A Study on the Emigration Enablers of the Romanian Students in Theology

Aurelian-Petrus PLOPEANU¹,
Daniel HOMOCIANU²,
Constantin-Valer NECULA³

¹ PhD Researcher (CS III), Department of Interdisciplinary Research - Humanities and Social Sciences, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania, aplopeanu@gmail.com.

² PhD Researcher (CS III), Department of Research, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Romania.

³ Associate Professor PhD, Andrei Șaguna Faculty of Orthodox Theology, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania, Mitropoliei Street No.20, 550179, constantin.necula@ulbsibiu.ro.

Abstract: The main purpose of this article is to describe and validate/test a set of hypothetical traits of the theology students from two important Romanian universities regarding their migration attitudes after graduation. The study is based on a consistent questionnaire survey, both in terms of architecture of variables and number of complete responses. After cleaning, processing and doing all the required derivations on the original data, statistical analysis methods have been applied. The results have brought solid arguments to validate all the hypotheses that marked the starting point of this study. They finally proved the importance of specific personal motivations and personality traits as key enablers of the decision to emigrate in the Western Europe.

Keywords: *migration, students in theology, multinomial logistic regressions, recognition of personal value, openness.*

How to cite: Plopeanu, A.-P., Homocianu, D., & Necula, C.-V. (2018). A Study on the Emigration Enablers of the Romanian Students in Theology. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 10(2), 180-197. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/55>

1. Introduction

It is considered that the migration intentions among the students is a topic that raised a major interest in the literature (Li, Findlay, Jowett & Skeldon 1996, Gibson & McKenzie 2011, Nguyen, Ropers, Nderitu, Zuyderduin, Luboga & Hagopian 2008). In terms of “brain drain”, the migration of intelligentsia or “highly skilled workers” (Docquier & Rapoport 2012) is a difficult task for policymakers and decision makers from developing countries and low income ones (Ushkalov & Malakha 2001, Gouda, Kitt, Evans, Goggin, McGrath, Last, Hennessy, Arnett, O’Flynn, Dunne & O’Donovan 2017). For instance, the migration intentions of Lebanese physicians is a phenomenon that has important consequences both in terms of losing important intellectual capital stocks and prior public investments in education (Akl, Maroun, Major, Afif, Abdo, Choucair, Sakr, Li, Grant & Schünemann 2008). Also, the same scenario happens in the case of Irish medical students (Gouda, Kitt, Evans, Goggin, McGrath, Last, Hennessy, Arnett, O’Flynn, Dunne & O’Donovan 2015), nursing students in South Korea (Lee 2015), Malawian medical students and recent graduates (Bailey, Mandeville, Rhodes, Mipando & Muula 2012) or even Pakistani medical graduates (Imran, Azeem, Haider, Amjad & Bhatti 2011).

The family characteristics are an important determinant of the decision to emigrate. For instance, if a student comes from a family without two cohabiting parents, then he/she manifests a great stimulus to emigrate in the future. The financial well-being of his/her family is another cause of the migration decision. In this direction, the gender really matters. Another determinant of migration intention is the current academic grades. Therefore, the top male and female students manifest different intentions not to emigrate, the academic performances influence mainly the male ones. (Lu, Zong & Schissel, 2009: 306-307) Moreover, “In addition to these direct influences, parents’ human capital has an indirect influence especially on male students’ migration intentions, as do parents’ financial situation and marital status for both males and females. However, given significant gender differences with respect to family background and intention, we argue that having parents with a relatively low socioeconomic status does not necessarily discourage students from intending to apply for permanent residence, especially if those students are male.” (Lu, Zong & Schissel, 2009: 307)

An interesting fact is that generalizing the potential causes for migration, especially the desire to earn more money as monthly wages, could be deceptive. This important decision is not based always on such an

assumption. It could be something more profound, like the family support for such a behavior. Hence, "Family considerations, such as family support for the decision to settle abroad, not surprisingly, play an important role in the mobility decisions of the survey participants, indicating that the decision to migrate is not simply an individual choice based on earning a higher salary or enjoying better work conditions abroad." (Güngör & Tansel, 2005: 222) Also, in the case of several Romanian medical students, their decision is based on higher wages they could earn abroad, but also on better working conditions, more jobs in the health system and greater satisfactions brought by it (Suciu, Popescu, Ciumageanu & Buzoianu, 2017: 4-5). Thus, at least for this particular group, the personal recognition received in such an environment could be a decisive factor in the decision to emigrate on the long run.

This study is one of the very few which offers a new and valuable perspective regarding the students' in Theology from Iasi and Sibiu migration intentions after graduation. The novelty of this perspective is the university domain the students have chosen. The reasons why they intend to emigrate after graduation is the determinant for choosing this particular topic. We try to understand the reasons behind this important decision. What matters the most? The social expectations, the personal fulfillment (career, money, standard of living, personal recognition, etc.), the personality traits or the parental role models?

The major motivation of the paper is to validate a considerable number of hypothesis, such as:

- H1. The Romanian students in theology who are more inclined to place a great emphasis on the recognition of their personal value are more likely to emigrate rather than reside in the country of origin.

- H2. The same general type of students who are seeing themselves as future entrepreneurs / freelancers / self-employed or employees in the private sector are more inclined to emigrate rather than stay.

- H3. The same general type of students who consider lower wages as the trait of lack of economic incentives and therefore a cause of migration are more likely to emigrate rather than stay in own country.

