# INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND GLOBALIZATION: A PANEL DATA ANALYSIS

**Manas Roy**

Assistant Professor
Department of Economics, School of Humanities and Social Sciences
Manipal University Jaipur, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

***Abstract:*****Globalization promotes free movement of economic activities across political boundaries of the states. Movement of goods and services is an indicator of globalization. When we are talking about globalization, we assume and visualize a world divided into fragments by international boundaries by the movement of goods and services and the movable factors of production across the borders towards higher returns. These movements should take place till the differences in the returns offered in the different corners of the global economy are ironed out and the differentiated world becomes truly integrated into a global village. The question arises how far it is true for human migration or movement of people across the globe.Migration serves not only as an instrument to adjust the composition of national and regional labour markets but also provides responses to the needs for skills and personnel resulting from technological advances, changes in market conditions as well as industrial transformations. It offers a potential to replenish declining work forces as well as to inject workers, potentially increasing innovation and mobility in work forces. The major objective of this paper is to theoretically as well as empirically search the causes of international migration for evidences of globalization.**

***IndexTerms*** **-Globalization, Migration, Panel data, Fixed effect, Random effect**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Globalizationis a phenomenon that promotes expansion of economic activities across boundaries of states[1], development of extensive worldwide patterns of economic relationships between nations that helps the process of increasing economic integration and growing economic interdependence between countries (Nayyar, 1996), emphasizing co-operation and acts as a means of prosperity of a nation by means of openness (Bhagwati, 2007). Since Globalization means openness, there should be free movement of people among countries since it is mostly due to economic causes (Ravenstein, 1885).But how far this proposition is actually carried out as far as the economic characteristics of globalization is concerned is the main findings of this study.

## II. SURVEY OF LITERATURE

### 2.1 Globalization: Concept and Its Economic Characteristics

Globalization is one of the most powerful forces shaping the world; however, there is no widely accepted definition of this complex phenomenon (Prakash and Hart, 1999). It is a microeconomic phenomenon that has caught people flatfooted (Wolfgang, 2000). The United Nations ESCWA[2] has written globalization as the reduction and removal of barriers between national borders in order to facilitate the flow of goods, capital, services and labour (HDR, 1999). The Commission on Global Governance[3]defines globalization as the process of deregulation and increasing interaction among the different economic entities with a view to move towards an integrated global market (Giddens, 1990). The International Monetary Fund (IMF,

[1]A sovereign state of which most of the citizens or subjects are united by factors which define a nation consisting of culture, history, and language (Collins English Dictionary, 1991, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2003)

[2]The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (UN-ESCWA) was established on 9 August 1973 pursuant to the Economic and Social Council's resolution in the year 1818. The purpose of setting up the commission was to raise the level of economic activity in member countries and strengthen cooperation among them. It was also intended to meet the need of the countries in western Asia for the services of a regional economic commission to promote the development efforts in the region

[3]The commission was established in 1992 with the full support of United Nations (UN) Secretary- General, Boutros Boutros Ghali

2002)[4] refers globalization as the increasing integration of economies around the world. It is a process of increasing international division of labour and the accompanying integration of national economies through trade in goods and services, cross-border investments and financial flows (Kohlar, 2003).

From various definitions and causal explanations we can mainly classify four economic characteristics of Globalization as movement of goods or services, movement of labour and people, movement of capital and movement of technology (Sengupta , 2001; Nayer , 2003; IMF, 2002). Among these four economic characteristics this paper is only trying to estimate and interprets the movement of people or migration as a parameter of increasing economic integration between countries in the world.

### 2.2. Migration: Concept

International human mobility has become a key feature in the globalized world. The ILO Convention on Migration defines a migrant people as a person who migrates from one country to another with a view to being employed otherwise by his own credit and includes any person regularly admitted as a migrant for employment(ILO,1949)[2].

Theoretical background of this study is based on the knowledge of theoretical concept and issues of Ravenstein's laws – The major causes of migration are economic (Ravenstein , 1885, 1889) which in their unspoken way, combined individual rational-choice theory and developmental inequalities found in much-discussed push-pull framework (Lee , 1966)[3]. These models dominated migration thinking during the mid - twentieth century. According to Massey, migration occurs at both macro as well as micro level (Massey, 1998). Despite the long history of research on migration, there is no single theory that captures the full complexity of migration. More recently, OECD governments note rising immigration with policies aimed at selecting certain migrants and keeping out others.

