Towards Understanding of Contemporary Migration

Causes, Consequences, Policies, Reflections

Editors:
Mirjana Bobić,
Stefan Janković

Contents

2.3. Some Aspects of Youth Attitudes Towards (E)migration: Case of Republic of Macedonia

Anica Dragović

Marija Drakulovska-Chukalevska

Ivana Dragović

Introduction

Republic of Macedonia, like other countries in the region is faced with three critical but interrelated demographic challenges. Firstly, there is an increasing number of Macedonians who are delaying marriage and/or decide to have fewer children. Secondly, it is stark ageing of the population, and thirdly, the great intensity of international migration.

As to the first, available data illustrate that the number of marriages are declining. For example, the crude marriage rate was 6.8 marriages per thousand population in 2015, thus lower than in 2008 (7.2 marriages per thousand population) and 1994 (8.1 marriages per thousand population). Further, the age of entering into marital union has also been increasing. Also, Macedonia has experienced a substantive decline in fertility since the onset of the socioeconomic transition. In slightly more than one decade, the total fertility rate declined from 2.2 in 1994 to 1.59 in 2002, averaging 1.47 children per woman in 2008. It slightly increased by 1.49 in 2015. These numbers highlight that

Macedonia is posited in the group of countries where fertility is below replacement (Dragovic, 2011: 14–35).

Simultaneously, Macedonian population is becoming older. Throughout the period 2005–2015, the participation of young population (0–14 years) decreased from 19.4% to 16.7%, while the share of old age one (65 and more) increased from 11.1% to 13.0% (ДЗС, 2016: 12). Also, age dependency ratio decreased from 50.1 in 1994 to 46.3 in 2002 and 42.0 in 2015 (UNDP, 2004; SSO, 2016: 15).

When it comes to migration, both internal and international, it can be said that it is a phenomenon that shapes the country history and is going to shape its future development as well. Based on the existing literature, within migration' history of Macedonia we can identify four periods. First one starts from the second half of the nineteenth century, when migration flows were directed toward Western Europe and overseas destinations. Poor living conditions were pushing factor for mainly young, unskilled men to try to earn additional income. Second period was on the turn of the XX century, when the last destinations for Macedonians were overseas countries, such as the United States, Australia and Canada. During this period, a significant number of the Macedonian population (according to estimation, around 30,000), also left the country and settled in Sofia in Bulgaria. In first two decades of the XX century, a sizeable Macedonian immigrant group was established in Canada, since the admission regulations and employment opportunities were most favorable there (van Selm 2007). Third period was initiated after the Second World War and in the second half of the XX century, when the Macedonian population was mostly emigrating to Western Europe (Switzerland, Germany and Austria), but also, to Australia and Turkey as well (CRPM 2007: 8; Uzunov, 2011: 2–5). Following Macedonia's independence, after 1991, emigration had not stopped. Moreover, it continued with even more strength, as the economic crisis increased, with rising unemployment rate (particularly among youth) and poverty rate, leading to bleak future perspectives of the country. Thus, analysis showed that fifteen percent of tertiary educated Macedonian resides outside the country in 2002 (Janevska, 2003). On the other hand, labour market data in Macedonia showed shortage of highly educated people (CRPM 2007: 8).

Considering the fact that Macedonia is traditionally an emigration country, and because of the unfavorable economic and social con-

ditions, emigration can be spelled out as one of the greatest challenges for the state, for the researchers and policy makers. Brain drain is particularly expected to prevail in the future (Dietz, 2010: 22, Dragovic, 2013). Having also in mind a significant (direct and indirect) impact of migration on almost all areas of society and life, as well as that high proportion of youth involvement in migration, this Chapter aims exactly at discussing (e)migration intentions of youth. It is expected that the results obtained from such research would be conducive for a more comprehensive future researches, in order to understand and closely monitor intentions of future migration flows in the country.

Methodological approach

The main aim of this Chapter is to present some empirical findings about the attitudes of the young population of Macedonia towards emigration in particular. Study itself does not focus on the actual or potential migration from Macedonia in a certain time period, as the empirical data refer to the individual attitudes concerning the likelihood of cross-border mobility and not the actual implementation of their intentions. Intentions precede migration, but not always lead to it, because it is much easier to declare migration intentions than actually to realize them in practice.

Relevant theories related to the explanation of the determinants towards emigration are diverse. From that point, we will start with Ernst Georg Ravenstein. Ravenstein outlined the first macro theory of migration and formulated a series of *laws of migration* (1876, 1885 and 1889). According to Ravenstein, type of settlement, gender, age, family status influence migration behavior. Ravenstein's *laws of migration* were revised by Everett Lee, who introduced the new macro theoretical framework, known as the *push-pull* model. Lee emphasizes the four types of factors that have an influence on migration process: the area of origin, area of destination, intervention and personal factors (Lee, 1966). Lee's model was extended by Phillip Neal Ritchey. Ritchey include in model community and family components. Granting him the large family the social contact with friends, the marriage and the children increase one's ties to the community and hence deter migration (Ritchey, 1976).

