fieri

Working papers

Report on TRAFIG Survey data

prepared by

Tommaso Frattini *(University of Milan and LdA)*

Irene Solmone (*LdA*)

in collaboration with

Ferruccio Pastore (FIERI)

CENTRO STUDI LUCA D'AGLIANO

November 2022

This paper has been produced in the framework of the TRAFIG project funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. No 822453.
It also benefits from the support of the Fondazione Compagnia di San Paolo

Fondazione Compagnia di San Paolo

Abstract

In this report we provide an in-depth analysis of part of the interviews conducted with 600 migrants in "situation of protracted displacement" in Greece and Italy within the framework of the TRAFIG (Transnational Figurations of Displacement) research project funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 programme under grant No. 822453 (https://trafig.eu/).

We first provide an overview of the key characteristics of the interviewees in Greece and Italy in terms of: demographic characteristics, migration experience, socio-economic outcomes in the destination country. This analysis shows that there exist immense differences between the characteristics of the population in protracted displacement living in these two countries. We then assess – through multivariate regression analysis – the extent to which individual characteristics of migrants are correlated with their outcomes in the host country. Results show that the most important factors associated with measures of "integration" or "success" in the host country, even when accounting for all other characteristics, are the region of origin and (consequently) migration history.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction[1]

In this report, we provide an in-depth analysis of part of the interviews conducted with several hundred of migrants in "situation of protracted displacement" in different countries within the framework of the TRAFIG (Transnational Figurations of Displacement) research project funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 programme under grant No. 822453 (https://trafig.eu/). Specifically, 1897 persons in situation of protracted displacement have been surveyed in six different countries (Pakistan, Jordan, DR Congo, Ethiopia, Italy, and Greece). We will focus here on the two countries that offer the most "comparable" setting: Greece and Italy. We will show that there exist immense differences between the characteristics of the population in protracted displacement living in these two countries, despite the similarities of Greece and Italy in terms of per capita income, international position, institutional framework, and even geography.

We will first provide an overview of the key characteristics of the interviewees in Greece and Italy in terms of: demographic characteristics, migration experience, socio-economic outcomes in the destination country. In the second part of the report, we will assess – through multivariate regression analysis – the extent to which individual characteristics of migrants are correlated with their outcomes in the host country.

2. Descriptive statistics

The sample is made up of 600 observations, equally divided between Italy and Greece. Interviews took place between April 2021 and June 2021 in Greece, and between February 2020 and April 2021 in Italy. The individuals interviewed differ substantially across the two countries of destination, in terms of personal characteristics, migration history and social and economic conditions at the time of the survey, as we show in the next section. For this reason, at all stages of the analysis we will always consider Italy and Greece separately. Interviews have been collected in a few pre-specified locations in each country. In Italy, interviews were conducted in Castel Volturno, Rome, Saluzzo, and Turin. In Greece, most interviews were conducted in Athens, with an additional 20% in the islands of Lesvos and Chios. Both in Italy and Greece more than 85% of the study sites were urban.

[1] The authors would like to thank Benjamin Etzold, TRAFIG's scientific coordinator, and Ben Buchenau, data analyst at BICC, for sharing valuable earlier analysis of TRAFIG's survey results that provided a useful background for the analyses presented here. The authors would also like to thank Panos Hatziprokopiou for his useful comments on a previous version of this paper.

3. Demographic characteristics

3.1 Origin

There is very little overlap between Italy and Greece in the areas of origin of the migrants interviewed. Even though the samples are not meant to be representative of the migrant populations in the two countries, as the focus is only on individuals in "protracted displacement"[2] and the sample was deliberately chosen to include origin groups that were also examined in other TRAFIG study countries, the choices made in the data collection phase, and the places in which individuals were interviewed, meant that the predominance of some areas and countries of birth in the sample partially reflect the migrant groups present in these two countries of destination, and specifically in the areas within each country where interviews were conducted. Still, some of the largest migrant communities are not included in the sample: in Italy, for example, Romanians, Moroccans and Tunisians (Roman et al., 2021). This is due to the definition of protracted displacement that was adopted and that tends to exclude migrants from communities with a high migration seniority, whose migration was not forced in the first place and who are overall well integrated.

Figure 1 – Countries of birth of respondents



[2] While conventionally protracted displacement refers to an exile lasting for more than five years (in this sense, according to UNHCR, 74% of the total global refugee population, i.e. 15.9 million persons, falls in this situation), in the TRAFIG project a broader definition was adopted. Protracted displacement was thus understood as a "long-lasting condition of economic precarity, marginalisation, rightlessness, which displaced people experience after their initial displacement" (Etzold et al, 2022: 6)

Migrants in the Greek sample originate from four main countries (Figure 1): Syria (33%), Afghanistan (33%), Congo (17%) and Pakistan (16%). It is also worth stressing that the distinction between Pakistani and Afghan origin is often blurred, with a number of individuals who were born in one country and grew up in the other, or migrated from one to the other at a young age (Roman et al., 2021). The range of origin countries of the Italian sample is instead wider, although the vast majority of the interviewees come from Sub-Saharan Africa: one third of the respondents were born in Eritrea, 16% in Nigeria, and 11% in Pakistan. The rest are divided across 20 other nationalities, most of which West African: for example, 6% were born in Gambia, 5% in Senegal, and 5% in Mali[3].

3.2 Gender and age

In both countries, most interviewed migrants are men: 72% in Greece, and 83% in Italy. The distribution across age groups is also similar, with three quarters of the sample aged 20 to 39. In Italy, however, migrants are slightly younger: almost half (46%) are in their twenties, while in Greece 43% are in their thirties. In both samples there are very few individuals under 20 and over 50 years old (Figure 2). This age profile is consistent with the characteristics of the overall sample, which is composed of forcibly displaced migrants who had to go through difficult and often risky journeys to escape their countries of origin.

Figure 2 – Age distribution of respondents



[3] The other countries of birth of individuals interviewed in Italy are: Cameroon, Chad, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Iran, Cote d'Ivoire, Kenya, Niger, Guinea-Bissau, Somalia, Sudan, Togo and Burkina Faso.

3.3 Education

Most migrants interviewed in Greece have at most a primary school diploma (73%), while in Italy individuals are more evenly distributed across education levels: 46% have a primary school diploma, and as many as 18% have obtained a university-level degree (

Figure 3). While in Italy the distribution of educational attainments in the overall migrant population is similar to that of the sample (in 2020, 47% of migrants had a low, and 14% a high level of education), migrants in Greece are on average better educated than those interviewed: almost half (48%) have an intermediate education (upper secondary degree), and 16% have a tertiary degree (6th Migration Observatory Report, Centro Studi Luca d'Agliano, p. 20).

Figure 3 – Distribution across education levels of respondents



3.4 Marital status and family

The higher concentration of individuals over 30 years old in Greece is reflected in their marital status and family size. While 56% of migrants in the sample in Italy are single, the same percentage in Greece is married or in a partnership (Table 1). Vice versa, 38% in Greece are single, while 31% in Italy have a stable spouse or partner.

Table 1 – Distribution of respondents by marital status

	Greece	Italy
Single	38.0%	55.7%
Married	51.0%	29.2%
In partnership, but not married	5.3%	12.1%
Separated or divorced	3.3%	1.3%
Widowed	2.3%	1.7%

Unsurprisingly, more than half of the individuals in the sample in Italy have no children, while in Greece slightly less than two thirds (62%) have one or more children. In fact, almost one quarter have more than two.

Furthermore, in Italy less than 20% of the respondents with children also live with them, while the share in Greece is 75%. Unfortunately, the data do not show whether the children that do not live in the parents' households are in the host country with the respondents or not. The differences in the profile of migrants in Greece and Italy in terms of gender and family composition is consistent with the overall migration history of the communities under study. In the Greek case, the majority of the interviewed people arrived in the country from Turkey after having been collectively displaced from Syria, Afghanistan or elsewhere. On the contrary, in Italy, the majority of surveyed migrants arrived through Libya following a very dangerous migratory route that is relatively seldom used by women and children.

4. Migration and legal status

4.1 Years in the country and years in displacement

Most individuals in the sample crossed the Greek and Italian borders between 2016 and 2019, and hence have been in the host country between 1 and 6 years. Individuals interviewed in Greece have generally been in the country for shorter periods of time: almost two thirds (62%) crossed the border in 2018 and 2019, while in the Italian sample the two most frequent years of arrival are 2016 (23%) and 2017 (17%), as we show in Figure 4. Furthermore, while the first arrivals in Greece are registered in 2009, about one fifth of individuals in the sample arrived in Italy before 2010, and two migrants crossed the Italian border around 1990 (not included in the figure).

Figure 4 – Share of respondents by year in which the border of Greece/Italy was crossed (2000 onwards)



The peaks registered in the data mirror those that can be found in Eurostat data on asylum applications during those years. Following the enactment of the EU-Turkey Statement of March 2016, which effectively restricted a significant part of undocumented migrant flows towards Europe, there was a sharp rise in applications in Greece between 2016 and 2019, since many of those who had arrived could not leave the new reception facilities (RICs). Instead, Italy saw a substantial growth in asylum applications from 2014 to 2017, with 2017 recording the second-highest number of applications in the EU, after Germany (Roman et al., 2021).

Table 2 – Distribution of respondents by years in the country and years in displacement (percentages by row)

Years in the country		**Years in displacement**				
		1-3	**4-5**	**6-10**	**11+**	**Total**
Greece	**1-3**	45.30	23.50	20.51	10.68	100.00
	4-5	0.00	56.60	22.64	20.75	100.00
	6-10	0.00	0.00	72.73	27.37	100.00
	11+	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00
	Total	35.45	28.43	22.74	13.38	100.00
Italy	**1-3**	29.55	40.91	22.73	6.82	100.00
	4-5	0.00	53.15	36.04	10.82	100.00
	6-10	0.00	0.00	51.39	48.61	100.00
	11+	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00
	Total	4.36	25.84	29.19	40.60	100.00

On average, migrants in Italy have been in displacement – defined as the difference between the year of the survey and the year in which they first left their home – for significantly longer periods of time than migrants in Greece. In fact, less than 5% have been in displacement for up to 3 years, and as many as 41% had migrated more than 10 years prior to the survey. In Greece, about a third of the migrants in the sample have been in displacement for up to 3 years, while only 13% have been in displacement for more than 10 years.

Migrants in Greece are more likely to have lived for most of their time in displacement inside the country: almost half of those who have been in the country for 1 to 3 years have been in displacement for the same period of time; similarly, 57% of those who had arrived 4 to 5 years before, and 73% of those who had arrived 6 to 10 years before, have been in displacement for the same number of years. Instead, in Italy the correlation between years in displacement and years spent in the country is lower, with almost half of those who had been in the country 4 to 10 years at the time of the interview, and about 70% of those who had arrived 1 to 3 years before, that had been in displacement for longer (Table 2).

