



MIGRATION FLOWS FROM IRAQ TO EUROPE FEBRUARY 2016

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (IOM)

IRAQ MISSION

DISPLACEMENT TRACKING & MONITORING | DTM



IOM IRAQ



MIGRATION FLOWS FROM IRAQ TO EUROPE

FEBRUARY 2016

How to read these findings

- The findings presented in this report cannot be considered representative of the whole Iraqi migrant population.
- The report's methodology was based on referrals, not on random sampling. Hence, any information presented in the report refers to the sample only, and not to the entire Iraqi migrant population. The findings cannot be generalized.
- Even though these findings cannot be considered statistically representative, they do provide key insights on this migration process, and they allow identifying important elements to inform policy and decision-making in Europe, Iraq and transit countries.

PURPOSE

This report presents the findings of a survey conducted by IOM Iraq during the months of November and December 2015, in the framework of the DFID-funded project "Understanding complex migration flows from Iraq to Europe through movement tracking and awareness campaigns".

The survey was conducted among Iraqi migrants who left Iraq during 2015 and are currently residing in Europe. Based on the responses gathered, this report presents information about the migrants' personal profile, journey planning and decision-making process, journey completion, current living conditions in the country of destination and intentions for the future.

METHODOLOGY

A structured questionnaire designed by IOM Iraq and translated to Kurdish and Arabic was administered to Iraqis who left the country during 2015 and are currently living in Europe.

Respondents were identified using a snowball sampling technique, also known as chain-referral. This method identifies respondents through the referral of the group's initial members. The process continues until a sample of predetermined size has been reached. Snowball sampling is a non-probability sampling technique used to identify research subjects where subjects are hard to locate or to reach, scarce or in hiding.

IOM's Rapid Assessment and Response Teams (RARTs) composed by Iraqi nationals were asked to identify, through their network of acquaintances, a convenience sample of 30 people who migrated to Europe from each of Iraq's eighteen governorates. Interviews were conducted by RARTs over the phone or Skype in Arabic and Kurdish.

The sampling is therefore based on the chain referral and personal network of IOM's RARTs. Migrants were identified and contacted thanks to the RARTs' personal network of friends, family and acquaintances, and through the network of those who migrated. This may constitute a selection bias, because

persons most likely to participate in this survey are those who have pre-existing connections with IOM staff. At the same time, the guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality, along with the trust relationship between the interviewees and the IOM staff who interviewed them, suggest that interviewees might have felt comfortable enough to answer sensitive questions with honesty.

The sample obtained with this technique is not statistically representative of the overall Iraqi migrant population because the population of reference is not known and IOM Iraq does not know the true distribution of the population and of the sample. Therefore the results cannot be generalized to the entire population of migrants who left Iraq in 2015.

However, this allowed IOM to reach a very high number of migrants residing in Europe, which casts light on the migrant phenomenon, identifying important elements worth investigating further in the next phase of the research project.

IOM Iraq collected a total of 503 questionnaires. Of these, 473 were used for this analysis while 30 were excluded after a quality check because they did not meet the eligibility criteria.

The report is articulated as follows:

1. Migrants' personal life and profile in Iraq before departure

- Governorate of origin and residence;
- Socio-demographics;
- Education and employment.

2. Preparation and organization of the journey

- Decision-making and planning;
- Choice of country of destination;
- Information gathering.

3. Journey

- Country of destination, itinerary, and routes;
- Group composition and family reunification;
- Duration and costs.

4. Expectations and access to services in country of destination

- Expected access to services;
- Current living conditions;
- Intentions for the future.

1. Sample: respondents' profile

Respondents by governorate of origin and governorate of residence at the time of departure

The graph and the table below show the number of respondents by governorate of origin and governorate of residence at the time of departure.





Figure 1: Respondents by governorate of origin and governorate of residence at the time of departure.

| Governorate | Governorate of origin | Governorate of residence at the time of departure |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Anbar | 43 | 18 |
| Babylon | 28 | 29 |
| Baghdad | 44 | 45 |
| Basrah | 27 | 28 |
| Dahuk | 19 | 28 |
| Diyala | 34 | 31 |
| Erbil | 3 | 27 |
| Kerbala | 29 | 27 |
| Kirkuk | 18 | 21 |
| Missan | 23 | 24 |
| Muthanna | 18 | 29 |
| Najaf | 28 | 30 |
| Ninewa | 50 | 24 |
| Qadissiya | 25 | 25 |
| Salah al-Din | 18 | 10 |
| Sulaymaniyah | 18 | 29 |
| Thi-Qar | 22 | 22 |
| Wassit | 26 | 26 |
| Grand Total | 473 | 473 |

Table 1: Number of respondents by governorate of origin and last governorate of residence at the time of departure.

