

Dr. Vesselin Mintchev
(Institute of Economics at the BAS, Senior research fellow,
v.mintchev@iki.bas.bg)

PROFILE AND ATTITUDES OF POTENTIAL EMIGRANTS FROM BULGARIA AFTER 2007: EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENTS

1. Introduction

In the last 20 years, Bulgaria has turned into a country generating migration. The population of the country has decreased with about 13% in 15 years of transition to a market economy (1989-2004) or with about one million and two hundred thousand people in absolute figures: 500 000 resulting from the negative natural growth and about 700 000 as a result of the migration.¹ According to unofficial data the Bulgarian Diaspora abroad amounts to about two and a half – three million people (taking into account both old and new permanent migration), while those living in the country are estimated to be seven and a half million people. According to the National Statistical Institute (NSI), about 22 thousand people have emigrated annually from the country between the years of the last two population censuses (1992-2001).²

Methodology of research³

Two studies were conducted within the frames of project No BUL1P201 of the MLSP (Ministry of Labour and Social Policy) and UN Population Fund. One has been devoted to the family models and the factors determining young people's decision to give birth and raise children. The second one concerns the internal and external migration as a factor for realization of the young people's and families. Both studies have an objective to help understand the demographic processes in Bulgaria, as well as the formation of policies, which comply with the real practices and attitudes of young people.

Methods of the sample

Both national surveys have been accomplished based on one common sample of 3 604 respondents, including four partially intersecting segments (Table 1). A total of 1828 persons aged between 15 and 35 have been interviewed on the

¹ Mansoor, A. and B. Quillin (2007) Migration and Remittances: Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union, Washington DC: The World Bank.

² Kalchev, Y. Census of Population, Housing Sector and Rural Entities (farms) in 2001, vol. 6 Sample studies, book 3 Territorial Mobility of Population, NSI, 2002.

³ The design of the methodology, sampling procedure etc. was done by the team of Agency of Socio-economic Analysis (ASA) and Center for Comparative Studies (CCS), coordinated by Dr Docho Mihailov. The field work was executed by ASA in April-May 2007.

„Family Models” questionnaire, and a total of 2 725 persons – on the „Migration” questionnaire. The section of these two samples is 1249 persons who have been interviewed with both questionnaires. In addition, both studies have been reinforced with a sample of 300 Roma who have been used only with the calculations on ethnical identity affiliations.

Table 1. *Aggregates*

	Task	Sample fulfilled
Family models (15 – 35)	620	579
Family models + Migration (15 – 60)	1230	1249
Migration (15 – 60)	1474	1476
Target Roma (15 – 60)	300	300
Total	3624	3604

The samples are made by NSI, assigned by ASA.

The implemented approach with two intersecting samples enabled the effective administration of the questionnaire. Under the representative samples (without the reinforced Roma aggregate), a total of 3 604 individuals have been surveyed, while thanks to the crossing samples a total of 4 553 cases have been processed. This approach allowed analyzing the connected questions from both sub-questionnaires. The considerably large samples have provided an opportunity for reliable sections of big sub-aggregates by the basic demographic features and other variables. The maximum admissible deviation is under 2%.

Besides the traditional statistical instruments (one-dimensional and two-dimensional dispersions, correlation and analyses of mean values), multi-dimensional statistics have been used as well (regression analyses for the migration data). These analyses make possible to turn down the variety of data into unified meaningful dimensions.

The questionnaires have been implemented by the face-to-face method at the homes of responding persons in the period April – May 2007. The Migration questionnaire includes 77 questions with 219 variables.

The studies of the migration in the so-called home (sending) countries work with data of empirical studies of:

- migration potential (potential emigration of the country);
- return emigrants.

The goal is to find answer to the question: when and in what conditions the cross-border mobility turns from survival factor into social realization factor?

This paper deals with the potential and profile of different type of potential emigrants (section 2); destinations, preferred employment and expected earnings are discussed in section 3; and finally in the concluding section 4 we present constraining and motivating factors of a decision to go abroad.

2. Migration Potential and Social-Demographic Profile

2.1. Migration Potential of Bulgaria

Data from the representative questionnaire can be interpreted towards stabilizing the Bulgarian emigration model. The main questions, on which basis the *migration potential* of the country can be evaluated, are two.

Question 82: What is the possibility to travel abroad as tourist, to work or to study for (a relevant) certain period of time?

Question 84: When do you plan to realize your intentions?

These two questions present information on the desire/reluctance to travel abroad, on the purpose and duration of the planned stay, as well as on when it can happen. The first question defines the potential emigrants by type: 1) *settlers*; 2) *long-term* (i.e. for more than a year) and 3) *short-term* (for less than a year) *Labour emigrants*.

The second question specifies the time horizon of the realization of the intentions, i.e. the „monitoring” of the purely hypothetical and already a matter of prestige in large communities migration intentions. Data for the migration potential are similar to previous studies, for instance the study of NSI⁴ in 2001; as well as the study of the Center for Comparative Studies⁵ in 2003. In the representative questionnaire inquiry during the population census in 2001 the potential emigrants (settlers plus Labour emigrants) are 14.8% of the population aged between 15 and 60. Now they are 12.1% (table 2).

To the fundamental question – *Does the potential emigration from Bulgaria decrease?* (in this case based on the *hypothetical* intentions of the Bulgarian population for realization abroad) – the answer could be rather in support of the stabilizing and to some extent redirecting the Bulgarian migration model and the intentions for cross-border mobility. The share decreases (in the frames of the statistical error). The numbers though show that over quarter of a million people in active age (after correction based on „time horizon” for realization of the intentions – *Question 84*) have intentions for cross-border mobility after 2001-2002.