- H4. The Romanian students in theology who manifest openness as psychological trait are more inclined to emigrate rather than stay.

- H5. The same general type of students who manifest agreeableness or conscientiousness as psychological traits are more inclined to stay rather than emigrate.

- H6. The older Romanian students in theology are more likely to reside in the country of origin rather than emigrate.

- H7. The Romanian students in theology with a higher degree of interpersonal trust are more likely to stay rather than emigrate.
- H8. The same general type of students having a higher average of high school grades are more likely to stay in own country rather than emigrate.

2. Data and methodology

Between 2017 and 2018, we have conducted a questionnaire-based investigation in two Romanian universities, namely Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași (UAIC) and Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu (ULB). We have focused mainly on the students at theology from the Faculty of Orthodox Theology “Dumitru Stăniloae” Iași (FTODS - UAIC) and those at Faculty of Orthodox Theology “Andrei Șaguna” Sibiu (FTAS - ULB). For FTODS, the total considered population was of almost 1000 students and we have collected a total number of 300 unique responses for 333 distributed questionnaires. For FTAS, the total considered population was of almost 450 students and we have collected 100 unique responses from 145 distributed. Therefore, the total amount of cases used for the overall analysis involved 400 distinct records collected via an online input form following the original questionnaire design into a spreadsheet data collector. The questionnaire was distributed under the printed format because of supervising needs and better control of the quality of the responses.

The raw data cleaning and processing involved the use of some spreadsheet functions for: (1) generating unique values for each field (e.g. deriving parents’ self-employed professions); (2) eliminating almost duplicates (semantic perspective); (3) the automatic replacements of values; (4) the automatic construction of dummy columns; (5) searching and verifying the belonging of a value to a set; (6) verifying and generating the appropriate symbols for all three levels of statistical significance used in most of the tables presented in this paper.

The general statistics and the short description of the variables used together with their abbreviation is available in table 1.

Table 1. Summary statistics including some abbreviations of the variables used

VARIABLES	Mean	Min	Max
OUTCOME VARIABLE (<i>MigrWesternEurope</i>)			
Probability of "Yes" (coded as 2) - we set "No" (coded as 0) as reference (ref.)	0.12	0	1
Probability of "I don't know" (coded as 1) - we set "No" as ref.	0.24	0	1
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES:			
Migration to Western Europe means recognizing own / personal value (<i>MigrateWest_IndivRecog</i>)	0.11	0	1
INDIVIDUAL'S CHARACTERISTICS AND PERSONALITY TRAITS			
Age of the respondent (<i>Age</i>)	23.63	18	55
Gender (<i>Male</i>)	0.87	0	1
Average of high-school grades (<i>HighSchoolAvgGrade</i>)	8.77	6.21	10
Average of baccalaureate grades (<i>BaccalaureateAvgGrade</i>)	7.98	5	9.9
Conscientiousness as hard work / sense of responsibility / perseverance (<i>Conscientiousness</i>)	0.88	0	1
Openness as independence / creativity / imagination (<i>Openness</i>)	0.57	0	1
Agreeableness as good manners / tolerance / obedience / altruism (<i>Agreeableness</i>)	0.89	0	1
INDIVIDUAL'S BELIEFS AND ATTITUDES			
Possible cause of migration - Communist Past (<i>MigrCause_CommunistPast</i>)	0.35	0	1
Possible cause of migration - Laziness (<i>MigrCause_Laziness</i>)	0.42	0	1
Possible cause of migration - Poor Work Ethic (<i>MigrCause_DegradedWorkEthic</i>)	0.22	0	1
Possible cause of migration - Lower Wages (<i>MigrCause_LowerWages</i>)	0.68	0	1
Possible cause of migration - Low Professional Satisfactions (<i>MigrCause_LowProfSatisf</i>)	0.28	0	1
Possible cause of migration - High Bureaucracy (<i>MigrCause_HighBureaucracy</i>)	0.37	0	1
Possible cause of migration - Social Injustice (<i>MigrCause_SocialInjustice</i>)	0.31	0	1
<i>DoYouSearchForAjob</i>	0.4	0	1
<i>FutureFreelancer</i> - we set employee in public sector (work for the state) as ref.	0.29	0	1
Future employee in the private sector (<i>FutureEmpInPrivSect</i>) - employee in public sector as ref.	0.25	0	1
Agree with the stimulating effect of competition (<i>CompetStimEffect</i>)	0.82	0	1
Individual freedom is a factor of progress (<i>IndivFreedomProgrFactor</i>)	0.56	0	1
Interpersonal trust on a 1-5 scale (<i>TrustInPeople</i>)	2.9	1	5
FAMILY BACKGROUND			
Self-employed profession - at least one parent (<i>AtLeast1ParentSelfEmpJob</i>) - no parent as ref.	0.31	0	1
Parents' severity on a 1-10 scale (<i>ParentsSeverity</i>)	6.74	1	10

N=400

In order to analyze the determinant factors that influence the probability (Scott Long and Jeremy Freese 2006) to choose a certain behavior regarding the migration (Yes, I will migrate / I don't know / No, coded as 2 / 1 / 0), we have used the following empirical model based on multinomial logistic (MNL) regressions (eq.1):

$$\ln[\Pr_i(K | X) / \Pr_i(\text{ref} | X)] = \beta_{0,K|\text{ref}} + \beta_{1,K|\text{ref}} * \text{MigrateWest_IndivRecog}_i + \sum_{j=2}^m \beta_{j,K|\text{ref}} * X_{ij} + \varepsilon_{K|\text{ref} i} \quad (1)$$

$\Pr_i$ is the probability of a certain behavior regarding the migration in Western Europe / outcome K for individual i, where $K = 1, 2$ and 0 is set as reference (ref=0), $i=1, \dots, n$, n as the total number of responses and $j=2, \dots, m$, m as the total number of independent variables. $\beta_{j,K|\text{ref}}$ measures the effect of a change in variable X_{ij} on the probability of a certain behavior. *MigrateWest_IndivRecog* is the core variable and it has the value of 1 only if the

respondent considers the migration to Western Europe equivalent to the recognition of personal value.

