Developing future scenarios of demographic, migratory and labour market processes in Slovenia:

Foresight findings

Kristina TOPLAK, Mojca VAH JEVŠNIK

ZRC SAZU

Borut JURIŠIĆ, Sabina ŠNEIDER, Amna POTOČNIK

MDA

2014

Information for reproducing excerpts from this report can be found at www.seemig.eu. Inquiries can also be directed to: Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of the Sciences and Arts, Novi trg 2, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia or by contacting ktoplak@zrc-sazu.si

Suggested citation: TOPLAK, Kristina - VAH JEVŠNIK, Mojca - JURIŠIĆ, Borut - ŠNEIDER, Sabina – POTOČNIK, Amna (2014): *Developing future scenarios of demographic, migratory and labour market processes in Slovenia: Foresight findings.* Foresight report developed within the project 'SEEMIG Managing Migration and Its Effects – Transnational Actions Towards Evidence Based Strategies'.

http://www.seemig.eu/downloads/outputs/SEEMIGForesightReportSlovenia.pdf

Executive Summary

A foresight exercise was carried out within the framework of the SEEMIG project in December 2013. Using input from various stakeholder groups (experts, decision makers and migrants/civil society representatives), and through the participant method of foresight, its aim was to discuss and develop common future scenarios in relation to migration and the labour market in Slovenia up to 2025. Each group was invited to a separate session where they brainstormed about the key factors (drivers) which would, in their opinion, most influence their country's future.

The economic situation was considered to be one of the key factors in all three groups, although in the group of migrants/civil society representatives it was more latently identified than in the other two groups, by referral only to labour market participation and (un)employment. All of the groups also had in common the perception of the importance of migration policy, but to varying degrees. The group of experts considered policy to be less important than the economy, climate-change related disasters and the unfavourable demographic situation, while the migrants/civil society representatives considered migration policy to be the key determinant of future developments. In contrast to the group of experts and decision makers, the migrants/civil society representatives also considered social integration and the creation of a multicultural society to be important drivers.

Through a set of workshops, a matrix of binary opposing future scenarios (positive and negative) was developed, using the five most important drivers selected and agreed upon by all participants: economic development, climate change, migration (and other state) policies, and demographic situation. The participants were also asked to place a specific person, i.e. a hero, with either positive or negative characteristics in the developed scenario.

According to the positive scenario, the steady inflow of immigrants due to favourable economic conditions would have a positive impact, since immigrants could fill the gaps in the Slovenian labour market. Immigrants would continue to come due to positive economic growth in the coming years. The current brain drain would be regulated with a set of policy measures, although the outflow would not stop. But the linkage between emigrants and Slovenia would be stronger. The structure of the immigrants coming to Slovenia was not specified. The consequences of increased immigration flow would be mainly on demographics, as the population of Slovenia would grow by 50%. The final positive consequence of immigration would be a richer, diverse, more numerous and therefore stronger society with a higher standard of wellbeing in 2025.

The negative scenario predicts an economic decline in Slovenia, increased unemployment rates and an increase in emigration of the educated population. Slovenia would still be a destination country, but mainly for low-skilled migrants from the global South. The decrease in social spending and subsequently the need to provide means of survival independent of the state and the market would force people to increasingly engage in agricultural activities with the aim of becoming self-sufficient in food and other resources. Local weather-related disasters (floods etc.) would trigger internal migration. The role of the state would be overridden by strong market dynamics and centralization of policymaking at the EU level. European directives would become increasingly binding and Slovenian government officials and policymakers would become merely executors of policies developed at the EU level. In the case of migration management, the inefficiency of the state would be reflected in uncontrolled functioning of migrant recruitment and employment agencies. The ageing of the population and increased emigration rates would result in depopulation and social deterioration. Care for the elderly would become a pressing need and a high priority, but although demand for migrant care workers would be high, people would not be able to afford to employ them. As a result, immigration of care workers to Slovenia would be barely existent.

The policy implications and recommendations that were identified in both the negative and the positive scenario include improvements of migration policies, especially in terms of developing mechanisms to limit brain drain, introducing mechanisms that enable successful return and re-

integration of Slovenian emigrants, and encouraging integration of immigrants, whereas development of anti-discrimination measures, benefits for young families, improvement of the elderly care system and strengthening of national policy in relation to the EU were scenario-specific.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of a foresight exercise carried out as a part of the SEEMIG project in Slovenia in December 2013. The aim of the exercise was to identify the main drivers that might influence the future in relation to migration and the labour market in Slovenia. The second step was to develop scenarios of a plausible future. In the framework of SEEMIG the foresight scenarios are an excellent complementary approach to other project outcomes and are at the same time applied as a preparation for the future.

1.1. The foresight method

Foresight is a qualitative approach which is intended to make sense of the future perceptions, expectations and fears of citizens. Its activities are designed to address critical questions which might significantly shape the future in the coming years. Although the name implies differently, the foresight exercise provides "mental maps of possible futures, but not as alternative predictions" (CEEHPN 2012, p. 4). In other words, it offers scenarios of alternative futures which might, but also might not happen. The benefits of foresight exercises for policymaking are significant. By creating mental maps of future (CEEHPN 2012) and discussing possible scenarios outside the box, foresight reinforces thinking about future steps to be taken should a specific scenario become a reality.