The evaluation of the migration potential is more realistic when counting the period for realizing the intentions. Data show that people, who would seek realization abroad in the current year, are 1/4 (25-30%) of the people stating intentions to emigrate. It is considered that not more than 10% of the people stated migration intentions in the current year will realize them in practice. The regularity is traced from the first empirical studies of NSI on this matter in the early 1990s, when observations of the border checkpoints are carried out in intervals of few years.⁶

⁴ <http://zaedno.de/article1079.html>

⁵ Mintchev, V., V. Boshnakov, I. Kalchev, V. Goev. External Migration from Bulgaria at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Estimates of Potential Emigrants' Attitudes and Profile. – Economic Thought, No 7, 2004.

⁶ Jekova, V. External and Internal Migration of the Population in Bulgaria. – Economic Studies, No 2, 2006, p. 193.

Table 2. *Share of Potential Emigrants from the Active Population, Corrected by the Time Horizon for Realization of the Intentions*

When do you think your intentions can be realized? (for abroad)	Short-term Labour migrants	Long-term Labour migrants	Settlers	Total
2001				
In the current year (%)	1.2	1.9	2.2	5.3
In the next 2-3 years (%)	2.2	3.4	4.3	9.9
In the far future (%)	1.2	1.3	1.7	4.2
Totally uncorrected (%)	4.6	6.6	8.2	19.4
<i>Emigration potential – number of people</i>				
This year	57 014	90 272	104 525	251 810
In the next 2-3 years	104 525	161 539	204 299	470 363
In the far future	57 014	61 765	80 769	199 548
Totally uncorrected	218 552	313 575	389 593	921 721
2003				
In the current year (%)	1.7	2.0	2.6	6.3
In the next 2-3 years (%)	2.3	3.9	3.7	9.9
In the far future (%)	0.8	1.9	1.2	3.9
Totally uncorrected (%)	4.8	7.8	7.5	20.1
<i>Emigration potential – number of people</i>				
This year	80 161	94 307	122 599	297 067
In the next 2-3 years	108 453	183 899	174 468	466 820
In the far future	37 723	89 592	56 584	183 899
Totally uncorrected	226 337	367 797	353 651	947 785
2007				
In the next 2-3 months (%)	0.8	0.9	0.4	2.1
In the current year (%)	1.7	2.1	0.8	4.6
In the next 2-3 years (%)	2.3	2.3	1.8	6.4
In the far future (%)	3.2	1.7	2.1	7.1
Totally uncorrected (%)	8.1	7.0	5.1	20.2
<i>Emigration potential – number of people</i>				
In the next 2-3 months	38 581	43 403	19 290	101 274
Till the end of the years	81 984	101 274	38 581	221 839
In the current year (till the end of the year – total)	120 565	144 678	57 871	323 114
In the next 2-3 years	110 920	110 920	86 807	308 646
In the far future	154 323	81 984	101 274	342 404
Totally uncorrected	390 630	337 582	245 952	974 164

Visible changes occur though in the years. In 2001 24.7% are the so-called settlers in the current year – data now, six years later, are analog. The data for the long-term and short-term Labour emigrants are different. The long-term Labour emigrants (who would realize their intentions in the current year) are about 26% in 2001, and already 42.4% in 2007. The intentions for short-term mobility in the current year increase – the short-term emigrants, who would

realize their intentions in near future, increase from 24.3% in 2001 to over 30% in 2007.⁷

All this shows redirecting of the Bulgarian migration model – the migration potential remains, as well as the considerably high intentions for settling; but the time horizon shortens, i.e. the realization of intentions in the near future, in the temporary (labor) emigration.

What is the migration potential by work positions? What is the situation few months after Bulgaria entering the European Union?

The high migration intentions among people with no particular occupation are obvious.

On the other hand, though, the country may lose more *Operators of machines, equipments and transport means*, as well as *Qualified industrial workers*. They have high intentions for working abroad for a period of more than a year. There is „somewhat likely / average possibility” and „very likely / big possibility” for 17.1% of the first and 12.4% of the second group. As a whole, the intentions of the people who have stated readiness for short-term mobility are analog.

The intentions in category *Applied experts* are also high, especially concerning short-term engagements abroad. There is an impression that among people with more prestigious positions – for example *Management personnel* – the intentions for short-term mobility do not differ substantially from the mentioned above.

The intentions for settling are considerably lower, but are nothing to sneer at – 7.4% for *Operators ...* and 6% for *Applied experts*.

This means that people with higher qualification, better opportunities for development on the Labour market, should also be subject of some active national policies – programs for mobility, career development, etc.

The distribution of the shares by positions of those, who do not seek realization abroad, is also noticeable. The conclusion that these are mainly people with positions of *Management personnel*, *Analytical experts* and *Producers in agriculture and forest economy* is outlined – and in the three types of potential emigrants. In this context, we cannot pass the almost rhetorical question „***The short-term emigration is an alternative of what?***” – desire to move, short-term emigration or just the cross-border Labour mobility increases in the modern global world, the so-called repeating (circular) migration model emerges.⁸

2.2 Social-Demographic Profiles of the Types of Potential Emigrants

The matter of the types of emigrants – settlers, long-term and short-term Labour emigrants, as well as the more conservatively inclined „non-migrants” –

⁷ For a first time in the current study the short-term labor emigrants include the so-called tourists, namely people who state that they travel as tourists or visiting, but intend to work during their stay.

