

Guzi, Martin; Mikula, Stepan

**Working Paper**

## Reforms That Keep You at Home: The Effects of Economic Transition on Migration

IZA Discussion Papers, No. 11369

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

*Suggested Citation:* Guzi, Martin; Mikula, Stepan (2018) : Reforms That Keep You at Home: The Effects of Economic Transition on Migration, IZA Discussion Papers, No. 11369, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA), Bonn

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/177173>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 11369

**Reforms That Keep You at Home:  
The Effects of Economic Transition on  
Migration**

Martin Guzi  
Stepan Mikula

FEBRUARY 2018

## DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 11369

# Reforms That Keep You at Home: The Effects of Economic Transition on Migration

**Martin Guzi**

*Masaryk University, CELSI and IZA*

**Stepan Mikula**

*Masaryk University*

FEBRUARY 2018

Any opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but IZA takes no institutional policy positions. The IZA research network is committed to the IZA Guiding Principles of Research Integrity.

The IZA Institute of Labor Economics is an independent economic research institute that conducts research in labor economics and offers evidence-based policy advice on labor market issues. Supported by the Deutsche Post Foundation, IZA runs the world's largest network of economists, whose research aims to provide answers to the global labor market challenges of our time. Our key objective is to build bridges between academic research, policymakers and society.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

## ABSTRACT

---

# Reforms That Keep You at Home: The Effects of Economic Transition on Migration<sup>1</sup>

Theory asserts that individuals' migration decisions depend more on their expectations about future income levels than on their current income levels. We find that the implementation of market-oriented reforms in post-communist countries, by forming good economic prospects, has reduced emigration as predicted by theory. Our estimates show that migration flows are highly responsive to reforms supporting private enterprises and financial services, which provide individuals with strong signals about their future prospects. Reforms that improve the management of infrastructure services are shown to have no link with migration patterns and this may be an important lesson for government policy.

**JEL Classification:** F22, J61, O15

**Keywords:** EBRD transition indicators, emigration, post-communist countries, multilateral resistance

**Corresponding author:**

Martin Guzi  
Masaryk University  
ESF, Lipová 41a, Brno, CZ 602 00  
Czech Republic  
E-mail: martin.guzi@econ.muni.cz

---

<sup>1</sup> This research was supported by a grant No. 15-17810S from the Czech Science Foundation. We are grateful to Peter Huber, Josef Montag, Lucia Mýtina Kureková and Tommaso Reggiani for helpful comments. We thank the participants at the 2016 IAMO Forum, the 2016 Young Economists' Meeting in Brno, and the "25 Years of Transformation of Centrally Planned Economies: Experiences and Perspectives" conference. Any remaining mistakes are our own. Correspondence: Martin Guzi (martin.guzi@econ.muni.cz).

## 1 Introduction

Migration theories consider that a lack of economic opportunities and job prospects at home is one of the main push factors which encourage people to seek a better future elsewhere and thus contribute to higher emigration rates. Positive expectations about future economic developments, by contrast, may keep people in the country and reduce emigration. This paper studies the migration flows in post-communist countries during their transition from centrally planned economies to open markets. The post-communist countries can be seen to provide a quasi-experimental framework for studying the impact of market-oriented reforms on emigration, thanks to their diverging paths of transition to market-oriented economies (Havrylyshyn 2007). Previous studies have shown that reforms in the post-communist countries significantly contributed to economic growth and job creation (see Babecky and Campos 2011 for an overview). In this paper we first illustrate how a given country's transition progress from a centrally planned to a market economy contributed to individuals' prospective assessments of their financial situation in that country. We then test whether market-oriented reforms, by forming good economic prospects, have reduced emigration as predicted by theory.

Our emphasis on the role of individuals' expectations about future economic developments on their migration decisions is inspired by two recent papers. Czaika (2015) shows that fluctuations in migration flows to Germany during 2001-2010 correlate with data on general economic and unemployment prospects obtained from Consumer Surveys by the European Commission. Using the same migration data, Bertoli, Bruckner, and Moraga (2016) show that negative expectations of future economic development in other European countries significantly influence the size of migration flows from those countries to Germany. These authors use the yields on 10-year government bonds as an indicator of macroeconomic conditions. In our research we extend these results by asking whether market reforms in post-

communist countries, as an indicator of the future attractiveness of the home country predicts the scale of emigration from these countries.

Our research therefore contributes to the literature on the determinants of international migration, emphasizing the importance of policies and institutional factors (e.g. Bertocchi and Strozzi 2008, Giuliotti et al 2013, Docquier et al 2014, Palmer and Pytlikova 2015, Czaika and de Haas 2017). To study migration patterns in the post-communist countries we employ migration data published by Abel (2017), which includes total migration flows between 28 post-communist countries of origin and 163 destination countries over five-year periods between 1990 and 2010.<sup>2</sup> The availability of this global data on migration flows is crucial because a substantial share of migration from post-communist countries is to other post-communist countries.

The issue of how market-oriented reform policies in the sending countries is associated with emigration, which is the focus of this study, has been rather under-explored to date. Poprawe (2015) and Cooray and Schneider (2016) have shown that high levels of corruption persuade people to move to countries with lower levels of corruption. Bergh et al (2015) have shown that low quality governance (as measured by Worldwide Governance Indicators) is also a push factor for migration. Ariu et al (2016) find that institutional quality is more important for high-skilled migration flows than for low-skilled migration. The negative implications of skilled migration, which include lower technological development and growth performance, therefore fall disproportionately on developing countries (Di Maria and Lazarova 2012). The transformation of a country's centrally planned economy to a market-oriented economy provides a unique opportunity to examine the link between structural and institutional reforms

---

<sup>2</sup> We include the following post-communist countries in our analysis: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

and migration. Throughout our analysis, we use a set of indicators to track each country's transition progress in four broad areas of the market economy – enterprises, markets and trade, financial institutions and infrastructure, and we evaluate the relevance of the reforms in these areas in reducing emigration.


## 2 Development of Migration Flows in Post-Communist Countries

Prior to 1989, any movement of citizens across borders in the post-communist countries was severely restricted (e.g. Kaczmarczyk and Okólski 2005). The collapse of communism, which led to a significant increase in political and social tensions, also resulted in substantial population movement. East-West migration flows were driven by economic, political and ethnic reasons. The flow of people belonging to minority ethnic groups particularly intensified immediately after the fall of iron curtain. Germany took the largest portion of these flows (approximately 1.5 million people between 1990 and 1995) originating from Poland, Romania and the former Soviet Union (OECD 2001). The flow of ethnic Germans was encouraged by legal guarantees within the German constitution, and therefore in the robustness analysis we show that our findings are robust to omitting migration flows directed to Germany from the sample.

