"HUMAN CAPITAL AND THE BRAIN DRAIN QUESTION: EDUCATION INVESTMENT VERSUS SKILLED LABOR EMIGRATION IN UZBEKISTAN"

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21811496

Nurshoda Aramova

Annotation

This article examines the tension between Uzbekistan's rapid expansion of higher education and technology training since 2016 and the parallel, largely unabated outflow of skilled workers to Russia, South Korea, Turkey, and a growing set of Western destinations. Uzbekistan has raised higher-education coverage from 9 percent of school graduates in 2016 to 42 percent in 2023, expanded its university count from 77 to 213 institutions, and attracted 38 foreign university branch campuses - the third-highest total in the world. The government's IT Park program has simultaneously built a domestic technology-training and export ecosystem targeting USD 5 billion in IT service exports and 100,000 new jobs by 2030. Against this investment, the article sets Uzbekistan's migration reality: an economy that produces roughly 650,000 secondary and vocational graduates each year but only about 300,000 new domestic jobs, a labor migration system historically oriented toward Russia and Kazakhstan, and an emerging but still small shift toward regulated, higher-skill placement in developed markets under a newly created Migration Agency. The article argues that Uzbekistan's human-capital strategy is not failing so much as running two policies in parallel without a connecting mechanism: education investment is producing graduates faster than the domestic economy can absorb them, while migration policy is only beginning to treat skilled emigration as an asset to be managed - through remittances, return incentives, and diaspora engagement - rather than a loss to be tolerated. Closing that gap, rather than raising enrollment further, is identified as the central policy task for the next decade.

Keywords

Human capital; brain drain; skilled migration; higher education reform; Uzbekistan; IT Park; vocational training; labor migration; remittances; El-Yurt Umidi; diaspora policy; return migration; youth unemployment; Central Asia; education investment

What Is the Brain Drain Question, and Why Does It Apply to Uzbekistan?

"Brain drain" describes a specific and measurable phenomenon: a country invests public resources in producing skilled graduates, and a disproportionate share of that investment's return - the graduate's productive working years - is realized in a different country's economy rather than the one that paid for the training. The concept is distinct from labor migration generally, which can be economically beneficial to a sending country through remittances, return knowledge transfer, and reduced domestic unemployment pressure. Brain drain becomes a policy problem specifically when the emigrating population is disproportionately educated or technically skilled relative to the domestic workforce, and when the sending country has no structured mechanism for recovering value from that outflow beyond remittance income.

Uzbekistan presents an unusually clean test case because its two relevant policies have moved on almost entirely separate tracks. Education policy since 2016 has been aggressively expansionary, treating enrollment and institutional growth as ends in themselves. Migration policy, by contrast, has only recently begun to distinguish skilled from unskilled outflows, having spent most of the post-independence period managing labor migration primarily as a safety valve for domestic unemployment rather than as a channel that might be selectively encouraged, discouraged, or looped back into the economy.

Why This Balance Matters for Uzbekistan's Development Model

The stakes are structural rather than incidental. Uzbekistan graduates approximately 650,000 students from general secondary, secondary-special, and vocational institutions each year, of whom only about a quarter continue on to university; the remainder enter a labor market that reportedly generates only around 300,000 new jobs annually. This arithmetic - roughly two graduates for every new job - is the single most important fact shaping both education and migration policy in Uzbekistan, because it means that even a fully successful higher-education expansion will not, by itself, close the country's youth employment gap. Labor migration has functioned as the pressure-release valve for this imbalance for three decades, and continues to do so: a considerable share of Uzbekistan's economically active population - by some estimates around one in five workers - is employed in Russia, Kazakhstan, or a Western country at any given time. What has changed is the government's own framing of this outflow. Historically treated as an unregulated, largely low-skill phenomenon concentrated in construction and agriculture, migration policy is now explicitly being repositioned - through a newly established Migration Agency - as a mechanism for supplying regulated, certified skilled labor to higher-income markets in Europe, North America, Japan, and South Korea, rather than simply tolerating informal outflows to traditional destinations. This is a meaningful shift in principle, but it also raises the central question this article addresses: can a government simultaneously invest in producing more skilled workers domestically while deliberately building the institutional pipeline to export a larger share of them, without one policy undermining the other?