⁸ Katseli, Luka T. Gaining from Migration Report: Main Conclusions. – In: Migration and Development – a Euro-Mediterranean Perspective, 26 and 27 April 2007, Rhodes.

Table 3. *Migration Potential by Work Positions*What is the possibility to work abroad *for a few months?*

	Not likely	Somewhat not likely	Somewh at likely	Very likely	Total
Management personnel	79.6	10.8	7.5	2.2	100.0
Analytical experts	82.1	8.3	7.1	2.4	100.0
Applied experts	72.8	14.1	9.1	4.0	100.0
Subsidiary personnel	77.2	11.4	8.9	2.5	100.0
Personnel for public services, security, trade	75.1	11.1	9.3	4.4	100.0
Producers in agriculture, forest industry and fishing, hunting	88.5	7.7		3.8	100.0
Qualified industrial workers	72.7	12.8	9.9	4.6	100.0
Operators of machines, equipments and transport means	68.9	16.4	8.2	6.6	100.0
Low-qualified workers	77.8	12.4	6.0	3.8	100.0
No particular occupation	67.0	12.4	7.2	13.4	100.0

What is the possibility to work abroad *for more than a year?*

	Not likely	Somewhat not likely	Somewh at likely	Very likely	Total
Management personnel	87.1	5.4	6.5	1.1	100.0
Analytical experts	90.5	4.8	3.6	1.2	100.0
Applied experts	80.6	8.7	7.7	3.0	100.0
Subsidiary personnel	84.2	7.0	6.3	2.5	100.0
Personnel for public services, security, trade	81.8	7.1	7.1	4.0	100.0
Producers in agriculture, forest industry and fishing, hunting	88.5	3.8	3.8	3.8	100.0
Qualified industrial workers	80.1	7.4	7.8	4.6	100.0
Operators of machines, equipments and transport means	75.6	7.3	7.3	9.8	100.0
Low-qualified workers	84.8	7.0	4.8	3.5	100.0
No particular occupation	71.1	11.3	7.2	10.3	100.0

What is the possibility *to settle in* another country?

	Not likely	Somewhat not likely	Somewh at likely	Very likely	Total
Management personnel	92.5	4.3	2.2	1.1	100.0
Analytical experts	91.7	4.8	2.4	1.2	100.0
Applied experts	86.6	7.4	4.7	1.3	100.0
Subsidiary personnel	89.2	5.7	2.5	2.5	100.0
Personnel for public services, security, trade	87.6	7.1	4.0	1.3	100.0
Producers in agriculture, forest industry and fishing, hunting	92.3	7.7	-	-	100.0
Qualified industrial workers	91.2	4.2	3.2	1.4	100.0
Operators of machines, equipments and transport means	85.4	7.3	3.3	4.1	100.0
Low-qualified workers	94.6	3.2	1.6	0.6	100.0
No particular occupation	86.6	5.2	5.2	3.1	100.0

can be by itself a separate topic. It can be compared with the analog profile, identified by the study of NSI in 2001.⁹ In this case, we suggest comparison by social-demographic characteristics of each type migrants/non-migrants. For this purpose, we use the indicators of NSI¹⁰ – intensity (i.e. frequency of the cases – for example share of citizens of Sofia, who would move) and range (i.e. the share of citizens of Sofia among the potential movers from the country).

Settlement

The intensity among the potential emigrant is lowest among the citizens of Sofia, and highest – among the population of the district towns in the country. For the long-term Labour emigrants the intensity among the citizens of the district towns, towns and villages is similar. In Sofia it remains lowest. In this sense the special place of the capital is obvious – with the high concentration of administration, business and opportunities for Labour realization.

Concerning the range of the potential emigrants by settlement – they are „recruited” mostly from the district towns and towns, and to a smaller extent from the Bulgarian villages, which corresponds to the intensity indicator. The share of the citizens of the capital is under 8%. Compared with previous studies the increasing intensity and respectively range of the citizens of the district towns outlines. Obviously the situation in the different regional centers is different, but as a whole the migration potential in most of them increases. Even so the circumstance that the people from other settlements find temporary realization exactly in Sofia, using its opportunities for arranging cross-border mobility, should not be underestimated. It is not coincidence that the share (range) of Sofia (as leading university center) is high among the people willing to continue their education in foreign universities.

Gender Dimensions

The intensity (frequency) among men potential emigrants is higher. This can be seen best in the long-term Labour emigrants. The situation is more balanced in the settlers and short-term emigrants. Corresponding, the range is more unbalanced in the long-term Labour emigrants, where over 60% of the potential emigration is recruited among men. The share of women undoubtedly dominates among the people willing to continue their education abroad – 69.2%.

Age

The intensity (frequency) is highest among the population aged up to 40. We should note that almost every 10th young person aged up to 20 evaluates himself/herself as a potential settler or potential long-term emigrant. Concerning the potential of the short-term emigration outlines the high frequency, with which the population in the groups aged 21-30 and 31-40 points out that would seek for realization abroad – whole 12.7% in the first case and 9.8% in the second. Concerning the range of the potential emigration – it is obvious that for

⁹ Kalchev, I. Census of the Population, Housing Fund and Agricultural Companies in 2001, Vol. 6 Excerpt Studies, book 3 Territorial Mobility of the Population, NSI, 2002.

¹⁰ Op. cit.

almost all emigrant types it will be recruited mainly among the population aged up to 40. The low share among the young people aged under 20 is an exception – in the sector of the short-term Labour emigration.