It is worth noting that in the governorates of Anbar and Ninewa, a high number of respondents originated from these governorates, but a much lower number used to reside there. This is probably because Anbar and Ninewa are among the governorates most affected by the current crisis. Hence, it can be inferred that many of the respondents were forced to flee their governorate of origin as a result of the hostilities and most likely displaced to other governorates. For this reason, at the time of departure, they were reported as not residing in their governorate of origin.

The situation in governorates such as Erbil or Sulaymaniyah, in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI), is the opposite, because they host internally displaced persons (IDPs) coming mostly from other governorates.



Map 1: Number of respondents by governorate of origin and last governorate of residence at the time of departure.

The map and the graph below show the number and percentage of respondents who declared to be IDPs at the time of departure, along with the breakdown by their governorate or origin.¹



Map 2: Number of IDPs in the sample, by governorate of origin.



Figure 2: Percentage of IDPs and Host Community members in the sample.

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether their district of residence was directly affected by military operations (MOs) at the time of departure and/or whether it was under the control of armed groups (AGs). The two options were not mutually exclusive. The table and figure below show the number of respondents residing in districts affected by military operations and/or under the control of armed groups aggregated by governorate of origin.




Figure 3: Respondents whose district of residence at the time of departure was affected by military operations and/or under the control of armed groups.

1. It is important to highlight that IDPs can be displaced within their own governorate of origin. Consequently, the number of IDPs can be higher than the difference between the respondents by governorate of origin and by governorate of residence at the time of departure (Table 1).

Respondents by ethno-religious affiliation

The table and graph below show the ethno-religious composition of the sample. It is remarkable that the ethno-religious break down of the respondents reflects the ethno-religious break down of the Iraqi population overall.² It is also worth mentioning that during the survey, RARTs were specifically asked to reach out to migrants belonging to ethno-religious minorities to obtain a diverse sample. Depending on the governorate, the requested quota was not reached, but minorities might still be slightly over-represented in the sample.

| Ethno-religious affiliation | # | % |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------|
| Arab Muslim Shi'a | 232 | 49% |
| Arab Muslim Sunni | 137 | 29% |
| Assyrian Christian | 2 | 0% |
| Chaldean Christian | 4 | 1% |
| Kurd Christian | 2 | 0% |
| Kurd Muslim Shi'a | 1 | 0% |
| Kurd Muslim Sunni | 66 | 14% |
| Kurd Unknown | 1 | 0% |
| Yazidi | 12 | 3% |
| Shabak | 1 | 0% |
| Turkmen Muslim Shi'a | 8 | 2% |
| Turkmen Muslim Sunni | 6 | 1% |
| Unknown | 1 | 0% |
| Grand Total | 473 | 473 |

Table 2: Respondents by ethno-religious affiliation.




Figure 4: Respondents by ethno-religious affiliation.

Age

The figure below shows the distribution of respondents by age: **72%** of the respondents are **30 years old or less**.




Figure 5: Distribution of respondents by age and sex.

Average age:

29


Median age:

28

2. No official updated data are available about the entire Iraqi population ethno-religious breakdown; however, estimations provide an indicative benchmark. In terms of religious affiliation, the overwhelming majority of the national Iraqi population is Muslim (estimated over 95%), of which the majority is Shi'a (estimated 60-65%) and the remaining are Sunni (30-35%). In terms of ethnic affiliation, Arabs are the largest ethnic group (75-80%), followed by Kurds (15-20%), and Turkmen, Assyrians, Chaldeans (approximately 5%). Ethnic and religious affiliations can overlap, meaning that different ethnic groups might share the same religious affiliation.

Sex

The sample is composed mainly of male migrants. The figure shows the percentages of the male and female population, together with the male to female ratio, namely the number of men for each woman accounted in the sample.



Ratio male/female:

13

of underage boys:

4

of underage girls:

0

Figure 6: Male and female percentages in the sample.

Marital status

The majority of respondents (approximately two thirds) are single. The figures below show the number of migrants by marital status at the time of departure and their percentages within the sample.




Figure 7: Number of respondents by family status.




Figure 8: Percentages of respondents by family status.

Approximately the same number had no dependents (neither children nor others) at the time of departure. The figures below show the number of migrants with dependents and their percentages within the sample.




Figure 9: Number of respondents with dependents.




Figure 10: Percentages of respondents by dependents.

Education

The respondents present varying degrees of education achievement, with only 11% reporting to have only completed primary education.




Figure 11: Completed level of education.

University education:


41%

Secondary education:

47%

Employment status at the time of departure

Most respondents reported to be employed at the time of departure. However, only half of those who were employed were employed full-time, meaning that only 27% of the entire sample had a full-time job.



Unemployed:

47%

Employed:

53%

Figure 12: Number of employed and unemployed migrants.

The figure below illustrates the job position or professional experience of the respondents at the time of departure.




Figure 13: Respondents' employment or professional experience at the time of departure.

