Introduction

From inception to fruition, intentions tell a narrative that encapsulates various dimensions of an individual's experiences, prompting researchers to delve deeply into the multifaceted realm of intentions. Within the field of demography, a significant focus has been dedicated to investigating these intentions, most commonly with fertility and migration intentions. Yet due to a lack of data on remigration behaviour, existing research often focuses on migrants' intentions as a proxy or an independent research area, aiming to examine a migrant's migration experience. However, the possibility of linking survey data with register data for intention realisation, which has been done in the internal mobility literature previously (de Groot et al., 2008) , has seen an increase in international migration as well. A study on the non-migrant Dutch population's mobility intentions and realisations has shown that the intention to migrate predicts actual mobility, with 34% of those who intended to emigrate doing so in the following five years (van Dalen & Henkens, 2013). Another study on the intentions to re-migrate for first-generation migrants in Switzerland found that 96% of those intending to stay in Switzerland did stay, while 71% of those who wanted to leave did so during the two years of the survey(Wanner, 2021). However, a similar study on the re-migration intentions of migrants in Sweden found that while the intention is the main determinant for re-migration, it is not enough to explain the discrepancy in re-migration behaviour, suggesting that in the case of long-term foreign-born residents, intentions are not a good proxy (Fuentes Monti & Mussino, 2021).

Once individuals initiate the migration process, they often continue to migrate more frequently than those who never embarked on the initial journey. In the Netherlands, migrants and their descendants are at higher odds of moving internationally than their local counterparts (Statistics Netherlands, 2020). Furthermore, the increase in the feasibility of movement through technology has enabled migrants to pursue various options, including returning to their place of origin, migrating onward to a third country, engaging in cyclical movements, or opting for permanent settlement. As the initial move, the follow-up mobility/immobility of migrants has policy implications for the origin and host countries, as well as an important role for the countries' population, society and economy(Constant & Massey, 2002).

In this paper, we analyse the remigration behaviour of migrants and their descendants in the Netherlands following their remigration intentions. The survey used was conducted in 2015 among Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese, Antilean, Somali and Polish immigrants by Statistics Netherlands, aimed to map the position of the migrant groups in the Netherlands. Our study focuses on both the first and second generations of migrants, allowing us to examine whether there are differences in the predictive power of remigration intention. This comparison is informed by variations in travel regulations, opportunity cost, and as well as social and human capital ties to both the country of residence and the country of origin (or to the country of origin of parents for the second generation).Overall, we aim to answer the following questions: how well can remigration intention predict remigration behaviour? What are the determinants and demographic characteristics associated with an increased likelihood of remigration intention realization? What are the determinants and demographic characteristics associated with an increased likelihood of individuals transitioning from an intention to stay to an unexpected move?

Intentions of migration

Remigration/settlement intentions carry significance in representing a migrant's plans with obstacles perceived in both countries. Assessing the ability of these intentions to predict actual behaviour holds both methodological and empirical importance.

It's important to note that remigration and settlement intentions often exhibit mobility bias, with survey questions often emphasizing the geographical aspects of the decision (Mjelva & Carling, 2020). Therefore, it is essential to not only explore why people intend to migrate but also why they intend to stay, and sometimes follow through with these intentions.

Settlement and Remigration

The return migration literature provides two reasons: one successful migration and the second failed migration. The new economics of labour migration suggests that migration is temporary, and the aim of the migrant is to maximize their benefits, mostly financial. Aligned with this theory, a study on Moroccans in Europe, migrants intended to return to their country of origin when their migration objectives were met (de Haas et al., 2015). A study on Andalusian emigrants in Northern Europe showed that the achievement of initial migration objectives was positively related to emigration (Rodriguez & Jiménez Carmen, 2006). The failed migration means that either due to wrong information or inability to achieve initial objectives of migration such as income, education or life achievements, these individuals opt out to return to their country of origin or leave the host country (Constant & Massey, 2002). However, there are other factors out of the control of migrants, such as not being able to get a longer permit of residence that can lead to departure. Other than these, the emigration decision from the host country is regarded as a rational decision by the migrant, considering possible obstacles and benefits (Borjas & Bratsberg, 1996).

Data

We use the survey of integration of minorities (SIM) 2015 and the register data for the following events: emigration, standardized household income and education. All variables have been translated from Dutch to English. Our sample is 5131 people. For our analysis, we keep the outcome variable to the first migration/re-migration behaviour since, after a first migration event, the initial plans can substantially change. Therefore, someone who wanted to return to the country of origin during the 2015 interview date, then returned in 2016 and came back in 2017 does not necessarily mean that they failed to realise their intention or are in a cyclical move. The return home could have changed the intentions. Therefore, we have informative censoring of individuals at the first migration after the interview to analyse the predicting capacity of intentions on migration behaviour. People who were away less than six months are not counted as remigrated/migrated.

