

I S E T

International School of Economics at TSU

Master Thesis

"Closing Russia's gates: conflict with Russia and new destinations of Georgian migrants"

By Tatuli Dushuashvili

Supervisor: Prof. Karine Torosyan

Tbilisi, 2012

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. History Review	5
3. Literature Review	7
4. Data	10
5. Methodology	16
6. Results	18
6.1. Destination countries before and after 2006	18
6.2. Characteristics of migrants	21
6.3. Changes in characteristics of migrants after 2006	26
7. Robustness check	29
8. Conclusions and direction for future research	30
9. References	33
10. Appendix	37

1. Introduction

Migration can be defined as the change in the geographical location of individuals. Although movement across the world has always been one of the main characteristics of people, the scale of this movement has increased significantly in the 21st century. Improved transportation and communication services, as well as the increased speed of globalization raised the number of international migrants up to 175 million individuals starting from the beginning of the XXI century (Philio, 2003).

Migration has significantly affected Georgia's economic and demographic situation after the country became independent in 1991. During the Soviet period, the Soviet Union was closed and its citizens, including Georgians, were not allowed to move freely to the rest of the world. Citizens of the USSR were only permitted to move inside the borders of the union. However, it should also be mentioned that, according to anecdotal evidence, Georgia's geographic location and diverse climate zones were always attracting tourists from the other Soviet republics rather than stimulating its citizens to migrate to other countries. More than 95% of Georgians were staying in their country, while citizens of the other Soviet republics tried to leave their home countries even during the Soviet period (Shinjiashvili, 2010). Although after the collapse of the Soviet Union Georgians and other citizens of the former Soviet Union were free to move to the rest of the world without any obstacles, the mass migration of Georgians started not because of this freedom, but because of political instability and economic hardship, which plagued Georgia right after its independence. A big part of the population was left unemployed, while those with jobs had low salaries. The population census in 2002 showed that the migration loss for this period was 1.1 million Georgian citizens: 20% of the population in the 1990s (Mansoor and Quillin, 2006). Although the bloc of the socialist countries collapsed and Georgians could move

to any country to find better job opportunities, many Georgians preferred to migrate to a familiar neighbor country, mostly to Russia, rather than to move to an unknown destination somewhere in the rest of the world.

Russia remained the main migration destination for Georgian migrants till diplomatic relations with Russia became tense in 2006. Cutting any kind of connection with Georgia, cancelling visas for Georgians and deporting Georgian migrants from Russia, forced a redirection of migration flows toward other destinations. This leads to the main question that I am going to answer in this paper: “to which countries did Georgian migrants redirect after 2006?” There was a common belief among people that Georgians would redirect to other former Soviet Union (FSU) countries, especially to Ukraine, as an alternative destination of Russia. On the other hand, researchers were considering Western Europe and North America to become popular destinations for Georgian migrants (Caucasus Research Resource Centers, 2007; International Organization for Migration, 2008; Shinjiashvili, 2010). My findings partially coincide with the latter statement and show that Greece, Turkey and other non FSU countries became new destination countries for Georgian migrants after 2006.

One more question this paper aims to answer is: what are the characteristics of Georgian migrants who choose to migrate to a particular country and not another? According to my findings, migrants who migrate to Greece, Turkey or other non FSU countries are characterized by the following features: migrants who are more likely to migrate to Greece and Turkey are not highly educated; migrants who know the English language are more likely to migrate to other non FSU countries; migrants who live in rural areas are more likely to migrate to Turkey, while living in rural areas of Georgia decreases the probability of moving to Greece or to other non FSU countries; those who are more likely to migrate to Turkey and other non FSU countries

move alone rather than with family members; women are more likely to migrate to Greece and Turkey, while men tend to go to other non FSU countries.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section I briefly review the migration history of Georgia after its independence. In section 3, I review the existing literature, which tries to answer the same question that I do or which reviews theoretical models of migration. I introduce my data and variables in section 4, while section 5 is dedicated to my analyses of the models, which are used to examine the likelihood of choosing one option out of the several available alternatives. Results are presented in section 6, a robustness check is presented in section 7 and finally, conclusions and directions for future research are pointed out in section 8.

2. History Review

Before determining destination preferences of Georgian migrants, it would be appropriate to review migration history of Georgians after the country's independence. The breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991 brought about a rapid change in the migration processes in Georgia, which became mainly caused by conflict-driven and economic reasons. Newly independent Georgia soon sunk into a civil war and conflicts with the two separatist regions, South Ossetia (1991-1992) and Abkhazia (1992-1993). Political instability and economic collapse reigned in the country. This dire political and economic background, not surprisingly, prompted people to search for shelter in the neighborhood regions. With no visa regime at that time, with the existing linkages and easiness of communication due to a familiar language, as well as other factors, Russia appeared to be one of the most attractive migration countries for Georgians. Most

Georgians who migrated to Russia during this period were from the elite circles of the country and included famous artists, scientist and intellectuals.

After a couple of years, Georgia was hit by the Rose Revolution. The new promising reforms and policies could have motivated migrants to return to Georgia, but the country's economic situation was still not very encouraging. According to the official statistics, the unemployment rate was still growing even after the Revolution, increasing from 11.5 percent in 2003 to 16.5 percent in 2008 (National statistics office of Georgia). The high rate of unemployment, especially among the young working-age population (National statistics office of Georgia), was still pushing many Georgians to migrate abroad. Despite the associated hardship and low quality jobs, which Georgians were performing abroad, the stream of Georgian migrants was still increasing (Akhmeteli, 2007).

Russia was keeping the leading place among destinations selected by Georgian migrants up until it introduced a visa regime with Georgia followed by a trade embargo and the deportation of Georgian migrants in 2006. In March of 2006 Russia banned import of Georgian wine; in May, imports of Georgian mineral waters Borjomi and Nabeghlavi were also banned (Until 2006 Georgia exported 64% of its beverage exports to Russia. This share fell to 28% in 2006 (United Nations Commodity Trade Statistics Database)); in September, Russian authorities stopped issuing visas for Georgians; in October, Russia cut off air, railway, land and sea transportation routes to and from Georgia. Even postal communication with Georgia stopped and by February 2007, 3000 Georgians were deported from Russia (Bodewing, 2007). Finally, a war between Russia and Georgia began in August 2008. After these developments of the Russian-Georgian relationship, it becomes quite clear that Georgian migration flows to Russia would not continue as intensively as before 2006. Thus, forced or voluntary Georgian migrants started to

search for new destinations of migration. According to researchers, Georgian migrants started shifting their destinations to North America and the European countries, instead of Russia (Caucasus Research Resource Centers, 2007; International Organization for Migration, 2008; Shinjiashvili, 2010).

After reviewing the history and the features of Georgian migration, I decided to take 2006 as a threshold year and see which countries became the main destinations of migration for Georgian migrants after 2006. In the following sections I will try to answer the questions of where the flows of Georgian migrants have redirected after diplomatic relations between Russia and Georgia have become tense; whether other FSU countries appeared to be an alternative to Russia and whether Georgians prefer moving to developed countries, such as Western Europe and North America, or choosing another option.

3. Literature Review

A variety of theories have tried to shed light on the migration issues. One part of migration theories consider migration to be made at individual level, while second part of theories consider that decision about migration is made at household level (Douglas S. Massey et al, 1993). Neoclassical economics is the part of migration theories, which consider decision about migration to be made by individuals. According to it, individuals decide whether to migrate in order to maximize their lifetime income. Sjaastad (1962) was among the first economists who applied the theory of neoclassical economics. According to him, people are

making investments by devoting their time to activities which will increase their productivity and give them more income in the future. Sjaastad considers migration as this type of investment.

In contrast to neoclassical economics, new economics of migration consider migration decisions to be made at household, rather than at individual, level (Douglas S. Massey et al, 1993). According to this theory, households focus not on income maximization, but on risk minimization, which can arise from economic fluctuations. This sometimes leads to a trade-off between choosing the countries which promise higher income, but higher risks of market failure and countries which promise lower income, but higher insurance.