The table below shows the respondents' monthly income at the time of departure. No respondent reported to be earning more than USD 2,000 per month. Approximately 29% reported to be earning less than USD 250 per month. This figure includes also those with no income at all.




Figure 14: Respondents' monthly income at the time of departure.

2. Decision-making and organization

Reason for departure

Respondents were asked to indicate the two main reasons that pushed them to migrate.³ Of the 379 who indicated no hope in the future as first reason (80% of the respondents), 120 did not provide a second answer.




Figure 15: The two main reasons for migration.

The decision to migrate does not seem to be attributable to one single cause, but rather to a set of circumstances.⁴ A preliminary reading of this response is the high level of volatility, the sense of uncertainty and the precariousness of the situation in Iraq.

Decision-making support

Respondents were asked whether they shared their intention of leaving with family, friends and acquaintances. Respondents could indicate as many options as applicable.




Figure 16: Number of respondents who informed family or acquaintances before departure.

- Although it is a broad reason, the option "no hope in the future" has been given because it was a recurrent answer in the face-to-face interviews, field visits and in the pilot questionnaire that preceded the draft of the current questionnaire. Respondents were therefore given the possibility to indicate a second option –to give them the opportunity to go more into detail.
- These instances will be further investigated through qualitative research methods during the next phase of the research.

Financial support

Respondents were asked about how they financially supported their journey. They could indicate as many options as applicable.




Figure 17: Financial support received by the respondents to organize the journey.

Country of intended destination at the time of departure

Respondents were asked what intended destination they had at the time of departure, and the main reason behind their choice. Germany was chosen by 47% of the respondents, Finland by 14% and Sweden by 10%.

Overall, the main reasons behind the respondents' choice were the perceived easiness to be granted refugee status and the presence of a network of support (i.e. relatives or friends) in the country.

The figure below shows the intended countries of destination by preference and the reasons for the choice.




Figure 18: Respondents' intended country of destination and reason of choice.

Information gathering

Respondents were asked about the information they collected to plan their journey, and about the sources they relied upon; they were also asked to rank the most important three.

The figure below shows the type of information that respondents ranked first of three. It can be noticed that 43% of respondents consider routes the most important information they collected before planning their journey, while 40% indicated costs.




Figure 19: Top most important information gathered to plan the journey.

When looking at the information mentioned as the top most important three, irrespectively of the ranking, the most frequently mentioned topic was costs (93%), followed by routes (78%) and transportation (60%).




Figure 20: Top three most frequently mentioned information topics.

Respondents were also asked about the sources of information they relied upon. In particular, they were asked to rank the top three sources they used.

The figure below reports the sources of information that respondents indicated as first in terms of importance.




Figure 21: Most important source of information for planning the journey.

The table below shows the three most frequently mentioned sources of information, irrespective of ranking. Word of mouth is the most frequently mentioned source (85%), followed by Internet (82%) and social media (82%).




Figure 22: Sources of information mentioned among the top most important three.

Respondents were then asked to describe more in detail what main channels facilitate word of mouth. Respondents were asked to indicate up to two options.




Figure 23: Main channels for word of mouth.

Satisfaction with the information and sense of preparedness

The respondents were also asked if they felt they had a good level of knowledge and awareness about the overall journey at the time of departure, particularly about the costs, the visa requirements in the destination country, and the refugee status eligibility criteria. The figure below shows how many respondents believed they had a good level of knowledge on these four topics. The respondents were invited to answer yes or no.




Figure 24: Number of respondents reporting to have a good knowledge before departure.

However, it is worth pointing out that 47% of those who stated that they felt they had a good knowledge of the visa requirements and 46% of those with a good knowledge of the refugee status eligibility criteria had used word of mouth as a main source of information.

The respondents were then asked if they felt satisfied with the information they had gathered before leaving Iraq. Although relatively similar to the previous question, there was a key difference: the former was a clear-cut question about self-awareness (i.e. did the migrant know enough before leaving, irrespectively of how difficult or easy it had been to build their knowledge). The second question was about the quality of information migrants obtained.





Figure 25: Level of satisfaction with the information gathered before departure.

After crosschecking the answers, it is important to highlight the large number of migrants reporting to be satisfied with the information gathered through word of mouth, regardless of the topic. Actually, 31% of those satisfied or very satisfied with the information collected about life in the country of destination, 39% of those satisfied or very satisfied with the information about asylum seeking procedures and 41% of those satisfied with information about visa requirements, obtained their information through word of mouth.

3. Journey

Country of destination

The following map shows the distribution of the respondents by country of current residence in Europe.



Map 3: Number of respondents by current country of residence.




Figure 26: Number of respondents by current country of residence.

Country of destination

The graph below shows the difference between respondents who indicated a given country as the intended country of destination before the departure and those who actually managed to reach that country.

