

Spatial Mobility of Highly Educated Migrants from BRIC Countries

KOMAI Hiroshi

University of Tsukuba

Introduction

Interest in deterritorialized global nomads is increasing. Originally, the word ‘nomad’ was used to indicate stock farmers who moved from one location to another, but the connotation has been enlarged to cover spatially mobile people in general. Jacques Attali conceptualized “hypernomads” as a “hyperclass”, referring to a new creative class. They are found in every heartland of multipolarized world where creative work and money concentrate, and are composed of business owners, managers, financiers, high level engineers, jurists, authors, designers, artists, and so on. Just under hypernomads exist “virtual nomads” composed of immobile salaried people and their families who share virtual objects, especially sports. “Infranomads” are exact opposites of hypernomads and are composed of people who are forced to move by poverty, poor health conditions and environmental destruction, and so on, seeking employment and shelter in unfamiliar places^{*1}. To climb up to a heartland, it is important to attract the mobile creative class^{*2}.

A similar situation has been pointed out by Zygmunt Bauman as well. According to Bauman, in the postmodern consumer society, a stratification of those “high up” and “low down” emerges corresponding to the degree of spatial mobility—the freedom to choose where to be. Those “high up” are “tourists” including “regular goers” who move globally. On the contrary, those “low down” are confined to all-too-real space^{*3}. Among the wanderers are “vagabonds” who are seen as the waste of the world. They “know that they won’t stay in a place for long since nowhere they stop are they likely to be welcome”^{*4}.

Since the “hypernomads” of Attali and “regular goers” of Bauman connote roughly the same people, I will refer to them as “global nomad” in this paper. I will attempt to create a picture of the types of global nomads based on a survey of highly educated migrants from BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China)^{*5}, and then examine the mode of contribution to the development of home countries based on types of global nomad.

The 636 samples of migrants from BRIC countries, the main objects of this paper, are composed of

Table 1 Settled Country by Home Country

			Settled Country				Total
			USA	UK	Australia	Japan	
Home Country	China	No.	30	62	52	31	175
		%	17.1	35.4	29.7	17.7	100.0
	Russia	No.	37	40	41	40	158
		%	23.4	25.3	25.9	25.3	100.0
	India	No.	14	22	38	48	122
		%	11.5	18.0	31.1	39.3	100.0
	Brazil	No.	26	17	30	108	181
		%	14.4	9.4	16.6	59.7	100.0
Total		No.	107	141	161	227	636
		%	16.8	22.2	25.3	35.7	100.0

p < 0.01

people who voluntarily replied to our call in English via the internet in four settled countries (Japan, UK, Australia, USA)^{*6}. The total distribution of home countries and settled countries are, in order of large to small ratios, as follows. For home countries, they were Brazil 28.5%, China 27.5%, Russia 24.8% and India 19.2%. For settled countries, they were Japan 35.7%, Australia 25.3%, UK 22.2% and USA 16.8%.

Table 1 shows the ratio of settled country by home country. We can point out relative concentrations from particular home countries in particular settled countries; namely Russians in the USA, Chinese in the UK, Indians and Chinese in Australia, and Brazilians and Indians in Japan.

Incidentally, all cross tabulations in this paper are statistically very strongly significant; namely all tables have a p value under 0.01 level by X² test.

Holders of doctoral degree (10.1%) and holders of masters degree (40.1%) make up more than half of our sample. Conversely, holders of bachelors degree make up only 28.5% and A level or equivalent constitute only 21.3%. Thus, the educational qualifications of our samples are quite high. As for occupation, professionals make up 35.5% and managers 11.9%. The total of these two highest status occupations reaches as much as 47.4%. Incidentally, technicians and associate professionals make up 11.0% and clerical, service, sales workers only 8.8%. Here, like educational qualifications, the occupations of our samples are concentrated in high-status ones.

Thus, we can say that the high IT ability shown by replies via the internet, high educational qualifications and high status occupations tell that a large part of our samples can be classified as “global nomads” as defined above.

Table 2 Affection toward Home Country and Settled Country

		Affection toward Settled Country	
		Strong	Weak
Affection toward Home Country	Strong	Double Allegiance	Home Country Oriented
	Weak	Settled Country Oriented	No Allegiance

Table 3 Distribution of Affection toward Settled and Home Country

			Affection toward Settled Country		Total
			Strong	Weak	
Affection toward Home Country	Strong	No. 259 % 40.7	No. 148 % 23.3	407 64.0	
	Weak	No. 102 % 16.0	No. 127 % 20.0	229 36.0	
Total		No. 361 % 56.7	No. 275 % 43.3	636 100.0	

1. Types of Global Nomads

I would like to propose the hypothesis that the degree of subjective separation from a certain place, or the intensity of deterritorialization, defines the attitudes and behavior of global nomads. So, I will typify global nomads according to the degree of affection toward the settled and home country. The degree of affection can logically be classified as shown in Table 2. In this paper, people with weak affection to both settled country and home country are categorized as “no allegiance” (hereafter, abbreviated as NA) type, those that have strong affection to both settled country and home country are called “double allegiance” (DA) type, those with strong affection to the settled country but weak affection toward the home country are called “settled country oriented” (SO) type and lastly those with weak affection to the settled country but strong affection toward the home country are called “home country oriented” (HO) type.