Within the framework of SEEMIG, foresight is a complementary approach to historical analysis, online surveys and population projections, which are some of the important project outputs. It brings together three stakeholder groups: experts, decision makers and migrants/civil society representatives, to discuss and develop common future scenarios in relation to migration and the labour market in their countries. The scenarios, interlinked with the historical, statistical and mathematical analyses, can significantly contribute to capacity building and the development of evidence-based strategies. (Toth 2013)

In Slovenia, foresight methodology was generally introduced in the early 2000s (Komac 2000), while the first technological foresight exercise was conducted as early as 1995 (Kos 1997). Researchers at the Institute for Economic Research have explored technological foresight more broadly (Stanovnik, Kos 2005), while researchers in the social sciences and humanities were less oriented towards the future and have more often opted for other, similar approaches to gathering data about the development of social processes (i.e. the Delphi method).

With regard to the history of conducting foresight exercises in Slovenia it is worth mentioning the Bled Forum on Europe, an international think-thank that promotes knowledge-based governance, the use of future studies and foresight in policymaking. The Bled Forum on Europe has held annual conferences since 1996, and from 2007 on they have had the character of foresight conferences, where professionals from the field of foresight studies present and discuss a wide array of topics from the future perspective. The main issues for the Bled forum are contemporary global challenges that will influence the future. (Bled Forum 2012)

1.2. Main findings of the SEEMIG foresight exercise

The foresight exercise developed two scenarios which were elaborated around the following key drivers: economic development, climate change, migration (and other state) policies and demographic situation. After developing two opposite scenarios, a positive and a negative, two different personal stories were further developed.

The scenarios and personal stories reveal that the most significant threat in relation to the labour market and migration is that of economic decline, which would result in a rise in unemployment

rates and increased emigration of educated and skilled individuals. The significant impact of economic decline would be reflected in difficulties in sustaining the welfare system, with negative implications for the medical and care sector, pension sustainability and social protection schemes. The unfavourable demographic situation with low birth rates and a significant rise in the numbers of the elderly was also recognised as a pressing issue with long-term negative consequences that needs attention from decision makers.

Policy recommendations arising in view of the identified socio-economic and demographic challenges include improvements of migration policies, especially in terms of developing mechanisms to limit brain drain and introducing mechanisms that enable the successful return and re-integration of Slovenian emigrants. Decision makers should also promptly react to the possible collapse of the pension and healthcare system by anticipating far-reaching consequences. To keep the birth rate high, various benefits should be provided for young families, including financial assistance and housing benefits. Apart from the threat of economic decline, the centralisation of decision making at the EU level was perceived negatively, as it could potentially lead to the ineffectiveness of national policymaking. The local (national) context should be strongly considered and policies should be developed, not just executed, by Slovenian public officials.

1.3. Structure of the report

The report is divided into five chapters. Following the introduction, the country context is described, focusing on the political and socio-economic situation and international migration dynamics in Slovenia (Chapter 2). Methodology and a description of the implementation of the foresight exercise are presented in Chapter 3, explaining when, where and how the four workshops were organized, who the participants were, how the obtained material was analyzed and which problems and difficulties were encountered. The results of the foresight exercise are presented in Chapter 4, which includes a description and comparison of the key drivers of migration as identified by the three groups of participants: migrants/civil society representatives, experts and decision makers, as well as the matrix of the binary opposing scenarios. The report concludes with a synthesis of the results, focusing particularly on policy challenges and recommendations (Chapter 5).

2. COUNTRY CONTEXT[1]

2.1. Political and socio-economic overview

Slovenia's economic development and consequently the extent of social policy provisions have been at the EU average over the last decade. But the trend has changed in the last five years when economic situation worsened due to a low level of foreign direct investment, political unwillingness to implement economic and social reforms, and mostly due to the continuing economic crisis after 2009. General indicators of economic development, such as real growth of GDP per capita, public debt or share of foreign direct investments, point towards economic decline (for detailed explanations see Cukut Krilić, Novak and Jurišić 2013).

The aggravated economic situation has influenced the quantity of social policy provisions available to individuals and the extent of social inequalities. There are some indications that point to increasing

---

[1] The Maribor Development Agency, as the regional development agency for the Podravje (NUTS3) region, is one of the two Slovenian partners in the SEEMIG project which were involved in conducting the foresight exercise in Slovenia. The foresight exercise was conducted at the national level, but has also kept a regional focus through inviting local and regional experts, researchers and migrants/civil society representatives into the groups that participated in the foresight exercise.

social and economic inequalities, especially in the period since 2009 (see Cukut Krilić, Novak and Jurišić 2013). The social welfare of the Slovenian population worsened in the period following the expansion of the economic crisis. Indicators such as the infant mortality rate, at risk of poverty rates, distribution of income in households, purchasing power parity and expenditures for social welfare show a gradual deterioration of the social system.

The effects of the economic crisis, which caused a drop in economic growth rates and produced unfavourable developments in the labour market, i.e. increasing unemployment rates, have particularly affected low-wage sectors such as the construction industry, which predominantly employ migrants (Pajnik et al. 2009). High unemployment rates[2] imply increased emigration of unemployed migrants, and also of highly educated individuals. This observable fact is gradually becoming more apparent in the last couple of years. The main economic and social challenges in Slovenia are therefore: decreasing public debt and stabilizing public expenditures, dealing with the continuing economic crisis and its effects, diminishing social inequalities, improving the labour market and creating new job opportunities.

