Vesselin Mintchev, Senior Research Fellow, Ph.D., Venelin Boshnakov, Iordan Kalchev, Associate Professor, Ph.D., Valentin Goev, Associate Professor, Ph.D.

EXTERNAL MIGRATION FROM BULGARIA AT THE BEGINNING OF THE XXI CENTURY: ESTIMATES OF POTENTIAL EMIGRANTS' ATTITUDES AND PROFILE[1]

The emigration potential is estimated, as well as the profile of settlers and the temporary long-term and short-term Bulgarian emigrants. The difference between the actual emigration and the generally declared intention to travel abroad is discussed.
The data from two surveys carried out using the same questionnaire in 2001 and 2003 is used. When identifying the profile of emigrants there have been established two types of variables: demographics; employment, education and previous stay abroad.
There are used standard cross-tabulations and binary logit-models. Three individual logit-models for each type of emigrant are estimated. It is emphasized that: the immediate emigration potential from Bulgaria (within the current year) does not differ dramatically from that of the countries of Central Europe; age and previous stay abroad are among the most important determinants of emigration attitudes of Bulgarian citizens; employment, education and incomes do not have the expected influence. It is argumented that migratory policies, based on restrictions and bilateral agreements (in their European version), could hardly be effective under the conditions of the newly created migration networks and the business which has found a niche in the provision of emigration services.

JEL: J61; J62; J11

Following the systematic changes at the beginning of the 1990's, Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) generated emigration. Bulgaria was no exception. For the years between the two most recent censuses of 1992 and 2001, Bulgaria's population dropped by about 6%. More than 1/3 of this decline was due to the international mobility of Bulgarian citizens. The gross emigration for the period was estimated at 196 thousand persons, i.e. an average of 22 thousand people emigrated each year (Census, 2001, p. 51.) Despite the actual ban on free movement during the Cold War years, emigration is not a new phenomenon in Bulgaria. According to different estimates, more than 900 thousand individuals had migrated from Bulgaria before 1945 and economic emigration between World War I and II was about 125,000 individuals. At the same time Bulgaria received more than 800 thousand persons (Mintchev, 1999). After 1945, based on bilateral agreements between Bulgaria and Turkey about 680 thousand ethnic Turks migrated from Bulgaria (Gashter, 2002, p. 5). Pursuant to different bilateral agreements,[2] Bulgarian workers were employed in Central Europe, the Komi Republic in the former USSR, in North Africa, etc.

[1] This research was supported by a grant from the CERGE-EI Foundation under a program of the Global Development Network. Additional funds for grantees in the Balkan countries have been provided by the Austrian Government through WIIW, Vienna. All options expressed are those of authors and have not been endorsed by CERGE-EI, WIIW, or the GDN."

[2] A source of information on these issues is the annual reports of SOPEMI.

Conflicting assessments of the new emigration wave consequences are to be found in the literature. They range from dramatic, in the sense of unrecoverable loss of human capital, measured in years of education and professional experience of the emigrants (Minkov, 1994, p. 166.) – to neutral, comparing the emigration potential of Bulgaria to that of Austria in the context of the processes of globalization (Gashter, 2002). This of course, is the country of origin point of view.

The fears for mass emigration from Central and Eastern Europe mainly towards the countries of the European Union (EU-15) are prompting serious discussions and evaluations of the east-west migration flow. Regardless of whether aggregate data would be used and respectively, cross sectional or time series models, benchmarking on prior emigrations from Southern to Northern Europe or among individual states in the USA. (See for instance Boeri, Bruecker, 2001, p. 10-14; Bauer, Zimmermann, 1999, p. 44-46;); or micro-data (Bauer, Zimmermann, 1999; Drinkwater, 2002; Papapanagos and Sanfey, 1998; Kule, Mancellari, Papapanagos, Qirici and Sanfey, 2000; Hazans, 2003; International Organization for Migration (IOM), 1999 and 2001); enabling characterization of potential emigrants from the point of view mainly of the human capital and network theories (Massey, Arango, Hugo, Kouaouci, Pellegrino, Taylor, 1993, p. 431-465.); the so-called *3%-4% Rule of Thumb* from the first analyses in the 1990s is adopted (Leyard, Blanchard, Dornbusch, and Krugman, 1992; Straubhaar, 2001, p. 169). Namely – Central and Eastern Europe would lose not more than 3-4% of its working-age population for a period of about 15 years after the lifting of the transitory restrictions on labor mobility for East European citizens[3]. Of them, however, only about a half would stay in the West for good, 2/3 of this flow is expected to be recruited from two countries – Poland and Romania.

Obviously, emigration from Central and Eastern Europe (of course, not counting Russia and the CIS states) does not pose a serious threat to recipient industrialized societies (see also Borjas, 1999), except for certain border regions in Austria, Germany and Greece[4]. In this sense, despite the extension of temporary labor mobility restrictions from EU expansion south, towards actual enlargement, the better immigration policy would still be „no borders – no immigrants" (Martin, 2003, p. 18.) The modest emigration potential of Bulgaria from the perspective of receiving countries, incl. – in comparison with other states from the European south-east – Albania, Romania and Moldova; does not take this issue off the agenda. This article is not intended to test hypotheses of a particular theory of

[3] Potential emigration assessments in the countries of South-Eastern Europe – Romania, Bulgaria and particularly Albania and to some extent in Poland exceed the respective assessments for Central Europe. See for example *Bauer, T. K. and K. F. Zimmermann*. Assessment of Possible Migration Pressure and its Labor Market Impact Following EU Enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe. - IZA Research Report, July 1999, N 3, p. 45.

[4] As regards undocumented labor emigration from Bulgaria to Greece in particular, see Markova, Evgenia and Alexander H. Sarris. 1997, "The Performance of Bulgarian Illegal Immigrants in the Greek Labor Market", *South European Society & Politics*, Vol. 2, N 2 (Autumn), p. 55-77.

international migration. We have to answer the question – "Who is leaving?" Here is why in the following sections we evaluate the emigration potential of this country and outline potential emigrants' profiles. For this purpose we are using micro-data from two opinion polls, conducted in 2001 and 2003 based on a questionnaire, incorporating standard human capital variables (gender, age, education, etc.) and network theory assumptions (in regard to prior stays abroad). Before that, however, we will briefly dwell on the use of emigration's micro-data empirical studies.

Potential emigration's micro-data empirical studies

Except for the studies of the International Organization of Migration in Central and Eastern Europe (IOM, 1999, 2001) potential emigration's micro-data empirical studies are an exception, rather than a rule. Meanwhile, rich information and analyses exist on the internal mobility of the population.