4.2 Journey and destination choice

The longer periods in displacement of migrants in Italy are also reflected in the number of countries crossed throughout the journey: more than half (57%) of individuals in Greece passed through only one country to reach their current place of living, and no one in the sample passed through more than 3; on the other hand, the majority of migrants in Italy (90%) passed through more than one country. The most frequent number of countries passed among individuals interviewed in Italy is 2 (40%), but 48% passed through 3 to 6 countries to get there. This is a consequence of the areas of origin of migrants in the sample: while most individuals interviewed in Greece come from Afghanistan or Pakistan, and only have to cross two borders to get to Greece, most migrants in Italy come from African countries, and therefore had to go through much longer overland trips which often involve crossing the borders of several African countries before reaching Lybia.

Table 3 – Share of respondents by reason for which they went to their current place of residence

	Greece	Italy
Easier to reach	53.3%	1.3%
Lived here before	2.3%	0.3%
Better economic conditions	17.3%	13.7%
More security	17.0%	1.3%
Better access to education	3.7%	1.3%
Better access to health care	2.7%	0.7%
Language/culture	0.3%	1.3%
Family reunification	7.7%	6.0%
Easier to move to other destination	11.3%	0.3%
Brought here	19.3%	39.7%
To join friends	7.7%	24.3%
Other	1.3%	17.0%

Note: total does not add up to 100% because respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

Migrants' places of residence in Italy and Greece at the time of the survey were not chosen as destinations for a significant part of the sample (Table 3). More than half of those in the Greek sample moved there simply because it was easier to reach (53%) or because they were brought there (19%), while in Italy the share that reported having been brought to the country is significantly higher (40%). These differences are to be expected, given the migrant routes in the Mediterranean and the geographical features of these countries: Greece provides an easy access to the EU through Turkey, while a considerable part of migrants from African countries who arrive to Italy are brought there by boat, through migrant smuggling or rescue operations.

4.3 Reason for migration and legal status

Personal insecurity is one of the most important reasons for migration for respondents in both Italy and Greece (Table 4). More specifically, 82% of the Greek sample and 35% of the Italian sample cite "insecurity, war and violence" among the most important reasons that led them to leave their home countries. Political persecution was cited by a quarter of respondents in Greece, and almost 40% of those in Italy, and for 27% of migrants in Italy (predominantly Eritreans) avoiding forced military service was among the most important drivers of migration.

The other two most frequently cited reasons for migration were economic (e.g. to find employment), and family reasons, which were indicated among the most important reasons for migration by, respectively, 23 and 11% in Greece, and 12 and 14% in Italy.

Table 4 - Share of respondents by reason for migration

	Greece	Italy
Economic reasons such as to find employment	23.3%	12.3%
Insecurity, war and violence	81.7%	34.7%
Land conflicts	3.0%	0.3%
Political persecution from the state government or other groups	25.3%	38.0%
(Forced) military service	2.7%	27.3%
Educational reasons such as further schooling or studies	4.0%	4.0%
Environmental factors and natural disasters	2.0%	0.0%
Family reasons (such as dispute at home, but also family members living abroad)	11.0%	14.0%
Other reasons	5.7%	7.7%

Note: total does not add up to 100% because respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

Since migrants in Italy have spent more time in the country, it is not surprising that a larger share have either been recognized as refugees, or been granted subsidiary protection, or another type of protection status (e.g. humanitarian/special protection). This group of beneficiaries of some form of international protection makes up almost three quarters of the sample (72%). Instead, in Greece only 33% of the respondents have already been granted international protection. Additionally, almost half (48.5%) of the migrants are still waiting for a decision on their asylum application, as opposed to only 19% in Italy. The share whose asylum application has been rejected is higher in Greece: 8%, compared to 2% in Italy (Figure 5).

Figure 5 – Respondents by legal status



Of those who have received protection or have been granted refugee status, the vast majority has received a temporary permit: 69% in Greece, and 94% in Italy. However, the share of migrants in Greece who do not know the duration of their permit is surprisingly high: 27%, compared to 2% in Italy.

4.4 Remigration intentions

Almost all migrants in the sample do not intend to move back to their home country permanently: only 0.01% in Greece, and 2% in Italy (respectively, 2 and 7 observations) express this intention. However, a small part plans to return temporarily within the following two years. The share is higher in Italy, probably because - on the one hand - the better economic conditions of interviewed migrants make it possible for them to plan an expensive trip home and - on the other hand - because the average years away from home are higher for migrants in Italy than in Greece. The worse living conditions that migrants in the Greek sample experience, as we will show in the following Section, might also be related to their future migration intentions: only 14% plan to remain in their current place of living, and 78% want to leave permanently. On the other hand, migrants in Italy mainly want to stay: 61%, as opposed to 35% who want to leave.[4]

Figure 6 – Return and future migration intentions of respondents



[4] Note however that the question asks whether they are willing to "move to another *place or country*". Since most respondents in Greece are interviewed in camps, they may simply be signalling their desire to leave the camps and find another location – possibly even within the Greek borders.

Despite the high share of respondents in Greece who state they would like to leave permanently, actual attempts to move to or visit another country are rather infrequent: only 13% attempted to move to or visit another country. This might be determined by the fact that many of the migrants in Greece were still waiting for a decision on their asylum applications, or by the fact that most of them were living in refugee camps at the time of the survey and might not have been at liberty to leave. In Italy, where migrants in the sample have spent more time in the host country on average, a significant part (41%) has tried to move to or visit another country. In fact, almost a fifth of the sample has tried more than twice (17%).

4.5 Circular migration

Almost all of the respondents in Italy who tried to move to or visit another country actually managed to do so, displaying a pattern of circular migration. Even though it is not possible, using these data, to understand the determinants of this path of secondary migration, and no information on individuals who did not return to Italy after visiting another country is available, it is possible to gain some insight on the characteristics and choices of migrants who stayed in other countries for some time, and came back.

The two most frequent countries of destination, visited by 25 respondents each (22% each of those who left and came back) are Germany and Switzerland. 16.5% (19 respondents) went to Norway, while 11.3% (13 respondents) went to Sweden, and 7% (8 respondents) went to France. Three quarters of the migrants who left Italy and came back are from Eritrea. Almost all of them are younger than 50, and 70% are 20 to 39 years old. Half of them (49%) have at most a primary school degree. Unsurprisingly, 90% have been recognised as beneficiaries of some form of international protection: asylum seekers are not allowed to leave Italy while they are waiting for a decision on their application. Still, 4 individuals in the sample (3.5%) did so. It is also interesting to note that 44% of them worked in the previous month, and most of them with a regular or a short-term contract. Less than one fifth live in an refugee camp, and about 45% have been subjected to acts of harassment, intimidation or violence.

By contrast, those who never left Italy, compared to migrants who left the country at least once, are younger on average (61% are aged 20-29), but the education levels are similar: those who stayed in Italy are slightly less frequently highly educated (17 v. 18%), less frequently in possession of at most a primary school degree (44 v. 49%), and more frequently educated at a high-school level (39 v. 33%). 18% are waiting for a decision on their asylum application, and 62% have been granted some form of protection (30 percentage points less than those who left). A significantly higher share lives in a refugee camp: 40%, compared to 14%. Still, about half of

them worked in the previous month (54%). The share who have been harassed or who have suffered from acts of violence is similar (46%), as is the share of those who feel rejected (13% among those who left, 15% among those who stayed).

4.6 Living and socio-economic conditions at the time of the survey

The general living and socio-economic conditions of migrants interviewed in Greece are worse, on average, than those of migrants interviewed in Italy. While less than one in three respondents in Italy live inside refugee camps, the percentage in Greece increases to 63% (Figure 7). Migrants inside refugee camps tend to have lower possibilities of integration, since their movements are often restricted. Furthermore, most migrants in the Greek sample are either waiting for a decision on their asylum application or have been rejected, and therefore have lower possibilities to engage in working or social activities outside the life of the camp. This difference between the two samples is explained with the particular legal regime regulating the mobility of asylum seekers in Greece, who are prevented from leaving the island where they have first arrived until the asylum procedure is completed (some of the issues covered in this paper are also discussed in more detail in Roman et al., 2021).

Figure 7 – Share of respondents living inside refugee camps



An indication of the quality of life can be whether migrants interviewed were granted access to health services when they were in need for them. While the majority answered yes, the share of

respondents that did not receive medical assistance when in need is substantial, and it is higher in Greece than in Italy: respectively, 36 and 14%.

In terms of employment, the share of migrants in the sample that have performed working activities in the 30 days before the interview is also higher in Italy: one in two migrants, compared to 28% in Greece. The type of employment also differs, and reflects the fact that most migrants are not in the conditions to find or commit to a regular, medium or long term contract. Only one third of those who worked in the previous 30 days in Italy, and 28% in Greece, has a "formal employment with a regular contract". In Italy, 38% worked with a short-term contract, while 13% were not employed with any contract and engaged in occasional labour. Instead, the majority of those who worked in Greece did not have a contract (63%) (Figure 8). It is important to note that these numbers are not at all representative, and that the number of individuals who answered this last question is extremely low: 84 in Greece and 150 in Italy.

Figure 8 – Type of employment among respondents who worked in the previous 30 days



Salary from employment was listed as the main source of living by almost half of respondents in Italy, while in Greece the first mean of subsistence for 59% of the sample is "aid or welfare benefits from the state or other organizations". Vice versa, a quarter of migrants in Italy rely on aid, while only 23% in Greece live on their salary.

Given the working and living conditions of migrants in the two countries, it is unsurprising that a much larger share of people interviewed in Italy feel that their economic situation has improved compared to their situation at home: two thirds (67%) are better or much better off, compared to only 16% in Greece. Among the rest of the sample in Greece, the majority has actually seen their

economic situation worsen, with 44% indicating that they are worse off, and 29% that they are much worse off compared to their home. Only 11% (and 14% in Italy) are in a similar economic situation.

4.7 Social Integration

In general, most migrants interviewed spend very little time with natives: 39% of the respondents in Greece regularly spend time with their families and 55% with people from their home communities or ethnic groups, and only less than one in ten interviewed listed members of the host community among the people they spend time with (Figure 9). In Italy, this share increases to one every four people: the higher share of people who live outside refugee camps, and the fact that half of the interviewees works, probably make it possible for these migrants to interact and bond more easily with natives.

Figure 9 – People with whom respondents regularly spend time



In fact, while in Italy 43% of the sample feels somewhat or extremely accepted by other people in the place where they live, in Greece this is true for only 12% of respondents. In both countries the percentage of people that feel accepted by some and rejected by others is above 40%, but in Greece almost 40% feel somewhat or extremely rejected (14% in Italy).

However, the share of migrants interviewed who have been subject to acts of violence or harassment is significantly higher in Italy: 47%, as opposed to 18% (Figure 10). Among these, those who have been subject to both harassment and violence in Italy are about one quarter, while more than half have only been harassed. In both countries, 14% of respondents have a large or very large fear of being subject to violence – approximately the same percentage of those who have already experienced violence – while around half declare they are not scared at all of violent acts.