Our primary independent variable for measuring re-migration intention is for the timeframe of 5 years.

Table 1 : Main explanatory variable		
Where do you think your future will be like in 5 years?		
In the Netherlands	81.89	4206
Part time	8.81	452
In the country of origin	4.56	234
In another country	4.66	239
Total	100	5131

While the question contains the word 'think,' we use 'intentions' instead of 'expectations' or 'aspirations' because aspiration questions typically lack a specified timeframe, whereas intention questions typically have one (Mjelva & Carling, 2020). Since the question poses the 5-year framework, we follow these individuals for the 5-year time period after their interview date. Therefore, our dependent variable is the (im)mobility of these individuals in 2015-2021. However, to avoid "stay" option from dominating the results due to much larger sample size, we decided to divide our analysis into two models. The first model is for analyzing remigration intentions and the second model is for those who intended to stay but ended up moving. The register data has information on emigration of registered individuals about the migration date, emigration date, migration type, country of origin, and destination country. The migration type variable and the origin and destination country variables are used together to assess the (im)mobility. The migration type has three possible options namely, migration, emigration and administrative removal. Administrative removals are for the individuals excluded from the population records by the municipality due to an unknown address, an inability to establish contact, and a lack of evidence that the person resides within the municipality. Based on the information provided with the destination and origin countries, we constructed the migration type variable as "stay in the Netherlands", "move to country of origin or parents' country of origin ", "onward migration" and "administrative removals".

Table 2 displays the distribution of intentions in its columns, along with the frequency distribution of these intentions based on our explanatory variables. Furthermore, within columns labeled "of whom stayed," "of whom return," and "of whom migrated," we present the percentages of individuals who adhered to their initial intentions, categorized by different factors. For instance, the variable "time in the Netherlands" reveals a linear increase in the likelihood of staying in the Netherlands as individuals spend more time in the country. In this context, second-generation immigrants show a 29% preference for staying in the Netherlands. In the subsequent column, we find data on individuals who originally intended to stay in the Netherlands and were indeed still residing there at the end of the observation period. Thus, we can interpret this as follows: while 80% of those who initially intended to stay and had lived in the Netherlands for 5 years remained, this percentage increased to 96% for those who had spent more than 10 years in the Netherlands. All of the remigration intentions including the part-time category had significant positive association with the actual remigration in comparison to staying in the Netherlands

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of dependent and independent variables with percentages of remigration/settlement intentions and actual moves

	Stay in the Netherlands		Return to the origin country or that of parents		Onward Migration		Part-time part-time	
	%	of whom stayed	%	of whom returned	%	of whom onward migrated	%	.
Actual mobility								
Stayed	91.9		63.2		74.9		83.4	
Returned	3.5		30.3		9.6		11.7	
Onward migrated	2.5		1.71		12.1		0.4	
Administrative removal	2.1		4.5		3.3		4.4	
Time in the country (at the time of survey)								
Less than 5 years	12.6	78.89	18.8	80.00	19.6	17.65	15.2	
5 to 10 years	14.9	78.84	17.9	38.30	15.06	12.00	14.6	
More than 10 years	43.1	94.72	50.0	26.24	30.5	14.44	59.9	
2nd gen	29.2	95.69	13.2	12.90	34.7	8.43	10.1	
Standardized household income (percentile)	44.9 (percentile)	46.19	35.37	19.7	41.18	44.57	40.02	
Education (ISLED level)	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.00	4.8	4.86	3.7	
Gender								
Woman	55.06	93.69	50.00	28.21	57.08	14.60	51.88	
Man	44.94	86.69	50.00	32.48	42.92	8.74	48.12	
Age	36.6	36.71	40.12	35.7	29.59	29.37	44.35	
Origin country								
Morocco	18.16	95.9	4.7	9.09	10.04	8.33	10.40	
Turkey	15.81	95.9	21.79	13.73	6.69	18.75	25.22	
Suriname	18.45	97.9	8.97	4.76	15.48	2.70	16.15	
Former Dutch Antillese	16.76	96.03	32.48	30.26	27.20	7.69	17.48	
Somalia	10.20	76.46	5.56	0.00	15.06	25.00	5.09	
Poland	20.61	84.08	26.50	62.90	25.52	14.52	25.66	

Table 2: Logistic regression of remigration among intended movers

Variables of interest	
Woman	0.105
	(0.200)
Standardized household income	-0.0197***
	(0.00417)
Origin Group (ref= Morocco)	
Turkey	0.811
	(0.667)
Antillian	-0.950
	(0.923)
Suriname	0.962
	(0.631)
Somalia	1.045
	(0.673)
Poland	1.871***
	(0.662)
Education Level	0.0324
	(0.0626)
Time in the Netherlands (ref. less than 5 years)	
Between 5 to 10 years	-0.770***
	(0.299)
More than 10 years	-0.681**
	(0.341)
2nd generation	-1.131**
	(0.448)
Age	-0.00549
	(0.00846)
Constant	-2.336***
	(0.795)
Observations	2620