The explanatory variable X_{ij} (see eq.1) contains an array of the following individual and family characteristics (table 1): age, gender, individual education (average of high-school and baccalaureate grades), personality traits (conscientiousness, agreeableness and openness), individual beliefs and attitudes (seven possible causes of migration, considerations regarding a current / future job, the stimulating effect of competition and the role of individual freedom as progress cause in life/society, trust in other people) and a brief family background (proxied by the self-employed profession of parents if existing for at least one of them and the severity of the parents). $\epsilon_{K|ref\ i}$ is the error term. For a reference other than the one above (0), we can compute coefficients as ln of odds ratios by subtraction starting from the initial reference (eq.2).

$$\ln[Pr_1(1|X) / Pr_1(2|X)] = \ln[Pr_1(1|X) / Pr_1(ref|X)] - \ln[Pr_1(2|X) / Pr_1(ref|X)] \quad (2)$$

The entire statistical analysis based on MNL regressions was performed using Stata 13.0 64 bits MP (MultiProcessing/ParallelEdition).

3. Results and statistical interpretations

Table 2 presents the MNL coefficients for estimating the probability to answer with “I don’t know if I will migrate after graduation” (eq.1) regarding the intentions of theology students from Iasi and Sibiu. For the first scenario (a), we have included in our model only the core variable *MigrateWest_IndivRecog* which proves to be strong and significant along all 6 scenarios. This core variable of our model demonstrates that migrating to Western countries for the recognition of personal value significantly increases the probability to be undecided rather than stay. For scenario (b), we progressively introduced other variables, namely *Age* manifesting a negative influence on the undecided category and *Openness* having a positive one. Starting with the 3rd scenario (c), the variable *Age* kept the same influence, *Consciousness* and *Agreeableness* started to manifest a negative influence, while *MigrCause_HighBureaucracy* exerted a positive one. Starting with scenario (c), *Openness* became insignificant along the rest of scenarios. Scenario (d) manifests the same influences like in the previous one, while the new entries *FutureFreelancer* and *FutureEmpInPrivSect* prove positive and significant effects. Scenario (e) and the most comprehensive scenario (f) record the same influences like the previous one.

Table 2. MNL coefficients as Ln of odds ratios for estimating the probability of choosing “I don’t know if I will migrate” for theology students from both Iasi and Sibiu

Probability of outcome1 (I don't know if I will migrate in Western Europe)	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
MigrateWest_IndivRecog	2.37*** (0.58)	2.36*** (0.60)	2.32*** (0.61)	2.26*** (0.61)	2.21*** (0.61)	2.22*** (0.61)
Age		-0.09** (0.03)	-0.09** (0.04)	-0.08** (0.04)	-0.08** (0.04)	-0.08** (0.04)
Male		0.56 (0.45)	0.58 (0.46)	0.55 (0.48)	0.6 (0.49)	0.61 (0.49)
HighSchoolAvgGrade		-0.3 (0.23)	-0.29 (0.24)	-0.14 (0.25)	-0.17 (0.25)	-0.17 (0.25)
BaccalaureateAvgGrade		-0.09 (0.17)	-0.13 (0.17)	-0.18 (0.18)	-0.14 (0.18)	-0.13 (0.18)
Conscientiousness		-0.63 (0.39)	-0.73* (0.40)	-0.77* (0.41)	-0.7* (0.42)	-0.71* (0.42)
Openness		0.51* (0.28)	0.39 (0.30)	0.35 (0.30)	0.33 (0.31)	0.34 (0.31)
Agreeableness		-0.75 (0.47)	-0.84* (0.48)	-0.9* (0.49)	-0.89* (0.49)	-0.91* (0.50)
MigrCause_CommunistPast			0.35 (0.29)	0.37 (0.30)	0.38 (0.30)	0.39 (0.30)
MigrCause_Laziness			0.31 (0.27)	0.29 (0.28)	0.29 (0.28)	0.29 (0.28)
MigrCause_DegradedWorkEthic			-0.28 (0.35)	-0.4 (0.36)	-0.41 (0.36)	-0.41 (0.36)
MigrCause_LowerWages			0.34 (0.30)	0.4 (0.31)	0.37 (0.31)	0.37 (0.31)
MigrCause_LowProfSatisf			0.04 (0.32)	-0.01 (0.33)	-0.07 (0.33)	-0.05 (0.33)
MigrCause_HighBureaucracy			0.51* (0.30)	0.57* (0.31)	0.56* (0.32)	0.56* (0.32)
MigrCause_SocialInjustice			-0.02 (0.31)	0.05 (0.32)	0.03 (0.32)	0.02 (0.33)
DoYouSearchForAjob				0.1 (0.28)	0.11 (0.29)	0.11 (0.29)
FutureFreelancer				0.93*** (0.33)	0.91*** (0.33)	0.9*** (0.33)
FutureEmpInPrivSect				0.79** (0.34)	0.85** (0.35)	0.84** (0.35)
CompetStimEffect					-0.25 (0.34)	-0.25 (0.34)
IndivFreedomProgrFactor					0.32 (0.28)	0.32 (0.28)
TrustInPeople					-0.12 (0.16)	-0.12 (0.16)
AtLeast1ParentSelfEmpJob						0.1 (0.30)
ParentsSeverity						0.01 (0.07)
Observations	400	380	380	380	380	380
LR chi2	83.75	122.49	135.21	146.47	153.82	154.3
Prob>chi2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Pseudo R square	0.12	0.18	0.2	0.22	0.23	0.23