## III. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The empirical literature on the determinants of migration includes a number of works, started in the nineteenth century (Ravenstein et. el, 1885). More recently few researchers has tried to shed light on factors affecting migration of people in their investigation of the magnitude of immigration (Hatton, 1995; Hatton and Williamson, 2002).[2] Several factors are likely to influence the destination of movements of people. Various studies have analyzed migration by taking into account the data of a particular country but few empirical works in the literature have tried to find out the economic factors that drives international migration by taking into account different countries. Even though globalization means connectedness, there seems to be a big disconnectedness between the fundamental concepts of defining globalization and quantifying its characteristics particularly through migration.

Since, it is quite difficult to obtain data on the spectrum of wages and salaries, the notion of taking an average wage rate without knowledge about the weights to be attached to each category of wage does not make much sense. So, the study is based on the predictions of a theoretical framework which is based on push-pull theory of migration (Lee et. el, 1966). For the sake of empirically investigation I have taken some economic determinants of migration flow. These economic determinants of migration are analyses with pooled cross country and time series data on migration into these countries.

## IV. METHODOLOGY

This study is completely based on secondary data analysis which has been collected from wide range of sources of various well reputed published data by various organizations. The selection of economic variables is based on extensive survey of literature. Methodologies considered include established research used by different researchers at different point of time. Due to unavailability of cross-country data I have made certain alterations in data[5]. Since I want to study international migration in the perspective of globalization, there is no alternative way left for me except the method I have adopted in my paper.

---

[4] IMF views economic globalization as a historical process that is the result of human innovation and technological progress. There are also broader cultural, political and environmental dimensions of globalization but I have already stated that my concern is only the Economic Globalization

[5] Taking some proxy variables

This study has considered migrationas dependent variable and the explanatory variables I have used are price level, income per capita, growth rate of economy, unemployment rate and country's welfare of the people (measured by HDI). The relationship between dependent and explanatory variables in a functional form then can be represented as:

$$M = f(P, Y, G, U, H)$$

Where,

M: International migration
P: Price level
Y: Income (per capita)
G: Economic growth
U: Unemployment
H: Welfare of people of the country

To make a clear understanding regarding its causes and consequences of this complex phenomenon requires sufficient data. Virtually no existing dataset captures international migration for all countries in the world (Wickramasekara, 2000). To minimize these difficulties I adopted some policies during my studies. A longitudinal approach to data collection, so that, the panel data analysis can be perform. In the study I have taken inflation rate(Average consumer prices, percentage change) as an indicator of price level, per capita GNI(PCGNI) as level of income, economic growth as GDP Growth (Constant prices, percent change), Unemployment rate as percentage of total labour force and HDI as an indicator of welfare of people of the receiving country.

## V. DATA SOURCES

### 5.1 International migration

This study considers international migrants (percentage of the population) of top ten countries with the largest number of international migrants as a dependent variable. The basic data to estimate the international migrant stock were obtained mostly from population censuses held during the decennial rounds of censuses (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population division, 2005 and 2010 and 2015 revision).

### 5. 2. Price

This study is considering Inflation (Average consumer prices, percentage change) as a measurable identifier of price level of the country.Inflation affect the real purchasing power of consumers, incomes and their welfare (ILO, 2004). A common notion is that people want to move in those countries where inflation rate is low and vice versa (Table-1) (Mouhoub, 2007; Kersting, 2007; ILO, 2004). Data on inflation is obtained from International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics data files, World Economic Outlook Database, catalogue Sources World Development Indicators, 2016.

### 5 .3. Income

It is very difficult to differentiate different kinds of labourers among various countries as part of migrant population that enters in any country caters to different sectors of economy. Since there is wide variation in the income, it is difficult to obtain data on the spectrum of wage and salaries of these migrant people. Considering this, I have taken PCGNI as a proxy for wage rate. The sources of this PCGNI is International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics data files, World Economic Outlook Database, catalogue Sources World Development Indicators, 2016 and explanatory note on 2013 HDR composite indices.

