Analysis of the KOSPI 200 Option and ODAX Option Markets Dynamics" by Ji Cao, Wolfgang Härdle and Julius Mungo, March 2009.

020 "Putting Up a Good Fight: The Galí-Monacelli Model versus 'The Six Major Puzzles in International Macroeconomics'", by Stefan Ried, April 2009.

021 "Spectral estimation of the fractional order of a Lévy process" by Denis Belomestny, April 2009.

022 "Individual Welfare Gains from Deferred Life-Annuities under Stochastic Lee-Carter Mortality" by Thomas Post, April 2009.

SFB 649 Discussion Paper Series 2009

SFB 649 Discussion Paper Series 2009

For a complete list of Discussion Papers published by the SFB 649, please visit http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de.