According to the data published by Abel (2017), which is the main data source for our econometric analysis below, emigration surged in the years immediately following the fall of the iron curtain but declined again as transition progressed (see Figure 1). In total, eight million people emigrated from post-communist countries between 1990 and 1995, but this flow then dropped to less than three million between 2005 and 2010. The average annual emigration rate, calculated as the number of emigrants over the total population in the post-communist countries, reached 2% between 1990 and 1995 before decreasing to 1.5%, 1% and 0.7% in the five-year periods that followed.

The nature of migration in the post-communist countries exhibits some specific patterns. First, most migration occurs between post-communist countries (see Figure 1). In part this may be due to the common language, as Russian is the lingua franca in many post-communist countries. Second, migration has mostly been short-term, with a significant level of return migration (Ledesma and Piracha 2004). The substantial economic disparities between post-communist countries may thus play an important role in determining the direction of these migration flows.<sup>3</sup> Third, migration patterns during the transition period were little affected by inward immigration from outside the post-communist countries. Between 1990 and 2000 less than a quarter of a million people immigrated from countries that were not in the post-communist group (see Figure 2). The number of immigrants to post-communist countries only increased during 2005-2010, when the total inflow from outside the post-communist countries reached 1.8 million. These immigrants mostly originated from Western Europe and Northern America.

Figure 1 Destinations of Migration Flows originating from Post-Communist Countries




Source: Own calculations based on data by Abel (2017)

<sup>3</sup> For example, Tajikistan attained only 14% of the Russian Federation's GDP in the early 1990s (World Bank databank).



Figure 2 Origins of Migration Flows to Post-Communist Countries



Source: Own calculations based on data by Abel (2017)

Note: Figure depicts immigration flows from outside the post-communist countries.

### 3 Transition from Plan to Market

The post-communist countries' transformation processes from planned to market economies took different pathways in terms of the speed and sequencing of reforms. To measure the progress of their economic transition, much of the literature relies on the EBRD transition indicators, which are available for all post-communist countries for the period from 1991 to 2010 at yearly frequency (see EBRD 2004). As an alternative, a few studies employ the Cumulative Liberalization Index (available for the years 1989–1997) published by the World Bank. Babecky and Havranek (2014) confirm a high correspondence (the correlation is greater than 0.9) between the World Bank and EBRD indicators. The main advantage of the EBRD indicators is that they cover four broad areas of the market economy – enterprises, markets and trade, financial institutions and infrastructure. Reform to enterprises indicates progress in privatization and enterprise restructuring. Reforms in markets and trade include price liberalisation and policies preventing the abuses of market dominance. For financial institutions, the indicators measure the development of the banking sector and the quality of


financial regulation. Infrastructure reform measures progress in commercialization and the quality of the regulatory framework for electricity, railways, telecommunications, and water (e.g. EBRD 2004). All indicators provide an 11-point scale from 1 to 4.33 (in increments of 1/3), with 1 representing no change from a centrally planned economy and 4.33 representing the full implementation of market-based principles.<sup>4</sup>

Figure 3 depicts the diversity in the post-communist countries' reform progress using the EBRD overall indicator, obtained as the unweighted average of the EBRD indicators pertinent to specific areas. The countries can be clustered into groups based on similarities in their path to economic transformation (for details see Aristei and Perugini 2015). The progress in transition was fastest and most well-balanced in the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Slovakia. Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Romania, and Slovenia has made notable transition progress, although some reforms were postponed to the later stages. The countries of the former Soviet Union (Albania, Armenia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Mongolia, Russia, and Ukraine) implemented reforms focused on price liberalisation and privatisation but have only registered weak progress in other areas. Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, and Tajikistan implemented reforms in the later stages of their transition. Finally, Belarus, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan have only made minimal progress towards market economic system. The transition to a market-oriented economy has been steady overall but uneven across the countries that we exploit in the analysis.

---

<sup>4</sup> Several authors admit that an improvement from value 1 to value 2 may actually be easier than a move from value 2 to value 3. Despite this limitation the EBRD indicators are commonly used in the literature.

Figure 3 Reform Progress in Post-Communist Countries



Source: EBRD (2012)

Note: The overall EBRD indicator is plotted. 28 countries are grouped into five clusters based on similarities in the timing and balance of their reforms.

Our empirical strategy hinges on the assumption that the implementation of market-oriented reforms in the post-communist countries has contributed to people’s expectations about their economic prospects in those countries. To test this hypothesis we employ data from eight waves of the Central and Eastern Eurobarometer studies collected in 18 countries during 1990-1997 (Reif et al 1997).<sup>5</sup> In each of these surveys, respondents were asked to evaluate their households’ financial situations in the previous twelve months and in the following twelve months on a scale from 1 to 5.<sup>6</sup> To focus on the population most prone to migration, the sample consists of individuals aged below 45 years (N= 38,589). Table 1 reports our results. In the model we relate the individuals’ assessments of their personal (household) financial situations in the year ahead (dependent variable) to the country’s progress from a centrally planned to a market economy in different areas. The specification includes controls at individual level

<sup>5</sup> Surveys were organized in Albania, Armenia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Ukraine.

<sup>6</sup> We reverse the scale so higher values imply an improvement in financial situation. Possible answers are 1 “Get a lot worse”, 2 “Get a little worse”, 3 “Stay the same”, 4 “Get a little better” and 5 “Get a lot better”. The survey also asked respondents to assess the overall economic situation in their country, but that question was only asked in the first three waves (1990-1992) therefore we do not use it here.

(gender, level of education, identifier for individuals aged over 30, and the retrospective assessment of their financial situation over the previous year), and at macro level (the country's economic growth and unemployment). We include fixed effects to control for any unobserved country or year-specific effects and errors are clustered at country level. The estimates presented in Column 1 confirm the hypothesis that reform progress (as measured by the overall EBRD indicator) is positively correlated with respondents' prospective assessments of their future financial situation. Columns 2-5 show that reforms conducive to entrepreneurial activity (column 2) and financial services (column 4) are particularly positively correlated with individuals' expectations regarding their households' financial situations. On the other hand, reforms related to the country's infrastructure (column 5) and markets and trade (column 3) are not related to respondents' assessments of their financial situations. These estimates further indicate that individuals who expressed more positive views about their past financial situations are also more positive about their future situations, and that males and young individuals make more optimistic assessments on average. Interestingly, the respondents' levels of education and macroeconomic conditions tend not to be related to their evaluations of their future financial situations.