Source: Own calculations for all 6 specifications / scenarios progressively including the core variable -(a) and the background controls -(b)-(f).

Note 1: Standard errors in parentheses. *, **, *** indicate significance at 10%, 5% and 1%, respectively.

Note 2: All variables (lines), both with and without significant influence (minimum 10%) were left in this table.

Table 3 emphasizes MNL coefficients for estimating the probability of choosing “I will migrate” for theology students from Iasi and Sibiu (eq.1). Along all 6 scenarios (a to f), the core variable *MigrateWest_IndivRecog* proved to be even stronger and significant, its coefficients being greater than in the

previous model, meaning a stronger positive influence on the likelihood of migrating than being undecided. Scenario (b) introduces variables showing negative significant influences towards the migration proclivity, namely *Age*, *HighSchoolAvgGrade* and *Agreeableness*, while the variable *Openness* exerts a positive effect. Scenarios (e) and (f) stress the same influences. Starting with the 3rd scenario, the variable *HighSchoolAvgGrade* losses definitively its effect. As a partial conclusion, the recognition of the personal value significantly increases the probability to migrate after graduation.

Table 3. MNL coefficients as Ln of odds ratios for estimating the probability of choosing “I will migrate” for theology students from both Iasi and Sibiu

Probability of outcome2 (I will migrate in Western Europe)	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
MigrateWest_IndivRecog	4.23*** (0.58)	4.27*** (0.64)	4.36*** (0.65)	4.28*** (0.65)	4.26*** (0.66)	4.28*** (0.66)
Age		-0.11** (0.06)	-0.12** (0.06)	-0.12* (0.06)	-0.11* (0.06)	-0.11* (0.06)
Male		0.08 (0.65)	0.02 (0.67)	0.07 (0.69)	0.22 (0.73)	0.24 (0.73)
HighSchoolAvgGrade		-0.64* (0.35)	-0.65* (0.37)	-0.53 (0.38)	-0.46 (0.38)	-0.48 (0.38)
BaccalaureateAvgGrade		-0.22 (0.26)	-0.24 (0.27)	-0.3 (0.28)	-0.29 (0.29)	-0.29 (0.29)
Conscientiousness		-0.78 (0.57)	-0.91 (0.60)	-0.95 (0.60)	-0.87 (0.61)	-0.93 (0.62)
Openness		1.48*** (0.49)	1.32** (0.52)	1.29** (0.52)	1.54*** (0.56)	1.58*** (0.56)
Agreeableness		-2.03*** (0.62)	-2.15*** (0.65)	-2.24*** (0.66)	-2.4*** (0.69)	-2.41*** (0.69)
MigrCause_CommunistPast			0.02 (0.45)	0.09 (0.46)	0.02 (0.48)	0.04 (0.48)
MigrCause_Laziness			0.13 (0.43)	0.06 (0.44)	0.01 (0.45)	0.02 (0.45)
MigrCause_DegradedWorkEthic			0.35 (0.49)	0.26 (0.51)	0.23 (0.52)	0.24 (0.52)
MigrCause_LowerWages			0.61 (0.48)	0.69 (0.49)	0.58 (0.50)	0.55 (0.50)
MigrCause_LowProfSatisf			0.47 (0.48)	0.42 (0.49)	0.28 (0.51)	0.3 (0.51)
MigrCause_HighBureaucracy			-0.03 (0.48)	-0.04 (0.49)	-0.01 (0.50)	-0.03 (0.51)
MigrCause_SocialInjustice			0.1 (0.51)	0.14 (0.51)	0.12 (0.52)	0.09 (0.53)
DoYouSearchForAJob				-0.27 (0.44)	-0.19 (0.45)	-0.19 (0.45)
FutureFreelancer				0.66 (0.52)	0.79 (0.53)	0.74 (0.55)
FutureEmplnPrivSect				0.79 (0.52)	0.93* (0.55)	0.91 (0.56)
CompetStimEffect					0.73 (0.61)	0.74 (0.62)
IndivFreedomProgrFactor					0.51 (0.46)	0.54 (0.46)
TrustInPeople					-0.35 (0.24)	-0.35 (0.24)
AtLeast1ParentSelfEmpJob						0.22 (0.46)
ParentsSeverity						0.05 (0.10)
Observations	400	380	380	380	380	380
LR chi2	83.75	122.49	135.21	146.47	153.82	154.3
Prob>chi2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Pseudo R square	0.12	0.18	0.2	0.22	0.23	0.23

Source and Notes 1 and 2 are the same as in Table 2.

