RESEARCH ARTICLE

WHY DO WOMEN MIGRATE INTERNALLY? EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF DETERMINANTS IN THE CASE OF ALBANIA

ETIS JORGJI
Faculty of Economy, University of Tirana, Tirana, Albania
Contact: etisjorgji@gmail.com

Abstract
Political changes in the early 1990s were associated by a series of economic and social changes, among which one the most important has been the migration. A considerable number of Albanians fled abroad or were displaced from less developed areas to more developed regions in search of better economic opportunities and better conditions of life. The main purpose of this study is to assess the determinants of internal migration in Albania during the transition period from a gender perspective. To analyze the determinants of migration is used multilevel logistic model, because this model approach aims to connect micro and macro models based in individual, family or contextual decisions level to migrate. On the basis of this model not only is analyzed the impact of the explanatory variables on the probability to migrate, but important conclusions arise regarding the existing differences in the probability to migrate between different categories. The contribution of this paper is emipirical and policy orientation; empirically, the study concludes that there are various factors that motivate women in the individual and family level and therefore has important implications for the design of gender-specific policies, particularly in the field of rural development. The findings in this study provide strong support for many of the traditional factors affecting migration, which include mobility by age, educational level, employment status. More importantly, it offers some findings related to the impact of family size and educational level of education on the probability to migrate.
Keywords: *internal migration; determinants; multilevel analysis, logistic regression*

Introduction

The collapse of the communist system in Albania in the early 1990s was associated with a range of essential economic, social, political and cultural transformation. Migration has been one of the most dynamic and one of the most important economical and social phenomena of transition (King, 2003; 2005 King & Vullnetari, 2003). Internal migration is an inevitable process today, which includes all age groups of the population and therefore no local or central government can avoid its treatment.

From the academic point of view, there is now an accepted consensus that migratory movements will continue in the future and will continue to be the key point of political and social challenges (Husa *et al.,* 2000). From a demographic perspective, migration is one of the main reasons for numerical changes (increase or decrease) of the population of a region or country, while being simultaneously an indication of social change (INSTAT, 2001).

For the first time in the history of Albania, families, individuals and social groups with different ways of dressing, mentality, lifestyle, past, are displaced in urban neighborhoods together (Dervishi, 2001; UNDP, 2002). Understanding the motivation of migrants, causes, trends and consequences, will help develop intervention strategies to minimize the negative effects of these flows and maximize the benefits that can be derived from them (King &Vullnetari, 2003).

The migration from villages to the cities is a direct result of difficulties in the agricultural sector. The situation is worse in villages and other rural areas. It is precisely the gap in income that has encouraged migration essentially rural – urban. People living in mountainous areas mainly in northern and southern regions of the country migrated to the

center as well as to the coast. The main reason is the economic difficulties that characterize the northern mountainous areas especially those without regional development, investment and small prospects for the future. Usually poor families migrate short distances due to financial resources, limited knowledge and skills.

In terms of gender, internal migration in Albania is dominated by women. Despite the major, already accepted role of women in international or internal migration, economists have been too slow in incorporating gender into the economic models of migration; gender has rarely been the focus of their studies and mostly served as a control variable.

There is now a growing acceptance in the social sciences related to the consideration of gender in the study of motives, the resultant and barriers to migration, although there have been few attempts to model explicitly the differences that exist in the determinants of migration between women and men. Such failures may result in incorrect conclusions, since theoretical and empirical models that focus on migration of men may not be effective in describing the migration of women. The main purpose of this study is to assess the determinants of internal migration in Albania during the transition period from a gender perspective.

Internal Migration in Albania: Literature Review

While Albania is known for its flows of international migration, it is fair to note there is considerable internal migration, which is understudied. Previous studies have shown that the internal and external migratory flows display specific characteristics in geographical terms as well as poverty; mainly internal migrants originated from the highlands and the north - east, migrate to the periphery of large urban centers and are generally poor (Zezza *et al.,* 2005). Internal migration in 1990 was at higher levels than emigration, but declined after the change of regime in 1992, to undergo a boom after the collapse of pyramid schemes in 1996-1997 (Hagen - Zanker & Azzarri, 2008).