Figure 10 – Share of respondents who experienced violence or harassment



Many of those who were subjected to violence reported that the acts of violence were carried out by members of the local community or by state actors, such as the police: respectively, 5 and 9% in Greece, and 7 and 6% in Italy. Domestic violence is not very common (2.3% in Greece and 0.3% in Italy), which might be determined by the extremely small presence of women in the sample. In Greece, the second most common type of violence listed is that by other migrants: 8% of respondents, as opposed to 1% in Italy.

5. Regression analysis

In the sections above we have described the key characteristics of our sample, in terms of their demographics, migration history and legal status, economic and social integration and secondary migration. We have so far distinguished only between migrants in Greece and in Italy and we have, for instance, noted that migrants in Italy tend to be younger and better educated than those in Greece, and to have spent more time in the host country. We have also noted that respondents

in Italy are more likely to have worked in the thirty days before the interview: what role do the age-education-migration experience profile of migrants play in determining their employment outcomes? It is likely that migrants who have spent more time in the host country have a higher employment probability than those who have arrived only more recently. We could assess that by comparing the employment probability of "recent" and "earlier" migrants. However, a significant difference in the labour market outcomes of these two groups would also not be enough to ascertain that the length of time spent in the host country matters for labour market integration. In fact, "recent migrants" might have different characteristics relative to "earlier" migrants, and these could also be associated with labour market success: they might have different levels of education, or come from origin countries that have different types of educational quality, or whose citizens are subject to different degrees of discrimination on the labour market (for instance because of more or less visible ethnic differences).

In this section, we try and assess the degree to which different migrants' characteristics are associated with a series of economic and non-economic outcomes, *after accounting for other characteristics.* For instance, we will address – for Greece and Italy separately – questions like: how much more likely to have a job is a migrant with tertiary education, relative to another migrant who is (almost) identical in terms of area of origin, age, gender, family structure, protection status, amount of time spent in the host country and in displacement? We will answer this type of questions through linear regression analysis, a statistical method which can be used to determine the degree to which one outcome (or dependent) variable is correlated with several explanatory (or independent) variables.

5.1 Outcome (dependent) variables

We will analyse, in turn, the following eight dependent variables in our analysis. These eight variables provide information on four main areas of interest: economic conditions, living conditions, social inclusion, and migration intentions. Note that, we have defined all the outcome variables as binary (or dummy) variables, which take either the values of 1 or 0.

Economic conditions:

- **Worked past 30 days.** Variable which takes a value of 1 if the respondent has worked for pay or profit in the 30 days previous to the interview, and 0 otherwise. Derived from Question 5.2.2 in the TRAFIG questionnaire (see Annex 1).
- **Better economic situation.** Variable that takes a value of 1 if respondents feel that their economic situation at the time of the interview, compared to their economic situation at

home, is "somewhat" or "much" better. The variable takes a value of 0 if the respondents' situation is "similar", "worse" or "much worse", compared to their economic situation at home. Derived from Question 5.2.5 in the TRAFIG questionnaire.

Living conditions:

- **Lives in large shelter.** Variable that takes a value of 1 if respondents answered "In a larger shelter such as a refugee camp or reception centre" to a question on their living arrangement, and 0 otherwise. Derived from Question 5.1.3 in the TRAFIG questionnaire.
- **Health access.** Variable that takes a value of 1 if respondents had access to a hospital or to other health services the last time they needed it, and 0 otherwise. Derived from Question 5.1.1 in the TRAFIG questionnaire.

Social inclusion:

- **Experienced violence or harassment.** Variable that takes a value of 1 if respondents have been subjected to violence, harassment or intimidation, and 0 otherwise. In the cases in which respondent prefer not to answer, the value is considered as missing, and the case is not used in the analysis. Derived from Questions 5.4.1a and 5.5.2 in the TRAFIG questionnaire.
- **Feels rejected.** Variable that takes a value of 1 when respondents feel "somewhat" or "extremely" rejected by other people in the place where they live, and 0 otherwise. Derived from Question 5.5.1 in the TRAFIG questionnaire.

Migration intentions:

- **Return intentions.** Variable that takes a value of 1 if respondents declare the intention of returning home or to their place of former living within the following two years, either permanently or temporarily, and 0 otherwise. Derived from Question 4.5.4 in the TRAFIG questionnaire.
- **Future migration intention.** Variable that takes a value of 1 if respondents intend to move to another place or country to live there in the future, either permanently or temporarily, and 0 otherwise. Derived from Question 4.6.4 in the TRAFIG questionnaire.

5.2 Independent variables

We will assess the correlation of each of the outcome variables above with a series of characteristics of the respondents:

- **Sex:** captured by a dummy variable that takes value 1 if the individual is male and 0 otherwise;
- **Origin:** captured by a set of three dummy variables for areas of origin: Sub-Saharan Africa, Western Asia and Southern Asia. In the regression we will only include the first two dummy variables, since individuals from Southern Asia can be identified by a value of 0 in both the Sub-Saharan Africa and Western Asia dummies.

  Note that individuals from Syria and Iran (respectively, 1 and 2 observations) have been classified as Southern Asians in Italy because of the extremely low sample size and the lack of other migrants from Western Asia, while in Greece, where Syrians represent one third of the sample, they have been classified as Western Asians. This has no effect on the regression results; it only has to be taken into account that the two coefficients have to be interpreted differently in Greece and in Italy.
- **Marital status:** captured by three dummies that identify individuals that are married or in a partnership, widowed, or single. In the regression we will only include the first two dummy variables, since singles can be identified by a value of 0 in both the married and widowed dummies.
- **Children**: a dummy that takes a value of 1 if the individual has any children, and 0 otherwise.
- **Age**: captured aby a set of three dummy variables identifying individuals which are, respectively, in the age group groups 50+, 30-49, and 16-29. In the regression we will only include the first two dummy variables, since young respondents can be identified by a value of 0 in both of the other age group dummies.
- **Education**: captured by a set of three dummies for "Low education", which takes a value of 1 for individuals who have only primary school education or at most have attended part of secondary school, and 0 in all other cases; "High education", which identifies individuals with university-level degrees; and "Intermediate education", which identifies individuals who have obtained at most secondary school education. In the regression we will only include the first two dummy variables, since the latter group can be identified by a value of 0 in both of the other education dummies.
- **Protection status:** captured by a set of four dummy variables which take a value of 1 for, respectively: individuals who have been recognized with some form of international protection; individuals whose asylum application has been rejected; individuals who don't know their status or never applied for protection; individuals still waiting for a decision on their asylum application. In the regression we will only include the first three

dummy variables, since the latter group can be identified by a value of 0 in all of the other three education dummies.

- **Years in the host country**: captured by a set of four dummies for the number of years spent in the country, calculated as the difference between the year of the survey and the year in which border was crossed. We have grouped years spent in the hoist country in the following categories: 11+; 6-10; 4-5; 1-3. In the regression we will only include the first three dummy variables, since immigrants who have been in the country for 1-3 years can be identified by a value of 0 in all of the other three dummies. Note that since there was only one observation for 11 or more years in the country in Greece, it has been included in the 6-10 years category.
- **Years in displacement**: captured by a set of four dummy variables for the number of years spent outside the home country, calculated as the difference between the year of the survey and the year in which individuals first migrated from their home. We have grouped years in displacement in the following categories: 11+; 6-10; 4-5; 1-3. In the regression we will only include the first three dummy variables, since immigrants who have been in displacement for 1-3 years can be identified by a value of 0 in all of the other three dummies.

Additionally, in Section 5.5, we will also consider realised circular migration among the independent variables.

5.3 Regression equation and interpretation of coefficients

With a slight abuse of notation, each regression consists in estimating the parameters β in the equation below, which expresses the outcome variable as a linear combination of a series of observable independent variables, pre-multiplied by an unknown parameter β, and a residual unobserved term u.[5] The parameters β are estimated through the so-called "Ordinary least squares" estimator.[6]

[5] This report is meant to foster dialogue between qualitative and quantitative researchers involved in the TRAFIG project and other interested researchers. It also aims at enhancing the integration of qualitative and quantitative findings and thus to open the way to further analyses and future research. For this reason, we have deliberately chosen to present our methodological approach in a non-technical and slightly didactic way, to make it readable and understandable also to a readership who lacks specific quantitative training.

[6] Specifically, the estimated parameters are those that minimise the sum of the squares of the differences between the observed outcome and the outcome predicted by the linear combination of the independent variables.

$$Outcome_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 male_i + \beta_2 origin_i + \beta_3 maritalstatus_i + \beta_4 children_i + \beta_5 agegroup_i + \beta_6 education_i + \beta_7 protectionstatus_i + \beta_8 yearsincountry_i + \beta_9 yearsindisplacement_i + u_i$$

Each coefficient β represents the relationship between each independent variable and the outcome variable, keeping all other independent variables constant, and they can be interpreted as the change in the outcome associated with a switch of the regressor of interest from 0 to 1. For instance, if $\beta_1 = 0.3$, this means the the outcome variable is 0.3 higher for men relative to women. If the outcome variable is employment probability (which ranges between 0 and 1), then that would mean that the employment probability of men is on average 0.3 percentage points higher relative to the employment probability of women who share the same values of all the other independent variables (origin, marital status, children, age group, education, protection status, years in the country, years in displacement).

The coefficients β will be estimated with different degrees of precision, measured by the so called "standard errors". We will use the standard errors and the estimated value of each β to compute a statistical "test" of the hypothesis that the actual value of β is 0. In other words, we are not only interested in the sign and magnitude of β, but also in the degree to which we can be sure that we have not obtained that value just "by chance", whereas its actual value was zero. Loosely speaking, our statistical test will tell us what is the probability that the estimated value of β is not zero just by chance. Conventionally, we will indicate with ***, **, * estimated coefficients for which the probability of obtaining a non-zero value just by chance is no more than 1%, 5% and 10%, respectively (these values correspond to a decreasing precision of the estimate).

5.4 Empirical Results

The results of the regressions are divided into the four main groups described above, each of which includes regressions on two dependent variables for both countries: economic conditions (Table 5), living conditions (Table 6), social inclusion (Table 7), and migration intentions (

Table 8).

5.4.1 Economic conditions

Main findings

- Age and education seem to have no effect in determining the probability of having worked in the previous month.
- Africans in Italy are disadvantaged relative to migrants from other areas in the probability of having worked.
- Syrians in Greece have a lower probability than Afghans and Pakistanis to have improved their economic situation.
- Time spent in the country, in Greece, and the years in displacement, in Italy, are positively associated with the probability of having worked in the previous month.
- Protection status and economic conditions do not seem to be correlated.

Results from regression on economic conditions are reported in Table 5. The row "mean of the dependent variable" (second row of the table from the bottom) indicates the share of individuals in the sample that worked in the previous month (columns 1-2), and that consider their economic situation to be better with respect to their situation at home (columns 3-4), by country (Greece in odd columns, Italy in even columns). This row does not report regression results, but it has been added to the table to facilitate the interpretation of the results.