Both neoclassical and new economics of migration agree that, individuals in one case and households in another, decide whether to migrate depending on the cost-benefit analyses. People decide to migrate if the net return from migration is positive. Benefits as well as costs of migration are determined by different factors. Some of them can be considered as benefits of migration and some of them as costs of migration. However, sometimes the same factor can be seen as benefit from migration to one type of individuals and as costs from migration to others (Everett S. Lee, 1966). For example safety, single and young individuals, who are risky and like adventures might like to move to less safe country (they see benefits from migration to this country), while same country would repel individuals with children, who prefer to feel safe (they see costs from migration to this country). Thus, individuals' behavior tends to be different not only because of different factors, but according to their age and place in a life-cycle (Nivalainen, 2003). According to Nivalainen, the highest probability of migration is attributed to couples that have just started their marriage and have no children or their children have not reached their school-age yet. At this stage of life, cost of migration is small as preschool-age children do not

tie families at the same place and their mobility is higher than mobility of families who have older children (Nivalainen, 2004).

Similar of having school-age children, White et. al (2005) consider being married as another cost of migration. According to them married women follow husbands whenever they go, while single women tend to the areas where job opportunities are higher (White et. al, 2005). Married women are tied migrants and change their residence in response to the husband's job opportunities. They are only followers, while husbands are considered to be the decision makers.

Distance between two countries, as another cost of migration, has also widely attracted researchers' attention (Olsson, 1965; Sjaastad, 1962; Schwartz 1973). According to Swchartz, distance has a negative effect on migration. The farther away the country is from the origin one, the less likely a person or a household is to migrate to that country. This adverse impact can be due to transportation costs (the farther the country is, the costlier it is to move there) or due to information costs (information diminishes with distance and people are less informed about the situation in countries which are located further away). Nivalainen links distance with migration reasons and claims that job-related reasons are a driving force for long-distance migration, while housing and family related reasons become the main determinant of short distance migration (Nivalainen, 2004). The reason that job related factors can be positively related to distance is the belief that if the economic situation is poor in one geographic area, it will also be poor in the surrounding countries. Thus, people tend to make long distance moves. As regards to the family related reasons, families are more likely to move to the neighboring countries thus decreasing the transportation costs of visiting the previous location and increasing the frequency of reunions with friends and the rest of their family members (Nivalainen, 2004; Schwartz 1973).

Apart from distance, the knowledge of the destination countries' language has positive effect on migration (Barry R. Chiswick and Paul W. Miller, 2000). Knowing the language of the host country can provide two types of benefits. First, it makes obtaining useful information easier. This helps migrants to analyze social, economic or political situation in the country to which they intend to move. Second, after moving to a particular country, knowing its official language helps migrants to integrate in the local society and to find a job faster and easier. Also, language skills can make migrants more productive and help them grow professionally (Slobodan Djajic, 2004).

Above reviewed migration theories and variables give bases to my research. In my model, households, and not individuals, are making decision which member of household to send and where to send. Their choice of destination country depends on the utility function, which is maximized while choosing one particular migration destination and not the other. I also apply the same variables which I reviewed above to see whether they have same impact on Georgian migrants or not: whether job-related reasons lead to longer moves, or whether migrants with children and spouses make shorter moves to the neighbor countries or how knowledge of particular country's language affect migration to that country. The results of my estimations are given in the next sections.

4. Data

To estimate the choice of migration destination of the Georgian migrants I analyze Georgian household data from the "Development on the Move" (DoTM) project funded by the

Global Development Network (GDN) and conducted by the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC) and ISET in 2008. The data for the project were collected using a comprehensive survey questionnaire that gathered information on migration histories of the respondents all the way back to 1981.

As there has been no recent census carried out after 2002, observations for the survey were selected according to the 2008 parliamentary election list, which splits the population into electoral units. Afterwards, three separate population strata were created: rural, urban and capital. Forty two Primary Sampling Units (PSU) were selected from the electoral units according to population's proportion in each stratum. Block-listing was performed within the selected PSUs. Block-listing was done by visiting all the households in the selected PSUs and asking them about their migration status. The final sample was selected based on the block-listing results, so that households with migrants had higher probability of being selected. The overall sample included 1940 households, out of which 620 households should be non-migrant households, 660 should be households with currently absent migrants and 660 should be households with returned migrants. But due to some misclassification of families during the block-listing (on many cases information about household migrant status was obtained from neighbors and was not always correct) and some non-responses only 1485 households were interviewed out of which 645 appeared to be households with non-migrants, 493 appeared to be households with absent migrants and 347 appeared to be households with returned migrants. For the thesis purposes, I am focusing on households with absent and returned migrants. Thus, my preliminary sample consists of 840 households, containing 1138 migrants (The number of migrants exceeds the number of households as in many cases there was more than one migrant from each household).

Although I have 840 households with migrants, in many cases migrants from the same household move to different destinations or move together with their family members. From Table 1 we can see that a big share (78%) of the sample migrants migrated alone, while the rest migrated either with one or more family members. For this reason I decided to look at migrant groups rather than individual migrants. I created migrant groups, which consist of migrants who moved to the same destination from the same household in the same year. After creating migrant groups, I am left with 878 such groups. Then, I defined a migrant group head, who is a senior male migrant, for migrant groups with males. For groups consisting of only women or women and children, a household head was defined to be the most senior migrant. The reason for assigning each migrant group with a head is that generally this person is a decision maker and other family members follow him or her. Unit of my analyses is a migrant group as people in the group are not making independent decisions, but rather are following the head migrant. Hence, to find out the characteristics of a migrant who chooses the migration direction, I keep only the characteristics of the head. Overall, I end up with 878 observations (i.e. migrant groups).

Table 1. Number of individuals in migrant groups.

Number of migrants in each group	% of migrants within each group
1	78%
2	12%
3	6%
4	4%
5	0.4%
7	0.1%

After discussing the sample, I will now turn to summarizing statistics for the variables used in my thesis. The dependent variable is the destination country. From the DoTM

questionnaire, destinations were divided into the following areas: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Israel, Russia, North America, Turkey, Greece (since Greece has always been a major destination for Georgians, it enters the data and my analysis separately from Western Europe), Western Europe, other Former Soviet Union (FSU) countries, and other non FSU countries. The share of migrants who migrated to Armenia, Azerbaijan or Israel appeared very small to be included in the analysis as a separate migration destination. Thus, I combine Armenia and Azerbaijan with other FSU countries and Israel with other non FSU countries. Although my data do not tell which countries are included in other non FSU group except Israel, according to International Organization for Migration (IOM) cluster “other” mainly consists of countries such as: China, Egypt, Japan, Argentina, Australia and so on. But in many cases these countries are not considered separately as few Georgians are living there (IOM, 2003). Also, Western Europe and North America did not appear to be significantly different choices (they appear to be statistically indistinguishable in the model estimation discussed below). Thus, I combined them into one destination. Finally, the tabulation of my dependent variable is given in the Table 2.

To explain migration destinations of the Georgian migrants, I applied individual specific as well as household specific explanatory variables. These variables are: sex of a migrant, whether a migrant had tertiary education before migration or not, pre-migration age of a migrant, having a partner, having children in the household, settlement type (whether migrant was living in urban, rural or capital area) before migration, average religiosity level of a migrant’s household, imputed knowledge of foreign language, whether a migrant migrated alone or with other family members, reasons for migration, size of migrant’s household, whether a migrant was employed before migration and whether a migrant had a job already fixed in the destination country before leaving.

Table 2. Tabulation of migration destinations.

Destination Countries	% share of Georgian migrants in each country
Greece	9%
Western Europe & North America	23%
Russia	47%
Turkey	7%
Other FSU	8%
Other non FSU	6%
Total	100%

Summary statistics of the explanatory variables are as follows: 66% of migrants are men and their mean age is 35 (not including children who migrated with parents or were sent alone to join their families abroad). The majority of migrants (89%) are in their best age for migration (the most productive part of the labor force), as their age varies from 18 to 50. Migrants mostly have completed secondary education (29%), secondary technical education (27%) or higher education (34%). As for settlement type, 36% of migrants live in rural areas, 46% live in urban areas and only 18% live in Tbilisi. Other statistics describing selected variables are given in the appendix (Table 1, 2, 3, 4).

