

Migration aspirations & decisions: A comparative study of Turkey and Ukraine

Wadim Strielkowski^a, Yuriy Bilan^{b,*}

^aCambridge Judge Business School, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

^bFaculty of Economics Science and Management, University of Szczecin, Poland

Received 24 April 2016; accepted 24 May 2016

Available online 27 May 2016

Abstract

Our paper analyses the intellectual perspectives of international migration based on its biases and underdeveloped aspects. We employ the empirical data from the survey questionnaire conducted in Turkey and Ukraine within the framework of the EU-funded EUMAGINE project with over 8.000 respondents. The aim of the research was to determine how Europe is perceived from outside the EU, and how these perceptions affect migration aspirations and decisions of potential migrants.

We assess the impact of demographic, structural and socio-cultural determinants of migration expectations, and draw the prospects for future studies on non-economic determinants of external migration.

Our main findings show that potential migrants can be divided into two streams of “euro-optimists” and “euro-pessimists” depending on such factors as social background, human and intellectual characteristics as well as other factors.

Copyright 2016, Mykolas Romeris University. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license. (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Keywords: International migration; EU enlargement; Intellectual economies; Turkey; Ukraine, European Union.

1. Introduction

International migration represents a multi-faceted phenomenon with links to a plethora of areas. In the recent years, geopolitical and economic changes in many countries including the countries of the former Soviet Union as well as the other economies in transition gave rise to the new approach to the external migration. Within this context, Turkey and Ukraine represents a particularly interesting example worth studying.

Although there are vast disparities between Turkey and Ukraine that does not allow drawing straightforward comparisons, there are some common social and economic characteristics that allow for a cross-national comparison. This comparison can be implemented to deal with ethnocentrism and supranational laws. Nevertheless, there

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: w.strielkowski@jbs.cam.ac.uk (W. Strielkowski), yuriy_bilan@yahoo.co.uk (Y. Bilan).

is a certain similarity in the social situation which provides justification for the topic of research. Both Turkey and Ukraine belong to the least successful countries in terms of socio-economic development in their respective geopolitical regions which leads to the shift of labour force from the poor countries to the wealthier ones. There is one more similarity between Turkey and Ukraine, which is the focus on the external migration to the European Union countries.

The geopolitical, civilizational dimension of the problem has been widely discussed in political and media discourse since the conflict began, with the formal basis of the refusal of the European integration policy by the Turkish and Ukrainian governments in favour of “islamisation”, in the case of the former, and integration in the post-soviet space, in the case of the latter.

The recent history of Turkey and Ukraine is replete with examples that confirm the verdict of Samuel Huntington: both countries belong to the group of so-called “torn countries” (Huntington, 1993), characterized as the one, on whose territory lies on the boundary between different ranges of civilization (between “Western” and “Eastern” worlds). Often these synthetic formations appear as the result of a voluntary way of establishing political boundaries after a military conflict (in this case, a border is drawn in the place where “the tanks stopped” and political association includes groups with a long history of hostility or significant socio-cultural differences, problematizing national solidarity and / or post-authoritarian democratization), or after a relatively peaceful distribution of spheres of influence or control between powerful political actors.

Our paper examines the methodological positions and gaps scientific discourse of external migration, as well as proposed, the scheme proposed research and its approbation on the basis of empirical data of two countries - Turkey and Ukraine. Under the social dimension of migration processes we mean a system of social dispositions and attitudes that determine the migratory behaviour of the population and the associated knowledge, perceptions and actions.

In this paper, we will consider the existing theoretical approaches to international migration, outline the theoretical and methodological foundations of the research paradigm, provide the most complete overview of the social dimension of external migration, examine methodological issues of trans-national migration, as well as present the empirical results of applied trans-national study. The empirical material on the basis of which approbation research schemes will be made originates from the research database of the EU-funded EUMAGINE project.

