Foreign Retired Migrants in Hungary*

Sándor Illés
Senior Research Fellow
HCSO – Demographic Research Institute
E-mail: illes@demografia.hu

Áron Kincses
Councillor
HCSO
E-mail: aron.kincses@ksh.hu

The paper examines international retirement migration (hereafter IRM) with particular attention to the newly emerging forms. On the basis of IRM statistics on Hungary, we drew up the motivational system of the twelve most important sending countries. Our main aim was to produce research results embedded into the contemporary conceptual framework. We analysed register based comparable data from the Hungarian Central Statistical Office between 1996 and 2008. In the interest of developing a valuable international migration policy in Hungary, we identified seven different motivational types (family oriented, work-driven, return, amenity seeking, crisis-led, ethnic related and higher pension hunting) from which two can be considered as gain generating forms (amenity seeking and return) and one (higher pension hunting) as a less beneficial kind for the receiving country. The paper concludes with recommendations for the Hungarian policy makers to remove legal impediments to the effective way of retirement migration without creating tensions among countries.

KEYWORDS:
International migration.
Retirement.
Migration policy.

* This paper was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The preliminary results of our research were published in the Romanian Review on Political Geography. I am grateful to *Professor Alexandru Ilies* and the anonymous referee of this article for their stimulating comments.

The recent literature "echoes" the multiple motivational system of international elderly migration (*Attias-Donfut–Wolff* [2005], *Oliver* [2007], *Brown–Glasgow* [2008]). We can foretell that all of the relevant sciences could provide a different classification by their own logic (*Ainsaar* [2004]). Moreover, the taxonomy of IRM related to Hungary could be also created from various points of view (*Meyer–Speare* [1985], *Frey–Liaw–Lin* [2000], *Withol de Wenden* [2001]).

Previous studies identified the main causes of IRM and defined some of its types (*Wiseman–Roseman* [1979], *Cribier* [1974], *Warnes* [2002]). In their pioneer study, *Wiseman* and *Roseman* [1979] separated three groups of retirement migration: kinship migration, return to place of origin and looking for amenity. The same reasons were identified in *Cribier*'s [1974] study: family re-unification, return to the area of origin and search for places with high amenity values. *Litwak* and *Longino*'s [1987] development model of later life stressed the role of time. They associated the three successive phases of elderly migration with typical residential requirements and thus, with migration decisions based on special motivations. In the first phase, the early retirement process, the rapid ageing and the wish for a better life (environmental and amenity considerations) prevail. The second takes place when frailty or ill-health begins, which creates a demand for services and support. In this phase the elderly are still – more or less – able to find cheaper residing solutions. The third stage of migration is marked by dependency, when a person is unable to live independently. *Karen O'Reilly*'s [1995] time perspective differed from Litwak and Longino's life course aspect. She underlined the time spent in the areas of origin and destination and proposed a five-fold typology: expatriates, residents, seasonal visitors, returners and tourists. *King*'s [2002] paper added another new factor, namely the crisis related migration (forced and impelled), to the list mentioned previously. Forced migration refers to cases, when individuals involved do not have power to decide. In the case of impelled migration, migrants play some role in the decision making process.

Warnes et al. [2004] presented a specific typology of the welfare position of international elderly migrants in contemporary European context. However, this most recent study was not able to form new types of IRM. *Warnes* ([2002] p. 140.) pointed out that the family oriented, the place-of-origin led, the amenity seeking and the working life related factors were crucial for later life migration. Thus, attention should be given not only to the popular or the maybe most significant types but also to the others for an in-depth understanding of the patterns of elderly migration.

1. Selection of IRM types relevant to Hungary

According to the empirical results of the 2003 survey on the Upper Balaton region (*Illés* [2007]) and the relevant literature highlighted previously, we can distinguish seven different motivation groups fitting into the Hungarian context: family oriented, work-driven, return, amenity seeking, crises-led, ethnic related, and higher pension hunting types. This typology is useful to judge the distinct impacts of each migration form on the country of destination. After classification, we weighted the types and aggregated the core elements of the typologies in a coherent motivational system by which a comprehensive basis was provided for international comparison.

Table 1

Immigrants staying in Hungary
by age group and country of citizenship, 1 January 2008
(person)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
Romania	4 378	53 732	7 726	*65 836*
Ukraine	1 173	13 860	2 256	*17 289*
Germany	436	9 252	4 748	*14 436*
Serbia	1 427	12 988	2 771	*17 186*
Bulgaria	52	631	445	*1 128*
Russia	227	2 073	487	*2 787*
Poland	82	2 184	379	*2 645*
USA	336	1 653	354	*2 343*
Austria	134	1 488	949	*2 571*
Croatia	73	660	119	*852*
Switzerland	15	260	312	*587*
Slovakia	280	4 547	117	*4 944*
Total of the former twelve countries	*8 613*	*103 328*	*20 663*	*132 604*
Rest of Europe	1 295	11 996	2 593	*15 884*
Europe (including Russia)	*9 572*	*113 671*	*22 902*	*146 145*
Rest of the World (including USA)	4 206	23 041	1 305	*28 552*
Total	*13 778*	*136 712*	*24 207*	*174 697*

Source: Demographic Database of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office.

The "*higher pension hunting*" type seems unusual at first, though a great number of retired immigrants from Romania and Ukraine fall into this category. On 1st January 2008, 7 726 international elderly immigrants from Romania, 2 256 later-life immigrants from Ukraine and 487 old people with immigrant status from distant Russia stayed in Hungary. (See Table 1.) In contrast, there were only 117 immigrants of retirement age living in Hungary from neighbouring Slovakia, which has a significant ethnic Hungarian population along the common frontier. The number of Ukrainian and Russian people, who are residents in our country, have doubled and quadrupled since 1996. These are the two countries besides Romania with which Hungary has had valid and functioning bilateral social political agreements deriving from a territorial principle since the early 1960s (*Lukács* [2000]). In the case of these latter states, the amount of the pension is calculated by the pension/social insurance organisation of that country, where the beneficiary's permanent address can be found, adding together the years of service performed in both countries. There is no burden sharing, consequently the state pension is paid only by one of the affected countries. Thus, pensioners from Romania (this possibility ceased on the day of EU accession of Romania (1st January 2007) due to the harmonization of Community legislation), Ukraine and Russia had made a rational decision based upon self-interest when they immigrated to Hungary as the Hungarian regulations granted them higher amounts of pension than they would have or could have got in their country of origin (*Illés* [2006]). In other words, the higher pension was probably a significant motivation factor for them.