Further, neo-classical economic theory, developed by Gary Becker in 1964, stresses the human capital investment as a part of the capital movement. Explanation concentrates on the expenditure on education and training, on acquiring information about the economic, political or social system and on the improvement of the emotional and physical health that in sum become seen as an investment. As it is aimed to increase the personal income in the future – by providing the workers with useful skills and physical abilities which will raise their productivity, these altogether appear as the push factors for emigration. In that context, income and income differences between area of origin and area of destination, as well as on differences between labor demand and labor supply are considered as a crucial factor in the final decision to emigrate.

On the macro level, this explanation as the main cause distinguishes the disparity existing between the low wage countries that have a labor surplus relative to capital, and high wage countries, which have a capital surplus relative to labor, which appears as suffice for migration. Thus, differences in wages, as well as differences in benefit, are the main push factor for the rational actors to emigrate. On the micro-level, concentrated on explaining the migration behavior, assumption is that the people are willing to migrate in order to maximize their productivity and thus gain the highest possible wages (Becker, 1964; Sjaastad, 1962; Castles and Miller, 2009: 21).

Human capital theory incorporates the social-demographic characteristics of the individual as an important determinant of migration at the micro-level. Depending on the specific type of labour demand in migrant receiving countries, migrants will be selected depending on their personal characteristics. For instance, young people are more likely to migrate than the elder, married migrants are required to migrate less than unmarried, as well as the people with migration experiences from rural areas who will be very likely to migrate again. In fact, the personal experience abroad is also a case of human capital, which, according to the theory, increases the chance for renewed migration (Massey et al., 1993: 435).

The raw political economy of labor migration theory distinguishes the low household or family income as the primary determinant of labor migration. According to this theory, even if the absence of wage differentials between the origin and destination country exists,

the risk-sharing motive is sufficient cause for the migration (Stark and Bloom, 1985: 174). In the context of the new economics of labor migration, it can be expected that in order to minimize the risk, the family will send abroad the household member with migration experience, if there is one. Households and families attempt to diversify their risk and income sources by sending one or more family members to work in foreign labor market, which is 'negatively or weakly correlated' with the local one (Massey et al., 1993: 36). In this case, if the economy of the origin country worsens and the income of the household decreases, it can rely on the family member abroad for financial support, which will help the family in the source country to cope with the problems.

When many people of the same nationality migrate to a particular destination, they usually form a migrant network there. The network consists of sets of interpersonal ties that connect the migrants, former migrants, and non-migrants in the origin and destination areas through the bonds of kinship, friendship, and shared community origin (Massey et al., 1993: 448). In case of migrant network in the country of destination, the risk-sharing motive is sufficient reason for migration. Youth is most likely to benefit from such social networks, because they tend to have more acquaintances with other young people, which are recognized by the other theories as the most mobile age group (McKenzie, 2006: 6). According to its essentials, the probability for cross-border mobility grows higher when the nationals have relatives and friends abroad, since these social networks reduce the migration expenses and risks, and increase the expected net gains (Stark, 1991).

Based on this theoretical review, we expect that the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents could have influence on their emigration decision. As a dependent variable we have selected the migration intention, while the gender, age, place of residence, family size and migration experience are considered as independent and exploratory variables (Bauer & Zimmermann, 1999; Drinkwater, 2002). Each of the exploratory variables give the opportunity to estimate the differences between expressing attitudes towards (e)migration, and to get a closer understanding of emigration intention.

On the basis of relevant literature potential emigrants were divided into the following groups: potential settlers (permanent emigrants), potential long term emigrants, potential short-term emigrants, and non-emigrants (Mintchev, Boshnakov, Kaltchev and Goev, 2004). In

addition, Fassmann and Munz also distinguish two types of emigrants' attitudes: permanent and temporary. Temporary could be long, short-term and commuting (Fassmann and Munz, 2002). Respondents were separated in accordance with the above typology.

Attitudes toward migration are operationalized through family emigration experience, personal migration experience, migration incentives and intentions. Analysis is itself based on the primary data collected through the anonymous questionnaire distributed to the students in their first and second year of the undergraduate studies at the Faculty of Philosophy in Skopje, from several departments within the faculty. Survey was conducted during the academic year 2014/2015. During the students' classes the questionnaire was self-completed by all students who were present in the lecture room during the lecture time at the time of conduct survey. In order to have an idea about the structure of respondents by selected socio-demographic characteristics, *Figure 2.3.1.* presents the percentage distributions of respondents according to certain background characteristics.