In 2001, 60 percent of internal migration flows was rural - urban, where almost half of the internal flows were directed towards Tirana (INSTAT, 2004). Internal migration flowa in Albania are often characterized by the reallocation of the entire family and the proportion of female migrants is extremely high, reaching 54 percent (INSTAT, 2004). Based on data from population registers, Bërxholli (2000: 169) suggests that between 1992 and 2000, an average of 150.750 people per year have migrated within the country. Of these only 36% were displaced in an urban center, while the remaining 64% went to rural areas, including peri-urban areas of Tirana, Durrës, Shkodra, Korça, etc. Cumulatively a total of 1,356,750 people, were displaced during these nine years or 40% of the total population of 2000 and almost double the number of international migrants recorded by counting the population for 1989-2001.

Regarding the determinants of internal migration evidence suggests (Survey of the Living Standards, 1998) that the reasons associated with the decision to migrate have been diverse and range from reasons related to work (44 %), reasons related to residence (37 %), hope for a better life (17 %) and the return from exile (2 %). Almost three-quarters of domestic movements of families was attributed to economic reasons such as starting a new job, the search for a better job or insufficient land (Vullnetari, 2007: 62).

The main reasons for migration to the cities are connected to insufficient land to support their families, lack of mechanization, inefficient policies to support agricultural production and the competitiveness of imported products, the backwardness of the villages and the difficulty of access to the road, the difficulties of lending from banks etc. (World Bank, 2003). Besides economic reasons, there are psychological reasons too; cities exert a great attraction for young people and there is a distorted message regarding migrants in the context of the consumer society (World Bank, 2003). However it is important to note that migration rural - urban is necessary for the development of Albania, process that requires human resources more concentrated in urban areas (World Bank,

2003). Analysis of the reasons for migration supports the previous results, especially importance of economic factors in the decision to migrate, such as work-related aspects like wages, new opportunities and seeking a better quality of land are the main factors that cause people to migrate, although these determinants take greater importance in the higher levels of education (Cattaneo, 2006). High rates of unemployment and deep poverty experienced by families might have induced strong tendency to migrate (*ibid*). Migrants generally are of working age and highly educated (World Bank, 2007). Previous studies indicate that internal migrants have diversified social – economic experiences (De Soto *et al.*, 2002) and the main motive of reallocation appears to be economic, and mainly connected with jobb opportunities (Carletto *et al.*, 2004).

In the period 1990 - 2005, about 20 percent of adults are displaced within the country, a phenomenon that is dominated by individual migration, while migration of the family as a whole is not widely encountered (Dumani & Stringa, 2009). Albanian migration is selective in terms of education. Rural migrants were supposed to be "poor quality" and therefore have to accept common work as an aspect of their economic strategy. Despite this, the population census (2001) and other studies have shown that migrants not necessarily are characterized by lower educational level than urban residents. Migrants often are of working age and more educated (World Bank, 2007). Also migrants are relatively young, most of them belongs to the age group 20-40 years. The migrant population is young, the phenomenon in question therefore affects especially the active population, which resulted in a concentration of manpower in or around the major cities. Immigrants are more educated and tend to move to provide economic benefits, while generally they succeed in their purpose and in average and ceteris paribus, they have higher returns to their personal characteristics (Cattaneo, 2006).

Determinants of Internal Migration of Women: Empirical Analysis

Migration is a social-economic phenomenon, that can be studied at different levels - macro and micro - and under different approaches: inflows or outflows, gross or net migration. Mincer (1978) argues that the key determinants of migration affect both decisions at the household level as well as at the individual level in similar ways, while the main difference between them, lies in whether the decision to migrate is taken based on the net benefits of family or individual benefits resulting from the reallocation. Different studies have shown that migration of women is much higher in volume and complexity than previously thought and that migration has causes and consequences based on gender differences (Chant, 1992). The migration of women is growing, despite restrictions on them in terms of their subordinate position in the family and society, income and employment opportunities (UN, 1995). Changes in migration between men and women may be less prominent than those that exist between different age groups, but may become more distinct when comparing features and intensity of migration in a specific context. The rate of migration of women can grow at a faster pace after the age of 16 to reach a maximum at a younger age than men, whereas, it remains lower than that of men by the age of retirement, after which female migration rates can exceed those of men again.

