



UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

**DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE ECONOMICHE
E AZIENDALI**

Via J. F. Kennedy, 6 – 43100 Parma – Italia

MARCO MAGNANI^a

^a University of Parma

**THE EFFECTS OF ASYLUM SEEKER SELF-SELECTION ON
THE INTEGRATION IN THE HOST COUNTRY**

WORKING PAPER EP01/2024

Parole chiave: migrant self-selection; asylum seekers; integration policies.

The effects of asylum seeker self-selection on the integration in the host country

MARCO MAGNANI*

May 2, 2024

Abstract

In this paper we study the process of self-selections undertaken by asylum seekers hosted in temporary reception center in Italy, in the Province of Parma. In particular, by differentiating migrants on the basis of their countries of origin and of their countries of destination we identify different groups in the sample population: refugees and illegal migrants, people directed to Europe and people directed outside Europe. Leveraging on the randomness of the sample with regard to both the dimensions previously mentioned, we compare these groups to identify their specific characteristics.

The relevance of this distinction introduced in the population of asylum seekers is then tested with respect to integration outcomes. In particular, we consider the proficiency in the Italian language and the effort exerted by migrants for labour market integration. In both areas, refugees obtain performances which are worse than those of illegal migrants.

This result has potentially sizable policy implications as the country of origin of asylum seekers is an information which is recorded soon after arrival. This knowledge can be used to design integration policies which are different for refugees and illegal migrants.

Keywords: migrant self-selection; asylum seekers; integration policies;

JEL classification: F22, J61.

*Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche ed Aziendali, University of Parma, Parma, Italy. Email: marco.magnani@unipr.it. Marco Magnani is the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments: I would like to thank the Prefecture of Parma for allowing the use of data collected during the project "From Extraordinary Reception Centers To The Integrated Reception System In The Province Of Parma" funded by the Asylum, Migration And Integration Fund (AMIF) of the European Union.

1 Introduction

Data collected by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) show that, in the period 2015-2021, more than 2 million people (2.151.010) reached Europe, after leaving their home country, to get a better life. The reception and the integration of this huge number of migrants is a crucial challenge for any European policy-maker interested in the welfare and in the cohesion of the hosting society.

The dynamics of flows show in fact that migration directed to Europe is a not a temporary emergency, but a permanent phenomenon. Despite total arrivals kept decreasing, after reaching a peak in 2015, during the so called European migrant crisis, the breakdown of the conflict in Ukraine and the forced displacement of civilians fleeing the war, reversed this trend. There is evidence thus that Europe and the European Union (EU) must be prepared to face, every now and then, sizable inflows of migrants.¹

In this context, retrieving information on the characteristics of the migrant population is crucial for the development of a forward-looking strategy to migration management. A specific circumstance is specially challenging for this task: the EU attracts a large number of people coming from many countries who also have many different migration motives. These motives are related to specific problems in the country of origin but are often intertwined with personal issues.

Country-specific problems involve different elements ranging from the political and social environment, where risks of persecution, violence and conflict originate, to the state of the economy, where lack of decent work and of access to rights and basic services arise, and where the level of poverty and gender inequality is determined, to the effects of environmental degradation and climate change. Personal issues concern, for instance, separation from family, or individual aspirations, and compose with country specific issues a multifaceted bundle whose analysis is specially challenging.

It is hard then to gain a clear understanding of the (self)-selection process undergone by migrants which is determined by multiple push and pull factors triggering the decision to migrate. For the same reasons it is also difficult to identify groups of people with similar characteristics and goals within such a varied population. These tasks however are of crucial importance for any policy-maker interested in designing integration policies which pursue sensible and feasible goals.²

The push factors which trigger migration from the country of origin indeed, largely affect the performance of asylum seekers in hosting countries. For instance, it is well known that refugees perform relatively worse in the labor market, both in terms of wages and of skill downgrading, when compared to economic migrants with similar characteristics (Brell et al., 2020, Fasani et al., 2022, and Nikolov, 2021).

On the other hand, the pull factors attracting people to a specific destination country also matter. In fact they are key in defining the level of human capital of migrants, which largely determines their chances to integrate in the labor market and to learn the language of the host country (Lange and Pfeiffer, 2019).

¹See <https://migration.iom.int/europe/>.

²On these issues see World Bank (2018) and IOM (2022).

Our purpose in this paper is to investigate the impact of these factors in differentiating the migrant population. This should provide useful information to develop sensible strategies of migration management which rely on a diversified approach where different pathways to integration exist for different individuals.