As I am going to apply probability changes in my analysis I have to avoid the problem which arises while calculating marginal effect of continues variables such as level of education or age. The fact that individual becomes one year older says nothing about change in probability of migrating to some destination. For dealing with this problem I turned education into dummy variable and tried to control for the effect of higher education. Thus, my dummy variable of

education is equal to 1 if individual has tertiary education and 0 if not. As regards to age, I made three age groups: young individuals (less than 25 years old), middle age individuals (between 25-50) and older individuals (more than 50 years old). Summary statistics of these variables are given in the appendix (Table 5).

One more variable that I decided to use in my model is knowledge of the destination country's language. Though I only have information about knowledge of a language of the returned migrants and household members of the absent migrants, but not absent migrants themselves, I impute missing knowledge of a particular language using household's average language ability. The fact that all/many household members speak a particular language points at a high probability that the absent migrant should also know that particular language. Thus, migrant's household's average knowledge of the destination country's language (which is basically, proportion of household members who speaks given language) serves a proxy of migrant's knowledge of the destination country's language. According to data statistics 72% of migrants are predicted not to speak English (probability of speaking English language is zero), while the rest 28% are more or less likely to speak English language (probability of speaking English language is more than zero). Russian language, however, is predicted not to be spoken by 16% of migrants only.

5. Methodology

While studying migrants' destination choice authors mostly apply discrete choice models as these models are used to examine the likelihood of choosing one out of several available alternatives. In those multiple choice models individual maximizes his/her utility when choosing migration destination. Thus, individual i 's utility from moving to country j should exceed his utility of moving to country k : $U_{ij} > U_{ik}$, where $j \neq k$. As in many cases it is difficult to find out individual's utility function, that is why U_{ij} is called random utility function and consists of observable factors Z_{ij} and unobservable factors ε_{ij} : $U_{ij} = Z_{ij}'\beta + \varepsilon_{ij}$. And probability that individual i will choose to migrate to country j is:

$$P(Y_i = j) = \frac{\exp(Z_{ij}'\beta)}{\sum_{l=1}^L \exp(Z_{il}'\beta)}$$

Choice models differ according to assumptions imposed on the error term ε_{ij} and on explanatory variables Z_{ij} . According to assumptions imposed on the error term, researchers decide which model of choice should be applied. Error terms may be distributed identically independently (iid) or be correlated. If error terms are correlated or not identically distributed, then property of Independence of Irrelevant Alternatives (IIA) is relaxed and nested logit model should be applied, but if errors are iid, then conditional logit, multinomial logit or mixed logit model should be applied. The IIA property means that "the probability ratio of individuals choosing between two alternatives does not depend on the availability or attributes of the other alternatives" (Christiadi and Cushing, 2007).

In my data I have only individual specific, and not choice specific, variables. Thus, out of several choice models I have to apply either multinomial or nested logit model. The difference

between these two models is in the assumption imposed on the error term. As I already mentioned, nested logit model is used when error terms are correlated as it relaxes IIA assumption. Hence, before choosing which model to apply, test for IIA property should be performed.

After applying Housman specification test, which checks whether odds ratio between any two alternatives changes when new choice is added, I could not find evidence against IIA property. You can see the results of this test in the Table 6 in the appendix. Our results suggest that odds ratio between outcome J and outcome K are independent of other alternatives. This gives me reason to apply multinomial logit model as there is no need for nested structure. In estimating the multinomial logit model I need to avoid problem of identification, which requires to set one set of parameter estimates (for one of the choices) to zero. This means that base country should be selected and other countries should be compared to it. Without loss of generality, in my model I took Greece as a base category, as according to summary statistics it is one of the common destination of Georgian migrants.

By using individual and household specific variables, I ran multinomial logit regression using the whole sample of migrants (out of 878 initial observations I only can use 760, due to missing values in some variables) to find out what personal characteristics determine individuals' choice to migrate to some particular country out of six destinations and not to the other. I calculated marginal effects of each variable to every destination to see how probabilities were changing when individual characteristics were changing. After it, I split the sample of migrants into two subsamples: migrants who migrated before 2006 (521 observations) and migrants who migrated after 2006 (239 observations). This type of division gave me an opportunity to compare the marginal effects of each variable before and after 2006 and see whether preferences of

Georgian migrants changed across years. For improving an efficiency of the model, I performed the test of combining alternatives, which tests whether all countries that I have in the model are sufficiently different from each other or not. Results of the test are given in the appendix (Table 11 and Table 12), according to which Greece and Turkey were not statistically different choices before 2006, while after 2006 Georgian migrants became indifferent between choosing Russia and the other FSU countries as destinations. More detailed analyses of the test are given in the result section (section 6.1).

Tables 7, 8 and 9, which are given in the appendix, present the coefficient estimates and various model statistics for the full as well as for two subsamples. Table 10 presents estimated marginal effects of model variables on choice probabilities before and after 2006. I now turn to a detailed discussion of these results.

6. Results

6.1 Destination countries before and after 2006.

There are two main questions that I try to address in my thesis. First, which are the countries where Georgian migrants redirected after Russia's gates became closed for them, and, second, what are the personal characteristics of the migrant who chooses to migrate to one or another country. As I have already mentioned in the methodology section, I applied a test for combining alternatives to test whether all countries that I have in the model were sufficiently different from each other before and after 2006. Results of the test state that before 2006 Greece

and Turkey were not statistically different choices for Georgian migrants. This means that while choosing their migration destination, Georgian migrants were indifferent about going to Greece or to Turkey. At the same time, however, they had distinct preferences when choosing between other destinations.

After 2006, Georgian migrants’ preferences changed significantly. As my analysis show, if before 2006 migrants were indifferent about whether to migrate to Greece or to Turkey, after 2006 these two countries became totally different choices for Georgian migrants who were making a decision where to migrate. Unlike Greece and Turkey, Russia and the other FSU countries (which include Ukraine among other countries) become statistically indistinguishable after 2006. If before 2006 Georgians were considering these two destinations as different places and were analyzing their drawbacks and advantages before choosing a destination country for migration, after 2006 Georgian migrants become indifferent about moving to Russia or to the other FSU countries.

Table 3. Percentage of migrants who migrated to given destinations before and after 2006.

	Before 2006	After 2006
Russia	45%	22%
Greece	11%	14%
Turkey	5%	20%
Western Europe and North America	19%	17%
Other FSU	13%	12%
Other Non FSU	5%	15%

From Table 3 we can see that, after 2006, the number of Georgian migrants moving to Russia declined by 50%. If before 2006 the number of migrants who choose Turkey and other non FSU countries was only 5% each, after 2006, the number of Georgian migrants migrating to

the other non FSU countries tripled, while the number of migrants moving to Turkey became four times larger. According to my sample statistics, number of migrants who migrated to Israel increased slightly (by approximately 1%) after 2006 compared to the number of migrants who migrated to Israel before 2006. Thus, this triple increase to other non FSU countries should not be due to increased emigration to Israel, but because of increased emigration to countries such as China, Egypt, Japan, Argentina or Australia. As regards to Georgians' migration to Greece, the number of Georgian migrants migrating to Greece after 2006 increased by more than 20% in relation to the number of migrants moving to Greece before 2006.

Apart from the above mentioned countries, the situation with Western Europe and other FSU countries remained the same. If before 2006, 19% of Georgian migrants were choosing Western Europe and North America as destination for migration, after 2006, this figure declined only by 2%. We have almost the same situation with the other FSU countries. If before 2006, 13% of Georgian migrants were moving to other FSU countries, after 2006, this number declined by 1%.

The conclusion derived from these figures is that, after the deportation of Georgian migrants from Russia, the cancellation of flights between Russia and Georgia, the abolishment of the Russian council in Georgia and, generally, the closure of Russia's gates for Georgians, Georgian migrants redirected from Russia to Greece, Turkey and other non FSU countries, and not to other FSU countries or to Western Europe and North America.

6. 2 Characteristics of migrants

After finding the countries where Georgian migrants redirected after 2006, in this section I will analyze personal characteristics of migrants who migrated to one or the other destination. The easiest way to interpret the effect of variables on choice probabilities is by looking at marginal effects, reported in Table 4. According to the obtained results, women's probability of migrating to Greece and Turkey is high, while men are more likely to migrate to FSU and other non-FSU countries. Being female increases a migrant's probability of migrating to Greece by 20%. Being male, however, increases a migrant's probability of moving to Russia by 21%. According to the obtained results, there is no significant effect of age on choice of destinations, in all but one case. When people become older, their probability of migrating to Western Europe and North America declines by 7%.