Each coefficient represents the percentage point difference between the reference and the omitted category. For example, the estimates reported in the first row of column (1) indicate that men in Greece have a probability of being employed which is 28 percentage points higher than women with comparable characteristics. The asterisks on the side of some coefficient estimates indicate to what extent our estimates are "statistically significant": the higher the statistical significance, the more confident we can be about the validity of our estimate. We report one asterisk for estimates that are significant at a 90%, two asterisks for 95% and three asterisks for 99%. We interpret confidently the estimate as capturing an actual association between the outcome and the independent variable if statistical significance is at least 95%, and we interpret with some more caveat coefficients with a 90% significance, whereas we interpret levels of statistical significance below 90% as an absence of association between the variables in our data. Note that some coefficients may not be statistically significant because of the low sample size, and could become statistically significant if a larger sample were available.

Regression results indicate that individual age and education profiles seem to have no effect in determining the probability of having worked in the previous month, both in Italy and Greece: there is no statistically significant difference across age groups and across levels of education. As we will discuss in more details below, this lack of effect goes against a vast literature showing

a positive correlation between education levels and employment chances, for both migrants and non-migrants. However, being in a younger cohort in Greece implies a higher probability of having improved one's economic situation, as indicated by the negative and statistically significant coefficients on the two age dummies in column (3) which signal that the probability of having improved their economic situation is lower for the age groups 30-49 and 50+, relative to migrants in the age group 16-29. In Italy, the possession of a higher-level education seems to be negatively related to the improvement of economic conditions; this might be determined by the fact that individuals with a university degree might have started from better economic conditions before the migration.

In Italy, migrants from Sub-Saharan Africa display a significant and sizable difference in the probability of having worked in the previous month relative to migrants from other areas: their employment probability is almost 21 percentage points lower relative to that of migrants from elsewhere with the same individual characteristics. This is a sizable difference, since the mean employment probability among our Italian sample is just above 50%. Although our data do not report information on individuals' ethnicity, it seems fair to assume that migrants from Sub-Saharan Africa are all black. Thus, we can formulate the hypothesis that structural racism against black people can – at least in part – explain this systematically lower employment probability.

While in Greece there seems to be no correlation between marital status and the probability of having worked, in Italy individuals who are married or in a partnership have a 16 percentage point lower probability of having worked with respect to singles. Most widowed individuals in the Italian sample do not work, but this result is not very informative since only nine respondents are widowed.

Table 5 - Regression results on economic conditions

Variable	Omitted Category		Greece	Italy	Greece	Italy
			Worked past 30 days		**Better economic sit.**	
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Gender	Female	male	0.2838***	0.0760	0.1605***	-0.1702**
			(0.0502)	(0.0809)	(0.0396)	(0.0705)
Age	16-29	age group = 30-49	-0.0237	0.0606	-0.0713*	-0.0024
			(0.0584)	(0.0774)	(0.0415)	(0.0762)
		age group = 50+	-0.1458	0.0894	-0.1175**	0.1607
			(0.0900)	(0.1676)	(0.0502)	(0.1508)
Education	Intermediate education	High education	-0.0371	0.1033	-0.0429	-0.1617*
			(0.1071)	(0.0859)	(0.0805)	(0.0821)
		Low education	-0.0450	0.0486	0.0498	-0.0184
			(0.0688)	(0.0663)	(0.0618)	(0.0659)
Area of origin	Southern Asia	Sub-Saharan Africa	-0.0321	-0.2060**	-0.1076	0.0362

			(0.0900)	(0.0859)	(0.0676)	(0.0880)
		Western Asia	-0.0934		-0.0967*	
			(0.0683)		(0.0553)	
Marital status	Single	Married / in partnership	-0.0255	-0.1590**	-0.0993**	-0.0173
			(0.0714)	(0.0688)	(0.0490)	(0.0645)
		Separated / widowed	-0.0026	-0.4706***	-0.0603	-0.2562
			(0.0942)	(0.1509)	(0.0851)	(0.1869)
Children	No children	children = Yes	0.0002	0.0195	0.0316	-0.0170
			(0.0703)	(0.0733)	(0.0486)	(0.0710)
Protection Status	Waiting for decision	Recognised	0.0921*	0.0347	-0.0392	-0.2099***
			(0.0557)	(0.0841)	(0.0385)	(0.0785)
		Irregular	0.1074*	0.1043	0.0508	0.1571
			(0.0646)	(0.1207)	(0.0602)	(0.0993)
Years in the country	1-3	4-5	0.2262***	0.0843	0.3751***	0.2955***
			(0.0783)	(0.1076)	(0.0669)	(0.1027)
		6-10	0.4935***	-0.0941	0.3318**	0.0858
			(0.1243)	(0.1281)	(0.1530)	(0.1254)
		11+		-0.0144		0.2011
				(0.1445)		(0.1416)
Years in displacement	1-3	4-5	0.0180	0.1681	-0.0983*	-0.0898
			(0.0754)	(0.1690)	(0.0541)	(0.1618)
		6-10	0.0331	0.3357*	-0.0751	-0.0854
			(0.0790)	(0.1735)	(0.0586)	(0.1722)
		11+	-0.2254***	0.2650	-0.1659**	-0.1392
			(0.0868)	(0.1890)	(0.0754)	(0.1878)
Mean of the dependent variable			0.2800	0.5034	0.1600	0.5709
Observations			299	292	299	284

*Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *, **, *** indicate that the estimated coefficient is statistically significant at the 10, 5 and 1 percent significance level, respectively. In Italy, Southern Asia includes individuals from Iran and Syria. In Greece, Syrians they have been classified as Western Asians. The dummy 6-10 years in the country in Greece also includes one observation for 11 or more years.*

The area of origin is not correlated with the probability of having worked in Greece, but individuals from Western Asia (i.e. exclusively Syrians) have a 9.7 percentage point lower probability of having improved their economic situation with respect to Afghans and Pakistanis. It is important to note that the share of people interviewed in Greece who have improved their economic situation is extremely low (16%), which is not surprising since many interviews have been conducted in refugee camps.

In Greece, more time spent in the country is associated with a higher probability of having worked in the past month: individuals who have crossed the border 4 to 5 years before have a 23 percentage points higher probability of employment with respect to those who entered the country in the previous 3 years, and the difference is even higher among those who have been in Greece for more than 5 years. With regards to the economic situation, there seems to be a

difference mainly between those who entered the country in the previous 3 years, and those who arrived before that, since the coefficients for the 6-10 and 11+ cohorts are similar in size. Instead, in Italy the years in the country do not have a significant impact on employment, while there is a significant difference across years in displacement: those who left their home 6 to 10 years before the interview have a 34 percentage point higher probability of working.

Remarkably, protection status does not seem to play a major role in neither the employment probability nor the improvement of economic conditions with respect to those at home. In Greece, both respondents who hold some type of international protection and those whose applications have been rejected and are thus irregularly resident in the country display higher probability of having worked relative to those who are still waiting for a decision on their asylum status (though the estimates are barely significant at conventional levels). This result is likely related to the fact that most of the asylum seekers are living in camps in islands where they have no job opportunities. In Italy, protection status appears not to be correlated with employment, although holders of international protection display a significantly lower 21 percentage points) probability than other migrants to state that their economic situation has improved. This lack of a clear correlation between protection status and economic conditions corroborates a general finding of the TRAFIG project, namely that protracted displacement can be conceptualised as a "multi-dimensional limbo" (Etzold et al. 2022: 19) where socio-economic marginalisation does not necessarily decrease with legal incorporation (Roman et al., 2021).

5.4.2 Living conditions

Main findings

- Sub-Saharan African migrants are less likely than anyone else to have received health care services when they needed them.
- Migrants who are waiting for a decision on their application status have a higher probability of living in a large shelter.
- The probability of living in a large shelter decreases significantly with years since arrival.
- In Italy, migrants who have been longer in displacement are less likely to have received adequate health care when they needed it.

Results from regression on living conditions are reported in Table 6. The gender of respondents with respect to the living and health access situation only has an impact in Greece, where men have a 16 percentage point lower probability of living in a large shelter, and an 11 percentage point lower probability of having been provided health assistance when in need.

Age is mainly uncorrelated to these two outcomes. The only partial exception is in Greece, where respondents aged 30 to 49 have an 11 percentage point lower probability of having received health access when in need, compared to the younger cohort. Note however that this coefficient is only marginally statistically significant.

A lower level of education is associated with a 14 percentage point higher probability of living in a large shelter in Italy, and with a 17 percentage point higher probability of having been provided health services in Greece.

In Greece, the region of origin of respondents is significantly associated with both outcomes. Relative to Southern Asian migrants, all other migrants are more likely to live in a large shelter. When it comes to access to health services, Sub-Saharan African migrants are less likely than anyone else to have received health care services when they needed them, both in Italy (-11 percentage points) and in Greece (-15 percentage points). Instead, migrants from Western Asia in Greece are those that are most likely to have received health care when needed. This is another possible indicator of structural racism against black persons, as suggested above for employment conditions. Both in Greece and in Italy, and unsurprisingly, migrants who are waiting for a decision on their application status have a higher probability of living in a large shelter. Instead, protection status seems to be uncorrelated with the probability of having received medical assistance when in need.

Table 6 - Regression results on living conditions

Variable	Omitted Category		Greece	Italy	Greece	Italy
			Lives in large shelter		**Health access**	
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Gender	Female	male	-0.1600***	-0.0034	-0.1127*	0.0069
			(0.0525)	(0.0552)	(0.0623)	(0.0562)
Age	16-29	age group = 30-49	0.0960	0.0505	-0.1080*	0.0031
			(0.0609)	(0.0590)	(0.0563)	(0.0568)
		age group = 50+	0.1088	0.1834	-0.1199	0.0193
			(0.1024)	(0.1417)	(0.0769)	(0.1028)
Education	Intermediate education	High education	0.0134	0.0609	-0.0183	-0.0326
			(0.1017)	(0.0531)	(0.1049)	(0.0637)
		Low education	-0.0709	0.1392***	0.1698**	-0.0297
			(0.0607)	(0.0459)	(0.0670)	(0.0487)
Area of origin	Southern Asia	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.4105***	0.0591	-0.1494*	-0.1121**
			(0.0811)	(0.0615)	(0.0871)	(0.0533)
		Western Asia	0.4650***		0.4701***	
			(0.0741)		(0.0775)	
Marital status	Single	Married / in partnership	0.1009	-0.0272	-0.0716	0.0000
			(0.0655)	(0.0456)	(0.0620)	(0.0539)