These results provide a tentative confirmation that the implementation of market-oriented reforms contributed to more positive evaluations of individuals' future financial situations. Next, we test whether those positive expectations induced by the reform progress led to lower rates of emigration.

Table 1 OLS results for prospective assessment of financial situation

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Financial situation during the past year	0.424*** (0.021)	0.424*** (0.020)	0.424*** (0.020)	0.427*** (0.021)	0.426*** (0.021)
GDP per capita (log)	0.067 (0.110)	0.045 (0.146)	0.102 (0.161)	-0.032 (0.094)	0.048 (0.147)
Unemployment rate	-0.014 (0.015)	-0.011 (0.015)	-0.008 (0.015)	-0.011 (0.020)	-0.004 (0.020)
Male	0.049*** (0.015)	0.049*** (0.015)	0.049*** (0.015)	0.048*** (0.015)	0.048*** (0.015)
Education: Secondary uncompleted	0.002 (0.014)	0.009 (0.013)	0.001 (0.016)	-0.004 (0.012)	-0.001 (0.013)
Education: Secondary completed	0.006 (0.022)	0.013 (0.018)	0.006 (0.021)	0.001 (0.023)	0.005 (0.021)
Education: Higher Education	0.026 (0.022)	0.036** (0.017)	0.025 (0.021)	0.020 (0.023)	0.025 (0.020)
Age: 30 or above	-0.148*** (0.013)	-0.147*** (0.014)	-0.148*** (0.014)	-0.147*** (0.013)	-0.148*** (0.014)
EBRD overall indicator	0.462** (0.209)				
EBRD Enterprise		0.332*** (0.105)			
EBRD Market			0.120 (0.112)		
EBRD Financial institutions				0.205*** (0.069)	
EBRD Infrastructure					-0.184 (0.148)
Constant	1.585 (1.038)	1.857 (1.263)	1.515 (1.623)	2.709*** (0.763)	2.255* (1.249)
Countries	18	18	18	18	18
Observations	38,589	38,589	38,589	38,589	38,589
Adjusted R2	0.300	0.301	0.299	0.299	0.299

Source: Central and Eastern Eurobarometer 1990-1997

Note: Estimation was carried out using OLS with country clustered White-Huber standard errors reported in brackets. All specifications include the country and year fixed effects. The dependent variable corresponds to answers to the question “And over the next 12 months, do you expect that the financial situation of your household will ...?” Possible answers are 1 “Get a lot worse”, 2 “Get a little worse”, 3 “Stay the same”, 4 “Get a little better” and 5 “Get a lot better”.

\*p = 0.1; \*\*p = 0.05; \*\*\*p = 0.01

#### 4 Migration model and estimation strategy

Our model relates to the standard neoclassical theory of migration, which predicts that migration decisions are responsive to economic disparities between countries (e.g. Massey et al 1993). We assume an agent who makes an optimal decision across multiple destinations as to whether to migrate or to stay, by comparing the expected benefits from migrating to the expected benefits of staying (Sjaastad 1962). The set of all possible destinations is given by  $J$  and the utility is assumed to be log-linear and depends on income and country-specific characteristics. Utility  $U_{ijt}$  related to migrating is given by:

$$U_{ijt} = \ln(w_{jt}) + A_{jt}(\cdot) - C_{ijt}(\cdot) + \epsilon_{jt}, \quad (1)$$

where  $A_{jt}(\cdot)$  denotes country  $j$ 's specific characteristics at time  $t$  and  $C_{ijt}(\cdot)$  gives the cost of migrating from  $i$  to  $j$  at time  $t$ . The utility includes a stochastic component  $\epsilon_{jt}$ . Similarly the utility of staying is given by:

$$U_{iit} = \ln(w_{it}) + A_{it}(\cdot) + \epsilon_{it}. \quad (2)$$

Assuming that the error term is identically and independently distributed and that it follows an extreme-value distribution we can apply results from McFadden (1984) (see also their application in Beine and Parsons 2015) to show that the bilateral migration rate between countries  $i$  and  $j$  is written as

$$\frac{M_{ijt}}{M_{iit}} = \frac{\exp(U_{ijt})}{\sum_k \exp(U_{ikt})}, \quad (3)$$

where  $M_{ijt}$  denotes the bilateral migration flow from country  $i$  to  $j$ . Rewriting (3) using (1) and (2) and taking logs yields an equation for bilateral migration flow:

$$\ln(M_{ijt}) = \ln(M_{iit}) + \ln(w_{jt}) + \ln(w_{it}) + A_{jt}(\cdot) - A_{it}(\cdot) - C_{ijt}(\cdot) + \epsilon_{ijt},$$

where  $\epsilon_{ijt}$  is the error term. This equation establishes the pull and push factors of migration: the wage differentials, the country-specific characteristics at destination and origin and the

costs of migration. In line with the literature on the determinants of migration (e.g. Mayda 2010; Beine et al. 2017, Gorinas and Pytlikova 2015) we estimate an equation similar to the gravity model:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{M_{ijt}}{P_{it}} = & \alpha + \beta_0 EBRD_{it} + \beta_1 \ln(GDP_{jt}) + \beta_2 \ln(GDP_{it}) + \beta_3 U_{jt} + \beta_4 U_{it} + \\ & \beta_5 \ln(S_{ijt}/P_{it}) + \beta_6 \ln(dist_{ij}) + \beta_7 border_{ij} + \beta_8 onestate_{ij} + \beta_9 lang_{ij} + \beta_{10} EU_{ijt} + \\ & \beta_{11} war_{it} + \beta_{12} \ln\left(\frac{P_{jt}}{P_{it}}\right) + \beta_{13} FH_{it} + \theta_i + \theta_j + \tau_t + \varepsilon_{ijt} . \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