2.2. Development of international migration

Slovenia has traditionally been an emigration rather than an immigration country. Prior to 1991, international migration movements were not considered as actual migration and were part of planned development policies. No social or political significance was ascribed to it, beyond the number of available workforce and urban planning. Internal migration within the former Yugoslav republics was the prevailing form of immigration to the country. After Slovenia became an independent country (in 1991), migration from former Yugoslav republics gained an international character. Due to historical connections to the former Yugoslav republics and the perceived cultural proximity of Slovenia, the territory of the former Yugoslavia remains the most significant area of origin of immigrants coming to Slovenia. Immigrants from other countries, i.e. EU countries, other European countries, Asia, or North America, are also residing in Slovenia, although in significantly smaller numbers compared to immigrants from former Yugoslavia. (SURS Prebivalstvo 2013) There are no indications that such a trend will change in the future.

Emigration flows from Slovenia included foreign citizens as well as Slovenian nationals. After Slovenia joined the EU in 2004 there were some indications of increased emigration of foreign citizens from the country compared to Slovenian nationals, but the trend changed during the economic crisis when Slovenian citizens are emigrating at a higher rate. The economic crisis had an impact on the net migration rate. Although the net migration rate was still positive in 2013, the number of immigrants decreased (by 9% compared to the same period of 2012) and in the case of Slovenian citizens the migration rate stayed negative from mid 2011 on, meaning more Slovenian citizens left the country than entered it. In 2013 the number of Slovenian citizens who emigrated (1,782) again exceeded the number of foreigners who emigrated (1,649). (SURS Naravno 2013).

Germany, Austria, Italy, Switzerland remain the main countries of destination, and in smaller numbers the USA and Australia. The latest emigration trends also indicate that Slovenia could face increased emigration from its territory in the future. Despite small numbers of migrants compared to the non-migrating population, changes in migration trends due to political and most recently economic transformations in Slovenia have the strongest implications for the labour market, industries that employ both low and highly skilled workers, the healthcare and education systems, and economic and social development.

---

[2] According to the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia (SURS) it was 13.5% in December 2013 (SURS, Aktivno prebivalstvo 2013). The rate was higher than the EU-28 in the same period (Eurostat, http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Unemployment_statistics).

According to the EUROPOP2013 projections of demographic development, the population of Slovenia will decrease by 52,000 by the year 2080. About 28% of the population will be aged 65 or over (17% in 2013). Up to 2022 the age-specific fertility rate in Slovenia will rise (from 1.59 in 2013 to 1.64 in 2022), the age-specific mortality rate will fall, but the international net migration rate will rise significantly (from 782 in 2013 to 4092 in 2021 or a slightly moderated 3989 in 2020).

The perception of immigration and immigrants among the general public can be described as rather negative. A general question measuring social distance towards different social groups, which was also regularly asked within Slovene public opinion polls and is also a part of the World Value Survey, is 'Which of the following groups of people you would not want to have as your neighbours?' The share of respondents who would not want to have immigrant neighbours was largest after the declaration of independence, with the arrival of displaced persons and refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina (39.6% in 1992 and 55.6% in 1993), and gradually stabilised at around one fifth of the population in 2008 (for details see Cukut Krilić, Novak and Jurišić 2013). The Slovene public opinion poll in 2012 showed a slight change in public opinion: 9.8% of the Slovenian population thought that people with different ethnic backgrounds should not be allowed to settle down in Slovenia, while 13.9% think many of them should be allowed to settle down. (SJM 2012)

The Slovenian media and the informed public view the current emigration flow as a significant issue and repeatedly warn of increasing numbers of individuals leaving the country, based on vague and unverified data. On the other hand, decision makers and government officials appear to not identify this trend as an emergency, since no steps have been taken towards regulation/management of the process.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Workshops

3.1.1. When and where were the workshops conducted

The workshops were conducted at the premises of the Maribor Development Agency in Maribor. The first three brainstorming sessions were conducted from December 3-5, 2013, and the scenario-preparation session was conducted on December 17, 2013. All sessions took place in spacious, quiet and comfortable rooms, which allowed undisturbed interaction of all participants. An additional room was provided for the scenario-preparation session, when participants were divided into two groups to develop opposing scenarios. All sessions were set up as a roundtable, which facilitated interaction and allowed the participants to simultaneously take notes of the process they were discussing. On average, the sessions were 3-4 hours long.

3.1.2. How were the workshops conducted

Upon arrival, the participants were warmly welcomed by the two moderators and their assistants and offered refreshments, with the aim of creating a relaxed and friendly environment where they would feel comfortable to share personal opinions with the rest of the group. Then, the moderators briefly introduced the SEEMIG project and the purpose of the foresight analysis. They explained why the participants were selected, how their responses will be used in the project and asked for their written consent to audio-record the sessions. They also explained that there are no good or bad answers and that the purpose of the first part of the brainstorming sessions is not to reach a consensus of differing opinions but to gather different points of view that will contribute to knowledge formation. An assistant moderator was appointed to observe the group dynamics and make notes.