Education

The following categories are used:

1. Primary or lower
2. Secondary – general
3. Secondary-vocational
4. Higher education (the people with doctorate degree are referred here too)

Concerning the *potential long-term Labour emigration* data show that the intensity is highest among the people with primary or lower education. This can be considered a confirmation of the hypothesis that *the emigration among higher qualified people has serious consequences regarding the opportunities for realization, respectively – the migration intentions of the population with lower qualification*. The intensity among the people with secondary-vocational education is also high for the long-term emigrants. This can be seen much clearer for the potential short-term emigration, where every 10th person with secondary-vocational education would seek for opportunity of short-term (generally less than a year) realization abroad. In this sense the outlined deficit of professions, requiring such a education, in the country is by far not a coincidence.

Concerning the range (structure) of the potential emigrants, by the studied type of criterion, the even distribution of the people orienting towards emigration among the main qualification groups (categories) of population is worth mentioning. *Still, the considerably high share of people with primary or lower and secondary vocational education for the long-term emigration is notable; as well as of those with vocational education – for the short-term emigration*. A serious problem for the decision-makers is the fact that so far no measures are taken concerning the correspondence of the need of the business and the qualification of the workforce. Inform decisions in this area can be made only based on profound analysis of the changes in the qualification of the population due to the emigration – Bulgarian literature and research circles do not offer yet analyses of the matters of „adding” and respectively „losing” skills. Such evaluation can be made on the basis of an empirical study among the returned emigrants.

Children in the family

In this case, the factor *Marital status* is presented based on presence of children, respectively their number in the family. We assume that exactly the children in a family (with formal marriage or based on cohabitation) are the factor, which influences making the decision to emigrate.

Concerning the intensity depending on the presence/lack of children and concerning their number in the family, we can see that for the settlers it is highest among the people with 1 child; for the potential long-term, as well as short-term emigration – the presence of children cannot be synonymously considered a factor for remaining in the country. Undoubtedly, this is an issue requiring deeper analysis.

This regularity is observed also in the range (structure) of the potential emigration – the potential migrants are recruited among the people with 1 child in the family – almost 42% of the cases. The data for the long-term Labour emigration seem paradox – in this category potential emigrants are recruited to even extent among the people without children and with more than 1 child – about 37% of the respondent in both cases. For the short-term emigration though the share of the people without children dominates – 40.5%, with high share of people with 1 child (31.1%).

Ethnic affiliation

The intensity of the settling intentions is highest among the Bulgarians and Roma. For the inconclusive/temporary (labor) emigration they are strongest among the Bulgarian Turks – almost twice higher intensity compared with the Bulgarian ethnic group. For the long-term Labour mobility, the intensity among the Roma community is considerably higher compared with the Bulgarian ethnic group. In paradox, according to us (contrary on previous study – see NSI, 2003¹¹) the intensity among the Roma for short-term Labour mobility is only 2.2%. In conformity with this the range in the migrants is mainly on the account of the Bulgarian ethnic group – 86.5% of the people willing to leave the country (in the „non-migrants”, which structure is closest to the ethnic structure of the population, the Bulgarian ethnic group is 82.5%). The situation is considerably the same in the inconclusive/temporary (labor) emigration, but here the share of the Turkish ethnic group exceeds 15% (in the „non-migrants” it is only 8.3%).

Concerning the intentions for education abroad, it is completely expectable that they are highest (as intensity and range) among the Bulgarian ethnic group.

Economic (labor) status

The Labour status (employed – unemployed) influences more and more on the Bulgarian migration model – a fact not clearly identified in the study of NSI (2001) or in the study of the Center for Comparative Studies for CERGE-EI Foundation in 2003. Gradually people start to value their engagement and the opportunities for realization in the country – this was also registered in the carried out by the project (*No BULIP201*) focus-group in Sofia. Now we notice that the intensity (frequency of the cases) for migration, and especially for inconclusive long-term emigration, is higher among the unemployed people, compared with the employed ones. It is an indicator that something in the country starts to change. But concerning the inconclusive short-term Labour mobility the intensity among the employed is higher – even though with less than 1 percentage point – compared with the intensity of the unemployed people.

As a result the range of the unemployed in the settlers and long-term emigrants is higher than their share in the so-called non-migrants (who serve as reference group).

¹¹ Mintchev, V., V. Boshnakov, I. Kalchev, V. Goev. External Migration from Bulgaria at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Estimates of Potential Emigrants' Attitudes and Profile. – Economic Thought, No 7, 2004.

Table 4. *Social-Demographic Profile of Potential Settlers*

Profile of potential settlers	Intensity (% of the cases)	Range (structure)
Place of residence		
Sofia	2.6	7.8
District town	6.8	42.6
Other town	6.3	29.8
Village	3.7	19.9
Gender		
Men	5.4	49.6
Women	4.9	50.4
Age		
Up to 20	9.8	24.8
21–30	7.2	28.4
31–40	6.4	27.7
41–50	3.4	12.8
51–60	1.3	6.4
Education		
Primary or lower	5.2	24.1
Secondary-general	4.9	24.8
Secondary-vocational	5.2	27.7
Higher	5.5	23.4
Children in the Family		
No children	3.7	33.8
1 child	7.5	41.9
2 or more children	4.8	24.3
Ethnic Group		
Bulgarian	5.4	86.5
Turkish	3.1	5.7
Roma	5.4	7.1
Other	3.1	0.7
Economic Status		
Employed	4.9	58.6
Unemployed	5.8	17.9
Other	5.6	23.6

3. Destinations, preferred employment sector, expected position

This section discusses the main destinations, preferred employment sectors and positions among the potential emigrants from the country; still more in some of the older EU member countries the opportunities for liberalization of the national Labour markets for Bulgaria and Romania are not adapted.¹²

¹² Markova, E. Expectations and Reality of Migration Flows Following Enlargement. Panel I during the conference on Migration and New Enlargement: Bulgaria and Romania, 18 May 2007, London.

