EAST-WEST EUROPEAN MIGRATION AND THE ROLE OF MOTIVATION IN EMIGRATION DESIRES*

SUMMARY

International migration has been extensively studied in the second half of the century, but mainly from economic, demographic, sociological and cultural-anthropological viewpoints. Psychologists have shown somewhat less interest in the issue, focusing on acculturation and adjustment problems of migrants. With the globalization and acceleration of migration at present, the authors argue, psychologists should also get more involved in better understanding the "migrant personality". They propose a model of the motivational structure of emigrants. This model was tested with 1,050 college students in three Central/East European countries: Albania, the Czech Republic and Slovenia. As predicted, it was found that students who want to emigrate have higher achievement and power motivation than students who do not want to emigrate. If this pattern is confirmed in other studies, this could have a significant effect on migration policy and research.
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At present, there are at least two general tendencies in international migration - tendencies which are likely to play a major role in the next 20 years. The first is usually referred to as the “globalization of migration”, the tendency of most countries to be affected by migratory movements. The broad spectrum of economic, social and cultural backgrounds of migrants adds to the complexity of migratory processes. The second tendency is the “acceleration of migration” - the fact of constant quantitative growth of the migration flow in modernity (Castles & Miller, 1993). The growing volume and diversity of migration challenges researchers to accurately diagnose, understand, and ease the consequences of migration at both societal and personality level.

Researchers have been trying, at least for the last few decades, to reflect the diverse economic, cultural and social characteristics of migrants. Since the 1960’s an enormous number of publications has piled up, reflecting studies concerned mainly with the cultural differences, and the socio-economic characteristics of immigrants. For example, economists, sociologists and demographers have scrupulously examined the positive and negative effects of migration to the economy, the social structure and the population growth of receiving countries (cf. Collinson, 1993). The close interrelatedness between migration and ethnic relations has long been recognized, and extensively studied by ethnologists and cultural anthropologists (cf. Castles & Miller, 1993). Psychologists have mostly studied acculturation processes: how individuals with a variety of cultural backgrounds assimilate, integrate, separate or marginalize in the society of their choice (see e.g., Al-Issa, 1997a; Berry, 1992; Berry & Kim, 1988; Padilla, 1980). And clinical psychologists have been challenged, especially during the last three decades, by the influx of migration to the Western countries in answering the question “Can psychology and psychiatry that reflect the worldview of Western cultures, be reasonably applied to individuals who have been socialized in non-Western countries?” (cf. e.g., Al-Issa, 1997b; Rogler, 1993; Cole et al., 1992; Westermeyer et al., 1983; Williams et al., 1991; Al-Issa, 1997; Aponte et al., 1995). Within the large body of psychological work on migrants, there is a common focus - migrants have been studied within the context of cultures - the culture of origin and the culture of the receiving society. This has been a major step forward done in the last several decades in order to better understand migrants, and contribute to their psychological and physical well-being.

Psychologists, however, have not been particularly interested in studying personality characteristics of the (e/im)migrant, relatively independent of culture of origin and socio-economic status (cf. Rogler, 1994). In their very reasonable attempts to position the migrant into the context of cultures, researchers within a variety of disciplines seem to often ignore the fact that migrants, independent of which part of the world they come, are often those particular individuals who choose to migrate: they take a decision, and achieve a goal - to re-settle in another country (cf. De Jong &
Gardner, 1981). In a word, on the one hand, migrants should be studied within their complex social, economic, political and cultural backgrounds - a well-established approach in the second half of the century; on the other hand, migrants should be studied as individuals who choose to move, which could be associated with specific personality characteristics, comparatively independent of cultural origin and economic status - a definitely underdeveloped approach. It appears that environmental factors cannot fully account for such human factors. And if we are to explain migration solely by the ‘East-West economic gap’, then we are to (wrongly) conclude that migration will disappear once economic and political differences are narrowed. Students of the migration processes actually argue that migration flows are going to increase in the next century, while economic and political conditions in traditional emigrant countries are going to improve (see e.g., Appleyard, 1991).

Undoubtedly, migration acceleration is also a result of high communications and transportation technologies; yet, only some individuals take advantage of that by choosing to migrate. Also, some people tend to constantly migrate - it appears that individuals who have once migrated, are more willing to migrate again, as compared to those who have never migrated (see e.g., Kupiszewski, 1996; Sakkeus, 1994). Then, are there individuals who have a “migrant personality”? It is logical to assume that there is something in common about the personalities of those who choose to migrate. Then, it is logical to assume that there are certain personality differences between those who choose to migrate and those who don’t. Paradoxically, it is students of ethnicity and ethnic group diversity who have pointed out some personality specificities of those who emigrate, emphasizing, for example, that they “are self-selected and therefore more energetic and enterprising than those left behind…” (Glazer, 1990: 28; also cf. Suarez-Orozco, 1990).

The Migrant Personality

Who migrates? As pointed out earlier, research has been focused on the economic and political predictors of migration. Studies of international migration have examined the so-called “push factors” - the unfavorable conditions in a given country that make people leave the country, and “pull factors” - the favorable conditions in (usually) developed countries that attract people to choose to settle there (cf. De Jong & Fawcett, 1991; Mitchell, 1989; Richmond, 1988). However, such research does not answer a crucial question: why, in a given country, under common socio-political conditions (e.g., unfavorable political situation and/or poverty), only some choose to leave their country.
Studying the motivational structure of migrants appears to be a reasonable way of better understanding the concept of a migrant personality. Most migrants choose to leave their country of birth and settle in another country. Motivational psychologists study choice behavior - what the individual chooses to do and why. Motives reflect the underlying reasons for behavior. The motive disposition serves to energize, direct and select behavior within the framework of constraints and opportunities afforded by the environment (McAdams, 1984).