Figure 2.3.1: Percentage distribution of respondents by certain background characteristics.

Backgrounds characteristics	Percent (%)	Number (n)
Overall	*100.0*	*216*
Place of residence		
Rural	14.4	31
Urban	42.6	92
Skopje	43.0	93
Gender		
Male	47.7	103
Female	52.3	113
Age		
18–19	15.7	34
20–21	26.4	57
22–23	34.7	75
24+	23.1	50
Number of family members		
1–3	34.3	74
4	47.2	102
5+	18.4	40

Source: Survey data

From the Figure 2.3.1 it can be seen that the total number of respondents is living in urban areas – 42.6%, 43.0% in Skopje (capital of R. Macedonia), while the other respondents (14.4%) live in the rural areas. According to gender structure, the majority or 47.7 % of respondents were male, and the remaining 52.3 percent were female. In terms of age, age group 18–19 consists 15.7% of the sample, age group 20–21 were 26.4%, next age group 22–23 shows the highest participation in a sample that is 34.7%, and age group 24+ were 23.1%. The majority of respondents' lives in family with 4 members (47.2%). Slightly more than one third of respondents (34.3%) live in family up to 3 members, and 18.4% percent live in family with 5+ members.

Data analysis is conducted by analizing the variable or with an uni-variant analysis, using the percent distribution. In order to precisely register whether the respondents have an impact on the answers, we have used the Bivariate analysis or contingency tables. Data processing is done using the Statistical Program for Social Science (SPSS).

Due to the fact that the sample is categorized as a non-probability purposive one, analysis and conclusion will refer only to students who were part of the survey. Nevertheless, the analysis of attitudes to (e) migration allows identifying some important aspects of emigration intention of youth in Macedonia. Results are based on categorical data for which dichotomous, nominal and ordinal data are used. Obtained data are analyzed at the level of the univariate, and bivariate analyses. For that purpose percentage and cross tabulation is used. Application of the binary logistic model is to determine the net effect of the factor variables mentioned above in shaping attitudes among respondents.

Analysis of the results

This part of the Chapter is devoted to the analysis of empirical findings that refer to general attitudes towards emigration, migration experience, intentions, information and eagerness to leave the home country. Based on the assumption drawn from the network theory, we might assume that the people who have already been abroad will be more likely to migrate than those who have not. In order to depict the previous migration experience of respondents – either their own or from some of the family members, students were asked two questions. First question was: *Is someone in your family was abroad on any grounds?*

The majority of the respondents (60.2%) reported that someone from their family experience with migration. On the contrary, their personal experience of living out of the country, either for study visit or to work is less. Namely, one out of three (28.7%) replied positively to the question: *Were you personally abroad for the sake of study or of work?* Those who were abroad, most often had been in Germany and stayed for several months. Importance of those questions is based on the assumption that the personal knowledge of international environment, i.e. previous stay abroad, could be considered as an important aspect of building social networks, migrant networks, and as it is could increase potential emigration (Makni, 2011: 192–193).

When the data on family and personal experience were controlled for by certain background characteristics, such as age, gender and family size, no significant differences were found. Again, it should be emphasized that the sample used in the Chapter is non-probability one and thus, the data analysis itself refers only to the sample, and could not be generalized. Nevertheless, data show that there are no statistical differences in the answers, even when they are being controlled by certain background characteristics of respondents in this particular study.

On the other hand, on the basis of several questions in the questionnaire, emigration intentions of surveyed students were identified as follows. Firstly, they were given the chance to select one among the three proposed options: a) *I prefer to live and work in Macedonia; b) I would like to live and work abroad* and *c) I would like to work abroad for some time, but again to get back in Macedonia.* The majority of respondents indicated the willingness to leave the country, reaching up to 38.9%. These are students who would like to live and work abroad for some time, but would eventually return to Macedonia. Close to them are those (35.2 %) who would like to live and work abroad. The lowest proportion, or more precisely one quarter, are the students who prefer to stay in Macedonia.

Following the classification available in the relevant literature and based both on the methodology used in survey and research results, our respondents could be divided into two groups. One consists of potential emigrants and second one from non-emigrants. First group might further be divided into potential settlers (38.9%) and long or short term mobiles (35.2%), while the rest is comprised of non-emigrants who do not consider moving abroad as a likely perspective.

Analysis bellow illustrated in Figure 2.3.2. refers to distribution of migration attitudes according to gender, age, place of residence and family size. As being said, these variables are not related to the respondents' opinions in an equal way. However, it must be pointed out that female student respondents from the youngest age group, students from Skopje, as well as those from bigger families are more prone to leaving the country with no intention to return.