Table 4. MNL coefficients as Ln of odds ratios for estimating the probability of choosing “I don’t know if I will migrate” only for theology respondents studying in Sibiu

Probability of outcome1 (I don't know if I will migrate in Western Europe)	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Age		-0.11 (0.09)	-0.24* (0.13)	-0.35** (0.15)	-0.64*** (0.22)	-0.66*** (0.24)
Male		1.93 (1.23)	2.44* (1.27)	2.76* (1.46)	5.06*** (1.95)	5.18** (2.03)
HighSchoolAvgGrade		-0.33 (0.45)	-0.66 (0.52)	-0.75 (0.62)	-2.24** (0.95)	-2.23** (1.06)
Conscientiousness		-2.02* (1.07)	-1.83 (1.18)	-1.99 (1.39)	-2.15 (1.47)	-2.25 (1.50)
Openness		1.64** (0.75)	2.13** (0.87)	2.44** (1.08)	3.45*** (1.30)	3.8*** (1.43)
Agreeableness		-1.73 (1.31)	-2.31 (1.49)	-3.73* (1.92)	-5.2** (2.24)	-5.26** (2.33)
MigrCause_CommunistPast			0.96 (0.64)	1.54* (0.80)	2.12** (0.98)	2.07** (1.02)
MigrCause_Laziness			-0.54 (0.65)	-1.21 (0.80)	-2.56** (1.13)	-2.62** (1.21)
MigrCause_DegradedWorkEthic			1.28* (0.70)	1.18 (0.84)	2.34** (1.08)	2.48** (1.14)
MigrCause_LowerWages			1.62* (0.94)	2.47** (1.16)	2.91** (1.30)	3.06** (1.38)
MigrCause_HighBureaucracy			-0.72 (0.79)	-1.57 (0.97)	-3.1** (1.31)	-3.05** (1.42)
FutureFreelancer				3.5*** (1.17)	4.68*** (1.54)	4.76*** (1.70)
IndivFreedomProgrFactor					3.05** (1.22)	3.2** (1.28)
Observations	100	99	99	99	99	99
LR chi2	22.92	46.49	65.44	82.16	96.81	98.63
Prob>chi2	0.0000	0.0001	0.0002	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Pseudo R square	0.12	0.24	0.34	0.43	0.5	0.51

Source and Note 1 are the same as in Table 2.

Note 2: Only those variables (lines) having a significant influence (minimum 10%) at least for one set of specifications (column) were left in this table.

Table 5. MNL coefficients as Ln of odds ratios for estimating the probability of choosing “I will migrate” only for theology respondents studying in Sibiu

Probability of outcome2 (I will migrate in Western Europe)	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
MigrateWest_IndivRecog	3.89*** (1.12)	4.28*** (1.48)	5.97*** (1.93)	5.52*** (1.91)	6.47*** (2.13)	6.51*** (2.11)
Age		-0.12 (0.10)	-0.16 (0.13)	-0.22* (0.12)	-0.25* (0.14)	-0.28* (0.15)
Openness		2.81* (1.67)	3.36 (2.17)	3.67 (2.31)	4.93* (2.78)	5.54* (3.15)
MigrCause_LowerWages			2.12 (1.37)	2.9* (1.63)	3.38* (1.97)	3.04 (2.00)
FutureFreelancer				2.41 (1.47)	3.56** (1.78)	3.48* (1.82)
Observations	100	99	99	99	99	99
LR chi2	22.92	46.49	65.44	82.16	96.81	98.63
Prob>chi2	0.00	0.0001	0.0002	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Pseudo R square	0.12	0.24	0.34	0.43	0.5	0.51

Source and Notes 1 and 2 are the same as in Table 4.

Table 4 presents the MNL coefficients for estimating the probability of choosing the answer “I don’t know if I will migrate” only for theology respondents studying in Sibiu. Here, a striking exception was emphasized only for this model and only for the theology students who study in Sibiu. Along all 6 scenarios, the core variable proved to be insignificant. Instead, for the most comprehensive scenario, (f), the variables *Male*, *Openness*, *MigrCause_CommunistPast*, *MigrCause_DegradedWorkEthic*, *MigrCause_LowerWages* and *FutureFreelancer* positively and significantly influence the indecisive attitudes towards migration, while negative effects are induced by *Age*, *HighSchoolAvgGrade*, *Agreeableness*, *MigrCause_Laziness* and *MigrCause_HighBureaucracy*.

Table 5 illustrates the MNL coefficients for estimating the probability of choosing “I will migrate”, but only for theology respondents studying in Sibiu. Here the situation changes in comparison with the previous one, the core variable *MigrateWest_IndivRecog* positively and significantly increases the probability to migrate after graduation along all 6 scenarios. More, from scenario (b) to the last one (f), its coefficients almost doubled. For the last scenario, the variable *Age* exerts a negative effect, while *Openness* and *FutureFreelancer* have positive influences, although they all have rather weak ones.