Studies of individual emigration intentions capture subjective opinion, attitudes, etc. in regard to the likelihood of cross-border mobility. The opportunity to evaluate emigration attitudes and potential emigrants' profiles is an advantage. Despite the high correlation of existing attitudes and actual emigration, the subjective character of the opinion expressed limits to this approach. It's very easy to claim that one would emigrate (even more so that in some communities this is a matter of prestige); it is much more difficult to emigrate indeed (Fassmann & Munz, 2002; Drinkwater, 2002). Attention is paid to the differences between the emigration propensity and its implementation, incl. the undertaking of specific preparatory steps. Usually this is due to the *manner, in which the questions are formulated, registering the emigration intentions*. If very generally formulated, such as – whether the respondents have *contemplated* travel / stay in Western Europe or overseas, a high, but rather hypothetic emigration potential may be expected. Conversely, the questions on undertaking specific actions in this regard, such as – fulfillment of the intentions in the current year; learning a foreign language; search for employment/employer in the "target" country; application for a work visa (IOM, 1999, 2001) etc., register considerably lower emigration attitudes: depending on the individual questions – usually under 1% of the working age population (IOM, 1999, 2001). This circumstance is taken into account in the current study. That's why the evaluation of the emigration potential from Bulgaria "is controlled" by a question regarding the *intentions for emigration in the current year* in the opinion polls, which we are using. Obviously, a small number of the potential emigrants would be ready to pay the direct and indirect economic and other costs of emigration,[5] as defined by the human capital theory.[6]

In the opinion polls a similar question is used, setting apart potential emigrants from non-emigrants (by their likelihood of emigration) through an ordinal scale of replies. The scale contains 4 or 5 categories of responses – from

[5] A possible explanation of this we may find in the option concept of *Burda, M.* Migration and option value of waiting. - Economic and Social Review, 1995, 27, p. 1-19, according to which the effect of the neoclassical *income differential* is limited by the uncertainty in the success of emigration

[6] Originally developed by *Sjaastad, L.* The costs and returns of human migration. - Journal of Political Economy, 1962, 70, p. 80-93.

„definitely not" to „definitely yes". The 5th option is normally reserved for „don't know /did not respond" .[7] In both opinion polls, on which our further analysis is based, a question with a 4-degree ordinal scale has been used.

On the other hand, based on the *planned duration of the stay abroad* usually three main potential emigrants groups are outlined – short-term emigrants (intending to spend abroad less than 1 year), medium-term emigrants (for a term of over 1 year) and settlers (see for instance Fassmann&Munz, 2002, who summarize micro-data empirical studies). Bastyr use a similar typology – permanent (definitive), temporary-resident and temporary (commuter) emigration (Bastyr, 2001). Clearly, the expected stay abroad differentiates permanent and temporary (long-, short-term and commuting) emigration attitudes. This imply specific policies: activation of a temporary, mainly short-term labor emigration based on bilateral agreements in both sending and receiving countries; regulation of emigration services' ventures – mainly in the countries of origin; a strict selective immigration policy in some of the main destinations, etc.

In conclusion, the types of potential emigrants are most frequently identified (1) by the self-assessed probability of leaving the country of origin – emigrants/non-emigrants, and (2) by taking into consideration the preferred duration of the stay abroad – permanent, long-term and short-term emigrants. In micro-data empirical study further we follow this approach. The stress of the analysis is laid on the differences between permanent and temporary emigration potential and different emigrants' profiles from Bulgaria.

The standard human capital variables – gender, age, education, usually are present in micro-data analyses. The „selection" of emigrants depends also on their family and employment status, as well as on prior stays abroad (Bauer, Zimmermann, 1999; Drinkwater, 2002). Papapanagos and Sanfey add to their analysis for Albania the type of settlement, income level, professional group and expressed approval/disapproval of the reforms conducted (Papapanagos and Sanfey, 1998; Kule, Mancellari, Papapanagos, Qirici and Sanfey, 2000). In our analysis we use three groups of variables:

1) Gender, age, family status and ethnicity;

2) Type of settlement, employment, education, income level (we have income data from 2003 opinion poll only) and previous stay abroad;

Each of the variables (determinants) mentioned above provides an opportunity to test hypotheses, inspired by particular theories and research traditions of international migration, particularly where macro-data analysis is available. At the same time the determinants' tests in regard to potential emigrants *in general,* tends to underestimate differences between permanent and temporary long- and short-term emigrants' attitudes. In this sense, except an answer to the

[7] Similarly, in the data of Papapanagos and Sanfey a four-degree ordinal scale is used with the categories "definitely not", "probably not", "probably yes" and "definitively yes" (Papapanagos and Sanfey, 1998). At the same time Drinkwater evaluated the inclination towards emigration by a 5-degree scale with response categories ranging between "very willing" and "very unwilling" (Drinkwater, 2002).

question – *„Who is leaving Bulgaria?"* we are also trying to learn why in some cases permanent, and in other cases – temporary emigration is preferred?

Usually, the micro-data analyses' objective is to evaluate the determinants' *partial/net effect*. Drinkwater, and Papapanagos et al. for example, assess a series of probit models, in regard to the net effect of human capital and network variables (Drinkwater, 2002; Papapanagos and Sanfey, 1998; Kule, Mancellari, Papapanagos, Qirici and Sanfey, 2000). Bauer and Zimmermann note the differences of the regression coefficients of education, employment and family status variables between the domestic and international mobility of the population (Bauer and Zimmermann, 1999). In the micro-study, based on the 2001 and 2003 opinion polls in Bulgaria (using an identical questionnaire, with one exception – in 2003 a question was added regarding the incomes of respondents) by means of one-dimension distributions (cross-tabulations) and a binary logistical regression, we attempt to uncover the reasons why in one set of circumstances permanent, and in another one – temporary (long-term or short-term) emigration is preferred? In this connection further on we review the overall emigration potential of the working-age Bulgarian population; the methods of analysis and the potential emigrants' socio-demographic profiles and attitudes.

General evaluation of the emigration intentions of Bulgarian citizens

Data sources

Empirical analysis uses micro-data from two surveys, conducted in 2001 and 2003. The 2001 survey included 25`000 respondents from 15 to 60 years of age (after reduction of the non valid questionnaires). It was conducted by the National Institute of Statistics during the regular population census and coincided with the lifting of Schengen restrictions on the movement of Bulgarian citizens[8]. The repeat survey was conducted in June-July 2003 by the Center for Comparative Studies – Sofia, the ALPHA Research sociological agency with the financial support of GDN – CERGE-EI, Prague. The 2003 survey used a similar questionnaire. The sample included approximately 1100 individuals and was later reduced to 1006 respondents aged from 17 to 65.

Types of potential emigrants

The survey applies the above approach towards categorization of potential emigrants, based on the answers to the question regarding emigration intentions of respondents. Its three items incorporate the criteria for determining the types of potential emigrants: (1) likelihood to emigrate; (2) duration of the perceived stay abroad.

[8] The results of this survey were published in Census 2001, Vol. 6, Book 3 "Territorial mobility of population". Sofia, National Institute of Statistics, p. 51-74.

Q3. How likely in the current and following years:	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Little likely	Unlikely
3.1/ You would go abroad to work/study for **several months?**	1	2	3	4
3.2/ You would go abroad to work/study for **more than one year**?	1	2	3	4
3.3/ You would **migrate and settle** in another country?	1	2	3	4

Because the respondents answer each item, the allocation of potential emigration types was conducted under the following 3-step iterative procedure. First, the group of "*potential settlers*" is formed, comprising all respondents who replied "very likely" or "somewhat likely" to item 3. Secondly, from the other respondents the group of potential *"long-term emigrants"* is formed, who gave the same responses to item 2. Likewise, after elimination of these two sub-groups and depending on the answers to item 1, potential *"short term emigrants"* were defined. All other respondents were classified as *"non-emigrants".* On that basis, we identify:

- *potential settlers (permanent emigrants)* – persons with high self-assessment of the likelihood to settle abroad;
- *potential long-term emigrants* – persons, who rated as very likely and somewhat likely to go abroad for a relatively lengthy period (more than 1 year);
- *potential short-term emigrants* – persons with high self-assessment of the likelihood to stay in another country for a period not exceeding one year;
- *non-emigrants* – persons, who do not consider likely to move abroad.