2. Literature review: theoretical and methodological concepts

In research literature on external migration there are functional and structural streams. The functional stream represents neoclassical macroeconomic and microeconomic approaches. The macroeconomic model regards labour migration in the context of economic development (Ranis & Fei, 1961). We employ the model that comprises methodological individualism and assumes that individuals make rational decisions that increase their utility based on the overview of market conditions. When it comes to migration, one can see that people migrate as a reaction to the difference in “attainable” well-being in “their” and “foreign” economic systems (Goss & Lindquist, 1995: 320).

In line with this approach, external migration is stimulated in particular spatial differences of supply and demand for labour. Each economic system is characterized by its unique specifications such as the degree of balance of labour and capital. The loss of balance stimulates migration. Mainstream course is a stream of relatively underdeveloped countries with relatively low levels of “attainable” well-being in relatively highly developed countries, as well as from rural to urbanized areas. The model predicts that the flow at some point meets the needs of the market and the characteristics of the economic systems are aligned. At some point comes the return of the labour force, spatial inequality equal. Thus the dynamics of migration processes is a “wavy” string of loss of balance and renewal of capital and labour, and migration has clear positive aspects, in particular in connection with the further training of labour sending countries, as well as in connection with the involvement in the economy of additional funds and innovative technology. In terms of methodology, the parallel can be drawn with the structural and functionalist paradigm in sociology with its idea of a revolving balance and social system as a well-functioning, even perfect, mechanism. Accordingly, the weaknesses of the model relevant methodological weaknesses close structural functionalism.

In the literature, one can find a wide range of criticism of the model described above. For example Massey (1993) points out that international migration, and migration from rural to urban areas has increased over the

years, despite high rates of unemployment in the developed and industrialized economies. Similarly, the predicted growth of underdeveloped economies is not always and not enough to pay back the migration processes. Thus, over long periods of observation there is no “levelling”, the return of the balance between capital and labour resources (Goss & Lindquist, 1995) emphasized the following three elements of the model, which do not work in practice.

First, one has to consider the issue of earnings and savings of migrants during their stay abroad. The money migrants make is usually not invested in the economic development of the country (for example, for capital construction and job creation), and is directed to consumption and thus fuelling inflation. Secondly, prior to departure to the host country the majority of newbies migrants had a job. Thus, international migration does not smooth the employment problem, and possibly even exacerbates it. Third, one can recall the case of the Philippines, where during the years of intensive external migration there has not been recorded a significant increase in salaries. Similarly, there is no reason to say that foreign workers from the Philippines learn new skills and gain valuable knowledge and enrich labour market of the country when they return, since the majority of external migrants from the Philippines perform low-paid unskilled work (which probably contributed to the loss of professional skills) in the host countries.

In order to overcome the limitations of neoclassical macroeconomic model, Harris and Todaro (1970) offer slightly modified interpretation, according to which individuals make decisions not only on the basis of objective knowledge about the market, the wage levels, the ability to improve their financial situation, but on the basis of perceptions and expectations, which are not necessarily objectively. From the point of view of sociological theorizing such an amendment can be correlated with those modifications that brought the structural-functional model of Merton’s dynamic functionalism: it no longer comes to be renewed equilibrium of the system of labour markets and host countries, and about not always rationally organized and contradictory movement (Kearney, 1986).

Models that merging the title “structural approach” focused on macro-processes which result in social and spatial inequality and restrictions guide and limit the life chances of individuals. Structural approach explains migration as a result of operational relations between the sending and receiving countries. The focus shifts from individual decisions and actions on objective social structures that create the necessary conditions for labour migration. The best-known models, confessed to be procured under this approach are dependent pattern (or underdevelopment of development) and the associated world-system model, which formed under the influence of neoMarxism. Analysing the reasons for the low level of socio-economic development and political stability of the former colonies and the “third world”, an explanation of backwardness through an appeal to the social and cultural factors, systems of values and norms might be use. More appropriate is an appeal to the dependence of the economy (politics and culture) of some countries and domination of others.

The new economic approach brings research focus on individuals, their decisions and actions to the level households, the main driving force in the actions which serves to minimize the risks (Stark, 1984, 1991). Migrating from this point of view appears households’ strategy aimed at diversifying profits, minimizing the risks of unemployment, poor economic conjuncture, etc.