Notably, the research showed that a total of 144 respondents (30%) did not reach their country of intended destination.




Figure 27: Comparison between countries of intended destination before departure and actual countries of destination.

Exit points from Iraq

The majority of respondents (94%) left Iraq through formal exit points. Of those who left the country through informal exit points (4% of the total sample), the majority had no access to formal exit points. The latter migrated from the governorates of Anbar and Ninewa, both highly affected by hostilities. To avoid crossing the front line, their safest route was through Syria towards Turkey.


| Exit point | # | % |
|--|------------|-----|
| Anbar governorate/Syria border (informal) | 1 | 0% |
| Baghdad International Airport | 131 | 28% |
| Basra International Airport | 63 | 13% |
| Dahuk governorate /Turkey (informal) | 4 | 1% |
| Erbil governorate/Turkey (informal) | 6 | 1% |
| Erbil International Airport | 52 | 11% |
| Fish Khabour (semi-formal land) | 1 | 0% |
| Ibrahim Khalil (formal land) | 62 | 13% |
| Najaf International Airport | 104 | 22% |
| Ninewa governorate/Syria border (informal) | 15 | 3% |
| Sulaymaniyah International Airport | 30 | 6% |
| Other | 4 | 1% |
| Grand Total | 473 | |

Table 3: main formal and informal exit points.

6% left Iraq through semi-formal or informal exit points

4% had no access to formal exit points

90% transited through Turkey



Map 4: Iraq main formal and informal exit points.

Entry to country of destination

The majority of the respondents (75%) entered their country of destination informally/illegally. Among the main reasons behind this, 46% of the respondents reported they did not have a visa, and 14% did not have a passport.





Figure 28: Number of respondents by modality of access to the country of destination (formal, informal and reason why informal).

Itinerary

The map below shows the itinerary followed by the respondents. The majority transited legally through Turkey and continued their journey illegally to Europe through Greece and the Balkans.



Map 5: Itinerary followed by the respondents from Iraq to Europe.

Household composition during the journey

The questionnaire also inquired about the composition of the household or group during the migrants' journey. The figure below shows, in percentages, with whom the migrants travelled to Europe and the actual numbers divided by sex.




Figure 29: Percentages of respondents by people they travelled with.




Figure 30: Number of respondents divided by sex and people they travelled with.

Intentions of spouse and/or children

When migrants had declared to be married and/or with children, but not to have travelled with them, they were asked about the plan they had for the rest of their family once they reached the country of destination.

The following figure shows, in percentages, the intention for the future of those respondents who left their spouse and/or children in Iraq (86 out of 473). Most (94%) expressed the intention of being joined by their family or spouse. More than 40% express the intention of being joined in the very near future (six month or less).




Figure 31: Intentions for the future about spouse and/or children left in Iraq.



Figure 32: Intentions for the future about spouse and/or children left in Iraq.

Duration and costs

Respondents were asked to indicate the length of their journey and the total cost, meaning the sum of transportation and living expenses. The figure below shows that only 6% of the interviewees took less than a week to reach their country of destination, while more than one third took a month or more.




Figure 33: Duration of the journey.

4. Country of destination: expectations and misconceptions

Work and financial support

Respondents were asked whether at the time of departure they had enough personal savings to support themselves financially during the first three months after arriving to the country of destination. Furthermore, irrespective of whether they had enough savings or not, respondents were asked to indicate the financial resources they were expecting to rely upon in the country of destination during the first three months. Respondents could indicate up to two options.




Figure 34: Respondents with enough savings for the first three months.




Figure 35: Different sources of financial support expected by the respondents.

Respondents were asked about their professional expectations on the short term (three months) and long term (one year) after their arrival to the country of destination.




Figure 36: Short and long-term job expectations.

Destination country

Respondents were asked to indicate up to three expected services or forms of support that they were expecting to receive from institutions in the country of destination. The respondents were then asked what services and support they actually received.

The figure below shows, for example, that 52 respondents (11%) mentioned work visa among the three services expected from the institutions of the country of destination, but that only 13 respondents (3%) actually received it.⁵




Figure 37: Comparison between expected and received services from the institutions of country of destination.

Refugee status

Respondents were asked whether based on their knowledge and the information gathered before the departure, they believed they fit the eligibility criteria to be granted refugee status. Respondents were also asked whether they eventually sought asylum and, if so, about the outcome of their application.

The following figure shows that 94% of respondents believed they fit the eligibility criteria at the time of departure, and 92% applied once they reached the country of destination. However, only 12% of respondents had been granted the refugee status at the time of the interview, while 56% were still being processed, and 25% had already been rejected.

5. Respondents were asked to indicate only up to three expected services. From the preliminary interviews and the pilot that preceded this questionnaire, it seems clear that giving the possibility to indicate as many options as applicable would have flattened the answers, as all these services were somehow expected. Later, respondents were asked whether they received a service or not, with the possibility to indicate as many as applicable. This was done in order to understand not only if their expectations were actually met, but also what kind of support the institutions actually provided, irrespectively from the expectations.