As it is well-known emigrants are persons, absent from their home country for more than one year, without having returned for more than three months. Those may be settlers or long-term emigrants. Over the last few years particular attention is paid to short-term emigration – up to 1 year; including the so-called commuters – persons, staying abroad for several days or weeks, but less than three months (Kalchev, 2001, p. 65-69.). The study of potential emigrants' profiles is of great interest both from the sending and receiving countries' point of view. These issues are to be found in the political debate. Frequently home and host countries' perspectives differ substantially. One could not deny, however that in these two cases both positive, as well as unfavorable consequences, are to be observed (see for instance Matloob and Vickerman).

Emigration potential from Bulgaria

Data show, that for 8,2% of working age population in 2001 and for 7,5% there of in 2003 it was "very likely" or "somewhat likely" *to settle in another country.* Similarly, *potential long-term emigrants* (i.e. persons, who would work/study abroad for a term of over 1 year, but without intention for final migration) were 6.7% in 2001 and 7.9% in 2003. As regards *potential short-term emigrants*, they amounted to 4,5% in 2001 and 4,9% in 2003 (see Table 1). The emigration potential of Bulgaria, defined in this manner, amounted to 19,4% in 2001 and just a little more (within the limits of the statistical error) – 20,2% in 2003. This estimate is about 5%

lower in comparison to the most recent study of potential emigration from Bulgaria, conducted by the International Organization of Migration. (IOM, 2001, p. 8.). About 1 million working-age Bulgarian citizens are disposed to look for social fulfillment abroad. Working-age population is about 5 million. That's why the matter has a considerable impact on the political debate in Bulgaria (Mintchev, 2003). It is noteworthy, however, that only 1/3 of potential emigrants is disposed to leave for good. During the two year period a trend was observed, although insufficiently clear-cut, towards a decline of settlers in favor of those, who prefer a temporary stay abroad. In this sense the ideas for liberalization of immigration policies of receiving countries and particularly of those from the European Union (EU-15) are not unfounded (Straubhaar, 2001; Matloob and Vickerman). As evident from the table, persons disposed to fulfill their intentions during the current year are ¼ of all potential emigrants. They represent on average 2% regardless of whether they are inclined to migrate for good or to stay abroad for 1 year or longer: 2,2% of respondents in 2001 and 2,6% of those in 2003 expressed a desire for final migration; similarly - 1,9% in 2001 and 2,0% in 2003 were the potential long-term emigrants; and 1,2% and respectively 1,7% were the potential short-term emigrants. This assessment of the emigration potential from Bulgaria looks more realistic. These were about ¼ million people during the two surveys. In 2003, however, the emigration propensity within the current year increased. This is more noticeable in regard to short-term emigration and could be related to the lifting of visa restrictions for Bulgarian citizens in the Schengen area.

Table 1

Shares of potential emigrants, adjusted by the time frames of the intentions to migrate (%)

Time frame of the intentions	2001			2003		
	Migrants	Long-term emigrants	Short-term emigrants	Migrants	Long-term emigrants	Short-term emigrants
As early as the current year	2.2	1.9	1.2	2.6	2.0	1.7
In the next 2-3 years	4.3	3.4	2.2	3.7	3.9	2.3
Later	1.7	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.9	0.8
Total unadjusted	**8.2**	**6.7**	**4.5**	**7.5**	**7.9**	**4.8**

Research methods for analysis of the types of potential emigrants

Scope and intensity of migration intentions

Two indicators for identifying the social and demographic profile of potential emigrants have been used in the study[9] – the scope and intensity of migration intentions:

[9] These indicators are used in the NIS publication referenced above - Census 2001, Vol. 6, Book 3 "Territorial mobility of population". Sofia, National Institute of Statistics, p. 55.

• *The scope* evaluates the structure of respondents (permanent; long-term and short-term emigrants) based on a given socio-economic variable. The latter are formed from the identical questions in the surveys of 2001 and 2003, related to gender, age, family status, etc. In the 2003 survey income level questions were also added. For example, the *scope* of short-term emigrants by gender shows the relative shares of men and women in the group of potential short-term emigrants. Therefore the gender structure of potential short-term emigration may be compared to the gender structure of the working-age population.

• *The intensity* measures the relative frequency of the opinions, expressed by the respondents in a given population category. For example, the intensity of men – potential short-term emigrants, shows their relative share in the total number of men surveyed. Thus the migration attitudes frequency among each population category of the sample researched has been documented.

Binary logistical regression

The micro-data analyses use multivariate models with a qualitative dependent variable. They encompass a broad range of independent variables, treated as determinants of individual migration attitudes. In most cases, such variables are also non-metered. This pre-determines the choice of probit or logit models (Bauer, and Zimmermann, 1999).

In order to evaluate human capital and network variables' net effects on the migration attitudes' pattern a series of binary logistical regression models are used.[10] Therefore the cross-tabulations assessments are enriched.

• *Dependent variable*

The categorization of respondents as *potential settlers, potential long-term and short-term emigrants and non-emigrants* is used for the design of three dichotomous

[10] The general shape of the logit model for a given emigration type is as follows:

$$Log\left(\frac{P(x)}{1-P(x)}\right) = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{Ki-1}\beta_{ij}X_{ij}$$, where:

P(x) is the probability of classifying the respondent as a potential emigrant,
N is the number of socio-demographic variables, included in the model (N=8).

A range of $K_i - 1$ dichotomous indicator variables X_{ij} is constructed in regard to each independent variable (i), where K_i is the number of options for response to the respective question. The β_{ij} coefficients rate the indicator variables' net effect on the specific type of migration attitudes. The values of regression coefficients are transformed (Greene, 2000, p.816):

$$\Delta P_{ij} = \beta_{ij} P_0 (1 - P_0) \qquad P_0 = \frac{\exp(\beta_0)}{1 + \exp(\beta_0)}$$, where:

P_0 is the chance of migration intentions' creation for a respondent of the reference group, evaluated by the constant of the model.

The numbers obtained ΔP_j measure the net change of the chance for the respondent's classification into a specific emigration type under the indicator variable X_{ij}, *ceteris paribus*.

dependent variables (respective potential emigrants' type/non emigrants). Each variables is assigned code «1» for a given group potential emigrants and code «0» for respondents – non-emigrants. In this way, using logit model for each emigrant type, the socio-demographic variables' net effect is identified.

- *Independent variables*

The identical questions in the 2001 and 2003 surveys assigned the independent variables' data. These questions provide relevant information on potential emigrants' intentions and socio-demographic profile (Table 2).

Table 2

Variables of the socio-demographic profile

Independent variable	Categories
1.Gender	(1) Female (reference category) (2) Male
2. Age	(1) Up to 30 yrs. (2) 30 – 40 yrs. (3) 40 – 50yrs. (4) Over 50 yrs. (reference category)
3. Family status	(1) Married (reference category) (2) Single /never married, divorced, widowed/
4. Education	(1) Primary and lower (reference category) (2) Secondary (3) Higher
5. Ethnic group	(1) Bulgarian (reference category) (2) Turkish (3) Roma
6. Type of settlement	(1) Rural (reference category) (2) Urban (3) Capital
7. Employment	(1) Employed (reference category) (2) Unemployed
8. Previous stay abroad	(1) No (reference category) (2) Yes
Reference group of respondents	
1.Gender	Female
2. Age	Over 50 yrs.
3. Family status	Married
4. Education	Primary or lower
5. Ethnic group	Bulgarian
6. Type of settlement	Rural
7. Employment	Employed
8. Previous stay abroad	No

The response's option of a lesser chance for classifying the respondent as a potential emigrant should be chosen for the reference category. I.e. the reference group is the potential non-emigrant – the respondents with lowest chances for emigration.

