

PROPENSITY OF YOUTH TO MIGRATE: EVIDENCE FROM KOSOVO³

This paper investigates the propensity of youth to migrate using the survey data from two universities in Kosovo. The logit model results suggest comprehensive and statistically robust evidence that migration propensity is negatively related to age. The respondents that have political concerns, that are against or indifferent to migration as a phenomenon, compared to those that support it, have indicated statistically significant negative migration propensity. Conversely, the data suggest that economic, cultural, and security variables are significantly and positively related to migration propensity. Moreover, the data suggests no statistically significant impact of gender, marital status, residence, employment, income, relatives' network, religion, and training, variables, on the migration propensity. The robustness of estimated results is supported by diagnostic tests. Finally, the fact that 59% of respondents have indicated a propensity to migrate, clearly emphasizes the seriousness of the migration challenge, and the consequential impact it may have on the future prosperity of the country.

Keywords: migration; youth; propensity; logit

JEL: F22; J61; O15

1. Introduction

The review of literature lists many factors of migration, and it encapsulates them into the push-pull factors of migration. In general, these can be further classified into economic, social, and political factors (European Commission, 2000; World Economic Forum, 2017; European Asylum Support Office, 2016). Presently, a combination of chronic political, economic, cultural, and security concerns, accompanied by a bleak future for overall prosperity in Kosovo, and high unemployment rates among Kosovo youth, have resulted in 59% of sample respondents expressing their willingness to migrate, as the data from this study indicates. The percentage of unemployed youth in the total unemployment is 34.7% (Kosovo Agency of Statistics, 2020). Ironically, the worrying migration trends in Kosovo, accompanied by fragile democratic governance, weak rule of law and corrupt economic governance, regardless of it being intentional or unintentional, have neither been understood as a real problem by most Kosovo politicians, nor by the past governments. Rather, outward

¹ Theranda Beqiri is from the University of Peja, Kosovo, email: theranda.beqiri@unhz.eu.

² Adriatik Hoxha is from the University of Prishtina, Kosovo, email: adriatik.hoxha@uni-pr.edu. (Corresponding author).

³ This paper should be cited as: Beqiri, T., Hoxha, A. (2022). *Propensity of Youth to Migrate: Evidence from Kosovo*. – *Economic Studies (Ikonicheski Izsledvania)*, 31(6), pp. 120-132.

migration has been unequivocally accepted as an ameliorating solution to the lack of overall prosperity and as an efficient instrument of reducing the high unemployment rate (estimated at 29% by the Kosovo Agency of Statistics, 2020).

In this paper, we will employ the logit model to examine the relationship between willingness to migrate, as the dependent variable, against age, gender, marital status, residence, employment, income, relatives abroad, migration reasons, migration perception, migration perspective, and training, as independent variables. The subsequent sections will include, *first*, a literature review of the migration determinants; *second*, a review of the main empirical findings; *third*, a review of applied econometric models; *fourth*, a description of data; *fifth*, logit regression analysis; and *sixth*, a summary of the main findings of the paper.

2. Literature Review

This section provides a brief literature review on the determinants of migration, such as the relationship of migration with GDP, income, unemployment differentials, migration motives, socio-economic determinants, geographic and cultural differences, policy issues, violation and abuse of human rights, exploitation, discrimination, free movement, education, and labour motives, distress migration, gender norms, life course transitions, and human security perspective.

Mintchev, Boshnakov, Richter & Ruspini (2017) have examined the importance of the reasons and the way migrants decide to leave the country for shorter or longer periods. They argue that the questions related to the determinants of migration and the type of migration are strongly related, because different types of migration may be contingent on different determinants. In solving the reasons why individuals migrate, they provide a comprehensive literature review of the functionalist and structuralist theories. They suggest that functionalist approaches attempt to rationalize migration as a function of market processes. In contrast, historical-structuralist theories state that international migration is triggered by the unequal political and economic distribution of power in the world economy. Blanchflower, Saleheen & Shadforth (2007) have found evidence of faster population growth in the UK due to migration from the Eastern European Countries (EEC), owing to higher GDP per capita in the UK. Second, they have observed that many of the new ‘migrants’ have stayed for only a short time and then returned home, to possibly return later. Third, they have found evidence that individuals from the EEC were relatively young, male, had low unemployment rates, lower wages, and high self-employment rates, and were especially likely to be in temporary jobs. Finally, they have argued that this immigration has made the labour market more flexible and may have lowered the Non-accelerating Inflation Rate of Unemployment (NAIRU).

In contrast, Chiang, Hannum & Kao (2013) have investigated the individual and altruistic economic motivations that are included in the demographic and economic research. Specifically, they have examined the role and importance of the non-economic goals of personal development, a motivation suggested in numerous qualitative studies of women migrants in China and elsewhere. Furthermore, Sprenger (2013) has empirically investigated the determinants of migration between 21 developed countries, members of the EU, and the

OECD. By using the data on migration flows over the period 2000 to 2009, he has examined the impact of traditional economic variables such as income, unemployment differentials, and geographical and demographic factors. Moreover, he has examined the impact of cultural differences on the mobility patterns in the EU before and after the 2004 enlargement round.

