ANALYSIS OF FACTORS INFLUENCING THE INTENTIONS TO MIGRATE FROM RURAL AREAS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA USING CAUCASUS BAROMETER 2015

Anna Dalaryan,
ATC-Agribusiness teaching center
anna.dalaryan@gmail.com

Abstract

Migration flows from South Caucasian countries have increased over the past century. These patterns contain positive and negative impacts on the home countries. Prior to analyzing such effects, the causes of migration should be considered and studied in-depth in order to understand the main reasons behind migratory intentions. For this study, Armenia and Georgia will be reviewed because, for many years, these countries shared similar migration traits. Given that a large number of emigrants are from rural areas in Armenia and Georgia, this study was conducted in order to understand the factors that motivate and create intentions to migrate from rural areas. This study's analysis utilizes the Caucasus Barometer Household Survey (2015) implemented by the Caucasus Research Resource Center's regional offices in Armenia and Georgia (CRRC,) and a logit model is used to evaluate the factors that create the intention to migrate from rural areas in Armenia and Georgia. The main factors to be analyzed are as follows: household income and employment status as control factors, and gender, age, education level, the presence of relatives abroad, trust towards the Government and the Parliament, and whether people are treated fairly by the Government or not as independent variables. The estimation results show that characteristics such as income, age, education years, trust toward the Government, and Government fairness are statistically significant factors that affect the migration from

rural areas of Armenia. Meanwhile, gender, age, education years, and presence of relatives living abroad are factors that significantly impact migration patterns from rural areas of Georgia.

Introduction

Migration is a well-known increasing phenomenon in developing countries, which is described as a process of movement of people from one area of the world to another in order to find improved living and working conditions. Migration has a tremendous impact on countries, especially when they are in the developing stage. It has both positive and negative impacts on the country that experiences it. First, migrants are sending remittances to their home countries, which have a tremendously positive impact on the country's economy. The huge contribution provided by remittances to the country's GDP creates a multiplier effect through consumption and investments, which positively contributes to the country's economy. On the other hand, a large level of remittances creates dependence from the country where the migrants are currently located, creating a potentially negative impact on exchange rates. Second, another harmful consequence set forth by migration is a concept known as "brain gain through brain drain." This happens when highly skilled workers leave their home countries because their skills and qualifications are in high demand abroad. It stipulates that highly valued human capital flows to countries where they are valued more. Since almost half of the population in both Armenia and Georgia is from rural areas, the direct impact of migration becomes increasingly visible.

As a part of the developing world, Armenia and Georgia currently face the issue of migration, and the biggest problem to address is how to understand its causes. Considering the fact that almost half of the population in these countries are from rural areas, and that high migration flows are occurring specifically from these areas, the understanding of the causes of its flows become highly important. In order to understand the basis of these flows from rural areas, this study will consider some possible causes and will highlight the main causes of migration from rural areas in Armenia and Georgia. The result of this study is the theoretical contribution

(Push and Pull factors) on the migratory factors, as well as their practical implications.

Historical overview
Migration phases in Armenia

Migration flows to be reviewed in this study began in the early 1980s when the Armenian and Georgian economies started to deteriorate following the collapse of the Soviet Union, which created a new and sizable migration flow. Due to increased migration, these countries are highly dependent on remittances at present (ETF 2013).

The social, political, and economic situation in Armenia became the main reasons for migration. To understand the significance of the problem, it is important to consider that between 1990 and 2005, 700,000-1,300,000 people emigrated from Armenia, which equals to ~22-40% of Armenia's population in 2008 (UNDP 2009).

Migration in Armenia could be separated by three phases:

Phase 1: Mass migration, 1988-1995

Phase 2: Decline and stabilization, 1995-2000

Phase 3: Less migration outflows, 2000-2010 (Manasyan & Poghosyan, 2012).