While acknowledging the role of women in socio-economic development in developing countries, some analysts are focused on status and their migration (Bilsborrow & Zlotnik, 1992; Bilsborrow *et al.*, 1987; Bonney & Love, 1991; Donato, 1993). Their findings show that gender asymmetry exists in all areas of life: social - cultural, economic and political, with constraints and opportunities that differ for males and females. Results from Mexico showed that wage differences between men and women were larger than those between migrants and non-migrants; educational level of men and women has a positive effect on migration. Kanaiaupuni (2000) concludes single women are more likely than married women to migrate, while the probability of men to migrate increases with the number of children in the family, result not verified for female migrants. Possession of agricultural land also reduces the probability of migration

for women, while the exercise of business activity in the family discourages migration for both sexes, but is more pronounced for men.

The probability of migration of women was positively associated with employment opportunities outside the farm and statistically not influenced by the size of the family farm and distance (Bilsborrow *et al.,*1987). Liang & Chen (2004) concluded that women primarily migrate for reasons related to employment , thus rejecting the approach that they migrate for reasons related primarily to marriage. Donato (1993) and Cerrutti & Massey (2001) conclude that the ownership of the family on the land, home and business, reduce the probability of migration among women, while the ownership of the house, as a proxy of wealth boosts the probability of migrating males. Mora & Taylor (2006) resulted in significant negative effects of land and family educational level on the probability to migrate, while household size was not found to be important, but the property had a positive impact. Domestic migration is positively correlated with the size of the family; the greater the family the greater the tendency of the individual to leave the family (Zhu, 1998: 169). Family structure is expected to be important in terms of the number of generations in the family and the dependency rate. Other important variables are the number of farmers, family economic resources and income, family ties and towns in the vicinity. Families with higher incomes are more likely to have migrants; migrants are more likely to come from large families with low rates of dependency, few farmers, higher family income (Zhu, 1998: 169). Families who own more land per person tend to have higher incomes, which facilitates migration. According Kanaiaupuni (2000), "migration is a process essentially conventional; explanations concerning gender and migration of men in most cases do not apply to women." Not only academic researchers did not take into account gender in their theoretical and empirical studies, but the migration policy has been dazzling on gender and migration perspective designed just for men (Ghosh, 2009).

The Model and Explanatory Variables

To analyze the determinants of migration is used multilevel logistic model (multilevel logistic regression) because of the advantages it has in analyzing the determinants when the dependent variable has a binary nature. These kinds of models also take into account the hierarchical nature of the targeted population. Multilevel model approach aims to connect micro and macro models based in individual, family or contextual decisions level to migrate. On the basis of this model not only can analyze the impact of the explanatory variables on the probability to migrate, but on the basis of coefficients of the regression called odds ratio, conclusions can be drawn regarding the existing differences in the probability to migrate between different categories.

The equation will generally be writed:

$$\log\left(\frac{®_i^{migrant}}{®_i^{nonmigrant}}\right) = \quad _o + \quad _1 X_i$$

Individual Level Variables

Age (AGE) is considered by economic migration theories and empirical findings one of the determining factors of migration. In this study, individuals are divided into six age groups at the time of migration: children less than 15 years, young people (15-24 years), 25-34 years, 35-44 years, 45-64 years and over 65 years; a division which aims to present the different stages in the socio - economic stages in an individual life such as the end of high school, career, marriage and retirement.

Status (CIVILstatus) is another variable to be considered as a potential factor in the decision to migrate. Single individuals are more likely to migrate, possibly because of a reallocation costs are much lower than in the case of married individuals; therefore married people are less likely to migrate, while descriptive analysis shows that the proportion of married couples is dominant among migrants. The probability of being migrant rise to early forties and then falls. Status is also an important determinant of migration, although its impact is twofold; generally migrants tend to be young and single (Tutu, 1995), but other results show that migrants tend to be married (Ackah & Medvedev, 2010).

Level of education (Education) is a determinant of migration as proved by various empirical evidence. Individuals analyzed are organized into five groups based on their level of higher education as follows: no education, primary education, compulsory education, secondary education and higher education graduate/postgraduate. Expectations about this factor is that mobility increases with education level. However, in the presence of high rates of unemployment and lower wages in all industries, people from different groups can have the same probability to change residence regardless of their educational level. Impact of internal migration in economic conditions depends not only on the amount of people who move, but also the "quality" of their own.