Standard errors in parentheses

*** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table 3: Logistic regression of remigration among unintended movers

Variables of interest		
Woman	-0.433***	
	(0.132)	
Standardized household income	-0.0226***	
	(0.00319)	
Origin Group (ref= Morocco)		
Turkey	0.236	
	(0.340)	
Antillian	-0.756	
	(0.477)	
Suriname	0.330	
	(0.330)	
Somalia	1.355***	
	(0.295)	
Poland	1.302***	
	(0.295)	
Education Level	-0.0963**	
	(0.0416)	
Time in the Netherlands (ref. less than 5 years)		
Between 5 to 10 years	0.427*	
	(0.258)	
More than 10 years	-0.340	
	(0.292)	
2nd generation	-0.489	
	(0.361)	
Age	-0.0155**	
	(0.00624)	
Constant	-3.462***	
	(0.465)	
Observations		27,748

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Methodolody

We use discrete time logistic regression since the binary outcome is independent and we can account for variables that change over time such as marital status, income and education. The

individuals in our models can end in the following four states: stay, return, onward migration and administrative removal. At the end, we have 33,283 person years. Table 2 shows the results for the logistic regression for those who intended to remigrate. Table 3 shows the results for the unintended movers.

For the model of remigration intention realization, our dependent variable is 0 for those who intended to remigrate and did not and 1 for those who realized their remigration intention. For the second model with unintended movers, the dependent variable takes the value of 0 for those who intended to stay and stayed and 1 for those who moved even though their initial intention was to stay.

Preliminary Findings

The results revealed several key findings. For the table 2, standardized household income exhibited a significant negative relationship with remigration intention realization, implying that as household income increased, the probability of realizing remigration intentions decreased. Additionally, the coefficients for origin groups, such as Poland, indicated significant variations in the likelihood of realizing remigration intentions when compared to the reference group (Morocco). Comparing the two models, the standardized household income has a significant negative relationship with unintended movers, implying that as household income increased, the likelihood of becoming an unintended mover decreased. Furthermore, similar to the first model, the coefficients for origin groups, such as Somalia and Poland, were significant, showing variations in the likelihood of becoming unintended movers when compared to the reference group (Morocco). Additionally, education level and age displayed significant associations with unintended movers. A lower level of education had a significant negative impact, suggesting that individuals with less education were more likely to become unintended movers.

We explore factors and their effects on remigration intention realization and unintended moving, offering insights into the complex mechanisms of international migration. Since our intention data is used from the cross-sectional 2015 SIM survey, there is a possibility that the respondents' intentions changed. A more definitive comment on the intention realization can be done through a panel data with the intentions checked more frequently.

References

Borjas, G., & Bratsberg, B. (1996). Who Leaves? The Outmigration of the Foreign-Born. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, *78*(1), 165–176.

Constant, A., & Massey, D. S. (2002). Return Migration by German Guestworkers: Neoclassical versus New Economic Theories. *International Migration*, *40*(4), 5–38. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2435.00204

de Groot, C., Mulder, C., & Manting, D. (2008). *Full article: Intentions to Move and Actual Moving Behaviour in The Netherlands*. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02673037.2011.542094

de Haas, H., Fokkema, T., & Fihri, M. F. (2015). Return Migration as Failure or Success? *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *16*(2), 415–429. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-014-0344-6

Fuentes Monti, A., & Mussino, E. (2021). *Did they stay or did they go: The role of intention behind re-migration behaviour*. Stockholm Research Reports in Demography. https://doi.org/10.17045/sthlmuni.14099168.v1

Mjelva, M. B., & Carling, J. (2020). *Surveys on migration aspirations, plans and intentions: A comprehensive overview*. https://open-research-europe.ec.europa.eu/articles/3-145

Rodriguez, V. R., & Jiménez Carmen, E. (2006). *Return and the Social Environment of Andalusian Emigrants in Europe*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248979158_Return_and_the_Social_Environment_of_Andalusian_Emigrants_in_Europe

Statistics Netherlands. (2020, April 9). *More emigrants among 2nd generation, but often returning* [Webpagina]. Statistics Netherlands. https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/news/2020/15/more-emigrants-among-2nd-generation-but-often-returning

van Dalen, H. P., & Henkens, K. (2013). Explaining emigration intentions and behaviour in the Netherlands, 2005–10. *Population Studies*, *67*(2), 225–241. https://doi.org/10.1080/00324728.2012.725135

Wanner, P. (2021). Can Migrants' Emigration Intentions Predict Their Actual Behaviors? Evidence from a Swiss Survey. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *22*(3), 1151–1179. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-020-00798-7