The more educated Georgian migrants are, the less likely they are to migrate to Turkey and Greece. According to one of the articles by the International Migration Organization in Georgia, the quality of demanded labor in Greece and Turkey is low and Georgian migrants who move to these countries for job opportunities are mostly working as nannies, housekeepers, laborers on constructions sites or cleaners in restaurants and hotels (Akhmeteli, 2007). From this anecdotal evidence it becomes clear that education is not an essential factor for these types of jobs and for this reason the probability of moving to Greece and Turkey declines by 46% and 3% respectively for migrants with tertiary education. On the other hand, migrants with high education tend to go to Western Europe and North America. The probability of choosing Western Europe and North America as destination increases by 10% for migrants with tertiary education.

Table 4. Marginal effects of each variable across countries.

	Greece	Russia	Turkey	Western Europe and North America	Other FSU	Other Non FSU
High Education	-0.459*	-0.027	-0.031**	0.104*	-0.002	0.003
Migrant group size	-0.006	0.107*	-0.054*	-0.029	0.013	-0.030**
Gender	-0.201*	0.211*	-0.080*	-0.050	0.077*	0.043*
Age	0.020	0.044	-0.024	-0.065*	0.002	0.023
Job fixed in the destination country	0.001	-0.069	0.026	-0.033	0.008	0.066*
Partner	-0.015	0.188*	-0.080*	-0.012	-0.062**	-0.016
Rural	-0.055*	0.080	0.094*	-0.188*	0.162*	-0.093*
Urban	-0.048**	-0.023	0.065**	-0.58	0.057	0.007
Household size	-0.007	0.017	-0.019*	-0.002	0.013	-0.002
Migration experience	-0.076*	0.125*	0.020	-0.053	0.026	-0.042*
Employed before migration	-0.006	-0.025	0.005	-0.045	0.088*	-0.016
Religiosity level	0.007	0.043*	-0.014**	-0.034*	-0.008	0.005
Average knowledge of English	-0.008	-0.059	0.035	0.036	-0.068	0.063*
Average knowledge of Russian	-0.075*	0.151*	-0.023	-0.123*	0.074**	-0.003
Children	0.027	0.012	0.054*	-0.056	-0.039	0.001
Migration reason: job related	0.041	-0.144**	0.024	0.096**	0.033	-0.051
Migration reason: study	-0.088*	-0.093	-0.049**	0.228**	0.029	-0.026
Migration reason: political	-0.075*	0.106	-0.071*	-0.030	0.097	-0.026

Note: * stands for 5% significance level and ** stands for 10% significance level.

Similar to education, knowledge of foreign languages has a significant effect on the decision of where to migrate. Probability of migrating to the FSU increases with Russian language knowledge. At the same time, migrants who know Russian are less likely to move to Greece, Turkey or Western Europe and North America. Probability of migrating to Russia increases by 15%, while probability of moving to other FSU countries increases by 7%, when the migrant knows Russian language. On the other hand, knowledge of the English language increases the probability of migrating to other non FSU countries by 6%. The official language of the Soviet Union was Russian, thus, the fact that people who speak Russian are more likely to move to the former Soviet Union countries is not surprising. As regards to the English language,

it becomes internationally spoken and knowledge of English language helps migrants to move to many locations, including other non FSU countries.

I will now turn to family ties and analyze their effect on the choice of the destination country. Migrants who have partners are less likely to migrate to Turkey and other FSU countries, while having partner has a positive effect on migrating to Russia. While it decreases the probability of moving to Turkey and other FSU countries by 8% and 6% respectively, having a partner increases the probability of moving to Russia by 19%. At the same time, migrants who are moving with their family members are most likely to migrate to Russia. Probability of migrating to Russia increases by 11% when the number of migrants moving from the same household to the same destination increases by one person. Thus, migrants who are more likely to migrate to Russia have partners and migrate with them or with other family members. We can see the opposite result with respect to Turkey. Migrants who move with their family members are 5% less likely to migrate to Turkey as compared to the migrants who move alone. Hence, people who have a partner or want to migrate with their partners or other family members are less likely to migrate to Turkey. Thus, it seems that many family groups were going to Russia, while there are mostly single-individual trips to Turkey. So we can argue that with change in destinations there should be less family-migration and more single person migration. According to the data statistics given in the Table 5, most individuals who migrate to Turkey are making very short-term moves (51.26%) and there is no need to migrate with family members, while individuals who migrate to Russia are making long-term moves (33.58%) and because of this reason they could move with family members rather than alone.

Migrants with children left in the household at home are more likely to migrate to Turkey. Having children increases the probability of moving to this destination by 5%. As I have

already mentioned, Turkey is the destination, to where people are more likely to move for very short-term and alone, rather than with family members. Thus, Georgian migrants with children prefer to move to Turkey for two reasons. First, Turkey has a border with Georgia and migrants who move to Turkey need less time for transportation which enables them to see their children frequently, and second, Georgia has no visa regime with Turkey and migrants can visit their family for free any time they wish (as we see from the Table 5, migrants move to Turkey mostly for less than one year). In addition, the results show that the larger is the household size, the less likely are the members of that household to move to Turkey. Hence, migrants who are more likely to migrate to Turkey are people who live in a small household, do not have a partner, who make very short term moves, who choose to migrate alone or who have children in their household.

Table 5. Migration duration of individuals migrating to Russia and Turkey.

Migration duration	% of migrants going to Turkey	% of migrants going to Russia
Very short-term migration (less than a year)	51.26%	9.46%
Short-term migration (from 1 to 5 years)	32.56%	29%
Medium-term migration (from 5 to 10 years)	12.79%	28.13%
Long-term migration (more than 10 years)	3.49%	33.58%

Another household specific variable is settlement type. According to the obtained results, Georgians who live in rural areas are more likely to migrate to Turkey or to other FSU countries. Probability of moving to Turkey increases by 9%, while probability of moving to other FSU countries increases by 16% when a migrant lives in rural places. On the other hand, living in the rural area of Georgia decreases the probability of moving to Greece, Western Europe and North America and other non FSU countries by 5%, 19% and 9% respectively. People who live in rural

areas have to move to Tbilisi first, and only afterwards they can fly to other countries. This increases their transportation costs and can affect a migrant's decision to move across shorter distances to places such as Turkey and other FSU countries (Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaijan), rather than moving to destinations which would require long distance moves. Also, the information about the situation in the whole world may not be as accessible for people who live in rural areas of Georgia as it is to people who live in urban areas and, because of this deficit of information, people who live in rural areas prefer to move to Turkey, which is a neighbor country and with which Georgia integrated fast in the last decade or to other FSU countries, which have stayed more or less familiar to Georgian migrants even after the collapse of the Soviet Union. As regards to the level of religiosity of household, although the marginal effects of this variable are small in absolute values and this variable plays rather small role while choosing destination country of migration, we can observe that the more religious migrants tend to go to Russia, while probability of moving to Turkey and Western Europe and North America declines with a decline in a household's religiosity level. This result is not surprising, as Georgia and Russia share a common religion, while people in Turkey and Western Europe and North America follow other religions.

According to anecdotal evidence as well as theoretical models, the main driving force of migration is income maximization and people move to places where the expected wages are high. According to my findings, people who move to find better job opportunities or to earn more money are more likely to go to Western Europe and North America. The fact that living standards and minimal wages are higher in Western Europe and North America compared to other destination countries should be the main factor which attracts Georgian migrants. Probability of moving to Western Europe and North America increases by 9% when earning

potential is the driving force of migration. Probability of migrating to Russia declines by 14% in cases when people want to migrate because of better job opportunities.

Similar to the job related reasons, migrants who seek to get higher education are more likely to migrate to Western Europe and North America. Probability of moving to Western Europe and North America increases by 23% while probability of moving to Turkey and Greece declines by 5% and 9% respectively, when the main purpose of migration is receiving higher education. Intuition behind this finding is simple: best and most popular universities are located in Western Europe and North America, which cannot be said about Greece or Turkey.