The dependent variable is the propensity to emigrate from  $i$  to  $j$  at  $t$  relative to the sending country population.  $M_{ijt}$  is the emigration rate calculated as the gross flow of migrants from country  $i$  to country  $j$  at  $t$  and  $P_{it}$  is the population in  $i$  at the beginning of period  $t$ . The key variables of interest are the  $EBRD_{it}$  indicators tracking each country's progress from a centrally planned economy to a market economy. We hypothesize that migration decisions depend on future income levels for which indicators of reform progress might serve as good proxies. In equation (4) we take into account the push and pull factors of migration used in the literature. Economic differences between the country of origin and destination are proxied by GDP per capita and their unemployment rates. The ethnic network,  $S_{ijt}/P_{it}$ , captured by the relative size of the migrant community born in country  $i$  and living in country  $j$  at  $t$ , can facilitate the integration in the destination and lower migration costs, thus increasing emigration (Pedersen et al 2008). The relative population sizes of the receiving and sending countries ( $P_{jt}/P_{it}$ ) account for demographic developments. Migration costs are approximated by the distance between the countries' capital cities measured in kilometers ( $dist_{ij}$ ), shared spoken languages ( $lang_{ij}$ ) and shared borders ( $border_{ij}$ ) between the two countries. As there may be higher migration between countries that were historically part of the same state, we define a dummy variable  $onestate_{ij}$  that indicates if countries were part of one state during

the 1980s (i.e. Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, or Yugoslavia). Similarly, EU enlargements in 2004 and 2007 triggered migration from post-communist countries to Western countries (Ortega and Peri 2013; Kahanec, Pytlikova and Zimmermann 2016) so we introduce a dummy variable  $EU_{ijt}$  that identifies country-pairs that are EU members in the period  $t$ . The escalation of ethnic tension has led to armed conflicts in seven post-communist countries over the studied period 1990-2010 (UCDP, 2015).<sup>7</sup> Political violence and armed conflicts trigger outmigration and therefore we control for the severity of armed conflict in our migration model. The variable  $war_{it}$  is defined as the number of fatalities over the period per 1000 inhabitants (for an armed conflict with more than 10 deaths per year). In parallel with their economic transformation, the post-communist countries also experienced changes in the political sphere that may potentially have influenced individuals' migration decisions. To capture the process of political liberalization in the sending country we include two indices ( $FH_{it}$ ) for political rights and civil liberties obtained from Freedom House database (Freedom House 2012). The description and summary statistics of all variables are presented in Table A1 in the Appendix.

The model also includes country of origin ( $\theta_i$ ) and country of destination ( $\theta_j$ ) fixed effects to control for country unobserved characteristics. We add period dummies  $\tau$  to account for period-specific changes. To avoid possible bias in the measurement of economic variables in early 1990s (see e.g. Svejnar 2002) we add the interaction terms for GDP per capita and unemployment rate.

One problem with the use of global migration data is the large proportion of zeros (65% in our data). Silva and Tenreyro (2006) show that the Poisson pseudo-maximum likelihood (PPML) estimator consistently estimates the gravity equation and is robust to different patterns

---

<sup>7</sup> Based on UCDP (2015), armed conflicts with fatalities were present in Azerbaijan (1991-1995, 1997-8, 2005, 2008), Bosnia and Herzegovina (1992-1995), Croatia (1992-1993, 1995), Georgia (1991-1993, 2004, 2008), Russia (Chechnya independence war 1994-2007), Tajikistan (1992-1998, 2000, 2010) and Uzbekistan (1999-2000, 2004).



of heteroskedasticity and measurement error, which makes it preferable to OLS. Additionally PPML performs well in the presence of a large proportion of zeros (Silva and Tenreyro 2011).

## 5 Results

Table 2 reports our main results from estimating equation (4). The dependent variable in all models is the emigration rate, i.e. the total number of people who left the country over the given five-year period per 1000 of the population. The explanatory variables are calculated at their mean values over each five-year period.<sup>8</sup> For the sake of comparison, column 1 reports OLS coefficients<sup>9</sup> but we refer to PPML coefficients in columns 2-6 as this is our preferred specification. The signs and significance of the variables are in line with literature. Emigrants are significantly more likely to choose destinations with high income per capita and lower unemployment. An increase in income per capita in the country of origin significantly reduces emigration. We find that networks in the destination country attract immigrants from the same origin and that people emigrate significantly more over shorter distances and to neighbouring states. Political changes, as captured by political and civil rights indices, are not significant. One possible explanation for this is that migration decisions are primarily economically motivated and country-to-country differences in individuals' freedoms are less important. The presence of armed conflict triggers outmigration from the affected country. Sharing an official language, having historically been part of the same state, or having EU membership are not identified as significant drivers of emigration.

---

<sup>8</sup> Our results remain unchanged when the values from the middle year are used instead of means.

<sup>9</sup> The dependent variable is expressed in logarithm in the OLS specification and therefore zero migration flows are replaced with one in order to keep them in the sample (e.g. Ortega and Peri 2013, Gorinas and Pytlikova 2015).

Table 2 Drivers of migration flows: Baseline results

Model	OLS (1)	PPML (2)	PPML (3)	PPML (4)	PPML (5)	PPML (6)
GDP per capita destination	0.215*** (0.060)	1.062*** (0.347)	1.097*** (0.346)	1.021*** (0.357)	1.088*** (0.336)	1.066*** (0.355)
GDP per capita origin	-0.292*** (0.088)	-0.895*** (0.305)	-0.921*** (0.296)	-1.051*** (0.293)	-0.631* (0.327)	-0.977*** (0.301)
Unemployment rate destination	-0.045*** (0.008)	-0.158*** (0.030)	-0.161*** (0.031)	-0.157*** (0.031)	-0.157*** (0.029)	-0.157*** (0.031)
Unemployment rate origin	0.030*** (0.007)	-0.015 (0.022)	-0.018 (0.022)	-0.014 (0.022)	-0.022 (0.021)	-0.027 (0.023)
Stock of immigrants destination	0.232*** (0.014)	0.496*** (0.030)	0.496*** (0.030)	0.497*** (0.031)	0.493*** (0.030)	0.495*** (0.030)
Distance (log)	-0.231*** (0.056)	-0.507*** (0.095)	-0.509*** (0.095)	-0.506*** (0.094)	-0.506*** (0.095)	-0.505*** (0.095)
Border sharing	0.261 (0.212)	0.307*** (0.119)	0.299** (0.118)	0.302** (0.119)	0.307** (0.119)	0.296** (0.118)
Statehood sharing in 1980s	0.929*** (0.193)	-0.104 (0.194)	-0.103 (0.192)	-0.103 (0.193)	-0.087 (0.195)	-0.089 (0.192)
Language sharing	0.585* (0.347)	0.124 (0.261)	0.123 (0.256)	0.131 (0.260)	0.132 (0.257)	0.134 (0.256)
EU membership	-0.168 (0.143)	0.006 (0.197)	-0.010 (0.203)	-0.041 (0.197)	0.077 (0.190)	-0.009 (0.204)
War casualties per 1,000	0.383*** (0.055)	0.962*** (0.185)	0.980*** (0.183)	0.859*** (0.179)	0.992*** (0.196)	0.861*** (0.190)
Population ratio (dest./origin)	1.626*** (0.169)	1.008 (0.821)	0.562 (0.779)	0.430 (0.899)	0.708 (0.764)	-0.093 (0.850)
Political rights origin	-0.100*** (0.034)	0.021 (0.099)	0.004 (0.103)	0.047 (0.098)	-0.011 (0.092)	0.004 (0.106)
Civil liberties origin	-0.211*** (0.041)	-0.250* (0.130)	-0.232* (0.132)	-0.236* (0.138)	-0.232* (0.124)	-0.200 (0.140)
EBRD overall indicator	-0.885*** (0.087)	-0.966*** (0.273)				
EBRD Enterprises			-0.679*** (0.216)			
EBRD Markets and trade				-0.478** (0.219)		
EBRD Financial institutions					-1.151*** (0.291)	
EBRD Infrastructure						-0.192 (0.295)
Constant	-4.119*** (0.626)	-0.461 (1.743)	0.196 (1.737)	-0.016 (1.844)	0.183 (1.768)	0.710 (1.813)
R2	0.69	0.81	0.81	0.8	0.81	0.81
Observations	17,577	17,577	17,577	17,577	17,577	17,577