Figure 2.3.2: Respondents' structure regarding general migration attitudes, distributed according to gender, age, place of residence and family size.

| Responders characteristics | Answers | | | |
	I prefer to live and work in Macedonia	I would like to live and work abroad	I would like to work abroad for some time, but again to get back in Macedonia	Total
Overall	25.1	36.1	38.9	100.0
Gender				
Male	23.3	35.0	41.7	100.0
Female	26.5	37.2	36.3	100.0
Age				
18–19	11.8	52.9	35.3	100.0
20–21	29.8	26.3	43.9	100.0
22–23	24	37.3	38.7	100.0
24+	30.0	34.0	36.0	100.0
Place of residence				
Rural	22.6	38.7	38.7	100.0
Urban	27.2	28.3	44.6	100.0
Skopje	23.7	43.0	33.3	100.0
Family size (no of members)				
1–3	25.7	39.2	35.1	100.0
4	29.4	32.4	38.2	100.0
5+	12.5	40.0	47.5	100.0

Source: Survey data

Similar trends are demonstrated in another survey from 2016, where the target group was unemployed persons in Macedonia. When asked whether they think of resettlement to another country, as many as 80% of respondents declared they had been reflecting on doing it,

out of whom 31% were seriously considering this option. Age and place of residence had no major effect on that (Латковиќ, Поповска, Старова, 2016: 27).

In the next survey question, respondents were asked to select how much do they adhere to the statement, 'I would like to go abroad for more than one month' on the scale from 1 to 4. Based on the obtained answers, almost two thirds (59.3%) endorsed this idea, 19.4 %, supported it partially, 13.4% opposed it, and 7.9% opposed it completely (see Figure 2.3.3.). Following respondents' answers an impression can be created that at least three quarters of students could be classified as short-term emigrants.

Figure 2.3.3: Respondents' structure according to emigration attitudes towards statement to stay abroad more than one month.

Answers	In percent (%)
Like	59.3
Almost like	19.4
Do not like	13.4
Do not like at all	7.9
Total	100.0

Source: Survey data

It can be concluded that the empirical results of present survey, as well as secondary analysis, fit into the general trends of migration in Macedonia. Namely, analyses of processed migration in Macedonia indicate that in recent years, there is an increasing number of people who stay temporarily abroad, for the reasons of employment, family matters, education, etc. On the basis of statistical data from the last Census held in 2002, 35.123 people have been residing abroad for a period of more than 1 year, while out of whom 65.5% were employed or stayed as a family member, while 34.5% resided broad for some other reasons (SSO, 2004: 22). Due to absence of more recent Census data, estimations from other sources claim that this number is probably much higher. For illustration, Macedonian citizens in European Union receiving countries amount to more than 10,000 persons per year for the period 2002–2009 (Bornarova & Janeska, 2012: 6).

When asked to choose the duration of stay abroad, students in our survey answered in the manner that could be classified in following way: up to 6 months (21.8%), 7–12 months (19.0%), 1–5 years (17.6%) and 5+ years (17.1%), with a significant part of those who were indecisive (18.5%).

Figure 2.3.4: Respondents' structure of emigration attitudes towards duration of staying abroad.

Answers	In percent (%)
up to 6 months	21.8
7 – 12 months	19.0
1 –5 year	17.6
5+ year	17.1
Do not know	18.5
Total	100.0

Source: Survey data

Majority of answers (40.8%) belong to the group of short-term emigrants, thus, to those who wish to spend less than one year or so abroad, while 34.7% could be treated as medium-term ones since they opt for more than one year of residing abroad (Fassmann and Munz, 2002).

It could be inferred that the low proportion of students who have stated that have had any king of emigration-experience (28.7%), has an impact on their readiness to stay abroad more than a year. Our respondents (slightly more than one out of ten) demonstrated their readiness to fulfill their intentions during the current year. Majority is ready to do that in one year or more. It is important to mention that one quarter of respondents have such an idea, but they do not know exactly when they are going to realize it. Nevertheless, despite the low level of emigration experience, a relatively large number of respondents classified in the group of those who stayed abroad more than one year, refers to the existence of push factors in the country. Those push factors are defined as less opportunity for job or lack of other opportunities, such as education, better quality of life, career, etc. In the same time, age structure could not be neglected, as it has to be considered as the most influential variable in emigration selection.

No doubts that the shortage of work opportunities in the country is the main push factor to take on decision to leave Macedonia. Half

of the potential migrants – 50,6%, indicate work as a main reason for their readiness to leave the country and live outside Macedonia. Another half claims other reasons to go abroad, like holidays, family visit, study, training or better education. However, it is interesting to mention that only few students have chosen to live in the country continously.