In Armenia, the first phase of migration started from 1988 and became mass migration after Armenia gained independence in 1991; the rates significantly increased from 1992 to 1994. This timeframe is known as the massive migration period; since the workplaces were reduced substantially, Armenia suffered from serious economic contraction and the living conditions worsened. During the same period, the labor emigrants tended to travel to the former Soviet Republic. However, some small flows (2.9-3.9%,) arrived in European countries throughout the nineties until to the early 2000s (Makaryan and Galstyan 2012).

The second phase of migration was observed between 1995 and 2000, which was characterized by the decline and stabilization of migration. The net migration rate during this period was 250,000 people, which comprised 7.8% of Armenia's population in 2000. The decline in migration was connected with the stabilization of the socio-economic situation in

Armenia, which was linked to the armed conflict with Azerbaijan due to the ceasefire in 1994 (Manasyan and Poghosyan 2012).

The third phase of migration (2000 to 2010) was characterized by decreased migration flows. During this period, the migration outflow rate was about 265,236, which is 9% of Armenia's population in 2011. Furthermore, return migration also increased in this timeframe. Until the 2000s, labor migrants were working mostly in construction, but starting from 2000, they became engaged in trade, services, production, and agricultural sectors (Manasyan and Poghosyan 2012).

Migration phases in Georgia

Migration in Georgia is considered as irregular. As in the case of Armenia, the history of Georgian migration can be separated into three phases:

Phase 1: Collapse of Soviet Union and the Conflict, 1990-1995
Phase 2: Economic Struggle, 1996-2004
Phase 3: Hope and economic rebuilding, post-2004 (ETF, 2013).

The first phase lasted 1990 to 1995. The highest flow of migrants started to be visible in Georgia from the early 1990s, which is characterized by ethnic factors. The main reasons for the mass flow of migrants were connected to the Georgian Civil War as well as the ethnic clashes in South Ossetia and Abkhazia in the beginning of the 1990s. The main directions of migration flows were mainly to EU countries, the U.S., and to the Russian Federation (MPC 2013).

The second phase of migration lasted from 1995 to 2003. In 1995, Georgia's economy started to recover, yet lower productivity levels continued to make it difficult for people to find jobs. As a result, people were forced to look for new working opportunities abroad. Another influential migratory factory was the state of the Russian economy, which started to grow after 1998 and provided new opportunities for Georgians to find work there (Labadze and Tukhashvili 2013). At the beginning of this phase, the return migrants were mostly Russians who have previously lived in Georgia or born there moved back to their country, but some Georgians also started to migrate to Russia. In 2000, a new visa regime was

introduced for Georgians in Russia, meanwhile, for citizens of most of the CIS countries, there is a free visa regime (IOM 2008).

During this period, Georgia's economy declined and state-owned enterprises became disoriented mainly due to the change to a free-market economy, reduced wages, and an increased unemployment rate. Since the amount of temporary migrates rose, the economic dependency on remittances also increased, and it became one of the main determinants of the economy. The economic situation became the first problem for migration in Georgia; people emigrate in order to have enough money to send to their families in the form of remittances (Badurashvili 2004).

During the third phase of migration, which started from 2003 and lasted until 2011, the Georgian economy developed and improved, which started to be visible from its gross national disposable income and GDP per capita which tripled (Labadze and Tukhashvili 2013).

This phase started after the "Rose Revolution,"[1] when, by using new opportunities for economic development as a result of slight development of business environment in Georgia, the reduction of corruption and criminal violence took place; this motivated migrants to return to their home countries (Labadze and Tukhashvili 2013).

Literature review

The impact of migration on a country's development status is both positive and negative. From one side, economic development decreases the migration, since when the economy is developed there are fewer push factors to migrate, whereas on the other hand, the migration influences the development by sending remittances, using new skills, knowledge, and experience (UN 2012).

As many researchers proved, the main causes of migration to be considered are the social, economic, and political issues. Simultaneously, migration is the main cause of different social, economic, and political changes in the world. Starting from the early years of mass migration, it is

---

[1] More Information about "Rose" Revolution is available here:
http://www18.georgetown.edu/data/people/cdw33/publication-32608.pdf

viewed as a consequence of the unequal distribution of wealth and power. Along with inequality, migrant workers were always considered as socially, economically, and politically vulnerable (Ballard 1987).