		Separated / widowed	-0.0002	-0.0101	-0.0294	0.1295*
			(0.1288)	(0.1692)	(0.1272)	(0.0731)
Children	No children	children = Yes	0.0412	-0.0379	0.1228*	0.0188
			(0.0680)	(0.0509)	(0.0739)	(0.0620)
Protection Status	Waiting for decision	Recognised	-0.1923***	-0.2211***	-0.0215	0.0507
			(0.0578)	(0.0721)	(0.0525)	(0.0633)
		Irregular	-0.1486**	-0.3111***	-0.0987	0.0194
			(0.0585)	(0.0796)	(0.0709)	(0.0950)
Years in the country	1-3	4-5	-0.2824***	-0.3352***	0.3822***	-0.0431
			(0.0792)	(0.0959)	(0.0703)	(0.0738)
		6-10	-0.2537**	-0.4611***	0.6047***	0.0776
			(0.1086)	(0.1039)	(0.1064)	(0.0926)
		11+		-0.5095***		0.0549
				(0.1132)		(0.1172)
Years in displacement	1-3	4-5	0.0079	0.1216	-0.0110	-0.0825
			(0.0719)	(0.1559)	(0.0726)	(0.0701)
		6-10	-0.0183	0.1579	-0.1149	-0.1420*
			(0.0780)	(0.1605)	(0.0771)	(0.0779)
		11+	0.1684*	0.1638	-0.1149	-0.1970*
			(0.0957)	(0.1699)	(0.1061)	(0.1123)
Mean of the dependent variable			0.6400	0.1867	0.6433	0.8571
Observations			299	294	299	281

*Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *, **, *** indicate that the estimated coefficient is statistically significant at the 10, 5 and 1 percent significance level, respectively. In Italy, Southern Asia includes individuals from Iran and Syria. In Greece, Syrians they have been classified as Western Asians. The dummy 6-10 years in the country in Greece also includes one observation for 11 or more years.*

In both countries, the probability of living in a large shelter decreases significantly with years since arrival. In Greece the only difference is between migrants who have been in the country for no more than three years and all the others, whereas in Italy the probability of living in large shelters keeps decreasing over time. With regards to health access, the years spent in the country only have an impact in Greece: the more time spent in the country, the higher the probability of having received medical assistance (note that this might also be mechanically due to the fact that the longer the time spent in the country, the more likely it is that the respondent has been in need of medical assistance at some point). Instead, in Italy years since migration do not matter, whereas migrants who have been longer in displacement are less likely to have received adequate health care when they needed it.

5.4.3 Social inclusion

Main findings

- Individuals from Southern Asia in Greece, and Sub-Saharan Africans in Italy, are those who were subjected to acts of violence or harassment more often.
- In Greece, Western Asians (Syrians) are those who declare feeling most rejected.
- In Greece, individuals who have been granted some type of international protection feel 16 percentage points less rejected than individuals who are waiting for a decision.
- In Greece, those who have been in displacement for more than 10 years are 17 percentage points more likely to feel rejected than those who have been in displacement for 1 to 3 years.
- In Italy, the probability of feeling rejected is quite low on average and generally uncorrelated to the independent variables.

Results from regression on social inclusion are reported in Table 7.

In Greece, the probability of having experienced acts of violence or harassment is mainly related to the region of origin of respondents. The coefficients of the dummies for Sub-Saharan Africa and Western Asia are the only two significant coefficients, except for the dummy for high education, and the only two highly significant coefficients. Individuals from Southern Asia are those who were subjected to acts of violence or harassment more often: the gaps with Sub-Saharan Africans and Western Asians are, respectively, -28 and -35 percentage points. In fact, migrants from Western Asia (Syrians) do not report any episode of harassment, intimidation or violence. Individuals with a high level of education are also less frequently victims of these acts: 17 percentage points less than individuals with an intermediate education level, while there is no significant difference between this latter group and those with a low education.

In Italy, as well, the region of origin is one of the few determinants of the probability of being subjected to acts of violence or harassment, with Sub-Saharan Africans that have a 20 percentage point higher probability than Southern Asians (another possible indicator of structural racism against black persons, beside employment and access to health services). However, the years spent in displacement are also highly significant: there is a strong difference mainly between those who have been in displacement 1 to 3 years, and those who have been on the move for longer periods of time. The differences between the first group and the others are between 37 and 40 percentage points. As we noted in the case of access of health services, however, this difference can simply be due to the fact that, having spent more years in the country, individuals are more likely to have been exposed at some point to harassment or violence than those with a shorter stay.

Even though they are the group that did not report episodes of harassment or violence in Greece, Western Asians (Syrians) in Greece are those who declare feeling most rejected: the difference with Southern Asians in the probability of feeling somewhat or very rejected is 36 percentage

points and highly significant, while there is no significant or large difference between Southern Asians and Sub-Saharan Africans.

In Greece, individuals who have been granted some type of international protection feel 16 percentage points less rejected than individuals who are waiting for a decision. The probability of feeling rejected is also negatively related to the time spent in the country: those who have been in Greece for 4 to 5 years are 20 percentage points less likely to feel rejected than those who arrived in the previous 3 years. At the same time, those who have been in displacement for more than 10 years are 17 percentage points more likely to feel rejected than those who have been in displacement for 1 to 3 years.

In Italy, the probability of feeling rejected is quite low on average (14%), and there is no significant difference across areas of origin. In fact, none of the independent variables seem to be correlated to the probability of feeling rejected in the country.

Table 7 – Regression results on social inclusion

Variable	Omitted Category		Greece	Italy	Greece	Italy
			Exp. violence/harassment		**Feels rejected**	
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Gender	Female	male	-0.0493	0.1325	0.0833	0.0420
			(0.0531)	(0.0842)	(0.0647)	(0.0547)
Age	16-29	age group = 30-49	-0.0392	0.0296	0.0527	-0.0905
			(0.0564)	(0.0811)	(0.0681)	(0.0583)
		age group = 50+	-0.0697	0.1285	0.2205**	-0.0814
			(0.0544)	(0.1611)	(0.1026)	(0.1409)
Education	Intermediate education	High education	-0.1678*	0.1200	-0.0158	0.0752
			(0.0989)	(0.0859)	(0.0998)	(0.0715)
		Low education	-0.0109	0.0650	0.0006	-0.0625
			(0.0741)	(0.0675)	(0.0761)	(0.0503)
Area of origin	Southern Asia	Sub-Saharan Africa	-0.2787***	0.2011**	-0.0961	0.0360
			(0.0775)	(0.0861)	(0.0902)	(0.0641)
		Western Asia	-0.3495***		0.3621***	
			(0.0676)		(0.0803)	
Marital status	Single	Married / in partnership	-0.0489	0.0531	0.0121	0.0340
			(0.0602)	(0.0699)	(0.0723)	(0.0493)
		Separated / widowed	0.0783	-0.0552	-0.2102*	0.0040
			(0.1372)	(0.1679)	(0.1151)	(0.1713)
Children	No children	children = Yes	0.0341	-0.1352*	0.1043	0.0018
			(0.0622)	(0.0750)	(0.0780)	(0.0518)
Protection Status	Waiting for decision	Recognised	0.0176	-0.0803	-0.1576**	0.0356
			(0.0450)	(0.0850)	(0.0626)	(0.0539)
		Irregular	0.0240	0.0462	0.0929	0.0004
			(0.0672)	(0.1205)	(0.0715)	(0.0845)

		4-5	0.0023	0.0988	-0.2048***	0.0022
			(0.0701)	(0.1106)	(0.0760)	(0.0808)
Years in the country	1-3	6-10	0.1423	0.1183	-0.1841	-0.0002
			(0.1550)	(0.1320)	(0.1345)	(0.0900)
		11+		0.1297		-0.0174
				(0.1510)		(0.0998)
		4-5	-0.0259	0.3701***	-0.0817	-0.0721
			(0.0653)	(0.1115)	(0.0773)	(0.1474)
Years in displacement	1-3	6-10	0.0359	0.4020***	0.1018	-0.1089
			(0.0722)	(0.1149)	(0.0838)	(0.1464)
		11+	-0.1171	0.3752***	0.1662*	-0.0761
			(0.0961)	(0.1440)	(0.0974)	(0.1550)
Mean of the dependent variable			.1769	.4674	.3867	.1448
Observations			293	285	299	284

*Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *, **, *** indicate that the estimated coefficient is statistically significant at the 10, 5 and 1 percent significance level, respectively. In Italy, Southern Asia includes individuals from Iran and Syria. In Greece, Syrians they have been classified as Western Asians. The dummy 6-10 years in the country in Greece also includes one observation for 11 or more years.*

5.4.4 Future migration intentions

Main findings

- Sub-Saharan Africans and Western Asians are about 20-22 percentage points less likely to want to return to their home in the following two years compared to Southern Asians.
- Almost all Asians in Greece and about half of Sub-Saharan Africans in both countries intend to move to a different place in the future.
- In Italy, individuals with children are less likely to plan on returning home in the following two years, while they are more likely to want to migrate to a different place.
- Recognized and irregular migrants in Italy are more likely to return home relative to those without children, while recognized migrants are also more likely to move to a different place in the future.
- More years in the country are associated to a higher probability of wanting to return home in both destination countries, and to a lower probability of wanting to migrate in the future.

Results from regression on future migration intentions are reported in Table 8.

Age and education have little or no impact in determining the intentions to return home or migrate to a different place, both in Greece and in Italy. The only exception is in Greece, where individuals with a low level of education have a 13 percentage point lower probability of wanting to migrate to a different place, if compared to those with an intermediate education level. Men seem to be slightly more inclined to move in the future: in Greece, they are 10 percentage points more likely to return to their home, while in Italy they are 26.5 percentage points more likely to move to a different place.

Area of origin is highly correlated to return and migration intentions, in both countries. Sub-Saharan Africans and Western Asians are about 20-22 percentage points less likely to want to

return to their home in the following two years compared to Southern Asians. Instead, the coefficients for area of origin in the regressions on the intention to migrate in the future are different in sign and magnitude in the two countries, mainly because of differences in the baseline values. When such baseline differences are taken into account, the intentions to remigrate are very similar for Sub-Saharan Africans in the two countries: about half of them, both in Greece and Italy, intend to migrate in the future (respectively, 48 and 46%). However, while almost all (90%) Southern Asians (Pakistanis and Afghans) in Greece want to move to a different place, in Italy the share among migrants from this region is only 6%. Therefore, the coefficients for the Sub-Saharan dummies in the two countries have opposite signs. There is no significant difference between Southern and Western Asians in Greece because in this latter group, as well, almost all individuals intend to move.