Figure 38: Comparison between number of respondents who believed they fit the eligibility criteria, those who applied and those who were granted asylum.

The figure below shows the refugee status of the respondents at the time of the interview, by ethno-religious background of the applicant.⁶




Figure 39: Respondents by ethno-religious affiliation and refugee status.

The figure below shows the status of asylum granting depending on the respondents' district of residence at the time of departure. The figure shows the number of respondents who applied for refugee status and whose district of residence was under armed groups' control or directly affected by military operations at the time of departure.




Figure 40: Refugee status by security conditions in the respondent's district of residence at the time of departure.

6. The current humanitarian crisis in Iraq, which began at the end of 2013, has a different impact on the various ethno-religious groups of the country. Iraq's ethno-religious communities tend to be concentrated geographically. In terms of distribution, before the beginning of the most recent humanitarian crisis, southern Iraq was inhabited mainly by Arab Muslim Shi'a. Arab Muslim Sunnis were more concentrated in central and western Iraq. Notably, major cities like Baghdad and Basrah were home to multiple ethno-religious groups. The majority of Kurds, both Sunni and Shi'a, were settled in the north and northeast regions, within the Kurdish Region of Iraq (KRI) and the disputed districts. Christians and other non-Muslim minorities such as the Kurdish Yazidis were settled in northwest Iraq, particularly in the governorate of Ninewa. Because of such a geographical concentration, certain groups (i.e. Yazidis, Arab Muslim Sunnis, non-Muslim minorities) were likely to be more directly exposed to the conflict or be more heavily affected.

Current living conditions and intentions for the future




Figure 41: Level of satisfaction with current living conditions.

Overall, 56% of respondents define themselves as satisfied or very satisfied with the current living conditions. Only 13% of respondents are unsatisfied and 3% very unsatisfied. However, looking more closely at the replies above, it is possible to notice that the two indicators showing a low level of satisfaction are legal status (work visa/asylum) and job/employment. Not only is job/employment status highly dependent on the legal status, but also the legal status is the only factor that actually determines whether the migrant can or cannot stay in the country of destination.




Figure 42: Intention to return to Iraq.

Finally, a key finding of this phase of the project has to do with the future intentions of Iraqi migrants. The results show that the majority of respondents (67%) do not want to return to Iraq, which speaks of the severity of the situation that led them to flee their home country in the first place.

Of the remaining respondents, 21% are still waiting to decide, 8% would consider returning to Iraq in the long term and 3% would consider returning in the next months. Given the importance of this topic, IOM will investigate it further in the next phase of the project.

Annex: questionnaire

NAME OF RART/INTERVIEWER:

| | | |
|--------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Governorate: | Relation with the interviewee: | |
| Date (dd-mm-yyyy): | <input type="checkbox"/> Friend/acquaintance | <input type="checkbox"/> Relative |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Sibling | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Instructions:

For closed answers, please always tick one choice, unless differently instructed.

If you tick Other, please always specify.

1. MIGRANT'S PERSONAL PROFILE AND LIFE IN IRAQ BEFORE DEPARTURE

1.1 Profile

| |
|--|
| 1.1.1 Pseudonym: _____ |
| 1.1.2 Sex: <input type="checkbox"/> a. male <input type="checkbox"/> b. female |
| 1.1.3 Age: _____ |
| 1.1.4 Was the migrant internally displaced after January 2014? <input type="checkbox"/> a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> b. No |
| 1.1.5 If displaced after January 2014 (if 1.1.4 =a), in what kind of accommodation was the migrant living before leaving Iraq? (DTM shelter category): _____ |
| 1.1.6 Was the migrant internally displaced between 2006 and 2013? <input type="checkbox"/> a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> b. No |
| 1.1.7 Ethno-religious group: _____ |
| 1.1.8 District of residence at time of departure: _____ |
| 1.1.9 District of origin (if different from district of residence before departure): _____ |
| 1.1.10 At the time of departure, was the migrant's district of residence directly affected by military operations? <input type="checkbox"/> a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> b. No |
| 1.1.11 At the time of departure, was the migrant's district of residence under AGs' control? <input type="checkbox"/> a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> b. No |

1.2 Household

1.2.1 Marital status:

- a. Single
- b. Married
- c. Widower/widow
- d. Divorced

1.2.2 Dependents:

- a. Children
- b. Others
- c. None

1.2.3 Number of household members: _____

1.2.4 Household average income per month (sum of household members' salaries):

- a. Less than US\$ 250
- b. US\$ 250–500
- c. US\$ 500–1,000
- d. US\$ 1,000–1,500
- e. US\$ 1,500–2,000
- f. US\$ 2,000–3,000
- g. More than US\$ 3,000