Within the frame of a motivational theory, originally developed and greatly stimulated by the works of McClelland (1961; 1975; 1985a), a model of the motivational structure of potential emigrants is proposed here. It is argued that potential emigrants have higher achievement and power motivation than non-migrants. The model is tested with data that was collected by Irene Frieze and colleagues in Albania, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia.

In 1991 Irene H. Frieze (Professor of Psychology, Business Administration, and Women’s Studies at the University of Pittsburgh), in collaboration with Anuska Ferligoj (Professor of Sociology at the University of Ljubljana), initiated a long-term survey research project of college students’ motivation and attitudes about work, family and gender issues. At that time, data was collected in Slovenia, the United States, and Japan. Since 1993 the study has been expanded to other countries in Central and Eastern Europe, also while Irene Frieze was working in Slovenia, Poland and the Czech Republic as a Fulbright scholar in 1994. A combined data base of all the survey data is being developed.

**Emigration in Central and Eastern Europe**

In 1990s Europe has been experiencing unprecedented migration flows. The actual migration size from Central and Eastern European countries to the West is difficult to estimate (for example, many migrants don’t have a illegal status) (cf. Ardittis, 1994; Kuprislewski, 1996). Chesnais (1991), reporting on a study for the European Community, found that the estimated size of population flow between 1991-1993 varies within the range of 500,000 to 20 million per year. Experts assume that at present the East-West migration flow is on average somewhere between 0.3 and 4.9 million per year (cf. Drbohlav, 1996).

In the era of socialism, most socialistic governments placed severe restrictions on emigration. Thus, although the “push-pull” factor (underspecialized economies, and totalitarian political systems) was present, there was not a considerable emigration from most of the socialist countries for most of the period before the mid-1980’s (cf. 338
Collinson, 1993; Boneva, 1992; Fassmann & Münz, 1994; Van de Kaa, 1993). (We exclude here the mass emigration for political reasons in the late 1950 s and the 1970 s - following the Hungarian Revolution, and the Prague Spring, and also, the migration of the so called nationals to their “country of origin”.) With the disintegration of the Soviet Block, the new governments have not restricted emigration as did the previous socialist governments (cf. Boneva, in press; Castes & Miller, 1993; Chesnais, 1991). “Opening the doors” of the ex-socialist countries, while the population experienced even greater economic hardships connected with transforming the state economies, have been undoubtedly major factors leading to mass emigration to the West in the early 1990’s (cf. Boneva, submitted; Münz & Ulrich, 1996; Wallace & Palyanitsya, 1995). There is an unquestionable “push” factor in the recent mass migration phenomenon in Europe. In a period of transition from socialism to democracy, the political and economic situation in all Central/East European countries has been unstable - although to various degrees. Industrial output growth turned negative after the changes were introduced, and inflation rates were very high at the beginning of the 1990s (cf. Winiecki, 1994). Wars have been the worst consequences.

A definite “push” factor in emigration is unemployment. Unemployment rates have become the highest these countries have ever encountered. A British study in the beginning of the 1990s predicted the unemployment of 12 million individuals in Central Europe within just a few years (cited in Rystad, 1992). At present unemployment in the Central European ex-socialist countries has decreased, and is similar to the West. But it should be stressed that unemployment virtually did not exist during socialism, people were used to having a job, and now being without a job appears very shocking to the population (cf. Kupislewski, 1996).

Within Central and Eastern Europe today unemployment rates are the highest among young adults with higher education or vocational training (Kupiszewski, 1996). In addition, the myth about “the unlimited opportunities of the West” may still be an important “pull factor” for those young people (Fassmann & Münz, 1994). Many speak about the attraction of unknown countries and the myth of the Western paradise, but information about the West, especially among the youth in these countries, is rather diffuse, and they have little idea about reality there (Drbohlav, 1996; cf. Boneva, 1992). All this could easily stimulate some young people, who feel that there are not enough opportunities for them, to want to leave their countries of birth.

Within this general picture, the socio-economic development of the ex-socialist European countries at the end of the 1990s actually differs considerably. Now there is a widely recognized 'split' between "Central" and "Eastern" European ex-socialist countries. The former (the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia and the Baltic Republics) are doing economically very well in the last three to four years - they have
stabilized economically and politically (cf. e.g., Borish & Noel, 1997; Kettle, 1996). So, it may be problematic now to argue that there is a very strong "push-pull" factor for the general population there to emigrate. Some authors do report decreases in emigration rates for Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary (e.g., Drbohlav, 1996; Juhasz & Dovenyi, 1996; Okolski, 1994; Wallace & Palyanitsya, 1995). Slovenia and the Baltic States have never been notably emigration countries (cf. Grecic, 1994). In fact, Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic are turning into immigration destinations (cf. Wallace & Palyanitsya, 1995; The World Factbook, 1995). These politically more stable, and economically more advanced ex-socialist countries may now act as a buffer zone for the mass emigration flows from further east (cf. Drbohlav, 1996).