In contrast, Piesse (2014) has examined the impact of socio-political, economic, and ecological factors on migration. In his view, the rising communal violence worldwide, often because of ethnic or religious intolerance, has led to increased levels of migration. Additionally, he suggests that economic disparity between developing and developed economies encourages the movement of skilled labour from the former to the latter. Moreover, the dynamics of the ecological environment have the potential to worsen food and water insecurity in various parts of the globe. Hence, the limited access to food and water resources may push people to migrate to countries where these resources are more readily available. The UNICEF (2014) study has found that labour migration push-pull factors are intensifying. Specifically, the high unemployment and absence of decent work opportunities, among other factors, push youth to migrate. The pull of demand for labour and skills mobility is permanent, structural, and growing, driven by technological changes, evolving markets, and spreading demographic transitions. Moreover, the study has found that up to 50% of migration flows comprise youth between ages 18 and 29.

On the other hand, Heckert (2015) has investigated internal migration among the Haitian youth, aged 10–24. The study has compared the characteristics of youth who migrate with education and labour motives and has determined the characteristics associated with family financial support to youth migrants. In comparison, Deotti & Estruch (2016) have examined migration as a common livelihood strategy for households across sub-Saharan Africa and North Africa. The study found that despite structural differences, these two regions have faced major migration and youth employment challenges. They have developed a conceptual framework to simultaneously address the root causes of distress migration of rural youth and leverage the potential of migration to reduce rural poverty and improve food security, with the overall objective of contributing to agriculture and rural development in migrants' areas of origin and migration-prone regions.

Similarly, Anderson, Apland, Dunaiski & Yarrow (2017) have explored the experiences of young people that migrate internally in Vietnam and the Philippines. They have investigated how gender hierarchies and gender norms influence the decision-making and experiences of youth migration. In contrast, Gavonel (2017) has investigated the relationship between life-course transitions to adulthood with the patterns and predictors of internal migration in low-income and middle-income countries. He has documented the patterns of prevalence, frequency, timing, reasons and streams of migration, employment at the destination, subjective well-being, and migration aspirations, with special emphasis on the factors associated with young men and women's decision to migrate, and the reasons for migrating. Moreover, Giménez-Gómez, Walleand & Zergawu (2017) have argued that to better understand the present migration and refugee crisis in Europe, it is necessary to understand the different migration drivers beyond the well-known economic determinants. They have examined migration from a broader human security perspective and have analyzed the determinants of regular and irregular migration flows from Africa to Europe for the period 1990 to 2014.

3. Review of empirical findings

According to Elbadawy (2011), one in three young men in Egypt in the age group 15-29 has expressed the willingness/intention to migrate. He finds that having a migrant on one's social network is one of the key factors in developing migration aspirations. The wealthiest youth are more likely to want to migrate to the West. Conversely, the analysis of Chiang et al. (2013) indicates that the desire for personal development is a common motivator for young migrants. Additionally, their results suggest that non-economic incentives may play an important role in youth migration in rural China and that positioning in family structures shapes the predisposition of individuals to migrate due to altruistic economic motivations.

In contrast, Herrera & Sahn (2013) have found that determinants of youth migration are heterogeneous by gender and destination. The higher the fathers' education, the more (less) likely are their daughters to move to urban (rural) areas. Next, they have found that young men and women, who spend their childhood in better-off households, are more likely to move to urban areas. Also, the presence of younger siblings increases the propensity of moving to rural areas. Access to primary schools during childhood decreases the likelihood of migrating to urban areas for both men and women. Conversely, Sprenger (2013) has presented an empirical study of migration flows between 21 EU Member States that are also OECD members over the period 1998 to 2010. His results indicate that economic factors are significant in analyzing migration flows. Furthermore, he found robust evidence that variables such as language, cultural proximity, and migrant network have a significant impact on migration flows. Additionally, the free movement of workers has a significant positive effect on migration.

According to Heckert (2015), both education and labour migration becomes more common with increasing age. Education migration is more common among youth born outside the capital and those first enrolled in school on time. Labour migration differs little by region of birth and is associated with late school enrollment. Moreover, rather than sending remittances home, many youth migrants continue to receive financial support from their parents. Provision of financial support to youth migrants is associated with current school enrollment. Female youth are more likely to be migrants, and less commonly receive support from their household of origin. On the other side, Deotti & Estruch (2016) suggest that migration decisions are driven by a variety of root causes (i.e. poverty, food insecurity, inequality, poor income-generating opportunities, and increased competition for scarce land and water resources). They are strongly context-specific and depend on the individual and household characteristics. The root causes of distress migration of rural youth, its impacts on the agriculture and rural development of the areas of origin, as well as its patterns differ according to the context. Furthermore, they argue that migration can have both positive and negative impacts in the rural areas of origin.