Some people migrate for political reasons. As has been mentioned earlier, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Georgia suffered from civil wars, conflicts and a revolution and sizable portion of Georgians migrated because of political reasons. Georgian political refugees were less likely to find a shelter in Turkey and Greece. The reason supporting this result could be the fact that in these countries they were not able to find people who would share their ideology. Unfortunately, countries which could be seen as a shelter for Georgian migrants appeared to be insignificant in my model and we cannot judge which country has the highest probability of receiving Georgian political refugees.

6. 3 Changes in characteristics of migrants after 2006.

After running the model using the whole sample and interpreting its marginal effects, I split the sample into two periods, before and after 2006, as this year is the year when the Russia-

Georgia relationship became tense and Russia's borders closed for Georgian migrants. Although the sample size of the migrants who migrated before 2006 is large enough (521 observations), the sample size of migrants who migrated after 2006 is small (239 observations). This leads to the result that marginal effects of variables after 2006 are insignificant. Despite this, there are still several changes in probabilities before and after 2006, which are worth interpreting.

Changes in probabilities before and after 2006 are given in the appendix (Table 10). According to the obtained results, although women were less likely to migrate to Western Europe and North America before 2006, after 2006 women's probability of migrating to Western Europe and North America not only increased but became higher than men's probability of migrating to these countries. Data statistics show that if women's share in Georgian migrants was only 29% before 2006, their share increased up to 41% after the threshold year. Since men, who were more likely to migrate to Russia before 2006 faced constraints, families had to search for new destinations. The fact that demand of female specific jobs increased in the world could push Georgian women to migrate and help family members to obtain better living conditions. My finding is also supported by the research of Erin Trouth Hofmann and Cynthia J. Buckley, according to whom the reason for increasing share of females among Georgian migrants is the fact that women-related jobs become more demanded in recent years (Hofmann and Buckley, 2011).

Similar to gender, age has also different marginal effects across destinations and across years. Probability of migrating to Russia or to other FSU countries increases with age, while probability of migrating to other destinations declines with age. The older Georgians get, the more likely they are to migrate to FSU countries. This finding could be valid for only current

generation and should not be generalized to the rest of Georgians. As currently old generation is former active members of Former Soviet Union, they can have nostalgia to old days when they were young and be eager to move to FSU countries. The fact that they still have contacts, friends and may be even family members through FSU countries could increase the probability of those people to migrate to these destinations.

As for household related variables, results show that if having partner was decreasing the probability of migrating to Greece, Western Europe and North America before 2006, after 2006 people who have partners are more likely to migrate to these destinations. On the contrary, if migrants who had partners were more likely to migrate to Russia before 2006, after 2006 having partner started decreasing their probability of migrating to Russia. As regards to children, if we look at child's effect on migration before and after the threshold year, we will find out that: having child at household was increasing the probability of migration to other non FSU countries until 2006 and start having negative effect on migration to other non FSU countries afterwards, while having child at household was decreasing the probability of migration to Western Europe and North America before 2006 and people with children at household became more likely to migrate to these destination afterwards.

Thus, people who are more likely to migrate to Western Europe and North America after 2006 are migrants who have partner or children at household. As these destinations are considered to be one of the farthest destinations from Georgia, one can conclude that Georgian migrants are not affected by family ties after 2006. However, Georgian people are known as people who have high altruism towards their future generation. According to Tamar Zurabishvili and Tinatin Zurabishvili (2010) Georgian migrants, as parents, feel responsible to their children to provide food and better living conditions. Exactly this high sense of responsibility could push

Georgian migrants to move away from their family members and live in farther countries seeking for better job opportunities rather than to stay in Georgia and live in hardship.

7. Robustness check

Above I have analyzed the destination choice of Georgian migrants conditioning on their decision to migrate. However, consideration of only migrants and omission of stayers, relies on the assumption that the odds ratio between any two alternative destinations is independent of other choices (IIA property). To be able to apply a multinomial logit model for migrants only, the odds ratio between any two destinations should be constant no matter whether a new destination (in my case staying in Georgia) is added or not. Here, I perform a robustness check of my model by adding “staying in Georgia” to the other options as one more alternative. After estimating the model with the expanded options, I once again test it for IIA property to see if omitting the Georgia option changes the odds ratio for other choices.

The sample for this check (people who choose a new added option) consists of absent migrants, returned migrants and non migrants. In my preliminary data, I had 4668 non migrant individuals. To make the two groups comparable (those who choose migration and those who choose staying in Georgia), I have to use one representative from each household, as in the previous model, in which I was omitting the staying in Georgia option, I used migrant group heads. For this purpose, I have randomly chosen one non-migrant representative from each household and my final sample of non-migrants is left with 1450 individuals. Adding them to the

absent and returned migrant group heads gave me 2328 observations for my new regression. Finally, while running a multinomial logit regression, only 1931 observations appeared to be valid because of the existing missing values in several variables.

As regards to the explanatory variables, some of them, which were characterizing absent and returned migrants, are not observed for non-migrants. For example, each absent or returned migrant had a reason to migrate before leaving Georgia, while we cannot observe reasons for migration for people who have never left the country. Thus, my new model consists of fewer variables (those, which are common for all three groups of migrants: absents migrants, returned migrants and non migrants) and a bigger sample (2328 observations).

Results of the multinomial logit regression of the expended model are given in the Appendix (Table 11). I then apply Hausman test of IIA assumption to see whether omitting Georgia as a choice would change the odds ratio between any two other destinations or not. According to Hausman test, which is given in the Appendix (Table 12), I could not find any evidence against IIA property. Thus, omitting option 0 (stay home) does not appear to change the odds ratio for the remaining options and indicates that the results reported in my main section are robust.

8. Conclusions and direction for future research

After the collapse of the Soviet Union people started to emigrate from Georgia with unprecedented intensity. This was mainly caused by internal conflicts and a poor economic

situation in the country. According to the latest census, which was carried out in 2002, 1.1 million citizens, which constitutes 20% of the population of the 1990s, left the country. Until 2006, the main migration destination for Georgian migrants was Russia. From 2006 on, the Russian-Georgian diplomatic relationships have started to become tense. In 2006, Russia stopped issuing visas for Georgians and a big part of Georgians living in Russia was deported from there. After this Georgian migrants started to search for new destinations. According to researchers, Georgian migration flows tend to be directed towards Western Europe and North America (Caucasus Research Resource Centers, 2007; International Organization for Migration, 2008; Shinjiashvili, 2010). Even though some of my findings are in line with these prognoses, as after 2006 the number of Georgian migrants moving to Greece increased by more than 20%, other results obtained in this study contradict them, as the number of Georgian migrants moving to other non FSU countries (which do not include Western Europe and North America) tripled, while the number of Georgian migrants moving to Turkey became four times larger in relation to the pre-2006 period. Additionally, even though the number of emigrants to Greece increased, the number of emigrants to other western European countries decreased somewhat. Hence, Georgian migrants redirected from Russia to Greece, Turkey and other non FSU countries and not towards other FSU countries or Western Europe and North America.

Using data from the DoTM survey, I found that Georgian migrants who migrate to Greece, Turkey and other non FSU countries are characterized by the following features. Migrants with tertiary education are less likely to move to Greece and Turkey and migrants who speak English are more likely to migrate to other non FSU countries. People who live in the rural areas of Georgia are more likely to migrate to Turkey, while living in rural areas decreases probability of migrating to Greece or to other non FSU countries. Migrants who are more likely

to migrate to Turkey and other non FSU countries mostly move alone rather than with family members. The share of women among migrants increased from 29% to 41% after 2006 and they are more likely to migrate to Greece and Turkey, while men tend to go to other non FSU countries.

Although six years have passed after the Georgian-Russian relationships became tense and Georgian migrant were deported from Russia, diplomatic relations between the two countries did not change for better. Hence, it can be predicted that Georgian migration flows will continue to be redirected towards Greece, Turkey and other non FSU countries. However, here one comes across the question about the recent economic crisis in Greece, which caused the country's unemployment rate to hit 21% in December, 2011 (European Commission Eurostat, 2011). Against this background, it becomes doubtful whether Greek labor market has room for immigrants, when its citizens are unemployed. Unfortunately, the data I am using was obtained before the crisis in Greece and I am not able to determine whether Georgian migrants remained in Greece after the recent crisis or whether they moved to new destinations. However, this is an interesting question to answer in future research.