Note: Estimation was carried out using OLS and Poisson pseudo-maximum likelihood (PPML), with country-pair clustered White-Huber standard errors reported in brackets. Dependent variable is the log emigration rate. All specifications include the country of origin, country of destination and period fixed effects.

\*p = 0.1; \*\*p = 0.05; \*\*\*p = 0.01

The coefficients in columns 1 and 2 on reform progress are negatively associated with emigration at the 0.01 significance level. To understand the link between reform and emigration, columns 3-6 include the four EBRD sub-indices measuring reform progress in different areas. Of these four indicators, the coefficient on reforms supporting the development of financial institutions is the largest in magnitude. Reforms supporting enterprises and market and trade are also identified as significant, while infrastructure reforms are insignificant. In section 3 we noted that reform to enterprises and financial institutions contributed to individuals' assessments of their future economic prospects. Our migration model confirms that the implementation of reforms in these two areas also significantly reduces emigration. This result supports our hypothesis that positive expectations about one's future situation, induced by reform progress in the home country, diminish incentives for emigration. This finding is consistent with migration prospect theory (Czaika 2015), which asserts that short-term bilateral migration flows are driven by expectations about the future economic situations in the home and potential destination countries.

To put the effect of the reform progress shown in Table 2 into perspective, we calculate the standardized beta coefficients for selected variables in Table 3. Beta coefficients make the estimates of our reform indicators directly comparable to the estimates of other pull and push factors. The results show that one standard deviation change in the overall EBRD indicator (in Column 2) is associated with a 0.36 standard deviation change in emigration. Taking the descriptive statistics in Table A1, an increase in overall reform progress by 0.78 (one standard deviation) is thus associated with a decrease in emigration by 0.76 person per 1000 population. Noteworthy, besides statistical significance, is the economic significance of reform progress. For example, the magnitude of overall reform progress (0.36) is similar to that of the GDP per capita in the country of origin (0.33). It is larger than the magnitude of distance (0.21) but attains a half the magnitude of the GDP per capita in the destination (0.66). According to the

standardized coefficients in Column 3-6, reforms supporting private companies and financial institutions exhibit the largest effect in decreasing emigration, 0.28 and 0.44 respectively. Reforms in these areas were also, as we have discussed, found to convey the strongest signals to individuals about their future economic prospects.

Table 3 Drivers of migration flows: Standardized coefficients

Model	OLS (1)	PPML (2)	PPML (3)	PPML (4)	PPML (5)	PPML (6)
GDP per capita destination	0.100***	0.657***	0.679***	0.632***	0.673***	0.660***
GDP per capita origin	-0.082***	-0.331***	-0.341***	-0.389***	-0.233*	-0.361***
Unemployment rate destination	-0.100***	-0.465***	-0.475***	-0.463***	-0.464***	-0.463***
Unemployment rate origin	0.070***	-0.048	-0.055	-0.045	-0.068	-0.085
Stock of immigrants destination	0.287***	0.810***	0.811***	0.812***	0.805***	0.809***
Distance (log)	-0.073***	-0.212***	-0.213***	-0.211***	-0.211***	-0.211***
Border sharing	0.016	0.025**	0.024***	0.024**	0.025**	0.024**
Statehood sharing in 1980s	0.060***	-0.009	-0.009	-0.009	-0.007	-0.008
Language sharing	0.021*	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006
EU membership	-0.010	0.0004	-0.001	-0.003	0.006	-0.001
War casualties per 1,000	0.056***	0.185***	0.188***	0.165***	0.190***	0.165***
Population ratio (dest./origin)	1.167***	0.957	0.533	0.408	0.672	-0.088
Political rights origin	-0.073***	0.020	0.004	0.045	-0.010	0.003
Civil liberties origin	-0.126***	-0.197	-0.183*	-0.186*	-0.183*	-0.158
EBRD overall indicator	-0.252***	-0.364***				
EBRD Enterprises			-0.280***			
EBRD Markets and trade				-0.182**		
EBRD Financial institutions					-0.444***	
EBRD Infrastructure						-0.071

Note: Standardized coefficients refer to models estimated in Table 2.

\*p = 0.1; \*\*p = 0.05; \*\*\*p = 0.01

## 6 Multilateral Resistance

The recent papers by Bertoli and Moraga (2013) and Bertoli et al. (2016) show that the presence of multilateral resistance to migration (MRM) violates the independence of the irrelevant alternatives assumption and distorts the coefficients estimated from bilateral migration flows.<sup>10</sup> This applies to our case because transition reforms were implemented

<sup>10</sup> The term *multilateral resistance to migration* was coined by Bertoli and Moraga (2013) but the concept is commonly used in the analysis of bilateral trade flows.

simultaneously in all the post-communist countries. Bilateral migration rates depend on opportunities to migrate to other countries, therefore our identification of those reforms' impacts on emigration may be confounded by the influence of transition progress in other countries.