Additionally, the research of Anderson *et al.* (2017) implies that norms and expectations relating to gender influence young people's decisions to migrate and their experiences as internal migrants. Gender norms and dynamics shape the opportunities that are available to young men and women, determine the demand for their labour, compel or proscribe their migration, and inform (perceptions) of their vulnerability. Only through an understanding of the risks and opportunities that accompany youth economic migration through a gender

perspective, can policy and programming effectively address risk and better empower young migrants. Also, Eshetu & Beshir (2017) suggest that 76.2% of the migrants left their homes at age ranges between 15 and 25 years. Similarly, they have found that 48% of the migrants were attending junior education level, while 28% and 13% of the migrants were attending secondary and primary education levels, respectively. Moreover, 80% of migrants were not married at the time of their migration. In addition, their study has found that the main reasons for rural-urban migration in the study areas were better jobs opportunities in the urban areas (44%), rural poverty (26%), search for further education (10%), starting a new business (8%), to be free from restrictive culture (8%) and better urban services (4%).

Furthermore, Mintchev et al. 2017 results suggest that other things equal, men, younger individuals, and persons without family commitments express higher migration propensity. Furthermore, migration is motivated to a great degree by education. Their results suggest that Bulgarians from all income ranges aspire to migrate, whereas they find no relationship between migration aspirations and certain income strata. Importantly, the occupation status, specifically students, unemployed, and individuals employed in agriculture, have a higher migration propensity, both long-term and short-term. Conversely, individuals working in the public sector exhibit a lower propensity to migrate, mainly due to the stability and security of such positions. Significantly, their data suggests that the individuals that migrate once, may migrate again, i.e. engage in circular migration, or may effectively permanently settle in the migrating country. Finally, they find that younger, unemployed, temporary workers, and individuals with better education show a higher propensity to re-migrate. Comparatively, Mintchev & Boshnakov (2018) analysis suggests that individuals of older age, with higher educational levels, employed, with higher living standards, exhibit greater willingness to stay. Likewise, married individuals, combined with those who have achieved their migration goals, are more likely to engage in temporary migration. In contrast, the individuals that are not married, that have not achieved their migration goals, or with longer stay outside the country are more likely to leave the country forever.

In contrast, Gavonel (2017) suggests that there is a significant share of migrants between 15 and 19 years old, and they are very likely to move more than once. In all countries, the migrants are more likely to move after the school-age years, between ages 17 and 18. These patterns in frequency and timing of moves provide new evidence that young individuals migrate very often, even before having finished school, which is key to understanding educational performance. They provide evidence that young people move for a variety of reasons that go beyond the economic-related reasons. Family formation and family reunion are also important motives for migrating, especially in the studied age range. The migration streams presented show that these youth do not necessarily follow rural-urban migration as it is generalized in the literature, and they shed light on the dynamics of the less studied rural-rural migration. Their results suggest that at this age, migration is a household strategy; although the migrants do not necessarily contribute remittances to their previous household, they are often receiving them from their caregiver. Furthermore, the results of Giménez-Gómez et al. (2017) indicate that a combination of push and pull factors influence the migration decisions of individuals. Particularly, rising political persecution, ethnic cleansing, human rights violations, political instability, and civil conflicts in African source countries are all significantly associated with increased migration flows into European destination countries. Therefore, their findings underscore the need for the EU and European countries

to collaborate with the source countries, not only in terms of supporting economic development in the source countries, but also in promoting human security: human rights, democracy, peace, and social stability.

4. Applied Econometric Models

This section provides a brief review of methodological issues. First, Chiang et al. (2013), have investigated the incentives for labour migration of youth in rural China, using panel data from the Gansu Survey of Children and Families, a longitudinal study of youth in rural Gansu Province of China. In contrast, Herrera & Sahn (2013) have utilized a sample of 2,676 individuals, aged 21 to 35 years, where 35% were internal migrants, and over half were defined as temporary migrants. Utilizing multinomial logit models, they have estimated the role of early childhood household and community characteristics in young people's decision to migrate. Comparatively, Heckert (2015) has employed the data from the 2009 Haiti Youth Survey. Specifically, the study has applied discrete-time event history analysis to model characteristics associated with education and labour migration, as well as a two-stage Heckman probit model to determine the characteristics associated with family financial support for two different samples of youth migrants. Similarly, Mintchev et al. (2017) have applied logistic regression analysis to examine the impact of different variables, obtain additional information, and contrast the outcomes provided by the survey instruments, to enhance the understanding of social inequalities, regional disparities, and migration policy determinants.