Still, the Central European ex-socialist countries hold quite different places on the migration continuum. There seem to be at least two different migratory scenarios (cf. Drbohlav, 1996). First, there is the rather moderate and fairly quiet emigration from Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Poland and the Baltic states. Hungary and Slovenia have practically zero migration rates. Poland, on the other hand, a traditionally emigrant country, has a decreasing emigration flow. In a 1992 survey, for example, 38 percent of a national sample indicated an intention to emigrate for work abroad (as compared to 63 percent in 1988) (Okolski, 1994). However, two nationally representative surveys in 1991 pointed to a very low frequency (2 percent) of those who intended to settle abroad permanently. Emigration from Czechoslovakia was at a reasonable level until 1992, but is increasing since (due to temporary labor migration) (Pavlic & Maresova, 1994). Pavlic & Maresova (1994) argue that "the potential for labor migration from former Czechoslovakia is enormous", with the greatest interest among young people (117).

For the rest of Eastern Europe, researchers agree, a second migratory scenario applies: "incessant and rather strong" or "aggressive and quick" migration flows (Drbohlav, 1996). Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, and Russia (not to mention Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia and ex-Yugoslavia, where the political and economic situation is extremely complicated) have all been going through a very difficult transition period. Their economies have not been doing well, and the political situation has been unstable in all of them for at least certain periods of time (see e.g., Kupiszewski, 1996; Van de Kaa, 1993). Under such conditions, it would logically be expected that many of their citizens will try to emigrate. However, emigration rates

---

1 It should be noted here that for the present study it does not matter if an individual chooses to emigrate for good, or to go to work abroad temporarily. The very act of migration - choosing to live in another country is a focus of interest here. Also, it has been well documented that many of those who go abroad intending to work there "only temporarily", later stay for good (cf. e.g., Drbohlav, 1996).
and emigration desires differ in these countries, too. While in Albania, to use the words of Van de Kaa (1993), “given the chance, the whole Albanian population of 3.5 million would be ready to pack its bags”, and among Romanians there is a similar propensity to emigrate (495), Bulgarians and Russians are less willing to emigrate than could be expected (Drbohlav, 1996; Van de Kaa, 1993; cf. Boneva, in press; 1995).

Within this context, Albania, the Czech Republic and Slovenia have been chosen to test our model. Each of the countries represents one particular type of emigration pattern: Slovenia is probably an area of the lowest emigration. Albania appears to be at the other extreme. And the Czech Republic is in-between: a lot of immigrants enter the country, and still a certain number of Czechs constantly emigrate (with a considerable level of temporary labor abroad).

**Albania.** The survey was administered there in 1996, a year before an unprecedented emigration flow from the country. Albania has one of the highest emigration rates in Europe - the officially estimated rate of 5 emigrants per 1,000 for 1995 (Costa, 1995) may be well below the real rate of emigration, considered to have amounted to 13% of the population in 1992 (INSTAT/UNFPA, 1996). Albania was one of the few European countries where a Stalinist-type political and economic system existed from World War II till 1991. For more than four decades highly restrictive China-oriented politics and a centrally planned economy kept Albania an extremely poor country, isolated from the world (cf. Schmidt, 1996; Zickel & Iwaskes, 1992). Agriculture, Albanian economy’s traditional mainstay, largely suffered from the Stalinist collectivization since the late 1940s, and the food output fell short of the needs of the rapidly increasing population (Duffy, 1995). Since April 1991 very slow political and economic changes have been initiated in the country. In its June 1991 economic program, the new government called for “rapid privatization” of state-owned property, including relinquishment of agricultural land to private farmers. The economy slightly rebounded in the 1993-1994 period, after the severe depression accompanying the beginning of the transformation of the centrally planned economy and agriculture in 1991. However, the economy’s paralysis by still existing Stalinist-ideology thinking, and widespread popular unrest have hindered going forward with privatization (cf. Zickel & Iwaskes, 1992; World Factbook, 1995). Albania’s limited industrial sector continued to decline in 1995. Large segments of the population, especially in the cities, continue to depend on humanitarian aid to meet basic food requirements. Unemployment is now a severe problem - the national average approaching 20% of the workforce in 1994 and 1995, with industrial areas having a rate of 30% (cf. Albania Human Development Report, 1996; Schmidt, 1996; World Factbook, 1995). Since March 1997, with the collapse of a get-rich-quick investment scheme,
political unrest has endangered reform and reversed the tendency of slow stabilization of the economy. This has also resulted in an influx of some 16,000 Albanian refugees to Italy in only the first days of the crisis (cf. e.g., Bohlen in The New York Times, June 8, 1997; RFE/RL Newsline, 23 May, 1997). There is obviously a very strong “push-pull” factor for Albanians to emigrate. Students of migration flows in Europe point out that the country is considered “a major threat” of emigration influx to the West (e.g. Van de Kaa, 1993).

The Czech Republic. The survey in the Czech Republic was carried out in 1994, a year after the breakup of the Czechoslovakian federation (on January 1, 1993). Since its independent existence, the Czech Republic has made the most rapid economic progress among the ex-socialist countries in Europe (Kettle, 1996). For example, the employment rate in the industry went up to 95.5% in 1993 from 84.1% in 1991. The inflation rate has stabilized, and exports to the West increased significantly after the break-up (Winiecki, 1993). The private sector share in the Czech economy went from 5 percent in 1989 to 60 percent in 1995 (Borish & Noel, 1997).

Even so, the Czech Republic could not quite avoid the negative consequences of the transition period. In 1993 the industrial output growth was still negative (Gabal, 1995). Major reform in the banking sector is still being postponed (Borish & Noel, 1997). Although the economy is rapidly stabilizing, and inflation is low, anxiety accompanies the transition period. In a recent survey, 86% of the respondents indicate inflation as their biggest concern (Rose & Hearpfer, 1996).