Employment status (Employment status) is another explanatory variable of the decision to migrate. According to the LSMS data cannot draw any conclusions regarding the employment status before migration. As a rough indicator of economic status will be taken in 1990, which coincides with the beginning of transition in Albania. On the basis of economic status individuals divided into three groups: employed, unemployed and inactive (outside the labor force). Under the standard approach in the theory of migration, unemployed people are more mobile when they are looking for a job. For this reason, higher migration probabilities are expected to have the unemployed and inactive, compared with employees.

Variables at the household level

Among other important variables that explain the propensity to migrate is the level of education in individual and family level. Studies have shown that the level of education of the household head is an important factor that explains poverty, low education levels indicate high levels of poverty (Audet *et al.*, 2006). Family size also affects per capita consumer spending and consequently the tendency to migrate.

Another important variable is the source of family income if they originate from more than one source and if the source is of secondary agricultural sector or otherwise. Rural households that provide income from the agricultural sector or from one secondary tend to be poorer than families, the proceeds of which are provided by the public sector, they have owned the land or cattle, and as such tend to smaller be poor (Audet *et al.*, 2006). The mountainous region has not only greater incidence of poverty, but the depth of poverty and inequality is greater than in Tirana.

Van der Vlist *et al.*, (2002) studied the effects of the characteristics of the house to the mobility of the family and their findings confirmed that the families that have owned the apartment are less likely to move than those who rent it while the impact of family characteristics affect mobility in different ways depending on its location in urban or rural area. Migrants are less likely to come from families that have owned the property, while household size and the number of men over 15 years in the family are positively correlated with the probability to migrate, as it serves as a rough indicator of prosperity labor force experienced by families.

Results and Conclusions

The probability of migrating and age are positively correlated, even for rural migrants can be concluded that they are relatively young, perhaps because women in rural areas marry at a relatively younger age. Rural women less than 24 years were 9.9 times more likely to migrate than those over 45.

Civil status seem to adversely affect the probability to migrate both rural and urban migrants; so female migrants tend to be married, findings that could support the various empirical findings, according to which women migrate mainly for family reasons. This finding is a reflection of the Albanian reality and position of women in society Regarding the educational level, it can be concluded that rural migrants have generally low level of education, because the probability to migrate seems to be negatively correlated with the level of education. Women without education are 7.7 times more likely to settle in rural areas than those with a university education. The displacements are selective in terms of education level for women.

The results of displacement towards cities where the expected returns to human capital are higher, seems to be incentive to migrate to women with relatively high educational level.

Table 1. Logistic Model Results for Rural and Urban Migrant women

Variables		Rural Migrants		Urban Migrants	
		B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Age at the moment of migration	<24	2.210**	9.116	0.574**	1.775
	25-34	1.140**	3.126	0.203**	1.224
	35-44	0.685**	1.985	0.890**	2.435
	45 +		1.000		1.000
Civil Status	Single	-2.685**	0.068	-1.186**	0.305
	Married/Divorced		1.000		1.000
Educational level	Without /elementary (4)	2.041**	7.701	-0.110*	0.895
	8-9	1.039**	2.825	-0.037	0.964
	Middle	-1.037**	0.354	-0.011	0.989
	High(university)		1.000		1.000
Employment	Yes	0.162**	1.176	1.316**	3.728
	No		1.000		1.000
Activity in 1990	Employed	0.238**	1.327	0.847**	2.332
	Unemployed	-1.044**	0.352	1.113**	3.042
	Other		1.000		1.000
Family size	1-2	-1.688**	0.185	-0.501**	0.606
	3	-2.743**	0.064	-0.418**	0.658
	4	-1.623**	0.197	-0.177**	0.838
	5	-0.953**	0.386	-0.850**	0.427
	6+		1.000		1.000
House ownership	Non-owner	-1.750**	0.174	-0.338**	0.713
	Owner		1.000		1.000
Quintile of real consum	1	0.841**	2.318	-0.666**	0.514
	2	0.439**	1.551	-0.590**	0.554
	3	0.446**	1.562	-0.216**	0.806
	4	-0.579**	0.560	0.178**	1.195
	5		1.000		1.000
Source of family income	Without any source	2.595**	13.393	0.283**	1.327
	At least one source		1.000		1.000
Subjectiv perception of poverty	Very poor	0.792**	2.209	-0.273**	0.761
	Poor	-0.553**	0.702	-0.095*	0.909
	Average	-0.210**	0.811	0.357**	1.430
	Rich /very rich		1.000		1.000
Educational level of family (adults) members		0.411**	1.508	-0.008	0.992
The average age of family adult members		0.003	1.003	-0.028**	0.973
Children (under 15 years) number		0.040*	1.041	0.358**	1.430
Number of adult men		-1.134**	0.322	-0.977**	0.376
Constant		-4.307		1.483	
Pseudo R^2		0.40		0.23	
		67 622		87 144	