Similar to the above, are the results of a research conducted in 2016 by the research team of the Foundation Friedrich Ebert in Skopje. Target population were young unemployed persons, aged 15–29 years, with a probability quota sample, sized 1009 respondents (Латковиќ, Поповска, Старова, 2016: 11–13). Based on the survey data, the primary reason for leaving cited, was a wish to improve living conditions by going abroad (60.40%). In addition, reasons related to employment, such as improved working conditions (37.40%), getting a job (32.90%), higher income (28.10%) and career advancement (13.50%), also were stated (ibid: 28).

As we can see, the primary motive for leaving the country is connected to the real economic and social conditions at home. Gross Domestic Product in Macedonia is lower in comparison to other countries, thus appearing as the key push factor, as stated in the neoclassical theory (Harris and Todaro, 1970, Castles and Miller, 2009). Inequality of income distribution (Gini-coefficient) published in 2015 (covering the year of 2013), was 37 per cent (a decrease from 38.8 per cent in the previous year). However, according to some social analysts, the richest 1 per cent of the population received 12 per cent of the total national income (in 1990 it was 4.5 per cent), which puts Macedonia at the third highest position in Europe when it comes to inequality of wealth distribution (Anceva, 2017: 3). Unemployment rate also is still very high, although slowly decreasing in recent years, from 28.0% in 2014, to 26.8 % by the end of 2015 (Anceva, 2017: 3). Despite the fact that the risk-of-poverty rate – according to the State Statistical Office, is slightly decreasing to 24.2 per cent of the population, with the poverty threshold defined as 60 per cent of median equivalent income, the risk of-poverty rate in 2015 still was 21.5 per cent. Furthermore, in 2015 the average gross wage in the country is around 520 euros. Nonetheless, over 70 per cent of all employees earn less than the average (Anceva, 2017).

Still, the decision to leave the country is very complex and a difficult one. In order to take final decision people take in consideration

benefits and costs from both receiving and sending countries. It is a long and thoughtful decision, based on the reflection on a context in which a person lives, availability of information and the environment where they want to go.

In order to check the real intention to leave a country, respondents were asked to state the source of information related to the life outside Macedonia. Largest number of students replied that vast information about the life and opportunities for living and working abroad had been received from their relatives and friends who already live abroad. This applies for slightly less than one third (31.5%) of respondents who were identified as potential emigrants. The second source of information was internet, which was chosen by 27.8%, followed by 25.3% who are informed from relatives and friends living in Macedonia.

Desirable destinations were Germany (16.7%), USA (14.8) and Italy (9.9%). These are countries belonging to the traditional emigrants' areas of Macedonia. According to another research, Macedonian emigrants point out that most desirable destination is Italy, USA, Switzerland and Germany (Uzunov, 2011: 8). Above presented findings correspond to a network theory of migration, as having friends and relatives abroad brings about higher probability for a cross border mobility (Stark, 1991; Faist 2000; Vertovec 2002; Pries 2004; Dustmann and Glitz 2005; Haug, 2008). Our data partly confirms this theoretical explanation, as the social network reduces the migration expenses and various risks, while increasing expected net gains – resulting exactly in migration (Makni, 2011: 194).

Binary logistic regression is further applied in this Chapter in order to predict the potential immigrants based on giving a set of indicators, at the same also demonstrating the relative importance of each of the predictors. Dependent variables that indicate the potential migration are expressed by respondents' preferences among following three statements: *I prefer to live and work in Macedonia; I would like to live and work abroad* and *I would like to work abroad for some time, but again to get back in Macedonia.* For the purpose of our analysis, respondents who preferred second and third statements have been identified as potential emigrants (Makni, 2011: 15; Mintchev, Boshnakov, Kaltchev, Goev, 2004). A dichotomous variable has been created. In order to construct the model, six (independent) factor variables has been included in the analysis, whose (quantitative) effect of the change in the dependent variable have been examined – i.e. gender, age, place of

residence, family size, the existence of a member of a household living abroad and personal migration experience (see: Figure 2.3.5.).

Figure 2.3.5: Description of the independent variables and references (base) group.

Independent variable	Categories
Gender	Female (reference group)
	Male
Age	24+ (reference group)
	Less than 24
Place of residence	Rural (reference group)
	Urban
Family size	5+ (reference group)
	Less than 5
Personal experience to stay abroad	Never be abroad (reference group)
	Were abroad for some reason (study or work)
Duration to stay	Less than 1 year (reference group)
	More than 1 year

The formal logistic model adopts the following form:

- $P(x)$ is the probability of classifying the respondent as a potential emigrant,
- N is the number of dependent variables included in the model (N=6).
- For each independent variable (i) a set of $(K_i - 1)$ number of dichotomous indicator variables X_{ij} is created, where K_i is the number of possible answers to the given question.
- β_{ij} coefficients evaluate the net factor effects of the indicator variables on the formation of emigration attitudes (Minchev and Boshnakov, 2007; Peng, Lee, Ingersoll, 2014; Wuench, 2014).