Family-connected immigration includes the types of family formation and family reunification, as well as the "closer to the relatives" moves. The most probable reason for the immigration of old persons is their intention to join their families arrived from the East. More specifically, the previously immigrated offsprings proceed to "import" their parents as well, as soon as the period necessary for their minimum degree of integration elapsed. The dominance of the family orientation as a motivation factor is confirmed by the fact, that the share of the sixty-and-over age group by country of origin was very similar to that of children of under fourteen within the total number of immigrants in 2008. (See Table 2.) The relevant proportions for some of the countries are as follows: Romania 31.9 percent, 31.8 percent; Ukraine 9.3 percent, 8.5 percent; Serbia 11.4 percent, 10.4 percent; Russia 2.0 percent, 1.6 percent, and Croatia 0.5 percent, 0.5 percent. Therefore we can conclude that not only the elderlies but also children followed the active immigrants. Although we cannot be sure whether they live together or separately, yet we can talk about family migration.

Table 2

Proportion of immigrants staying in Hungary by country of citizenship and age-group, 1 January 2008
(percent)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
Romania	31.8	39.3	31.9	*37.7*
Ukraine	8.5	10.1	9.3	*9.9*
Germany	3.2	6.8	19.6	*8.3*
Serbia	10.4	9.5	11.4	*9.8*
Bulgaria	0.4	0.5	1.8	*0.6*
Russia	1.6	1.5	2.0	*1.6*
Poland	0.6	1.6	1.6	*1.5*
USA	2.4	1.2	1.5	*1.3*
Austria	1.0	1.1	3.9	*1.5*
Croatia	0.5	0.5	0.5	*0.5*
Switzerland	0.1	0.2	1.3	*0.3*
Slovakia	2.0	3.3	0.5	*2.8*
Total of the former twelve countries	*62.5*	*75.6*	*85.4*	*75.9*
Rest of Europe	9.4	8.8	10.7	*9.1*
Europe (including Russia)	*69.5*	*83.1*	*94.6*	*83.7*
Rest of the World (including USA)	30.5	16.9	5.4	*16.3*
Total	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100..0*	*100.0*

Source: The authors' own calculation.

Table 3

Proportion of immigrants staying in Hungary by country of citizenship and age-group, 1 January 2008
(percent)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
Romania	6.6	81.6	11.7	*100.0*
Ukraine	6.8	80.2	13.0	*100.0*
Germany	3.0	64.1	32.9	*100.0*
Serbia	8.3	75.6	16.1	*100.0*
Bulgaria	4.6	55.9	39.5	*100.0*
Russia	8.1	74.4	17.5	*100.0*
Poland	3.1	82.6	14.3	*100.0*
USA	14.3	70.6	15.1	*100.0*
Austria	5.2	57.9	36.9	*100.0*

(Continued on the next page.)

(Continuation.)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
Croatia	8.6	77.5	14.0	*100.0*
Switzerland	2.6	44.3	53.2	*100.0*
Slovakia	5.7	92.0	2.4	*100.0*
Total of the former twelve countries	*6.5*	*77.9*	*15.6*	*100.0*
Rest of Europe	8.2	75.5	16.3	*100.0*
Europe (including Russia)	*6.5*	*77.8*	*15.7*	*100.0*
Rest of the World (including USA)	14.7	80.7	4.6	*100.0*
Total	*7.9*	*78.3*	*13.9*	*100.0*

Source: The authors' own calculation.

The "Eastern-type" family reunification (parents followed their children) had only low probability in the case of elderly immigrants of German descent. 4 748 immigrants of sixty years or older from Germany, 949 from Austria and 312 from Switzerland stayed in Hungary at the beginning of 2008. (See Table 1.) After calculating the index of dissimilarity or discrepancy of generations (the index of the elderly is divided by the index of the non-elderly) by countries we received about 2.7 for Germans, 3.2 for Austrians, 6.1 for Swiss citizens and 3.5 for Bulgarians. (See Table 4.) These four greatest values reflect that family reunification plays a less important role in these cases. It is probably no coincidence that Germany, Austria and Switzerland are just the three countries with which Hungary signed EU-conform agreements on social security around the turn of the millennium. (The peculiar Bulgarian case is explained hereinafter.) Within their framework, the years of service performed both abroad and in Hungary can be aggregated, and it is also possible to transfer the benefits to the territory of the other contracting party in the case of immigration. The foregoing shows that people arriving from the West have their pensions transferred to our country and intend to own and maintain properties here (*Illés–Michalkó* [2008]). Since their consumption takes place in Hungary and they cover their health and social care expenses from their own resources (*Szőke* [2006]), they obviously generate benefits for the host country. Meanwhile, in the case of people arriving from the East, the cost of the Hungarian pension, the health and social insurance is not certainly counterbalanced by the imported capital, the potential consumption and activity, which serve mainly their own and their relatives' benefits. Thus, this latter situation does not seem nearly as positive as it does in the case of "Western arrivals" from the angle of the utilitarian international migration policy emerging in Hungary.

Table 4

Indices of immigrants staying in Hungary by country of citizenship, 1 January 2008

Country	Index of the elderly	Index of the non-elderly	Index of dissimilarity of generations
Romania	0.753	1.046	0.720
Ukraine	0.837	1.030	0.813
Germany	2.111	0.795	2.655
Serbia	1.035	0.994	1.041
Bulgaria	2.532	0.717	3.530
Russia	1.121	0.978	1.147
Poland	0.920	1.015	0.906
USA	0.970	1.006	0.964
Austria	2.369	0.747	3.170
Croatia	0.896	1.019	0.880
Switzerland	3.411	0.555	6.146
Slovakia	0.152	1.157	0.131
Total of the former twelve countries	*1.000*	*1.000*	*1.000*

Source: The authors' own calculation.