3.1.2.1. Workshops 1-3: Brainstorming and brain-mapping sessions – arriving at key drivers of

migration

The brainstorming session began with an open-ended question that encouraged participants to think about the key factors which, in their opinion, influence their country's future in relation to migration and labour market. They were asked to focus on the period up to 2025. The motivation to participate was high and the discussion was open and free-floating in all three groups. In the first group, i.e. the migrants/civil society representatives group, the participants preferred to discuss current issues associated with migration, especially the problem of integration of immigrants into the majority society. Although the moderators encouraged free associations and open communication, their intervention was eventually necessary to direct the discussion towards future predictions. In the other two groups no such intervention was necessary. During the second stage of the brainstorming session, the moderators asked the participants to cluster the enumerated ideas into main themes. Suggestions were written down on a flipchart and subsequently evaluated according to the perceived importance and degree of uncertainty. Clarifications and some guidance were needed in the civil society group, but overall the grouping was done mostly by the participants.

3.1.2.2. Workshop 4: Synthesis (selection of main drivers, development of matrix,

formation of mixed groups, development of scenarios)

All participants were invited to the second workshop with the intention of developing a matrix of binary opposing scenarios. At the session, the participants first introduced themselves to each other and then spokespersons for the civil society, experts and decision makers groups presented the most important conclusions, i.e. drivers, from the previous workshops. Under the guidance of the moderators all drivers were reviewed, and the participants were encouraged to select five which they considered to be the most important in the set time frame. After a short debate, an agreement on the key drivers was reached. With the assistance of the moderators the drivers were put into the matrix of binary opposing scenarios: positive and negative.

After the formulation of the matrix, two mixed groups were formed with migrants/civil society members, experts and decision makers equally represented in each of them. The groups decided which scenario they would prefer to develop and proceeded with work in two separate rooms. They were asked to imagine the dynamics of migration and the labour market in Slovenia within a set time horizon of 2025, keeping in mind the most important jointly identified drivers. More particularly, they were encouraged to think about what the future would look like if the selected drivers were shaping reality by 2025. In one group there was one individual who dominated the discussion. In order to create space for the other participants' opinions, the moderators asked additional questions and encouraged equal participation of all individuals.

The participants were then asked to place a specific person with either positive or negative characteristics in the developed scenario. They were encouraged to think about what that specific person would do if he/she encountered such circumstances and what his/her life would look like in such a country. This was a departure from thinking in abstract terms to considering a real-life situation on a micro level, through the lens of a chosen 'hero'. The workshop concluded with the two groups coming back together to present the positive and negative scenarios and the respective heroes to each other. There were no significant overlaps between the scenarios.

3.2. Participants

65 individuals or organizations were invited to join three groups: migrants/civil society representatives, experts and decision makers at the local and national level. The main idea was to invite a wide range of participants; therefore we invited immigrants, emigrants, return migrants and institutions or individuals working with migrants; experts from different fields of expertise; and decision makers from local and national governmental or other public institutions dealing with

migration and related issues. The participants were invited in approximately equal proportions, i.e. 20 to 23 per group. 13 participants were finally present at the foresight exercise, 5 from the migrant/civil society representatives' group, 5 from the experts' group and 3 from the decision makers' group. The selection could not be done properly, since 80% of the people invited declined to participate in the foresight exercise.

In the group consisting of migrant and civil society representatives, the participants' age span ranged from 26 to 65 years. Two immigrants were also acting as representatives of two different NGOs, which organize different activities and offer support to migrants. One participant was a representative of a local (nationally funded) centre for adult education that offers language courses for immigrants and has a lot of experience working with migrants. One participant was a return migrant who has now lived in Slovenia for over a decade. One participant moved to Slovenia only a couple of years ago and another 30 years ago. The last and youngest participant in the group was born abroad, but has lived in Slovenia for almost his entire life. The migrants originated from two countries, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Mali, and the participant who returned to Slovenia lived in Germany. An additional participant was a second generation migrant, a part of the project team who also shared personal experiences and added to the discussion.

Researchers and experts from different fields of expertise were invited to participate in the group of experts. The participants that decided to join the brainstorming session of the foresight exercise have backgrounds in history, sociology, demography, intercultural relations and anthropology. All of the experts were or still are closely connected to the studies of migration in their respective fields of work. Most of them are working as researchers and one is a tenured university professor.

The decision makers came from three different institutions, the Ministry of Labour, Family, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, EURES and the Institute of Macroeconomic Analysis and Development, which is a governmental institution. Other invited representatives of relevant state institutions (from the Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, local municipality, etc.) did not attend.

3.3. Approach to analyzing material

The recorded audio files, written comments and photographs from the four sessions were revisited and discussed among the moderators and their assistants. They exchanged their impressions of the participants' input and the sessions in general and presented ideas for further analysis. A short written description was prepared in order to pinpoint the emerging themes in each of the four sessions, which would serve as a starting point when preparing the national report.

Final interpretations and policy recommendations were jointly developed by the moderating team, focusing on the following aspects: results of the brainstorming sessions in all three groups, matrix of potential shapers of different features, and two scenarios in theoretical and narrative manner. The implications of the foresight scenarios were assessed in relation to migration and the labour market and evaluated in light of the previous project findings. Several quotations were chosen to support the analysis and enrich the report.

3.4. Problems and difficulties

The main difficulties encountered in the process of organizing and conducting the workshops were twofold. First, the motivation to participate at the sessions was low, although moderators approached potential participants individually by e-mail and/or phone, explaining the importance of the project and their role in the exercise. The least interest in participating was noted in the group of decision makers, who did not recognize the importance of the exercise and potential benefits it may

have for evidence-based policy making. Apart from a lack of motivation, their low response rate can also be attributed to busy work schedule and engagement in other pre-scheduled activities. It could be argued that low participation and absence of specific profiles (i.e. trade union representatives) led to less input, less varied ideas and narratives and less interesting debates. However, it cannot be claimed that any of the groups were underrepresented, since the organizers managed to assure relatively equal participation.