The NA type are closest to what we think of as spatially mobile nomads. The DA type, dispersed from their homelands but still maintaining a sense of belonging to it, and having affection to the settled space as well, can be seen as the diaspora type nomads⁷. On the contrary, both SO and HO types have an inclination to only one territory, and hence have the weakest characteristic as nomads.

Table 3 shows the distribution of types of global nomads in the survey. The degree of affection to the settled country and home country are constructed by five categories; namely “not at all or very little”, “little”, “moderate”, “much” and “very much”. In this table, “weak” is the combination of “not at all

Table 4 Plan for 5 to 10 Years by Type of Global Nomad

			Plan for 5 to 10 Years				Total
			Move to Another Country	Continue to Live in Present Country	Go back to Home Country	Other	
Type of Global Nomad	Double Allegiance	No. 14 % 5.4	No. 155 % 59.8	No. 71 % 27.4	No. 19 % 7.3	259 100.0	
	Settled Country Oriented	No. 6 % 5.9	No. 88 % 86.3	No. 3 % 2.9	No. 5 % 4.9	102 100.0	
	Home Country Oriented	No. 23 % 15.5	No. 68 % 45.9	No. 50 % 33.8	No. 7 % 4.7	148 100.0	
	No Allegiance	No. 16 % 12.6	No. 75 % 59.1	No. 28 % 22.0	No. 8 % 6.3	127 100.0	
Total		No. 59 % 9.3	No. 386 % 60.7	No. 152 % 23.9	No. 39 % 6.1	636 100.0	

p < 0.01

or very little”, “little” and “moderate”, and “strong” is the combination of “much” and “very much”. As shown in Table 3, the distribution, in order of decreasing ratio, is as follows; DA type 40.7%, HO type 23.3%, NA type 20.0% and SO type 16.0%. DA type is clearly the largest group showing the importance of this type.

The validity of the types is supported the answers to “plan for the next 5 to 10 years” and “current legal status”. Table 4 shows plan for residence for the next 5 to 10 years by respondent type. The top response is “continue to live in present country” (60.7%), followed by “go back to home country” (23.9%). Very few responded “move to another country” or “other”. By type, quite naturally, 86.3% of SO type “continue to live in present country”. Among those choosing “go back to home country”, the HO type (33.8%) was the largest group and DA type (27.4%) followed.

Table 5 shows current legal status, with “citizen”, the most stable status, occupying 29.2%, and “permanent resident”, the next most stable option, being 36.0%. The total of these two categories accounts for roughly two thirds of responses. By type, for “citizen”, many responses are from the SO type and very few are from the HO type. “Permanent resident” has a notable concentration in the DA type. “Work permit holder”, with low stability, is common in the HO type. To sum up, the degree of stability of current legal status is closely correlated with types of global nomad, with the exception of the NA type.

2. Conditions Influencing the Type of Global Nomad

What factors work differentiate the types of global nomad? Firstly, the relation between high

Table 5 Current Legal Status by Type of Global Nomad

			Current Legal Status							Total
			Citizen	Permanent Resident	Work Permit Holder	Spouse/ Partner	Student	Visitor	Other	
Type of Global Nomad	Double Allegiance	No. %	67 25.9	115 44.4	47 18.1	7 2.7	10 3.9	1 0.4	12 4.6	259 100.0
	Settled Country Oriented	No. %	49 48.0	28 27.5	17 16.7	2 2.0	5 4.9	0 0.0	1 1.0	102 100.0
	Home Country Oriented	No. %	31 20.9	45 30.4	51 34.5	7 4.7	8 5.4	2 1.4	4 2.7	148 100.0
	No Allegiance	No. %	39 30.7	41 32.3	29 22.8	3 2.4	11 8.7	0 0.0	4 3.1	127 100.0
	Total	No. %	186 29.2	229 36.0	144 22.6	19 3.0	34 5.3	3 0.5	21 3.3	636 100.0

p < 0.01

Table 6 Highest Educational Qualification by Type of Global Nomad

			Highest Educational Qualification					Total
			Ph.D. Degree	Master's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	A Level or Equivalent	Other	
Type of Global Nomad	Double Allegiance	No. %	17 6.5	106 40.9	67 25.9	51 19.7	18 6.9	259 100.0
	Settled Country Oriented	No. %	12 11.8	40 39.2	38 37.3	11 10.8	1 1.0	102 100.0
	Home Country Oriented	No. %	15 10.1	62 41.9	49 33.1	9 6.1	13 8.8	148 100.0
	No Allegiance	No. %	20 15.7	47 37.0	27 21.3	24 18.9	9 7.1	127 100.0
	Total	No. %	64 10.1	255 40.1	181 28.5	95 14.9	41 6.4	636 100.0