Source: author's calculation based on LSMS 2008 data. (** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$)

From the above, we can conclude that the reasons for the migration of these women simply do not relate to the family, but appears to be related to the career or the best opportunities of employment to the urban areas. Family size has a negative impact on the probability of

migrating, or more specifically, rural and urban migrants generally come from families with six or more members and smaller size discourages migration of their family.

The average age of adults, seems to positively affect migration of women to rural areas and negatively towards urban areas. The same conclusion can be drawn regarding the educational level of the family, while the number of children under 15 years seems positively impact their migration. Regarding the number of adult males in the family seems to have a negative impact on migration, probably due to their commitments in agriculture in regions of origin. Regarding the source of household income, it seems to be an important factor that encourages migration, especially to rural areas. Women who migrate to rural areas tend to come from families that have no income, and thus we can conclude that their migration can be considered as an alternative to leave the difficult economic conditions of families of origin. Finding seems to be reinforced by the results related to the probability of women to migrate depending on real consum spendings in the family. Women who move to rural areas seem to have originated from families belonging to lower quintiles, while this factor discourages migration to urban areas, women originated from relatively affluent families tend to move to urban areas. Regarding movements in different destinations, we can also conclude that the subjective poverty is a contributing factor. Women derived from households that consider themselves poor are more likely to move to rural areas, while this factor negatively affect or reduces the probability of their migration to urban areas. The results confirm the relative deprivation as a factor important to move to other rural areas in the case of women, while women stemming from relatively affluent families tend to move towards urban areas, probably due to better opportunities of life, which for them can be affordable, but not feasible in rural areas of origin.

The study has theoretical and political implications. First, multilevel approach considers the decision to migrate as an interaction of individual, family and community variables. This approach not only addresses the resultant migration of family decisions, but also underlines the selectivity of migrants. Moreover, the model can be used to analyze the effects of contextual factors in migration. Consequently, migrant women not only will not be accepted fundamental actors in this process, but the process of migration itself can be misunderstood by policymakers and consequently designed to wrong policies. While acknowledging that migration is a process of gender and identifying the different factors determinants and consequences for men and women, policymakers can develop right migration policies, from which can benefit both sexes as well as the regions of origin and those of destination.

References

1. Ackah, C. & Medvedev, D. (2010). Internal Migration in Ghana: Determinants and welfare impacts. Paper presented at the PEGNet Conference 2010: Policies to Foster and Sustain Equitable Development in Times of Crisis Development Bank of Southern Africa, Midrand South Africa, 2-3 September 2010.

2. Audet, M., Boccanfuso, D., Makdissi, P. (2006). The Geographic Determinants of Poverty in Albania, *Working Paper 06-12*, Groupe de Recherche en Économie et Développement International, Université de Sherbrooke

3. Barjaba, K., & King, R. (2005). Introducing and theorising Albanian migration. In R. King, N. Mai & S. Schwandner (Eds.), *New Albania Migrantion*: Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.

4. Bërxholi, A. (2000) *Regjistrimet e Përgjithshme të Popullsisë në Shqipëri. Vështrim Historik (Censuses in Albania. A Historical Perspective)*. Tirana: Akademia e Shkencave, Qendra e Studimeve Gjeografike.

5. Bilsborrow, R.E. & Zlotnik, H. (1992). Preleminary report of the United Nations Expert Group Meeting on the Feminization of Internal Migration, *International Migration Review* 26: 138 – 161

6. Bonney, N. & Love, J. (1991). Gender and migration: Geographical mobility and the wife's sacrifice, *The Sociological Review* 39: 335 – 348.