References

1. Akhmeteli Nina, “For Most Georgian Emigrants Money Overshadows Lack of Rights”, *International Organization for Migration*, 2007. <http://www.iom.ge/index.php?releases&money>
2. Bodewing Kurt, “Economic and political transition in Georgia”, *Committee Reports, Annual Session*, 2007. <http://www.nato-pa.int/default.asp?SHORTCUT=1171>
3. Caucasus Research Resource Centers, “Migration and return in Georgia: trends, assessments, and potential”, 2007. <http://crrccenters.org/store/files/Projects/DRC-CRRC%20Migration%20Trends%20Study%20final%2030JAN2008.pdf>
4. Chiswick R. Barry and Paul W. Miller, “A model of destination language acquisition: Application to male immigrants in Canada”, *Springer, Vol. 26, No. 2*, pp 145-161, 2000. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/y5nu85g380678t18/>
5. Christiadi and Brian Cushing, “Conditional logit, IIA and alternatives for estimating models of interstate migration”, *Paper presented at the 46th annual meeting of the Southern Regional Science Association*, Charleston, SC, March 29-31, 2007. <http://www.rri.wvu.edu/pdffiles/wpcushing2007-4.pdf>
6. Djajic Slobodan, “Assimilation of Immigrants: Implications for Human Capital Accumulation of the Second Generation”, *Journal of Population Economics*, 2004. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/3fep396jebhavbv8/>
7. Hofmann Erin Truth and Cynthia J. Buckley, “Cultural Responses to Changing Gender Patterns of Migration in Georgia”, *International migration*, 2011. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.14682435.2010.00681.x/abstract?userIsAuthenticated=false&deniedAccessCustomisedMessage=>

8. International Organization for Migration, “Labor migration from Georgia”, 2003. <http://www.iom.ge/index.php?publications&Labour>
9. International Organization for Migration, “Migration in Georgia: A country profile”, 2008. http://publications.iom.int/bookstore/index.php?main_page=product_info&products_id=498
10. Lee S. Everett, “A Theory of Migration”, *Springer*, 1966. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2060063>
11. Mansoor Ali, Bryce Quillin, “Migration and remittances: Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union”, *The World Bank*, 2006. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTECA/Resources/257896-1167856389505/Migration_FullReport.pdf
12. Martin Philio, “Managing international labor migration in the 21st century”, *South Eastern Europe Journal of Economics 1*, pp 9-18, 2003. <http://www.asecu.gr/Seeje/issue01/martin.pdf>
13. Massey S. Doulgas, Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino and J. Edward Taylor, “Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal”, *Population and development Review*, 1993. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2938462>
14. National Bank of Georgia, Annual report 2006, 27. <http://www.nbg.gov.ge/uploads/publications/annualreport/2007/annual2006eng.pdf>
15. Nivalainen Satu, “Determinants of Family Migration: Short Moves vs. Long Moves”, *Springer*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp 157-175, 2004. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20007899>
16. Nivalainen Satu, “Where do migrants go? An analysis of rural and urban destined/originated migration in Finland in 1996-1999”, *Pellervo Economic Research Institute Working Papers*, 2003. <http://www-sre.wu-wien.ac.at/ersa/ersaconfs/ersa04/PDF/317.pdf>

17. Olsson Gunnar, “Distance and Human Interaction. A Migration Study”, *Wiley-Blackwell*, Vol. 47, No. 1, pp 3-43, 1965. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/490577>
18. Schwartz Aba, “Interpreting the Effect of Distance on Migration”, *Chicago Journals*, Vol. 81, No. 5, pp 1153-1169, 1973. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1830643>
19. Shinjiashvili Tamar, “Recent Migration Tendencies from Georgia”, European population conference, 2010. <http://epc2010.princeton.edu/abstractViewer.aspx?submissionId=100642>
20. Sjaastad A. Larry, “The Costs and Returns of Human Migration”, *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 70, No. 5, pp 83-93, 1962. <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=00223808%28196210%2970%3A5%3C80%3ATCAROH%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Q>
21. Tchaidze Robert, Torosyan Karine, “Development on the move: measuring and optimizing migration’s economic and social impacts in Georgia”, Global Development Network and Institute for Public Policy Research, 2008
22. United Nations Commodity Trade Statistics Database, <http://comtrade.un.org/db/dqBasicQueryResults.aspx?cc=all,%20??&px=S2&r=268&y=2005,%202006&p=643,%200&rg=2&so=9999&rpage=dqBasicQuery&qt=n>
23. White Katherine J. Curtis, Kyle Crowder, Stewart E. Tolnay, Robert M. Adelman, “Race, Gender, and Marriage: Destination Selection during the Great Migration”, *Springer*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp 215-241, 2005. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4147344>
24. Zurabishvili Tamar and Tinatin Zurabishvili, “The feminization of labor migration from Georgia: the case of Tianeti”, *Laboratorium*, 73-83, 2010. http://www.soclabo.org/UserFiles/Journal/2010.01/Art_pdf/06_zarub.pdf

25. European Commission Eurostat, Unemployment statistics, **Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**/statistics_explained/index.php/Unemployment_statistics
26. National statistics office of Georgia, Unemployment statistics. http://geostat.ge/?action=page&p_id=145&lang=geo

Appendix

Table 1. Summary statistics of explanatory variables (part 1).

Household size including migrants	%	Religiosity level of household (frequency of visiting church)	%
1 person household	2%	every day	1%
2 person household	9%	more than once a week	4%
3 person household	22%	once a week	11%
4 person household	27%	at least once a month	24%
5 person household	20%	only on special holidays	32%
6 person household	12%	less often	21%
7 person household	4%	Never	7%
8 person household	2%	Migration reasons	%
9 person household	2%	Economic	82%
10 person household	0.2%	Study	7%
11 person household	0.1%	Political	6%
		Other	16%

Table 2. Summary statistics of explanatory variables (part 2).

Settlement type	%
Rural	36%
Urban	46%
Capital	18%

Table 3. Summary statistics of explanatory variables (part 3).

Level of education	%
No primary education	0.58%
Primary education (either complete or incomplete)	0.46%
Incomplete secondary education	1.73%
Completed secondary education	29.34%
Secondary technical education	26.47%
Incomplete higher education	5.29%
Completed higher education	33.83%
Post-graduate degree	0.69%

Table 4. Summary statistics of explanatory variables (part 4).

	Job Fixed Pre-migration	Children in the Household	Has Partner	Employed Before Migration	Prior Migration Experience
Yes	23%	50%	62%	38%	19%
No	77%	50%	38%	62%	81%

Table 5. Summary statistics of explanatory variables (part 5).

Has tertiary education	%	Age group	%
Yes	34%	less than 25 years old	22%
No	66%	25-50 years old	67%
		more than 50 years old	11%

Table 6. Hausman tests of IIA assumption (N=760)

H₀: Odds (Outcome-J vs. Outcome-K) are independent of other alternatives.

Destination	Chi2	P>chi2	Evidence
<i>Russia</i>	-3.798	---	---
<i>Turkey</i>	-4.196	---	---
<i>Western Europe and North America</i>	-12.632	---	---
<i>Other FSU</i>	-1.828	---	---
<i>Other Non FSU</i>	-10.657	---	---
<i>Greece</i>	0.435	1	for H ₀

Table 7. Multinomial logit regression using the whole sample.