p < 0.01

educational qualification and type is shown in Table 6. Viewed from higher to lower qualification, doctoral degrees are relatively common in the NA type, in accord with the characteristics of this type, and is very uncommon in the DA type. Masters degrees, roughly speaking, evenly distributed among the types. Bachelors degrees are relatively common in the SO type and A level or equivalent is relatively common in the DA type, followed by a few in the NA type. To sum up, there is a general tendency for high educational qualification to decrease in the order of NA, SO, DA type with a slight deviation in the NA type. For occupation, there were no statistically significant correlation with type.

Table 7 Influence of Political Situation of Home Country on Decision to Migrate by Type of Global Nomad

			Influence of Political Situation of Home Country on Decision to Migrate					Total
			Very High	High	Moderate	Little	Very Little	
Type of Global Nomad	Double Allegiance	No. %	18 6.9	29 11.2	31 12.0	23 8.8	158 61.0	259 100.0
	Settled Country Oriented	No. %	34 33.3	18 17.6	11 10.8	10 9.8	29 28.4	102 100.0
	Home Country Oriented	No. %	8 5.4	8 5.4	17 11.5	18 12.2	97 65.5	148 100.0
	No Allegiance	No. %	8 6.3	14 11.0	16 12.6	13 10.2	76 59.8	127 100.0
	Total	No. %	68 10.7	69 10.8	75 11.8	64 10.1	360 56.6	636 100.0

p < 0.01

Table 8 Influence of Clear and Fair System of Law and Order of Settled Country on Decision to Migrate by Type of Global Nomad

			Influence of Clear and Fair System of Law and Order of Settled Country on Decision to Migrate					Total
			Very High	High	Moderate	Little	Very Little	
Type of Global Nomad	Double Allegiance	No. %	67 25.9	57 22.0	46 17.8	21 8.1	68 26.3	259 100.0
	Settled Country Oriented	No. %	52 51.0	15 14.7	17 16.7	7 6.9	11 10.8	102 100.0
	Home Country Oriented	No. %	23 15.5	30 20.3	38 25.7	11 7.4	46 31.1	148 100.0
	No Allegiance	No. %	22 17.3	28 22.0	23 18.1	14 11.0	40 31.5	127 100.0
	Total	No. %	164 25.8	130 20.4	124 19.5	53 8.3	165 25.9	636 100.0

p < 0.01

Next, Table 7 shows replies to the question “to what extent did the political situation in your home country affect your decision to migrate?” by type. “Very high” and “high” choices were extremely common for SO type (51.0%) but were uncommon in all other types. In other words, the majority of SO types decided to migrate due to the political situation in their home countries.

Likewise, societal conditions in the settled country influences the type of global nomad. Table 8 shows replies to the question “to what extent did a clear and fair system of law and order attract you to migrate to your settled country?” by type. If we look at the total of “very high” and “high” choices, the

Table 9 Home Country by Type of Global Nomad

			Home Country				Total
			China	Russia	India	Brazil	
Type of Global Nomad	Double Allegiance	No.	52	44	65	98	259
		%	20.1	17.0	25.1	37.8	100.0
	Settled Country Oriented	No.	30	44	8	20	102
		%	29.4	43.1	7.8	19.6	100.0
	Home Country Oriented	No.	35	36	41	36	148
		%	23.6	24.3	27.7	24.3	100.0
	No Allegiance	No.	58	34	8.0	27	127
		%	45.7	26.8	6.3	21.3	100.0
Total		No.	175	158	122	181	636
		%	27.5	24.8	19.2	28.5	100.0

p < 0.01

SO type occupies the top (65.7%), with the choice becoming fewer in the order of DA and NA types. The fewest is for HO type (35.8%).

To sum up, high educational qualification correlates intensely with the type of global nomad. Political and societal conditions in both the home and settled country influence the decision to migrate of SO type most strongly. The other types are much more influenced by societal conditions in the settled country than in the home country.

3. Types of Global Nomad and Home Country

Table 9, which shows home country by type of global nomad, demonstrates remarkable result; NA types are overwhelmingly Chinese, and in the same way, Russians are common among SO types, and Brazilians among DA types. Indians show a relative concentration among DA and HO types.

To explain the particular concentration of home country among each type, let us look at affection to home and settled country by home country. Table 10 shows affection to home country by home country. “Very strong” and “strong” replies are especially uncommon among Chinese and Russians, constitutes only slightly more than half. The 51.5% figure for Chinese is the lowest among the four home countries. On the contrary, more than 70% of Brazilians and more than 90% of Indians chose those two choices.