We perform this analysis using data on asylum seekers, and focusing on the case of Italy, which is one of the main entry gates to Europe. Indeed, Italy has been the country of first arrival for 591.119 migrants, between 2015 and 2021, amounting to about 27.5% of total arrivals.³

According to Eurostat data, a large fraction of this population, 81.19%, amounting to 484.200 individuals applied for asylum. Asylum seekers, despite being very much homogeneous for what concerns their demographic characteristics, (men represents 82,5% of the total population while people aged 18 to 34 years old amount to a share of 74.7%), have more than 100 nationalities, corresponding to a wide range different situations in their home countries.⁴

This evidence confirms that people reaching Italy are pushed by many heterogeneous factors affecting the decision to migrate. Analogously, if we look at the countries of final destination of migrants, an elaborate scenario emerges, which is further complicated by the circumstance that a non-trivial share of asylum seekers is made up of secondary movers. This people who initially left home to leave in another country outside the EU (typically in Libya), decided then to reach Europe, after a period of staying.⁵

The provisions of the EU Dublin Regulation, which requires asylum seekers to file their applications for international protection in the country of their first arrival in the EU, in fact blurs the picture. The population hosted in Italy includes people who do not share a unique final destinations but are directed to different countries, often other than Italy.⁶

The arrival in Italy is thus the outcome of many circumstances, which depend both on the conditions of the home country as well as on the conditions of the (planned) destination country. It follows that the Italian population of asylum seeker results from

³See IOM data, available at the link reported in previous footnote 1.

⁴Statistics on the countries of origin of migrants are available here: [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/migration-asylum/](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/migration-asylum/asylum/). According to the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, based on the work by Gleditsch et al. (2002) and Petterson et al. (2019), some of these countries, for instance Sudan, Nigeria and Somalia, face major conflicts. Some other countries are plagued with droughts, floods, and extreme temperatures for instance, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Niger, Somalia and Bangladesh, where, according to the World Development Indicators provided by the World Bank, on average, more than 3% of the population was hit by these phenomena, in the period 1990-2009. Some other countries suffer of a lack of democracy; for instance Guinea and Ethiopia are classified by the Economist Intelligence Unit as authoritarian regimes. Lastly, in countries like Senegal or Côte d'Ivoire, no specific problems are present.

⁵According to a survey conducted by World Bank between January and March 2017 on a random sample of asylum seekers in Italy, one out of five of them were secondary movers. For further details on this issue and for an in-depth description of the population of asylum seekers in Italy see World Bank (2018).

⁶The Dublin Regulation (Regulation No. 604/2013) is a EU law that establishes that the member state responsible for the examination of an application for asylum, submitted by persons seeking international protection which entered irregularly the EU, shall be primarily the state of first arrival.

a complex self-selection process of the type first studied in the seminal contribution by Roy (1951) and then developed by Borjas (1987), Chin and Cortes (2015) and Aksoy and Poutvaara (2021), where push and pull factors interact.

In order to gain a deeper knowledge of this population, we take advantage of an original database, which includes the result of a survey, conducted between October 2018 and March 2019, on a representative sample of the asylum seekers hosted in temporary reception centers in the Province of Parma. Based on available information we classify migrants along two dimensions.

The first dimension is their country of origin, and we classify as refugees, people coming from countries plagued by major conflicts, and as irregular migrants all the others.⁷ This should capture the effects of push factors on the decision to migrate. The second dimension is the declared destination country, and we distinguish between people initially directed to Europe, to Italy, outside Europe, and to no specific final destination. This has the purpose of capturing the effects of pull factors on the migration decision.

Leveraging on these classifications, we study how people with different home countries and different destination countries differ among each other to single out the effects of pull and push factors affecting the decision to migrate. This makes it possible to identify the specific characteristics which distinguish each group from the rest of the migrant population.

Our analysis relies on the paper by Aksoy and Poutvaara (2021) but takes a different perspective. These authors in fact, as most of the literature in this field, compare the population of migrants to people in the country of origin with similar socio-demographic characteristics to obtain insights on self-selection.⁸

Instead we do not consider the differences between migrants and their compatriots who decided not to migrate. We focus on differences within the migrant population, between people coming from different countries, and heading to different destinations. In a sense, we shift the point of view from the origin country, and from the assessment in quantitative and qualitative terms of the decrease in domestic labor supply, to the point of view of the destination country which focuses on the increase in total labor supply.

Our results show that statistically significant differences emerge between refugees and illegal migrants on specific aspects. In particular refugees are more likely to be above the age of 25, to be Christian and to have low income, suggesting that asylum seekers in this group are pushed to leave their home country mostly by religious discrimination which also affect their ability to earn income in the labor market. If we restrict the analysis to people coming from country plagued by major conflicts, where push factors are stronger, we also find that asylum seekers in this group are positively selected in terms of education.

⁷According to the Refugee Convention signed in 1951 a refugee is "someone who is unable or unwilling to return to their country of origin owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion" (UNHCR, 1951, pp.3). An irregular migrant is someone who undertakes a "movement that takes place outside the regulatory norms of the sending, transit and receiving country" (IOM, 2011).