Migration systems approach is talking about the international structures as the macro- and micro-level structures, which are characterized by an intensive exchange of resources, capital and people. Macro-level components of the migration systems are: political structures, establishing migration regimes; economic structures of domination and dependence recreating hypoplasia backward and high level of development of successful areas; cultural and linguistic structure, structuring the interaction of migrants and residents of the host country. Micro-level components are: the structure of kinship and friendship embodied in the network communication (Fawcett, 1987).

The last component – social network – is the focus of the analysis of a relatively independent approach to the study of migration. Migration networks - personal direct and mediated communications that link the former and actual migrants, non-migrants. Such networks increase the likelihood of international migration, because it reduces the cost and time of receipt of the necessary information, and the risk of movement and spending. In this sense, the migration network is a kind of social capital (Massey et al., 1993: 448).

For the entire spectrum of theories of migration there is one thing in common – all of them are characterized by some common omissions and bias. In the sections that follow we will look at them and imagine the way how they have been addressed using specific methodological and methodical tasks within the EUMAGINE project.

3. Methodology and tools used in the EUMAGINE project

The research literature views the migration phenomenon from the point of view of the host countries as well as from the perspective of these countries in the optimization of migration policy in connection with real and imagined threats (trafficking, illegal migration, saturation of the labour market by non-residents at the expense of employment of residents, the problems of cultural adaptation, law-abiding and identity newcomers, etc.).

One of the most common features of migration discourse that penetrates through interdisciplinary framework is that the Outside the field of view of the researcher, as is often the prospect of sending countries, and that the complex migration path in which a person is not just traveling and returns, and makes it commercially, “acquiring” kinship, property and political rights, linguistic and cultural competencies lead to the emergence and spread of the phenomenon known as “transnationalism” (Schiller, Basch, & Blanc-Szanton, 1992).

Generally recognized response to a possible deformation of the “science of optics” is a comparative transnational research focus, which allows you to reject unwanted ethnocentrism, to get a broader perspective as to the positions of host and sending countries from the position. The project EUMAGINE covered four countries (Morocco, Senegal, Turkey, and Ukraine) with a fairly long history of mass with respect to external migration and the general direction of migration targeted at the EU countries.

Certainly this research strategy involves new challenges because it is often trans-national (and even subnational) research in one way or another and are trans-national, which means that the heterogeneity of the “field” problematizes the equivalence of methods used for making conclusions (Jowell, 1998: 168–177). According to Jowell (1998), there are two extremes on the content of the answer to the question of equivalence in trans-national study two approaches: (1) approach the maximum quality approach, in which the study design, methods and tools as possible to adapt all investigated contexts, but a comparison of individual cases problematized; (2) consistent quality approach, in which the study design, methods and tools remains unchanged, but increases the risk that “local” specificity remain behind the scenes. Because there is an objective reason to criticize both the name of the approach our task we see in their “reconciliation” in order not to lose the quality of conduct meaningful comparison in trans-national terms. The EUIMAGINE project was implemented with such an attempt: a quantitative component of the project foresaw the use of a single tool without any adaptations, and accounting “local” specificity is achieved through a qualitative component (semi-structured interviews with the competent and influential representatives of local communities).

Furthermore (this criticism usually applies to all non-sociological models of migration behaviour), a comprehensive study of external migration should take into account the fact that migrants and non-migrants potential migrants are representatives of some socio-demographic groups, carriers of the important characteristics - from gender and age group to the cultural, religious, ethnic, identity, which essentially can determine the migratory behaviour or to determine the barriers to migratory behaviour. The EUMAGINE project helped to verify the hypotheses about the influence of gender (and other individual characteristics (age, involvement in social networks, education, and migration history) on the migratory experience, behaviour and migration performance.

Third, attention is non-sociological approaches usually remains that the massive representation (perception, motivation, goals and values) are particularly important in the modern world where communication, logistics, transport technology and popular culture and create the ability and desire to migrate (Mishchuk & Grishnova, 2015; Semiv, 2012). Not paid due attention to the motivations, acceptance, discourse, that is, symbolic, social and cultural reality (see e.g. Boneva & Frieze, 2001; or Chirkov, Vansteenkiste, Tao, & Lynch, 2007). The EUMAGINE project focused on two types of mass representations: firstly, the concepts associated with the decision to migrate and, secondly, the ideas associated with the destination of migrants, with the host country.