There are some macro models, offered by the migration theory: the Gravity models of migration, Pull-Push (Cost-benefit analysis) migration model, and the Markov chain migration model (Aleshkovski and Iontsev 2004), that help explain why people choose to migrate. In this study, the Push-pull migration model is the most useful (Mayda 2008), especially when the issue of the international labor migration is largely experienced in the Armenian and Georgian cases. Table 1 summarizes the push-and-pull factors which affect the decision to migrate according to the World Bank (WorldBank 2006).

Table 1: Push and Pull factors: Motivations for Migration

	PUSH Factors	PULL Factors
Economic and demographic	Poverty, unemployment, low wages, high fertility rates, lack of basic health and education	Prospects of higher wages, potential for improved standard of living, personal or professional development
Political	Conflict, insecurity, violence, poor governance, corruption, human rights abuses	Safety and security, political freedom
Social	Discrimination based on: ethnicity, gender, religion etc.	Family reunification, ethnic (diaspora migration) homeland, freedom from discrimination

Source: The World Bank; Migration and Remittances: Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union

Among all Push Factors, some economic, political, and social were chosen to analyze in this study. The range of economic and demographic factors included in this study are unemployment, income, education, age. The political factors include the trust towards Government, and the fairness of the Government. The social factor is composed by the household income level.

Based on previously conducted studies and results that indicate that income and employment status are two of the most significant Push migratory factors, they were considered as the main independent variables in the model and analysis.

Income and Migration

In order to assess the impact of income level on the intention to migrate, empirical studies were conducted in Armenia and Georgia. Certain studies proved that in many cases, Armenian households experience high levels of financial problems, meaning that income is not enough to cover additional expenses; current income levels can only cover living expenses (ILO 2009). For many households in Armenia, migration becomes the main source of income (World Bank 2002). Migration as a source of income is considered as a form of remittances as they help raise the income level (Grigoryan 2013).

The impact of income on migration is studied in Georgia as well, which shows the same results. The presence of migrants in the household changes the income level; households that have migrants have higher income level in comparison to those without migrants (CRRC/ISET 2010). According to the "Population Migration from Georgia to EU Countries" study, the main factor that causes migration is the expectations of higher income (Esadze 2010).

Unemployment and Migration

The other Push Factor of migration to be reviewed in this study is unemployment. The main migration flows from the South Caucasus regions can be explained by the sense of hope of attaining better employment abroad. Both Armenia and Georgia have experienced labor migration, and this is undoubtedly considered as the main cause of migration from these countries. After conducting several studies on this region, it is proven that higher income and better employment opportunities are the main reasons for migration (ISET 2017). For example, a study called "Migration of Rural Population in Post-Soviet Period" conducted in 2011 shows that the main reason of migration from rural areas to other countries is due to the absence

of jobs, thereafter the lower salaries and the lack of jobs according to their specialization (Galstyan 2011).

Other social-economic factors and Migration

Empirical studies revealed striking evidence on social-economic factors, which influence migration and create motivation (push factors) to migrate. There is an increasing migratory tendency in post-Soviet countries where the main issue continues to be weak economies, which do not contain migration policies. The main issue continues to be the lower standards of living of migrant households, which positively impacts the labor migration from these countries (Korobkov 2014).

The main determinants of migration in the South Caucasus countries were analyzed and discussed in Armen Asatryan's study. The analysis found that economic factors are the main causes for migration; specifically, these factors are the external policies and regulations, as well as the relations between countries. The research shows that if the economic situation in these countries remains the same, the rates of migration would increase. Migration becomes easier especially when there is a network of relatives and friends (Asatryan 2007).

Based on another study, Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan have similar aspects, since they share a common legacy of socio-economic culture from the Soviet era. The research found a positive relationship between migration and remittances. Furthermore, the analysis revealed that the excess level of remittances correlates with an increase in new migration flows. Also, as was found in the Armenian case, there was no impact on education due to migration (Grigoryan 2013).