The *work-related* form is typical of the elderly immigrants who formerly carried out economic activity or work in Hungary. The Polish and Bulgarian cases are special because they reflect the inheritance of pre-1988 small-scale labour migration within the socialist block (*Iglicka* [2001]). Besides Polish miners and Bulgarian agricultural workers, Cuban, Vietnamese and Mongolian women also worked in Hungary based on bilateral agreements (*Hárs* [2002]). The number of Polish and Bulgarian elderly immigrants stagnated from the collapse of the former economic system and the economic disintegration of the region. The work-related immigrants could also arrive from Russia because a huge amount of military personnel served in Hungary. It is assumed that the former mixed marriages partly channelled this sort of immigration. (A lot of Hungarian male guest workers were employed in the German Democratic Republic. Similarly to the Russian case, the main motivation factor of intermarriages for many German wives was also immigration. At the same time, the migration of husbands with Hungarian origin could be judged as international return migration.) The proportion of actives was similar to that of the elderly within the reference groups of Polish (1.6 percent, 1.6 percent) and Russian citizens (1.5 percent, 2.0 percent). Bulgarians show an exceptional case because the share of the elderly was remarkably greater than that of the non-elderly at the beginning of 2008 (1.8 percent and 0.5 percent). (See Table 2.) The index score of

dissimilarity of generations, which reflects the deviation from family oriented reasons, is 3.5 for Bulgaria. It is the second highest value behind that of Switzerland (See Table 4.) meaning the weak role of family connected motivations in staying in Hungary. The age structure of Bulgarian immigrants was the second oldest among the twelve countries under examination. Those citizens of Bulgaria, who had formerly performed agricultural activity in Hungary, aged in place and there was no new immigrant flux maintaining their number or rejuvenating their composition (*Mód* [2003]).

Return migration is considered as a counter-flow of previous emigration. In other words, return migration is the end of emigration (*Altamirano* [1995], *Rodríguez–Fernández-Mayoralas–Rojo* [1998], p. 239.). This form is similar to the amenity-seeking type: it is an element of the most simple migration system formation. Recent return migration to Hungary is one of the consequences of extensive emigration with only few labour motivations that began after the Second World War and was caused by the isolation of the Western and Eastern blocks. Hungarians did not move to the West as guest workers (*Hárs* [2002]), and they had no chance to join the guest workers' mass movements in a legal way, either. Thus, our connection to the Western labour migration system was only limited and unidirectional. About 400 000 Hungarians have left the country directly across the iron curtain or indirectly with tourist passport since 1956 (*Hablicsek–Illés* [2007]). As a result of the previous processes, elderly return migration started immediately after the collapse of the socialist political regime. The relatively fast start is a distinguishing feature of this form because the family oriented- and the amenity seeking types started only half a decade later. Return migration from Germany stemmed from several sources. Following the historical logic, its first source was the second generation of ethnic German emigrants who had been forced away from Hungary as a direct consequence of the Second World War (*Czibulka–Heinz–Lakatos* [2004]). An additional source could be those Hungarian emigrants who had left the country after the 1956 Revolution and had been admitted – in the greatest number – to Germany as political refugees. Besides the former ones, 3-4 thousand illegal emigrants as a third source were directed mainly to West Germany every year. Germany was the primary receiving country of the emigration hump from 1988 to 1992 but based on the juvenile age structure of Hungarian emigrants, it is not likely that this last wave would form a fourth source.

Before the Second World War, the United States of America was the main destination country of the emigration flow to the New World. After that, from the sources mentioned in the section on West Germany, a large number of immigrant population with Hungarian background evolved there. It is interesting to note that according to *Warnes*' contribution ([2001] p. 382.) on US retired pension beneficiaries overseas, Hungary as a target area had a high growth rate (12.7%) between 1997 and 1999.

This indicated the intensification of elderly migration to Hungary that is consistent with the Hungarian data. (See Appendix.) According to the most recent Eurostat figures, approximately 86 thousand Hungarian emigrants lived in 30 European countries in 2006. More than three-quarters of them lived in Germany (57%), Austria (19%) and Switzerland (4%), forming a basis for elderly return migration to Hungary.

The *amenity seeking* form dealt with by a great number of studies is a relatively new sort of international retirement migration (*King–Warnes–Williams* [2000], *O'Reilly* [2000], *Williams et al.* [2000], *Casado-Díaz–Kaiser–Warnes* [2004], *Oliver* [2007]). The number of cases belonging to this type has been increasing rapidly since the 1980s and its growth rate is greater than that of other IRM types in the European North-South relation (*Warnes* [2001]). This form can be characterised by high independence of work- and crisis-related reasons and less importance of family-related motivations (*King–Warnes–Williams* [1998] p. 101., 106.). It means return to a country (except for the home countries), where former experiences were gained. Amenity seeking elderly migration is nothing else than environmental preferences and lifestyle-led elderly migration with former tourist experiences gained in the destination area. A high rate of multiple-residence, multiple identity and peripatetic lifestyle is also its common distinguishing feature (*King–Warnes–Williams* [2000]). In this case, migration is not a clearly separate action but an element of the mobility system generated by multiple spatial moves. *King–Warnes–Williams* ([1998] p. 93.) pointed out that IRM is not necessarily the final stage in the migratory life course of individuals since it often involves or stimulates derivative or following migration back to the former residence or somewhere else (*Casado-Díaz–Kaiser–Warnes* [2004] p. 373.). In an inland country like Hungary with dry continental climate and dissimilar history of tourism, it is a difficult problem to conceptualise this new phenomenon investigated usually in warm coastal areas. What factors are attractive? The partial answer is as follows (*Csordás–Juray* [2007], *Michalkó–Lőrincz* [2007], *Rátz–Michalkó* [2008]):

– attractions of Hungary drawing the tourists to Budapest, the overcrowded capital (no),
– Lake Balaton, the second attraction of the country till the end of the 1990s (maybe or already not),
– old and newly created spas (yes),
– cottages close to Lake Balaton or spas (yes),
– cheap farmhouses in remote small villages or on the Great Hungarian Plain (yes),
– green and secure environment, silence, cheap (especially healthcare) services (yes).

The former range of possible attractions was merely identified in accordance with the regional surveys of one of the authors and the relevant literature reviewed previously. We are aware that the explanatory power of the listed factors can not be proved or cancelled entirely on the basis of country-level macro data. However, there are two simple statistical methods giving insight into amenity seeking IRM. The first is the investigation of the change in affluence figures of some selected sending countries. It is combined with searching of over-representation of IRM in the context of the elderly immigrant subpopulation of Hungary. The official data of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office show impressive German and Swiss dynamics since their average annual growth rates were approximately 13.6 and 6.6 respectively, between 1996 and 2008. The volume of Austrian IRM did not increase considerably, while that of American IRM remained stable. As a *second* method, we compared the distribution of the sixty-and-over age group with that of the fourteen-and-below age group by country of origin. (See Table 3.) At the end of the investigation period, a great deal of difference was discovered between these figures (in the advantage of the elderly) in the case of two countries (Austria 36.9 percent and 5.2 percent; Switzerland 53.2 percent and 2.6 percent). The proportion of the elderly with German origin was a little bit lower (32.9 percent for the sixty-and-over age group; 3.0 percent for the fourteen-and-below age group).