1.3 Education and employment

1.3.1 Completed education level:

- a. Primary
- b. Secondary/Intermediate
- c. Secondary/Preparatory
- d. Undergraduate
- e. Postgraduate
- f. PhD
- g. Other: _____

1.3.2 What was the migrant's professional experience or area of expertise before leaving Iraq?

- a. Farming /agriculture/pastoral activity
- b. Sale/trade/business
- c. Skilled manual (carpenter, plumber, electrician, mechanic, beautician, ...)
- d. Unskilled manual (mover, cleaner, ...)
- e. Skilled non-manual (IT, engineer, ...)
- f. Health practitioner (nurse, doctor, ...)
- g. Administration/ secretarial/office job
- h. Government (civil servant, police, army)
- i. Other: _____

1.3.3 What was the migrant's employment status before leaving Iraq:

a. Employed

b. Unemployed

1.3.4 Only if employed (if 1.3.3=a, otherwise go to 1.3.6):

a. Full-time

b. Part-time

c. Occasional

1.3.5 Only if employed (if 1.3.3=a, otherwise go to 1.3.6):

a. Public sector

b. Private sector

1.3.6 Personal average income per month:

a. Less than US\$ 250

b. US\$ 250–500

c. US\$ 500–1,000

d. US\$ 1,000–1,500

e. US\$ 1,500–2,000

f. US\$ 2,000–3,000

g. More than US\$ 3,000

2. PREPARATION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE JOURNEY

2.1 Decision making and planning

2.1.1 Country of intended destination at the time of departure:

a. Austria

b. Belgium

c. Finland

d. France

e. Germany

f. Hungary

g. Italy

h. Netherlands

i. Slovenia

j. Sweden

k. UK

Other: _____

2.1.2 At the time of departure, did the migrant speak the language of the country of destination?

a. Yes

b. No

2.1.3 At the time of departure, did the migrant speak English?

a. Yes

b. No

2.1.4 Why did the migrant choose their country of intended destination?

- a. Easier to get visa
- b. Easier to get asylum
- c. Easier to reach
- d. Cheaper to reach
- e. Relatives/friends already living in the country
- f. Other: _____

2.1.5 What was the main reason for the departure? (*Tick up to two*)

- a. No hope in the future
- b. Unemployment
- c. General security concerns
- d. Targeted violence
- e. Joining family members
- f. Other: _____

2.1.6 Did the migrant have contacts in the country of destination? *Please tick as many as applicable.*

- a. Spouse
- b. Friends
- c. Relatives
- d. Sibling
- d. None
- e. Other: _____

2.1.7 Did the migrant inform anyone of the decision to leave Iraq? *Please tick as many as applicable.*

- a. Household
- b. Extended family
- c. Friends
- d. Nobody
- e. Other: _____

2.1.8 What was the main declared reason for the departure?

- a. Tourism
- b. Study
- c. Work
- d. Visiting family/friends
- e. Medical issues
- f. Other: _____

2.1.9 Who supported the journey financially? *Please tick as many as applicable.*

- a. Self-supported
- b. Household
- c. Extended family/friends
- d. Other: _____

2.1.10 With whom did the migrant travel?

- a. Alone
- b. With a friend/relative

- c. With spouse
- d. With spouse and children
- e. With a group
- f. Other: _____

2.1.11 Only if married or with children (if 1.2.1=b or 1.2.2=a), and if travelling without them (if 2.1.10=a, or 2.1.10=b, or if 2.1.10=e, or if 2.1.10=f), what is the plan for the spouse/children?

- a. Join in the next three months
- b. Join in the next six months
- c. Join in the future
- d. Waiting to decide
- e. Stay permanently in Iraq

2.1.12 Did the migrant have enough savings to support themselves during the first three months in the country of destinations?

- a. Yes
- b. No

2.1.13 Did the migrant obtain a new passport to leave Iraq?

- a. Yes
- b. No

2.1.14 Only if the migrant obtained a new passport (if 2.1.13=a, otherwise go to 2.2), through what channels did they get it?

- a. Formal/legal
- b. Informal/illegal

2.1.15 Only if the migrant obtained a new passport (if 2.1.13=a, otherwise go to 2.2), how long did it take?

- a. One week or less
- b. Two to three weeks
- c. One month or more

2.1.16 Only if the migrant obtained a new passport (if 2.1.13=a, otherwise go to 2.2), how much did the passport cost?

US \$: _____

2.2 Information gathering

2.2.1 Did the migrant have a smartphone before leaving Iraq?

- a. Yes b. No

2.2.2 Did the migrant have access to the internet before leaving Iraq?

- a. Yes b. No

2.2.3 Before leaving Iraq, what was the migrant's main source of news and information? *Rank the first three sources in order of importance.*

| Priority (1-2-3) | Source of information |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | a. TV |
| | b. Radio |
| | c. Facebook |
| | d. Internet |
| | e. Newspapers/Magazines |
| | f. UN agencies/NGOs |
| | g. Local authorities or institutions |
| | i. Word of mouth |
| | j. Other: _____ |