Based on the literature reviewed on the relationship between income and migration, as well as the connection between employment status and migration, this study asks if the low income level and employment status can predict the willingness to migrate from rural areas of Armenia and Georgia.

Hypothesis: Low income level and unemployment are factors that stimulate migration from rural areas of Armenia and Georgia.

Data description

This study was conducted by analyzing data from the Caucasus Barometer household survey, 2015. The survey was conducted by the CRRC's regional office in Armenia and Georgia (CRRC 2015).

The sample for the survey includes a total of 1,863 households from Armenia and 2,251 households from Georgia. Table 2 summarizes the settlement type of surveyed households both in Armenia and Georgia, as it shows 31.6% (589 households) and 38.8% (874 households) of surveyed households are from rural areas in Armenia and Georgia respectively.

Table 2: The settlement type of surveyed households in Armenia and Georgia

	Rural		**Urban**		**Capital**	
Armenia	589	31.6%	656	33.2%	618	33.2%
Georgia	874	38.8%	744	33.1%	633	28.1%

Migration issues are highly visible in rural areas in Armenia as shown in the survey results, which indicates that 45.3% of rural households in Armenia expressed intentions to migrate in the future (temporary migration,) whereas in the Georgian case the same indicator finds reveals this rate is only 28.4%.

Migration issues are highly visible in rural areas in Armenia, which also is also proved by the survey result indicating that 45.3% of rural households in Armenia are ready to migrate in the future (temporary migration,) in the case when the same indicator for Georgia is only 28.4%. The issue of future migration becomes more important when also considering the households who are willing to migrate in the future from national capitals and urban areas. The result of the survey shows that 65.1% in Armenia and 57.9% of households in Georgia are willing to migrate in future from urban and capital areas.

The cross-tabulation analysis show that people who are willing to migrate are 25-36 years old. These people mainly have secondary technical education (63.6% in Armenia and 51.4% in Georgia) and mainly unemployed (65% in Armenia and 66% in Georgia.) Another

characteristics of these households that are willing to migrate in future is the monthly income level, which covers food and clothes. With regards to trusting the Government, 45% of Armenian households that are willing to migrate fully distrust their Government, and 42% in Georgia neither trust nor distrust it.

Methodology

In order to assess the likelihood of people who are willing to migrate from rural areas within the following set of independent variables – social-demographic, economic and political variables – the logit model, which we used in this study is specified as follows:

Pr |Y=1| X= $\frac{\exp(a'x)}{1-\exp(a'x)'}$, where:

Pr is the probability of the people who want to migrate from rural areas.

Y=1 represents the rural people who wants to migrate in future.

X is a vector, which includes the social-demographic, economic, and political variables.

In order to estimate and interpret the parameters, the maximum likelihood approach is used to estimate the percent change in odds ratio.

Empirical specification

The research methodology of this study is quantitative. The main instrument, which is used in order to conduct the analysis, is the secondary data collected by Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC Armenia and CRRC Georgia) collected in 2015. The Caucasus Barometer (CB) dataset is used in order to analyze the factors that affect the willingness of temporary migration from rural areas, both for Armenia and Georgia. The main objective of this study is to understand the factors that affect the decision to migrate; this reason not only economic but also social demographic and political factors were included in this model in order to gain a final understanding of what type of factors can be classified as the main causes that impact the decision to migrate from rural areas.

The empirical specification of the Logistic Regression model for this study is done through modeling the binary dependent variable as a function of the social-demographic, economic, and political variables.

$Pr \quad (MGR=1)=F(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Gend + \alpha_2 Age + \alpha_3 Edu + \alpha_4 Emp + \alpha_5 Rel + \alpha_6 Trust + \alpha_7 Fairness + \alpha_8 Money)$

For Armenia and Georgia separately, two logistic regression models were developed that include the aforementioned dependent, independent, and control variables.

Secondary data analysis was conducted in order to test the hypothesis via logistic regression analysis. During the analysis, 90%, 95%, and 99% confidence levels were used.