Thirdly, it is considered as an assumption that the high index of dissimilarity of generations due to family related reasons reflects the significant role of amenity-seeking moves. Therefore, we suppose that amenity seeking motives play a significant role in Swiss (6.1), Austrian (3.2) and German (2.7) migrants' life and have smaller explanatory power on the immigration of US citizens (1.0).

Crisis-related IRM is the sixth category. It was defined for special situations that are more complex than the classical refugee flows. Such case arose, for example, in the successor states of Yugoslavia during the civil war (*King* [2002] pp. 96–97., *Sirkeci* [2005]).

2. Hypothetical motivational system

In this section we anticipate that the purely one-motif-form of IRM does not exist in reality, and place emphasis again on the interconnectedness of different IRM classes presented previously. We weighted the types by countries and compassed the typologies into a coherent motivational system in order to make international comparison.

An indirect estimation was made to test the relative weight of each type mentioned in the previous chapter on the one hand, and to draw comparison with another research on the other. We constructed a hierarchical motivational system of citizens from the top twelve sending countries (covering more than four-fifths of IRM to Hungary at the beginning of 2008) in which the elderly immigrants staying in Hungary were classified by the most reliable three groups of IRM, assuming that the fourth one, namely the ethnic factor (*Kocsis–Bottlik–Tátrai* [2006]) related to all countries. In other words, the sending countries were categorized according to their firstly, secondly and thirdly dominant retirement migrant types living in Hungary, completed with a constant that is the ethnic Hungarian background. We suppose that though each migration class associates with separable motivations for migration and has different effects on the receiving country, it reflects the main motive of migration or migrants, too. Based on the various impacts of different IRM types, conclusions were drawn in the form of hypotheses on IRM related to Hungary. Table 5 includes the earlier discussed facts and hypotheses in a complex and coherent system.

Table 5

Types of international retirement migration (IRM) in Hungary by citizenship of immigrants

Citizenship	First motive	Second motive	Third motive	Fourth motive
Romanian	family oriented	work related	higher pension hunting	ethnic related
Ukrainian	work related	family oriented	higher pension hunting	ethnic related
German	return	family oriented	amenity seeking	ethnic related
Serb	crisis related	family oriented	work related	ethnic related
Bulgarian	work related	family oriented	return	ethnic related
Russian	work related	higher pension hunting	family oriented	ethnic related
Polish	work related	family oriented	return	ethnic related
US	return	family oriented	amenity seeking	ethnic related
Austrian	return	amenity seeking	family oriented	ethnic related
Croatian	crisis related	family oriented	return	ethnic related
Swiss	return	amenity seeking	family oriented	ethnic related
Slovakian	family oriented	work related	return	ethnic related

Source: The authors' own calculation.

In order to compare our indirect-estimation-based motivational system with other results, we had to quantify the perviously mentioned structure of types by sending countries. Therefore we created weights for each type by citizenship of immigrants.

The weight of the first motivator type was four multiplied by the number of the elderly by citizenship in 2008, the second motivator type was three multiplied by the number of the elderly by citizenship in 2008, the third motivator type was two multiplied by the number of the elderly by citizenship in 2008, and the fourth as a constant motivator type (ethnicity) was one multiplied by the number of the elderly by citizenship in 2008.

Table 6

Relative weights of IRM types by citizenship

Citizenship	First motivator	Second motivator	Third motivator	Fourth motivator
Romanian	family oriented (4)	work related (3)	higher pension hunting (2)	ethnic related (1)
Ukrainian	work related (4)	family oriented (3)	higher pension hunting (2)	ethnic related (1)
German	return (4)	family oriented (3)	amenity seeking (2)	ethnic related (1)
Serb	crisis related (4)	family oriented (3)	work related (2)	ethnic related (1)
Bulgarian	work related (4)	family oriented (3)	return (2)	ethnic related (1)
Russian	work related (4)	higher pension hunting (3)	family oriented (2)	ethnic related (1)
Polish	work related (4)	family oriented (3)	return (2)	ethnic related (1)
US	return (4)	family oriented (3)	amenity seeking (2)	ethnic related (1)
Austrian	return (4)	amenity seeking (3)	family oriented (2)	ethnic related (1)
Croatian	crisis related (4)	family oriented (3)	return (2)	ethnic related (1)
Swiss	return (4)	amenity seeking (3)	family oriented (2)	ethnic related (1)
Slovakian	family oriented (4)	work related (3)	return (2)	ethnic related (1)

Source: The authors' own calculation.

Concerning Table 6, it is supposed firstly that the relative distance of the different types from one another is the same. Secondly, we regarded the effect of the different IMR forms on the absolute number of retirement migrant stocks in 2008 by country of citizenship. (See Table 1.) This is due to the fact that the number of immigrants staying in Hungary depends on four factors. The emigration figures and the changes of status, of which the acquisition of Hungarian citizenship is the most important, decrease the absolute number of the elderly immigrant stock just as the number of deaths of immigrants. The ageing process produces new elderly immigrants (of sixty years and over) in Hungary year by year; in other words, ageing in place (*Attias-Donfut–Tessier–Wolff* [2005]) increases the total number of international elderly migrants. Thirdly, in the absence of reliable statistical data, we do not take into account

the effect of migration units (groups of people who moved together) in which the interrelation of motives between members is more interlaced than among individual migrants.

Hereinafter, Table 6 is extended in a manner that we aggregated the ranked motivators to include also the effect of the country of citizenship. In Table 7 the elements of frequency distribution (X) are multiplied by the weight of motivators (F) by each cell. Results are labelled as weighted frequencies of IRM types. Adding these values together by rows, total (T) column is got as a final result, which is the weighted frequency distribution of IRM types related to Hungary. The result is of standard distribution expressed as a percentage.