2.2.4 What was the migrant's main source of information to plan their journey? *Rank the first three sources in order of importance.*

| Priority (1-2-3) | Source of information |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | a. TV |
| | b. Radio |
| | c. Facebook |
| | d. Internet |
| | e. Newspapers/Magazines |
| | f. UN agencies/NGOs |
| | g. Local authorities or institutions |
| | h. Travel agencies |
| | i. Word of mouth |
| | j. Other: _____ |

2.2.5 What are the main channels for word of mouth? *Tick up to two.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. Mosque/religious community centre | <input type="checkbox"/> e. Direct contact with someone who left (sibling, friend, relative) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. School/university | <input type="checkbox"/> f. Mediated contact with someone who left (acquaintances, friends of friends) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. Social activities (football club, café) | <input type="checkbox"/> g. Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. Work place | |

2.2.6 What was the main information the migrant collected before leaving to plan their journey? Rank the first three topics in order of importance.

| Priority (1-2-3) | Topic |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | a. Routes |
| | b. Costs |
| | c. Transportation |
| | d. Visa requirements |
| | e. Asylum seeking procedures |
| | f. Life in the country of destination |
| | g. Other: _____ |

2.2.7 At the time of departure, did the migrant think they had sufficient information to plan the journey?

- a. Yes b. No

2.2.8 Was the migrant fully aware of the cost of the trip before the departure?

- a. Yes b. No

2.2.9 Did the migrant have any knowledge of the visa requirements of the countries of destination or transit before the departure?

- a. Yes b. No

2.2.10 Did the migrant have any knowledge of the eligibility criteria to obtain the status of refugee in the intended country of destination?

- a. Yes b. No

2.2.11 Please rate the level of satisfaction with the information collected before departure about the following topics:

| | Very satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------|---------|--------------|-------------------|
| Routes | | | | | |
| Costs | | | | | |
| Transportation | | | | | |
| Visa requirements | | | | | |
| Overall/general wellbeing | | | | | |
| Asylum seeking procedures | | | | | |
| Life in country of destination | | | | | |
| Other: _____ | | | | | |

2.3 Expectations and hopes

2.3.1 Before the departure, how did the migrant expect to support themselves during the first three months in the country of destination? *Tick up to two.*

- a. Find a job
- b. Savings
- c. Support from household/family in Iraq
- d. Support from household/family in country of destination
- e. Support from country of destination institutions
- f. Other: _____

2.3.2 Did the migrant believe they fit the criteria to obtain refugee status in the country of destination?

- a. Yes
- b. No

2.3.3 What kind of job did the migrant hope to get in the first three months after arrival?

- a. Any job
- b. Same job as in Iraq
- c. Better paid job than in Iraq
- d. Other: _____

2.3.4 What kind of job did the migrant hope to get within a year?

- a. Any job
- b. Same job as in Iraq
- c. Better paid job than in Iraq
- d. Other: _____

2.3.5 What kind of support from the institutions of the country of destination did the migrant expect? *Tick up to three.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. Free/subsidized accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> h. Free/subsidized healthcare |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. Cheap accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> i. Job seeking support |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. Cash assistance | <input type="checkbox"/> j. Any job |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. Refugee status | <input type="checkbox"/> k. Skills-fitting job |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e. Work visa | <input type="checkbox"/> l. Language classes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> f. Legal assistance for asylum seeking | <input type="checkbox"/> m. Free/subsidized education/vocational training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> g. Legal assistance for family reunification | <input type="checkbox"/> n. Passport/nationality of country of destination |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> o. Other: _____ |

3. JOURNEY

3.1 Duration and costs

3.1.1 Overall duration of the journey from Iraq to the country of destination:

- a. One to two days
- b. Less than a week
- c. One to two weeks
- d. Three weeks
- e. One month or more

3.1.2 Date of departure: _____

3.1.3 Date of arrival: _____

3.1.4 Overall cost of the entire journey: US\$ _____

3.1.5 Transportation: US\$ _____

3.1.6 Living expenses: US\$ _____

3.2 Itinerary: departure from Iraq

3.2.1 Exit point from Iraq:

- a. Basra International Airport
- b. Najaf International Airport
- c. Baghdad International Airport
- d. Sulaymaniya International Airport
- e. Erbil International Airport
- f. Ibrahim Khalil (formal land)
- g. Fish Khabour (semi-formal land)
- h. Sar Zeri (semi-formal land)
- i. Ninewa governorate/Syria border (informal)
- l. Anbar governorate/Syria border (informal)
- m. Dahuk governorate /Turkey (informal)
- n. Erbil governorate/Turkey (informal)
- o. Other: _____