The marginal effects for all variables in the model by means of formula are as following:

$$P_o = \exp(\beta_o) / 1 + \exp(\beta_o) \text{ and } \Delta P_j = \beta_j * P_o * (1 - P_o).$$

- Po gives the probability to develop emigration intentions of a respondent from the reference (base) group, evaluated using the model's constant, while
- ΔPj measures the net change in the probability that the respondent will develop migration intentions under the indicator variable Xij.

Firstly, the probability of the base group to form the emigration intention also was calculated by defining it as an emigration potential. After applying a formula[7] to convert odds to probability, it comes out that the model predicts that 79.92% of respondents are going to be potential emigrants. In other words, probability to develop an emigration intensity is Po = 0.799. In applying the next formula: ΔPj = ßj*Po* (1-Po), the independent variable's net effect is identified. Results are presented in Figure 2.3.6.

Figure 2.3.6: Results of binary logistic regression.

Independent variables	B	Sig.	Exp(B)	ΔPj
Constant	1.381	0.070	3.980	0.222
Gender	0.151	0.639	1.162	0.024
Age	0.321	0.391	0.962	0.052
Place of residence	-0.039	0.935	0.962	-0.006
Family size	0.965	0.061	0.381	0.155
Personal experience to stay abroad	0.278	0.457	1.321	0.045
Preference duration to migration	0.318	0.332	1.375	0.051

B – Regression coefficient. Sig. level of significance. Exp (B) odds ΔPj net change of probability.

This model predicts that the odds of emigration are 1.162 times higher for male students than for female students. According to age structure, odds of deciding to emigrate are 0.962 times higher for students younger than 24. When it comes to places of residence, odds of emigration from urban areas and Skopje are 0.962 times greater in comparison to respondents from rural areas. The model predicts that the odds for emigration are 0.381 times higher for a family with less than 5 members. The odds to decide to emigrate are 1.321 times higher for students who have some experience living abroad. In addition, the

---

7   Po = 3.980 / 1 + 3.980

odds for potential emigration are 1.375 times higher for respondents who express willingness to stay abroad more than one year.

The evaluated logit model confirms that family size, age, emigration experience and readiness to move from country for a longer period increase the readiness to emigrate from Macedonia. According to data, no other variable has a crucial role in formation of the decision to move. Priority factor is family size, which increases the likelihood of emigration intensity by 15 percentage points. Age, migration experience and intention to stay abroad for more than 1 year increase the probability for forming the migration decision by around 5 percentage points.

Current survey data that refer to migration potential are not controlled by household economic approach. Of course, if economic variables such as household assets and specific income sources were part of questionnaire and consequently were introduced into the model of explanation, they could give deeper understanding about potential migration of students. Namely, motivation for emigration, above all in poor family conditions is based on the motivation to move for individual, personal goals but also for the survival of the household. In fact by sending member of family abroad guarantees family income and reduce risks incurred due to many reasons.

Although the determinants of migration have been already studied extensively, far less is known about the role of family size on migration, as well as the structure of household of origin. Empirical data prove that the household or family appear as main unit for migration choice, having in mind the economic role of migrants' remittances, particularly in developing context. Namely, family aim is to maximize household income, and emigration is seen as one of the sources of insurance or financial enhancement. Actually, it is the family security strategy that exists in developing countries in order to increase family income, help another member in the family, enhance the quality of life or opportunity for education, as well as to provide financial contributions for health-caring of their parents (parental care) (Stark 1991; Ratha et al, 2011; Stöhr, 2015). Taking in consideration the above given explanation, and the fact that Macedonia is a traditional emigration area, as well as the developing country, the role of family or family background (such as household characteristics, size, number of siblings), seems as a relevant factor that has an impact on the on students' potential decision to emigrate.

In fact, migration is characterized by a certain degree of selectivity, where individuals in a differentiated manner, response to the sending and to the receiving country (Lee, 1966). Lee emphasized the importance of the individual factors – where the age is one of them, because they are supposed to be related to differences in the migration behavior. In general, age of the migrants is of great importance for migration behavior, where the younger adults are more likely to emigrate in comparison to older ones. Data explored in this chapter proves the importance of age for increasing potential emigration from the country. Young people are more likely to migrate than the elder, because they have more prolonged possibilities to establish the working career and their costs of moving are lower. Also, fact that the majority of them are single and do not have a children reduces the cost for travelling, increases mobility, overall making the decision to emigrate to become stronger.