For the first type of submissions to the project used the concept of “migration project” as defined by Mai (2004), who understands the goal of any migration project as “identify and movement in space representation of the desired identity and lifestyle, using that migrants are (design) itself” (Mai, 2004: 4). For the second type representations (representations associated with the host country) used the term “geographic imaginations” is often used. The concept refers to the subjective perception of human space, specific locations (areas), people living in them, political and economic opportunities associated with specific places (Gregory, 1994). Such perceptions are formed not only erratically during the formation of the individual life experience and purposefully - under the influence of political and cultural discourses passed “inherited”, contribute to the formation of identities. Without

regard to whether the objective picture painted by geographical representation, it is updated and has material consequences, like any other cultural, symbolic design. An important type of mass representations of migration studies within the framework of the EUMAGINE project is the notion of returning migrants, about successful and unsuccessful experiences of migration.

Fourth, in the present study migration shifts towards the analysis of economic factors that often do not explain, but only describe, in fact in itself a statement of statistical indicators, salary levels, quality of life in the home and host countries is a descriptive study. There is no “bridge”, the link between migration research and analysis of social change, a broader social theory. The trend or longitudinal studies on migration, which complicates the diagnosis of what social innovations bring with them “waves of migration”, are also scarce.

In the empirical part of our paper we will focus on testing the above conceptual scheme of study include: specific terminological apparatus; theorizing main links between elements of social reality, defining migratory behaviour; tools of empirical sociological study of migratory behaviour. Based on the above conceptual scheme, we will present a system of determinants influencing migration intentions. Within this framework, we consider the effect the influence of socio-demographic, structural and socio-cultural factors. Indicator of viability of this technique may be the presence of common patterns in the empirical material Turkey and Ukraine, and in case of discrepancies - their understandable differences of a society.

4. Migration context of two societies: Turkey and Ukraine

We shall start with a brief excursion into the context of migration between the two societies. When it comes to Turkey, the most current actual trends of migratory behaviour of the population emerged in the late 1960s, when due to a series of bilateral intergovernmental agreements aimed at overcoming the high unemployment in Turkey and raising funds in stable currencies of foreign countries (in accordance with the positions of the dominant while the neoclassical macroeconomic model), hundreds of thousands of Turkish citizens migrated to Germany, Austria, Holland, Belgium and other European countries. Further, external migration from Turkey to Western Europe intensified by family reunification and asylum Turkish citizens countries of Europe (the latter figure fluctuated considerably, in particular, with the aggravation and mitigation, followed by the Kurdish problem in recent decades) (TÜSGAD 1999: 67). European countries are the main, though not the sole focus of external migration from Turkey. Areas such as North Africa and the Middle East are much smaller than in popularity. By the end of the 2000s, more than three million Turkish citizens living abroad, of whom 2.7 million, or about 6% of the population in Europe (Erf, 2002).

Contemporary history of Ukraine is marked by deep crisis in the economy and employment in particular, the low level of institutional efficiency of the state apparatus, as well as the phenomenon of poverty working - factors stimulating mass external migration (Bilan, 2012; Borshchevska, 2012). Similarity of the Ukrainian case is that, as in the case of Turkey, the mass outmigration touched quite a large part of the population: expert assessments include such indicators as 7 million people in 2006 (World Bank, 2006) and 4.5 million people in 2009 year, or about 10% of the country's citizens (Čajka, Jaroszewicz, & Strielkowski, 2014; Markov, 2009), 1.7 million of which are in the European Union. However, the figures in the European Social Survey for 2008 show that the question “Have you conducted paid work abroad for more than six months in the last ten years?” the affirmative reply was obtained by the 5.4% of Ukrainian respondents and only by 1.4% of Turkish respondents. The discrepancy data mass and expert survey is quite explainable: respondents could hide illegal employment experience abroad; the period of employment may not exceed six months; representative for the society as a whole certainly has released a sample of the field of attention uneven distribution of such a feature as the experience of labour migration, which is likely to be more common in the border regions of the investigated companies.