The second problem encountered was the use of the recording device in the group of decision makers. It was pointed out (by a government representative) that he would represent only the official government position on the discussed issues if the session was recorded, and declined to share his subjective predictions. This might have hampered the inputs of the participants, as this group was the least talkative of the three. Had this not been the case, the individual would have been able to share experiences from other governmental positions held in the past, which would have given additional insight into the topic.

4. RESULTS OF THE FORESIGHT EXERCISE

4.1 Key drivers of migration

During the first three workshops, each group of participants was asked to engage in a process of creative thinking and brainstorming about the key factors, i.e. drivers, which in their opinion influence their and their country's present and future in relation to migration and the labour market. They were asked to focus on the period up to 2025.

4.1.1. Experts

The group of experts emphasized, first and foremost, the tremendous influence of economic prospects on migration dynamics. Economic growth will in their opinion lead to an increase in immigration and a decrease in emigration, and vice versa. They argued that the current economic paradigm leads to cataclysm and that the unprecedented economic growth prior to the crisis can no longer be achieved. This calls, they claim, for a re-evaluation and reconsideration of the existing regime. They considered climate-change related catastrophes to be another important and realistic driver that may have a significant impact on the economy and migration patterns and stressed the very likely struggle for water resources after 2025. The demographic situation was considered, especially the ageing of the population and related social issues, depopulation of certain geographic areas within Slovenia due to low birth rate and emigration of younger generations of Slovenes, and the repopulation of poorly inhabited rural areas by immigrants. It was also noted that migration policy plays an important part in regulating migration processes within and outside Slovenia.

4.1.2. Public officials

Similar to the group of experts, public officials stated that the economic situation is the most important identified driver, which has significant implications for all other societal spheres. They also recognized the important regulatory function of migration (mobility) policies for attracting or discouraging potential immigrants and limiting the emigration of educated and skilled individuals. Reintegration policies were considered to be an important part of migration policies, especially as a mechanism to encourage the return of expatriate Slovenes. The educational system was mentioned as an important factor for encouraging or discouraging migration. The participants commented on the current and (most likely) future trend of mobility of young people for education purposes. They perceived student mobility as a favourable and positive phenomenon that should be encouraged, but stressed the importance of students eventually returning to Slovenia with new knowledge and experience from abroad.

4.1.3. Migrants and civil society representatives

The group of civil society representatives and migrants initially focused on the current migration situation in Slovenia, with a particular focus on the integration of immigrants into the majority society and a variety of problems associated with social exclusion. Inclusion in the labour market was perceived as most important for the integration of immigrants. To assure labour market participation of immigrants, positive discrimination measures should be adopted and implemented by the state. All migration policies, they argued, should be developed using a bottom-up approach, i.e. taking into consideration the needs, rights and obligations of migrants and native citizens. They emphasized that immigration to Slovenia is an ongoing process that will continue in the future and that will assure the inflow of needed labour force, as well as enrich Slovenian society with diverse, multicultural dynamics.

4.1.4. Comparison of key drivers

The clusters of ideas in all three groups were written down as they emerged. The moderators then asked the participants to rank them hierarchically on a scale from most to least important. Synthesis of the drivers in each group is as follows:

Drivers	Experts	Public Officials/Decision-makers	Migrants/civil society representatives
Driver 1	Economic prospects in Slovenia	Economic prospects in Slovenia	Character of migration policy
Driver 2	Climate change	Character of migration policy	Labour market participation
Driver 3	Demographic situation	Educational system	Social integration
Driver 4	Character of migration policy		Diversity/multicultural dynamics

In all three groups, the economic situation was considered to be one of the key factors, although in the group of migrants/civil society representatives it was more latently identified than in the other two groups, by referral only to labour market participation and (un)employment. Furthermore, all of the participants agreed upon the importance of migration policy, but to varying degrees. The group of experts considered policy to be less important than the economy, climate-change related disasters and the unfavourable demographic situation, while civil society members considered migration policy to be the key determinant of future developments. The latter also identified social integration and the creation of a multicultural society as important drivers, which was significantly less considered by the other two groups.

4.2. Matrix of key drivers

Development of the matrix took place during the second workshop and it included input from all participants. The participants debated, jointly identified and scored the following four main drivers that will most likely influence migration processes and labour markets in the future, taking into consideration those that would have most effect on their daily lives:

1.) economic development
2.) climate change
3.) migration (and other state) policies

4.) demographic situation

After a short discussion, the matrix of binary opposing scenarios was developed:

POSITIVE SCENARIO	NEGATIVE SCENARIO
Economic growth	Economic decline
Stable climate	Climate-related disasters
Efficient migration and other state policies	Inefficient migration and other state policies
Demographic change	Demographic change

4.3. Development of scenarios (macro-level analysis)

The group tasked with developing a positive scenario included representatives of all three invited groups (migrants/civil society representatives, experts in the field and policymakers in the field). Through a discussion of the already identified factors, which were agreed upon as the key factors to influence the migration trends in the future, several ideas were put forth. The moderator allowed a broad discussion, where all members of the group gave their opinion on the current situation as well as past experience, which served as a way to identify patterns of how the group perceives the past development of migration. This stream of thought was then projected to the future, what it would be like if nothing were to change, in order to set a mental frame for the foresight exercise. Next, the participants started evaluating how this prediction might change when the factors (pre-identified as key factors to influence migration) would influence the set hypothetical timeline of future development of events and their effects on migration. No wild cards were used.