Emigrant experience, especially when linked with the readiness for a long-term stay abroad, appears as factor that has an important impact on potential emigrants' decision. As those two aspects are the part of migration network theory, this conclusion supports one of its hypotheses: at some point, experiences can prevail over economic determinants of cross-border mobility, thus being a strong attracting pull-effect, from the perspective of the host country. Therefore, the people with migration experience in a certain country will be very likely to migrate there again, because they have already paid some of the costs of migration, such as learning the language and the culture, leading to a number of obstacles for emigration to be overcome. In addition, the personal experience abroad is also a type of human capital, which, according to the theory, increases the return of migrating.

Concluding remarks

In sum, in this Chapter we have outlined some major trends in attitudes toward emigration, as well as some aspects of readiness to move out from the country. According to our empirical findings, students appear to be particularly keen on mobility, irrespective of some of their specific socio-demographic characteristics. The majority of respondents belong to a group of potentially permanent migrants, being ready to move within one year, when faced with an opportunity. No doubts

that shortage of work opportunity in the country is the main push factor to take on future decision to emigrate from Macedonia

Intention of young people to move out of the country of their residence is related to their optimism concerning the expectations and hope that somewhere else there are better life chances, compared to their home country. The main source of information about the living and work circumstances abroad have been received from their relatives and friends who already live across the border. They consider countries with more stable economies as the ones that could offer social security and plenty of choices in terms of working conditions, professional career, and life options. While the intensity of leaving the country permanently increases, present analysis could be conducive for a more comprehensive study, given the fact that many documents (such as policy documents, strategies, action plans and programs) related to migration are already adopted and need to be further implemented in practice.

References

Anceva, M. 2017. *Annual review of Labour Relations and Social Dialogue Macedonia* 2016. Skopje: Fridirh Ebert Shtifung.

Bauer, T. and Zimmermann, K. 1999, *Assessment of Possible Migration Pressure and its Labour Market Impact Following EU Enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe*, IZA Research Report No. 3.

Becker, G. 1964. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bornarova, S., Janeska, V. 2012. *Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe*. Final Country Report. European Commission, DG Employment.

Center for Research and Policy Making (CRPM). 2007. *Strengthening Cross-Border Cooperation in the Western Balkan Regarding Migration Management – Macedonia*, Occasional Paper No. 12, Skopje: Center for Research and Policymaking.

Castles, S. and Miller, M. 2009. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. (4th revised edition) Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan and Guilford Books.

Diets, B. 2010. Migration and Remittances in Macedonia. A review. *Arbeiten aus dem Osteuropa – Institut Regensburg*, No. 281, ISBN 978-3-938980-

30–9, available at: http://hdl.handle.net/10419/57794, accessed on February, 19th 2017.

Dragovic, A. 2011. Fertility in the Republic of Macedonia, in *Selected Research Papers in Social Change, Education, Labour Market, and Criminology*, Volume II, Linz: Johannes-Kepler-Universität.

Dragovic, A. 2013. Effects of the international migration of highly skilled persons on the development. The Global in the Local – the Case of the Republic of Macedonia, in: *Proceedings from International scientific conference Skopje-Krakow Sociological Seminar Global-Local/Local-Global*. Skopje.

Drinkwater, S. 2003. Go West? Assessing the willingness to move from Central and Eastern European Countries. *Flowenla Discussion Paper 5* Hamburgisches Welt-Wirtschafts-Archiv (HWWA) Hamburg Institute of International Economics (available at:https://www.researchgate.net/publication/24133994_Go_West_Assessing_the_Willingness_to_Move_from_Central_and_Eastern_European_Countries, accessed on February, 19th 2017).

Државен завод за статистика, 2016. Македонија во бројки, 2016 (Macedonia in Numbers, 2016), Државен завод за статистика. Скопје.

Dustmann, C., Glitz, A. 2005. *Immigration, Jobs and Wages: Theory, Evidence and Opinion*. Center for Research and Analysis of Migration, CEPR, London.

Faist, T. 2000. *The Volumes and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fassmann, H. and Munz, R. 2002. EU enlargement, and future East-West migration in Europe., in: Laczko, F. et al. (eds.). *New Challenges for Migration Policy in Central and Eastern Europe*. IOM, ICMPD and TMC Asser Press.

Fras M., Vasiljeva I. 2010. *Migration and Youth in Europe – New Realities and Challenges*. Council of Europe, European Youth Centre of the Council of Europe. Budapest.

Haug, S. 2004. Migration Networks and Migration Decision-Making. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* Vol. 34, No. 4: 585–605.

Harris, J and Todaro, M. 1970. Migration, unemployment, and development: A two-sector analysis. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 60, No. 1: 126–142.

Janeska. V. 2003. *Migration of History educated and Skilled Persons from the Republic of Macedonia*, SS. Cyril and Methodius University-Skopje, Institute of Economics, Skopje.