The Education Investment Side: Scale Without Precedent in the Region

The scale of Uzbekistan's higher-education expansion since 2016 is not in dispute. Enrollment coverage rose from 9 percent of eligible school graduates to 42 percent by 2023 - a near five-fold increase in under a decade - and the university system grew from 77 institutions to 213, of which 97 are now non-state or foreign-affiliated. For the 2023-2024 academic year alone, the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovation admitted 381,000 new students, though only 15.7 percent of those places were state-funded, with the remainder paying tuition fees averaging USD 550 to 750 per year - a detail that matters because it shifts a meaningful share of the expansion's financing burden onto households rather than the state budget.

Uzbekistan has also positioned itself, deliberately, as a regional hub for imported higher education: with 38 international branch campuses operating in the country, it ranks third in the world by this measure, behind only China and the United Arab Emirates. Interest-free education loans, expanded specifically for women since the 2022-2023 academic year, disbursed 1,548.6 billion sums to roughly 137,400 students in 2023 alone. Funding for the El-Yurt Umidi ("Hope of the Nation") Foundation, which sponsors study at prestigious foreign universities, rose from 200 billion sums in 2022 to 500 billion sums in 2024 - a decision that, notably, funds the very kind of overseas study most closely associated with permanent skilled emigration, since a share of scholarship recipients historically do not return. On the technical-skills side specifically, the government's IT Park program has built a parallel training and export ecosystem: a dedicated online IT Park University, founded with EPAM Systems and delivering instruction mainly in English to students who need not relocate to Tashkent; a target of USD 5 billion in IT service exports and 100,000 new IT-sector jobs by 2030; and, as of the February 2024 decree establishing an International Digital Technology Center, a push toward 1,000 resident foreign IT companies. These initiatives represent Uzbekistan's most direct attempt to create high-value domestic employment for the technically skilled graduates the education system is now producing at scale.

The Emigration Side: A Historically Low-Skill System Now Shifting Upward

Set against this education investment, Uzbekistan's outward migration numbers remain large by any regional standard, even as their composition is changing. Historical patterns are dominated by Russia, which has accounted for well over half of registered labor migrants, followed at a considerable distance by Kazakhstan and Turkey, with South Korea and the UAE together representing only a small single-digit share. The large majority of these migrants have historically worked in construction and agriculture - sectors that, whatever their economic value to migrant households, do not correspond to the skilled, degree-holding population the education system is now producing. Two shifts are underway. First, the stock of Uzbek emigrants recorded abroad appears to have fallen sharply in recent years - from an estimated 1.76 million in 2018 to roughly 880,000 in 2022 - a change that may reflect both improved domestic conditions and measurement inconsistencies inherent to a migration-data system that, as international observers note, still lacks a reliable national census baseline. Second, and more directly relevant to the brain-drain question, the destinations and composition of migration are diversifying beyond the traditional Russia-Kazakhstan-Turkey corridor: the South Korea labor corridor has grown into one of the more structured skilled- and semi-skilled channels in the region, and a smaller but researcher-documented flow of highly educated Uzbek professionals now moves toward Europe, North America, and other developed markets outside the CIS entirely.

The IT sector illustrates the risk in concentrated form. Uzbekistan's IT Park program is explicitly designed to retain technically trained graduates domestically by offering export-oriented employment inside the country, but it competes directly with an international market for the same skill set - a market in which comparable regional talent pools, most visibly Russia's own IT workforce, have shown that a meaningful share of technically skilled professionals will relocate abroad when domestic conditions (currency risk, career ceiling, political environment) diverge from what is available internationally. Uzbekistan has not yet published data with the granularity to show what share of IT Park-trained graduates remain employed domestically versus relocate abroad after training - a gap in the government's own monitoring that this article treats as a policy problem in its own right, addressed below.