The essential difference from the Turkish case is that migration flows from Ukraine are more “bottom-up” arise from the actions and practices of individual migrants or related subjects of business and not stimulated by international agreements on employment, as happened in the case of Turkey in the 1960s and the 1970s. However, the absence of such opportunities for migration to Europe does not stop Ukrainian citizens: while 40% of Turkish respondents answered affirmatively to the question “Ideally, if you had the opportunity, would you move to live or work abroad in the next five years or would have remained in their country?” in Ukraine, the figure was 47%.

Table 1
Social and demographic characteristics and the willingness to migrate: Turkey and Ukraine.

Respondents		The average value of answers to the question: “Ideally, if you had the opportunity to go abroad to live or work in the next five years, you would go or stay in their own country?”		The statistical significance of differences between mean values	
		Turkey	Ukraine	Turkey	Ukraine
Gender	Female	0.31 (<i>N</i> =1044)	0.44 (<i>N</i> =1189)	0.000**	0.000**
	Male	0.5 (<i>N</i> =956)	0.52 (<i>N</i> =810)		
Age	16–25 years	0.48 (<i>N</i> =808)	0.55 (<i>N</i> =685)	0.000**	0.000**
	35–45	0.33 (<i>N</i> =434)	0.38 (<i>N</i> =485)		
Years of education	5–10 years	0.38 (<i>N</i> =868)	0.4 (<i>N</i> =244)	0.073	0.006**
	15–20 years	0.44 (<i>N</i> =314)	0.51 (<i>N</i> =584)		

Note: * Significant at $p < 0.05$; **Source:** Own results.

** Significant at $p < 0.01$.

5. Empirical estimations and the main results

In case of Turkey, among the top migration countries were Germany (8.6%), France (6.9%) and Belgium (5.2%). In case of Ukraine, respondents identified Germany (7.2%), the US (6.4%), and Italy (6.2%). The Russian Federation took the fourth place with 4.5%. Migration intentions of Turkish respondents almost exclusively focused on the EU, while the relevant intention of Ukrainian respondents cover and countries such as the United States, the Russian Federation and Canada.

Quantitative difference between the Turkish and Ukrainian society is smeared when it comes to concrete actions rather than abstract migration intentions. The answers to the more specific question of intention to move in these countries over the next five years revealed that about the same percentage of respondents in both countries have such intentions (20.9% for Turkey and 22.9% for Ukraine). Ukrainian respondents declared a desire to migrate (under favourable conditions) is significantly at odds with the answers to the question about more specific intentions and actions, which may indicate a greater popularity in Ukraine “migration discourse” - that is, the relative mass verbally inclination to fix the desire to migrate with no real intentions and action to migrate. Below, we based on the methodology of the EUMAGINE project consider the socio-demographic, socio-cultural and structural dimension of migration behaviour of Turkish and Ukrainian respondents.

In both societies analysed respondents’ gender is fixed link with the desire to migrate: men significantly more likely to declare such a desire (Table 1). Female respondents differ little in their desire to migrate, which (as in the case of men) further decreases with increasing values of the age and the presence of children. Thence, we can assume that an appeal to traditional gender behaviours can help to explain this distribution. This hypothesis, like the hypothesis of emancipatory impact of migration experience, requires verification, but the social fact of the differences already registered.

In the analysed companies indicated a negative relationship between age and the desire to migrate. In addition to age characteristics by which young people are more likely to change and new experiences, there are probably more complex explanations, in particular, socio-cultural and structural. In terms of socio-cultural importance is the way in which meanings and symbols give some “added value” of external migration. In structural terms, the important thing is how rooted in the life of their societies child-rearing responsibilities and relationships, including marriage, and involvement in the labour collective (or lack or weakness of such a rootedness) promote or prevent external migration.

An interesting contrast seems fixed on the influence of education on migration and desire Turkish Ukrainian respondents (Table 2).

The assumption that the positive impact of education on the desire to migrate comes from the fact that the educational experience brings greater transparency worldview formation of a more diverse range of communication skills and knowledge of foreign languages, opportunities to take part in the programs of student exchange and so on.