Table 8 - Regression results on future migration intentions

Variable	Omitted variable		Greece	Italy	Greece	Italy
			Return intention		**Future migration intention**	
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Gender	Female	male	0.0980**	-0.0042	0.0348	0.2657***
			(0.0393)	(0.0719)	(0.0425)	(0.0696)
Age	16-29	age group = 30-49	-0.0399	-0.1116	-0.0030	0.0181
			(0.0373)	(0.0735)	(0.0449)	(0.0725)
		age group = 50+	-0.0300	-0.1663	-0.0201	-0.1481
			(0.0394)	(0.1471)	(0.0598)	(0.1505)
Education	Intermediate education	High education	-0.0284	0.0126	0.0699	-0.0717
			(0.0742)	(0.0820)	(0.0641)	(0.0776)
		Low education	0.0257	-0.0491	-0.1332**	-0.0597
			(0.0553)	(0.0590)	(0.0659)	(0.0564)
Area of origin	Southern Asia	Sub-Saharan Africa	-0.2058***	-0.2217**	-0.5031***	0.2892***
			(0.0625)	(0.0900)	(0.0784)	(0.0593)
		Western Asia	-0.2208***		0.0111	
			(0.0519)		(0.0502)	
Marital status	Single	Married / in partnership	-0.0761*	0.0583	0.0889	0.0341
			(0.0459)	(0.0563)	(0.0592)	(0.0627)
		Separated / widowed	-0.0867	0.2650	0.0264	-0.1970
			(0.0838)	(0.1854)	(0.1098)	(0.1304)
Children	No children	children = Yes	0.0001	-0.1484**	0.0111	0.1167*
			(0.0468)	(0.0673)	(0.0679)	(0.0674)
Protection Status	Waiting for decision	Recognised	-0.0703**	0.2735***	0.0092	0.1357**
			(0.0349)	(0.0785)	(0.0377)	(0.0681)
		Irregular	0.1827***	0.4602***	-0.0849	0.0038
			(0.0617)	(0.1232)	(0.0578)	(0.1092)

		4-5	0.2094***	0.1911**	-0.2172***	-0.1340
			(0.0569)	(0.0958)	(0.0613)	(0.0818)
Years in the country	1-3	6-10	0.1113	0.1313	-0.1708	0.0809
			(0.1201)	(0.1137)	(0.1246)	(0.1049)
		11+		0.0492		0.1848
				(0.1233)		(0.1184)
		4-5	0.0170	-0.0668	0.0152	-0.0808
			(0.0527)	(0.1568)	(0.0439)	(0.1243)
Years in displacement	1-3	6-10	-0.0562	-0.0693	-0.0245	-0.1000
			(0.0524)	(0.1579)	(0.0451)	(0.1305)
		11+	-0.2126***	-0.1078	-0.1188*	-0.0054
			(0.0643)	(0.1763)	(0.0694)	(0.1497)
Mean of the dependent variable			.1367	.3101	.8567	.4894
Observations			299	282	299	291

*Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *, **, *** indicate that the estimated coefficient is statistically significant at the 10, 5 and 1 percent significance level, respectively. In Italy, Southern Asia includes individuals from Iran and Syria. In Greece, Syrians they have been classified as Western Asians. The dummy 6-10 years in the country in Greece also includes one observation for 11 or more years.*

In Italy, the presence of children also plays a role in determining the intention to move or return home: individuals with children are 15 percentage points less likely to return home in the following two years, while they are 12 percentage points more likely to want to migrate to a different place. This is plausible: families are less likely to go back to a probably difficult situation, since they are less mobile, but they are more likely to want to build a better future, and therefore make the effort to look for new and better places to live in.

Recognised and irregular migrants in Italy are 27 and 46 percentage points more likely to return home than those waiting for a decision. This might be explained by the fact that, for the first group, legal security makes it possible to move more easily and maybe visit family members back home without the fear of not being let back in the country, and for the second group, the lack of legal status might make a return home more likely. In Greece, instead, recognised migrants are 7 percentage points less likely, while irregular migrants are 18 percentage points more likely to want to return home.

Protection status only matters in Italy in determining future migration intentions: recognised migrants are 13.5 percentage points more likely to want to move in the future.

While more years in the country are associated to a higher probability of wanting to return home in both destination countries, they are associated to a lower probability of wanting to migrate in the future. This is also plausible: more time spent in the country means more time to integrate and build social and economic networks. More years in displacement are negatively associated to both outcomes in Greece, while they have little impact in Italy (although the coefficients are mostly negative here too).

5.5 Circular migration

Main findings

- Including secondary migration as an additional explanatory variable does not generally affect the estimate of coefficients on other independent variables.
- The probability of having worked in the previous month and the improvement of individual economic situations are the only outcomes that are significantly correlated with secondary migration.
- The intention to migrate in the future is positively correlated to having already left the country in the past.

As mentioned in Section 4.5, about one third of the respondents in Italy left the country for a period of time and visited or moved to other places, whereas in Greece only three individuals in the sample successfully moved to a different country for some time. The characteristics of these respondents in Italy were not, in isolation, dissimilar from those of the rest of the sample. In this last section we want to assess the extent to which these "circular (or secondary) migrants" display different outcomes relative to other migrants with the same observable characteristics. To do this, we extended the regression analysis presented above including a dummy variable that identifies circular migrants, and we will assess whether this is systematically associated with differences in economic and non-economic outcomes, once all other individual migrants' characteristics have been taken into account.

The results of this exercise, reported in Table 9, indicate that the only outcomes that are significantly correlated with secondary migration are the probability of having worked in the previous month, and the improvement of individual economic situations. Obviously, this analysis was only performed for Italy. Individuals who left Italy for some time have a 14.5 percentage point lower probability of having worked in the month prior to the interview, relative to comparable migrants who never left Italy. Yet, they display a 21 percentage point higher probability of declaring that their economic situation has improved relative to their situation in the home country. This latter result, however, might be determined by initially worse economic conditions.

Unsurprisingly, the intention to migrate in the future is positively correlated to having already left the country in the past: individuals who left are 24 percentage points more likely to want to leave in the future.

All other outcomes – housing, health access, social integration – are not significantly related to having migrated away from Italy for some time; the coefficient is small in size and not statistically significant at conventional levels.

When including this additional control, the other coefficients remain substantially unchanged, with only a few exceptions.

To conclude on this point, it is worth highlighting that these regression results do not provide a clear confirmation of the 'mobility trap hypothesis' that has been formulated on the basis of the qualitative analyses conducted in Greece and Italy (Etzold et al. 2022: 30; Roman et al. 2021: 43). According to that hypothesis, mobility - in particular intra-EU secondary mobility - can be an important factor in mitigating or ending protracted displacement, but it can also lead to new forms of instability and exclusion. Further research on this important point is needed.

Table 9 – Regressions including control on secondary migration (Italy only)

Variable		Worked past 30 days	Better economic situation	Lives in large shelter	Health access	Experienced violence/ harassment	Feels rejected	Future migration intention
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Gender	male	0.0865	0.1762***	-0.0056	0.0063	0.1406*	0.0421	0.2463***
		(0.0815)	(0.0572)	(0.0554)	(0.0553)	(0.0829)	(0.0550)	(0.0691)
Age	age group = 30-49	0.0825	0.1284*	0.0460	0.0018	0.0449	-0.0905	-0.0192
		(0.0778)	(0.0684)	(0.0611)	(0.0577)	(0.0810)	(0.0592)	(0.0698)
	age group = 50+	0.1098	0.0959	0.1803	0.0184	0.1393	-0.0814	-0.1733
		(0.1707)	(0.1549)	(0.1413)	(0.1036)	(0.1585)	(0.1415)	(0.1502)
Education	High education	0.1116	0.1280	0.0590	-0.0329	0.1254	0.0752	-0.0862
		(0.0859)	(0.0799)	(0.0530)	(0.0637)	(0.0853)	(0.0714)	(0.0758)
	Low education	0.0615	0.0310	0.1364***	-0.0303	0.0747	-0.0625	-0.0816
		(0.0664)	(0.0582)	(0.0461)	(0.0491)	(0.0677)	(0.0502)	(0.0551)
Area of origin	Sub-Saharan Africa	-0.1742**	-0.0332	0.0526	-0.1138**	0.2242**	0.0360	0.2355***
		(0.0871)	(0.0829)	(0.0630)	(0.0531)	(0.0875)	(0.0667)	(0.0590)
Marital status	Married / in partnership	-0.1776***	0.1016*	-0.0236	0.0011	0.0415	0.0340	0.0629
		(0.0681)	(0.0613)	(0.0468)	(0.0536)	(0.0695)	(0.0493)	(0.0590)
	Separated / widowed	-0.5024***	0.1431	-0.0043	0.1311*	-0.0749	0.0040	-0.1494
		(0.1563)	(0.1373)	(0.1709)	(0.0749)	(0.1646)	(0.1718)	(0.1183)
Children	children = Yes	0.0313	-0.1302**	-0.0402	0.0181	-0.1274*	0.0018	0.0970
		(0.0725)	(0.0632)	(0.0508)	(0.0618)	(0.0749)	(0.0520)	(0.0641)
Protection Status	Recognised	0.0611	0.0530	-0.2265***	0.0493	-0.0635	0.0356	0.0914
		(0.0831)	(0.0727)	(0.0731)	(0.0623)	(0.0854)	(0.0559)	(0.0662)
	Irregular	0.1007	-0.0818	-0.3101***	0.0197	0.0409	0.0004	0.0097
		(0.1201)	(0.0937)	(0.0796)	(0.0950)	(0.1201)	(0.0845)	(0.1037)
Years in the country	4-5	0.0931	-0.2841***	-0.3370***	-0.0436	0.1059	0.0022	-0.1483*
		(0.1048)	(0.1030)	(0.0967)	(0.0740)	(0.1090)	(0.0812)	(0.0808)
	6-10	-0.0589	-0.2145*	-0.4682***	0.0758	0.1433	-0.0002	0.0221
		(0.1259)	(0.1268)	(0.1035)	(0.0932)	(0.1310)	(0.0906)	(0.1021)
	11+	0.0437	-0.2917**	-0.5216***	0.0517	0.1719	-0.0174	0.0859
		(0.1457)	(0.1429)	(0.1162)	(0.1171)	(0.1517)	(0.0998)	(0.1180)
Years in displacement	4-5	0.1574	0.2140	0.1239	-0.0818	0.3618***	-0.0721	-0.0622
		(0.1673)	(0.1590)	(0.1568)	(0.0704)	(0.1105)	(0.1482)	(0.1214)
	6-10	0.3215*	0.2286	0.1610	-0.1412*	0.3909***	-0.1089	-0.0758
		(0.1726)	(0.1652)	(0.1612)	(0.0786)	(0.1146)	(0.1471)	(0.1294)
	11+	0.2606	0.1570	0.1650	-0.1965*	0.3709**	-0.0761	0.0056
		(0.1875)	(0.1806)	(0.1707)	(0.1120)	(0.1434)	(0.1553)	(0.1452)
Secondary migration	Left for some time	-0.1451**	0.2117***	0.0295	0.0077	-0.1010	-0.0000	0.2425***
		(0.0728)	(0.0643)	(0.0527)	(0.0522)	(0.0717)	(0.0551)	(0.0626)
Mean of the dependent variable		0.5034	0.5709	0.1867	0.8571	0.4674	0.1448	0.4894
Observations		292	284	294	281	285	284	291

*Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *, **, *** indicate that the estimated coefficient is statistically significant at the 10, 5 and 1 percent significance level, respectively. Southern Asia includes individuals from Iran and Syria.*

6. Conclusions

Despite the small sample size and the peculiar sampling, these results provide some interesting insight into and a better understanding of the living conditions of migrants in situations of protracted displacement in Greece and Italy.