Socio-demographic profile of potential permanent emigrants (settlers) from Bulgaria

The potential of permanent emigration commands increased interest in the native and receiving countries, alike. In the first case it is related to unfavorable demographic and social consequences, negative remittances, etc.; in the second – to pressure on the host countries' labor market (Piracha, and Vickerman).

Gender, age, family status and ethnic origin of potential settlers – scope/structure and intensity

The gender structure of potential settlers in 2003 appeared more balanced, in comparison to 2001. This could be due to the structure of 2003 sample (in 2003 53% of those polled were female; while in 2001 they were 48,8%); but it could also reflect formation of attitudes for activating the so-called family emigration (reunification of families) after the lifting of the Schengen requirements and the decline of emigration to Turkey. Yet the intensity of the intentions to leave the country for good still remains higher with men (see Table 3).

The age structure of potential settlers comes as no surprise. More than ½ of the potential permanent emigration is recruited among the population under 30 years of age. Worth noting is the fact that the scope of settlers grew in the next age group of 31-40 years of age in 2003 as compared to 2001. Similarly, the intensity of intentions to emigrate for good was considerably higher among these two age groups, as compared to people over 40 years of age. During the period in question the intensity increased among 30 and 40 years olds and declined among the elderly population (see Table 3). This is in conformity with theories, treating emigration as an investment decision (Sjaastad, 1962). The permanent emigrants' time horizon falls with the advancement of age. Therefore their emigration's propensity also declined.

Data from both surveys are also similar in regard to the family status of potential settlers. They were recruited almost equally among married and singles. Consequently, the intensity among the latter is about twice as high in comparison with the attitudes for final migration among married individuals.

The ethnic characteristics of potential permanent emigration have been changing visibly. The ethnic structure of potential settlers reproduces the ethnic makeup of working age population in Bulgaria. Over 80% of potential settlers are recruited from the Bulgarian ethnic group. In 2003 however, the scope of ethnic Turks declined nearly threefold and this of the Roma population increased by the same margin exactly. While the intensity among Bulgarians was approximately the same during the two surveys – about 8%; among Turks it fell from 9,2% in 2001 to 3,8% in 2003. The exact opposite – among Roma it grew respectively from 3,5% to 10,4% (see Table 3). This is an issue, to which no simple response could be given. Most likely permanent migration towards Turkey exhausted its potential. On the other hand the social problems of Roma, exacerbated by the liberal reforms, conducted for more than a decade now, as well as their mobility, which is higher in principle, generated high attitudes in favor of emigration for good.

Table 3

Socio-demographic profile of *potential settlers*. Scope/Structure and intensity of migration intentions

Categories of individuals by:	Structure 2001		Intensity	Structure 2003		Intensity
	Total	Settlers	2001	Total	Settlers	2003 г.
Gender						
Female	48.8	41.4	6.9	53.0	49.3	6.9
Male	51.2	58.6	9.4	47.0	50.7	8.0
Age						
Up to 30 years of age	29.8	50.5	13.9	23.4	52.0	16.6
31 – 40	23.6	25.9	9.0	20.9	30.7	11.0
41 – 50	25.4	15.9	5.1	20.8	10.7	3.8
Over 50	21.3	7.7	2.9	35.0	6.7	1.4
Family status						
Single	33.8	47.2	11.5	28.5	45.9	11.9
Married	66.2	52.8	6.5	71.5	54.1	5.6
Education						
Primary and lower	27.7	17.5	5.2	31.2	18.7	4.5
Secondary	53.6	61.6	9.4	51.7	56.0	8.1
Higher	18.8	20.9	9.1	17.1	25.3	11.0
Ethnic group						
Bulgarian	82.0	83.8	8.3	84.7	86.1	7.6
Turkish	12.1	13.6	9.2	8.3	4.2	3.8
Roma	5.9	2.5	3.5	7.0	9.7	10.4
Settlement						
Rural	27.8	18.2	5.4	30.9	16.0	3.9
Urban	59.9	64.4	8.8	55.8	65.3	8.7
Capital	12.3	17.4	11.6	13.3	18.7	10.4
Employment						
No	49.0	51.2	8.5	46.5	44.0	7.1
Yes	51.0	48.8	7.8	53.5	56.0	7.9
Prior visits abroad						
No	94.8	86.7	7.5	88.5	72.0	6.1
Yes	5.2	13.3	21.1	11.5	28.0	18.1
Personal Income						
Up to 1 minimum salary (MS)	–	–	–	43.0	50.0	8.6
1 to 2 MS'	–	–	–	39.4	29.2	5.5
2 to 3 MS'	–	–	–	10.9	9.7	6.6
Over 3 MS'	–	–	–	6.6	11.1	12.5

Settlement, education, employment, incomes and prior stays abroad of potential settlers – scope/structure and intensity

The type of settlement structure of potential settlers – capital, urban or rural – was approximately the same in 2001 and 2003. The majority of potential settlers were taken on from towns – about 65% of the people intending to leave for good.

Similarly the intensity did not change during the period. It was highest in Sofia – more than 10% in 2003 and lowest in villages, where it fell from 5,4% in 2001 to 3,9% in 2003 (Table 3). These results are similar to other studies of potential emigration from Bulgaria (IOM, 2001). The capital city's population has higher inclination for permanent cross-border mobility.

A large part of potential settlers were individuals with secondary education – 61,6% in the survey of 2001 and less by about 5% in 2003. The share of higher education graduates grew – from 20,9% in 2001 to 25,3% during the repeat survey in 2003. The intensity of intentions remains stable – with a barely detectable increase of individuals with higher education and some decline among individuals with secondary or lower education (in both cases the changes are within the margin of statistical error) (Table 3).

Like other studies, it had also been established that employment (respectively the level of unemployment) are not among the leading determinants of permanent emigration (Bauer, Zimmermann, 1999). Potential settlers were taken on almost equally among employed and unemployed, and in 2003 the share of employed was even greater than that of unemployed respondents. Information on the income level structure is available only in the survey, conducted in 2003. Over ¾ of potential settlers were recruited among persons, earning less than two minimum salaries a month.[11] At the same time the intensity of attitudes for migration was considerably higher among individuals, receiving in excess of three minimum salaries. The very low income level provides an explanation why unemployment is not among the significant motives for permanent cross-border mobility (see Table 3).

Data from both surveys illustrate an increase of the share of people, having stayed abroad (in this case for a period of more then 3 months). If in 2001 they were 13,3%, in 2003 their scope reached 28%. As regards the intensity of the attitudes for migration – it was about three times higher among people, having stayed abroad both in 2001, and in 2003[12] (see Table 3).

Logit model's results

The logit model with a dependent variable, differentiating potential settlers from non-emigrants, estimates sizeable net effects of the independent variables included (see Table 4). The McFadden's likelihood ratio index (LRI), however, shows a relatively low explanation capability of the model. The 2001 large sample pre-determined a significant weight of each indicator variable in spite of the respective net effect's low value. It has to be noted that the results confirm partially the conclusions of the one-dimensional analysis.