Next, if we look at affection to settled country by home country in Table 11, “very strong” and “strong” replies are the least common among Chinese, representing only 27.4%, in sharp contrast with around 40% in the other three home countries. For Brazilians in particular, as many as 43.1% replied “very strong” or “strong”. In short, affection of Chinese is the weakest not only toward the home country but also toward the settled country where U.K. and Australia are the main bodies. Thus, Chinese are the

Table 10 Affection toward Home Country by Home Country

			Affection toward Home Country					Total
			Very Strong	Strong	Moderate	Weak	Very Weak	
Home Country	China	No.	30	36	50	7	5	128
		%	23.4	28.1	39.1	5.5	3.9	100.0
	Russia	No.	37	37	33	20	9	136
		%	27.2	27.2	24.3	14.7	6.6	100.0
	India	No.	55	37	6	2	5	105
		%	52.4	35.2	5.7	1.9	4.8	100.0
	Brazil	No.	88	40	23	6	17	174
		%	50.6	23.0	13.2	3.4	9.8	100.0
Total		No.	210	150	112	35	36	543
		%	38.7	27.6	20.6	6.4	6.6	100.0

p < 0.01

Note: The number of respondents in this table is less than other tables for technical reasons. The figure for China includes one person from India, likewise India has one from Russia and Brazil one from China.

Table 11 Affection toward Settled Country by Home Country

			Affection toward Settled Country					Total
			Very Strong	Strong	Moderate	Weak	Very Weak	
Home Country	China	No.	17	31	76	30	21	175
		%	9.7	17.7	43.4	17.1	12.0	100.0
	Russia	No.	25	35	37	28	33	158
		%	15.8	22.2	23.4	17.7	20.9	100.0
	India	No.	24	23	39	23	13	122
		%	19.7	18.9	32.0	18.9	10.7	100.0
	Brazil	No.	45	33	59	17	27	181
		%	24.9	18.2	32.6	9.4	14.9	100.0
Total		No.	111	122	211	98	94	636
		%	17.5	19.2	33.2	15.4	14.8	100.0

p < 0.01

core of the NA type, the most typical type of global nomad.

Brazilians has opposite characteristics from the Chinese. They have strong affection toward the home country, and also have the strongest affection toward one settled country, mainly Japan. Thus they compose the core of the diaspora type nomad, namely the DA type.

Indians have strong affection toward India and relatively strong affection toward settled countries with Australia and Japan being the main bodies. Thus, the numbers of DA type and HO type among Indians are roughly the same, and the total of these two types exceeds half. Lastly, Russians show weak affection toward their home country, being second only to Chinese, and on the contrary, they have

Table 12 Plan for 5 to 10 Years by Home Country

		Plan for 5 to 10 years				Total
		Move to Another Country	Continue to Live in Present Country	Go back to Home Country	Other	
Home Country	China	No. 18	129	23	5	175
		% 10.3	73.7	13.1	2.9	100.0
	Russia	No. 23	115	5	15	158
		% 14.6	72.8	3.2	9.5	100.0
	India	No. 8	63	40	11	122
	% 6.6	51.6	32.8	9.0	100.0	
	Brazil	No. 10	79	84	8	181
		% 5.5	43.6	46.4	4.4	100.0
Total		No. 59	386	152	39	636
		% 9.3	60.7	23.9	6.1	100.0

p < 0.01

strong affection toward the settled country mainly the USA. In this way, Russians constitute the core of SO type global nomads.

The previously mentioned results are also reinforced by the “plan for 5 to 10 years” by home country. As shown in Table 12, more than 70% of those who plan to “continue to live in present country” are Chinese or Russians, with slightly more being Chinese. This seems intuitive for Russians, who make up the majority of SO types. But for Chinese, the replies that they plan to live in the present country contradicts the fact that they make up the majority of NA types. As for Brazilians, the choices are roughly equal for present country and home country corresponding to their status as DA type majority. As for Indians, although more than half said they planned to live in the present country, almost one third said they planned to return to India, showing their strong affection to their home country.

Now, let us examine the conditions behind the differences by home countries. Table 13 shows the degree of “influence of the political situation in the home country to migrate” by home country. The share of “very high” and “high” are extremely high for Russians, reaching 47.4%, far exceeding other countries with less than 16%. If we look at “influence of a clear and fair system of law and order in the settled country to migrate” by home country in Table 14, the top spot is also held by Russians. The total of “very high” and “high” reaches 64.6%, or nearly two thirds. Chinese are next, Indians are third and Brazilians are last. Thus, Russians appears to be escaping the political situation in their home country and have sympathy with the societal conditions of settled countries, and as a result, the SO type constitutes the majority.