Table 7

The motivational system of IRM by types

Types (X)		Motivators (F)				Total (T)	Proportion (percent)
		1. f_1	2. f_2	3. f_3	4. f_4		
Family oriented	x_1	4×7 843=31 372	3×11 072=33 216	2×1 748=3 496	1×0=0	68 084	32.9
Return	x_2	4×6 363=25 452	3×0=0	2×1 060=2 120	1×0=0	27 572	13.3
Work related	x_3	4×3 567=14 268	3×7 843=23 529	2×2 771=5 542	1×0=0	43 339	21.0
Ethnic related	x_4	4×0=0	3×0=0	2×0=0	1×20 663=20 663	20 663	10.0
Amenity seeking	x_5	4×0=0	3×1261=3 783	2×5 102=10 204	1×0=0	13 987	6.8
Crisis related	x_6	4×2 890=11 560	3×0=0	2×0=0	1×0=0	11 560	5.6
Higher pension hunting	x_7	4×0=0	3×487=1 461	2×9 982=19 964	1×0=0	21 425	10.4
Total		*82 652*	*61 989*	*41 326*	*20 663*	*206 630*	*100.0*

Source: The authors' own calculation.

The types are ranked as follows in descending order: family oriented (32.9%), work related (21.0%), return (13.3%), higher pension hunting (10.4%), ethnic related (10.0%), amenity seeking (6.8%), and crisis related (5.6%) ones. Comparing this motivational structure with the reasons of residing in four southern European destinations listed by *King–Warnes–Williams* ([2000] p. 94.), we can offer some remarks on the differences between IRMs to inland with dry continental climate and to coastal areas with Mediterranean climate. The role of family related links was significantly higher in inland (32.9%) than in coastal areas (7.5%). The same can be observed in the case of work- or business related reasons (21.0 percent and 3.3 percent). However, the amenity related motivators such as climate, environment, peaceful life, health, lower living costs, social advantages (the presence of the national community

and friends, lively social life, opportunity for relatives to visit, friendly local population) and admiration of the destination country had overwhelmingly higher proportion in the British retirement migration to the Mediterranean than in the elderly immigration to Hungary (76.9 percent and 6.8 percent). Ethnic related sub-reasons were also found among the factors of social (the presence of the British community) and practical advantages (English is widely spoken) in the Mediterranean survey. All in all, a total of 5 percent was received for ethnic related motives, which is the half of the relevant Hungarian figure derived from the constant (10%).

Walters' article ([2000] p. 149.) provides a subsequent opportunity for comparison. He investigated three types of later-life migration within the United States between 1985 and 1990. The amenity migrants, as first type, constituted 46 percent of all the retired inner movers, which were characterised by residential and economic independence with a distinctive spatial pattern of immigration. The residentially and economically dependent assistance migrants were the second type with 28 percent. They can be described by the combined effects of low income and widowhood. Many of them lived with their adult children or in low-cost accommodations. The last type consisted of severely disabled migrants without spouse, admitted to nursing homes or other institutions. This group amounted to 26 percent of all retired migrants.

Based on these three independent researches, it can be concluded that the disability-led elderly migration flows did not cross the international borders. In researches conducted not only on attractive environmental areas but also on the country as a whole, the share of assistance migrants with family orientation reached the one-quarter of all elderly migrants. In Hungary, 6.8 percent of the elderly immigrants had amenity seeking motives. The relevant US value was 46 percent, which is still lower than the earlier-mentioned proportion of British retirement migration to the Mediterranean region (76.9%). *Rodríguez–Fernández-Mayoralas–Rojo* ([1998] p. 189.) reported the highest share in their study on European retirees on the Costa del Sol, one of the most popular resorts of IRM in Spain.

In this section of the paper, we highlighted the significant structural and motivational differences between the inland- (*Kulcsar–Bolender–Brown* [2008]) and coastal later life migration. We can assume that elderly migration to Lake Balaton is semi-costal. The high proportion of family oriented, work related and return motivational types characterised the Hungarian situation. Additionally, we also identified two peculiar, namely the crisis related and the pension hunting motives. These processes reflect the otherness of IRM to Hungary (*Williams–Baláz* [1999], *Kovács* [2000], *Nemes Nagy* [2002], *Kuus* [2004]) in comparison with British IRM to the Mediterranean region. However, the system of motivations has complex features, and not only the macro factors (*Nell* [2004]) but also the human agents (*Ley* [2004]) played important roles in both cases.

3. Conclusions

IRM is an emerging phenomenon of the second half of the twentieth century. We analysed the heterogeneous mass of international elderly migrants from demographic, spatial, historical and legal points of view and divided the IRM into the following seven motivational types: family oriented, return, work-driven, amenity seeking, higher pension hunting, crises-led, and ethnic-related ones. We created a motivational system of the twelve most important sending countries using an indirect estimation method. The system of types of IRM based on empirical materials was a cognitive construction, in fact. The elements of this extremely flexible system (sending countries, types, weights) could be modified in accordance with the specific research aims. It takes into account a number of sending countries from which trustworthy information can be gained and also several migration types relevant for the receiving country. The absolute number of weights depends on the number of types investigated, but their values are changed as the researcher wishes. The method can be extended to the other stages of the life course (for instance childhood, students, active earners), too. Moreover, there is no doubt that the method is suitable for investigating all age brackets covered by this research. As a result, the paper provides a method applicable, in particular, to comparative studies. Our primary aim was to examine the Hungarian patterns of IRM, and the results were embedded into the international research context.

The results showed high significance of the family oriented, work driven and return types; in contrast to this, the amenity seeking type played a smaller part in the motivational system of IRM to Hungary than in that of British IRM to the Mediterranean region. *Walters* [2000] distinguished three different types of elderly migrants within the United States. *King–Warnes–Williams*' [2000] primary motives covered five types in the Mediterranean region. In addition to them, we identified two new sorts of IRM, namely the crisis-led and the higher pension hunting types. It is very likely that the number of international elderly migrants is more than its internal counterpart. This statement seems valid as opposed to the previously cited researches of international scope since they did not address clearly the case of disabled migrants without spouse flowed to nursing homes or other institutions. However, the socially integrated Europe, the different price levels of full board in institutions and those of burials will increase the chance of the international movement of severely disabled persons.