First of all, even when accounting for other demographic characteristics, protection status, years in displacement and in the country, the region of origin of individuals is almost always highly correlated with social and economic outcomes. For example, origin is one of the few determinants of the probability of having worked in the previous 30 days in Italy. In Greece, Africans and Syrians are more likely to live in a large shelter, and both in Greece and Italy Africans have a lower probability of having received health assistance. In Italy, where almost half of the sample has either been harassed, intimidated, or been a victim of acts of violence, Africans are those who have incurred in these situations the most. Africans are also the least likely to want to return to their home, and in Italy they are the most likely to want to leave the place they are currently living in. In Greece, Syrians feel the most rejected. All in all, the overall picture that emerges suggests that racialisation processes (and possibly structural racism) have a role in shaping migrants' mobility and existential trajectories, and their (non-)integration paths. Further and more targeted research on this crucial dimension is strongly needed.

At the same time, migration history also plays an important role. Economic outcomes such as the probability of having worked in the previous month and the improvement of individual economic conditions are strongly correlated with the years spent in the country. Longer periods in the country are associated with better economic conditions in both Greece and Italy, indicating that there might be a process of integration underway, however slow, difficult and uneven. Instead, extended periods of displacement have the opposite effect, and migrants who have been on the move for more than 10 years tend to have worse possibilities, especially in Greece. This might be due to the scarring effects that a too long protracted displacement has on migrants, and which seems to affect not only employment and economic conditions, but also other dimensions of integration (such as the probability of being subjected to acts of violence or harassment, or of feeling rejected, and access to health assistance).

More years in Italy and Greece are also associated with better living conditions, and in Greece with a greater access to health - even if this result might be determined by the fact that the more time passes, the higher the probability that the need of medical assistance arises, or the

probability that migrants know better who to turn to for help. In Italy, longer periods of displacement are also associated with a higher probability of being subjected to violence or harassment, while in Greece migrants who have been in the country for more years feel more accepted by the host community.

The other variable that is highly correlated with the outcomes considered is protection status. Migrants waiting for a decision on their asylum applications are often in very different living conditions than those who have been recognised as refugees or in need of protection. In fact, the latter are more likely to have worked in the previous month and they are less likely to feel rejected in Greece, and they are less likely to be living in a large shelter in both destination countries.

Surprisingly (and contrary to a vast literature in economics and sociology), age and education in most cases have little or no impact on living outcomes, and there seems to be no reward for individual education. The most important factors associated with measures of "integration" or "success" in the host country, even when accounting for all other characteristics, seem to be the region of origin and (consequently) migration history. The channels through which migrants arrived in the countries of destination, which are determined by their origins, seem to have a scarring and persistent effect, which affects living and social conditions even after several years.

In conclusion, it could be stated that, particularly in the southern periphery of a rich region like the European Union, the geopolitics of irregular migration not only shapes migration journeys (as it is obvious), but it does also strongly influence subsequent integration (or, more often, marginalisation and exclusion) paths.

References

Etzold B. and Fechter A.-M- (2022) Unsettling protracted displacement: connectivity and mobility beyond 'Limbo', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2022.2090153

Frattini T. and Solmone I. (2022) 6th Migration Observatory Report: Immigrant Integration in Europe, *Centro Studi Luca d'Agliano*

Roman, E., Belloni, M., Cingolani, P., Grimaldi, G., Hatziprokopiou, P., Papatzani, E., Pastore, F., Siotou, A. and F. Vlastou (2021). Figurations of Displacement in southern Europe: Empirical findings and reflections on protracted displacement and translocal networks of forced migrants in Greece and Italy (TRAFIG working paper no. 9)

Appendix

This Section presents the complete Questionnaire.

Questionnaire Template

TRAF·G
Transnational Figurations of Displacement

for interviews conducted in
Greece, Italy, Jordan, Pakistan, DR Congo and Ethiopia

content

1. INTERVIEW METADATA

Q1 Partner Organization implementing this research

- Pre-selected according to country and institution

Q1 Researcher

- Single-choice name

Q1 Event number

- Three-digit-number

Q1 Time and Location of Study

- Date as YYYY-MM-DD

Q1 Name of study site

- Single-choice site list

Q1 Type of study site

- Urban Site
- Peri-urban Site
- Rural Site

Q1 Does the respondent live in a refugee IDP camp?

- Yes
- No

2. INFORMED CONSENT

Q2 Researcher

- I have read out/explained in detail the information sheet to the potential participants.
- I have made sure to the best of my ability that the participants understand that they will participate voluntarily in the TRAFIG research.
- I confirm that the participants were given the opportunity to ask questions about the study, and that all thequestions asked by the participants have been answered correctly and to the best of my ability.
- I confirm that the potential participants have understood that they can withdraw their consent any time without giving a reason.
- A copy of this Informed Consent Form has been provided to the participants.

Q2 Witness

- I have witnessed the accurate reading of the Information Sheet and the consent form to the potential participant, and the individual has had the opportunity to ask questions. I confirm that the individual has given his/her consent freely.

INFO: Researcher and witness consent is to be checked with OK. Additionally, both names, signatures and the dates are collected.

3. PERSONAL INFORMATION

Q3.1.1 Gender – What is the sex of the respondent?

- Male
- Female
- Not specified / prefer not to say

Q3.1.2 How old are you?

- 16-19
- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60+

Q3.1.3a In which country were you born?

- Single-choice selection of countries different for study location

Q3.1.3b Other country (asked only if Q3.1.3a is ‚other')

- Open text

Q3.1.4a Please name the region /governate in your country of origin, in which you were born.

- Open text

Q3.1.5a Are you a citizen of this country?

- Yes
- No

Q3.1.5b Is your country of citizenship the same as the country of birth? (asked only if 3.1.5a is ‚no')

- Yes
- No

Q3.1.5c What is your country of citizenship? (asked only if 3.1.5b is ‚no')

- Yes
- No

Q3.1.6a Are you currently registered in this country?

- Yes
- No

Q3.1.6b Do you have a permanent or temporary residence permit in this country? (if 3.1.6a is ‚yes')

- Permanent residence permit
- Temporary residence permit
- I do not know

Q3.1.6c Have you ever been registered in this country before? (if 3.1.6a is ‚no')

- Yes
- No

Q3.1.7 Are you registered with the local authorities at your current place of living?

- Yes
- No

Q3.1.8 Have you ever applied for regularization in this country?

- Yes
- No

Q5.3.4 Have you ever applied for asylum or another protection status in a different country?

- Yes
- No

Q5.3.5 In which country had you applied for asylum or another protection status? (if 5.3.4 is ‚yes')

- Open text

Q3.1.8 What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- None
- Primary school attended, but not completed
- Primary school
- Secondary School attended, but not completed
- Secondary or high school
- Tertiary education - university, colleges or polytechnical
- Other (such as Madrasa, vocational training etc.)

Q3.2.1 What is your marital status?

- Single
- Married
- In partnership, but not married
- Seperated or divorced
- Widowed
- Other

Q3.2.2a How many sons and daughters do you have?

- Any number

Q3.2.3 How many people do currently live in your household? (Number, including the respondent)

- Any number

Q3.2.4 Who is currently living with you in your household? (if 3.2.3 is greater than or equal to ‚1')

- My husband / wife / partner
- My brother(s)
- My Sìster(s)
- My son(s)
- My daughter(s)
- My or my spouse's father
- My or my spouse's mother
- Other relatives such as cousin(s), uncle(s), aunt(s), grand parent(s)
- Other persons (non-family)

4. DISPLACEMENT MOBILITY

Q4.1.1 What have been the most important reasons for leaving your home/place of former living?

- Economic reasons such as to find employment
- Insecurity, war and violence
- Land conflicts
- Political persecution from the state government or other groups
- (Forced) military service
- Educational reasons such as further schooling or studies
- Environmental factors and natural disasters
- Family reasons (such as dispute at home, but also family members living abroad)
- Other reasons

Q4.1.1b Please specify this 'other reason' (if 4.1.1 is ‚other reason‘)

- Open text

Q4.2.1 In which year did you first flee, migrate or move from your place of origin?

- Any year

Q4.2.2 In which year did you last depart from your former place of living to come to this place?

- Any year

Q4.2.3a From which country did you leave?

- Single-choice selection of countries different for study location

Q4.2.3b Name of other country (if 4.2.3a is ‚other‘)

Q4.2.4 From which town/village did you leave?

- Open text

Q4.2.5 On the way to your current place of living, how many countries did you pass through?

- Any number from 0 to 6

Q4.2.6 Which countries did you live in or travel through on your way?

- Open text

INFO: Q4.2.7 and Q4.2.8 appears as often as indicated in Q4.2.5.

Q4.2.7 Transit Country name

- Single-choice selection of countries different for study location

Q4.2.7b Name of other country of transit (if 4.2.7 is ‚other‘)

- Open text

Q4.2.8 How much time did you spend in this country?

- Years (Any number from 0 to 20)
- Months (Any number from 0 to 12)

Q4.2.9 Did you depart from your home alone?

- Yes
- No

Q4.2.10 With whom did you depart from your home? (if 4.2.9 is ‚no')

- With close family members (spouse, parents, children, Sìblings)
- With other relatives
- With friends or other people I know
- With other people I did not know

Q4.2.11 Have you been involuntarily seperated from family members on your journey so that you/they ended up at different places?

- Yes
- No

Q4.2.12 Have you intentionally split up from family members on your journey so that you/they went to different places?

- Yes
- No

Q4.2.12 Did anyone support you to move to your current place of living?

- Yes
- No

Q4.2.13 Who supported you to move to to your current place of living? (if 4.2.12 is ‚yes')

- Family members and/or friends living back home
- Family members and/or friends living here
- Family members and/or friends living in another country
- People I met along the way
- People I met through social media
- Paid smugglers
- Other persons or groups

Q4.3.1 In which year, did you cross the border to your current country of living?

- Any year

Q4.3.2 In which year did you arrive here/at this place (the last time)?

- Any year

Q4.3.3 Why did you come to this place?

- It is closer or easier to reach than other places
- I have lived here/in this place before
- Economic conditions here are better (e.g. more jobs) than in other places
- Security situation here is better than in other places
- There is a better access to education than in other places
- There is a better access to health care than in other places
- Language, tradition and customs are similar to home
- To reunite with my family who already lived here before I came
- To join friends or other people I know, who already lived here before I came
- From this place I can easier move on to another place or country
- I was brought here /assigned to this place by authorities
- Other reasons

Q4.4.1 In which places have you lived in THIS country since leaving your home and before coming to this place?

- Open text

Q4.4.2 Do you experience any restrictions in moving freely around in the country you now live in?

- Yes
- No

Q4.4.3 Which restrictions do you face in moving around freely within this country? (if 4.4.2 is ‚yes')

- Legal restrictions linked to my registration/refugee status
- Aid and services only at this place available and not elsewhere
- Lack of transport infrastructure
- Lack of financial means to settle elsewhere
- Security concerns such as violence at other places
- Social and gender related restrictions
- Lockdowns and other Corona virus-related mobility restrictions
- Other

Q4.5.1 Since the initial displacement from your home, have you returned there?