As for Chinese, it is notable that dissatisfaction towards the settled country is high, in contrast to the result of “plan for 5 to 10 years”. Table 15 shows the replies to the question, “to what extent are you

Table 13 Influence of Political Situation in Home Country on Decision to Migrate by Home Country

		Influence of Political Situation in Home Country					Total
		Very High	High	Moderate	Little	Very Little	
Home Country	China	No. 11	16	26	17	105	175
		% 6.3	9.1	14.9	9.7	60.0	100.0
	Russia	No. 41	34	25	13	45	158
		% 25.9	21.5	15.8	8.2	28.5	100.0
	India	No. 7	5	11	16	83	122
	% 5.7	4.1	9.0	13.1	68.0	100.0	
	Brazil	No. 9	14	13	18	127	181
		% 5.0	7.7	7.2	9.9	70.2	100.0
Total		No. 68	69	75	64	360	636
		% 10.7	10.8	11.8	10.1	56.6	100.0

p < 0.01

Table 14 Influence of Clear and Fair System of Law and Order of Settled Country on Decision to Migrate by Home Country

		Influence of Clear and Fair System of Law and Order of Settled Country on Decision to Migrate					Total
		Very High	High	Moderate	Little	Very Little	
Home Country	China	No. 35	45	38	14	43	175
		% 20.0	25.7	21.7	8.0	24.6	100.0
	Russia	No. 63	39	26	10	20	158
		% 39.9	24.7	16.5	6.3	12.7	100.0
	India	No. 28	26	21	9	38	122
	% 23.0	21.3	17.2	7.4	31.1	100.0	
	Brazil	No. 38	20	39	20	64	181
		% 21.0	11.0	21.5	11.0	35.4	100.0
Total		No. 164	130	124	53	165	636
		% 25.8	20.4	19.5	8.3	25.9	100.0

p < 0.01

satisfied with the equality of work-related opportunities in the settled country?” by home country. The total of satisfied samples, meaning those who answered either “very high” or “high” makes up more than half of Russians and Indians, whereas only slightly more than 40% of Chinese chose these answers. Incidentally, far fewer of the Brazilians expressed satisfaction.

Likewise, Table 16 shows replies to the question, “to what extent are you satisfied with equality in the society/community of the settled country?” by home country. Quite like the “work-related opportunities” question, the total of satisfied samples was more than half among Russians and Indians, whereas it was less common among Chinese and even slightly lower among Brazilians. However,

Table 15 Equality of Work-Related Opprtunities in Settled Country by Home Country

			Equality of Work-Related Opprtunities in Settled Country					Total
			Very High	High	Moderate	Little	Very Little	
Home Country	China	No.	25	47	60	24	19	175
		%	14.3	26.9	34.3	13.7	10.9	100.0
	Russia	No.	44	44	43	22	5	158
		%	27.8	27.8	27.2	13.9	3.2	100.0
	India	No.	30	38	32	16	6	122
		%	24.6	31.1	26.2	13.1	4.9	100.0
	Brazil	No.	30	40	57	24	30	181
		%	16.6	22.1	31.5	13.3	16.6	100.0
Total	No.	129	169	192	86	60	636	
	%	20.3	26.6	30.2	13.5	9.4	100.0	

p < 0.01

Table 16 Equality in the Society/Community of Settled Country by Home Country

			Equality in the Society/Community of Settled Country					Total
			Very High	High	Moderate	Little	Very Little	
Home Country	China	No.	32	52	70	9	12	175
		%	18.3	29.7	40.0	5.1	6.9	100.0
	Russia	No.	48	47	39	16	8	158
		%	30.4	29.7	24.7	10.1	5.1	100.0
	India	No.	27	39	33	18	5	122
		%	22.1	32.0	27.0	14.8	4.1	100.0
	Brazil	No.	22	59	47	30	23	181
		%	12.2	32.6	26.0	16.6	12.7	100.0
Total	No.	129	197	189	73	48	636	
	%	20.3	31.0	29.7	11.5	7.5	100.0	

p < 0.01

the gap is very small compared to Table 15. From these two tables, we can say that the affection of Chinese toward settled countries is weak because of dissatisfaction with the equality in the settled countries. Given that the acceptance system for migrants seems to be matured in the UK and Australia, the low degree of satisfaction with equality in these two main settled countries among Chinese is quite interesting. As was pointed out earlier, most Chinese wish to stay in the settled country, notwithstanding the low satisfaction.