The group that developed negative scenario also consisted of participants from all three groups. The scenario development started with a short discussion of the four selected key drivers. The discussion proceeded smoothly, with only occasional interventions by the moderator to return the discussion on the right track. The idea of scenario development and the development of a personal life story in the next stage was accepted without any difficulties. A minor problem occurred when one of the participants from group of experts tried to dominate the scenario development exercise. A moderator intervened and asked the other participants to become more actively involved in the scenario development exercise. The process of scenario development followed the list of four selected key drivers, but the environment key driver was not incorporated into the scenario in an equal measure. No wild cards were used in the development of the negative scenario.

4.3.1. Scenario 1 (positive scenario)

There was no breakdown into two time periods.

The key factors, as previously identified, which contributed to the favourable development within the country were: economic growth, stable climate, effective migration and other state policies (ensuring the quality of living) and demographic change.

The group did not try to identify which action was needed in order to insure the positive turn of the identified key factors influencing migration flows; they merely acknowledged the fact that the key factors are developing in a favourable way.

Among these factors, economic growth was identified as the prime factor, which will influence other factors as well, and that it seems reasonable that economic growth will become strong and positive by the end of 2016. However, this economic growth will not present a strain on the environment,

thus the favourable climate and environment will remain as it is. This would in effect mean that the economic growth starting in 2016 would begin attracting migrants, but due to an effective migration policy (along with other supporting policies), a steady flow of migrants will begin coming into Slovenia. The participants calculated that the population of Slovenia may grow by an additional 50% of the current population without seriously straining the country's resources, thus the policies would only be aimed at better integration of migrants into the society. These policies would take effect as soon as the flow of people migrating into Slovenia began to increase. At the same time policies would be undertaken to attract outgoing migrants to return to Slovenia in order to prevent the current brain drain. The outflow of Slovenian migrants would not stop, but mechanisms would be established to either attract outgoing migrants to return, or if not to return, to become part of the Slovenian network abroad in order to further increase Slovenia's economic growth.

The biggest effect economic growth would have, however, would be on the improved demographics, as with the stable and secure economic environment it would become easier for young people to establish their own families and the process would be further stimulated by national policies. Along with positive migration policies this would also contribute to a demographic increase through increased births among the local population as well as migrants coming to Slovenia, which would further help them to permanently settle in Slovenia.

All of these positive effects (starting with the positive economic growth in 2016) would continue in the demographic growth (starting around 2018, when the positive economic environment has become a reality), which would finally produce a stronger society with a higher standard of wellbeing in 2025.

4.3.2. Scenario 2 (negative scenario)

The description of the negative scenario could not be divided in two time periods because the participants decided not to make the division during the scenario development.

Due to the economic decline in Slovenia, there would be an increase in unemployment rates and an increase in emigration of the educated population. Slovenia would still be a destination country, but it would attract mainly low-skilled migrants from the global South. Another negative effect of the economic decline would be a decrease in social spending and subsequently the need to provide means of survival independent of the state and the market. Hence, people would begin to increasingly engage in agricultural activities with the aim of becoming self-sufficient in food and other resources. Seasonal immigration of low-skilled agricultural workers would be in high demand. Apart from unfavourable economic conditions, Slovenia would have to cope with local climate-related disasters (floods etc.) that would have an effect on internal migration. The role of the state would be overridden by strong market dynamics and the centralization of policymaking at the EU level. European directives would become increasingly binding and Slovenian government officials and policymakers would become merely executors of policies developed at the EU level. In the case of migration management, the inefficiency of the state would be reflected in uncontrolled functioning of migrant recruitment and employment agencies. The ageing of the population and increased emigration rates would result in depopulation and social deterioration. Care for the elderly would become a pressing need and a high priority, but although demand for migrant care workers will be high, people would not be able to afford to employ them. As a result, immigration of care workers to Slovenia would be barely existent.

4.4. Development of personal life histories within scenarios ('heroes', micro-level analysis)

4.4.1. Scenario 1 / positive scenario

Only one hero was selected, but the scenario covers this hero as well as his family and additional members of the household.

The hero is a young man with the typical Slovenian name Franc, who was born in Slovenia in the early eighties.

Due to the positive economic growth Slovenia became attractive for Russians who wanted to find employment here. This was also the case of Franc's wife Svetlana, who was among Russian students that came to Slovenia and found the country very pleasant, with lots of unspoiled nature and milder winters than she was used to, but above all the country was not overcrowded. The similarities between the two Slavic languages helped her to learn Slovene during her study years, although she had no problem communicating with people in English in most places. After their marriage Franc was able to capitalize upon Svetlana's knowledge of Russia and set up a successful tourist agency which offers exploration holidays in Russia and event holidays in Slovenia. He received additional funding for his pilot tours, since his approach to tourism was recognised as innovative, offering cultural and natural heritage vacation options to foreign guests in Slovenia as well as offering northern historical safari tours to the vast plains of Russia.