Table 6. MNL coefficients as Ln of odds ratios for estimating the probability of choosing “I don’t know if I will migrate” only for theology respondents studying in Iasi

Probability of outcome1 (I don't know if I will migrate in Western Europe)	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
MigrateWest_IndivRecog	2.71*** (0.66)	2.74*** (0.68)	2.82*** (0.71)	2.88*** (0.73)	2.79*** (0.72)	2.78*** (0.72)
Age		-0.09** (0.04)	-0.09** (0.04)	-0.07* (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)
MigrCause_Laziness			0.59* (0.33)	0.66* (0.34)	0.66* (0.34)	0.67* (0.34)
MigrCause_DegradedWorkEthic			-1.36** (0.56)	-1.43** (0.57)	-1.39** (0.58)	-1.39** (0.58)
MigrCause_HighBureaucracy			0.5 (0.36)	0.65* (0.38)	0.71* (0.39)	0.72* (0.39)
FutureFreelancer				0.71* (0.39)	0.65 (0.40)	0.67* (0.41)
FutureEmplnPrivSect				1.18*** (0.42)	1.31*** (0.43)	1.33*** (0.44)
Observations	300	281	281	281	281	281
LR chi2	65.43	93.08	109.49	119.9	128.5	129.2
Prob>chi2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Pseudo R square	0.13	0.19	0.23	0.25	0.27	0.27

Source and Notes 1 and 2 are the same as in Table 4.

Table 6 presents the MNL coefficients for estimating the probability of choosing “I don’t know if I will migrate” only for the theology

respondents studying in Iasi. The core variable *MigrateWest_IndivRecog* manifests positive and significant influences along all scenarios from (a) to (f), a situation which proves that the recognition of personal value through migration significantly increases the probability of indecisive attitudes towards migration after graduation. For the most comprehensive scenario, the positive effect of the variable *FutureEmpInPrivSect* is strong and highly significant, the negative influence of *MigrCause_DegradedWorkEthic* is also emphasized, while other influences are rather weak, but still significant (*MigrCause_Laziness*, *MigrCause_HighBureaucracy* and *FutureFreelancer*).

Table 7. MNL coefficients as Ln of odds ratios for estimating the probability of choosing “I will migrate” only for theology respondents studying in Iasi

Probability of outcome2 (I will migrate in Western Europe)	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
<i>MigrateWest_IndivRecog</i>	4.4*** (0.69)	4.57*** (0.77)	4.67*** (0.80)	4.73*** (0.81)	4.62*** (0.83)	4.65*** (0.83)
Age		-0.12* (0.07)	-0.12* (0.07)	-0.09 (0.08)	-0.12 (0.09)	-0.11 (0.09)
Conscientiousness		-1.1* (0.63)	-1.22* (0.67)	-1.44** (0.69)	-1.24* (0.73)	-1.35* (0.74)
Openness		1.15** (0.58)	1.02* (0.61)	1.06* (0.62)	1.31** (0.66)	1.36** (0.67)
Agreeableness		-2.32*** (0.69)	-2.5*** (0.73)	-2.59*** (0.74)	-2.74*** (0.77)	-2.73*** (0.77)
<i>FutureEmpInPrivSect</i>				1.21* (0.69)	1.46** (0.74)	1.45* (0.76)
<i>TrustInPeople</i>					-0.67** (0.33)	-0.68** (0.33)
Observations	300	281	281	281	281	281
LR chi2	65.43	93.08	109.49	119.9	128.5	129.2
Prob>chi2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Pseudo R square	0.13	0.19	0.23	0.25	0.27	0.27

Source and Notes 1 and 2 are the same as in Table 4.

Table 7 highlights the MNL coefficients for estimating the probability of choosing “I will migrate” only for theology respondents studying in Iasi. Again, for all scenarios, the core variable is robust, highly significant and positively influences the probability to migrate after graduation.

For scenario (f), the positive effect of *FutureEmpInPrivSect* is positive and significant, while a significant negative influence of *MigrCause_DegradedWorkEthic* is highlighted. The rest of the influences are weak, but significant (*MigrCause_Laziness*, *MigrCause_HighBureaucracy* and *FutureFreelancer*).

4. Discussion

Starting from the tables 3, 5 and 7, first we have tried to synthesize the most powerful common influences for all three profiles corresponding to theology students (overall – those studying in Iasi and Sibiu; studying only in Sibiu; and only in Iasi, respectively) who chose the answer “I will migrate” (outcome 2) when asked if they will migrate in Western Europe after finishing their studies. Those influences correspond to the following variables:

- the variable which represents the core of the model (*MigrateWest_IndivRecog*) has a positive influence on the decision to migrate after graduation, with the highest average magnitude and the strongest and the most stable significance in all six tested scenarios;

- *Openness* has a positive influence on outcome 2, with less average magnitude and stable significance only in three of five tested scenarios;

- *Age* has a negative influence, with the smallest average magnitude, but with stable significance in at least two of five tested scenarios. From the above statistical analyses, it results that the theology students who intend to migrate in Western Europe after graduation put the greatest emphasis on their personal value recognition, an element that makes us believe that they are willing to experience something else and in different social and cultural environments. We cannot state that these students will not become priests or they are without calling or vocation for this noble mission, but their inclinations towards migration, at this moment, make them atypical, at least from a theoretical perspective. Moreover, the same group of students who considers migration an option for the future, also manifests an accent put on openness, a variable that emphasizes their potential capacity to be flexible and open-minded. Another idea, based on statistical analysis, is an intuitive one, namely: the older the Romanian students in theology are, the more likely to stay rather than emigrate in Western European countries.

In terms of the most powerful specific influences on outcome 2, for the same aforementioned profiles and based on the same tables above (3, 5 and 7), we can present the following corresponding variables:

- *Conscientiousness* has a negative influence on the probability of outcome 2 with the highest average magnitude and significance in all five tested scenarios, for the group of respondents studying only in Iasi;

- *TrustInPeople* exerts a negative influence with less average magnitude and significance in both final tested scenarios, for the same group of Iasi;

- *MigrCause_LowerWages* has a positive influence on the probability of the outcome 2 with a relatively high average magnitude and significance in only two of the four scenarios tested, for the group of respondents studying only in Sibiu;

- *FutureFreelancer* manifests a positive influence with a relatively high average magnitude and significance only in two scenarios of the three tested, for the same group of Sibiu.