[11] In 2003 the minimum salary in Bulgaria was BGN 110/month or (EUR 55/month).

[12] From that point of view network theory approach seems to be of great importance for international migration studies (see for instance Gurak, and Fe Caces, 1992).

Table 4

Binary Logistical Regression
Dependent variable: Target group (1): *Potential settlers*
Base group (0): Non-emigrants

	2001			2003		
	Sig. level	B	ΔP_j(%)	Sig. Level	B	ΔP_j(%)
Gender						
Male	0.000	0.410	0.3	0.816	0.066	0.02
Age						
30 years of age	0.000	1.808	1.4	0.000	2.898	0.89
31 – 40	0.000	1.271	1.0	0.000	2.575	0.79
41 – 50	0.000	0.623	0.5	0.157	0.904	0.28
Family Status						
Singles	0.000	0.236	0.2	0.015	0.737	0.23
Education						
Secondary	0.000	0.501	0.4	0.447	0.345	0.11
Higher	0.000	0.608	0.5	0.152	0.772	0.24
Ethnic group						
Turkish	0.000	0.489	0.4	0.067	-1.359	-0.42
Roma	0.000	-0.699	-0.5	0.481	0.420	0.13
Settlement						
Urban	0.000	0.515	0.4	0.130	0.576	0.18
Capital	0.000	0.820	0.6	0.664	0.224	0.07
Employment						
Unemployed	0.000	0.227	0.2	0.212	0.392	0.12
Prior visits abroad						
Yes	0.000	1.597	1.2	0.000	2.517	0.77
Constant	–4.86			-5.78		
Chance for the base group (P_0)	0.8%			0.3%		
McFadden's LRI	0.108			0.248		

Reference categories of individuals in the logistical model

Independent variable	Reference category
Gender	Female
Age	Over 50 years of age
Family Status	Married
Education	Primary or lower
Ethnic group	Bulgarian
Settlement	Rural
Employment	Yes
Prior visits abroad	No

Other terms being equal, in 2003 considerable net effects were observed in regard to four variables tested – *age, marital status, ethnic origin (in regard to Bulgarian Turks) and prior stays abroad*. The most significant results were obtained in regard to age-variable – expectations of the high likelihood among younger people to leave

Bulgaria for good were confirmed. The net effects of the indicator variable for the youngest respondents (up to 30 years old) were highest in both 2001 and 2003 surveys. Considerable effects were also observed in regard to marital status, which confirmed the hypothesis for stronger attitudes of singles towards permanent emigration. Clearly, family is a stable deterrent factor when forming the individual intentions for migration.

In 2001 and 2003 high net effects were obtained for the indicator variable of prior experience abroad. *The very fact of the visit* has a serious impact on attitudes for future emigration – respondents, who already had been abroad, are more likely to emigrate definitively.

The widespread concept of the high mobility of traditional Bulgarian minorities was not supported entirely by the results received. It would be interesting to note that in 2001 in regard to Roma a negative value of the regression coefficient was received, showing a lower inclination to migrate, than for the Bulgarian ethnic group. The results regarding ethnic Turks confirmed the apparent change in their migration attitudes in the two-year period. While in 2001 the respondents of Turkish origin expressed stronger intentions to migrate, in 2003 the opposite effect was observed (with negative regression coefficient at 7% significance level).

In general, the other independent variables – gender, education, type of settlements and employment, which had a significant effect in 2001, no longer retain the same impact. The results received in regard to the gender of respondents did not evidence significant differences between male and female attitudes towards permanent emigration in 2003. Neither could the education be considered a significant factor of emigration intentions, because no significant difference was observed among higher education individuals in comparison to the reference category (persons with primary or lower education).

In 2003 insignificant results were obtained both in regard to the type of settlements – capital, urban and rural; as well as in connection with the employment status. No stronger inclination for migration was confirmed for the urban population. As it was to be expected, paradoxically availability of employment had no impact on permanent emigration wishes. Moreover, the regression coefficient, obtained in 2001, had the lowest value, which evidence rather weak net effect of employment variable on migration attitudes.

Socio-demographic profile of potential long-term emigrants

Potential long-term emigrants comprise those respondents, who would wish to move abroad for over a one year period without intentions to settle. In this section we are reviewing the scope/structure and intensity of the above socio-demographic variables, the same as the sequence of earlier presentation.

Gender, age, family status and ethnic origin of potential long-term emigrants – scope/structure and intensity

Firstly, differences are observed mainly in the scope, but also in the intensity between potential settlers and long-term emigrants in regard to their gender structure. About 2/3 of potential long-term emigration was recruited among the

working age male population – 65,4% in 2001 and 67,1% in 2003. Similarly the intensity of intentions among men was twice as high as that of women. In 2003 this difference grew. Intensity among men arrived at 11,2%, while with women it was only 4,9% or over 11% of men and less than 5% of women, disposed for long-term cross-border mobility (Table 5).

Table 5

Socio-demographic profile of *long-term emigrants*. Scope/Structure and intensity of migration intentions

Categories of individuals by:	Structure 2001		Intensity 2001	Structure 2003		Intensity 2003 r.
	Total	Long-term emigrants		Total	Long-term emigrants	
Gender						
Female	48.8	34.6	4.7	53.0	32.9	4.9
Male	51.2	65.4	8.5	47.0	67.1	11.2
Age						
Up to 30	29.8	47.1	10.6	23.4	51.9	17.4
31 – 40	23.6	25.9	7.3	20.9	26.6	10.0
41 – 50	25.4	20.0	5.3	20.8	19.0	7.2
Over 50	21.3	7.0	2.2	35.0	2.5	0.6
Family status						
Single	33.8	45.8	9.0	28.5	46.2	12.6
Married	66.2	54.2	5.5	71.5	53.8	5.9
Education						
Primary or lower	27.7	23.9	5.8	31.2	16.5	4.1
Secondary	53.6	60.5	7.5	51.7	65.8	10.0
Higher	18.8	15.6	5.6	17.1	17.7	8.1
Ethnic group						
Bulgarian	82.0	78.7	6.4	84.7	82.3	8.0
Turkish	12.1	13.1	7.2	8.3	15.2	15.0
Roma	5.9	8.1	9.2	7.0	2.5	3.0
Settlement						
Rural	27.8	28.3	6.8	30.9	34.2	8.7
Urban	59.9	58.4	6.5	55.8	46.8	6.6
Capital	12.3	13.3	7.2	13.3	19.0	11.2
Employment						
No	49.0	53.6	7.3	46.5	40.3	6.7
Yes	51.0	46.4	6.1	53.5	59.7	8.6
Prior visits abroad						
No	94.8	87.0	6.1	88.5	65.8	5.8
Yes	5.2	13.0	16.9	11.5	34.2	23.3
Personal income						
Up to 1 minimum salary (MS)	–	–	–	43.0	42.3	7.9
1 to 2 MS'	–	–	–	39.4	37.2	7.6
2 to 3 MS'	–	–	–	10.9	11.5	8.5
Over 3 MS'	–	–	–	6.6	9.0	10.9

The potential long-term emigrants' age structure was similar to that of potential settlers. A more serious difference existed only in regard to respondents between 41-50 years of age. Their relative share both in 2001 and in 2003 was about 20%. In 2003 it was twice over the share of the same age interval potential settlers. Similarly, the intensity was highest among the working age population under 30, growing from 10,6% in 2001 to 17,4% in 2003. The next age interval's (31-40) intensity also grew. Unlike the attitudes among potential settlers aged 41-50, whose intensity was declining, in the case of same-age long-term emigrants an increase was observed, reaching 7,2% in 2003 (see Table 5).