Reading the Two Trends Together: Where the System Is, and Is Not, Connected

Three points of connection between education and migration policy already exist, though none is yet operating at the scale needed to resolve the underlying imbalance. The Migration Agency's shift toward regulated, certified skilled-labor placement in high-income markets is, in effect, an acknowledgment that some share of the education system's output will be exported regardless of domestic absorption capacity, and an attempt to capture more value from that outflow - through certification, worker protections, and presumably higher remittance income per migrant - than the historically informal Russia-and-Kazakhstan-oriented system provided.

Reintegration policy is the second, and currently weakest, link. Uzbekistan has invested in institutions to manage migrants leaving the country but has done comparatively little, to date, to structure the return of skilled migrants into domestic employment or entrepreneurship - the gap that determines whether overseas experience becomes a long-term national asset or a one-way transfer. Third, remittance policy functions as a passive rather than active bridge: remittance inflows remain a meaningful share of Uzbekistan's GDP and are widely used by receiving households for food, housing, and family expenses, but the government has not yet built systematic instruments - matched savings products, diaspora investment bonds, or similar mechanisms used elsewhere - to convert remittance flows into the kind of productive domestic investment that could employ the next cohort of university graduates.

Current Problems in Uzbekistan's Human Capital Model

1. "A Structural Graduate-to-Job Mismatch"

With roughly 650,000 secondary and vocational graduates entering the labor force annually against approximately 300,000 new jobs created, Uzbekistan's arithmetic guarantees continued outward pressure regardless of how successful any individual education or IT-training program is. Raising enrollment further, without a corresponding increase in the rate of high-value job creation, does not close this gap - it widens the pool of qualified people competing for a domestic job market that has not grown at a comparable pace.

2. "Financing the Expansion Through Households Rather Than the State"

With only 15.7 percent of new 2023-2024 university admissions state-funded, and average tuition running USD 550 to 750 per year in an economy where this represents a substantial share of median household income, the financing model for Uzbekistan's education expansion transfers much of the cost, and therefore much of the risk, onto families. This creates a subtle incentive problem: a household that has borrowed or saved to finance a degree has a stronger incentive to seek the highest-paying job available for that credential, wherever it is located, than a household whose child's education was primarily state-financed.

3. "No Systematic Data on Where Trained Talent Actually Goes"

Neither the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovation nor IT Park publishes a tracked outcome measure showing what share of graduates - overall, or specifically from flagship programs like El-Yurt Umidi or IT Park University - remain employed in Uzbekistan one, three, or five years after completion. Without this data, it is not possible to distinguish a genuinely successful training pipeline from one that is functioning primarily as a subsidized on-ramp to emigration, and government decision-making on where to expand capacity is proceeding without the single most relevant piece of information for making that decision well.

4. "Weak Reintegration and Diaspora-to-Domestic Investment Channels"

Migration policy has developed faster on the outbound side - agency creation, destination-country agreements, certification programs - than on the return side. Without structured incentives for returning migrants to invest overseas savings or apply overseas experience domestically, as noted in recent regional migration research, the most likely outcome for a skilled Uzbek professional abroad is continued residence in the destination country rather than a planned return, converting what could be a circular, development-reinforcing migration pattern into a more traditional one-way brain drain.

Solutions and the Path Forward

Four responses correspond to the problems identified above. First, education-capacity planning should be explicitly linked to sectoral job-creation data rather than treated as an independent target; the Ministry of Higher Education's own credit-modular and qualification-requirement reforms provide an administrative mechanism through which enrollment growth in a given field could be paced against realistic domestic absorption capacity in that field, reducing the number of graduates for whom emigration is the only route to using their degree.