The estimated model consists of the following dependent, independent, and control variables:

Dependent Variable

Intention to migrate (MGR): The main objective of this study is to understand the factors that impact the decision to migrate from rural areas. As a dependent variable of this model, the following question is posed: "If you had a chance, would you leave the country for a certain period of time to live somewhere else?" the outcome of this variable is coded as "1" if the answer is "Yes" and, "0" if the answer is "No." Since the outcome of the dependent variable is binary, logistic regression is used for modeling purposes.

Independent Variables

Household monthly income, per member (Inc): Considering the findings from different studies that show that income level leaves a higher impact on dictating the intention to migrate, the Household monthly income – adjusted per member – is chosen as one of the main independent variables for this model. Accordingly, the Income variable is a continuous variable in this model.

Employment (Emp): As previously discussed in the literature review, the other important factor that describes the intention to migrate is employment. This is a binary variable that is derived from the following

question: "Are you currently employed?" This variable takes a value of 0 if the respondent is unemployed and 1 if he/she is employed.

Control Variables

The range of control variables include other important push factors that impact one's intention to migrate, these variables are:

Age: Age is a continuous variable in this dataset.

Education (Edu): Education years is a continuous variable in this dataset since it shows the years of education obtained by the respondents.

Relatives living abroad (Rel): This variable shows whether the respondent has relatives that currently live abroad or not. It is a binary variable, which takes the value of 0 if they do not have relatives living abroad, and 1 if the respondent has relatives that are currently living abroad. In this model, this variable was derived from the following question, "Do you have a close relative currently living abroad, outside the borders of country?"

Trust towards Parliament and Executive Government (Trust): This variable shows trust towards Parliament and Executive Government, where the outcomes are derived from responses from the following question, "Please, asses your level of trust towards…" Trust is a binary variable that takes the value of 0 if there is distrust and 1 if there is trust.

Fairness of Government (Fairness): This political variable shows the fairness of the Government, which we get through the answers to the following question: "Under the present government in the country, do you completely agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or completely disagree that people like yourself are treated fairly by the government?" This is a binary variable that takes the value of 1 if the responded agrees and 0 if he disagrees.

In the model developed for this study, all the variables (except the age variable) were included as binary variables with corresponding base categories. Particularly, the base category for *Employment, it* is the unemployment, for *Gender,* it is female, for *Relatives currently living abroad,* it is if the respondent does not have relatives living abroad, for *Trust* it is distrust, and finally, for *Fairness,* it is that the household disagrees with the statement.

The employment and income levels were hypothesized to negatively impact the decision to migrate from rural areas since the availability of higher income and employment creates favorable conditions not to migrate. Accordingly, the education level was anticipated to negatively impact the decision to migrate, because higher education levels create opportunities for better employment. Age is expected to have a negative impact on the decision to migrate, since the older people become, the higher the willingness to leave the county becomes. Household income per member was anticipated to negatively impact the willingness to migrate in future, since with higher income, living conditions will improve. The variable that shows whether the respondents have relatives currently living abroad is anticipated to positively impact to the willingness to leave the country, since their living conditions abroad may motivate them to migrate. The trust towards Parliament and Executive Government and Fairness of the Government are anticipated to negatively impact the decision to migrate, because as more people trust the Parliament and Executive Government, the willingness to live in their country rather than migrate increases; the following statement is true in the case of Fairness of Government.

Estimation results

This study's estimation results are represented in Table 3. The following table summarizes the logit parameter estimated with the associated p-values, odds ratios, and the percent changes in odds ratios. The estimation results were obtained using the STATA software package. The estimation results were discussed only in terms of statistically significant percent change in odds ratios using 1%, 5%, and 10% significance level for each country.

Statistically significant variables for rural areas in Armenia are the household's income level per member, age of the respondent, years of education, trust towards Parliament/Executive Government, and fairness of the Government.

The findings for rural areas in Armenia reveal that the employment status is not statistically significant, while the other independent variable – the Household's monthly income level per member is a statistical significance indicator of the willingness to migrate from rural areas, and

shows that with other factors held constant, as the monthly income level of the household (per member) increases by 1 USD, the likelihood of willingness to migrate in the future increases by 0.4%. This finding shows that unlike the increase in income level, people are more willing to migrate from rural areas of Armenia.