At present the Czech Republic is reported as having zero net migration rate (The World Factbook, 1995) - because of low emigration rates, but mainly because of the increasing rates of immigration into the country (cf. Wallace & Palyanitsya, 1995). Although the economy has stabilized, some Czechs still emigrate, or leave temporarily for jobs abroad (then some decide to remain there for good), or commute regularly across the border for work. However, there is no reliable statistical data on the size and the type of population movements (cf. Chesnais, 1991; Martin, 1992; Wallace & Palyanitsya, 1995). In a survey in 1991 carried out by the Institute of Social and Political Sciences of Charles University, one in six respondents expressed an interest in working abroad. The greatest interest appeared among respondents below 25, and decreased among older respondents (Pavlik & Maresova, 1994).

Slovenia. Surveys were administered there in 1993, 1994 and 1995. Slovenia, one of the newly formed countries after the dissolution of Yugoslavia, has been independent since mid-1991. It was been the most prosperous of the regions making up the former Yugoslavia, with many industries (cf. Bufon, 1996). With the transition from a state owned and controlled economy to a market economy, two major consequences followed. First, in 1992 unemployment was up to three times the 1989 level
- mainly because some companies that were not profitable were no longer supported by the government and went bankrupt. Second, privatization of part of the earlier nationalized industries has been slow. Privatization rates are much lower than in the Czech Republic (cf. Markotich, 1996).

Like the Czech Republic in Central Europe, Slovenia is doing well economically at present, and is considered one of the Central European countries in the group of Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic (cf. Bufon, 1996). Slovenia has never experienced great emigration of its nationals. Rather, it has been an immigration destination of other (ex) Yugoslav nationals (Grecic, 1994). Since 1980s immigration rates in Slovenia have been increasing, while emigration rates have been declining - from 6,710 in 1980 to only 984 in 1994 (Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia, 1996). Thus, the country may well be the Central-European country with the lowest emigration rate (lower than the Czech Republic and even Hungary) (cf. Drbohlav, 1996).

Theoretical Frame of the Study

The study of human motivation has been of particular interest to personality psychologists since the work of Murray (1938), who identified a list of motives that might drive behavior. McClelland’s theory of the achievement and power motives (McClelland, 1961; 1985; McClelland et al., 1973), that draws upon Murray’s work, is the theoretical frame of this study. Motives have generally been thought of as the stable underlying basis of behavior, largely formed in childhood; thus, motives are not easily open to change, even under radical environmental changes (cf. Emmons & King, 1989; McClelland, 1961; 1985). Each motive refers to a cluster of affectively-toned desired goal-states, which can be expressed in a variety of alternative ways. The latter are labeled as “outlets” or behavioral correlates of the motive (cf. McAdams, 1984; McClelland, 1985a). Behavior is determined not only by motives, but also, for example, by person’s skills and values, and the characteristics of the environment. Motives are believed to account for the long-term behavioral tendencies, hence, for the consistency of the personality (cf. e.g., Emmons, 1995; McClelland, 1985b; Winter & Stewart, 1995). If an individual’s motive is frustrated within a given environment, she or he may try to find a better environment to express her or his motive. Thus, individual’s achievement and power motives may influence, under given cultural and socio-economic conditions, whether he or she will choose to emigrate.

The achievement motive was initially defined by McClelland as a recurrent concern to do better for its own sake, for the intrinsic satisfaction of doing better, to meet or surpass some standard of excellence, to excel, or do something challenging and unique (McClelland, 1961). Doing better often means finding a shorter, or more effi-
cient path to a goal. As McClelland writes, “it would be more accurate to call the achievement motive the efficiency motive, since the motive of doing things better involves efficiency calculations” (cf. McClelland, 1985a: 249).

Later studies, however, have found that achievement motivation is not a unitary structure. While strivings to work hard and to do better for its own sake, and to master or exceed a personal standard reveal the essence of the motive, competitiveness has also been found to be a major component of achievement motivation (e.g., Cassidy & Lynn, 1989; Jackson et al., 1976; Spence & Helmreich, 1979; Veroff & Veroff, 1980). McClelland (1961) and Atkinson (1964) were the first to show that “achievers” perform at a higher level when they can compare results with others. Helmreich & Spence (1978) have identified three relatively independent components within the achievement motive: Work (“desire to work hard”), Mastery (“desire for intellectual or physical challenge”), and Competitiveness (“desire to succeed in competitive interpersonal situations”), and have developed subscales to measure each of these components.

Most of the research on achievement motivation has been concentrated on school achievement and doing well in business (and career success) (e.g., Fyans, 1980; McClelland, 1985a; Spence, 1980; Veroff, 1982). Only a few studies have linked achievement motivation to innovativeness, avoiding routine, or migration (cf. McClelland, 1985a). In his in-depth study of Navaho Indians Kolp (1965) found high achievement motivation to be associated with a specific behavioral pattern - a tendency to travel in constant search for a more challenging goal, which he termed “restlessness”. Using McClelland’s (1961) work showing a correlation between achievement motivation of the population and the economic development of a country, Matter (1977) studied the relationship between the achievement motive score and the migration patterns of graduates in a mid-Western United States community within a period of sixty years. He found that during a period of economic growth, mean achievement-motivation scores were significantly higher for those remaining in the community than for those who left. For the periods of economic stability or decline, however, mean achievement-motivation scores were higher for those who left than for those remaining in the community (Matter, 1977).