Results regarding the marital status of long-term emigrants coincide with the settlers' ones. Long-term emigrants were recruited almost equally among singles and married individuals. The intensity for singles was twice over. It grew from 9% in 2001 to 12,6% in 2003.

Although the ethnic makeup of potential long-term emigration was similar to that of potential permanent emigration, in 2003 some differences were observed. The share of ethnic Turks among long-term emigrants was preserved – 13,1% in 2001 and 15,2% in 2003. The share of Roma, however, fell from 8,1% to 2,5%. This corresponded to a doubling of long-term emigration intensity among ethnic Turks in Bulgaria (respectively from 7,2% to 15%). At the same time, an opposite trend was to be observed with the Roma – long-term mobility attitudes among them fell from 9,2% in 2001 to only 3% for 2003 (see Table 5).

Settlement, education, employment, incomes and prior stays abroad of potential long-term emigrants – scope/structure and intensity

The type of settlements' structure of potential long-term emigrants differs from that of potential settlers by the higher relative share of rural population. In 2001 it amounted to 28,3%, and in 2003 – to 34,2%. The respective share of rural population settlers was – 18,2% in 2001 and even 16% during the survey, held in 2003. An increase of long-term emigration intensity among the capital-city population was marked – from 7,2% to 11,2% (see Table 5).

Potential long-term emigrants were recruited mainly among individuals with secondary education, whose share grew from 60,5% in 2001 to 65,8% in 2003. The scope of individuals with primary or lower education narrowed sharply. On the other hand, a very slight increase of the university degree holders' share among long-term emigrants was obvious. The intensity of emigration attitudes was highest for individuals with secondary education reaching 10% in 2003. As it was the case of potential settlers, the long-term emigration intensity grew in regard to university degree holders and fell among people with primary education (see Table 5).

Once more respondents' labor market status had no impact on the structure and intensity of potential long-term emigrants. The results were similar to those of potential settlers. While in 2001 the share of unemployed among potential long-term emigrants was 53,6%, in 2003 it fell to about 40% - i.e. most of the long-term emigration was already recruited among employed individuals. Similarly, the

intensity among the latter was higher (see Table 5). Just like the potential settlers' income structure, the long-term temporary emigration was recruited mainly among individuals, earning up to the equivalent of two minimum salaries a month. However, the intensity was highest among respondents, receiving more than three minimum salaries.

The analysis of the prior stays abroad variable's once again confirmed its decisive impact on emigration attitudes. A "restructuring" of the scope was to be observed – the share of potential long-term emigrants, having been abroad, grew from 13% in 2001 to 34,2% in 2003. Their intensity increased from 16,9% in 2001 to as much as 23,3% during the survey in 2003. This represented a four-time greater intensity in comparison to respondents not having been abroad (Table 5). I.e. one of every four Bulgarian citizens, having traveled abroad, was a potential long-term emigrant.

Logit model's results

A logit model with a dependent variable, differentiating potential long-term emigrants from non-emigrants, is also being estimated (see Table 6). McFadden's LRI values obtained for 2003 survey's data show a higher reliability in comparison to potential settlers' regression. Four independent variables – *gender, age, family status and prior stay abroad* had significant net effects in 2003. Unlike potential settlers' gender characteristics; in that case men demonstrated a higher propensity to emigrate than women. The strongest net effects were again to be seen with the age indicator variable and primarily individuals among less than 30 years of age. So the high attitudes among young Bulgarians to leave for a long time, but not necessarily for good were obvious. Similarly, the marital status indicator variable had a significant net effect with a positive coefficient. Evidently, family limits the attitudes towards long-term emigration. Prior stay abroad regression coefficient's high values both with 2001 and 2003 data, outline the relevance of network theory assumptions as regard to international migration (Gurak, and Fe Caces. 1992.). Clearly, past foreign country's experience is an important factor for both permanent and temporary long-term emigration.

As regards education, ethnicity, type of settlement and employment variables no significant effects are observed. No significant differences are observed between university degree holders and the reference group. One may conclude that the education grade does not have the expected impact on long-term emigrants' behavior. The ethnic origin variable does not receive statistically significant coefficients, too. Finally, long-term emigration attitudes of Bulgarians, ethnic Turks and Roma population are similar. Likewise the attitudes of working age population are analogous irrespective of their type of settlements – urban or rural. No significant effect of labor market status has been observed. Similarly, unemployment does not generate emigration pressure. The regression coefficient of the employment variable once more show a low value in 2001.

Table 6

Binary Logistical Regression
Dependent variable: Target group (1): *Long-term emigrants*
Base group (0): Non-emigrants

	2001			2003		
	Sig. level	B	ΔP_j(%)	Sig. level	B	ΔP_j(%)
Gender						
Male	0.000	0.665	0.5	0.004	0.836	0.1
Age						
Up to 30 years	0.000	1.850	1.5	0.000	4.626	0.4
31 – 40	0.000	1.394	1.1	0.000	3.953	0.4
41 – 50	0.000	1.017	0.8	0.002	3.242	0.3
Family Status						
Single	0.000	0.242	0.2	0.017	0.764	0.1
Education						
Secondary	0.000	0.403	0.3	0.474	0.292	0.0
Higher	0.014	0.268	0.2	0.393	0.458	0.0
Ethnic group						
Turkish	0.008	0.153	0.1	0.829	0.107	0.0
Roma	0.025	0.357	0.3	0.316	-0.819	-0.1
Settlement						
Urban	0.389	0.059	0.0	0.221	-0.429	-0.0
Capital	0.042	0.204	0.2	0.641	-0.218	-0.0
Employment						
Unemployed	0.004	0.176	0.1	0.553	0.182	0.0
Prior visits abroad						
Yes	0.000	1.636	1.3	0.000	2.362	0.2
Constant	–4.82			-7.00		
Chance for the base group (P_0)	0.8%			0.1%		
McFadden's LRI	0.092			0.308		

Reference categories of individuals in the logistical model

Independent variable	Reference category
Gender	Female
Age	Over 50 years of age
Family Status	Married
Education	Primary or lower
Ethnic group	Bulgarian
Settlement	Rural
Employment	Yes
Prior visits abroad	No

Socio-demographic profile of potential short-term emigrants

Persons, who prefer to spend abroad less than a year, are not emigrants by definition. I.e. the perception of this category of respondents as potential short-term *emigrants* is conditional (Kalchev, 2001, p.65-69.). One way or another, short-term cross-border mobility is an alternative to long-term emigration. In this section we outline the profile and the intentions precisely of potential short-term emigrants from Bulgaria.

Gender, age, family status and ethnic origin of potential short-term emigrants – scope/structure and intensity

The gender structure of potential short-term emigration is closer to the similar structure of long-term emigrants, than that of the settlers. Short-term emigration was recruited mainly among men, their relative share growing from 59,4% in 2001 to 64,6% in 2003. At the same time the intensity among the working-age male population showed a certain increase, and among women – conversely – a decrease. It must be pointed out that the intensity of short-term emigration intentions is weaker, than the one of long-term emigration (see Table 7).