The paper discusses a peculiar Hungarian kind of IRM, namely the higher pension hunting type. This sort of migration has high policy relevance, since a further increase in the number of higher pension hunting immigrants is in no way desirable within the present legal regulatory framework. If this phenomenon continues on a large scale, it will necessitate interference with the spontaneous processes. We pro-

pose that the Hungarian body launch international negotiations with Ukraine and Russia and make a decision on conversion from the old, territorial-principle-based social political agreements into new ones with share burdening. The best way of resolving the problem would be to conclude bilateral agreements (*Warnes* [2002], *Rédei* [2007]) except for countries accessed to the European Union (for instance Romania). Our general message addressed to policymakers is as follows: it is important to treat the various matters in a differentiated manner depending on the types of elderly immigrants.

Appendix I

We can foretell that the idea of methodological steps applied in the paper was compiled from the general table method of demography within which life table computation is most widely used, especially in the analyses of mortality. In the following, we draft the method applied for turning the data of Table 3 into accurate mathematical formulas step by step.

X matrix means the elements of the types of International Retirement Migration (IRM).

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & x_{13} & x_{14} \\ x_{21} & .. & .. & .. \\ .. & & & .. \\ .. & & & .. \\ & & & .. \\ .. & .. & .. & .. \\ x_{71} & x_{72} & x_{73} & x_{74} \end{pmatrix}.$$

F matrix signifies the weights of motivators multiplied by the absolute numbers of those retirement migrants (60–X) of each country who were staying in Hungary at the beginning of 2008.

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \\ f_3 \\ f_4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

T matrix (Total column) marks the sum of the rows and it equals to *X* matrix multiplied by *F* matrix.

$$T = X \cdot F = \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & x_{13} & x_{14} \\ x_{21} & .. & .. & .. \\ .. & & & .. \\ .. & & & .. \\ & & & .. \\ .. & .. & .. & .. \\ x_{71} & x_{72} & x_{73} & x_{74} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \\ f_3 \\ f_4 \end{pmatrix} =$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{1i} \cdot f_i \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{2i} \cdot f_i \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{3i} \cdot f_i \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{4i} \cdot f_i \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{5i} \cdot f_i \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{6i} \cdot f_i \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{7i} \cdot f_i \right)$$

Last column *D* indicates the proportion of the sum of the rows (*T*). In other words *D* matrix means *X* matrix weighted by *F* matrix. This is equal to the distribution of *T* matrix.

$$D = \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{1i} \cdot f_i}{\sum_{k=1}^{7} \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{ki} \cdot f_i} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{2i} \cdot f_i}{\sum_{k=1}^{7} \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{ki} \cdot f_i} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{3i} \cdot f_i}{\sum_{k=1}^{7} \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{ki} \cdot f_i} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{4i} \cdot f_i}{\sum_{k=1}^{7} \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{ki} \cdot f_i} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{5i} \cdot f_i}{\sum_{k=1}^{7} \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{ki} \cdot f_i} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{6i} \cdot f_i}{\sum_{k=1}^{7} \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{ki} \cdot f_i} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{7i} \cdot f_i}{\sum_{k=1}^{7} \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{ki} \cdot f_i} \right)$$

Appendix II

Table A 1

Immigrant foreign citizens by age group and country of origin, 1996–1999
(person)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
Romania	1 838	16 813	2 838	*21 489*
Ukraine	1 007	5 151	844	*7 002*
Germany	162	2 117	438	*2 717*
Serbia	834	4 127	725	*5 686*
Bulgaria	40	202	31	*273*
Russia	256	1 415	152	*1 823*
Poland	29	591	14	*634*
USA	265	1 461	95	*1 821*
Austria	49	482	53	*584*

(Continued on the next page.)

(Continuation.)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
Croatia	120	608	100	*828*
Switzerland	15	165	51	*231*
Slovakia	190	1 322	30	*1 542*
Total of the former twelve countries	*4 805*	*34 454*	*5 371*	*44 630*
Rest of Europe	1 076	4 524	260	*5 860*
Europe (including Russia)	*5 116*	*37 759*	*5 427*	*48 302*
Rest of the World (inlcuding USA)	1 653	12 489	776	*14 918*
Total	*6 769*	*50 248*	*6 203*	*63 220*

Source: Here and hereinafter the Demographic Database of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office.

Table A 2

Immigrant foreign citizens by age group and country of origin, 2000–2003
(person)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
Romania	2 922	33 837	2 689	39 448
Ukraine	847	8 172	637	9 656
Germany	180	1 665	422	2 267
Serbia	447	3 140	364	3 951
Bulgaria	26	186	11	223
Russia	144	921	126	1 191
Poland	29	278	8	315
USA	270	1 411	130	1 811
Austria	37	354	66	457
Croatia	34	308	44	386
Switzerland	24	172	50	246
Slovakia	103	2 307	32	2 442
Total of the former twelve countries	*5 063*	*52 751*	*4 579*	*62 393*
Rest of Europe	820	4814	229	5863
Europe (including Russia)	*5 613*	*56 154*	*4 678*	*66 445*
Rest of the World (inlcuding USA)	1 586	9 171	627	11 384
Total	*7 199*	*65 325*	*5 305*	*77 829*

Table A 3

Immigrant foreign citizens by age-group and country of origin, 2004–2007
(person)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
Romania	2 796	32 891	2 841	38 528
Ukraine	863	10 892	756	12 511
Germany	379	4 019	1 784	6 182
Serbia	511	5 532	795	6 838
Bulgaria	31	211	20	262
Russia	132	840	100	1 072
Poland	39	416	16	471
USA	297	1 427	141	1 865
Austria	184	1 077	336	1 597
Croatia	33	239	25	297
Switzerland	24	144	57	225
Slovakia	231	2 737	143	3 111
Total of the former twelve countries	*5 520*	*60 425*	*7 014*	*72 959*
Rest of Europe	790	5 702	523	7 015
Europe (including Russia)	*6 013*	*64 700*	*7 396*	*78 109*
Rest of the World (including USA)	2 324	13 852	801	16 977
Total	*8 337*	*78 552*	*8 197*	*95 086*

Table A 4

Immigrant foreign citizens by age-group and country of origin, 1996–2007
(person)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
Romania	7 556	83 541	8 368	99 465
Ukraine	2 717	24 215	2 237	29 169
Germany	721	7 801	2 644	11 166
Serbia	1 792	12 799	1 884	16 475
Bulgaria	97	599	62	758
Russia	532	3 176	378	4 086
Poland	97	1 285	38	1 420

(Continued on the next page.)