3.2.2 Means of transportation:

- a. Private car
- b. Taxi
- c. Bus
- d. Train
- e. Plane
- f. Foot
- g. Other: _____

3.2.3 Cost in US\$ (from Iraq to next stop): _____

3.2.4 Crossing*:

- a. Legal
- b. Illegal

**We consider any entry or crossing legal, as long as it is authorized by local authorities (even if the migrant has no ID or visa).*

3.2.5 Only if illegal (if 3.2.4=b, otherwise go to 3.3), why? Please tick as many as applicable.

- a. Illegal is cheaper
- b. Illegal is faster
- c. No access to formal exit points
- d. No passport
- e. No visa
- f. Unaccompanied minor
- g. Other _____

3.2.6 Only if no visa (if 3.2.5=e, otherwise go to 3.3), why did not the migrant have a visa?

- a. The migrant applied but the application was rejected
- b. The migrant did not apply because they did not know the procedure
- c. The migrant did not apply because they thought that it would be certainly rejected
- d. Other: _____

3.2.7 Only if no passport (if 3.2.5=d, otherwise go to 3.3), what was the main reason why the migrant did not have a passport?

- a. The migrant could not reach a passport office
- b. The waiting time for issuing the passport is too long
- c. The migrant did not have the necessary documents to apply for a passport
- d. The migrant did not know how to apply
- e. Other: _____

3.3 Itinerary

| | a. Entry point | b. Legal or illegal | c. Transportation | d. # of days | e. If illegal, why? |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------|---|
| 3.3.1 Transit county 1: | | | | | e1. No visa e2. No passport e3. No access to formal crossing point e4. Other: _____ |
| 3.3.2 Transit county 2: | | | | | e1. No visa e2. No passport e3. No access to formal crossing point e4. Other: _____ |
| 3.3.3 Transit county 3: | | | | | e1. No visa e2. No passport e3. No access to formal crossing point e4. Other: _____ |
| 3.3.4 Transit county 4: | | | | | e1. No visa e2. No passport e3. No access to formal crossing point e4. Other: _____ |
| 3.3.5 Country of destination: | | | | | e1. No visa e2. No passport e3. No access to formal crossing point e4. Other: _____ |

3.4 Communication and information during the journey

3.4.1 Did the migrant have a smartphone during the journey?

- a. Yes b. No

3.4.2 Did the migrant have access to the internet during the journey?

- a. Yes b. No

3.4.3 During the journey, what was the migrant’s main source of news and information? *Rank the first three sources in order of importance.*

| Priority (1-2-3) | Source of information |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | a. TV |
| | b. Radio |
| | c. Facebook |
| | d. Internet |
| | e. Newspapers/Magazines |
| | f. UN agencies/NGOs |
| | g. Local authorities or institutions |
| | i. Word of mouth |
| | j. Other: _____ |

4. COUNTRY OF DESTINATION – current condition in the country of arrival

4.1 Current conditions

4.1.1 Did the migrant reach the country of intended destination (the one planned before departure)?

- a. Yes b. No

4.1.2 Currently, is the migrant residing legally in the country of destination?

- a. Yes b. No

4.1.3 Did the migrant seek asylum (i.e. apply for the status of refugee)?

- a. Yes b. No

4.1.4 If yes, did the migrant obtain the refugee status?

- a. Yes
 b. No
 c. Still in process

4.1.5 What kind of support from the institutions of the country of destination did the emigrant actually receive? *Please tick as many as applicable.*

- a. Free/subsidised accommodation
- b. Cheap accommodation
- c. Cash assistance
- d. Refugee status
- e. Work visa
- f. Legal assistance for asylum seeking
- g. Legal assistance for family reunification
- h. Free/subsidised healthcare
- i. Job seeking support
- j. Any job
- k. Skills-fitting job
- l. Language classes
- m. Free/subsidised education/vocational training
- n. Passport/nationality of country of destination
- o. None
- p. Other: _____

4.1.6 Is the migrant currently employed?

- a. Yes
- b. No

4.1.7 Only if employed (if 4.1.6=a, otherwise go to 4.1.8):

- a. Formally
- b. Informally (no regular contract or work permit from host country)

4.1.8 How does the migrant rate their level satisfaction?

| | a. Very satisfied | b. Satisfied | c. Neutral | d. Dissatisfied | e. Very dissatisfied |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Accommodation | | | | | |
| Job/Employment status | | | | | |
| Legal status (visa/Asylum) | | | | | |
| Services (Health, education) | | | | | |
| Overall/general wellbeing | | | | | |

4.2 Intentions for the future

4.2.1 Does the migrant consider the idea of returning to Iraq?

- a. No
- b. Yes, in the next few months
- c. Yes, in the next few years
- d. Yes, in the far future
- e. Waiting to decide
- f. Other: _____