Conversely, Anderson et al. (2017) have applied a primarily qualitative research design to explore the topics of gender, youth, and migration in an in-depth and contextualized manner. Additionally, they have analyzed existing (secondary) quantitative data to examine the patterns of internal economic migration in Vietnam and the Philippines. Moreover, Eshetu & Beshir (2017) have employed a probit regression model to show that age, years of schooling, relatives in receiving areas, monthly income in sending areas, and family size, have a statistically significant impact on the rural-urban migration. In addition, Gavonel (2017) has used a panel dataset on youth born in 1994-95 in Ethiopia, India, Peru, and Vietnam, to investigate the impact of the life-course transitions to adulthood on the patterns and predictors of internal migration in low-income and middle-income countries. Furthermore, Mintchev & Boshnakov (2018) have employed a binary logistic regression to investigate the choice of Bulgarian migrants on whether to stay or re-migrate and to analyze the impact of the specific factors that help explain the development of incentives for the Bulgarian migrants to migrate. Correspondingly, Wondimagegnhu & Zeleke (2017) have utilized a stratified sampling technique to select a total of 200 household heads in three agro-ecologies of the study area. They have used structured questionnaires as a principal primary data collection method and logistic regression to perform the analysis. Next, we turn to the description of the data and dataset.

5. Data and Variables

The survey was conducted with students at the University of Prishtina (UP) and University of Peja (UPE), both located in Kosovo, during April and May 2018. Specifically, the sample has 500 observations, 300 from UP and 200 from UPE. The following questions were asked to the students: 1. Do you think to migrate after completion of your education (1 = yes; 2 = no). 2. Age (in years). 3. Gender, (1 = female; 2 = male). 4. Marital status, (1 = not married; 2 = married). 5. Where is your residence, (1 = village; 2 = city). 6. Employment status, (1 = yes; 2 = no). 7. Monthly family income in euros, whereas the income ranges are: 1 = (0 to 500); 2 = (501 to 1000); 3 = (1001 to 2000); and 4 = (greater than 2000). 8. Do you have any relative that has migrated abroad (1 = yes, 2 = no). 9. For what reasons would you migrate (multiple selection question: political, (1 = yes, 2 = no); economic, (1 = yes, 2 = no); religious, (1 = yes, 2 = no); cultural, (1 = yes, 2 = no); and security, (1 = yes, 2 = no)). 10. How do you perceive migration (single selection question: 1 = risk; 2 = opportunity; 3 = both risk & opportunity). 11. Do you think that migration should be prevented, (single selection question: 1 = it should be stopped; 2 = it should be encouraged; 3 = it is not relevant). 12. Have you followed any well-organized and well-structured program from any agency/organization that deals with migration issues (1 = yes; 2 = no).

Questions 2 to 12 represent the independent variables. Note that for practicality, the numbering of independent variables, X's, has started from 2, i.e., X2, X3, ..., X12, to match the number of independent variables and their respective coefficients with the number of questions described above. The income variable has been utilized as a scale variable, X7_i, and as an ordinal variable (X7A_i, X7B_i, X7C_i, and X7D_i). Note, that the coefficient of X7A_i is not estimated since it is used as a benchmark for other income ranges. Additionally, question 9 is a multiple selection question, where the respondents were required to identify one or more correct answers in a list of possible answers. For example, respondents were allowed to select political, economic, and cultural reasons, if applicable to them. However, for the purpose of estimating logit model regressions, these responses, i.e., sub-questions, have been expressed with separate variables. Specifically, political reasons with X9A_i, economic reasons with X9B_i, religious with X9C_i, cultural with X9D_i, and security reasons with X9E_i. On the contrary, questions 10 and 11 are single selection questions, where respondents were asked to pick only one answer from a predetermined set of responses with three options each. For example, the perception of migration in question 10 as an opportunity is represented with X10A_i, as risk with X10B_i, and as both risk and opportunity with X10C_i. Likewise, the perspective on migration in question 10 that it should be stopped is represented with X11A_i, it should be encouraged with X11B_i, and it is not relevant with X11C_i. Note, that coefficients of variables X10A_i and X11A_i, are not estimated since these values are used as the respective benchmarks.

6. Results

The logit regressions have been run by fitting all the variables in the model; however, the estimated test statistics have indicated that several of the independent variables do not have

a statistically significant relationship with the dependent variable. The fully unrestricted model, using income as a scale variable, is written as,

$$L_i = \text{LN}[P_i/(1 - P_i)] = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 X2_i + \alpha_3 X3_i + \alpha_4 X4_i + \alpha_5 X5_i + \alpha_6 X6_i + \alpha_7 X7_i + \alpha_8 X8_i + \alpha_9^A X9A_i + \alpha_9^B X9B_i + \alpha_9^C X9C_i + \alpha_9^D X9D_i + \alpha_9^E X9E_i + \alpha_{10}^B X10B_i + \alpha_{10}^C X10C_i + \alpha_{11}^B X11B_i + \alpha_{11}^C X11C_i + \alpha_{12} X12_i + u_i \quad (1)$$

Table 1

Logit model estimated coefficients using age, gender, marital status, residence, employment, income, income-group, and relatives variables