Table 2

The relationship of socio-demographic characteristics of respondents in Ukraine and their migration experience.

Respondents		The average value of answers to the question: “Have you performed any paid work abroad for more than six months in the last ten years?”	The statistical significance of differences between mean values
Gender	Female	1.96	0.000**
	Male	1.91	
Age	16–25 years	1.92	0.000**
	35–45 years	1.91	
Level of education	Unfinished secondary	1.96	ns
	Secondary (including vocational)	1.93	
	Higher education	1.94	

Note: * Significant at $p < 0.05$; **Source:** Own results.** Significant at $p < 0.01$.

Duration of education can be positively associated with the desire to migrate for other reasons (and not just the causes, has a positive connotation): in a “crisis of society” educated professionals often unclaimed or low-paid, and the system of education to the needs of a low-paid market. Accordingly, the duration of education may be associated with criticality and pessimistic assessment of their life prospects at home. And in this case, a higher desire to migrate from more highly educated respondents is an indicator of dysfunctional phenomena. From this point of view, the results are explainable: a more dynamic and less affected by the crisis, the Turkish economy in the duration of education at least promotes a desire to migrate than in Ukrainian.

Let us compare the distribution of indicators desire to migrate to the distribution parameters of the migration experience using the European Social Survey database (Table 2). Because among Turkish respondents carriers relevant experience proved to be too small even for hypothetical conclusions, we restrict ourselves in the following comparison Ukrainian respondents.

As one can see, the rate of migration experience coincides with the distribution by gender, captures the high prevalence of migration experience in the age group between 35 and 45 years (while migration desire more pronounced in younger). Significant differences of the migration experience of the respondents with different educational levels have been recorded, but it remains possible hypothetically assume a higher prevalence of such experiences have received a special technical education, further - higher education, and the last to have the least educated.

Structural “limitations” or, on the contrary, the characteristics favouring desires to migrate in particular can be considered through the issue of marital status and presence of children (Table 3). Being married is negatively associated with the desire to migrate. Both in the case of Turkey and in the case of Ukraine the greatest differences were recorded between respondents who have never been married and unmarried respondents at the time of the study (at 0.001 level). The same significant differences recorded between respondents living with their children and childless respondents. Another characteristic which determines the hypothetical migration of respondents was the presence of relatives living abroad. In Turkey, respondents’ connection between this structural characteristic and the desire to migrate is not fixed, while for the Ukrainian respondents such communication is essential. In other words, in the case of Ukraine characteristic indicates structure is differentiated and, in the case of Turkey – it does not indicate anything.

Speaking about the social and cultural characteristics that define the migration desire, we mean submission, relationships and estimates produced by the respondent and relevant to the issue of migration behaviour (Table 4). To identify such sociocultural characteristics were selected indicators aimed at identifying some “stereotypical” ideas, attitudes and evaluations of respondents. The spectrum considered in this article includes a number of socio-cultural characteristics of migratory expectations and perceptions of their country and “Europe”. Below is a series of isolated analytically integrated indicators. The integrity and validity of the integration index is an argument in favour of the migration expectations should be regarded as a coherent structure consistent consciousness of the respondent with respect to logical built in his worldview, and therefore dominion scientific analysis and the incorporation in the context of broader theoretical constructs. It has to be noted that for the Turkish respondents

Table 3
Structural characteristics and the desire to migrate.

Respondents		The average value of answers to the question: “Ideally, if you had the opportunity to go abroad to live or work in the next five years, you would go, or would have remained in their country?”		The statistical significance of differences between mean values	
		Turkey	Ukraine	Turkey	Ukraine
Family status	Never been married	0.51 (<i>N</i> =833)	0.57 (<i>N</i> =695)	0.000**	0.000**
	Married at the time of the research	0.32 (<i>N</i> =1117)	0.4 (<i>N</i> =1067)		
Relatives abroad	No relatives abroad	0.39 (<i>N</i> =1345)	0.45 (<i>N</i> =1613)	0.86	0.000**
	Have relatives abroad	0.43 (<i>N</i> =655)	0.57 (<i>N</i> =385)		
Children living with the respondent	Have children (live with the respondent)	0.31 (<i>N</i> =991)	0.41 (<i>N</i> =1057)	0.000**	0.000**
	Does not have children (live with the respondent)	0.49 (<i>N</i> =1009)	0.54 (<i>N</i> =941)		

Note: * Significant at $p < 0.05$; **Source:** Own results.