- Yes
- No

Q4.5.2 How many times have you returned there? (if 4.5.1 is ‚yes')

- Any number

Q4.5.3 In which year, did you return to your place of origin the last time? (if 4.5.1 is ‚yes')

- Any year

Q4.5.4 Do you intend to return to your home / place of former living within the next two years?

- Yes, but only temporarily
- Yes, permanently
- No

Q4.5.5a Why do you plan to return to your home? (if 4.5.4 is ‚yes, temporarily' or ‚permanently')

- To be close to my family and friends
- To return to my old livelihood
- To secure assets (such as land, property, livestock, etc.) back home
- To culivate (seeding, harvesting)/to collect resources from the forest/plantation (honey, wood,charcoal)
- Due to the end of the conflict and/or an improved security Sìtuation there
- To help to rebuild my home community
- Due to financial assistance I can receive to return (i.e. through an IOM programme)
- Due to the lack of legal security here
- Because I do not see a long-term perspective for myself here
- Because I do not feel welcomed here
- Other reasons

Q4.5.5b What are the reasons why you do NOT intend to return to your home? (if 4.5.4 is ‚no')

- I am afraid to return home due to persisting violence, insecurity and/or persecution
- My family and friends are also here (current place of living) and will also not return
- I have nothing to return to (lost assets, destruction of home and livelihood etc.)
- I see better long-term perspectives here (place of living) than there
- My family living at home depends on money I make here and what I transfer

- I would feel uncomfortable to come home empty handed
- For other reasons

Q4.6 Since you are living here, how many times have you tried to visit/move to another country?

- Any number from 0 to 5

Q4.6.2 To which country did you try to go?

- Open text

Q4.6.3a Did you apply for a visa to go to this country?

- Yes
- No

Q4.6.3b What kind of visa have you applied for to move to that other country? (if 4.6.3a is ‚yes')

- Work / employment / business
- Study / further education
- Tourism
- Visit family or friends
- Family reunification
- Medical reasons
- Other

Q4.6.3c What is the status of your visa application? (if 4.6.3a is ‚yes')

- A decision is still pending
- My application was rejected
- It was approved and I am awaiting the departure
- My application was accepted, I went, and have returned meanwhile
- I do not know

Q4.6.3d Did you go to this country, and stayed there for some time?

- Yes
- No

Q4.6 How much time did you spend in this country? (if 4.6.3d is ‚yes')

- Any year from 0 to 10

Q4.6.4 Do you intend to move to another place or country to live there in the future?

- Yes, but only temporarily
- Yes, permanently
- No

Q4.6.5 Where would you want to go to? (if 4.6.4 is ‚yes, temporarily' or ‚permanently')

Q4.6.6 Why do you intend to go to that place? (if 4.6.4 is ‚yes, temporarily ‚permanently')

- It is closer or easier to reach than other places
- I have lived there/in this country/place before
- The economic conditions there are better (e.g. more jobs) than elsewhere
- The security situation there is better than elsewhere
- There is a better access to education there
- There is better access to health care
- Language, tradition and customs are similar to my place of home

- To reunite with my family who already live there
- Other reasons

Q4.6.7 Are there any reasons why you can NOT move on to another country? (if 4.6.4 is ‚yes, temporarily' or ‚permanently')

- Yes
- No

Q4.6.8 What hinders you from moving on to another country? (if 4.6.7 is ‚yes')

- I do not know how / lack of information
- Visa and border restrictions are difficult to overcome
- The route is dangerous (e.g. fear of death, violence and criminality on the journey)
- The journey is too expensive (lack of financial means for fees, transport costs, bribes)
- My family situation (such as fear of separation from family members)
- I have no support from others to make that journey
- Health risks or Corona virus-related mobility restrictions
- Other difficulties

Q4.6.9a Have you ever applied/been suggested for resettlement or relocation to another country?

- Yes
- No

Q4.6.9b For which country have you applied or been selected for resettlement or relocation? (if 4.6.9a is ‚yes')

- Open text

Q4.6.9c What is the status of your resettlement or relocation application? (if 4.6.9a is ‚yes')

- A decision is still pending
- My application was rejected
- It was approved and I am awaiting the departure
- My application was accepted, I went, and have returned meanwhile
- I do not know

5. MARGINALISATION AND PROTRACTEDNESS

Q5.1.1 Did you have access to a hospital or other health services the last time you needed it?

- Yes
- No

Q5.1.2a Are you currently enrolled in educational activities?

- Yes
- No

Q5.1.2b Are other members of your household currently enrolled in educational activities?

- Yes
- No

Q5.1.3 How do you currently live?

- In a house/flat owned by me/my household
- In a rented house/flat/room
- In a flat/ room provided to me/us for free
- In a larger shelter such as a refugee camp or reception centre
- Other housing arrangement
- I do not have housing/accomodation

Q5.1.4 In the last 12 months, have you received support by the government or state agencies, international organisations, local non-governmental organisations or religious groups?

- Yes
- No

Q5.1.5 What kind of support did you receive and by whom? (if 5.1.4 is ‚yes')

Support type

- Shelter or accomodation
- Food or food vouchers
- Cash transfers
- In-kind transfers
- Medical support & health care
- Legal advice
- Vocational training, language courses or other education
- Other support

Support actors

- Government / state agencies
- International Organizations
- National/local NGOs
- Religious groups

INFO: Multiple choice table with possibility to check each combination of support type and actors.

Q5.2.2 Have you worked during the past 30 days for pay or profit?

- Yes
- No

Q5.2.3 What kind of work did you do? (if 5.2.2 is ‚yes')

- Formal employment with a regular contract
- Occasional work with a short-term contract
- Occasional work/day labor without a contract
- Self-employment/business on my own terms
- In a cash/food-for-work-program
- Other

Q5.2.4 What are currently the most important sources of living for you and the members of your household? (ranking top three livelihood choices: 1st, 2nd and 3rd)

- Salary from employment or pay from other work
- Resources in my home community (such as agriculture, plantation, forest products)
- Agricultural work here
- Business income (non-agricultural, formal or informal)
- Money/aid received from people living in this place/city
- Money/aid received from people living elsewhere in this country
- Money/aid received from people living abroad (in another country)
- Aid or welfare benefits from the state or other organizations
- Other
- No further source

Q5.2.5 How is your current economic situation compared to your previous situation back home?

- It is much worse now
- It is worse now than it was before
- It is similar
- It is somewhat better than it was before
- It is much better now

Q5.4.1a Have you ever been subjected to violence at the place you are currently living?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

Q5.4.1b What kind of violence have you experienced? (if 5.4.1a is ‚yes')

- Violence by members of the local community
- Violence by other migrants or refugees
- Violence by the state actors such as police
- Domestic violence
- Other forms of violence

Q5.4 How much do you fear being subjected to violence here / in this country?

- Very large fear
- Large fear
- Little fear
- No fear

Q5.5.1 To what extent do you feel accepted/rejected by other people in the place where you live?

- I feel extremely rejected by them
- I feel somewhat rejected by them
- I feel accepted by some, but rejected by others

- I feel somewhat accepted by them
- I feel very much accepted by them

Q5.5.2 Have you ever been subjected to harassment or intimidation at the place you now live?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

Q5.5.3 Have some negative experiences here influenced your intention to move to another place?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

6. CONNECTIVITY

Q6.1.1 At this place you currently live at, with how many people did you spend time (outside of your home) within the last week?

- Any number

Q6.1.2 Who are these persons you regularly spend time with? (if 6.1.1 is greater than / equal to ‚1')

- Members of my family
- Persons from my home community
- Persons from my ethnic group
- Persons I know from work
- Persons I know from my religious group
- Persons coming from other countries (other migrants/refugees)
- Persons born in this place (members of the host community)
- Other persons

Q6.2.1 Do any persons who are very important for you currently live in OTHER places than here?

- Yes
- No

Q6.2.2 How many persons would you like to mention (max. 5 persons)? (if 6.2.1 is ‚yes')

- Any number from 1 to 5

INFO: Q6.2.3 to Q6.2.7 appears as often as indicated in Q6.2.2.

Q6.2.3 What is your relationship to that person?

- My husband / wife / partner
- My brother / sister
- My son / daughter
- My father / mother
- Another relative (cousin, uncle, aunt, grand parent etc.)
- My friend
- My business partner or colleague
- A member of my church/mosque or other religious group
- Another person (non-family)

Q6.2.4 Where - in which COUNTRY - is this person currently living?

- Open text

Q6.2.5 Where - in which CITY or village - is this person currently living?

- Open text

Q6.2.6 How do you mostly maintain contact with this person?

- Personal visits
- Phone calls & SMS
- Social media (such as facebook, whatsapp, ...)
- Other

Q6.2.7 How often are you in contact with one another?

- Daily
- Several times a week
- One time a week or less
- Not very frequent
- Currently no contact

Q6.2 What kind of support do you receive from or give to this person?

Support type

- Financial support (receiving/sending money, providing credit etc.)
- Food and/or agricultural produce
- Care support (taking care of children, elderly or disabled family members)
- Emotional support (trust relation, advice on personal or family decisions)
- Legal support (helping with documents and legal procedures)
- Other form of support

Support direction

- Receiving
- Giving

INFO: Multiple choice with possibility to check each combination of support type and direction.

7. SPECIAL SECTION – CORONA CRISIS

Q7.1 Did the corona crisis have a significant impact on your life?

- Yes
- No

Q7.2 How has the corona crisis impacted your life? (if 7.1 is ‚yes')

- I had respective symptoms and health problems myself
- Family members or other persons close to me had health problems
- Family members or friends died due to the corona virus
- I and/or other family members could not work and earn an income
- I / my children could not go to school
- My/our living situation was very difficult
- I could not meet others and felt lonely and isolated
- I could not access legal support or advice related to my status or asylum procedure
- Financial transfers from family members not living here were reduced or stopped
- I could not travel/go to other places

Q7.3 How is your current economic situation compared to before the corona crisis?

- It is much worse now
- It is worse than it was before
- It is similar
- It is somewhat better than it was before
- It is much better now

Q7.4 During the corona crisis, are you/have you been more or less in contact with the people in your life than before?

Contact type

- members of my family living in other places
- friends living in other places
- colleagues from work / classmates from school
- members in my religious group
- neighbours and other members of the local community

Contact frequency

- more
- same
- less
- not applicable (no contact at all)

INFO: Sliders with possibility to check each combination of contact type and frequency.

Q7.5 During the Corona crisis, did you receive more or less support by different organisations, groups or persons than before that?

Support type

- government or state agencies

- international organisations
- national / local NGOs
- religious groups
- neighbours or local community
- own family living here
- own family living in other places

Support frequency

- more
- same
- less
- not applicable (no contact at all)

INFO: Sliders with possibility to check each combination of support type and frequency.