### 5.4. Growth

This study considers GDP (Constant prices, percent change) as an indicator of countries development. This study has taken percentage change of GDP growth and not per capita GDP since there is a possibility of multicollinearity between PCGNI and GDP per capita. The migration rate to a given destination is estimated to be an increasing function of that country's GDP and a decreasing function of the GDP of all the other host countries in the sample (Table-1) (Mayda, 2005; Mouhoub, 2008 ; Baldwin , 2005; Hatton et. el, 2002; Etzo, 2010). The sources of this data is International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics data files, World Economic Outlook Database, catalogue Sources World Development Indicators, 2016.

### 5.5. Unemployment

The study has taken unemployment as percentage of total labour force. Unemployment refers to the share of the labour force that is without work but available for and seeking employment. Unemployment in the home country is a factor that propels people to emigrate abroad. Unemployment effects of economic globalization figure prominently in policy debates about migration

(Krugman, 1993; Mussa, 1993; ILO, 2004, HDR, 2009). The unemployment rate appear to be the key variables whose changes are able to push flows of migrants away from their regions and to direct them to better off destinations (Etzo et.el, 2010). The sources of data on unemployment total as percentage of total labour force is International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics data files, World Economic Outlook Database, catalogue Sources World Development Indicators, 2016.

**5.6 HDI**

International movers move to a country with higher HDI than their country of origin (HDR, 2009; Baldin, 2005)[6]. The Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite statistic of life expectancy, knowledge or education, and decent standard of living. Numerous studies have supported the curvilinear relationship between socio-economic development and migration in a localized framework (Table-1). The sources of data on HDI is Human Development Report (UNDP), 2016 and explanatory note on HDR, 2016 composite indices.

## VI. MODEL SUMMARY

### 6.1 Theoretical framework

In the study datahas beenconsolidated in two ways. Firstly, the study has selected top ten countries with the largest number of International migrants. Selection of countries are based on UN population division database (2005, 2010 and 2015 revision). In fact, the study hasselected11 countries in total which are top ten countries with the largest number of International migrants. This selection is again based on the logic that each of the countries should be in the top in at least two revisions, otherwise they are excluded (2005 and 2010 revisions). For example Italy is in 11$^{th}$ position in 2015 revision but not in the list in 2005 or 2010 revision either. So Italy is excluded from the database. For the same reason United Arab Emirates is also excluded (6$^{th}$ position in 2015 revision but not in the list in 2005 or 2010 revision).But the study is considering India and Ukraine in this list as India though not is in the list of top 10 as per 2015 revision but was in the list of 2005 as well as 2010 revision (with 7$^{th}$ and 9$^{th}$ position respectively). Similarly, Ukraine is in 10$^{th}$ position in 2010 revision (though placed in 13$^{th}$ in 2015 revision). So the list of top ten countries with the largest number of International migrants considers the countries like United States, Russian Federation, Germany, France, Saudi Arabia, Canada, India, United Kingdom, Spain, Australia and Ukraine (Table - 2 and Table -3). From Table-2 it is seen that according to 2005 and 2010 revisions rankings of the first three countries like United States, Russian Federation and Germany were remains same throughout these two revisions with 20.2, 6.4, 5.3 percentage and 20.0, 5.7 and 5.0 percentage share of migrants in their total population in 2005 and 2008 revisions respectively. It has also seen that France was in 4$^{th}$ position, Saudi Arabia in 5$^{th}$ position, Canada in 6$^{th}$ position, India in 7$^{th}$ position, United Kingdom in 8$^{th}$ position and Spain in 9$^{th}$ position according to 2005 revision with 3.4, 3.3, 3.2, 3.0, 2.8 and 2.5 percentages of migrants in their total population in 2005 revision. Whereas according to 2008 revision Saudi Arabia was in 4$^{th}$ position, Canada in 5$^{th}$ position, France in 6$^{th}$ position, United Kingdom in 7$^{th}$ position, Spain in 8$^{th}$ position and India in 9$^{th}$ position with 3.4, 3.4, 3.1, 3.0, 3.0, 2.5 percentage of migrants in their total population respectively. In Table -2 the data is given according to 2015 revision. It is seen that United States is again in the top with 19.7 percent of migration. It is followed by Germany, Russian Federation and Saudi Arabia with 4.9, 4.7 and 4.1 percent of migration. India is becoming in the 10$^{th}$ position in this revision. Secondly, for analysis by pooled time-series, cross-section data the study has taken eleven cross-sections. For each cross-section specific variable, the study has made a separate series of independent variables corresponding to each cross-section. the study has arranged pool data (unbalanced)[7] in stacked form, where all of the data for a variable are grouped together in a single column, that is I made the database stacked by cross-section. Toanalyzedata in panel time series, cross-section data Quantitative micro software E Views (9.1 Version) has been used.