It can be argued that “high achievers” will seek better opportunities in new socio-economic environments out of a country, if their immediate social environment does not afford enough options for “outlets”. Also, it can be assumed that those who want to emigrate tend to be motivated by “desire for intellectual or physical challenge” (Mastery motivation), and “desire to succeed in competitive situations” (Competitiveness motivation), but not necessarily by “desire to work hard” (Work motivation). Working hard for its own sake, it is assumed, is not a part of the ‘core’ of the
“emigrant motivation” that refers to a constant search for challenges (Mastery) and competition (Competitiveness). The presumption that individuals who want to emigrate will tend to have higher achievement motivation, and in particular, they tend to be in search of more challenging goals (Mastery motivation), and aspire for more competitive situations (Competitiveness motivation) than individuals who do not want to emigrate has been tested in the present study on potential emigrants in Albania, the Czech Republic and Slovenia.

The power motive is defined as a recurrent preference or readiness for experiences of having impact, control, or influence over others and the world (McClelland, 1975; Winter, 1973). This is most often expressed either as a desire to lead, to feel strong and powerful, or as a desire to gain fame, public attention, or recognition (cf. McAdams, 1988a; McClelland, 1975; 1985; Winter, 1973). Similar to "high achievers", power-oriented individuals are often concerned about developing skills, and doing well in school or on the job, but they do this in order to be recognized, to become "visible", to "gain reputation or position" (McClelland, 1985a: 304). Thus, similar to achievement motivation, the need for power is associated with a distinctive interpersonal style - a competitive approach in all types of interaction. Competition, however, is a means to dominance rather than to excellence - to lead, to gain a position, or to become prominent, recognized (cf. Winter, 1973: 119; Winter & Stewart, 1978).

As there are numerous forms of power and influence, power motivation can be understood best as energizing instrumental behaviors - a variety of behaviors, through which a person can acquire the feeling of having impact, or control, or influence. However, most power outlets are less socially acceptable than achievement outlets (McClelland, 1985a). Empirical research has linked power motivation to strivings for an autonomous control of one's own life, and risk-taking (see e.g., McClelland, 1975; 1985; Winter, 1973). It is assumed that such strivings, if frustrated, can easily influence decision-making to emigrate. Striving for prominence, or recognition - another pervasive expression of power, is often expressed in a desire for wealth and prestigious possessions (cf. McClelland, 1985a; Winter, 1973). If such strivings are frustrated by the social environment, a power motivated person may, logically, seek better opportunities for becoming recognized, gaining wealth and prestigious possessions by emigrating. These presumptions have not been previously tested.

On the other hand, power motivation has been associated with a negative self-image and dissatisfaction with status. The general disposition of power-oriented people is believed to be dissatisfaction with one's position in society and with the status quo (e.g., McClelland, 1975; Winter, 1973). A decision to emigrate could be associated with such a disposition.
As evident, the power motive, like the achievement motive, is not a unitary construct. However, there is less research on what its major components are. In this study, based on the work of McClelland (1975; 1985) and Winter (1973), three components of the power motive are outlined: the desire for control and authority over others, or Leadership, the desire to become prominent, to be recognized by others - Prominence, and the desire to have impact, to act on behalf of others, to help in order to influence other's lives - Helping power. Winter (1996) emphasizes personal power (the Leadership component in our study) as the 'core' of the power motive. Leadership motivation can easily be frustrated under conditions of socio-political change in Central/Eastern European countries, where the meaning of "power" is being re-defined. More generally, it can be argued that a country of economic decline or stagnation and/or political uncertainty will afford less opportunities for well-defined control and authority over others. The other power motive component - Prominence, refers to strivings to do things in order to draw attention to oneself, or to acquire wealth and prestige possessions in order to impress others (cf. McClelland, 1985a; Winter, 1988). These have been well-recognized strivings of some emigrants (see e.g., De Vos, 1990). To generalize, potential migrants are expected to score higher on Leadership and Prominence motivation as compared to non-migrants. On the other hand, it is assumed that acting powerfully on behalf of others, or Helping motivation within the Power motive can more easily find acceptable "outlets" in most social environments. Because of this, no prediction can be made on the Helping motivation of potential migrants and non-migrants.

Method

Study Participants

Data were collected between the years 1993 and 1996. All 1,050 study participants were college students. Sample sizes varied across countries and are shown in detail in Table 1. The survey was administered in the Czech Republic in 1994 (the sample was drawn from business students), and in Albania in 1996 (mixed sample). For Slovenia, samples in 1993 and 1994 were social science students, while the 1995 sample was economic students. Questionnaires varied slightly, but all included the Achievement Motivation Scale (Helmreich & Spence, 1978), and all but Albania - the Power Motivation Scale (Schmidt & Frieze, 1997). Survey items were translated from English into the language of the country by native speakers, and translated back into English by a second person to check the accuracy of translation.
Table 1: Desired Place to Live for the Majority of Their Adult Lives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country and year</th>
<th>Where I am now</th>
<th>Within 100 miles</th>
<th>In another part</th>
<th>In another country</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>25\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>12\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>8\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>37\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>(19.4%)</td>
<td>(9.3%)</td>
<td>(6.2%)</td>
<td>(28.7%)</td>
<td>(36.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>46\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>34\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>15\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>27\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>(28.0%)</td>
<td>(20.7%)</td>
<td>(9.1%)</td>
<td>(16.5%)</td>
<td>(25.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>59\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>58\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>(27.6%)</td>
<td>(27.1%)</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
<td>(27.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>35\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>38\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>(22.7%)</td>
<td>(24.7%)</td>
<td>(16.2%)</td>
<td>(36.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>74\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>166\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>(19.0%)</td>
<td>(42.7%)</td>
<td>(8.2%)</td>
<td>(30.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Slovenia is a small country, so the within 100 miles option was not provided.
\textsuperscript{a} - Potential (e)migrants
\textsuperscript{b} - Comparison groups