** Significant at $p < 0.01$.

this figure is significantly lower than the Ukrainian respondents, indicating that in the perception of Ukrainian respondents migratory expectations are allocated in a more autonomous structure of consciousness, which is more “tangible”, “relief” and is present in the individual and mass consciousness.

6. Conclusions and implications

Our paper reviewed the scientific discourse of the migration paradigm, analysed the theoretical and methodological basis and methodology of the EUMAGINE project, filled in the gaps, and illustrated by the findings and potential of the mentioned project the empirical findings of Turkish and Ukrainian respondents. Our results determined the influence of social, demographic cultural and structural factors on the propensity to migration and the willingness to migrate. Future research directions related to the detailed social portrait of the respondents according to their migratory expectations, experiences and plans, clustering “Euro-optimists” and “Euro-pessimists”, as well as with the creation of the model, integrating socio-cultural, institutional, structural, demographic and economic determinants of migration plans and behaviour.

One important conclusion one can make from our results is the fact that each of the integrated socio-cultural indicators in the case of Ukraine is more holistic, more internal consistency. Interestingly, though, and requires verification conclusion is that in Ukrainian society practices of external migration are perceived more holistically, said the practice is perceived as more autonomous part of social reality, the perception is more stereotyped in the individual and mass consciousness, which highlights the need to consider the migration expectations in Ukraine as a discursive practice (i.e. practice is manifested not only and not so much at the level of behavioural, both at the verbal and symbolic).

Migration expectations of Turkish and Ukrainian respondents differ significantly: Ukrainian respondents are more optimistic and, in our view, such a common leitmotif analysis of migratory expectations of the population of Ukraine. In favour of this interpretation is testified to the fact that migration expectations of Turkish and Ukrainian respondents are significantly different: the Ukrainian respondents are significantly more positive (perhaps more mythologized) despite the fact that the legal possibilities for external migration to the EU citizens of Ukraine less.

It becomes obvious that complex socio-cultural structures contribute to the formation and reconstruction of this phenomenon. In particular, a critical assessment of its “domestic” reality the Ukrainian respondents significantly differs from the assessment of conformity of the Turkish respondents, which, presumably, is explained as an objective condition is more static and crisis and more dynamic and emerging economies, Ukraine and Turkey, and (in the case of Ukraine) the power of the imaginary and the real benefits of the “Soviet past” with a more

Table 4
Integrated indicators of socio-cultural predictors of migration expectations.

Integrated indicator of migration expectations		Indicator of migration expectations		Indicator of country's evaluation		European evaluation index	
		When a woman goes to live or work in Europe, then this could be a good experience for her		P1. A woman's life in Turkey [Ukraine]		Peu1. A woman's life in Europe	
		A14. When a man goes to live or work in Europe, then this could be a good experience for him		P2. A man's life in Turkey [Ukraine]		Reu2. A man's life in Europe	
		A15. Most of the Turks [Ukrainians], went to live or work in Europe to become rich		P3. Schools in Turkey [Ukraine]		Reu3. Schools in Europe	
		A16. Most of the Turks [Ukrainians], went to live or work in Europe receive valuable skills		P4. Healthcare in Turkey [Ukraine]		Reu4. Healthcare in Europe	
				P5. Helping the poor by the government in Turkey [Ukraine]		Reu5. Helping the poor by the government in Europe	
The degree of integrity of the integrated index (α -Cronbach)	Ukraine	0.72		0.77		0.79	
	Turkey	0.58		0.69		0.75	
The value and significance of integrated index difference between the average values	Ukraine	2.64	0.000*	2.51	0.000*	3.81	0.357 ns
	Turkey	2.76		3.09		3.84	
Correlation with the response to the question "Ideally, if you had the opportunity, would you move if you live or work abroad in the next five years or would have remained in their country?"	Ukraine	-.303 **		-.251 **		.161 **	
	Turkey	-.233 **		-.103 **		0.13 **	

Note: Source: Own results.