Variable	Coefficient	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
constant	α_1	**1.637 (0.043)	n/a	**1.588 (0.050)	n/a
X2 _i - age	α_2	** -0.077 (0.034)	-0.011 (0.474)	** -0.076 (0.036)	-0.012 (0.424)
X3 _i - gender	α_3	0.115 (0.569)	0.115 (0.568)	0.115 (0.570)	0.112 (0.578)
X4 _i - marital	α_4	0.164 (0.695)	0.000 (1.000)	0.167 (0.690)	0.008 (0.985)
X5 _i - residence	α_5	-0.039 (0.835)	-0.008 (0.965)	-0.038 (0.840)	-0.011 (0.954)
X6 _i - employment	α_6	0.202 (0.417)	*0.387 (0.093)	0.209 (0.404)	*0.389 (0.092)
X7 _i - income	α_7	0.000 (0.486)	0.000 (0.707)	n/a	n/a
X7A _i - €0-500	α_7^A	n/a	n/a	(0.000)	(0.000)
X7B _i - €501-1000	α_7^B	n/a	n/a	-0.056 (0.809)	-0.018 (0.937)
X7C _i - €1001-2000	α_7^C	n/a	n/a	-0.104 (0.799)	0.003 (0.995)
X7D _i - > €2,000	α_7^D	n/a	n/a	-0.048 (0.959)	-0.005 (0.995)
X8 _i - relatives	α_8	0.6 (0.369)	0.299 (0.178)	0.207 (0.366)	0.299 (0.179)
Omnibus Test	Chi-square	7.07 (0.422)	***19.09 (0.008)	6.69 (0.669)	**18.96 (0.026)
Model Summary	-2 Log-likel.	**669.79	**674.05	**670.17	**674.19
Cox & Snell R ²	p value	(0.014)	(0.037)	(0.013)	(0.037)
Nagelkerke R ²	p value	(0.019)	(0.050)	(0.018)	(0.050)
Hosmer & Lemeshow Test	Chi-square	7.61	*13.81	11.24	9.88
	p value	(0.472)	(0.087)	(0.188)	(0.274)

Note 1: *** – significant at 1 percent l.s., ** – at 5 percent l.s., * – at 10 percent l.s. For example, equation in column 5 is: $L_i = \text{LN}[P_i/(1 - P_i)] = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 X2_i + \alpha_3 X3_i + \alpha_4 X4_i + \alpha_5 X5_i + \alpha_6 X6_i + \alpha_7^B X7B_i + \alpha_7^C X7C_i + \alpha_7^D X7D_i + \alpha_8 X8_i + u_i$.

In contrast, the fully unrestricted model that uses income as an ordinal variable is written as,

$$L_i = LN\left[\frac{P_i}{1 - P_i}\right] = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 X2_i + \alpha_3 X3_i + \alpha_4 X4_i + \alpha_5 X5_i + \alpha_6 X6_i + \alpha_7^B X7B_i + \alpha_7^C X7C_i + \alpha_7^D X7D_i + \alpha_8 X8_i + \alpha_9^A X9A_i + \alpha_9^B X9B_i + \alpha_9^C X9C_i + \alpha_9^D X9D_i + \alpha_9^E X9E_i + \alpha_{10}^B X10B_i + \alpha_{10}^C X10C_i + \alpha_{11}^B X11B_i + \alpha_{11}^C X11C_i + \alpha_{12} X12_i + u_i \quad (2)$$

Nevertheless, by employing the sequential elimination of regressors procedure, the variables have been eliminated sequentially by relying on the statistical significance of their estimated coefficients, i.e., their respective test statistics and p values. Hence, it can be argued that no statistically significant information is lost by omitting those variables from the model. The regression results, fitting migration as the dependent variable, whereas age, gender, marital status, residence, employment, income, and relatives as independent variables have been presented in Table 1. The logit regression coefficients using income as a scale variable have been presented in columns 3 and 4, whereas the logit regression coefficients using income as an ordinal variable, have been presented in columns 5 and 6. Furthermore, in columns 4 and 6 we have restricted the intercept term, i.e., $\alpha_1 = 0$. The regression results suggest that we may not reject the hypothesis that the coefficient of age variable, α_2 , is statistically significant at a 5 percent level of significance (l.s.) in columns 3 and 5, while it is insignificant in columns 4 and 6. Specifically, if age increases by one year, on average and ceteris paribus, the log of odds of the willingness to migrate will decrease by 0.077 in column 3, respectively by 0.076 in column 5. In contrast, the coefficients of all other variables are statistically insignificant, with the exception of the employment coefficients, α_6 , in columns 4 and 6, though only at 10 percent l.s.

The regression diagnostics, respectively, the Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients suggest that the overall fit of our model is good only in columns 4 and 6. This table reports the goodness-of-fit test showing a chi-square statistic of 19.09, respectively 18.96, with a significance level of $p < 0.008$, respectively 0.026. The p level of 0.008, or 0.026, informs us that the goodness-of-fit test can be taken seriously and that it provides evidence that we have a meaningful model. The Model Summary table presents additional information on the usefulness of these models. The row titled -2 Log-likelihood shows a value of 674.05, respectively 674.19, which is not good. Smaller values are the best, and such values can easily range into the hundreds. Thus, based on the evidence, one may not be satisfied with this test, as high values of this test do not add credence to these models. With regards to the Cox & Snell R Square and the Nagelkerke R Square tests, the test values of 0.037 and 0.050 for both columns 4 and 6, suggest that only 3.7%, respectively 5.0% of the variability in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables. The Hosmer-Lemeshow Goodness of Fit Test is the best test available to evaluate the fit of the logistic regression model. For this test to provide evidence of a good fit, one needs to fail to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, p values greater than 0.05 are desired. The results show a chi-square value of 13.81, respectively 9.88, with a significance level of 0.087, respectively 0.274. Namely, the model in column 4 does not satisfy, whereas the model in column 6 satisfies this criterion, (for a detailed discussion of the diagnostic tests, see Aldrich and Cunnigham, 2016).