Second, expanding state-funded and interest-free loan places - building on the existing preferential lending program for women - would reduce the degree to which household financing risk pushes graduates toward the highest available wage regardless of location, and is a comparatively low-cost lever relative to the overall scale of education spending already underway.

Third, IT Park and the Ministry of Higher Education should jointly publish graduate employment-location tracking, following the same cohorts of El-Yurt Umidi and IT Park University graduates over multiple years; this is primarily a data-infrastructure investment rather than a policy change, and it would let policymakers evaluate flagship programs by actual retention and return-migration outcomes instead of enrollment or graduation counts alone.

Fourth, the Migration Agency's mandate should be extended from managing outbound placement to actively structuring return: diaspora investment instruments, tax incentives for returning entrepreneurs, and formal recognition of foreign work experience in domestic hiring and licensing would each, individually, be modest interventions, but together they would begin converting Uzbekistan's already large skilled diaspora from a pure remittance source into a source of returning capital and expertise, which is the mechanism most directly capable of narrowing the graduate-to-job gap identified as the root problem in this article.

Conclusion

Uzbekistan's education investment since 2016 is real, well-documented, and by regional standards unusually large in scale - a near five-fold increase in higher-education coverage, a tripling of the university system, and a purpose-built technology-training and export ecosystem in IT Park. None of this is undercut by the brain-drain question; the two trends are not evidence that education reform has failed, but evidence that it has outpaced the second half of the policy problem, which is what happens to a graduate once trained. With roughly twice as many secondary and vocational graduates each year as the domestic economy currently creates jobs, some degree of skilled outward migration is not a policy failure to be eliminated but a structural reality to be managed - through better data on where graduates go, through financing models that reduce the pressure toward emigration, and through a migration and diaspora policy that treats returning skill and capital as seriously as it now treats outbound placement. The country that solves this second half of the problem converts what is currently framed as a loss into what development economists call a migration-development "circuit" - and Uzbekistan's institutions, notably its newly created Migration Agency, are only now beginning that work.

REFERENCES:

1. Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Admission Statistics and Reform Report, 2023–2024 Academic Year.

2. The Diplomat. "New Uzbekistan, New Universities, New Problems" (2023).

3. The Diplomat. "How Are Patterns of Labor Migration From Uzbekistan Changing?" (2024).

4. UNICEF. Uzbekistan Education Sector Analysis (2022).

5. UNESCO Institute for Statistics. Uzbekistan Country Education Profile (2023).

6. Muratov, A. & Wilkins, S. "International Branch Campuses in Central Asia: The Case of Uzbekistan," Higher Education Policy (2024).

7. IT Park Uzbekistan. Results of 2023: Transformation and Plans for 2024.

8. Presidential Decree of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. DP-25. On the Establishment of the International Digital Technology Center (2024).

9. Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Resolution No. 297. On the Creation of IT Park University (2022).

10. El-Yurt Umidi Foundation. Annual Report on Overseas Scholarship Placements (2024).

11. Global Partnership for Education. Uzbekistan Education Sector Compact 2023–2026.

12. International Organization for Migration (IOM). Migration Situation Report: Uzbekistan (2023).

13. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Support and Reintegration of Labor Repatriates in Uzbekistan (2022).

14. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). Labour Migration in Central Asia (2023).

15. Thorez, J. “Brain Drain from Central Asia: Labor Migration Like Any Other?” HAL-SHS Working Paper (2021).

16. Central Asia-Caucasus Institute. “Uzbekistan's Strategic Migration Pivot: Institutionalizing Managed Mobility for Global High-Income Markets” (2026).

17. Eurasian Research Journal. “Uzbekistan External Migration: Key Trends and Directions,” Vol. 4, No. 1 (2022).

18. World Bank. Migrant Household Survey: Remittance Use in Uzbekistan (2017).

19. State Statistics Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan (UZSTAT). External Migration Statistics Bulletin (2023).

20. Agency for External Labor Migration under the Ministry of Employment and Labor Relations. Annual Migration Report (2023).