	Turkey	Russia	Western Europe and North America	Other FSU	Other Non FSU
Education	0.057 (0.397)	0.452 (0.315)	0.985* (0.324)	0.496 (0.372)	0.579 (0.395)
Migrant group size	-0.678 (0.418)	0.308 (0.211)	-0.076 (0.249)	0.170 (0.252)	-0.462 (0.386)
Gender	0.605** (0.348)	2.136* (0.292)	1.328* (0.305)	2.303* (0.381)	2.457* (0.421)
Age	-0.550** (0.304)	-0.106 (0.252)	-0.525* (0.267)	-0.188 (0.312)	0.188 (0.328)
Job fixed in the destination country	0.324 (0.399)	-0.179 (0.337)	-0.184 (0.367)	0.056 (0.392)	0.863* (0.408)
Partner	-0.796* (0.355)	0.627* (0.303)	0.101 (0.315)	-0.305* (0.363)	-0.117 (0.405)
Rural	1.817* (0.585)	0.884* (0.406)	-0.433 (0.441)	1.803* (0.532)	-1.336* (0.690)
Urban	1.369* (0.544)	0.464 (0.364)	0.230 (0.369)	0.971** (0.501)	0.641 (0.446)
Household size	-0.180 (0.143)	0.120 (0.111)	0.070 (0.119)	0.188 (0.135)	0.044 (0.148)
Migration experience	1.354* (0.546)	1.352* (0.487)	0.800 (0.529)	1.289* (0.548)	0.118 (0.647)
Employed before migration	0.145 (0.356)	0.004 (0.290)	-0.161 (0.318)	0.708* (0.344)	-0.231 (0.395)
Religiosity level	-0.275* (0.125)	0.017 (0.071)	-0.251* (0.098)	-0.148 (0.117)	0.013 (0.091)
Average knowledge of English	0.576* (0.797)	-0.048 (0.689)	0.264 (0.706)	-0.458 (0.855)	1.169 (0.779)
Average knowledge of Russian	0.474 (0.478)	1.136* (0.394)	0.197 (0.411)	1.379* (0.487)	0.730 (0.542)
Children	0.463 (0.424)	-0.255 (0.338)	-0.556 (0.360)	-0.595 (0.414)	-0.277 (0.451)
Migration reason: economic	-0.131 (0.751)	-0.812 (0.561)	0.046 (0.631)	-0.212 (0.703)	-1.201** (0.669)
Migration reason: study	0.713 (1.455)	1.500 (1.197)	2.520* (1.216)	1.955 (1.336)	1.166 (1.296)
Migration reason: political	-0.711 (1.277)	1.537** (0.804)	1.157 (0.851)	1.909* (0.859)	0.732 (0.999)
Pseudo R ² =0.1708	Number of observations=760		Log likelihood= -1036.6833		

Table 8. Multinomial logit regression using sample of migrants who migrated before 2006.

	Turkey	Russia	Western Europe and North America	Other FSU	Other Non FSU
Education	0.353 (0.560)	0.610 (0.390)	1.332* (0.410)	0.684 (0.466)	0.534 (0.564)
Migrant group size	-0.201 (0.497)	0.172 (0.232)	-0.068 (0.272)	0.233 (0.281)	-1.641 (1.002)
Gender	0.670 (0.512)	2.294* (0.368)	1.915* (0.399)	2.385* (0.488)	3.060* (0.693)
Age	-0.612 (0.491)	-0.477 (0.334)	-0.949* (0.365)	-1.077* (0.429)	0.535 (0.515)
Job fixed in the destination country	-1.012 (0.669)	-0.763** (0.403)	-1.215* (0.471)	-0.677 (0.487)	-0.138 (0.602)
Partner	-0.954** (0.527)	0.564 (0.377)	-0.120 (0.399)	-0.305 (0.462)	-0.035 (0.612)
Rural	2.067* (0.856)	0.888** (0.491)	-0.371 (0.542)	2.445* (0.717)	-2.231** (1.203)
Urban	1.070 (0.795)	0.344 (0.437)	-0.003 (0.459)	1.259** (0.688)	0.473 (0.626)
Household size	-0.272 (0.216)	0.166 (0.136)	0.153 (0.148)	0.197 (0.169)	0.119 (0.208)
Migration experience	1.053 (0.783)	1.417* (0.592)	0.806 (0.649)	1.487* (0.674)	0.247 (0.895)
Employed before migration	-0.168 (0.515)	-0.359 (0.359)	-0.630 (0.399)	0.674 (0.441)	-0.768 (0.571)
Religiosity level	-0.325 (0.202)	0.162 (0.137)	-0.127 (0.145)	0.036 (0.172)	-0.110 (0.199)
Average knowledge of English	0.513 (1.118)	-0.082 (0.826)	0.161 (0.863)	-0.667 (1.101)	1.590 (1.080)
Average knowledge of Russian	-0.130 (0.686)	1.130* (0.488)	0.194 (0.521)	1.305 (0.611)	0.239 (0.780)
Children	0.498 (0.602)	-0.261 (0.407)	-0.819** (0.451)	-0.729 (0.507)	-0.193 (0.667)
Migration reason: economic	1.090 (1.215)	-0.309 (0.602)	0.702 (0.695)	0.147 (0.811)	0.320 (0.984)
Migration reason: study	2.553 (1.733)	1.335 (1.224)	2.238** (1.268)	1.599 (1.452)	2.232 (1.617)
Migration reason: political	0.746 (1.505)	2.092** (1.099)	1.671 (1.162)	2.269** (1.177)	1.488 (1.521)
Pseudo R ² =0.1926	Number of observations=521		Log likelihood= -635.0696		

Table 9. Multinomial logit regression using sample of migrants who migrated after 2006.

	Turkey	Russia	Western Europe and North America	Other FSU	Other Non FSU
Education	0.262 (0.698)	0.580 (0.693)	0.976 (0.686)	0.682 (0.315)	1.208 (0.699)
Migrant group size	-1.125 (0.836)	1.115* (0.637)	-0.603 (0.771)	-0.159 (0.751)	0.355 (0.725)
Gender	0.805 (0.577)	2.706* (0.617)	0.728 (0.586)	2.833* (0.709)	2.368* (0.657)
Age	-0.749 (0.487)	0.892** (0.516)	-0.186 (0.509)	0.669 (0.568)	-0.187 (0.546)
Job fixed in the destination country	2.025* (0.788)	1.134 (0.829)	1.824* (0.805)	1.863* (0.851)	2.579* (0.815)
Partner	-0.726 (0.602)	-0.014 (0.631)	0.470 (0.644)	-0.512 (0.693)	-0.299 (0.706)
Rural	1.716** (0.940)	1.610** (0.906)	-0.804 (0.989)	1.491 (0.987)	-0.752 (1.024)
Urban	1.520** (0.886)	1.125 (0.838)	0.845 (0.775)	1.028 (0.900)	0.854 (0.792)
Household size	-0.074 (0.245)	-0.145 (0.263)	-0.010 (0.252)	0.345 (0.283)	-0.018 (0.276)
Migration experience	0.928 (0.963)	-0.751 (1.089)	0.591 (1.068)	1.057 (1.111)	-0.645 (1.172)
Employed before migration	1.581* (0.698)	0.881 (0.716)	1.425* (0.727)	1.438** (0.760)	1.485* (0.756)
Religiosity level	-0.546* (0.246)	-0.414** (0.249)	-0.609* (0.246)	-0.699* (0.283)	-0.064 (0.266)
Average knowledge of English	0.790 (1.564)	0.743 (1.609)	0.648 (1.577)	-0.249 (1.727)	1.381 (1.613)
Average knowledge of Russian	1.409** (0.791)	1.252 (0.807)	0.508 (0.797)	1.804** (0.935)	1.409 (0.890)
Children	0.245 (0.737)	-0.087 (0.757)	-0.026 (0.759)	-0.472 (0.847)	-0.266 (0.810)
Migration reason: economic	-21.22 (2.848)	-22.01* (2.809)	-20.614* (2.875)	-20.59* (2.646)	-22.878* (2.795)
Migration reason: study	-32.01 (0.706)	0.733 .	3.410* (1.578)	2.353 (1.623)	-0.572 (1.368)
Migration reason: political	-33.585 (84861)	-1.409 (1.902)	-0.842 (1.778)	1.009 (1.749)	-2.013 (1.810)
Pseudo R ² =0.2671	Number of observations=239		Log likelihood= -311.29049		

Table 10. Marginal effects of each variable before and after 2006.