A number of alternatives have been proposed that we follow in order to address the challenge posed by MRM. First, we follow Mayda (2010) and extend the baseline regression model by including a multilateral pull (MP) effect to the model specification that captures the additional wage gain per kilometre from moving to another destination. This is calculated for all destinations as an average of per capita GDP weighted by the inverse of distance from the origin country:

$$MP_{ijt} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_c \ln \frac{GDP_{ct}}{dist_{ic}}$$

where  $C$  is a set of  $n$  destinations alternative to  $j$ . The second column in Table 4 reports these estimates with the MP term included, which remain essentially unchanged compared to the baseline estimates in the first column.<sup>11</sup> Second, we follow Beine and Parsons (2015) and include destination-time fixed effects in the baseline model to control for multilateral resistance of the destination countries. The coefficients of the reform indicators are larger than in the baseline model (compare Column 1 and 3) and highly significant. This is the only specification in which the estimate for the indicator measuring progress in infrastructure reforms is marginally significant at the 0.1 level. Third, following Gröschl (2012), and Czaika and Parsons (2017), we add two terms to our baseline model based on distance ( $MRMD_{ijt}$ ) and common borders ( $MRMB_{ijt}$ ) to account for MRM. These terms are defined as follows:

$$MRMD_{ijt} = \sum_{k=1} \theta_{kt} dist_{ik} + \sum_{m=1} \theta_{mt} dist_{mj} - \sum_{k=1} \sum_{m=1} \theta_{mt} \theta_{kt} dist_{km}$$

---

<sup>11</sup> Full results are available from the authors upon request.

$$MRMB_{ijt} = \sum_{k=1} \theta_{kt} b_{ik} + \sum_{m=1} \theta_{mt} b_{mj} - \sum_{k=1} \sum_{m=1} \theta_{mt} \theta_{kt} b_{km}$$

where  $\theta_{kt}$  is the population of the given country as a share of the world population,  $b_{ij}$  is a border dummy and  $dist_{ij}$  is the bilateral distance between the origin and destination.<sup>12</sup>

Table 4 Drivers of migration flows: Dealing with multilateral resistance

	Baseline	Multilateral pull term	Destination-time fixed effects	Multilateral resistance to migration
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
EBRD overall indicator	-0.966***	-0.971***	-1.332***	-1.113***
	(0.273)	(0.272)	(0.282)	(0.274)
EBRD Enterprises	-0.679***	-0.719***	-0.917***	-0.743***
	(0.216)	(0.221)	(0.210)	(0.214)
EBRD Markets and trade	-0.478**	-0.477**	-0.717***	-0.575***
	(0.219)	(0.218)	(0.206)	(0.217)
EBRD Financial institutions	-1.151***	-1.160***	-1.212***	-1.227***
	(0.291)	(0.285)	(0.259)	(0.279)
EBRD Infrastructure	-0.192	-0.185	-0.534*	-0.329
	(0.295)	(0.308)	(0.313)	(0.294)

Note: Each coefficient is obtained from a separate estimation. Baseline estimates from Table 2 are presented in Column 1. The alternative methods of dealing with multilateral resistance are motivated by the literature: Mayda (2010) in Column 2, Beine and Parsons (2015) in Column 3 and Gröschl (2012) in Column 4.

\*p = 0.1; \*\*p = 0.05; \*\*\*p = 0.01

Column 4 shows that the baseline results (in Column 1) are robust to controlling for multilateral resistance. Reform progress in all areas except infrastructure is identified as reducing emigration. The downward bias in the baseline model is explained by the fact that the

<sup>12</sup> There are other approaches proposed in the literature which we cannot apply to our situation. First, the Common Correlated Effects estimator developed by Pesaran (2006) is proposed by Bertoli and Moraga (2013). This approach is based on OLS estimation and therefore it is not suitable in our case because our dependent variable includes a large proportion of zeros. Second, origin-time fixed effects are included to capture the multilateral resistance (Ortega and Peri 2013; Beine et al 2017). This method is not suitable in our case since we have the variables of interest (EBRD indicators) defined along origin-time dimensions. Third, the inclusion of origin-nest dummies based on Pesaran's (2006) Cross-section Dependence (CD) test is used to remove location specific unobserved components (Bertoli and Moraga 2015). The optimal partition of destination countries into nests is decided by CD-test so that the loss of identification power is benefited by the lower risk of incorrect specification. The CD-test does not converge so we fail to identify the optimal origin-nest structure in our analysis.

implementation of transition reforms occurs simultaneously in countries that most migrants consider close substitutes. The reform progress in their country of origin is thus correlated with the reform progress in their potential migration destinations, and if this is not controlled for then the estimated effect of the reform indicators in the sending country also captures reduction in migration flows that is due to the increased attractiveness of the destination countries. Importantly, the interpretations obtained from the baseline model hold, and the effect of economic prospects induced by reform progress on emigration is slightly larger when the attractiveness of alternative destinations is controlled for.

## 7 Robustness Analyses

We perform a series of robustness tests of the baseline model specification. First we show that the results are robust to removing all migration flows directed to Germany. This is motivated by the fact that German law granted the possibility of obtaining citizenship to ethnic Germans residing abroad (OECD 2001). Migration moves motivated by the benefits of this regulation are unrelated to transition process and may therefore contaminate our results. Column 2 in Table 5 shows that the estimates of the EBRD indicators measuring reform progress in relation to enterprises and financial institutions are slightly smaller in comparison with baseline results in Column 1. The reform indicators associated with markets and trade and infrastructure are insignificant. Columns 3 and 4 show that our baseline results are robust to dropping migration flows from and to Russia, respectively. Russia is considered the hegemon of the post-communist group and it is important to establish that our results are not driven by any single country. These robustness tests confirm the strong link between the implementation of market-oriented reforms, specifically in the areas identified above, and migration patterns.

Column 5 estimates equation (4) with the immigration rate as the dependent variable (defined as the number of immigrants as a share of the population in the sending country). The

central hypothesis in this paper is that positive economic prospects lower emigration. Column 5 confirms that the positive economic prospects formed by reform progress also stimulate immigration. It confirms that the implementation of market reforms contributes to positive economic assessments and makes a country more attractive to immigrants.