Svetlana, on the other hand, has become a successful interpreter of Russian heritage and tradition, leading a cultural association for Russian migrants to Slovenia with joint folklore and artist colonies contributing to cultural and intellectual exchange as well as networking between members of both groups. With their economic situation they did not have to worry about raising a family and have three children of their own, where their oldest son loves IT and is actively looking into possibilities of developing integrated keyboard symbols for different writing systems. He is developing this idea together with his schoolmate, who is the daughter of an Iranian mother and an Icelandic father, also living in Slovenia. Their middle daughter is considering going into the family business as she loves to travel and has dreams of owning a fleet of private airplanes, after becoming a commercial airline pilot. Their youngest son is currently attending elementary school where he's part of the young volunteers helping children of foreign families overcome linguistic barriers through extracurricular activities as part of the school's multicultural programme.

Since both Franc and Svetlana integrated family and work life they do need some household assistance, and therefore they hired Nazmija as a maid. Nazmija is part of the Slovenian ethnic Roma minority. She is employed part-time in a kindergarten helping Roma children with integration into society at the kindergarten which both of Franc and Svetlana's older children attended and that's how they met. Being a part-time maid (two days a week) for Franc and Svetlana turned out to be of great help to Nazmija's husband Mario, who was a local transporter and was able to expand his business (local trade between Slovenia and his native Northern Italy) into an Italian-Russian-Slovenian international transport venture through Svetlana's and also Franc's business and social network. Their children – twins – attend the same school as Franc and Svetlana's youngest child.

4.4.2. Scenario 2 / negative scenario

The participants who developed the negative scenario chose only one hero, a foreign citizen – an immigrant from Bosnia and Herzegovina who moved to Slovenia in 2008. The participants decided that their hero, although he has a university degree in science, could only find employment that required a high school diploma. Moreover, in 2012 he would lose his job and would have to register at the Employment Office. He would continue to apply for jobs in engineering but without success. He would not decide to move out of the country to Western or Northern Europe and would apply for Slovenian citizenship.

After being unemployed for two years, he would apply for a state subvention for self-employment and start growing garlic in Prlekija (rural eastern part of Slovenia). This part of the hero's life is influenced by the consequences of economic decline that lead people to find means of survival independent of the state and the market. Like many people in Slovenia, the hero will be increasingly

engaged in agricultural activities with the aim of becoming financially independent and self-sufficient in food. He would experience continuous discrimination due to the ineffective migration policy. After 10 years, in 2022, he would obtain Slovenian citizenship.

Further economic decline and the state's recognition of the importance of self-sufficiency in food production would provide a business opportunity that he would grasp. By 2025 he would become a successful businessman in the food production trade and would create new employment possibilities for the local population. Due to personal experience he would not outsource employment agencies to secure a labour force. The society would not accept him without prejudice, but he would be recognized and respected due to his business success and ability to adjust to specific conditions.

5. SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The workshop participants highlighted several threats and opportunities related to future developments within the framework of migration and the labour market in Slovenia. Their views on possible future trajectories are in many respects compatible with the current country-specific socio-economic situation reviewed in the WP3 country report (Cukut Krilić, Novak and Jurišić 2013) and briefly summarized at the beginning of this paper. The scenarios and personal stories reveal that the most apparent threat is that of economic decline, which will result in the rise in unemployment rates and increased emigration of educated and skilled individuals. A significant impact of the economic decline will be reflected in difficulties of sustaining the welfare system, with negative implications for the medical and care sector, pension sustainability and social protection schemes. The unfavourable demographic situation with low birth rates and a significant rise in the numbers of the elderly was also recognised as a pressing issue with long-term negative consequences that requires the attention of decision makers.

Apart from the threat of economic decline, the centralization of decision making at the EU level was perceived negatively, as it could potentially lead to the ineffectiveness of national (public, including migration) policymaking. The local (national) context should be strongly considered and policies should be developed, not just executed, by Slovenian public officials. Climate-change related disasters were considered probable in the set time frame and were discussed in relation to possible large-scale internal mobility due to flooding or drought.

Policy recommendations arising in view of identified socio-economic and demographic challenges include improvements of migration policies, especially in terms of developing mechanisms to limit brain drain and introducing mechanisms that enable successful return and re-integration of Slovenian emigrants. The role of the migration policy also includes ensuring integration packages that facilitate the inclusion of immigrants into Slovenian society. Since integration was recognized as a two-way process, the need to introduce anti-discrimination measures and publicly address the emerging multicultural dynamics with positive public campaigns was suggested. Decision makers should also promptly react to the possible collapse of the pension and healthcare system by anticipating far-reaching consequences. To keep the birth rate high, various benefits should be provided for young families, including financial assistance and housing benefits.