	Russia		Turkey		Western Europe and North America	
	Before 2006	After 2006	Before 2006	After 2006	Before 2006	After 2006
Education	-0.062	-0.078	-0.013	-0.004	0.1328	0.035
Migrant group size	0.053	0.276	-0.010	-0.010	-0.029	-0.228
Gender	0.205*	0.191	-0.055*	-0.009	0.008	-0.376
age	0.065	0.182	-0.001	-0.008	-0.071**	-0.136
Job fixed in the destination country	-0.004	-0.183	-0.008	-0.001	-0.081**	-0.004
Partner	0.195*	-0.008	-0.052*	-0.005	-0.064	0.139
Rural	0.023	0.325	0.050	0.009	-0.202*	-0.284
Urban	-0.028	0.048	0.025	0.004	-0.077	-0.034
Household size	0.015	-0.048	-0.014*	-0.001	0.003	-0.006
Migration experience	0.121*	-0.208	-0.005	0.007	-0.072	0.122
Employed before migration	-0.057	-0.112	0.003	0.002	-0.073**	0.040
Religiosity level	0.059*	0.009	-0.013*	-0.001	-0.037*	-0.046
Average knowledge of English	-0.020	0.023	0.020	0.001	0.041	-0.005
Average knowledge of Russian	0.174*	0.024	-0.034	0.002	-0.125*	-0.186
Children	0.064	0.027	0.032	0.003	-0.088**	0.042
Migration reason: job related	-0.171*	-0.101	0.029	0.002	0.116*	0.178
Migration reason: political	-0.147	-0.225	0.050	-0.099	0.157	0.517
Migration reason: other	0.104	-0.197	-0.027	-0.026	-0.044	-0.102

Table 10. Marginal effects of each variable before and after 2006 (continued).

	Other FSU		Other Non FSU		Greece	
	Before 2006	After 2006	Before 2006	After 2006	Before 2006	After 2006
Education	-0.004	-0.030	-0.002	0.082	-0.050*	-0.03
Migrant group size	0.018	-0.068	-0.026*	0.031	-0.005	-0.001
Gender	0.050	0.135	0.014	0.071	-0.223*	-0.012
age	-0.055**	0.068	0.017**	-0.104	0.045*	-0.001
Job fixed in the destination country	0.009	0.004	0.011	0.188	0.072**	-0.007
Partner	-0.060	-0.087	-0.003	-0.055	-0.014	0.001
Rural	0.226*	0.164	-0.042*	-0.212	-0.053*	-0.002
Urban	0.107	0.011	0.001	-0.024	-0.028	-0.005
Household size	0.006	0.061	-0.001	-0.006	-0.010	-0.001
Migration experience	0.034	0.213	-0.011	-0.134	-0.067*	-0.001
Employed before migration	0.115*	0.029	-0.007	0.045	0.019	-0.005
Religiosity level	-0.002	-0.047	-0.002	0.082	-0.004	0.002
Average knowledge of English	-0.071	-0.169	0.025	0.154	0.003	-0.003
Average knowledge of Russian	0.056	0.116	-0.009	0.050	-0.062**	-0.006
Children	-0.039	-0.054	0.002	-0.019	0.028	0.001
Migration reason: job related	0.018	0.119	0.004	-0.348	0.001	0.149
Migration reason: study	-0.004	0.027	0.012	-0.214	-0.067*	-0.004
Migration reason: political	0.046	0.501	-0.005	-0.177	-0.074*	0.002

Note: * stands for 5% significance level and ** stands for 10% significance level.

Table 11. Test for combining alternatives before 2006.

Alternatives tested	Chi2	P>Chi2
<i>Russia – Turkey</i>	42.167	0.001
<i>Russia - Western Europe and North America</i>	61.723	0
<i>Russia - Other FSU</i>	33.682	0.014
<i>Russia - Other Non FSU</i>	29.029	0.048
<i>Russia - Greece</i>	66.899	0
<i>Turkey - Western Europe and North America</i>	31.182	0.027
<i>Turkey - Other FSU</i>	32.465	0.019
<i>Turkey - Other Non FSU</i>	33.321	0.015
<i>Turkey – Greece</i>	23.424	0.175
<i>Western Europe and North America - Other FSU</i>	53.606	0
<i>Western Europe and North America - Other Non FSU</i>	28.368	0.057
<i>Western Europe and North America – Greece</i>	52.636	0
<i>Other FSU-Other Non FSU</i>	37.623	0.004
<i>Other FSU – Greece</i>	58.553	0
<i>Other Non FSU – Greece</i>	34.413	0.011

Table 12. Test for combining alternatives after 2006.

Alternatives tested	Chi2	P>Chi2
<i>Russia – Turkey</i>	33.294	0.015
<i>Russia - Western Europe and North America</i>	34.067	0.012
<i>Russia - Other FSU</i>	14.675	0.684
<i>Russia - Other Non FSU</i>	26.775	0.083
<i>Russia - Greece</i>	104.707	0
<i>Turkey - Western Europe and North America</i>	18.474	0.425
<i>Turkey - Other FSU</i>	21.683	0.246
<i>Turkey - Other Non FSU</i>	29.309	0.045
<i>Turkey – Greece</i>	113.815	0
<i>Western Europe and North America - Other FSU</i>	25.894	0.102
<i>Western Europe and North America - Other Non FSU</i>	24.102	0.152
<i>Western Europe and North America – Greece</i>	120.938	0
<i>Other FSU-Other Non FSU</i>	23.995	0.155
<i>Other FSU – Greece</i>	2148.598	0
<i>Other Non FSU – Greece</i>	120.984	0

Table 13. Multinomial logit regression using Georgia as a choice country for migration.

	Greece	Russia	Turkey	Western Europe and North America	Other FSU	Other Non FSU
Education	0.240 (0.286)	0.816* (0.192)	0.310 (0.320)	1.261* (0.213)	0.856* (0.266)	0.785* (0.287)
Gender	-0.293 (0.255)	1.786* (0.197)	0.261 (0.273)	0.965* (0.204)	1.915* (0.305)	2.163* (0.333)
Age	-0.765* (0.184)	-0.969* (0.139)	-1.204* (0.210)	-1.319* (0.160)	-1.024* (0.203)	-0.679* (0.222)
Partner	0.009 (0.250)	0.653* (0.197)	-0.514** (0.286)	0.110 (0.215)	-0.185 (0.269)	-0.198 (0.305)
Rural	-0.301 (0.354)	0.395 (0.267)	1.426* (0.507)	-0.841* (0.312)	1.374* (0.421)	-1.782* (0.559)
Urban	-0.063 (0.319)	0.268 (0.246)	1.320* (0.480)	0.074 (0.244)	0.791** (0.413)	0.453 (0.330)
Household size	-0.178* (0.084)	-0.089 (0.061)	-0.392* (0.106)	-0.155* (0.072)	-0.052 (0.086)	-0.179** (0.100)
Migration experience	23.69* (0.596)	25.27* (0.449)	24.98* (0.529)	24.46* (0.496)	25.12* (0.515)	23.98 .
Employed before migration	0.185 (0.254)	-0.095 (0.181)	0.223 (0.286)	-0.273 (0.219)	0.567* (0.247)	-0.236 (0.297)
Religiosity level	0.130 (0.095)	0.148* (0.069)	-0.086 (0.104)	-0.086 (0.075)	0.029 (0.099)	0.151 (0.101)
Average knowledge of English	-1.422* (0.574)	-0.979* (0.374)	-1.025** (0.529)	-0.852* (0.351)	-1.095** (0.563)	-0.014 (0.447)
Average knowledge of Russian	-0.474 (0.298)	0.329 (0.219)	0.079 (0.327)	-0.157 (0.247)	0.602** (0.316)	0.164 (0.362)
Children	4.859* (0.360)	4.458* (0.309)	4.937* (0.400)	4.12* (0.331)	4.106* (0.376)	4.342* (0.406)
Pseudo R ² =0.2877		Number of observations=1931		Log likelihood= -1873.2464		

Note: * stands for 5% significance level and ** stands for 10% significance level. Standard errors are given in the brackets.

Table 14. Hausman tests of IIA assumption (N=1931)

H₀: Odds (Outcome-J vs. Outcome-K) are independent of other alternatives.

Destination	Chi2	P>chi2	Evidence
<i>Georgia</i>	24.589	1	for H ₀
<i>Russia</i>	-4.657	---	---
<i>Turkey</i>	-34.439	---	---
<i>Western Europe and North America</i>	56.434	0.861	for H ₀
<i>Other FSU</i>	18.196	1	for H ₀
<i>Other Non FSU</i>	5.249	1	for H ₀
<i>Greece</i>	-12.099	---	---