Table 2
Logit model estimated coefficients using age, political, economic, religious, cultural, security, perception, perspective, and training variables

Variable	Coefficient	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
constant	α_1	** -1.764 (0.221)	n/a	-1.709 (0.236)	n/a
X2 _i - age	α_2	-0.056 (0.139)	*** -0.086 (0.000)	-0.055 (0.146)	*** -0.083 (0.007)
X9A _i - political	α_9^A	** -1.052 (0.022)	** -1.084 (0.018)	** -1.044 (0.023)	** -1.077 (0.019)
X9B _i - economic	α_9^B	*** 1.426 (0.000)	*** 1.358 (0.000)	*** 1.403 (0.000)	*** 1.340 (0.000)
X9C _i - religious	α_9^C	-0.553 (0.722)	-0.524 (0.727)	-0.525 (0.731)	-0.499 (0.736)
X9D _i - cultural	α_9^D	*** 1.541 (0.000)	*** 1.482 (0.000)	*** 1.536 (0.000)	*** 1.479 (0.000)
X9E _i - security	α_9^E	*** 1.095 (0.001)	*** 1.038 (0.001)	*** 1.105 (0.001)	*** 1.047 (0.001)
X10A _i - risk	α_{10}^A		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
X10B _i - opportunity	α_{10}^B	** 2.822 (0.017)	1.758 (0.006)	** 2.807 (0.018)	*** 1.765 (0.006)
X10C _i - risk & opp.	α_{10}^C	* 2.021 (0.088)	0.978 (0.134)	* 2.009 (0.091)	0.987 (0.130)
X11A _i - stopped	α_{11}^A		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
X11B _i - encouraged	α_{11}^B	*** 1.775 (0.000)	*** 1.829 (0.000)	*** 1.789 (0.000)	*** 1.840 (0.000)
X11C _i - not relevant	α_{11}^C	* -0.432 (0.088)	* -0.467 (0.063)	** -0.461 (0.065)	** -0.492 (0.048)
X12 _i - training	α_{12}	0.226 (0.459)	0.181 (0.507)	n/a	n/a
Omnibus Test	Chi-square p value	*** 158.41 (0.000)	*** 173.01 (0.000)	*** 157.86 (0.000)	*** 172.56 (0.000)
Model Summary	-2 Log-likel.	518.45	520.14	519.00	520.59
Cox & Snell R ²	p value	(0.272)	(0.292)	(0.271)	(0.292)
Nagelkerke R ²	p value	(0.366)	(0.390)	(0.365)	(0.389)
Hosmer & Lemeshow Test	Chi-square p value	2.55 (0.959)	4.46 (0.793)	4.29 (0.830)	4.18 (0.841)

Note 1: *** – significant at 1 percent l.s., ** – at 5 percent l.s., * – at 10 percent l.s. For example, equation in column 3 is: $L_i = \text{LN}[P_i/(1 - P_i)] = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 X2_i + \alpha_9^A X9A_i + \alpha_9^B X9B_i + \alpha_9^C X9C_i + \alpha_9^D X9D_i + \alpha_9^E X9E_i + \alpha_{10}^B X10B_i + \alpha_{10}^C X10C_i + \alpha_{11}^B X11B_i + \alpha_{11}^C X11C_i + \alpha_{12} X12_i + u_i$. Similarly, equation in column 6, where $\alpha_1 = 0$ and $\alpha_{12} = 0$, is: $L_i = \text{LN}[P_i/(1 - P_i)] = \alpha_2 X2_i + \alpha_9^A X9A_i + \alpha_9^B X9B_i + \alpha_9^C X9C_i + \alpha_9^D X9D_i + \alpha_9^E X9E_i + \alpha_{10}^B X10B_i + \alpha_{10}^C X10C_i + \alpha_{11}^B X11B_i + \alpha_{11}^C X11C_i + u_i$.