Emigration desires were tapped by the question “Where would you like to live for the majority of your adult life?” Studies on the dynamics of migration decision-making processes have shown that desire to move is the first step to the actual move (see e.g., Goldsmith & Beegle, 1962; Taylor, 1969). We identified as potential emigrants those respondents who chose the option to live in another country for the rest of their lives. Our comparison group comprised those who chose to stay in their country of birth, independent of the particular choices for settlement within the country. For the purposes of our study, we decided to ignore the process of migration within each of the countries of concern. “Do not know” answers for all samples were treated as missing, too (See Table 1). Significance tests of Pearson correlation showed no sex differences in emigration desires in any of the countries.
Measurement

As mentioned before, McClelland (1961) defines the Achievement motive as a recurrent concern to do better for its own sake, to surpass a personal standard of excellence, and to do something challenging and unique. There have been a number of attempts to measure achievement motivation by objective measures (e.g., Cassidy & Lynn, 1989; Jackson et al., 1976; Piedmont, 1989; Smith, 1973; Helmreich & Spence, 1978). The scale developed by Helmreich & Spence (1978) most closely follows McClelland’s definition of the Achievement motive. Their Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire (WOFO) has two parts. The first part consists of twenty-three items measuring the achievement motive. The validity of the Achievement scales was explored in a number of studies, administering the WOFO questionnaire to several types of samples (see Helmreich & Spence, 1978; Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

Factor analysis of the items confirmed earlier voiced arguments that achievement motivation is a multidimensional phenomenon. Subscales derived from the analysis were designated: Work (the desire to work hard), Mastery (the preference for challenging tasks and for meeting internal standards of excellence), and Competitiveness (the enjoyment of interpersonal competition) (Helmreich & Spence, 1978). This three-component measure of achievement motivation at least partially overlaps with previously identified dimensions (cf. Cassidy & Lynn, 1989; Jackson et al., 1976; Veroff et al., 1975). Helmreich and Spence (1978) report Cronbach alphas of .64 for the Work scale, .61 for the Mastery, and .74 for the Competitiveness subscales. In a replication of the Achievement scales reliability computations, Johnson and Perlow (1992) report reliability based on a sample of 390 college students: .55 for the Work, .63 for the Mastery and .71 for the Competitiveness subscales. In spite of these low alphas, the scales have been extensively used as an objective measure of the achievement motive (cf. Spence & Helmreich, 1983; Veroff, 1982).

The Achievement scale for this study comprises twenty-two items, and is a modified Helmreich & Spence Achievement scale. Reliability data was computed on a larger sample than used here, and included United States students. Although not inconsistent with other studies, the reliability of the original scale for our sample of 1,864 college students was comparatively low (Cronbach’s alpha=.70). To improve Cronbach alpha, five of the original items were deleted for the analysis. Item 23 (“I find satisfaction in exceeding my previous performance even if I don’t outperform others”) was dropped because of our inconsistent use of this item in the different countries. For example, it was not used with the Slovene sample in 1993, or with the Czech sample. A consistent Achievement scale for all countries was selected for the
statistical analysis. This principle was also followed in deciding to delete four other original items, because these items showed negative correlations for the Slovene data of 1995 (item #1 “It is important for me to do whatever I’m doing as well as I can even if it isn’t popular with people around me”), for the Albanian data (item #7 “I would rather do something at which I feel confident and relaxed than something which is challenging and difficult” - reversed), for the Czech and the Albanian data (item #9 “I would rather learn easy fun games than difficult thought games” - reversed), and for the Czech data (item #12 “I prefer to do things that require a high level of skill”).

Four other items were added to the reduced scale, designed so that they closely followed McClelland’s definition of the Achievement motive. They involve improving one’s performance over a long period of time (item #4: “Doing something better than I have in the past is very satisfying”, item #21: “The more talents I acquire, the more successful I will feel”, and item #22: “I enjoy improving upon my past performance”), and doing something unique (item #20: “Learning to do something unique gives me a sense of satisfaction”). This final (modified) Achievement scale that is used in the statistical analysis here has Cronbach alpha .75.