(Continuation.)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
USA	832	4 299	366	5 497
Austria	270	1 913	455	2 638
Croatia	187	1 155	169	1 511
Switzerland	63	481	158	702
Slovakia	524	6 366	205	7 095
Total of the former twelve countries	*15 388*	*147 630*	*16 964*	*179 982*
Rest of Europe	2 186	15 282	903	*18 371*
Europe (including Russia)	*16 742*	*158 613*	*17 501*	*192 856*
Rest of the World (including USA)	5 563	35 512	2 204	43 279
Total	*22 305*	*194 125*	*19 705*	*236 135*

Table A 5

Immigrants staying in Hungary by age-group and country of citizenship, 1 January 1996
(person)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
Romania	7 760	54 095	3 850	65 705
Ukraine	617	3 341	474	4 432
Germany	142	2 596	349	3 087
Serbia	2 592	12 195	705	15 492
Bulgaria	49	1 105	466	1 620
Russia	98	957	69	1 124
Poland	229	4 037	255	4 521
USA	66	1 658	284	2 008
Austria	11	555	128	694
Croatia	59	441	32	532
Switzerland	13	151	47	211
Slovakia	51	425	14	490
Total of the former twelve countries	*11 687*	*81 556*	*6 673*	*99 916*
Rest of Europe	1 489	20 679	2 345	24 513
Europe (including Russia)	*13 110*	*100 577*	*8 734*	*122 421*
Rest of the World (including USA)	645	16 167	721	17 533
Total	*13 755*	*116 744*	*9 455*	*139 954*

Table A 6

Immigrants staying in Hungary by age-group and country of citizenship, 1 January 2000
(person)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
Romania	5 448	45 654	6 241	57 343
Ukraine	1 405	8 083	1 528	11 016
Germany	297	8 314	1 020	9 631
Serbia	1 569	8 457	917	10 943
Bulgaria	71	1 001	427	1 499
Russia	316	2 436	250	3 002
Poland	146	3 647	351	4 144
USA	279	2 626	356	3 261
Austria	72	801	180	1 053
Croatia	157	915	90	1 162
Switzerland	23	267	132	422
Slovakia	99	1 577	41	1 717
Total of the former twelve countries	*9 882*	*83 778*	*11 533*	*105 193*
Rest of Europe	1 244	20 005	2 603	*23 852*
Europe (including Russia)	*10 847*	*101 157*	*13 780*	*125 784*
Rest of the World (including USA)	2 112	24 075	1 154	27 341
Total	*12 959*	*125 232*	*14 934*	*153 125*

Table A 7

Immigrants staying in Hungary by age-group and country of citizenship, 1 January 2004
(person)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
Romania	4 771	43 693	7 212	55 676
Ukraine	1 273	9 903	1 920	13 096
Germany	206	5 845	1 342	7 393
Serbia	1 479	9 501	1 387	12 367
Bulgaria	49	679	390	1 118
Russia	258	1 700	286	2 244
Poland	71	1 882	243	2 196

(Continued on the next page.)

(Continuation.)

Country	Age group			
	0–14	15–59	60–X	*Total*
USA	271	1 195	237	1 703
Austria	59	504	217	780
Croatia	160	629	113	902
Switzerland	35	232	176	443
Slovakia	100	2 325	47	2 472
Total of the former twelve countries	*8 732*	*78 088*	*13 570*	*100 390*
Rest of Europe	800	9 747	1 681	12 228
Europe (including Russia)	*9 261*	*86 640*	*15 014*	*110 915*
Rest of the World (including USA)	2 927	15 453	814	19 194
Total	*12 188*	*102 093*	*15 828*	*130 109*

References

AINSAAR, M. [2004]: *Reasons for Move: A Study on Trends and Reasons of Internal Migration with Particular Interest in Estonia 1989–2000*. Turku University. Turku.

ATTIAS-DONFUT, C. – TESSIER, P. – WOLFF, F.-C. [2005]: Immigrants at Retirement. *Retraite et Société*. No. 44. (Best of 2005) pp. 6–39.

ATTIAS-DONFUT, C. – WOLFF, F.-C. [2005]: Transmigration and Life Choices at Retirement. *Retraite et Société*. No. 44. (Best of 2005) pp. 41–67.

ALTAMIRANO, A. T. [1995]: Return Migration on the Policy Agenda in Sweden. *Applied Geography.* Vol. 15. No. 2. pp. 267–278.

BROWN, D. L. – GLASGOW, N. [2008]: *Rural Retirement Migration*. Springer. New York.

CASADO-DIAZ, M. A. – KAISER, C. – WARNES, A. M. [2004]: Northern European Retired Residents in Nine Southern European Areas: Characteristics, Motivations and Adjustment. *Ageing and Society.* Vol. 24. No. 2. pp. 353–381.

CRIBIER, F. [1974]: Retirement Migration in France. In: *Kosinski, L. A. – Prothero, R. M.* (eds.): *People on the Move*. Matheum. London. pp. 361–363.

CZIBULKA, Z. – HEINZ, E. – LAKATOS, M. [2004]: *A magyarországi németek kitelepítése és az 1941. évi népszámlálás.* KSH. Budapest.

CSORDÁS, L. – JURAY, T. [2007]: A második otthonok mint térformáló tényezők. *Földrajzi Közlemények*. Vol. 131. No. 3. pp. 187–201.

FREY, W. H. – LIAW, K. L. – LIN, G. [2000]: State Magnets for Different Elderly Migrant Types in the United States. *International Journal of Population Geography.* Vol. 6. No. 1. pp. 21–44.

HABLICSEK, L. – ILLÉS, S. [2007]: 1956-os kivándorlás népességi hatásai. *Statisztikai Szemle*. Vol. 85. No. 2. pp. 157–172.

HÁRS, Á. [2002]: Channelling and Filtering Migration: Hungary's Bilateral Labour Migration Agreements. *International Journal of Population Geography.* Vol. 8. No. 2. pp. 165–182.

IGLICKA, K. [2001]: *Poland's Post-War Dynamic of Migration.* Ashgate. Aldershot.

ILLÉS, S. [2006]: Indirect Estimation on the Types of International Elderly Migration in Hungary. *Romanian Review on Political Geography.* Vol. 8. No. 1. pp. 55–63.

ILLÉS, S. [2007]: Polgármesteri szemmel a turizmusról és migrációról. *Comitatus.* Vol. 17. No. 10. pp. 50–66.