The low degree of satisfaction among Brazilians toward equality in the settled countries seems to reflect poor working conditions and discriminative social circumstances in Japan, the main settled country. Still, we should not forget the fact that Brazilians have strong affection toward the settled

Table 17 To What Extent Possibility of Assisting Home Country's Development Affects Decision to Return to Home Country by Type of Global Nomad by types of Global Nomad

			Degree of Effect					Total
			Very Much	Much	Moderate	Little	Not at All Very Little	
Type of Global Nomad	Double Allegiance	No.	77	69	53	27	33	259
		%	29.7	26.6	20.5	10.4	12.7	100.0
	Settled Country Oriented	No.	15	14	17	16	40	102
		%	14.7	13.7	16.7	15.7	39.2	100.0
	Home Country Oriented	No.	40	27	38	23	20	148
%		27.0	18.2	25.7	15.5	13.5	100.0	
No Allegiance	No.	13	25	35	21	33	127	
	%	10.2	19.7	27.6	16.5	26.0	100.0	
Total	No.	145	135	143	87	126	636	
	%	22.8	13.5	22.5	13.7	19.8	100.0	

p < 0.01

countries including Japan.

4. Possibility of Contributions by Global Nomads to the Development of the Home Countries

Interest in diaspora type-nomads, defined as those moved from the home country to settle in another country but still maintain affection toward the home country, has increased recently from the viewpoint of examining the potential of these people to contribute to the development of the home country^{*8}. They have the potential by either staying in the settled country or returning to the home country. The potential is believed to stem from the ways of thinking and patterns of behavior of these diasporic people, who have experiences living outside their home country, which might stimulate the development of the home country.

Next, I will discuss the potential of contribution to the development of the home countries by type of global nomad. I will look at responses to two questions, namely, "to what extent the possibility of assisting the home country's development affects the decision to return to the home country", and "to what extent the possibility of starting one's own business in the home country affects the decision to return to the home country".

Table 17 shows the effect of the possibility of assisting the home country's development to the decision to return to the home country. The total of "very much" and "much" is highest for the DA types (56.3%), followed by HO types. On the contrary, the SO and NA types have very low totals. In addition, the effect of the possibility of starting one's own business in the home country on the decision

Table 18 To What Extent Possibility of Starting Own Business Affects Decision to Return to Home Country by Type of Global Nomad

			Degree of Effect					Total
			Very Much	Much	Moderate	Little	Not at All Very Little	
Type of Global Nomad	Double Allegiance	No.	88	51	43	14	63	259
		%	34.0	19.7	16.6	5.4	24.3	100.0
	Settled Country Oriented	No.	19	16	20	7	40	102
		%	18.6	15.7	19.6	6.9	39.2	100.0
Home Country Oriented	No.	45	21	31	22	29	148	
	%	30.4	14.2	20.9	14.9	19.6	100.0	
No Allegiance	No.	22	22	32	15	36	127	
	%	17.3	17.3	25.2	11.8	28.3	100.0	
Total		No.	174	110	126	58	168	636
		%	27.3	17.3	19.8	9.1	26.4	100.0

p < 0.01

Table 19 Chinese Business Founders with Experience Studying Abroad (Changzhou City, Jiangsu Province)

Name	Kind of Business	Position	Education	Country Stayed	Year of Return
H. X.	Information Consultant	General Manager	Ph. D.	Japan	2002
Z. C.	Automation Equipment	General Manager	Ph. D.	Japan	2006
P. D.	Software	General Manager	Ph. D.	Netherlands U.S.A.	2008
L. S.	Medical Robotics	General Manager	Ph. D.	Japan	2009

to return to the home country is shown in Table 18. The total of “very much” and “much” is highest for the DA types (53.7%), followed by the HO types, but the SO and NA types have rather low totals, just like in Table 17. In short, the possibility of contributing to the development of the home country most strongly influences decisions among DA types to return, followed by HO types.

The following are the results of an interview survey of Chinese and Russian business founders or managers with high positions, conducted in China and Russia. All respondents were people who had previously studied abroad and returned to their home countries. Table 19 is a list of four business founders surveyed in China. The survey was conducted in Changzhou City, Jiangsu Province, on August 22, 2011, with a group interview method^{*9}. The number of business founders among former students who studied abroad is large in Jiangsu Province, next only to outstanding Beijing and Shanghai. Hence, the area is exceptionally noteworthy in China^{*10}. The surveyed persons were all males ranging in age from their late thirties to early forties.

H. X. came to Japan in 1990, and after getting a Ph. D. worked in enterprise resource planning in a

textile related enterprise in Japan. A senior fellow students from the same graduate school invited him to return to China in 2002, and in Changzhou City he founded an information consultant enterprise providing the know-how for business founding. His first child, a senior high school student, and his wife were in Japan. He himself had spent two years in Japan even after his return to China. His second child, an elementary school student lived in the same city with his grandmother.

Z. C., after getting a Ph.D. in Japan, originally intended to settle in Japan. However, he returned to China in 2006, as he observed the remarkable development of Chinese automobile makers. Firstly, he worked for an enterprise founded with capital assistance from the Chinese government in 2007. In 2008, he founded his present company producing automation equipment. Orders came not only from the domestic market but also from India and Viet Nam. He was considering extending his business to Japan in the future. He was a member of the Association of Engineers Studied in Japan, which has 60 members.