Table 5. *Social-Demographic Profile of the Potential Long-Term Labour Emigrants*

Profile of potential long-term Labour emigrants	Intensity (% of the cases)	Range (structure)
Place of residence		
Sofia	4.0	8.7
District town	8.2	36.7
Other town	8.0	27.0
Village	7.2	27.6
Gender		
Men	9.9	64.8
Women	4.8	35.2
Age		
Up to 20	11.2	20.5
21–30	9.1	26.2
31–40	9.3	28.7
41–50	5.1	13.8
51–60	3.1	10.8
Education		
Primary or lower	8.2	27.7
Secondary-general	6.6	24.1
Secondary-vocational	7.3	27.7
Higher	6.6	20.5
Children in the Family		
No children	5.8	37.0
1 child	6.5	25.5
2 or more children	10.5	37.5
Ethnic Group		
Bulgarian	6.3	72.4
Turkish	13.2	17.3
Roma	9.7	9.2
Other	6.3	1.0
Economic Status		
Employed	6.7	57.5
Unemployed	10.1	22.8
Other	6.5	19.7

Destinations

Which *destinations* are preferred by the Bulgarian citizens?

Seven countries of the European Union (EU-15), together with USA, Turkey and Canada are among the first 10 preferred countries by the potential Bulgarian emigrants. 14% of the respondents would prefer Spain, 12.8% – Germany and 9.9% – UK.

Table 6. *Social-Demographic Profile of the Potential Short-Term Labour Emigrants*

Profile of potential short-term Labour emigrants	Intensity (% of the cases)	Range (structure)
Place of residence		
Sofia	6.5	12.6
District town	9.2	36.3
Other town	7.5	22.4
Village	8.5	28.7
Gender		
Men	8.9	51.6
Women	7.5	48.4
Age		
Up to 20	8.7	13.9
21–30	12.5	31.4
31–40	9.8	26.5
41–50	4.9	11.7
51–60	5.5	16.6
Education		
Primary or lower	6.9	20.2
Secondary-general	7.9	25.6
Secondary-vocational	10.2	34.1
Higher	7.5	20.2
Children in the Family		
No children	7.3	40.5
1 child	9.1	31.1
2 or more children	9.2	28.4
Ethnic Group		
Bulgarian	8.2	82.1
Turkish	13.6	15.7
Roma	2.2	1.8
Other	3.1	0.4
Economic Status		
Employed	8.5	63.7
Unemployed	8.1	15.7
Other	7.8	20.6

The high interest in some of the countries is due to the preferences of the tourists – Spain, Italy and Turkey. Nevertheless Spain attracts most long-term Labour emigrants. Regarding the opportunities for migration, i.e. permanent emigration (connected among the rest with the so-called *negative transfers* – yet not studied in the Bulgarian literature problem) preferences towards Spain, Germany and USA outline. Leading destination for the people willing to continue their education abroad is France – 19% of the declared preferences, followed by UK, USA, Italy and Czech Republic.

Table 7. *Social-Demographic Profile of Non-Migrants*

Profile of non-migrants	Intensity (% of the cases)	Range (structure)
Place of residence		
Sofia	77.7	17.8
District town	64.2	30.2
Other town	65.2	23.1
Village	72.5	28.9
Gender		
Men	66.5	45.5
Women	71.0	54.5
Age		
Up to 20	58.5	11.2
21–30	59.2	17.7
31–40	63.0	20.3
41–50	76.1	21.5
51–60	81.9	29.4
Education		
Primary or lower	73.9	25.8
Secondary-general	70.4	27.0
Secondary-vocational	67.2	26.7
Higher	63.4	20.5
Children in the Family		
No children	73.6	49.2
1 child	63.1	26.0
2 or more children	66.7	24.2
Ethnic Group		
Bulgarian	68.7	82.5
Turkish	60.3	8.3
Roma	79.0	7.9
Other	81.3	1.4
Economic Status		
Employed	67.8	61.2
Unemployed	70.3	16.5
Other	69.7	22.2

Employment sector

Concerning the *sectors*, where the potential emigrants think they would have realization, we can state the following.

The share of people who would emigrate without knowing what exactly they will work abroad continues to be alarmingly high – almost half of the respondents. If we evaluate the informativeness of the potential emigrants by gender and age (table 10), we will see that the share of the people willing to emigrate without a clear perspective concerning the employment sector, ex-

pected position, etc., separately for women and people aged under 35, is considerably higher than the potential emigrants – men. The conclusion is that the people are inclined to emigrate despite the risks and uncertainty. Among the first 5 sectors of preferred (possible) employment are: 1) Construction – 10.5% of the cases; 2) Services (serving the individual) – 8%; 3) Agriculture – 5.7%; 4) Hotels and restaurants – 4.6%; 5) Transport – 4.6% (table 9).

At the same time obvious is the visible difference between the genders regarding the employment sectors – in the construction and transport for instance prevail men potential emigrants, and in the sectors *Hotels and restaurants, Healthcare, Household activities* – women. If we compare the people aged under 35 with those over 35, we can conclude that the older people are engaged to a higher extent in agriculture or construction, unlike the younger people, who are oriented towards sectors like *Tourism* (Hotels and restaurants) or other service activities.