As a result of this study, the control variables used in the model show the following impact for rural areas in Armenia: everything else held constant;

• Each additional year of age of the respondent decreases the likelihood of willingness to migrate in the future by 5.8%,

• Each additional year of education decreases the likelihood of willingness to migrate in the future by 7.4%,

• The trust towards the Government and Parliament decreases the likelihood of the willingness to migrate by 50.8%,

• The belief that people are fairly treated by the Government increases the likelihood of the willingness to migrate in the future by 66.3%.

The findings for rural areas in Georgia show that both the income and employment status are not statistically significant indicators of the willingness to migrate in the future, whereas some of the control variables are significant.

As a result of the analysis, the control variables used in the model show the following impact for rural areas in Georgia: everything else held constant;

• Male respondents are less willing to migrate in the future than females, by 43.8%,

• Each additional year of age decreases the likelihood of the willingness to migrate in the future by 6.6%,

• Each additional year of education increases the likelihood of the willingness to migrate in the future by 12.7%;

• Having relatives living abroad increases the likelihood of the willingness to migrate in the future by 16.8%.

Table 3: Estimation results; Authors own calculations: *p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01

	ARMENIA			GEORGIA		
	Coeffi-cients	Odds ratios	% change in odds ratios	Coeffic ients	Odds ratios	% change in odds ratios
Respondent gender (base: female)	**-0.251**	**0.777**	**-22.2%**	**-0.576**	**0.562**	**-43.8%**
Male	*(0.277)*			*(0.007)***		
Age	**-0.601**	**0.942**	**-5.8%**	**-0.068**	**0.934**	**-6.6%**
Age	*(0.000)****			*(0.000)***		
Education level(years)	**-0.076**	**0.926**	**-7.4%**	**0.119**	**1.127.**	**12.7%**
Education level	*(0.080)**			*(0.003)***		
Employment (base: unemployed)	**0.153**	**1.165**	**16.5%**	**0.372**	**1.451**	**45.2%**
Employed	*(0.511)*			*(0.121)*		
Relatives living abroad (base: do not have)	**0.137**	**1.147**	**14.7%**	**0.989**	**2.688**	**168.8%**
Have	*(0.733)*			*(0.000)***		
Trust towards Government (base: distrust)	**-0.709**	**0.492**	**-50.8%**	**0.041**	**1.042**	**4.2%**
Trust	*(0.004)****			*(0.872)*		
Fairness of the Gov. (base: Disagree)	**0.508**	**1.663**	**66.3%**	**-0.099**	**0.905**	**-9.4%**
Agree	*(0.080)**			*(0.673)*		

Household's income per member	0.003	1.003	0.4%	-0.002	0.997	-0.3%
Monthly USD	(0.100)*			(0.148)		

Discussion

Considering the importance of migration flows from Armenia and Georgia (especially from rural areas,) and the importance of understanding the causes of these flows, a logit model was estimated to evaluate the impact of social-demographics, economic, and political factors on the decision to migrate from rural areas by using the 2015 survey data (Caucasus Barometer) collected by the CRRC's regional offices in Armenia and Georgia.

The analysis of this study found that the main push factors that create the willingness to migrate from rural areas of Armenia are the monthly income level of the household (per member) and fairness of the government, while years of education, age, and trust towards Government decrease the willingness of migration.

In Georgia, the main push factors are the years of education and the presence of relatives living abroad, while the other factors – the age and gender of the respondents – decreases the willingness of migration.

Taking into account the hypothesis and the findings, the hypothesis is partially accepted for Armenia, since only the households' income level is a statistically significant factor that impacts the willingness to migrate in the future from rural areas. Considering this fact, the important issue to consider in both the Armenian and Georgian cases is the creation of employment opportunities, especially for rural areas, since the main cause of migration flows is the lack of appropriate employment.

Bibliography

Aleshkovski, Ivan, and Vladimir Iontsev. 2004. "Mathematical Models of Migration." Accessed October 14, 2016. http://www.eolss.net/sample-chapters/c15/e1-26-09-06.pdf.