### 6.2. Panel data analysis

The term panel data refers to multi-dimensional data frequently involving measurements over time. Panel data contain observations on multiple phenomena observed over multiple time periods for the same sorts of individuals. The data are usually collected over time and over the same individuals and then a regression is run over these two dimensions (Gujarati, 2003). They are more informative (more variability, less collinearity) and estimates are more efficient. They allow to control for individual unobserved heterogeneity since unobserved heterogeneity is theproblem of non-experimental research, the latter benefit is especially useful.

Considering panel data regression model like:

$$y_{it} = a + bx_{it} + e_{it}$$

[6] High HDI countries imposes restriction to move (HDR, UNDP, 2009)

Where, $y_{it}$ is the dependent variable, $x_{it}$ is the independent variable, a andb are coefficients, i and t are indices for individuals and time. The error $e_{it}$is very important in this analysis. Assumptions about the error term determine whether we speak of fixed effects or random effects.

**6.2.1 Fixed effect models**

There are unique attributes of individuals that are not the results of random variation and that do not vary across time. Adequate, if we want to draw inferences only about the examined individuals.In a fixed effects model, $e_{it}$ is assumed to vary non-stochastically over i or t making the fixed effects model analogous to a dummy variable model in one dimension.

**6.2.2 Random effect models**

There are unique, time constant attributes of individuals that are the results of random variation and do not correlate with the individual regressors. This model is adequate, if we want to draw inferences about the whole population, not only the examined sample. In a random effects model, $e_{it}$ is assumed to vary stochastically over i and trequiring special treatment of the error variance matrix.

The selection between these methods depends upon the objective of our analysis, and the problems concerning the exogeneity of the explanatory variables. Panel data models examine fixed and/or random effects of entity (individual or subject) or time.

**6.2.3 Hausman test**

The Hausman specification test[8] ((Hausman, 1978) is a statistical hypothesis test in econometrics compares fixed effect and random effect models.If the null hypothesis that the individual effects are uncorrelated with the other regressors in the model is not rejected, a random effect model is better than its fixed counterpart.The critical difference between FE and RE was that FE allowed for correlation between the unobserved effect and the explanatory variables whereas RE requires these to be uncorrelated(Table-4). In general, we should assume that the unobserved effect is correlated with the explanatory variables. This is a more conservative approach. However, if the unobserved effect is uncorrelated with the explanatory variables then the RE estimator is more efficient than the FE estimator and hence we would prefer to use it instead.

The null hypothesis of the study is

$H_0$: There are no attributes of individuals within the measurement set and no effects across time

**6.2. Results and discussions**

On the basis of data the study has performed the panel data analysis and tried to find out that whether the panel data model is suitable for FE or RE model (Table -4). The Hausman's specification test gives the p value as 0.0687 which is smaller at 10 percent significance level (Table -5) which implies that the Hausman Test is insignificant. It means that there is a correlation between the error terms and the independent variables of the model. Thus we can estimate our panel data by fixed effect model and analyze the result based on this model. So, we reject the hypothesis that there is no correlation between the error term and independent variable and suggest the FE model for estimating the impact of explanatory variables on International migration of this set of countries is concerned. The value of Adjusted R-squared is 0.945456 which shows that the model is fit for prediction. Panel data analysis by FE test gives the coefficients and t statistic which shows that PCGNI and GDP are significant at 5 percent and 10 percent level of significance respectively (Table - 6). The coefficient of PCGNI is 0.000248 which has same implication as table -1. But the sign of the coefficient of GDP is -0.192697 which is contradictory of our assumptions.

The country specific coefficients are shown in table - 7. The values of the country specific coefficients tells us some interesting findings. The coefficient tells us that Saudi Arabia is in the highest ranked country as far as International migration is concerned. The second and third position holds by Australia and Ukraine. This result is quite interesting as well as confusing also as Table-2 and Table-3 are concerned. The country like USA which is in the first ranked in both the revisions becomes second last (coefficient value (-5.569711) only before Spain with coefficient value (-6.067192) after performing panel data by introducing the explanatory variables. It means that as far as international migration is concerned the country somehow shows some restriction. So opening up concept of Globalization is not true as far as the results are concerned. On the basis on the result if we rank the countries (Table - 7) then we show I contradiction with rank given on the basis of International migration.

**VII. CONCLUSION**

The empirical analysis in this study by taking the country set of top ten countries with the largest number of International migrants shows that, PCGNI and GDPas explanatory variables help us to take migration decisions whereas other factors are

clearly insufficient factor for explaining the dynamics of migration. This is an important postulate and contradiction of the theoretical approaches which were prevailingly used in the studies for estimating international migration focus on some policy debates which fuelled the migration inflows from countries if significant gaps of unemployment, price level and welfare level.

The limited predictive or descriptive ability of push-pull theory of migration to explain migration dynamics in the countries and theory discussed earlier help us to apply this approach to studying migration processes in the age of globalization. These factors are important elements that set the contexts in which migration theory has been traditionally developed and studied. But this study raises question over the appropriateness of the application of theories developed in the framework of migration where only two factorsare likely to be more significant while other variables are lesser importance.

The analysis has shown PCGNI is a good first indicator and GDP is the second one which helps us to understand migration decisions which is supported by previous literature as already mentioned. This is an important postulate as the predictive theory of migration to explain migration dynamics in eleven countries invite to search out a new approach to studying migration processes in this globalized world. As such it offers a ground for migration research in respect to testing the already established theories. The process also enables us to study movements in a comparative cross-country framework which facilitates to investigate international factors. There is a scope of study further through the investigation of affecting factors of migrant people in their decisions to migrate by structural and institutional variables in different countries.

***Figures and Tables***

| Factors of migration | Advantages of migration | Disadvantages of migration |
|---|---|---|
| Income/GNI[a] | Greater income | Lower income |
| Unemployment[a] | Lower unemployment | Greater unemployment |
| Inflation[a] | Lower inflation | Higher inflation |
| GDP[a] | Higher GDP | Lower GDP |
| HDI[b] | Higher HDI | Lower HDI |

Table - 1: Economic factors of International migration

Source: [a] Towards a fair deal for migrant workers in the global economy: International labour conference,92nd session,ILO,Geneva,first edition,2004,Report-VI, Chapter 2, Table-2.1,pp-18
[b]HDR (UNDP), 2009

Table-2: Top ten countries with the largest number of International migrants (2005 & 2010 revision)

| Name of the country | 2005 | | | Name of the country | 2010 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of international migrants (in thousands) | Share of all international migrants (percentage) | Rank | | Number of international migrants (in thousands) | Share of all international migrants (percentage) | Rank |
| United States | 38,354,709 | 20.2 | 1 | United States | 42,813,281 | 20.0 | 1 |
| Russian Federation | 12,079,626 | 6.4 | 2 | Russian Federation | 12,270,388 | 5.7 | 2 |
| Germany | 10,143,626 | 5.3 | 3 | Germany | 10,758,061 | 5.0 | 3 |
| France | 6,471,029 | 3.4 | 4 | Saudi Arabia | 7,288,900 | 3.4 | 4 |
| Saudi Arabia | 6,360,730 | 3.3 | 5 | Canada | 7,202,340 | 3.4 | 5 |
| Canada | 6,105,722 | 3.2 | 6 | France | 6,684,842 | 3.1 | 6 |
| India | 5,700,147* | 3.0 | 7 | United Kingdom | 6,451,711 | 3.0 | 7 |
| United Kingdom | 5,408,118 | 2.8 | 8 | Spain | 6,377,524 | 3.0 | 8 |
| Spain | 4,790,074 | 2.5 | 9 | India* | 5,436,012 | 2.5 | 9 |
| Australia | 4,097,204 | 2.2 | 10 | Ukraine | 5,257,527 | 2.5 | 10 |
| Total | 99,510,985 | 52.3 | - | Total | 110,540,586 | 51.7 | - |
| World | 190,633,564 | 100.0 | - | World | 213,943,812 | 100.0 | - |

Source: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population division, Trends in International Migrant Stock: The 2005 Revision, UN database (New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social

Affairs, Population division, 2005, 2010)
N.B. As countries collect statistics on migration in varying ways, it is often difficult to harmonize them across countries; differences in counting deeply affect rank orders

Table-3: Top ten countries with the largest number of International migrants (2015 revision)

| Name of the country | 2015 | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of international migrants (in thousands) | Share of all international migrants (percentage)* | Rank* |
| United States | 46,627,102 | 19.7 | 1 |
| Germany | 12,005,276 | 4.9 | 2 |
| Russian Federation | 11,643,276 | 4,7 | 3 |
| Saudi Arabia | 10,185,945 | 4.1 | 4 |
| United Kingdom | 8,543,120 | 3.5 | 5 |
| Canada | 7,835,502 | 3.3 | 6 |
| France | 7,784,418 | 3,2 | 7 |
| Australia | 6,763,663 | 2.7 | 8 |
| Spain | 5,852,953 | 2.4 | 9 |
| India | 5,240,960 | 2.1 | 10 |
| Total | 115,430,265 | 50.6 | - |
| World | 243,192,681 | 100.0 | - |

Source: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population division, Trends in International Migrant Stock: The 2015 Revision, UN database (New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population division, 2015)
N.B. As countries collect statistics on migration in varying ways, it is often difficult to harmonize them across Countries; differences in counting deeply affect rank orders.
* Authors own compilation on the basis of first two columns

Table – 4: Choosing between Fixed effect (FE) and Random effect (RE) model

| FE | RE | Model to be chosen |
|---|---|---|
| $H_0$ is rejected (Fixed Effect) | $H_0$ is not rejected (No Random Effect) | Fixed effect model |
| $H_0$ is not rejected (No Fixed Effect) | $H_0$ is rejected (Random Effect) | Random effect model |
| $H_0$ is rejected (Fixed Effect) | $H_0$ is rejected (Random Effect) | Choose one of the two depending on the result of Hausman test |

Source:Borjas, G. J. and L. Hilton, 1996, Immigration and the Welfare State: Immigrant Participation in Means-Tested Entitlement Programs. The Quarterly Journal of Economics 111, 576-604

Table - 5: Hausman's Specification Test Results

| Test Summary | Chi-Sq. Statistic | DF | Prob. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cross-section random | 10.240264 | 5 | 0.0687* |

Source: Authors own calculation

Table - 6: FE model of panel data analysis

Source: Authors own calculation

Table -7: Country Specific Effects (FE model) and their rank

Source: Authors own calculation

**ACKNOLEDGEMENT**

At the very outset I express my deep sense of gratitude to Prof. (Dr) N.D Mathur, HOD, Dept. of Economics, Manipal University Jaipur who enriched me with qualitative suggestions. I would also like to acknowledge my deep sense of respect to Prof. (Dr) Manju Singh, Director, School of Humanities & Social Sciences, Manipal University Jaipur for providing constant encouragement to submit this paper. I am indebted to my institute, Manipal University Jaipur for enormous inspiration, assistance and help from different quarters.

| Dependent Variable: Migration ; Panel analysis(Fixed Effects) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-statistic | Prob. |
| Common effect | -3.163137 | 4.840946 | -0.653413 | 0.5167 |
| Inflation | -0.002662 | 0.005923 | -0.449479 | 0.6552 |
| PCGNI | 0.000248 | 7.43E-05 | 3.342505* | 0.0016 |
| Unemployment | -0.008862 | 0.008945 | -0.990660 | 0.3269 |
| GDP | -0.192697 | 0.101184 | -1.904425** | 0.0630 |
| HDI | 12.48464 | 7.577048 | 1.647692 | 0.1061 |
| Adjusted R-squared: 0.945456 ; *5 percent level it is significant ; **10 percent level it is significant | | | | |

| Name of country | Coefficient (Fixed Effect) | Rank of the country | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Name of country | Rank |
| United states | -5.569711 | Saudi Arabia | 1 |
| Russian Federation | 0.910726 | Australia | 2 |
| Germany | -3.118658 | Ukraine | 3 |
| France | -2.287856 | Canada | 4 |
| Saudi Arabia | 16.18274 | Russian Federation | 5 |
| Canada | 3.389038 | India* | 6 |
| United Kingdom | -5.042339 | France | 7 |
| Spain | -6.067192 | Germany | 8 |
| Australia | 7.786238 | United Kingdom | 9 |
| Ukraine | 5.140830 | United states | 10 |
| India* | -0.882279 | Spain | 11 |