P. D. went to the Netherlands first and got a Ph.D. and acquired Dutch nationality renouncing his Chinese one. He got a job in Silicon Valley in 2000, but lost his job during the economic crisis in 2008. He returned to China in 2008, partly accepting the advice of a Japanese engineer, and found a job in Amoy. Then he founded his present software company in Changzhou City. Although the expectation from the Chinese government was very high, he received no concrete assistance, and outsourcing orders were fewer than those of Beijing or Shanghai.

L. S. got his Ph.D. in Japan in 2008. After one year of work in Tokyo, he returned to China. He founded an enterprise dealing with research and development of medical robots together with a Chinese who had received Ph.D. from Tokyo University. When they founded the company, the Chinese government assisted them with 15 million Chinese yuan. The business situation in Changzhou City is good, although there is lack of highly talented people. The merit of experiences in Japan is not the technology itself but knowledge of business systems and work attitudes.

The main reason for the decision by these individuals to return seems to be the abundance of business chances including assistance from the Chinese government. It enacted policies to encourage people who had studied abroad to found businesses in high-tech industries, and in particular the plan of an “industrial park of businesses founded by people with experience studying abroad” achieved great success^{*11}. The capital assistance Z. C. and L. S. received from the government seems to have been from this plan.

However, permanent settlement in China is not necessarily the norm for returning students from abroad. According to a survey conducted in Beijing in 2000, decisive permanent settlers made up only 44.3% of 551 business founders with experience studying abroad. The others were “overseas Chinese and Chinese descendants with or without Chinese nationality” who had foreign nationalities or permanent residency in foreign countries, including “short-time returners”^{*12}. In this sense, the livelihood bases of H. X., whose wife and a child were in Japan, and of P. D. who had Dutch nationality,

Table 20 Russians with Experience Studying Abroad (Moscow)

Name	Kind of Business	Position	Education	Country Stayed	Year of Return
K. K.	Construction	General Director of Construction Project	MBA	UK	2004
A. P.	Petroleum	Director of Planning and Assets Management	MBA	USA	2002
S. S.	Insurance	General Asset Management	Uncertain	UK	2004
D. G.	Business Consultant	Manager of Strategic Planning	MA	UK	2004

were not in China. In addition, Z. C. still has a relationship with Japan. In a way, this accords with the NA type prevalence among Chinese in our questionnaire survey.

Table 20 is a list of four Russians who had studied abroad, interviewed individually on August 10-11, 2010, in Moscow^{*13}. The interviewees were all males aged in their late thirties or early forties.

K. K. came to London in 2000, and acquired an MBA in 2001. Then he worked in London for a US company doing business and planning development. He returned to Russia in 2004. Now in Moscow, he works as the general director of an architectural engineering project in a medium-sized company. His wife also got an MBA in 2001 in London. Now she works for a US company dealing with executive recruiting. K. K. feels that UK corporations are superior to Russian ones in terms of efficiency, sense of responsibility and communication. In spite of this feeling, he chose to return to Russia because he felt that cultural differences were hampering his carrier development in the UK. He said his wife felt the same.

A. P. did a short internship at a major bank in London, and then he worked in Russia but was unemployed during the 1998 financial crisis. He got the chance to do an MBA in the USA, and acquired it in 2001 from a state university and then worked for several months in New York. He returned to Russia in 2002. He said he thought decision making was faster in Russia than the USA because teamwork is natural in Russia, and competition is not between nationalities but between local professionals in Russia. For these reasons, he returned to Russia, and after two job changes, was hired by TNK BP, one of the largest petroleum companies in Russia. Now he is its Director of Planning and Assets Management.

S. S. worked at a state-owned bank and then a Dutch bank in Russia, but lost his job during the 1998 financial crisis. He decided to leave Russia for the UK. In London, he worked for two global investment banks, JP Morgan and UBS for five years in total. He returned to Russia in 2004, and after working for RosBank, one of the major banks in Russia, he began working in general asset management for an Italian insurance company in 2009. He said he planned to develop his company in Russia in the future. He said he found the management style in Russia to be vertical, while in the UK it was less

Table 21 To What Extent Possibility of Starting Own Business Affects Decision to Return to Home Country By Home Country

			Degree of Effect					Total
			Very Much	Much	Moderate	Little	Not at All Very Little	
Home Country	China	No.	36	33	43	16	47	175
		%	20.6	18.9	24.6	9.1	26.9	100.0
	Russia	No.	36	23	26	26	47	158
		%	22.8	14.6	16.5	16.5	29.7	100.0
	India	No.	46	23	21	8	24	122
		%	37.7	18.9	17.2	6.6	19.7	100.0
	Brazil	No.	56	31	36	8	50	181
		%	30.9	17.1	19.9	4.4	27.6	100.0
Total	No.	174	110	126	58	168	636	
	%	27.3	17.3	19.8	9.1	26.4	100.0	

p < 0.01

direct and more polite. Hence, he said he was trying to apply the British style to his present company. Incidentally, he had dual (Russian-British) citizenship.