Asatryan, Armen. 2007. "Migration in the South Caucasus Republics." Accessed October 11, 2016. http://www.crrc.am/hosting/file/_

static_content/fellows/fellowship06/A%20Asatryan/Armen%20Asatryan_r eport.pdf.

Badurashvili, Irina. 2004. "Determinants and consequences of irregular migration in a society under transition. The case of Georgia, Caucasus." Accessed September 23, 2016. http://paa2004. princeton.edu/papers/41960.

Ballard, Roger. 1987. "The political economy of migration: Pakistan, Britain and the Middle East." *Workers and the Social Order* 17-21.

CRRC. 2015. *Caucasus Barometer Household Survey.* Accessed 2016.

Dermendzhieva, Zvezda. 2011. "Migration from the South Caucasus: who goes abroad and what are the economic implications?" Accessed October 8, 2016. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/ 14631377.2011.595135?scroll=top&needAccess=true.

Esadze, Ketevan. 2010. "Population Migration from Georgia to EU Countries." Accessed January 2017. http://ies.tsu.edu.ge/data/file_db /esadze/Ketevan%20Esadze%20Master%20Thesis%20Population%20Migr ation%20from%20Georgia%20to%20EU%20Countries.pdf.

ETF. 2013. "Migration and Skills in Armenia and Georgia." Accessed October 12, 2016. http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/B711838175EB7 62EC1257B4D0042FF65/$file/Migration&skills_Armenia&Georgia.pdf.

Galstyan, Mihran. 2011. *Labor-Migration of Rural Popoulation in Post-Soviet Period.* Accessed November 26, 2016. http://lraber.asj-oa.am/5862/1/2011-1-2_(164).pdf.

Grigoryan, Aleksandr. 2013. "Who else migrates from Armenia?" Accessed October 12, 2016. http://www.aea.am/files/papers/w1318.pdf.

ILO. 2009. *Migration and Development.* Yerevan: UN Armenia.

IOM. 2008. "Migration in Georgia: A Country Profile ." Accessed October 12, 2016. http://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/georgia _profile2008.pdf.

ISET. 2017. "Georgia and the Gravity of Migration."

Korobkov, Andrei. 2014. "The Post-Soviet Labor Migrations: The socio-economic, legal and financial aspects." Accessed October 12, 2016. http://citation.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/7/4/2/ 5/pages74259/p74259-2.php.

Labadze, Lasha, and Mirjan Tukhashvili. 2013. "Costs and Benefits of Labour Mobility between the EU and the Eastern Partnership Partner Countires." Accessed September 29, 2016. http://www.case-research.eu/sites/default/files/Georgia%20country%20study%20-%20final.pdf.

Makaryan, Gagik, and Mihran Galstyan. 2012. "Costs and Benefits of Labour Mobility between the EU and the Eastern Partnership Partner Countries." October 31. Accessed October 11, 2016. http://www.case-research.eu/sites/default/files/Armenia%20country%20study%20-%20final.pdf.

Manasyan, Heghine, and Gevork Poghosyan. 2012. "Social Impact of Migration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe." April. Accessed September 25, 2016. ec.europa.eu .

Mayda, Anna Maria. 2008. "International Migration: A panel data analysis of the determinants of bilateral flows." Accessed October 5, 2016. http://faculty.georgetown.edu/amm223/InternationalMigration.pdf.

MPC. 2013. "The Demographic-Economic Framework of Migration ." Accessed September 29, 2016. http://www.migrationpolicycentre.eu/docs/migration_profiles/Georgia.pdf.

O'Rourke, Kevin, and Richard Sinnott . 2013. "Migration Flows: Political Economy of Migration and the Empirical Challeneges." *IIIS Discussion Paper No. 6, SSRN.*

UN. 2012. "Migration and human mobility." Accessed October 5, 2016. http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/Think%20Pieces/13_migration.pd.

UNDP. 2009. "MIGRATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES." Accessed October 2, 2016. www.am.undp.org.