Table 5 Drivers of migration flows: Robustness checks

	Baseline	Omitting flows to Germany	Omitting flows to Russia	Omitting flows from Russia	Immigration rate
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
EBRD overall indicator	-0.966*** (0.273)	-0.665** (0.281)	-0.903*** (0.265)	-0.966*** (0.273)	0.780** (0.303)
EBRD Enterprises	-0.679*** (0.216)	-0.463** (0.227)	-0.608*** (0.219)	-0.679*** (0.216)	0.543** (0.259)
EBRD Markets and trade	-0.478** (0.219)	-0.254 (0.223)	-0.521** (0.210)	-0.478** (0.219)	0.460** (0.188)
EBRD Financial institutions	-1.151*** (0.291)	-0.963*** (0.308)	-1.104*** (0.337)	-1.151*** (0.291)	0.644** (0.314)
EBRD Infrastructure	-0.192 (0.295)	-0.089 (0.312)	-0.153 (0.245)	-0.192 (0.295)	1.005** (0.456)

Note: Each coefficient is obtained from a separate estimation. Baseline estimates from Table 2 are presented in Column 1. The estimation sample excludes migration flows to Germany (Column 2), to Russia (Column 3), and from Russia (Column 4). The dependent variable in Column 5 is the immigration rate. \*p = 0.1; \*\*p = 0.05; \*\*\*p = 0.01

## 7 Conclusion

This paper confirms, in line with the migration theory, that positive expectations about economic development diminish incentives for emigration. Our research builds on the literature on transition economies, which has found that reform progress has positive effects on economic growth and job prospects in the long-run. Using data from Eurobarometer surveys we first show that the implementation of market-oriented reforms in post-communist countries has contributed to positive assessments of individuals' financial situations. We identify that



reforms conducive to private business and financial services generate particularly high economic prospects. In the second step, we show that the positive expectations of future economic development formed by market-oriented reforms reduce people's motivation to leave their country. Our identification strategy exploits variation in the transformation processes from planned to market economies in 28 post-communist countries. We identify that reforms supporting private enterprises and the development of financial institutions, which also provided individuals with the strongest signals about their future prospects, are associated with lower emigration. Examples of such reforms may include privatization, removal of state subsidies and the gradual liberalisation of interest rates and supervision of the financial sector. Progress in infrastructure reforms, on the other hand, does not generate such positive signals and is not found to be linked with emigration. We confirm that our conclusions are robust to the potential bias induced by multilateral resistance to migration.

Our results point towards several conclusions. The migration prospects theory by Czaika (2015) asserts that temporary migration flows are more driven by future prospects whereas permanent migration is driven by absolute economic disparities. Given the temporary nature of migration in post-communist countries (Ledesma and Piracha 2004), our research confirms that these migration intentions are responsive to people's expectations of economic development. The reform-driven improvements in domestic economic prospects translated to lower emigration flows and higher immigration.

Recent research by Ariu et al (2016) found that migration flows of high-skilled individuals are more sensitive to differences in governance quality than flows of low-skilled migrants. Avoiding or delaying economic reforms thus creates an economic burden not only by reducing the country's growth performance but also through brain drain (Di Maria and Lazarova, 2012). According to our research, reforms that open a country's markets to private activities and improve credit accessibility reduce emigration the most. Reforms that improve

the management of infrastructure services is shown to have no link with migration decisions and this may be an important lesson for government policy. The conclusions from our research suggest that pro-business reforms should be implemented in developing economies as a priority, before reforms in infrastructure regulation, in order to reduce emigration.

## References

- Abel, G. J. (2017), Estimates of Global Bilateral Migration Flows by Gender between 1960 and 2015. *International Migration Review*. doi:10.1111/imre.12327
- Aristei, D. & Cristiano Perugini, C. (2015). The Drivers of Personal Income Inequality in Transition, and the Role of Reform Approaches. In: Perugini C., Pompei F. (eds) *Inequalities During and After Transition in Central and Eastern Europe. Studies in Economic Transition*. Palgrave Macmillan, London
- Ariu, A., Docquier, F., & Squicciarini, M. P. (2016). Governance quality and net migration flows. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 60, 238-248.
- Babecký, J., & Campos, N. F. (2011). Does reform work? An econometric survey of the reform–growth puzzle. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 39(2), 140-158.
- Babecky, J., & Havranek, T. (2014). Structural reforms and growth in transition. *Economics of Transition*, 22(1), 13-42.
- Beine, M., Bourgeon, P., & Bricongne, J. C. (2017). Aggregate fluctuations and international migration. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*. doi:10.1111/sjoe.12258
- Beine, M., & Parsons, C. (2015). Climatic factors as determinants of international migration. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 117(2), 723-767.
- Bergh, A., Mirkina, I., & Nilsson, T. (2015). Pushed by Poverty or by Institutions? Determinants of Global Migration Flows. *IFN Working paper (No. 1077)*. Research Institute of Industrial Economics.
- Bertocchi, G., & Strozzi, C. (2008). International migration and the role of institutions. *Public Choice*, 137(1), 81-102.
- Bertoli, S., & Moraga, J. F. H. (2013). Multilateral resistance to migration. *Journal of Development Economics*, 102, 79-100.

- Bertoli, S., & Moraga, J. F. H. (2015). The size of the cliff at the border. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 51, 1-6.
- Bertoli, S., Brücker, H., & Moraga, J. F. H. (2016). The European crisis and migration to Germany. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 60, 61-72.
- Cooray, A., & Schneider, F. (2016). Does corruption promote emigration? An empirical examination. *Journal of Population Economics*, 29(1), 293-310.
- Czaika, M. (2015). Migration and economic prospects. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(1), 58-82.
- Czaika, M. & de Haas, H. (2017). Migration and economic prospects. *International Migration Review*, 51(4), 893–926.
- Czaika, M. & Parsons, C. R. (2017). The gravity of high-skilled migration policies. *Demography*, 54(2), 603-630.
- DiMaria, C., & Lazarova, E. A. (2012). Migration, Human Capital Formation, and Growth: An Empirical Investigation. *World Development*, 40(5), 938–955.
- Docquier, F., Peri, G. & Ruysen, I. (2014). The Cross-country Determinants of Potential and Actual Migration. *International Migration Review*, 48: 37–99.
- EBRD (2004). *Transition report 2004*. European Bank for Reconstruction and Development London.
- Freedom in the World 2012 – Methodology. <http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world-2012/methodology>
- Giulietti C., Guzi M., Kahanec M., Zimmermann K.F. (2013). Unemployment benefits and immigration: evidence from the EU. *International Journal of Manpower*. 34(1), 24-38.
- Gorinas, C. & Pylikova, M. (2015). The Influence of Attitudes toward Immigrants on International Migration, *International Migration Review*, 51(2), 416–451.
- Gröschl, J. (2012). Climate change and the relocation of population. *Beiträge zur Jahrestagung des Vereins für Socialpolitik 2012: Neue Wege und Herausforderungen für den Arbeitsmarkt des 21. Jahrhunderts – Session: Migration II, No. D03-V1*
- Havrylyshyn, O. (2007). Fifteen years of transformation in the post-communist world: Rapid reformers outperformed gradualists. *Cato Development Policy Analysis Series Paper*, (4).
- Kaczmarczyk, P., & Okólski, M. (2005). International migration in Central and Eastern Europe—current and future trends. In *United Nations expert group meeting on international migration and development, mimeo*.