	Opportunities	Threats	Policy implications and recommendations
Scenario 1/ Positive scenario	Steady flow of immigrants will fill gaps in the labour market		Improvements of integration policy
	Ethnic diversity		Employment of anti-discrimination meassures Media campaigns
		Brain drain	Policy addressing emigration meassures and reintegration meassures
		Low birth rate	Benefits offered to young families
Scenario 2 / Negative scenario	High-skilled migrants bring innovation and creativity		Better integration policies
		Increase of unemployment rates and increase of emigration of educated people due to economic crisis	Policy measures to address emigration
		Unsustainability of welfare system due to economic decline and unfavourable demographic situation (ageing)	Challenges for social and healthcare systems rise, elderly care system needs improvement
		Centralization of decision-making at the EU level leads to ineffectiveness of national policy	Critical stands are diminished, policy makers are not makers, but executors of policy Strengthening of state policy and inclusion of local perspectives in policy-making
		Climate-change related weather disasters with impact on migration	Early detection and efficient reaction Intersectoral cooperation and coordination

		dynamics	

According to the positive scenario, the steady inflow of immigrants due to favourable economic conditions would have a positive impact, since immigrants could fill the gaps in the Slovenian labour market. The migration outcome of the positive scenario is that immigrants would continue to come due to positive economic growth. The current brain drain would be regulated with a set of policy measures, although the outflow would not stop. The linkage between emigrants and Slovenia would be stronger. The structure of the immigrants coming to Slovenia was not specified. The consequences of increased immigration flow would be mainly on demographics, as the population of Slovenia would increase by 50%. The final positive indirect consequence of immigration would be a richer and more numerous and therefore stronger society with a higher standard of wellbeing in 2025.

The migration outcome of the negative scenario on the other hand is that emigration of educated people would increase and immigration of low-skilled migrants from the global South would prevail. Due to drastic changes in the economic production of food the seasonal immigration of low-skilled workers in agriculture would be in high demand. Internal migration would also increase. There would be a great demand for migrant care workers for the elderly, but care workers would not immigrate to Slovenia due to unfavourable economic conditions. The consequences of the increased emigration rates (together with the ageing of population) would be depopulation and social deterioration. Indirect consequences could also be seen in the uncontrolled functioning of migrant recruitment and employment agencies.

It should be emphasized that immigration was perceived as a positive phenomenon in both scenarios. Even the negative scenario, for example, recognized the significant potential of highly-skilled immigrants who could benefit from the economic crisis by taking advantage of the existing economic niche areas, and bring innovation and creativity into the Slovenian labour market (Hero 2). However, such a generally positive perception could be attributed to the structure of the participants. Had the group of participants included more of the general public and key decision makers from the Ministry of the Interior, the scenarios would most likely have been less favourably inclined towards immigration (see also subchapter *2.2. Development of International Migration,* in this report, on Slovenian public opinion on immigration).

To sum up, the policy implications and recommendations that were identified in both the negative and the positive scenario include improvements of migration policies, especially in terms of developing mechanisms to limit brain drain, introducing mechanisms that enable successful return and re-integration of Slovenian emigrants, and encouraging integration of immigrants, whereas the development of anti-discrimination measures, benefits for young families, improvement of the elderly care system and strengthening of national policy in relation to the EU were scenario-specific.

6. REFERENCES

Bled Forum on Europe, 2012, Accessed at: http://www.bled-forum.org/history/materiali/Bled_Forum_on_Europe_factsheet.pdf

Central and East European Health Policy Network, Strategic Scenarios 2020: The future of CEE Healthcare, *Central and East European Health Policy Network*, 2012. Accessed at: http://www.ceehpn.eu/images/pdfs/Scenarios2020.pdf (3. 3. 2014)

Cukut Krilić, S., Novak, T. and Jurišić, B., *Dynamic Historical Analysis of Longer Term Migratory, Labour Market and Human Capital Processes in Slovenia*, 2013.

Eurostat, Unemployment statistics, (up to January 2014). Accessed at: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Unemployment_statistics (25. 2. 2014)

Komac, M., Tehnološko predvidevanje: instrument nabora družbeno in gospodarsko relevantnih vsebin raziskovanja (Technology foresight: a convenient tool for the prioritization of scientific research), *Informacije MIDEM*, 30 (2), 2000, pp. 105-109.

Kos, M., Tehnologije za 21. Stoletje (Technologies for 21st Century), *Gospodarski vestnik,* 13, 1997.

Pajnik, M., Bajt, V., Herič, S. Mapping and evaluating migration and integration policies: the case of Slovenia - working paper No. 2. Ljubljana: Mirovni Inštitut, 2009. Accessed at: http://primts.mirovni-institut.si/images/pdf/working_papers/swp2_slovenia.pdf (19.2.2014)

SJM – Slovensko javno mnenje 2012/2: Evropska družboslovna raziskava (Slovenian Public Opinion Survey). Accessed at: http://www.adp.fdv.uni-lj.si/opisi/sjm122/opis-podatkov/ (15. 4. 2014)

Stanovnik, P., Kos, M., Technology foresight in Slovenia, 2005. Accessed at: http://www.ier.si/html/publikacije/Working%20paper-27.pdf (15. 4. 2014)

SURS, Aktivno prebivalstvo, Slovenija, december 2013 - končni podatki (Active population, Slovenia, December 2013 – final data), Accessed at: https://www.stat.si/novica_prikazi.aspx?id=6059 (25. 2. 2014)

SURS, Naravno in selitveno gibanje prebivalstva, Slovenija, 3. četrtletje – začasni podatki (Natural and migration changes of population, Slovenia, 3rd quarter 2013 – provisional data). Accessed at: https://www.stat.si/eng/novica_prikazi.aspx?id=6027 (13. 4. 2014)

SURS, Prebivalstvo Slovenija, 1. Oktober 2013 – končni podatki (Population, Slovenia, 1st of October 2013 – final data). Accessed at: http://www.stat.si/novica_prikazi.aspx?id=6028 (13. 4. 2014)

Toth, E. F., *SEEMIG, Developing foresight scenarios for SEEMIG, Methodological guideline*, Bratislava, Infostat. 2013.