The most powerful negative specific influences on outcome 2 for the students in Iasi are caused by conscientiousness and interpersonal trust. We could explain these influences as it follows: the students who manifest scrupulous, hard-working, dutiful and careful behaviors are individuals who are opposed to nonconformist ones (DeYoung, Peterson and Higgins 2002) and, therefore, are not very inclined to make radical changes by taking risky decisions like migration in Western Europe after graduation. The students who show an increased trust in the people around are not willing to migrate maybe due to their capacity to construct and develop networks of mutual trusts who can institutionally solve in an efficient manner specific problems and issues. In other words, "In those networks, members bet valued outcomes on the likelihood that other people will meet their responsibilities competently... For thousands of years, trust networks have performed an enormous range of political, economic, and spiritual work for human beings, especially those human beings who could not rely on governments to provide them with sustaining services." (Tilly 2007:5)

The most powerful negative specific influences on outcome 2 for the students in Sibiu are caused by two variables: *MigrCause_LowerWages* and *FutureFreelancer*. Lower wages, as one of the most important migration causes, is a very striking finding. The theology students from Sibiu who consider that people usually migrate in Western European countries due to lower wages are not inclined to migrate after graduation. In other words, their decision is based not on this kind of perspective, but greatly on their personal value recognition which is not synonymous with material rewards paid for their effort. Another important negative influence is based on their desire to become freelancers after graduation. Hence, the individuals who are eager or intend to become entrepreneurs (not priests) are stimulated to stay in the home country instead of migrating in Western Europe.

For those choosing the answer "I don't know if I will migrate" (outcome 1), the most powerful common influences derived starting from tables 2, 4 and 6 correspond to:

- *FutureFreelancer* has a positive influence, with the highest magnitude and stable significance in at least two of the three scenarios tested. The main idea is this: if the decision to become entrepreneur after graduation is highly appreciated by the theology students, then they are undecided to emigrate or not.

- *MigrCause_HighBureaucracy* - overall, high bureaucracy as a cause for migrating abroad presents a positive effect on outcome 1, with less magnitude and significance in most of the four tested scenarios, but on each group its influence is rather divergent: a positive influence for the group of Iasi and a negative one for that of Sibiu.

- *Age* has a negative influence, with the smallest average magnitude and significance in at least three scenarios of the five tested. The older the Romanian students in theology are, the less likely to be undecided to migrate or not in Western European countries.

In terms of the strongest specific influences on outcome 1, based on the same tables above (2, 4 and 6) and for the same mentioned profiles, we can present the following related variables:

- *MigrCause_DegradedWorkEthic* has a negative effect on the undecided students about migrating abroad, the highest average magnitude and high and stable significance in all four tested scenarios for the theology group studying in Iasi.

- *MigrCause_Laziness* exerts a positive influence on the undecided ones with less average magnitude and significance in all four tested scenarios, for the same theology group of Iasi;

- *Male* has a positive influence on the undecided students, with high average magnitude and significance in four of the five tested scenarios, for the theology students in Sibiu;

- *HighSchoolAvgGrade* manifests a negative effect on the undecided ones, with less magnitude and significance only in two scenarios of the five tested, for the same group of Sibiu;

- all three variables, namely: *MigrCause_LowerWages*, *MigrCause_DegradedWorkEthic* and *MigrCause_CommunistPast*, exert positive influences on the undecided students and have a considerable magnitude and significance in at least three scenarios of the four tested, for the same group of Sibiu;

- *MigrCause_Laziness* presents a negative influence on outcome 1, less magnitude and significance only in two of the four tested scenarios, for the same group of Sibiu;

- *IndivFreedomProgrFactor* has a positive effect on outcome 1, with high average magnitude and significance in both final scenarios tested, for the same students who study theology in Sibiu;

- for the theology students in Sibiu who are undecided, the influence of the core variable (*MigrateWest_IndivRecog*) is not emphasized in table 4, due to its lack of significance or consistency.

Consequently, we can state that the hypothesis H1, H4 and H6 are validated in general (overall) and also for both distinct groups from Iasi and Sibiu. Moreover, H2 - the future employee in the private sector part is overall validated and also for the distinct group of Iasi, while H2 - the future freelancers' part and H3 are validated only for the distinct group of Sibiu. Similarly, H5 - Agreeableness is overall validated and also for the distinct group of Iasi, while H5 - Conscientiousness and H7 only for the distinct group of Iasi. Finally, H8 is validated only in general and, somehow strikingly, not on each of the two specific groups.

5. Conclusions

The paper studies how migration intentions after graduation for theology students from two Romanian universities, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi and Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, are mainly affected by the personal background, traits and attitudes and not by parental role models. Using a unique survey conducted among the theology students in these university centres in 2017 and 2018, we analyze the influences of these variables towards the emigration proclivity. The findings emphasize mainly that the recognition of personal value, as one of the most important driver to go abroad, significantly increases the probability to migrate after graduation. Moreover, an important personality trait, openness, positively and significantly influence the probability to migrate in the Western Europe, while agreeableness is a strong negative determinant of such a subjective decision.