D. G. worked in economic research in Warsaw in 1997, and began working for a private business in the USA in 1998. He went to the UK in 2001, and acquired an MA in economics from Oxford University, and then worked at the Oxford Research Institute doing research methodology. After returning to Russia in 2004, he founded two companies in turn. His current business consultancy with 80 employees focuses on understanding small businesses and finding new markets. It cooperate with world famous business consultancies like Bain and McKinsey, and also the food giant Nestley. Thus, it is one of only a few Russian companies that operate based on global standards. His reasons for returning were, firstly that Russia has many opportunities to do business, and secondly problems with getting a work permit in the UK.

These four Russians are exceptional among people with experience studying abroad because they are different from the SO type, which constituted the majority among Russians in the questionnaire survey, as they chose not to stay in the settled country but to return. Two of the interviewees left Russia as they were unemployed in the financial crisis in 1998. The reason cannot be said to be dissatisfaction with the “political situation” in our questionnaire survey. With regards to the decision to return, two pointed out business chances in Russia as well as barriers to career enhancement and getting work permits. In addition, it is interesting to note that their experiences in the UK and USA contributed to the creation of business networks with super-national enterprises in the same area, as well as changes in their ideas and practices of the management administration style in Russia.

Incidentally, Table 21 shows the distribution of “to what extent the possibility of starting one’s own

business affects the decision to return to home country” by home country. The total of “very much” and “much” are, in decreasing order, India, Brazil, Russia, China, with Russia and China being less than average. So we have to note the fact that the eight interviewees are rather the minority among Chinese and Russian highly educated migrants.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the NA type typically seen among Chinese can be said to constitute already deterritorialized global nomads or people with the potential to become so. In this sense, the Chinese tendency toward high spatial mobility including with the home country is worthy of attention. By contrast, the DA type, or diaspora type nomad, and the HO type with their strong territorial inclination, have the possibility to contribute to the development of the home countries. SO types, which are typical among Russians, have a common characteristics with political refugees in a sense, and thus have a territorial inclination in the opposite direction of the HO type.

Additional Remark: This paper was written based on the research results of the project on “Comparative Studies on the New Immigrants from BRIC countries in America, Australia, Japan and the UK”, for the period 2009-2012, funded by a grant-in-aid scientific research, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (principal investigator is Professor Chen Lixing, Kwansai Gakuin University, Japan). I participated in this project as an affiliated researcher. The Japanese translation of this paper had been already published in Igarashi, Yasumasa & Junich, Akashi, eds., *Gurobal Jinzai' o Meguru Seisaku to Genjitsu (Policy and Actuality Concerning 'Global Talent')*, Tokyo: Akashi-Shoten, 2015.

*1 Attali, J., *Une Brève histoire de l'avenir*, Paris: Fayard, 2006, pp.206-213.

*2 Ibid., p.52.

*3 Bauman, Z., *Globalization: The Human Consequences*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988, chap. 4. He uses the word “mobility”, but the term includes the meaning of movements of social statuses as well, so, I added “spatial” here.

*4 Ibid., p.92.

*5 Recently, the word “BRICS countries”, adding South Africa to original Brazil, Russia, India, China, has been used more often. But in this paper, the word “BRIC countries” connoting the original four countries is used.

*6 The survey via internet was conducted through the on-line survey site of the China Comparative Perspective Network affiliated to the London School of Economics, and responses were accepted until October 31, 2012.

*7 As for the definition of “diaspora”, see, Cohen, Robin, *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*, 2nd edition, London and New York: Routledge, 2008, chap. 1.

*8 As for the relationship between diasporas and development, see, Castles, S. & Miller, M. J., *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*, 4th edition, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, sec. 3, chap. 3.

*9 A Chinese acquaintance of a member of our team gathered four interviewees in China including

himself. The interview was conducted at a conference room of Toshiba Transformer factory located in Changzhou City.

*10 The number of businesses founded by people with experience studying abroad in Jiangsu Province in 2003 was a little less than 1,000, following around 5,000 in Beijing and Shanghai, putting it slightly ahead of Guangdong Province. See, Niyou, Tai, *New Migrants and Chinese Economic Development* (in Japanese), Tokyo: Taiga Shuppan, 2012, p.153, Table 9.

*11 Ibid., p.214.

*12 Ibid., p.203 and p.212, note 8.

*13 We were able to find four interviewees in Moscow, via the internet, with the cooperation of the administrator of a mailing list with about 300 Russians who had studied abroad. The interviews were conducted in hotels and coffee shops located in Moscow.