On the other hand, the short-term emigration age structure differs considerably from that of long-term emigrants and particularly of settlers' age breakdown. Potential short-term emigrants were recruited mostly among the young (under 30), but also among the higher age intervals, including persons over 50 (Table 7). From this point of view, short-term emigration shall be defined as an alternative for older working-age population. Intensity of intentions was highest in the first age interval – up to 30 years of age, increasing during the period from 6% to 8,5%.

Unlike the emigrant types, reviewed in the preceding sections, about 2/3 of short-term emigration would be recruited among married persons. Their relative share grew from 60,2% in 2001 to as much as 68,8% during the second survey of 2003. The intensity was almost the same irrespective of the marital status. However, it prevailed slightly among married respondents. That was also a distinction between short-term and long-term cross-border mobility (see Table 7).

Short-term emigrants were recruited mainly among Bulgarian ethnic group. However their relative share dropped by nearly 9% (from 85,6% in 2001 to 77,1% in 2003). Conversely, the share of working age Roma population got bigger - from 4,1% to 14,6%. This was in conformity with their increased short-term emigration intensity, which arrived at 10,4% in 2003. It's nearly twice over when compared to Bulgarians and ethnic Turks. (see Table 7). The ethnic makeup of potential short-term mobility was similar to that of permanent emigration. In this sense, short-term emigration could be viewed as an alternative, not only for elderly individuals, but for the Roma population as well.

Table 7

Socio-demographic profile of *short-term emigrants*. Scope/Structure and intensity of migration intentions

Categories of persons by:	Structure 2001		Intensity 2001	Structure 2003		Intensity 2003 г.
	Total	Short-term emigrants		Total	Short-term emigrants	
Gender						
Female	48.8	40.6	3.8	53.0	35.4	3.2
Male	51.2	59.4	5.3	47.0	64.6	6.6
Age						
Up to 30	29.8	39.5	6.0	23.4	41.7	8.5
31 – 40	23.6	27.4	5.3	20.9	18.8	4.3
41 – 50	25.4	23.1	4.1	20.8	27.1	6.2
Over 50 years	21.3	10.0	2.1	35.0	12.5	1.7
Family Status						
Single	33.8	39.8	5.3	28.5	31.3	5.3
Married	66.2	60.2	4.1	71.5	68.8	4.6
Education						
Primary or lower	27.7	19.4	3.2	31.2	18.8	2.9
Secondary	53.6	58.6	5.0	51.7	62.5	5.8
Higher	18.8	22.0	5.3	17.1	18.8	5.2
Ethnic group						
Bulgarian	82.0	85.6	4.7	84.7	77.1	4.5
Turkish	12.1	10.2	3.8	8.3	8.3	5.0
Roma	5.9	4.1	3.2	7.0	14.6	10.4
Settlement						
Rural	27.8	21.1	3.5	30.9	33.3	5.1
Urban	59.9	63.3	4.8	55.8	54.2	4.6
Capital	12.3	15.6	5.7	13.3	12.5	4.5
Employment						
No	49.0	47.8	4.4	46.5	43.8	4.5
Yes	51.0	52.2	4.7	53.5	56.3	5.1
Prior visits abroad						
No	94.8	85.0	4.1	88.5	70.8	3.8
Yes	5.2	15.0	13.3	11.5	29.2	12.1
Personal income						
Up to 1 minimum salary (MS)	–	–	–	43.0	37.0	4.1
1 – 2 MS'	–	–	–	39.4	37.0	4.4
2 – 3 MS'	–	–	–	10.9	15.2	6.6
Over 3 MS'	–	–	–	6.6	10.9	7.8

Type of settlements, education, employment, incomes and prior stays abroad of potential short-term emigrants – scope/structure and intensity

Type of settlements' structure of potential short-term emigrants is almost the same as that of the sample observed. Likewise the intensity is similar among urban and rural working age population (see Table 7). Unlike the two other emigrant types, no higher intensity is observed among capital-city citizens. Such could probably be viewed only in regions, bordering Greece.

The education variable of potential short-term emigration is characterized by the well-known high relative share of individuals with secondary education. However the higher intensity among university degree holders emblematic for long-term emigration is not observed (see Table 7).

Joblessness does not stimulate short-term emigration. In addition, employed individuals' intensity towards long-term, incl. permanent emigration is higher in comparison with their short-term emigration attitudes. This could be interpreted from the point of view of emigration costs. The labor supply in Bulgaria seems to be motivated (to a certain degree) by the need to earn for emigration purposes.

The incomes' variable does not differ considerably from both short-term and long term emigrants' perspective. Once again ¾ of short-term emigrants were recruited among individuals, earning up to two minimum salaries a month. The intensity of respondents, earning more than three minimum salaries a month is also higher, although to a lesser degree, in comparison with long-term emigrants.

The situation in regard to prior stays abroad variable is also similar. In 2001 only 15% of potential short-term emigrants had been abroad, while in 2003 their relative share was nearly double. In the course of both opinion polls a higher intensity was observed among individuals, having had foreign country experience – about 12-13%. However, this is greatly below the intensity of long-term mobility attitudes (see Table 7).

Logit model's results

Short-term emigrants' logit model has the lowest explanatory capacity in comparison to the previous two models, which is evident from the 2003 McFadden's LRI level (see Table 8). Five independent variables received significant regression coefficients – *gender, age, prior stays abroad, ethnic origin (in regard to the Roma population) and education*.

Table 8

Binary Logistical Regression
Dependent variable: Target group (1): *Short-term emigrants*
Base group (0): Non-emigrants

	2001			2003		
	Sig. Level	B	ΔP_j(%)	Sig. Level	B	ΔP_j(%)
Gender						
Male	0.000	0.411	0.4	0.004	0.968	0.3
Age						
Up to 30	0.000	1.325	1.1	0.000	2.075	0.6
31 – 40	0.000	1.018	0.9	0.068	1.067	0.3
41 - 50	0.000	0.689	0.6	0.028	1.198	0.3
Family Status						
Single	0.030	0.163	0.1	0.885	-0.056	0.0
Education						
Secondary	0.001	0.342	0.3	0.024	1.287	0.4
Higher	0.000	0.452	0.4	0.037	1.451	0.4
Ethnic group						
Turkish	0.834	-0.026	-0.0	0.787	-0.174	-0.0
Roma	0.114	-0.288	-0.2	0.010	1.729	0.5
Settlement						
Urban	0.000	0.327	0.3	0.638	-0.178	-0.1
Capital	0.000	0.460	0.4	0.450	-0.437	-0.1
Employment						
Unemployed	0.127	0.109	0.1	0.483	0.259	0.1
Prior visits abroad						
Yes	0.000	1.708	1.5	0.000	2.131	0.6
Constant	–4.75			-5.86		
Chance for the base group (P_0)	0.9%			0.3%		
McFadden's LRI	0.066			0.186		

Reference categories of individuals in the logistical model

Independent variable	Reference category
Gender	Female
Age	Over 50 years of age
Family Status	Married
Education	Primary or lower
Ethnic group	Bulgarian
Settlement	Rural
Employment	Yes
Prior visits abroad	No

In the case of short-term emigration, males differ from females by their stronger attitudes in favor of short-term mobility. Age indicator variable attained stable net effects, identical with previous models' results. Evidently less than a 30 year age interval got higher coefficients' values. Similarly the prior visit abroad variable showed a strong and stable net effect on emigration behavior. The higher education grade received stimulated short-term emigration. The chance for such attitudes was higher among university degree holders as compared to the reference group (primary and lower education). It is worth noting that the chance for short-term emigration among the Roma is visibly greater in comparison to the reference group (Bulgarians). This is not the case, however, with ethnic Turks, where the indicator variable has an insignificant coefficient.