More specific, on each theology group the results are quite interesting, with different influences and magnitudes. Therefore, for the theology group from Iași, there is a strong tendency towards the more general model, in terms of coefficients and their magnitude: the core variable *MigrateWest_IndivRecog* which means to consider migration to Western Europe as the equivalent of recognizing personal value and, the *Openness* as a personality trait are the ones that most increase the likelihood a student will migrate after graduating theology, while the *Agreeableness* seems to have a negative influence. The variable *FutureEmpInPrivSect*, meaning a student sees

himself as a future employee in the private sector, is in fact a new positive enabler of such a decision, while *Conscientiousness* and *TrustInPeople* are actually negative ones.

In the case of theology students who study in Sibiu, this group has some features that are more pronounced than the overall model and the group of theology students from Iasi. Therefore, the students from Sibiu put a much more emphasis (positive) on the recognition of the personal value, on the possibility that in the near future to start a career as freelancers (self-employees) and on openness as personality trait as the main drivers of migration intentions after graduation. The results are quite striking because they stress some particular features and a much more pronounced mundane perspective of those willing to migrate after graduation and who take into consideration not to become priests. Therefore, the theology students from Sibiu who manifest intentions to migrate after graduation are much more equipped than the other ones with those qualities needed to succeed in a globalized and flexible “global village” (McLuhan and Powers 1989), qualities to be found to the individuals who are market-friendly and pursue their own interests in a rational manner.

In conclusion, without emphasizing definitive and rigid statements, we stress that the decision to migrate in the Western Europe for Romanian students in theology after graduation is mainly associated with a combination of seeking recognition of personal value and a set of traits such as flexibility, independence, creativity and curiosity.

References

- Bailey, N., Mandeville, K. L., Rhodes, T., Mipando, M. & Muula, A. S. (2012). Postgraduate career intentions of medical students and recent graduates in Malawi: a qualitative interview study. *BMC Medical Education*, 12(87): 1-10.
- DeYoung, C., Peterson, J., & Higgins, D. (2002). Higher-order factors of the Big Five predict conformity: Are there neuroses of health? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33(4), 533-552.
- Docquier, F., & Rapaport, H. (2012). Globalization, brain drain, and development. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 50(3), 681-730.
- Elie A. A., Maroun, N., Major, S., Afif, C., Abdo, A., Choucair, J., Sakr, M., Li, C. K., Grant, B/ J. B., & Schünemann, H. J. (2008). Post-graduation migration intentions of students of Lebanese medical schools: a survey study. *BMC Public Health*, 8:191, 1-8.

- Gibson, J., & McKenzie, D. (2011). The microeconomic determinants of emigration and return migration of the best and brightest: Evidence from the Pacific. *Journal of Development Economics*, 95(1), 18-29.
- Gouda, P., Kitt, K., Evans, D. S., Goggin, D., McGrath, D., Last, J., Hennessy, M., Arnett, R., O'Flynn, S., Dunne, F., & O'Donovan, D. (2015). Ireland's medical brain drain: migration intentions of Irish medical students. *Human Resources for Health*, 13(11), 1-9.
- Gouda, P., Kitt, K., Evans, D. S., Goggin, D., McGrath, D., Last, J., Hennessy, M., Arnett, R., O'Flynn, S., Dunne, F., & O'Donovan, D. (2017). Push and stay factors affecting Irish medical student migration intentions. *Irish Journal of Medical Science*, 186, 25-31.
- Güngör, N. D., & Tansel, A. (2014). Brain drain from Turkey: return intentions of skilled migrants. *International Migration*, 52(5), 208-226.
- Imran, N., Azeem, Z., Haider, I. I., Amjad, N. & Bhatti, M. R. (2011). Brain drain: post-graduation migration intentions and the influencing factors among medical graduates from Lahore, Pakistan. *BMC Research Notes*, 4(417), 1-5.
- Lee, E. (2015). Factors influencing the intent to migrate in nursing students in South Korea. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 1-9.
- Li, F. L. N., Findlay, A. M., Jowett, A. J. & Skeldon, R. (1996). Migrating to learn and learning - to migrate: a study of the experiences and intentions of international student migrants. *International Journal of Population Geography*, 2, 51-67.
- Long, S. J., & Freese, J. (2006). *Regression models for categorical dependent variables using Stata*, 2nd ed. College Station. TX: Stata Press.
- Lu, Y., Zong L., & Schissel, B. (2009). To stay or return: migration intentions of students from People's Republic of China in Saskatchewan, Canada. *International Migration & Integration*, 10, 283-310.
- McLuhan, M., & Powers, B. R. (1989). *The Global Village: transformations in world life and media in the 21st Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nguyen, L., Ropers, S., Nderitu, E., Zuyderduin, A., Luboga, S. & Hagopian, A. (2008). Intent to migrate among nursing students in Uganda: Measures of the brain drain in the next generation of health professionals. *Human Resources for Health*, 6(5), 1-11.
- Suciu, S. M., Popescu, C. A., Ciumageanu, M. D., & Buzoianu, A. D. (2017). Physician migration at its roots: a study on the emigration preferences and plans among medical students in Romania. *Human Resources for Health*, 15(6), 1-9.

- Tilly, C. (2007). Trust Networks in Transnational Migration. *Sociological Forum*, 22(1), 3-24.
- Ushkalov, I. G., & Malakha, I. A. (2001). The "Brain Drain" as a global phenomenon and its characteristics in Russia. *Russian Social Science Review*, 42(5), 79-95.