To identify the three basic components of the achievement motive among emigrants, we use slightly modified Work, Mastery and Competitiveness subscales (items deleted in the overall scale were not used in the subscales either). Five items (“I find satisfaction in doing things as well as I can”; “There is satisfaction in a job well done”; “Doing something better than I have in the past is very satisfying”; “I like to work hard”; “Part of my enjoyment in doing things is improving my past performance”) comprise the Work subscale (Alpha= .66). Nine items of the Mastery subscale (“When a group I belong to plans an activity, I would rather direct it myself than just help out and have someone else organize it.”; “If I’m not good at something I would rather keep struggling to master it than move on to something I may be good at.”; “Once I undertake a task, I persist.”; “I prefer to do things that require a high level of skill.”; “I more often attempt tasks that I am sure I can do than tasks I believe I can do.”; “I like to be busy all the time.”; “The more talents I acquire, the more successful I feel I will be.”; “I enjoy improving upon my past performance.”; “I find satisfaction in exceeding my previous performance even if I don’t outperform others.”) measure the striving to do better and better, the desire for intellectual and physical challenge (Alpha= .56). Five items (“I try harder when I’m in competition with other people.”; “I enjoy being in competition with others.”; “It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.”; “It is important to me to perform better than others on a task.”; “I feel that winning is important in both work and games.”) comprise the Competitiveness subscale (Alpha= .74). These subscale alphas are low (although compatible with earlier reported Cronbach alphas), but we used the scales because of their previous use in the literature.
The Power motivation scale (Schmidt & Frieze, 1997) was constructed as a self-report measure of the power motive. Schmidt and Frieze (1997) report high reliability (Alpha=.86). For our study the Power motive Cronbach’s alpha coefficient reliability estimate was .86. As power motivation is not a unitary structure either, we selected three subscales from the Power motivation scale, based on theory and confirmed by a factor analysis. Five items (“If given the chance, I would make a good leader of people.”; “I enjoy planning things and deciding what other people should do.”; “I think I would enjoy having authority over other people.”; “I like to give orders and get things going.”; “I think I am usually a leader in my group.”) were found to measure the striving to be a leader, to attain a prestigious status (the Leadership subscale) (Alpha=.81). Six items (“I would like doing something important where people looked up to me I find satisfaction in having influence over others.”; “I enjoy debating with others in order to get them to see things my way.”; “I want to be a prominent person in my community.”; “I like to be admired for my achievements.”) measure doing something better in order to be recognized, to become prominent, visible through having impact on others (the Prominence subscale) (Alpha =.75). Five other items (“I would like for my ideas to help people.”; “I often worry that the next generation will live in a worse world than the one I live in.”; “I am very concerned over the welfare of others.”; “When people I know are trying to solve problems, my gut instinct is to offer them helpful suggestions.”; “It would be very satisfying to be able to have impact on the quality of others’ lives.”) were first selected to measure “socialized power”, or acting on behalf of others (Helping subscale). Since item #15 (“I often worry that the next generation will live in a worse world than the one I live in”) reduced considerably the Cronbach alpha of the subscale, we dropped it in the final Helping subscale (Alpha=.72).

Results

Our major variable was based on reports of where the participants wanted to live for the majority of their adult lives. The wording of the response scales differed somewhat, but always included a “don’t know” option and an option for “in another country”. (Frequencies of responses to these categories are shown in Table 1.) As expected Albanian students were most interested in emigration, while moving to another country was least selected by Slovenian students.

Overall motivation scores. 2 X 2 (sex by desire to migrate) MANOVAs were done for the Slovenia and Czech data. For Slovenia, the main effects of desire to emigrate were significant in the predicted direction. Those wanting to leave the country scored higher on achievement (F (1, 522)=20.10, p<.0001), and on power (F (1,
522)=5.44, p<.02). No other main effect or interaction were significant for Slovenia. For the Czech data, the predicted differences between those who wanted to stay and those who wanted to leave were also confirmed for both the achievement scores (F (1, 118)=17.61, p<.0001), and the power scores (F (1, 118)=12.65, p<.001). There was also a main effect for sex for the achievement scores (F (1,118)=6.54, p<.012). The interaction was not found significant. A univariate analysis was done for Albania, because the Power motivation scale was not included in the questionnaire there. The predicted difference between those who wanted to stay and those who wanted to leave was confirmed in the analysis of the achievement scores (F (1, 78)=15.03, p<.0001). The interaction was not significant, and there was no main effect on sex for Albania. (See Table 2.)

Table 2: Mean Achievement and Power Motivation Scores for Those Wanting to Stay or Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Motivation Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to stay</td>
<td>3.66 (.62) a***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to leave</td>
<td>4.16 (.52) b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to stay</td>
<td>3.51 (.63) a***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to leave</td>
<td>3.98 (.42) b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to stay</td>
<td>3.60 (.39) a***</td>
<td>3.35 (.44) a**</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to leave</td>
<td>3.96 (.24) b</td>
<td>3.69 (.28) b</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to stay</td>
<td>3.45 (.30) c***</td>
<td>3.32 (.38) a**</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to leave</td>
<td>3.72 (.46) d</td>
<td>3.61 (.51) b</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to stay</td>
<td>3.62 (.35) a***</td>
<td>3.45 (.46) a*</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to leave</td>
<td>3.78 (.47) b</td>
<td>3.51 (.62) b</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motivation subscales. Sex by desire to migrate (2 X 2) MANOVAs were done for the Czech Republic and Slovenia separately, using the three Achievement and the three Power motivation subscales as the dependent variables (means are shown in Tables 3 and 4). Our predictions were confirmed for both countries. For the Slovenia data we found main effects for desire to emigrate on Mastery (F (1, 522)=20.35, p<.005), Competitiveness (F (1, 522)=9.46, p<.002), and on Prominence (F (1, 522)=6.00, p<.015) scores, with those wanting to emigrate scoring higher that those who wanted to stay. For the Czech Republic, there was no interaction. The predicted differences in those wanting to stay and those wanting to leave were found for the Mastery, Competitiveness, Leadership and Prominence motives. As predicted, there was no main effect on Work or Helping. There was also a main effect for sex on the Mastery subscale (F (1, 118)=5.78, p<.018), with men scoring higher than women.