Unlike the long-term emigration, marital status variable does not acquire significant net effect. Logically, family is not a discouraging factor for the short-term mobility. Once more types of settlement and employment status variables have had no significant effects. Moreover, even based on 2001 large sample's data, the employment status's regression coefficient obtains a statistically insignificant value. Evidently the availability of employment doesn't reduce the emigration pressure in Bulgaria.

*

Bulgaria's emigration potential, not counting potential short-term emigration, amounts to 14-15% of its working-age population. Taking into account the attitudes for migration only in the current year, it would not exceed 4-5%, i.e. by 1-2% more than the *3%-4% Rule of Thumb* (Leyard, Blanchard, Dornbusch, and Krugman, 1992; Straubhaar, 2001, p. 169). In this sense, the current study confirms that the "*East-West"* migration flow would exceed by only a few percent the currently existing labor mobility within the boundaries of the European Union (EU-15).

The analysis of the first two groups of socio-demographic variables, where in addition to cross-tabulations we estimate in series three separate logit models for each type of potential emigrants, leads to the following conclusions and summaries:

- *Gender* has a substantial net effect on potential temporary emigration. This is true more specifically of short-term mobility. Emigrants – men, who do not wish to settle, are more mobile. Things are different with the emigration for good, where in conformity with the new economics of migration assumptions (Stark, 1991) the decision is rather a collective one – of the family, and where no differences between the attitudes of the genders are observed.
- As regards *age* the highest result has been obtained in regard to temporary long-term emigration. The difference between settlers and short-term emigrants is considerable. In accordance with the human capital theory one may conclude that elderly individuals' mobility grows when planned stay abroad is shorter.
- In regard to *family characteristics* (in our case – marital status) similar conclusions have been made. Family is a deterrent factor for potential long-term

emigration, but not for short-term one, where the mobility of married individuals is even greater (Marital status variable obtains a negative regression coefficient).

- The ethnic background of potential emigration is unavoidable. Only in the case of temporary long-term emigration similar attitudes are established among Bulgarians, Turks and Roma. It may be claimed that the settlers' potential of Bulgarian Turks is exhausted – in 2003 the regression coefficient had a negative value in regard to the reference group – the Bulgarian ethnic group. On the other hand, quite logically, the Roma appeared more mobile among potential short-term emigrants.
- As regards the other variables – *type of settlements, education, employment (incomes* – only in the 2003 survey) *and prior stays abroad*; significant results have been obtained only for the *prior stays abroad* variable. Its net effect is almost as significant, as that of age. Clear network theory assumptions in regard to the significance of prior stays abroad deserve special attention.
- *Education variable* shows a significant net effect only for short-term emigrants. Contrary to expectations, the *employment* and *incomes* variables have had no significant impact. The same could also be said about the respondents' *settlements*. The one-dimensional analysis shows a situation, which is a paradox at first sight: employed and higher income individuals have higher emigration attitudes.

References:

Bastyr, I. Impact of the Czech Republic's entry into the EU on relations with Austria with an emphasis on employment, labor market and migration. - In: Migration potential of the Czech Republic's population (Migration potential model), analytical part. 2001, Vol. 1a.

Bauer, Th. K. and K. F. Zimmermann. Assessment of Possible Migration Pressure and its Labour Market Impact Following EU Enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe. - IZA Research Report, 1999, N 3.

Boeri, T. and H. Bruecker. Eastern Enlargement and EU-Labour-Markets: Perceptions, Challenges and Opportunities. - IZA DP 2001, N 256.

Borjas, G. Economic research on the determinants of emigration: Lessons for the European Union. - World Bank technical paper, 1999, N 438.

Burda, M. Migration and the option value of waiting. - Economic and Social Review, 1995, N 27, p. 1-19.

Census 2001, Vol. 6, Book 3 "Territorial mobility of population". Sofia, National Institute of Statistics.

Drinkwater, S. Go West? Assessing the willingness to move from Central and Eastern European Countries. University of Surrey, UK, Department of Economics, 2002, mimeo (www.econ.surrey.ac.uk/sdrinkwater/go-west.pdf)

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

Gashter, A. The Ambiguities of Emigration: Bulgaria since 1988. - International Migration Papers, 39, ILO, Geneva, 2002.

Greene, W. H. Econometric Analysis. 4th Edition. NJ, Prentice Hall, 2000.

Gurak, D. T. and Fe Caces. Migration networks and the shaping of migration systems. – In: Mary Kritz, Lin Lean Lim, and Hania Zlotnik (eds). International Migration Systems: a Global Approach. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992, p. 150-176.

Hazans, M. Potential emigration of Latvian labour force after joining the EU and its impact on Latvian labour market. University of Latvia and BICEPS, 2003, mimeo.

International Organisation for Migration. Migration Potential in Central and Eastern Europe. Geneva, 1999.

International Organisation for Migration. Profile and Motives of Potential Migrants from Bulgaria. Sofia, 2001.

Kalchev, I. International Migration of Population in Bulgaria. Dunav Press, 2001.

Kule, D. and A.t Mancellari, H. Papapanagos, S. Qirici, P. Sanfey. The causes and consequences of Albanian emigration during transition: Evidence from micro-data, 2000, www.inomics.com/cgi/

Leyard, R. and O. Blanchard, R. Dornbusch, P. Krugman. East-West Migration: The Alternatives. Cambridge MA, MIT Press, 1992.

Markova, E. and A. H. Sarris. The Performance of Bulgarian Illegal Immigrants in the Greek Labor Market. - South European Society & Politics, 1997, Vol. 2, N 2 (Autumn), p. 55-77.

Martin, Ph. Managing International Labor Migration in the 21st Century. - South Eastern Europe Journal of Economics, 2003.

Massey, D. S. and J. Arango, G. Hugo, A. Kouaouci, A. Pellegrino, J. E. Taylor. Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal. - Population and Development Review , 1993, 19, N 3, p. 431-465.

Minkov, M. La migration internationale en Bulgarie. - Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales, 1994, Vol. 10, N 10.

Mintchev, V. Old, new and future European Union citizens: path through full participation to democratic life. – In: Research/action on citizenship education for old, new and future EU citizens (SATCHEL), Code: 101486-CP-2002-IT-Grundving-G1, 2003, mimeo.

Mintchev, V. External Migration and External Migration Policy in Bulgaria. - South-East Europe Review, Quarterly of the Hans Bockler Foundation, 1999, N 3, p. 124-126.

Papapanagos, H. and P. Sanfey. Intention to emigrate in transition countries: the case of Albania. – Journal of Population Economics, 2001, Vol.14, N 3.

Piracha, M. and R. Vickerman. Immigration, Labour Mobility and EU Enlargement. University of Kent, Discussion paper N 02/11, 2002.

Sjaastad, L. The costs and returns of human migration. - Journal of Political Economy, 1962, 70, p. 80-93.

Stark, O. Migration decision making: A review article. - Journal of Development Economics, 1991, 14, p. 251-259.

Straubhaar, T. East-West Migration: Will it be a Problem? - Intereconomics, July/August, 2001.

19.VII.2004