** Significant at $p < 0.01$.

* Significant at $p < 0.05$.

efficient system of social protection and security. Evaluation of "European" respondents Ukraine and Turkey does not differ at significant level and declined in both cases to the positive.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the EU FP7 EUMAGINE (“Imagining Europe from the outside”) No. 244703 (funding scheme SSH-2009-4.2.2: Perspectives from outside the EU on human rights, democracy and peace). We wish to thank the project coordinator, Dr Christiane Timmerman, for her support.

References

- Bilan, Y. (2012). Specificity of border labour migration. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 11, 2(26), 82–97.
- Boneva, B. S., & Frieze, I. H. (2001). Toward a concept of a migrant personality. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 477–492.
- Borshchevska, Y. (2012). Perception prism of state authorities and NGOs on migration in Ukraine. *Economics & Sociology*, 5(2), 11–22.
- Čajka, P., Jaroszewicz, M., & Strielkowski, W. (2014). Migration incentives and flows between Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine and the European Union: A Forecasting Model. *Economics & Sociology*, 7(4), 11–25.
- Chirkov, V. I., Vansteenkiste, M., Tao, R., & Lynch, M. F. (2007). The role of self-determined motivation and goals for the study abroad in the adaptation of international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 31, 199–222.
- Erf, R. (2002). *Internal and external migration in Morocco, Turkey and Senegal: A comparative report* (p. 63). The Hague: NIDI.
- ESS Round 4: European Social Survey Round 4 Data (2008). Data file edition 4.1. Norwegian Social Science Data Services, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data.
- Fawcett, A. (1987). Explaining diversity: Asian and Pacific migration system. In J. Fawcett, & B. Carino (Eds.), *Pacific Bridge: The new immigration from Asia and the Pacific Islands*. New York: Center for Migration Studies.
- Goss, J., & Lindquist, B. (1995). Conceptualizing international migration: A structuration perspective. *International Migration Review*, 29(2), 317–351.
- Gregory, D. (1994). *Geographical imaginations*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Harris, J. R., & Todaro, M. P. (1970). Migration, unemployment and development: A two-sector analysis. *The American Economic Review*, 1970, 126–142.
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 22–49.
- Jowell, R. (1998). How comparative is comparative research? *American Behavioural Scientist*, 42, 168–177.
- Kearney, M. (1986). From the invisible hand to visible feet: Anthropological studies of migration and development. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 331–361.
- Mai, N. (2004). Looking for a more modern life: the role of Italian television in the Albanian migration to Italy. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture*, 1(1), 3–22.
- Markov, I. (Ed.). (2009). *Ukrainian labour migration in Europe: findings of the complex research of the processes of Ukrainian labour immigration*. CARITAS Ukraine: International Charitable Foundation.
- Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J. E. (1993). Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal. *Population and Development Review*, 19(3), 431–466.
- Mishchuk, H., & Grishnova, O. (2015). Empirical study of the comfort of living and working environment – Ukraine and Europe: Comparative assessment. *Journal of International Studies*, 8(2), 67–80.
- Ranis, G., & Fei, J. C. (1961). A theory of economic development. *The American Economic Review*, 533–565.
- Schiller, N. G., Basch, L., & Blanc-Szanton, C. (1992). Transnationalism: A new analytic framework for understanding migration. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 645(1), 1–24.
- Semiv, L., & Hvozdoanych, Y. (2012). The intellectual migration of the youth in Ukraine: The backgrounds for “brain circulation”. *Journal of International Studies*, 5(2), 72–81.
- Stark, O. (1991). *The migration of labor*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Stark, O. (1984). Discontinuity and the theory of international migration. *Kyklos*, 37(2), 206–222.
- TÜSGAD. (1999). *Turkey's window of opportunity*. Istanbul, TUSIAD.
- World Bank. (2006). *World development report*. Washington: World Bank.