ILLÉS, S. – MICHALKÓ, G. [2008]: Relationships between International Tourism and Migration in Hungary: Tourism Flows and Foreign Property Ownership. *Tourism Geographies.* Vol. 10. No. 1. pp. 98–118.

KING, R. – WARNES, A. M. – WILLIAMS, A. M. [1998]: International Retirement Migration in Europe. *International Journal of Population Geography.* Vol. 4. No. 1. pp. 91–111.

KING, R. – WARNES, A. M. – WILLIAMS, A. M. [2000]: *Sunset Lives: British Retirement Migration to the Mediterranean.* Oxford. Berg.

KING, R. [2002]: Towards a New Map of European Migration. *International Journal of Population Geography.* Vol. 8. No. 1. pp. 89–106.

KOCSIS, K. – BOTTLIK, ZS. – TÁTRAI, P. [2006]: *Etnikai térfolyamatok a Kárpát-medence határainkon túli régióiban, 1989–2002*. MTA Földrajztudományi Kutatóintézet. Budapest.

KOVÁCS, Z. [2000]: Hungary at the Threshold of the New Millennium: The Human Geography of Transition. In: *Kovács, Z.* (ed.) *Hungary Towards the 21st Century – The Human Geography of Transition.* Geographical Research Institute of HAS. Budapest. pp. 11–27.

KULCSAR, L. J. – BOLENDER, B. C. – BROWN, D. L. [2008]: The Formation and Development of Rural Retirement Destinations. In: *Brown, D. L. – Glasgow, N.* (eds.): *Rural Retirement Migration.* Springer. New York. pp. 55–89.

KUUS, M. [2004]: Europe's Eastern Expansion and Reinscription of Otherness in East-Central Europe, *Progress in Human Geography.* Vol. 24. No. 3. pp. 472–489.

LEY, D. [2004]: Transnational Spaces and Everyday Lives. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers.* Vol. 29. No. 2. pp. 152–164.

LITWAK, E. – LONGINO, C. F. [1987]: Migration Patterns among the Elderly: Developmental Perspective. *Gerontologist.* Vol. 27. No. 2. pp. 266–272.

LUKÁCS, É. [2000]: Wanderbewegungen als Folgen eines Beitrittes der MOE-Länder – die Sicht Ungarns. In: *Hrbek, R.* (ed.) *Die Osterweiterung der Europäischen Union.* Europäisches Zentrum für Föderalismus-Forschung. Tübingen. pp. 68–86.

MEYER, J. W. – SPEARE, A. [1985]: Distinctive Elderly Mobility: Types and Determinants. *Economic Geography.* Vol. 61. No. 1. pp. 79–88.

MICHALKÓ, G. – LŐRINCZ, K. [2007]: A turizmus és az életminőség kapcsolatának nagyvárosi vetületei Magyarországon. *Földrajzi Közlemények*. Vol. 131. No. 3. pp. 157–169.

MÓD, L. [2003]: Bolgár kertészek Szentes környékén. *Alföldi tanulmányok.* 19. pp. 110–117.

NELL, L. M. [2004]: Conceptualising the Emergence of Immigrants Transnational Communities. *Migration Letters.* Vol. 1. No. 1. pp. 50–56.

NEMES NAGY, J. [2002]: Spatial Gravity Centres of the Dynamics and the Crisis in Hungary. *Hungarian Statistical Review.* Special Number 7. pp. 75–85.

OLIVER, C. [2007]: *Retirement Migration: Paradoxes of Ageing*. Routledge. London.

O'REILLY, K. [1995]: A New Trend in European Migration: A Contemporary British Migration to Fuengirola. Costa del Sol. *Geographical Viewpoint.* Vol. 23. No. 4. pp. 25–36.

O'REILLY, K. [2000]: *The British in the Costa Del Sol*. Routledge. London.

RÁTZ, T. – MICHALKÓ, G. [2008]: A Balaton turisztikai miliője: a magyar tenger sajátos atmoszférájának turizmusorientált vizsgálata. *Turizmus Bulletin*. Vol. 11. No. 4. pp. 13–19.

RÉDEI, M. [2007]: *Mozgásban a világ. A nemzetközi migráció földrajza.* ELTE Eötvös Kiadó. Budapest.

RODRÍGUEZ, V. – FERNÁNDEZ-MAYORALAS, G. – ROJO, F. [1998]: European Retirees on the Costa del Sol: A Cross National Comparison. *International Journal of Population Geography*. Vol. 4. No. 2. pp. 183–200.

SIRKECI, I. [2005]: Conflict and International Migration: Iraqi Turkmen in Turkey. In: *Iontsev, V.* (ed.) *International Migration Trends*. MAX Press. Moscow. pp. 193–201.

SZŐKE, A. [2006]: New Forms of Mobility Among Western European Retirees: German Migrants in South-West Hungary. In: *Szczepaniková, A. – Canek, M. – Gril, J.* (eds.) *Migration Processes in Central and Eastern Europe: Unpacking the Diversity*. Multicultural Center. Prague. pp. 42–45.

WALTERS, W. H. [2000]: Types and Patterns of Later-life Migration. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*. Vol. 82. No. 3. pp. 129–147.

WARNES, A. M. [2001]: The International Dispersal of Pensioners of Affluent Countries. *International Journal of Population Geography.* Vol. 7. No. 3. pp. 373–388.

WARNES, A. M. [2002]: The Challenge of Intra-Union and In-Migration to "Social Europe". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies.* Vol. 28. No. 2. pp. 135–152.

WARNES, A. M. ET AL. [2004]: The Diversity and Welfare of Older Migrants in Europe. *Ageing and Society.* Vol. 24. No. 2. pp. 307–324.

WILLIAMS, A. M. – BALÁZ, V. [1999]: Transformation and Division in Central Europe. In: *Hudson, R. – Williams, A. M.* (eds): *Divided Europe*. Sage. London. pp. 162–185.

WILLIAMS, A. M. ET AL. [2000]: Tourism and International Retirement Migration: New Forms and Old Relationship in Southern Europe. *Tourism Geographies.* Vol. 2. No. 1. pp. 28–49.

WISEMAN, R. F. – ROSEMAN, C. C. [1979]: A Typology of Elderly Migration Based on the Decision Making Process. *Economic Geography.* Vol. 55. No. 2. pp. 324–337.

WITHOL DE WENDEN, C. [2001]: Un essai de typologie des nouvelles mobilités. *Hommes et Migrations*. No. 1233. pp. 5–12.