Quite expectedly, the share of women who would not work is higher than the share of men. On the other hand, the share of the older people who would not work is higher than the share of the young people aged under 35. This is probably due to a certain type of „family migration” – older relatives; parents are engaged with raising born abroad grandchildren, etc.

Expected position

Concerning the expected *position* the following 3 things draw the attention:

➤ The potential emigrants are not well informed about their possible realization.

➤ Positions, requiring low qualification (or „as it comes/as it happens”), prevail.

➤ The share of those who expect positions of high-qualified workers (7.8%) and applied experts (5.7%) is not at all neglected. It turns out that 14% of the potential emigrants are people with qualification and experience, which allow them to expect good professional realization abroad. We should not underestimate the will for emigration exactly among these circles.

Ways of travelling

Regarding the ways of realization of the potential intention for emigration, the following results are outlined:

1. free/individual travelling, contracting – 24.9% of the cases;
2. invitation from relatives, friends – 23.7%;
3. through mediator firm – 22.3%.

Obviously, these three opportunities are considered equally relevant.

On the other hand, every 10th person plans to use an individual contract. The share of the people who would rely on existing bilateral agreements between Bulgaria and the host countries is about 4%. It turns out that not more than 1/4 of the potential emigration can be regulated through the registration regime of the firms, by the Employment Agency, the agreements for mutual hiring of citizens, etc. In other words, consciously or not, in the years Bulgaria has oriented towards liberal migration policy.

Table 8. *Destinations of Potential Bulgarian Emigrants (%)*

Which country would you go, if you had the chance?	Migration type					Total
	Tourism, visit abroad	Education abroad	Short-term Labour migrants	Long-term Labour migrants	Settlers	
Spain	14.3		10.2	19.9	15.9	14.0
Germany	7.1	4.8	12.2	9.9	15.9	12.8
UK		14.3	11.2	10.5	9.5	9.9
USA	14.3	14.3	6.1	8.8	15.9	9.2
Greece	7.1	9.5	9.2	9.9	7.9	8.7
Italy	14.3	14.3	6.1	7.7	7.9	7.5
France	3.6	19.0	6.6	8.3	2.4	6.3
Turkey	10.7		8.7	1.1	1.6	3.9
Netherlands	3.6		3.1	2.2	2.4	2.9
Canada	3.6		2.0	1.1	4.8	2.6
Switzerland	7.1		1.0	1.7	1.6	2.1
Belgium	3.6		2.6	2.2	0.8	1.7
Cyprus			1.5	2.2		1.5
Austria			2.6	0.6	0.8	1.2
EU country	3.6		1.0	1.1	2.4	1.2
Australia			0.5		2.4	0.9
Russia			1.5	0.6		0.8
New Zealand	3.6		1.0	0.6	0.8	0.8
Czech Republic		4.8	1.0			0.5
Denmark				1.7		0.5
Egypt				0.6	0.8	0.5
Slovenia			0.5		0.8	0.3
Israel			1.0			0.3
Brazil			0.5	0.6		0.3
Ireland			0.5	0.6		0.3
Poland				0.6		0.3
Bahamas				0.6		0.2
Finland				0.6		0.2
Libya			0.5			0.2
Montenegro			0.5			0.2
Portugal						0.2
Africa						0.2
Iceland						0.2
Kosovo				0.6		0.2
Norway			0.5			0.2
Iran				0.6		0.2
Romania				0.6		0.2
Monaco					0.8	0.2
Sweden			0,5			0.2
Asia				0.6		0.2
Japan					0.8	0.2
I do not know	3.6	19.0	7.1	4.4	4.0	7.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 9. *Expected Realization of the Potential Bulgarian Emigrants – Employment Sector (%)*

What do you intent to work abroad (economic activities)?	Short-term Labour migrants	Long-term Labour migrants	Settlers	Total
Construction	8.2	13.5	9.8	10.5
Other activities in service of the public and individual	7.7	10.0	5.7	8.0
Agriculture, hunting and forest industry	6.0	7.1	3.3	5.7
Hotels and restaurants	4.4	5.9	3.3	4.6
Transport, storage and communications	2.2	4.1	4.9	3.6
Household activities	2.7	4.7	1.6	3.2
Trade, repair and technical service (automobiles, personal belongings, household goods, etc.)	0.5	3.5	4.1	2.5
I will study	1.6	2.4	4.1	2.5
I will not work	4.9	0.0	0.8	2.1
Processing industry	1.6	2.4	1.6	1.9
Production and distribution of electric and heat energy	1.6	0.6	4.1	1.9
Healthcare and social services	1.1	1.8	2.5	1.7
Extracting industry	0.0	1.8	0.8	0.8
Real estate operations, leasing activity and business services	0.0	1.2	0.8	0.6
Financial mediation	0.5	0.0	0.8	0.4
State governance and defense; obligatory public insurance	0.0	0.6	0.8	0.4
Fishing	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.2
Education	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.2
I do not know now, I will decide later	56.3	40.6	50.0	49.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Regarding the amounts of money needed for organizing the travel (*immediate price of the emigration*), they vary depending on the type of potential emigration. Over 1/2 of the potential migrants consider the amounts necessary for leaving/organizing a permanent stay abroad not less than 800 EUR (in 48.4% of the cases – over 1000 EUR). This amount decreases with reducing the planned stay abroad – in all cases in the long-term, as well as short-term potential Labour emigrants, expectations of 800 EUR have more than 1/4 of the respondents. It seems the immediate price of the travel has increased in the last few years (for comparison see the questionnaire study of Center for Comparative Studies from December 2005¹³).