⁸This literature is reviewed in the recent papers by Spitzer and Zimran (2018) and Guichard (2020). Aksoy and Poutvaara (2021) study migrants heading to various destinations in Europe, while Guichard (2020) and Brückner et al. (2016) focus on the case of asylum seekers in Germany.

This result is in line with the findings of other paper in this field of the literature (Aksoy and Poutvaara, 2021)

Religion also plays a significant role when migrants heading to different destinations are compared. Asylum seeker who initially planned to reach Europe are more likely to be Christian. In addition to this, women are more frequently directed to Europe suggesting that not only religious discrimination but also gender discrimination matters.

Interestingly, having children is an element which differentiate asylum seekers with different final destinations. They in fact are less likely to migrate outside Europe when they have children. We focus on this aspects in our theoretical model.

This positive analysis permits to ex-post validate the grouping procedure of the population of asylum seekers and to rely on the classification based on origin and destination countries to study the performances of asylum seekers in terms of integration. We consider this issue in terms of integration in the labor market, and of proficiency in Italian. We thus contribute to the debate on this issue, started by Aksoy et al. (2023) who analyze the effects of local labor market conditions and attitudes towards immigrants on multi-dimensional integration outcomes of refugees in Germany.

The paper has the following structure. Section 2 presents the theoretical model. Section 3 describes the data. Section 4 includes the empirical strategy. Section 5 reports the results of the empirical analysis concerning the self-selection of asylum seekers. Section 6 reports the results of the empirical analysis concerning the performances of asylum seekers in terms of integration. Section 7 duly concludes.

2 Theoretical framework

We describe the self-selection process undergone by asylum seekers by means of a simple model, which introduces a small variation in the theoretical framework by Aksoy and Poutvaara (2021) to account for the effect on the decision to migrate of the size of the household of origin. In our setting, a generic agent i is the sole income earner in a household which counts $n_i \geq 1$ members. Income is used for consumption and is equally distributed among household members. A single agent thus fully uses labor income for own consumption, while a married agent shares income and consumption with the partner with the children.

Labor income earned by the agent differs in case of migration and in case of non-migration.

If agent i migrates, labor income is the wage rate paid in destination country d to a worker with the same characteristics as agent i in terms of gender g , and of human capital beyond primary education h_i . This wage rate is defined by the following equation

$$w_i^d = \exp(\alpha_{d,g} + r_{d,g}h_i - \pi_g)$$

where $\exp(\alpha_{d,g})$ is the wage rate paid to a person of gender g with primary education, $r_{d,g}$ is the gender-specific return to human capital beyond primary education in country d , and π_g is a gender specific loss in productivity. This loss is due to the adjustment effort

required to adapt to the different characteristics of the labor market in the host country and to acquire the necessary language skills.

Migration is not always successful, and there is a probability $0 < s_{k,g} < 1$ that country d is not reached. In this case no wage w^d is earned, and the agent incurs a gender specific utility loss equal to $L_{M,g}$, independent from the destination country. Both in case of success and in case of failure there is an individual-specific migration cost ϵ_i which is assumed to be independently and identically distributed for agents of the same home country.

If the agent decides not to migrate, labor income is the wage rate paid to a worker with the same characteristics as agent i in the home country, and is equal to

$$w_i^k = \exp(\alpha_{k,g} + r_{k,g}h_i)$$

where $\exp(\alpha_{k,g})$ is the wage rate paid to a person of gender g with primary education, and $r_{k,g}$ is the gender-specific return to human capital beyond primary education.

The wage rate w^k is only earned if the agent is not victim of persecution or violence, when instead a utility loss $L_{k,g}$ occurs. The probability of this circumstance is gender specific and equal to $0 < q_{k,g} < 1$.

Following Aksoy and Poutvaara (2021), we assume that utility is logarithmic in consumption. Consumption is equal to labor income divided by the size of the household, n_i , i.e. is equal to the average level of consumption for each household member.

In this setting, the decision to migrate depends on the comparison between expected utility from remaining in the home country and expected utility from migrating. If the agent decides not to migrate, expected utility is

$$\begin{aligned} EU_i^k &= (1 - q_{k,g}) \log\left(\frac{w_i^k}{n_i}\right) - q_{k,g}L_{k,g} \\ &= (1 - q_{k,g}) [\alpha_{k,g} + r_{k,g}h_i - \log(n_i)] - q_{k,g}L_{k,g} \end{aligned}$$

If the agent decides to migrate expected utility is

$$\begin{aligned} EU_i^d &= (1 - s_{k,g}) \log\left(\frac{w_i^d}{n_i}\right) - s_{k,g}L_{M,g} - \epsilon_i \\ &= (1 - s_{k,g}) [\alpha_{d,g} + r_{d,g}h_i - \pi_g - \log(n_i)] - s_{k,g}L_{M,g} - \epsilon_i \end{aligned}$$