Next, the focus turns on the relationship of the propensity to migrate, as the dependent variable, against political, economic, religious, cultural, security, perception of migration, perspective on migration, and participation in training, as independent variables. The logit regression results have been presented in Table 2. The intercept term in columns 4 and 6 has

been restricted to zero, i.e., $\alpha_1 = 0$. Furthermore, the coefficient of training variable in columns 5 and 6 has been restricted to zero, i.e., $\alpha_{12} = 0$, considering that it is highly statistically insignificant. The comprehensive evidence from the regression results suggests that age, political, economic, cultural, security, perception and perspective variables are highly statistically significant. Next, only the results of the logit model in column 6 will be interpreted, as it looks as the most parsimonious model based on the diagnostic tests. Specifically, the age coefficient, α_2 , is significant at 1 percent l.s., hence, it indicates that if age increases by one year, on average and ceteris paribus, the log of odds of the willingness to migrate will decrease by 0.083. If the respondents have political concerns, on average and ceteris paribus, the log of odds of the propensity to migrate will decrease by 1.077, and the regression coefficient is significant at 5 percent l.s. While this coefficient is statistically significant, the sign is not very plausible, thus it should be cautiously considered. Conversely, if the respondents have economic, cultural or security concerns, on average and ceteris paribus, the log of odds of the propensity to migrate will increase by 1.340, respectively by 1.479 and 1.047, while the respective regression coefficients are significant at 1 percent l.s. Furthermore, if the respondents perceive migration as an opportunity, on average and ceteris paribus, the log of odds of the propensity to migrate will increase by 1.765, compared to those that view it only as a risk, and the coefficient is highly significant at 1 percent l.s. Also, if the respondents perceive migration as both opportunity and risk, then, on average and ceteris paribus, the log of odds of the propensity to migrate increases 0.987, compared to those that view it only as a risk, however, the coefficient is not statistically significant at any meaningful l.s.

The regression diagnostics, respectively, and the Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients, indicate that the overall fit of the model is good. This table reports the goodness-of-fit test showing a chi-square statistic of 172.56, with a significance level of $p < 0.000$. The p level of 0.000 informs that the goodness-of-fit test can be taken seriously and that it provides evidence that this is a meaningful model. The Model Summary table presents additional information on the usefulness of this model following the insertion of the independent variables. The column titled -2 Log likelihood shows that a value of 520.59 is good. Thus, one may be satisfied with this test, as relatively low values of this test add credence to the model. Moreover, the Cox & Snell R Square and the Nagelkerke R Square tests, provide additional evidence that model is valuable. The test values of 0.29 and 0.39 in column 6, suggest that 29.2%, respectively 39% of the variability in the dependent variable is explained by the fitted independent variables. The Hosmer-Lemeshow Goodness of Fit Test is the best test available to evaluate the fit of the logistic regression model. For this test to provide evidence of a good fit, one needs to fail to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, the chi-square value of 4.18 with a significance level of 0.841 provides additional evidence that the model in column 6 is consistent in explaining the behaviour of the dependent variable as a function of independent variables. The subsequent section summarizes the main findings of this paper.

7. Conclusion

Undoubtedly the migration process is a consequence of several pull and push factors of migration that are often country or region specific and are contingent on the characteristics

of a certain country or region. As the review of literature has shown, the migration inducing factors can range from non-economic incentives such as desire for personal development, (Chiang et al., 2013), parent's education (Herrera & Sahn, 2013), economic factors, language, cultural proximity, migrant networks, free movement of workers (Sprenger, 2013), education, age and gender (Heckert, 2015; Mintchev & Boshnakov, 2018), poverty, food insecurity, inequality, poor income-generating opportunities and increased competition for scarce land and water resources (Deotti & Estruch, 2016), gender-related norms and expectations (Anderson et al., 2017), and rising political persecution, ethnic cleansing, human rights violations, political instability, and civil conflicts (Giménez-Gómez et al., 2017). In contrast, the most significant benefits for the high-income countries, as Blanchflower et al. (2007) have found in the case of the UK, are mostly of macroeconomic nature. Specifically, the immigration tends to increase the labour supply by more than it increases demand, thus aiding in suppressing inflationary pressures, and potentially reducing the natural rate of unemployment, and boosting economic growth.

The results of the logit models developed in this paper clearly suggest that gender, marital status, residence, employment (significant at 10 percent l.s.), income (both scale and ordinal measures), relatives' network, religious and training variables have no statistically significant impact on the propensity of youth migration in Kosovo. Conversely, age is negatively related to the migration propensity. Oddly, the respondents with political concerns have a negative propensity to migrate. Likewise, the respondents who think that migration should be stopped, and those that consider it an unimportant phenomenon exhibit a negative propensity to migrate. Importantly, the results suggest that respondents with economic, cultural, and security concerns have a statistically significant higher propensity to migrate, compared to the respondents without these concerns. The diagnostic tests suggest that the results are statistically robust. Finally, although this paper offers a modest contribution to the literature, perhaps the development of a survey in the future studies with more questions, larger sample size, cross-country data, and the addition of time dimension, through panel analysis, will certainly help in enhancing the understanding of the root causes of youth migration in countries like Kosovo, countries of Western Balkans, and other countries that face similar challenges.