¹³ Mintchev, V., V. Boshnakov. The Economics of Bulgarian Emigration – Empirical Assessment. – Economic Thought, No 7, 2006.

Table 10. *Expected Realization of the Potential Bulgarian Emigrants by Age and Gender – Employment Sector (%)*

What do you intent to work abroad (economic activities)?	Under 35	Over 35	Men	Women
Agriculture, hunting and forest industry	4.5	7.3	6.5	4.6
Fishing		0.4	0.3	
Extracting industry	0.5	0.8	1.2	
Processing industry	1.3	2.0	1.8	1.4
Production and distribution of electric and heat energy	1.3	2.0	2.6	0.4
Construction	8.3	11.8	17.1	0.7
Trade, repair and technical service	1.3	4.1	3.2	1.4
Hotels and restaurants	5.1	3.3	2.4	6.8
Transport, storage and communications	1.9	4.5	5.6	
Financial mediation	0.5			0.7
Real estate operations, leasing activity and business services	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.4
State governance and defense; obligatory public insurance	0.3	0.4		0.7
Education	0.5			0.7
Healthcare and social services	1.1	2.0	0.6	2.5
Other activities in service of the public and individual	7.5	6.1	6.2	7.8
Household activities	2.1	4.1	0.3	6.0
I will not work	3.2	8.9	4.4	6.8
I will study	5.9		1.8	5.7
I do not know now, I will decide later	54.0	41.9	45.6	53.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note: Answered 621 (22.8%) of 2725 respondent.

Expected payment

Expected monthly payment abroad – here the expectations of the respondents seem more concrete compared with the Employment sector, Positions, etc. **Every 5th person expects income of about 1200 EUR.** Approximately so much are also the people who expect incomes of over 1600 EUR. Only the detailed analysis of the information, received from the people who have already been abroad, can help us evaluate how realistic are these expectations. In all cases, though these are incomes way above the average payment in Bulgaria.

4. Socioeconomic factors in making a decision to emigrate

Our study does not follow strictly the known in the literature *Push/Pull factors* classification. Our goal is to delimit the factors (reasons), which keep the Bulgarian population in the country, as well as to „see” the ones, which urge for emigration.

Table 11. *Expected Realization of the Potential Bulgarian Emigrants – Position (%)*

Positions	Short-term Labour migrants	Long-term Labour migrants	Migrants	Total
Low-qualified workers	13.2	26.5	14.0	18.2
Qualified industrial workers	7.7	7.1	9.1	7.8
Applied experts	5.5	5.3	6.6	5.7
Personnel for public services, security and trade	4.4	4.7	2.5	4.0
Operators of machines, equipments, transport	1.1	4.1	5.8	3.4
I will study	1.6	2.4	4.1	2.5
Supplementary personnel	1.6	4.1	0.8	2.3
Analytical experts	2.2	1.2	3.3	2.1
I will not work	4.9	0.0	0.8	2.1
Producers in agriculture, forest industry, fishing, hunting	1.1	0.6	0.8	0.8
Management personnel	0.0	1.2	0.8	0.6
I do not know now, I will decide later	56.6	42.9	51.2	50.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 12. *Ways of Organizing the Travel (I) (%)*

How do you plan to realize your travel abroad?	Short-term Labour migrants	Long-term Labour migrants	Settlers	Total
Private (independent) travel	26.8	25.6	21.1	24.9
Invitations from relatives, friends	23.7	21.1	27.6	23.7
Mediatory firm	23.2	27.8	13.0	22.3
Individual Labour contract	10.3	10.6	12.2	10.9
Applying/continuing education	4.6	4.4	11.4	6.2
Bilateral agreement for workforce exchange	4.1	3.3	3.3	3.6
Application for green card	1.0	2.2	3.3	2.0
Marriage/cohabitation	1.0	0.0	2.4	1.0
Other	5.2	5.0	5.7	5.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Constraining factors

Interesting here is the opportunity to compare people who would stay in the country with those who would orient to emigrate.

What keeps people in Bulgaria?

The gradation of these factors is as follows:

➤ *Attachment to the family.* Non-migrants seem to be more attached to the family, friends, etc. If this factor is considered important and very important by

Table 13. *Amounts of Money Needed to Realize the Intentions*

What amounts of money do you think is needed to realize your travel abroad?	Migration type					Total
	Tourism, Visit abroad	Educational abroad	Short-term Labour migrants	Long-term Labour migrants	Migrants	
Up to 200 EUR	20.8	–	8.7	6.6	3.2	6.9
More than 200 up to 400 EUR	8.3	4.8	12.8	11.5	6.3	10.4
More than 400 up to 600 EUR	16.7	–	15.4	11.0	4.8	10.9
More than 600 up to 800 EUR	–	9.5	9.2	8.8	8.7	8.6
More than 800 up to 1000 EUR	4.2	9.5	10.3	14.8	6.3	10.6
More than 1000 EUR	16.7	14.3	15.9	20.9	48.4	25.0
I cannot say	33.3	61.9	27.7	26.4	22.2	27.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 14. *Expected Payment When Abroad (%)*

What monthly income do you expect to have (receive) during your stay abroad?	Short-term Labour migrants	Long-term Labour migrants	Migrants	Total
Up to 400 EUR	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.6
More than 400 up to 800 EUR	14.9	13.3	4.0	11.6
More than 800 up to 1200 EUR	12.9	24.9	18.3	18.6
More than 1200 up to 1600 EUR	12.4	13.8	14.3	13.4
More than 1600 EUR	11.3	18.2	34.1	19.6
I cannot say	47.9	29.3	28.6	36.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

74.5% of the potential settlers and 85.1% of the long-term emigrants, then by the more conservative non-migrants it is considered in more than 90% of the cases.