- Kahanec, M., Pytlikova, M., & Zimmermann, K. F. (2016). The free movement of workers in an enlarged European Union: Institutional underpinnings of economic adjustment. In *Labor Migration, EU Enlargement, and the Great Recession* (pp. 1-34). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Ledesma, M. L. & Piracha, M. (2004). International Migration and the Role of Remittances in Eastern Europe. *International Migration*, 42(4), 65–83.
- 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.
- Mayda, A. M. (2010). International migration: A panel data analysis of the determinants of bilateral flows. *Journal of Population Economics*, 23(4), 1249-1274.
- Mayer, T., & Zignago, S. (2011). Notes on CEPII's distances measures: The GeoDist database.
- McFadden, D. (1984). Econometric Analysis of Qualitative Response Models, in Z. Griliches and M. Intriligator (eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics*, Vol. 2, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- OECD (2001). Trends in migration flows in Central and Eastern Europe, in *Migration Policies and EU Enlargement: The Case of Central and Eastern Europe*, OECD, Paris.
- Ortega, F., & Peri, G. (2013). The effect of income and immigration policies on international migration. *Migration Studies*, 1(1), 47-74.
- Palmer, J. R., & Pytlikova, M. (2015). Labor market laws and intra-European migration: The role of the state in shaping destination choices. *European Journal of Population*, 31(2), 127-153.
- Pedersen, P. J., Pytlikova, M., & Smith, N. (2008). Selection and network effects—Migration flows into OECD countries 1990–2000. *European Economic Review*, 52(7), 1160-1186
- Pesaran, M. H. (2006). Estimation and inference in large heterogeneous panels with a multifactor error structure. *Econometrica*, 74(4), 967-1012.
- Poprawe, M. (2015). On the relationship between corruption and migration: empirical evidence from a gravity model of migration. *Public Choice*, 163(3-4), 337-354.
- Reif, K., & Cunningham, G. & Hermson, Louis & Vantomme, Jacques (1997). Central Archive for Empirical Social Research (1997): Central and Eastern Eurobarometer 1990-1997: Trends CEEB1-8. European Commission [Principal investigator]. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA3648 Data file Version 1.0.0, doi:10.4232/1.3648

- Silva, J. S., & Tenreyro, S. (2006). The log of gravity. *The Review of Economics and statistics*, 88(4), 641-658.
- Silva, J. S., & Tenreyro, S. (2011). Further simulation evidence on the performance of the Poisson pseudo-maximum likelihood estimator. *Economics Letters*, 112(2), 220-222.
- Sjaastad, L. A. (1962). The costs and returns of human migration. *Journal of political Economy*, 70(5, Part 2), 80-93.
- Svejnar, J. (2002). Transition economies: Performance and challenges. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16(1), 3-28.
- UCDP (2015). UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset v.5-2015. Uppsala.
- UN (2013a). Trends in International Migrant Stock: Migrants by Destination and Origin (United Nations Database, POP/DB/MIG/Stock/Rev.2013). New York, NY: United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- UN (2013b). World Population Prospects: The 2012 Revision. DVD Edition. New York, NY: United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

## Appendix

Table A1 Definition, sources and descriptive statistics of main variables used in the analysis

Description	Variable	Source	Mean	St. Dev.	Minimum	Median	Maximum
Migration flow relative to population at origin (per 1,000)	$M_{ijt}/P_{ijt}$	Abel (2017), UN (2013b)	0.186	2.075	0.000	0.000	101.259
Non-zero migration flows			0.537	3.496	0.000	0.007	101.259
GDP per capita at destination (1,000 USD, log)	$\log(GDP_{jt})$	WDI	2.029	1.284	-1.410	2.104	4.837
GDP per capita at origin (1,000 USD, log)	$\log(GDP_{it})$	WDI	2.084	0.768	0.089	2.170	3.370
Unemployment rate at destination (%)	$U_{jt}$	WDI (ILO)	8.732	6.117	0.380	7.280	36.180
Unemployment rate at origin (%)	$U_{it}$	WDI (ILO)	11.993	6.470	3.640	10.780	34.720
Stock of immigrants (per 1,000; log)	$\log(S_{ijt} + 1/P_{it})$	UN (2013a)	-6.702	3.390	-11.908	-8.064	5.156
Physical distance (km, log)	$\log(dist_{it})$	Mayer and Zignago (2011)	8.400	0.867	4.088	8.595	9.824
Common border	$border_{ij}$	Mayer and Zignago (2011)	0.029	0.167	0.000	0.000	1.000
Same country in 1980s	$onestate_{ij}$		0.033	0.177	0.000	0.000	1.000
Common language	$lang_{ij}$	Mayer and Zignago (2011)	0.009	0.097	0.000	0.000	1.000
EU membership	$EU_{ijt}$		0.026	0.158	0.000	0.000	1.000
War casualties relative to population (per 1,000)	$war_{it}$	UCDP (2015)	0.065	0.398	0.000	0.000	4.034
Share of pop. in destination and origin (log)	$\log(P_{jt}/P_{it})$	UN (2013b)	0.114	1.968	-6.623	0.175	6.928
Political rights	$PR_{it}$	Freedom House	3.544	1.984	1.000	3.250	7.000
Civil liberties	$CL_{it}$	Freedom House	3.572	1.632	1.000	3.600	7.000
EBRD overall EBRD indicator		EBRD	2.564	0.782	1.030	2.675	3.962
EBRD Enterprises		EBRD	2,644	0,855	1,000	2,777	4,000
EBRD Markets and trade		EBRD	2,975	0,788	1,089	3,179	4,087
EBRD Financial institutions		EBRD	2,129	0,800	1,000	2,066	4,000
EBRD Infrastructure		EBRD	1.961	0.765	1.000	1.934	3.670