7. Carletto, C., Davis, B., Stampini, M., Trento, S., & Zezza, A. (2004). Internal Mobility and International Migration in Albania. ESA Working Paper 04(13).

***8.* Cattaneo, C. (2006).** The Determinants of Actual Migration and the Role of Wages and Unemployment in Albania: an Empirical Analysis. *LIUC Working Paper 16.*

9. Chant, S. (ed), (1992). *Gender and Migration in Developing Countries*, London: Belhaven Press

10. De Soto, H., Gordon, P., Gedeshi, I., & Sinoimeri, Z. (2002). *Poverty in Albania. A Qualitative Assessment*. Washington: World Bank.

11. Dervishi, Z. (2001) Urbanizimi i jetës së popullsisë fshatare apo ruralizimi i qyteteve? Rasti i Tiranës (Urban life of rural migrants or urban ruralisation? The case of Tirana). *Politika dhe Shoqëria*, 1(8): 33-42.

12. Donato, K.M. (1993). Current trends and patterns of female migration: Evidence from Mexico, *International Migration Review*, 27: 748 – 771.

13. Ghosh, Jayati (2009). Migration and Gender Empowerment: Recent Trends and Emerging Issues, United Nations Development Program (UNDP), *Human Development Reports*, Research Paper 2009/4.

14. Hagen – Zanker, J. & Azzarri, C. (2008). Are internal migrants in Albania leaving for the better?, *Working paper MGSoG/2008/WP008*, www.governance.unimaas.nl

15. INSTAT (2001). *Population and Housing Census 2001 – Living condition and inequality in Albania*, Albania

16. INSTAT (2004). Migration in Albania-Population and Housing Census 2001. Tirana: INSTAT

17. Kanaiaupuni, Shawn M. (2000). Reframing the Migration Questions: An Analysis of Men, Women, and Gender in Mexico, *Social Forces*, 78 (4): 1311-1347

18. King, R. (2005). Albania as a laboratory for the study of migration and development. *J. of Southern Europe and the Balkans, 7* (2).

19. King, R., Skeldon, R., & Vullnetari, J. (2008). *Internal and International Migration: Bridging the Theoretical Divide.* The IMISCOE Theories of Migration and Social Change Conference, Oxford.

20. Liang, Z., And White, M., (1996). "Internal migration in China, 1950-1988," *Demography* 33(3), pp. 375-384.

21. Mincer, Jacob (1978). Family migration decisions. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 86 (5), pp. 749-773.

22. Tutu. K. (1995). Determinants of Internal Migration. In: Twum-Baah, K.A., J.S. Nabila, and A.F. Aryee (Eds.). Migration Research Study in Ghana. 1. Internal Migration. Ghana Statistical Service (GSS). 97-113.

23. United Nations, (1995). *The World's Women: Trends and Statistics*, New York: United Nations

24. UN Population Division (2002). Replacement Migration: Is It a Solution to Declining and Aging Populations?

25. Van der Vlist A.J., Gorter, C., Nijkamp, P. & Rietveld, P. (2002). Residential mobility and local housing market differences, *Environment and Planning A*, 34, 1147 – 1164.

26. Vullnetari, J., & King, R. (2008). 'Does your granny eat grass?' On mass migration, care drain and the fate of older people in rural Albania. *Global Networks, 8*(2), 139-171.

27. World Bank & INSTAT (2003). *Albania: Poverty During Growth. A Poverty Profile of Albania*, background paper for the World Bank Poverty Assessment, Washington, DC and Tirana, World Bank and INSTAT. June 28, 2003 Report No. 40071- AL

28. World Bank (2007). Albania: Urban Growth, Migration and Poverty Reduction, A Poverty Assessment June 19, 2007

29. Zezza, A., Carletto, G., & Davis, B. (2005). Moving away from poverty: a spatial analysis of poverty and migration in Albania. *J. of Southern Europe and the Balkans, 7*(2).

30. Zhu, J. (1998). "Rural out-migration in China: A multilevel model," in *Migration, Urbanization, and Development: New Directions and Issues*. Ed. Richard E. Bilsborrow. New York: UNFPA; Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 157–186