Table 3: Achievement Motivation Subscales: Mean Work, Mastery, and Competitiveness Motivation Scores for Those Wanting to Stay or Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to stay</td>
<td>3.62 (.36) a***</td>
<td>3.36 (.51) a*</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to leave</td>
<td>3.84 (.39) b</td>
<td>3.57 (.52) b</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Motive scores ranged from 1=low to 5=high.
Means in the same column with different subscripts are significantly different within motivation ratings.
* p<.05
**p<.001
***p<.0001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Competitiveness</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Czech Republic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to stay</td>
<td>4.14 (.47)</td>
<td>3.38 (.38)</td>
<td>3.40 (.84)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to leave</td>
<td>4.25 (.51)</td>
<td>3.67 (.38)</td>
<td>4.12 (.45)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to stay</td>
<td>4.03 (.44)</td>
<td>3.22 (.34)</td>
<td>3.21 (.60)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to leave</td>
<td>4.10 (.44)</td>
<td>3.43 (.47)</td>
<td>3.78 (.71)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slovenia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to stay</td>
<td>4.08 (.45)</td>
<td>3.49 (.42)</td>
<td>3.36 (.61)</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to leave</td>
<td>4.14 (.52)</td>
<td>3.68 (.62)</td>
<td>3.57 (.87)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to stay</td>
<td>4.18 (.39)</td>
<td>3.46 (.41)</td>
<td>3.33 (.68)</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to leave</td>
<td>4.28 (.47)</td>
<td>3.72 (.44)</td>
<td>3.59 (.71)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Motive scores ranged from 1=low to 5=high.
Means in the same column with different subscripts are significantly different within motivation ratings.
* p<.05
**p<.001
***p<.0001

Table 4: Power Motivation Subscales: Mean Leadership, Prominence, and Helping Motivation Scores for Those Wanting to Stay or Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Prominence</th>
<th>Helping</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Czech Republic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to stay</td>
<td>3.19 (.59)</td>
<td>3.58 (.62)</td>
<td>3.36 (.52)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to leave</td>
<td>3.73 (.52)</td>
<td>4.06 (.48)</td>
<td>3.42 (.57)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to stay</td>
<td>3.14 (.64)</td>
<td>3.44 (.48)</td>
<td>3.50 (.44)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to leave</td>
<td>3.73 (.62)</td>
<td>3.83 (.74)</td>
<td>3.15 (.60)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Albania a 2 X 2 (sex by desire to migrate) MANOVA was done, using only the three Achievement motivation subscales - Work, Mastery and Competitiveness as the dependent variables, because Power motivation was not measured there. The predicted differences between those who wanted to stay and those who wanted to leave were confirmed for both Mastery and Competitiveness scores. However, contrary to our predictions, there was also a main effect on Work scores for Albania ($F(1, 78) = 4.25, p < .043$). (See Table 3.) The interaction, and the main effect for sex were not found significant.

**Discussion**

Our results confirmed that potential emigrants are highly achievement motivated people. In all three countries that we surveyed, those who want to emigrate have higher achievement motivation as compared to those who do not want to emigrate. The achievement motivation is best expressed in trying to always do things better and better, to excel one's own standard - in our study measured by Mastery subscale, and to succeed in competitive interpersonal situations (measured by Competitiveness subscale). In all three countries students who wanted to emigrate scored significantly higher on Mastery and Competitiveness than students who did not want to move after graduation.

Between 8.2 and 28.7 percent of the students in our study expressed a desire to emigrate after graduation. This may mean that countries of economic decline (or sta-
bility but not growth) are also threatened by loosing some of their highly motivated citizens by emigration. The consequences of “high-achievers drain” on the economy of a country may be considerable. Work by McClelland (1961) suggests that nations with a relatively high percentage of high achievement motivated individuals have higher rates of economic growth. Then, we can expect that emigration of high achievers from a country of economic decline can have further negative effect on the economy.

In our study students who were potential emigrants in all three countries had higher power motivation scores than students who do not want to emigrate. Also, students who wanted to emigrate, as compared to those students who wanted to stay in their country in both the Czech Republic and Slovenia scored higher on the Prominence subscale, and in the Czech Republic - on the Leadership subscale. Since the power motive is associated with certain behavior outlets, we can argue that students who want to emigrate tend to want to be in control, to be visible or famous, to be wealthy and to compete successfully for positions more so than students who do not want to emigrate. Power motivated individuals have been found to be effective managers, and members of government bureaucracies (McClelland, 1985a).

Our hypothesis is yet to be tested with individuals who have already undertaken concrete steps to emigrate (e.g., applied for emigration visas), and with first generation (“primary”) immigrants, those who have recently re-settled in a new country. Also, we would like to broaden the scope of the countries tested - within Central/Eastern Europe, and, hopefully, beyond. If our model is confirmed in future studies this could have significant impact on migration policy and research.
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EUROPSKE MIGRACIJE ISTOK - ZAPAD I ULOGA MOTIVACIJE U ŽELJAMA ZA MIGRACIJOM

SAŽETAK

Međunarodne migracije su se sveobuhvatno proučavale u drugoj polovici stoljeća, ali većinom s ekonomskog, demografskog, sociološkog i kulturno-antropološkog gledišta. Psiholozi su pokazali manje interesa za ovu temu, usredotočujući se na akulturaciju i probleme prilagodbe kod migranata. Sa sadašnjom globalizacijom i ubrzanjem migracije, tvrde autori, psiholozi bi se također morali više angažirati u boljem razumijevanju “migrantske osobnosti”. Oni predlažu model motivacijske strukture emigranata. Taj je model testiran na 1.050 studenata u tri srednjoistočnoeuropske zemlje: Albaniji, Češkoj i Sloveniji. Kao što se pretpostavljalo, rezultati su pokazali da studenti koji se žele iseliti imaju veća postignuća i motivacijsku volju nego oni koji to ne žele. Ako se taj uzorak potvrdi i u drugim istraživanjima, to bi moglo imati znatan učinak na migracijsku politiku i istraživanje.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: međunarodna migracija, motivacija, Albanija, Češka, Slovenija