References

- Aldrich, J. O., Cunnigham, J. B. (2016). *Using IBM SPSS Statistics: An Interactive Hands-On Approach*. Second Edition. Sage Publications. ISBN 978-1-4833-8357-6.
- Anderson, K., Aplan, K., Dunaiski, M., Yarrow, E. (2017). *Women in the wind: analysis of migration, youth economic empowerment and gender in Vietnam and in the Philippines*. Report Summary, Commissioned by Plan International France & Plan International Asia to CORAM @ Coram Children's Legal Centre (CCLC). <https://plan-international.org/publications/women-in-the-wind>.
- Blanchflower, D.G., Saleheen, J., Shadforth, C. (2007). *The Impact of the Recent Migration from Eastern Europe on the UK Economy*. The Bank of England, 2007. <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/-/media/boe/files/speech/2007/the-impact-of-the-recent-migration-from-eastern-europe-on-the-uk-economy.pdf>.
- Chiang, Y., Hannum, E. C., Kao, G. (2013). *It's Not Just About the Money: Motivations for Youth Migration in Rural China*. Asia-Pacific Education, Language Minorities and Migration (ELMM) Network Working Paper Series. 6. <http://repository.upenn.edu/elmm/6>.

- Deotti, L., Estruch, E. (2016). Addressing rural youth migration at its root causes: A conceptual framework. Knowledge materials, Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, 2016, Social Policies and Rural Institutions Division, ISBN 978-92-5-109270-5. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5718e.pdf>.
- Elbadawy, A. (2011). Migration aspirations among young people in Egypt: Who desires to Migrate. Economic Research Forum, Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. 619.
- Eshetu, F., Beshir, M. (2017). Dynamics and determinants of rural-urban migration in Southern Ethiopia. – Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics, Vol. 9(12), pp. 328-340, Dec. 2017, DOI: 10.5897/JDAE2017.0850, Article N: A406D8966624, ISSN 2006-9774, <http://www.academicjournals.org/JDAE>.
- European Asylum Support Office. (2016). The Push and Pull Factors of Asylum-Related Migration: A Literature Review. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2016. PDF ISBN 978-92-9494-238-8 doi:10.2847/065054 BZ-04-16-847-EN-N. European Asylum Support Office, 2016.
- European Commission. (2000). Push and pull factors of international migration A comparative report. Luxembourg Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2000. ISBN 92-92-828-9721-4, © European Communities, 2000. <https://www.nidi.nl/shared/content/output/2000/eurostat-2000-theme1-pushpull.pdf>.
- Gavonel, M. F. (2017). Patterns and Drivers of Internal Migration Among Youth in Ethiopia, India, Peru and Vietnam. University of Oxford. Young lives. Working Paper No. 169, March 2017. <https://www.younglives.org.uk/content/patterns-and-drivers-internal-migration-among-youth-ethiopia-india-peru-and-vietnam>.
- Giménez-Gómez, J-M., Walle, Y. M., Zergawu, Y. Z. (2017). Trends in African Migration to Europe: Drivers Beyond Economic Motivations. Center for Economic Governance and Economic Development Research (CEGE), Number 330 – December 2017, ISSN: 1439-230511100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002718823907>.
- Heckert, J. (2015). New perspective on youth migration: Motives and family investment patterns. Demographic Research, Volume 33, Article 27, Pages 765–800, Published 14 October 2015. <http://www.demographic-research.org/Volumes/Vol33/27/> DOI: 10.4054/DemRes.2015.33.27.
- Herrera, C., Sahn, D., (2013). Determinants of Internal Migration Among Senegalese Youth. February 2013. The UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) for the benefit of developing countries. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2229584.
- Kosovo Agency of Statistics (KAS). (2020). Labour Force Survey (2019). Series 5: Social Statistics. <https://ask.rks-gov.net/media/5412/labour-force-survey-2019.pdf>.
- Mintchev, V., Boshnakov, V. (2018). The choice of Bulgarian migrants – Stay or leave again?. – Economic Studies, 27(2), pp. 45-64.
- Mintchev, V., Richter, M., Ruspini, P., Boshnakov, V. (2017). Determinants of Migration and Types of Migration and Mobility. – In: Richter, M., et al. Migration and Transnationalism Between Switzerland and Bulgaria. Springer International Publishing, pp. 25-60.
- Piesse, M. (2014). Factors Influencing Migration and Population Movements – Part 1. Future Directions International. Independent Strategic Analysis of Australia’s Global Interest. 24 October 2014. <https://www.futuredirections.org.au/publication/factors-influencing-migration-and-population-movements/>.
- Sprenger, E. (2013). The determinants of international migration in the European Union: An empirical analysis. IOS Working Papers, No. 325, Institut für Ost- und Südosteuropaforschung, Regensburg, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:101:1-201301296861>.
- UNICEF. (2014). Migration and Youth: Challenges and Opportunities. Edited by Jeronimo Cortina, Patrick Taran & Alison Raphael, the Global Migration Group, 2014 UNICEF. https://globalmigrationgroup.org/system/files/23_Key_Messages_and_Policy_Recommendations.pdf.
- Wondimagegnhu, B. A., Zeleke, M. E. (2017). Determinants of Rural Out-Migration in Habru District of Northeast Ethiopia. Hindawi. – International Journal of Population Research, Vol. 2017, Article ID 4691723, 8 pages, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/4691723>.
- World Economic Forum. (2017). Migration and Its Impact on Cities. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/migration-and-its-impact-on-cities>.