➤ *Positive expectations for improvement of the way of life.* Non-migrants are also more optimistic concerning the potential of the country – over 77% of them have optimistic attitudes for the perspectives for Bulgaria. The situation with the potential settlers, though over 65% of them are also optimistic, is more different. The long-term emigrants are optimistic in about 60% of the cases.

➤ *Availability of business/good employment.* It is noticeable that the potential settlers and long-term emigrants have higher requirements for *Availability of business/good employment*.

The different attitudes for the non-migrants and potential settlers are outlined particularly strong when it concerns fears that it is difficult to find „documented” (legal) employment abroad, as well as fears of the uncertainty of the realization abroad. For the non-migrants it is almost 20 percentage points more

serious problem than for the potential settlers and long-term emigrants.

The share of those who fear intolerant attitude towards foreigners in the so-called host country is unexpectedly high. Again these fears are significantly more serious among the non-migrants.

In conclusion we should draw the attention to at least two things:

➤ Obviously the attitudes of the non-migrants and potential emigrants are similar, especially concerning their attachment to family and friends or the expectations for the country. There are crossings when the potential risks of *making a decision for emigration* are evaluated. The fears in the so-called non-migrant are significantly more serious.

➤ Factors like higher taxes and insurances abroad (considered towards keeping the population in the country) or loss of social support and healthcare services, remain in the background. On one hand, it is due to the hypothetical character of the declared intentions; on the other hand, though, the respondents are not worried at all by the higher taxes and insurance burden in the attracting destinations – Spain, Germany, UK, etc., or by the loss of social services in the country. ***Probably the serious reserves and opportunities for coordinating measures with the host countries, which could make the tax and social area „more visible” for the conservative non-emigrants, as well as for the more mobile categories of the population, are exactly here.***

Motivating factors

The study tests number of variables (identified as *motivating the emigration attitudes factors*). Here we have information only for the potential emigrants. The non-migrants have not answered the respective questions.

➤ Among the evaluated factors, ***Higher payment is the most significant one***, i.e. short-term economic factor – according to almost 90% of the respondents, namely the higher payment in the host, target countries is „important” and „very important” factor, a reason for leaving the country.

➤ ***To live with high living standard*** follows – over 80% of the case.

➤ ***To support my family in Bulgaria*** comes third (74.8%).

The leading factors are of economic nature. The short-term economic motives seem to outweigh – „higher payment” over the long-term desire to live „with higher living standard”. ***The motive for supporting the family outlines, which corresponds to the identified above migration attitudes, despite the presence of one or more children in the household.***

When we look in more details to the factors motivating the permanent and temporary potential emigrants, the picture is heterogeneous.

For the settlers (so-called permanent emigration) *Higher payment* and *To live in the conditions of higher living standard* possess almost equal significance. The gradation above comes from the temporary emigration. The difference between the visions on this matter of the settlers and short-term emigrants is almost 10 percent points.

Supporting the family is a serious motive mostly for the long-term potential emigrants. Paradoxically, this motive is valid to a higher extent for the settlers

than for the short-term Labour emigration.

➤ Only after that come *Seeking better professional realization* (66.7%) and *Ensuring better education* (62.8%).

➤ Motives, as *I wish to acquire experience* (58.4%) and *I do not wish to live anymore in this country* (41%), become more significant.

In other words, the long-term social factors, depending on professional realization and ensuring better according to the respondent's education, outline.

We cannot underestimate factors like *Acquiring experience*, which, on one hand, are a reaction of the closeness of the regime from 19 ago; and on the other hand – reveal the increasing mobility after opening of Bulgaria to the global world economy. The evaluation of „*I do not wish to live in this country anymore*” shows a specific shade of dissatisfaction and bitterness.

Still, we have to mention that there are differences by type of emigration. Factors like *Professional realization* and *Education* are more significant for the settlers than for the ones preferring short-term Labour mobility, while their visions for *Acquiring experience* are similar.

The statement *I do not wish to live in this country anymore* is revealed more explicitly for the settlers than the short-term emigrants – there is almost 40 percentage point difference in the visions of the two categories potential emigrants.

In conclusion, there are a few factors, „pushing” the Bulgarian population abroad:

➤ economic (short-term economic logics and motivation prevailing);

➤ social – professional realization, education – which, together with the rest, shows how the Bulgarian economy and social area (in this case – the education area) can *compete for the population*;

➤ significant is the openness, the will to see and know the world, as – alas! – the lack of will to live in Bulgaria anymore;

➤ finally, the analyzed here factors influence quite differently on the types of potential emigrants. So despite the proclaimed lately visions¹⁴ that the dilemma permanent-temporary cross-border mobility is not current anymore, these factors suggest different management approaches and policies. Our opinion is that it is early to state that the Labour mobility is neither an alternative to the permanent emigration, nor that the short-term emigration does not keep the long-term one.

¹⁴ Katseli, Luka T. Gaining from Migration Report: Main Conclusions. – Migration and Development – a Euro-Mediterranean Perspective, 26 and 27 April 2007, Rhodes.