WorldBank. 2002. *Growth Challenges and Government Policies in Armenia.* Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

—. 2006. "Migration and Remittances." Accessed October 10, 2016. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTECA/Resources/257896-1167856389505/Migration_FullReport.pdf.

ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻՑ ԵՎ ՎՐԱՍՏԱՆԻՑ ՄԻԳՐԱՑԻԱՅԻ ՆՊԱՏԱԿԱԴՐՈՒՄՆԵՐԻ ՎՐԱ ԱԶԴՈՂ ԳՈՐԾՈՆՆԵՐԻ ՎԵՐԼՈՒԾՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ԸՍՏ ԿՈՎԿԱՍՅԱՆ ԲԱՐՈՄԵՏՐԻ 2015
Ամփոփագիր

Աննա Դալալյան,
ԱՈԻԿ- Ազրոբիզնեսի ուսուցման կենտրոն
anna.dalaryan@gmail.com

Բանալի բառեր. *գյուղական միգրացիա, տնային տնտեսություն, եկամուտ, զբաղվածություն, տնտեսական և քաղաքական գործոններ*

Անցած դարից ի վեր մեծացել են միգրացիոն հոսքերը Հարավային Կովկասի երկրներից: Այդ հոսքերը ունենում են ինչպես դրական, այնպես էլ բացասական ազդեցություն այն երկրների վրա, որոնցից հոսքը տեղի է ունենում: Մինչ այդպիսի ազդեցությունների վերլուծությունը, պետք է առավել խորը հաշվի առնել և ուսումնասիրել միգրացիայի մտադրություն ունենալու հիմքում ընկած պատճառները: Այս ուսումնասիրության համար կդիտարկվեն Հայաստանը և Վրաստանը, քանի որ երկար տարիներ այս երկրներում նկատվել են միգրացիայի համանման հատկություններ: Հաշվի առնելով այն փաստը, որ միգրանտների մեծամասնությունը Հայաստանի և Վրաստանի գյուղական բնակավայրերից է, այս ուսումնասիրությունը նպատակ ունի հասկանալու այն գործոնները, որոնք նպաստում են գյուղական բնակավայրերից արտագաղթելու մտադրություններին: Ուսումնասիրությունը իրականացնելու համար օգտագործվել է Կովկասյան հետազոտական ռեսուրսների կենտրոնի Հայաստանի և Վրաստանի տարածաշրջանային գրասենյակների կողմից 2015 թվականին իրականացված տնային տնտեսությունների

Կովկասյան բարոմետր հետազոտությունը, ինչպես նաև լոգիստիկ ռեգրեսիայի մոդելը, որն օգտագործվել է Հայաստանի և Վրաստանի գյուղական բնակավայրերից արտագաղթելու մտադրության վրա ազդող գործոնները գնահատելու համար: Ուսումնասիրության մեջ ներառված վերլուծության ենթակա հիմնական գործոններն են՝ տնային տնտեսությունների եկամուտները և զբաղվածությունը, իսկ որպես վերահսկող գործոններ՝ հարցվողի սեռը, տարիքը, կրթական մակարդակը, արտերկրում հարազատների առկայությունը, կառավարության և խորհրդարանի նկատմամբ վստահությունը և արդյոք կառավարությունը արդար է վերաբերվում բնակչությանը: Գնահատման արդյունքները ցույց տվեցին, որ Հայաստանի գյուղական վայրերից արտագաղթելու մտադրության վրա ազդող գործոններից վիճակագրորեն նշանակալի են հետևյալները՝ տնային տնտեսությունների եկամուտները, տարիքը, կրթական մակարդակը, կառավարության և խորհրդարանի նկատմամբ վստահությունը և արդյոք կառավարությունը արդար է վերաբերվում բնակչությանը: Վրաստանի գյուղական վայրերից արտագաղթելու մտադրության վրա ազդող գործոններից վիճակագրորեն նշանակալի են հետևյալները՝ սեռը, տարիքը, կրթական մակարդակը և արտերկրում հարազատների առկայությունը: