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Abstract. Background, purpose. The present study was conducted in response to a consistent upward trend in migration from Lithuania, with the aim to determine what personality traits may be linked with a likeliness to emigrate in a sample of Lithuanian students. Authors investigate the concept of migrant personality as an alternative to the socio-economic causation theory most often used to explain migration behaviour. Method. Empirical data was gathered using a questionnaire including questions on attitudes toward migration and post-graduation plans as well as the standard Big Five Inventory (Benet-Martinez, John, 1998) questions measuring Extraversion, Agreeability, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness to Experience. Four respondent groups were extracted from the data according to migratory intentions to facilitate between group comparisons. Results and conclusions. Obtained results revealed two personality traits – Conscientiousness and Openness to Experience – as being linked with migratory intentions. Students with no intention to migrate scored higher on Conscientiousness than their counterparts that do intend to move abroad and those undecided about the likelihood of such a move. Openness to Experience was more expressed among students who had plans to move country than those with ambiguous attitudes toward migration, possibly linking Openness to Experience with a likelihood to emigrate.
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INTRODUCTION

The current wave of migration from Lithuania started after its emancipation from the Soviet Union in 1991 and has dramatically changed in nature since Lithuania’s accession in the European Union in 2004.
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According to official statistics alone, 334,000 people emigrated from Lithuania from year 1990 to 2005, which constitutes a fifth of working age citizens (Ambrozaitiene & Svidleriene, 2006). The growing volume of emigrants resulted in poor demographic indicators and hence gained major attention from policy makers and researchers over the past decade (Gliosaite, 2004).

Causes of migration are usually justified by invoking the neoclassical model, stating that it occurs due to geographical differences in work demand and supply - people choose to migrate due to potential income differences in sending and receiving countries (Sotelo, Gimeno, 2003; Massey, Arango, Hugo, Kouaouci, Pellegrino, Taylor, 1993). However, Sotelo, Gimeno (2003) also note that most emigrants living in developed countries come from countries of medium level of economic development rather than below medium. Boneva, Frieze (2001) also remark that some studies fail to find a direct and clear relationship between emigration and economic conditions of a country. These arguments point to findings of Justman, Levy, Gabriel (1988), who noted that economic, social, and political factors account for up to 75 percent of emigration, thus the causes of the rest 25 percent remain unclear. These causes might possibly be related more to the individual than to economic or social factors. It may be presumed that people who choose to move abroad or have clear intentions to emigrate have a specific set of personality traits.

Migration, just as any other complex social phenomenon, cannot be grounded in economical reasoning alone as it fails to account for differences in emigration volumes in equally developed countries and reasons behind why some people within the same country choose to move abroad while others rather stay. Lithuania makes for a justified research subject in this field as it has the highest fluctuation of residents caused by migration of all post-soviet bloc nations (Ambrozaitiene, 2006). This phenomenon suggests a major role of the cultural variable and its manifestation in personal motives in choosing to migrate.

Although emigration is a social problem with various social consequences, such as diminishing of national identity, the decision to emigrate is made by the individual. Therefore, explaining emigration solely by social, cultural, economic and political variables is inadequate, because it ignores the initial subject of the decision, namely the emigrating individual. Even studies focused on the individual level confine
themselves to socio-demographic variables such as gender, age, education level, profession, marital status and place of residence (Glytosos, 1999; Arrehag, Sjorberg, Sjoblom, 2006). Although considerable research has focused on economical and political processes responsible for the growing number of migrants, little research has taken into account personal factors, i.e. psychological characteristics involved in migratory behavior. However, studies that have been conducted in this domain explored links between migration suicidal behavior (Kwan, Ip, 2007), psychosocial stress, helplessness, negative life events, perceived lower social support (Dalgard, Thapa, Hauff, McCubbin, Syed, 2006), subjective evaluation of one’s health (Kirkcaldy, Siefen, Wittig, Schuller, Brahler, Merbach, 2005), capability to maintain close interpersonal relationships, achievement and leadership motivation (van Ecke, Chope, Emmelkamp, 2005) and being motivated by work and family values (Boneva, Frieze, 2001).

Economic and regional development research in Lithuania shows that people choose to emigrate from Lithuania due to difficulties in finding employment in their home country, unsatisfactory pay or living conditions, or the desire to be reunited with family members already living abroad (Gliosaite, 2004). A substantial portion of people emigrating from Lithuania are university graduates, the unemployed, or students under the age of 34. Women are more likely to emigrate than men, however they more often leave for studies or reuniting with family members rather than in pursuit of employment (Gliosaite, 2004).

Boneva and Frieze argue that environmental factors such as “unfavorable economies in country of origin or network of support in the receiving country (…) create the conditions for wanting to leave, but desires to do so are based in the personality of those who make the choice” (2001: 478). A study by Boneva and Frieze (2001) explores the relationship between an individual’s dispositional motives and values and their migratory intentions or lack thereof. A study with a sample of students from Albania, The Czech Republic and Slovenia, showed a statistically significant correlation between migratory intentions and achievement and power motivation, with students who had migratory intentions scoring higher on both of the mentioned scales than their counterparts that displayed no migratory intentions. A correlation between migratory intentions together with either high achievement or power motivation together with work centrality was found in another
study with a sample of students from Croatia, the Czech Republic, Russia and Slovenia (Boneva, Frieze, 2001).

van Ecke, Chope, Emmelkamp (2005) conducted a study in order to test whether immigrants were more prone to any specific attachment style than non-immigrants in the U.S. The study in question utilized the Adult Attachment Projective test with a sample of Californians, who live near their family, and immigrants from Belgium and The Netherlands. The results confirmed the hypothesis that unresolved attachment style and immigrant status have a statistically significant correlation. Researchers concluded that dominance of unresolved attachment status among the immigrant population points to emigration as a traumatic experience (van Ecke et al., 2005). An alternative interpretation, that would require further research in order to be confirmed, could be that the actual choice to emigrate could be linked with an unresolved attachment style.

Although few studies (Boneva, Frieze, Ferligoj, Jarsova, Pauknerova, Orgocka, 1997, 1998; Boneva, Frieze, 2001; van Ecke, Chope, Emmelkamp, 2005) have pursued the link between personal factors and migratory behavior, ample research in the field of personality psychology points to a few potential hypotheses regarding personality traits involved in the likeliness to emigrate. In a study with a sample of Lithuanian students we expect to find that Neuroticism will be negatively correlated with migratory behavior (H1), as by definition this trait is linked with nervousness, anxiety and tension (John, Srivastava, 1999) – all factors that could potentially inhibit migration. The link between Neuroticism and the Behavioral Inhibition System (BIS), responsible for withdrawal and avoidance behavior (Smits, Boeck, 2006), also points to the unlikelihood of migratory intentions among individuals scoring high on this scale, as they can be expected to avoid potentially uncomfortable situations, which moving abroad to a foreign country would undoubtedly bring more of than life in a well familiar setting.

We expect to also find a negative correlation between migratory intentions and the Agreeability and Conscientiousness traits (H1), as both are linked with organizational citizenship behavior (Borman, Penner, Allen, Motowidlo, 2001; Neuman, Kickul, 1998), which, among other characteristics, includes following rules and procedures (Borman et al., 2001; John, Srivastava, 1999). Aluja, Garcia (2004), in a study of links
between personality traits and social values, also found that Conscientiousness was linked with order and responsibility, which, we believe, include feeling responsible for one’s country or family, both reasons for not wanting to move abroad. We therefore expect Conscientiousness to be important in the context of migratory behavior. As Openness to Experience has been found to be related with the depth of one’s experiential life (John, Srivastava, 1999), we expect to find a positive correlation between this trait and the intention to migrate for a short period of time (H2). Openness to Experience, by definition, indicates curiosity and willingness to try out new experiences, and, we expect, settings. Finally, we expect Extraversion, which pertains to an active lifestyle and high self-esteem (John, Srivastava, 1999), to positively correlate with intentions to migrate for a longer time period (H3). We expect that active and confident individuals would have an easier time opting to try their luck abroad after, say, unsuccessful attempts to secure a satisfactory quality of life back home.

METHOD

Two paper-survey instruments were used in this study, both applied before class starting time in the university setting with the lecturer’s consent. The first part – a six question survey drafted by the authors, first of all asks respondents whether they have already lived abroad for a longer than a six-month period, with their data excluded from later analysis as time spent in emigration could be an influential factor in itself. Respondents are also asked about whether or not they intend to move abroad, whether they have already chosen the time and destination, and, if so, whether they plan to return. The final question asked the students about what motives could drive them to move abroad, with the answer choices: getting accepted to a foreign university, negative political/social changes in Lithuania, interesting job offer abroad, reuniting with a family member or friend living abroad, inability to sustain oneself on wage earned in Lithuania and boredom with the situation at hand all chosen from the most popular motives found research on reasons for migration among Lithuanians (Gliosaite, 2004; Ruzgys, Eriksonas, 2006; Savareikiene et al, 2005).
The second instrument sought to evaluate the expression of personality traits using the Big Five Inventory (BFI), (Benet-Martinez, John, 1998). The BFI consists of 44 phrases, which the research participants evaluate on a 5 point Likert scale according to how well they describe them (1 – totally disagree to 5 – totally agree). The inventory measures Extraversion ($\alpha = .7603$), Agreeableness ($\alpha = .6652$), Conscientiousness ($\alpha = .7152$), Neuroticism ($\alpha = .7964$) and Openness to Experience ($\alpha = .8171$, after excluding the 41st question, which negatively correlated with other items on the scale).

A total of 176 college students were surveyed during this study in the months of March and May of 2007 in the Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas, Lithuania. The research sample consisted of 148 females (84.1 percent) and 28 males (15.9 percent), with the average age at 21.34 years. The disproportionately represented female and male subjects reflect distribution of male and female students in the studied population. The sample consisted mostly of fourth year undergraduate students (41 percent) with 40.9 percent majoring in psychology and 25.6 percent in business management. University students were chosen as a group potentially possessing migratory intentions due to unlikelihood of many of them possessing familial and work obligations in Lithuania. As according to cumulative causation theory, an initial migratory act may alter motivation and perception, which may become an autonomous cause of repeated migration (Delechant, 2001; Massey et al., 1993), participants that answered yes to the statement “I have lived abroad for longer than a six month period” namely 15, or 8.5 percent of the sample, were excluded from the data.

**RESULTS**

Participants were divided into four groups according to their attitudes towards migration: **non-migrants** (N=43) – participants who have no intentions to emigrate under any circumstances; **potential short-term migrants** (N=35) – participants that plan to move abroad for a brief, fixed period of time, i.e. 6 months to 2 years; **potential long-term migrants** (N=11) – participants that plan to move abroad for over a 10 year period; **undecided** (N=41) – participants that are not convinced of
their future plans, and answered “I don’t know” to most of the respective questions.

31 of the 176 respondents didn’t fall under either of the enlisted categories due to insufficient or inconsistent answers.

Cross-tabulation of participants according to gender with a random sample of 28 female and 28 male respondents shows no difference between male and female participants in their migratory intentions ($\chi^2$ test value = 2.33, df = 1, $p = 0.127$. Personality characteristics also did not differ between male and female participants (Extraversion: $t$=.357; df=54; $p=.722$; Agreeability: $t$=-.756; df=53; $p=.453$; Conscientiousness: $t$=-1.891; df=52; $p=.064$; Neuroticism: $t$=-1.664; df=53; $p=.102$; Openness to Experience: $t$=.842; df=46.55; $p=.404$). As further correlation analysis between groups is impossible with the random sample of 28 because of the insufficient number of respondents falling into the different groups according to migratory intentions, the entire sample will be used for further comparisons.

As ANOVA could not be used for comparing the groups due to their differing size and lack of normal distribution, the Mann-Whitney rank sum test was used to compare expression of personality traits among respondents according to their migratory intentions.

The results obtained by comparing expression of personality traits among various groups according to migratory intentions showed no statistically significant difference in the domains of Extraversion, Agreeability and Neuroticism, so part of the first hypothesis and the third hypothesis were rejected. However, a tendency of difference under the Openness to Experience domain was found between the undecided and the potential short-term and long-term migrant groups, with the potential short-term and long-term migrants scoring higher on this scale than the undecided group (see Table 1).

The results confirmed that a high level of Conscientiousness correlates to a lack of migratory intentions, with this result holding true in comparing the non-migrant group to either undecided, potential short-term and long-term migrant groups. As each of the potential migrant groups scored lower on the Conscientiousness scale than the non-migrant group, the same result was obtained when comparing non-migrants with a conjunction of the potential migrant groups (see Table 2).
Table 1. Mann-Whitney test comparing BFI test scores: potential short-term migrant and undecided groups and potential long-term migrant and undecided groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extraver-</th>
<th>Agree-</th>
<th>Conscien-</th>
<th>Neuroti-</th>
<th>Openness to experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>medium rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(short-term migrants)</td>
<td>44,42</td>
<td>41,44</td>
<td>41,45</td>
<td>43,54</td>
<td><strong>44,36</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(undecided)</td>
<td>38,86</td>
<td>44,52</td>
<td>43,07</td>
<td>40,53</td>
<td><strong>35,98</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney crit.</td>
<td>692,000</td>
<td>739,000</td>
<td>740,000</td>
<td>740,500</td>
<td>601,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptotic p value (2-sided test)</td>
<td>0,319</td>
<td>0,581</td>
<td>0,772</td>
<td>0,591</td>
<td><strong>0,130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

medium rank

| (long-term migrants) | 21,44     | 20,50  | 15,83     | 22,61    | **25,06** |
| (undecided)         | 18,90     | 19,19  | 20,02     | 18,53    | **17,05** |
| Mann-Whitney crit.  | 113,000   | 121,500| 97,500    | 102,500  | 71,500     |
| Corrected p value   | 0,566^a   | 0,761^a| 0,319^a   | 0,343^a  | **0,053^a** |

a – not corrected for tied values.

Table 2. Mann-Whitney test comparing BFI test scores: non-migrant group with potential short-term, long-term and undecided groups and a conjunction of the latter three groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extraver-</th>
<th>Agree-</th>
<th>Conscien-</th>
<th>Neuroti-</th>
<th>Openness to experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>medium rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non-migrants)</td>
<td>47,09</td>
<td>50,56</td>
<td><strong>55,54</strong></td>
<td>47,59</td>
<td>43,91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(short-term migrants)</td>
<td>48,66</td>
<td>46,14</td>
<td><strong>42,52</strong></td>
<td>48,30</td>
<td>49,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney crit.</td>
<td>1063,500</td>
<td>997,500</td>
<td>798,500</td>
<td>1083,500</td>
<td>932,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptotic p value</td>
<td>0,783</td>
<td>0,439</td>
<td><strong>0,023</strong></td>
<td>0,901</td>
<td>0,347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

medium rank

| (non-migrants)   | 36,28     | 35,49  | **38,44** | 35,53    | 35,03                  |
| (undecided)      | 33,24     | 34,33  | **28,88** | 34,28    | 32,57                  |
| Mann-Whitney crit. | 529,000   | 560,500| 402,500   | 559,000  | 506,000                |
| Asymptotic p value (2-sided test) | 0,534     | 0,812  | **0,049** | 0,798    | 0,610                  |

medium rank

| (non-migrants)   | 24,74     | 24,80  | **26,92** | 24,17    | 23,03                  |
| (long-term migrants) | 26,17     | 25,89  | **16,44** | 28,67    | 30,89                  |
| Mann-Whitney crit. corrected p value | 169,500   | 172,000| 103,000   | 147,000  | 118,000                |
| 2* (2-sided test) | 0,790     | 0,849  | **0,047** | 0,408    | 0,134                  |
Table 3 summarizes the obtained links between different personality traits and migratory intentions among research participants: the non-migrant group scored higher on the Conscientiousness scale than the potential short-term and long-term migrant and undecided groups; short-term and long-term migrant groups scored higher on the Openness to Experience scale than the undecided group; the different groups according to migratory intentions displayed no difference in the domains of Extraversion, Neuroticism and Agreeableness.

The most popular of the enlisted motives for a potential motive for migration were: an interesting job offer (68.2 percent); getting accepted to a foreign university (57.4 percent); partner or family moved abroad (54 percent); insufficient wage for getting by in Lithuania (53.4 percent) and in case of negative social or political changes in Lithuania (26.1 percent).
Only 2.8 percent of the participants stated that they wouldn’t go to live abroad for any of the enlisted reasons. Respondents were asked to mark all possible motives for choosing to migrate rather than just the most prevalent one.

We explored how the enlisted motives were related to expression of the five personality traits among research participants. Four different motives showed a statistically significant correlation to the expression of a specific personality trait. *Getting accepted to a foreign university* is a motive that correlated with Extraversion and Openness to Experience, with respondents that scored high on either of the two scales being more likely to choose this motive for potential migration. This motive also showed a negative correlation with expression of the trait Conscientiousness, meaning it was not marked by those who scored high on this particular scale. *If a partner or family moved abroad* is a motive that was more prominent among respondents that scored high on the Neuroticism scale. *Getting an interesting job offer abroad* is a motive that was more likely to be chosen by people who scored high on the Extraversion scale, however, the correlation was not statistically significant (p=.056). *If life in Lithuania becomes boring* is a motive that had a negative correlation with Conscientiousness, and was thus not likely to be marked by respondents who scored high on this scale (see Table 4).

**Table 4. Kruskal Wallis Test comparing motives for potential emigration with expression of personality traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motives</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Agreeability</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>Openness to experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance to foreign university</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>(p¹=.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p¹=.004)</td>
<td>(p=.013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuniting with family living abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>(p¹=.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting job offer abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p¹=.056)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life in Lithuania becomes boring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>(p=.013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* – statistical tendency, however a statistically significant difference was not found
¹ – asymptotic p values
< – negative correlation
> – positive correlation
Another relationship we explored was whether respondents who marked more (4-7) potential motives for migration differed on expression of personality traits from those who marked less (1–3) motives. Even though no statistically significant differences were found, a statistical tendency of difference was observed in the domain of Conscientiousness (p=.07), with those who scored high on this scale marking more motives for potential emigration (see Table 5). Another noteworthy observation is that a significantly larger number of respondents marked over 3 motives.

Table 5. T-Test Group Statistics comparing personality traits between students, who marked many vs few potential motives for migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motive groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>T-test</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28,7333</td>
<td>4,15736</td>
<td>.53671</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>28,4310</td>
<td>4,79170</td>
<td>.44490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeability</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32,2712</td>
<td>5,11533</td>
<td>.66596</td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>32,3966</td>
<td>5,01802</td>
<td>.46591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30,6949</td>
<td>4,75704</td>
<td>.61931</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>32,0870</td>
<td>4,95518</td>
<td>.46207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24,8983</td>
<td>5,36173</td>
<td>.69804</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>24,2500</td>
<td>5,54331</td>
<td>.51468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32,3833</td>
<td>5,66312</td>
<td>.73111</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>32,0991</td>
<td>5,40867</td>
<td>.51337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - group 1 marked 1–3 motives, group 2 marked 4-7 motives

DISCUSSION

The motives for potential emigration revealed by the study correspond to results of the latest studies on causes of migration conducted in Lithuania. Prevalent motives for emigration among the study's participants, i.e. getting an interesting job offer and wanting to reunite with family members who are already living abroad befit the findings of
Gliosaite (2004) and Matuziene, Savareikiene, Zickiene (2005), and illustrate that work and relationships are important factors for students in making life decisions. The second most prominent deciding factor for potential emigration - acceptance to a foreign university - presumably reflects the motives of students as a specific population of the study. Even though students marked various motives for potential emigration, only a small portion of the surveyed students (N=20) said they would like to live abroad in the future. This result shows that students would rather like to live in Lithuania, however do not reject the possibility of living abroad in the future in case of suitable circumstances, such as getting an interesting job offer.

As it had been expected, a statistically significant difference was found in the expression of personality traits among the different groups according to migratory intentions. The research data showed a link between the expression of two personality traits, namely Conscientiousness and Openness to Experience, and the intention to emigrate. Results confirmed the part of our hypothesis (H1) stating that highly expressed Conscientiousness is related to not having migratory intentions. Students that do not plan to emigrate scored higher on the Conscientiousness scale than those who plan to move abroad for a short or long time period and those who have no clear opinion on the subject. The finding that higher expression of Conscientiousness can be found among students who don’t have migratory intentions corresponds to the link between expression of Conscientiousness and citizenship behavior and compliance in organizations found by Allen et al. (2001) as well as Newman, Kickul (1998).

The explanation of this link lies within the definition of Conscientiousness as a trait - people who control impulses and comply with norms dictated by society (John, Srivastava, 1999) are more likely to remain in their home country rather than emigrate. Individuals who score high on this scale are goal oriented, organized and likely to contemplate before acting, plan objectives and prioritize (John, Srivastava, 1999). It can be said that this combination of personality characteristics aid a person in setting realistic goals and obtaining a firm position in the local labor market, hence the likelihood that these individuals wouldn’t try their luck abroad. The negative correlation between Conscientiousness and migratory intentions could also be explained by invoking the
link between Conscientiousness and responsibility found by Aluja and Garcia (2004), as feeling responsible for your country could be a strong inhibiting factor.

Even though a statistically significant difference was found between the groups according to migratory intentions only in the domain of Conscientiousness, the study revealed a tendency of difference in the expression of Openness to Experience among the different groups. Students who didn’t have a clear opinion on whether they would choose to emigrate scored lower on the Openness to Experience scale than those who plan to emigrate for a short or long period of time. It may be presumed that high expression of Openness to Experience helps to frame the desire to move abroad and broaden horizons. The hypothesis stating that high expression of Openness to Experience will be linked with planning to move abroad for a short period (H2) was not confirmed as respondents who plan to emigrate for a long period of time scored highest on the Openness to Experience trait. Further research with a larger sample would be necessary to measure this link, because this study featured a relatively small group of students planning to move abroad for a long time accumulated from the total population of students.

The definition of Neuroticism and research associated with this trait shows that it is relative to avoidance of punishment and losing reinforcement (Allen et al., 2001), thus our hypothesis that scoring high on this trait would negatively correlate with migratory intentions. The absence of such a link corresponds to results of a study by van Ecke et al. (2005), which shows that immigrants possess a high level of unresolved attachment style (which by definition coincides with Neuroticism), therefore individuals who have a high expression of this trait do not necessarily remain to live in their home country. The absence of a correlation between the expression of Neuroticism and migratory intentions also matches Aluja and Garcia's (2004) finding that Neuroticism is not relative to social values.

Hypothesis 3 (H3), which stipulated that high expression of Extraversion is linked with planning to migrate for a long time period, was not confirmed. Such a correlation was expected as extraverts are motivated by the reinforcement stimulus (Smits, Boeck, 2006), however, the study showed that this link is not necessarily relative to the intention to migrate. Extraverts typically possess positive emotionality and are active
(John, Srivastava, 1999), and the study showed that these characteristics could be equally directed at creating one’s well-being in the home country or abroad.

The part of the first hypothesis stating that Agreeability is related with being undecided over one’s migratory intentions was not confirmed. The foresight of this link was based on results of a study by Newman and Kickul (1998) who purported that Agreeability is linked with achievement motivation, and together with Conscientiousness it can be related with organizational citizenship behavior, however, this link proved true only for Conscientiousness in our study. Boneva and Frieze (2001) also formulated a migrant personality type, who possesses high achievement motivation; however our study shows that it is not necessarily linked with high expression of Agreeability.

In conclusion, the most evident difference found in our study between students who plan to emigrate and those who do not is that the latter have a higher expression of Conscientiousness and the former score higher on Openness to Experience. As students with highly expressed Conscientiousness showed to be less likely to emigrate, a potential means of preventing emigration in Lithuania could be citizenship education. Even though results of the study point to links between two personality traits and migratory intentions, they describe only the studied sample and do not presuppose a causal relationship. Longitudinal studies measuring expression of personality traits and migration intentions and how they change throughout time and what influence they have on actual migratory behavior would be necessary in order to state this relationship.

Also our study has certain limitations related to the overreliance on self-report data and no verification of socially desirable responses in completing questionnaires. The small number of participants also suggests cautious generalization and interpretation of results. It was impossible to check gender differences in personality traits in relation to migratory intentions due to the small sample of male respondents (N=28). The small number of participants did not allow us to use more sophisticated data analysis methods. Therefore, future research is necessary to determine whether other individual differences could predict migratory intentions in larger and more diverse samples.
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Annex 1

Gender
Check the box that applies
Male ☐ Female ☐

Age: __________

Year in university: ____________________________________________________________

Major: _______________________________________________________________________

Below you will find some questions regarding your future plans. Circle the one answer that suits you most unless directions indicate otherwise

1) I have lived abroad for longer than a six month period. Yes No

2) I am determined to stay and live in Lithuania. Yes No I don’t know

3) I would like to live abroad in the future. Yes No I don’t know

4) I plan to go abroad for:
a) up to 6 months;
b) up to 2 years;
c) up to 10 years;
d) for good;
e) I don’t know;
f) I don’t intend to live abroad.

5) I would go to live abroad if: (circle all appropriate answers) a) I got accepted to a foreign university;
b) There were negative political/social changes in Lithuania;
c) I got an interesting job offer abroad;
d) My partner or family moved abroad;
e) I couldn’t live off of my wage in Lithuania;
f) I got bored of living here;
g) other (indicate) ________________________;
h) I wouldn’t go to live abroad for any of the enlisted reasons.

6) I plan to go abroad for a lengthy period of time and have already planned the time and location. Yes No I don’t know

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: asmenybės savybės, migruoti linkusi asmenybė, migracija.
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