**REFERENCES**

**[1]**Baldwin, M. 2005.Migration in the Middle East and Mediterranean. Panteion University, Athens, Greece

**[2]** Bhagwati, J. N. 2007. In Defense of Globalization. Oxford University Press, New York

**[3]** Borjas, G. J. and Hilton, L. 1996. Immigration and the Welfare State: Immigrant Participation in Means-Tested Entitlement Programs. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 111, 576-604

**[4]**Etzo, T.I. 2010.The determinants of the recent interregional migration flows in Italy: A panel data analysis. University of Cagliari, MPRA Paper, 26245

**[5]** Gujrati, N.D. 2003.Basic Econometrics. McGraw Hill

**[6]**Giddens, A. 1990. The Consequences of Modernity. Cambridge Polity Press, 4th edition

**[7]** Hatton, T.J. 1995. A model of UK emigration: 1870-1913. Review Economic Stat, 77,407-415

**[8]**Hatton, T. J., and Williamson, J.G. 2002. What fundamentals drive world migration? NBER working paper series, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1050 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138, Working Paper ,9159

**[9]** Human Development Report. 1999. UNDP

**[10]** Human Development Report. 2009. People in motion: who moves where and why. Overcoming Barriers, Human mobility and development, Chapter 2

**[11]** ILO. 1949. Migration for Employment Convention. Convention concerning Migration for Employment, 97(11)

**[12]**ILO. 2004. A fair globalization: Creating opportunities for all. Report of the world commission on the social dimension of globalization, Commission's report *Beginning at home*, Geneva III (1), 233-334

**[13]** IMF. 2002. Globalization: Threat or Opportunity. IMF staff paper

**[14]**Kersting, K. 2007.Staff Papers. Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, 2, April

**[15]** Kohler, H. 2003. Toward a Better Globalization. Debating the pros and cons of globalization, Eberhard Karls University

**[16]** Krugman, P. R. 1993: What do undergrads need to know about trade. American Economic Review, 83, May, 23-26

**[17]** Lee, E.S. 1966. A Theory of Migration. Demography, 3(1), 47-57

**[18]** Massey, D. S., and Taylor, J. E. 1998. Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium. Oxford, Clarendon Press

**[19]**Mayda, A.M. 2005. International Migration: A panel data analysis of economic and non- economic determinants. Institute for the Study of Labour (IZA), Georgetown University,Bonn, Discussion paper, 1590

**[20]**Mouhoub, M.E. 2007. Macroeconomic determinants of migrants' remittances in the southern and eastern Mediterranean countries. Working paper CEPN, presented at 6th International conference of the MEEA, Dubai, March, 14-16

**[21]** Mussa, M. 1993. Making the practical case for freer trade. American economic review,83, May,372-376

**[22]** Nayer, B.R. 2003. Economic Globalization and Its advance: From shallow to deep integration. Economic and political weekly, 38(45), 4776

**[23]** Nayyar, D. 1996. Globalization: the past in our present. The Indian Economic Journal, 43 (3)

**[24]** Prakash, A. and Hart, J. A. 1999. Globalization and governance. Routledge, London

**[25]** Ravenstein, E. G. 1885. The Laws of Migration, Journal of the Statistical Society of London, Blackwell Publishing for the Royal Statistical Society, 48 (2), 167-235

**[26]** Ravenstein, E.G. 1889. The Laws of Migration II. Journal of the Statistical Society, 52 (2),214-301

**[27]** Sengupta, C. 2001. Conceptalising globalization: Issues and implications. Economic and Political weekly, 36(33), 3137

**[28]** Wickramasekara, P. 2000. Asian Labour Migration: Issues and Challenges in an Era of Globalization. International migration papers, International labour office, Geneva, 57

**[29]** Wolfgang,R. (2000). Critical Choice: The United Nations, networks, and the future of global governance, IDRC Publishers