Латковиќ, Т., Поповска, М., Мирјана, Б., Старова, Н. 2016. *Невработеноста на младите во Република Македонија ('Youth Unemployment in Macedonia')*. Фридрих Еберт Фондација во Скопје. Скопје: Контура.

Lee, E. 1966. A Theory of Migration. *Demography*, Vol.3 No.1: 47–57.

Makni, V. 2011. Student Migration Potential: The Case of Bulgaria. *South-Eastern Europe Journal of Economics* 2: 187–206

Massey, D., Arango, J., Hungo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegino, A. and Taylor, E. 1993. Theories of International Migration: A review and Appraisal. *Population and Development Review*, Vol.19 No.3: 431–466.

Markiewicz, M. 2006. *Migration and Remittances in Macedonia*, CEA, October.

McKenzie, J. D. 2007. *A profile of the world's young developing country migrants.* World Bank Policy Research and IZA Working Paper 2948, Bonn.

Minchev, V. and Boshnakov, V. 2007. Migration Survey, in: Mihailov et al. (eds.). *Family Patterns and Migration: National Representative Survey.* Sofia: Agency for Socio-Economic Analyses, Center for Comparative Studies, MLSP & UNFP.

Mintchev, V., Boshnakov, V., Kaltchev, I. 2004. *Who is leaving? Potential emigration from Bulgaria in the beginning of the XXI century.* Institute of Economics, Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Science. (Available at: http://www.eldis.org/go/home&id=17781&type=Document#.WI-5BtIrLIU, accessed on February, 19th 2017)

Peng, C-Y. J., Lee, K. L., Ingersoll, G. 2002. An Introduction to Logistic Regression Analysis and Reporting. *The Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 96 No. 1: 3–14.

Pries, L. 2004. Determining the causes and durability of transnational labour migration between Mexico and the United States: some empirical findings', *International Migration*, Vol. 42, No.2: 3–39.

Ravenstein, E. G. 1876. Census of the British Isles. *Birthplaces and migration Geographical Magazine* 3: 173–229.

Ravenstein, E. G. 1885. The Laws of Migration. *Journal of the Statistical Society*, Vol. 8 No.2: 167–227.

Ravenstein, E. G. 1889. The Laws of Migration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol.52 No.2: 214–301.

Ratha, D., Mohapatra, S. and Scheja, E. 2011. Impact of migration on economic and social development: A review of evidence and emerging issues. *Policy Research Working Paper Series* 5558, The World Bank Vol. 61, No. 3: 380–89.

Ritchey, N. 1976. Explanations of Migration. *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol.2: 363–404.

Sjaastad, L. 1962. The Costs and Returns of Human Migration. *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol.70: 80–93.

Stark, O. 1991. *The Migration of Labor.* Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

Stark, O., and Bloom, D. 1985. The new economics of labor migration. *American Economic Review*, Vol.75, No.2: 173–178.

State Statistical Office in the Republic of Macedonia. 2008. (Natural populations change, 2008. SST. 2.4.9.08 627, Statistical review: population and social statistics). Skopje: State Statistical Office.

State Statistical Office in the Republic of Macedonia 2008. (Natural populations change, 2008. No.2.1.9.17, 2008). Skopje: State Statistical Office.

State Statistical Office in the Republic of Macedonia. 2016. Regions of the Republic of Macedonia, 2016. Skopje: State Statistical Office.

State Statistical Office. 2004. *Census of Population, Households and Dwellings in the Republic of Macedonia*, 2002, Book I, Skopje, Skopje: State Statistical Office.

Stöhr, T. 2015. Sibling interaction in migration decisions: Who provides for the elderly left behind? *Journal of Population Economics*. Vol. 28, No. 3: 593–629.

UNDP. 2004. *Socio-economic disparities among municipalities in Macedonia*. Skopje: Reprint.

Uzunov, V. 2011. Macedonian Emigration: History, Trends and Current Profile. *Iustinianus Primus Law Review*, Skopje Vol 2. No.1: 1–19.

Van Selm J. 2007. *Macedonia: At a Quiet Crossroads*, Migration Information Source, June, available at: http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/macedonia-quiet-crossroads last accessed on February, 19th 2017).

Vertovec, S. 2002. Transnational networks and skilled labor migration. Paper given at the conference: *Ladenburger Diskurs 'Migration' Gottlieb Daimler und Karl Benz Stiftung, Ladenburg*, 14–15 February.

Wuensch, K. 2014. *Binary Logistic Regression with SPSS*. (Retrieved from http://core.ecu.edu/psyc/wuenschk/MV/Multreg/Logistic-SPSS.PDF, accessed on February 19th 2017).