The choice to migrate requires $EU_i^d > EU_i^k$, a condition which occurs if the individual migration cost is sufficiently low and

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_i < \epsilon_* &= [(1 - s_{k,g})r_{d,g} - (1 - q_{k,g})r_{k,g}]h_i + \\ &\quad + (1 - s_{k,g})\alpha_{d,g} - (1 - q_{k,g})\alpha_{k,g} - (q_{k,g} - s_{k,g})\log(n_i) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

holds. It follows that the probability that agent i migrates depends on the cumulative distribution of the random individual-specific migration cost and is $p_i = \Phi_{k,g}(\epsilon_i^*)$. The characterization of the threshold value ϵ^* for the migration cost which separates people who decide to migrate from people who do not migrate, makes it possible to obtain several results to be tested in the empirical analysis.

Consider now in details the elements that drive the choice to remain in the home country or to migrate, and the determination of ϵ^* .

Note that the agent is pushed to choose the option which provides the highest expected increase in household income. This effect is summarized by the term

$$[(1 - s_{k,g}) r_{d,g} - (1 - q_{k,g}) r_{k,g}] h_i + (1 - s_{k,g}) \alpha_{d,g}$$

in Equation 1, which depends on the human capital accumulated by the agent beyond primary education. A first result, analogous to the result obtained in Aksoy and Poutvaara (2021) follows:

Proposition 1 (Aksoy and Poutvaara (2021)). *Migrants are positively self-selected in terms of their human capital if $(1 - s_{k,g}) r_{d,g} > (1 - q_{k,g}) r_{k,g}$ and negatively self-selected in terms of their human capital otherwise*

Proof. Take the first derivative of $p_i = \Phi_{k,g}(\epsilon_i^*)$ with respect to h_i to obtain

$$\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial h_i} = [(1 - s_{k,g}) r_{d,g} - (1 - q_{k,g}) r_{k,g}] \frac{\partial \Phi_{k,g}(\epsilon_i^*)}{\partial \epsilon_i^*}$$

□

This suggest that refugees, who migrate from their home countries because of the high probability of being victim of discrimination or violence, are more likely to be positively self-selected than irregular migrants whose risk of being discriminated or abused is lower.

A further element which affects the choice of the agent, is the size of the household of origin. Note, in fact, that, whenever the agent earns a labor income either in the home country or abroad, he/she pays a cost because earnings are shared with other household members, and personal income decreases. This cost gets larger if household size increases and if the probability of being successful in the labor market increases. Conversely, it decreases when the probability of a failure increases. As a consequence, for given household size, the largest reduction in cost occurs when the agents chooses the riskiest option. This effect is summarized by term $-(q_{k,g} - s_{k,g}) \log(n_i)$ in Equation 1, and allows us to obtain a second result:

Proposition 2. *An increase in the size of the household of origin increases the probability that agent i migrates if $s_{k,g} > q_{k,g}$, and decreases it otherwise.*

Proof. Take the first derivative of $p_i = \Phi_{k,g}(\epsilon_i^*)$ with respect to n_i to obtain

$$\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial n_i} = \frac{s_{k,g} - q_{k,g}}{n_i} \cdot \frac{\partial \Phi_{k,g}(\epsilon_i^*)}{\partial \epsilon_i^*}.$$

This quantity is positive if $s_{k,g} > q_{k,g}$. □

When $s_{k,g} > q_{k,g}$ holds, and the probability not to reach the destination country are higher than the probability of being discriminated or abused in the home country, the

agent has the incentive to leave. Opposite dynamics are at work when instead $s_{k,g} \leq q_{k,g}$ so that the incentive to remain in the home country is strengthened.

In this context, irregular migrants are more likely to be induced to migrate if they live in big households. Since they come from countries with minor or no conflicts and face a low probability of being victim of discrimination or violence, the circumstance where $q_{k,g}$ is sufficiently low to have that $s_{k,g} \geq q_{k,g}$ occurs more often. On the other hand refugees, who come from countries with major conflicts and face a high risk of discrimination are less likely to migrate if they live in big households. In this case in fact $q_{k,g}$ is high and the circumstance where $s_{k,g} < q_{k,g}$ occurs more often.

We can interpret as the effect of cost mutualization. Mutualization in fact allows to reduce the impact on individual utility of bad outcomes either of the choice to remain in the home country or of the choice to migrate. In this context, economies of scale existing in large households play a role as they improve the ability to cope with negative labor market outcome causing household members to be more prone to make risky choices.⁹

If we now focus on pull factors affecting self selection we can expect the impact of the size of the household to be negative if the destination country is close to the home country and relatively safe, so that the probability of failure, $s_{k,g}$, is low. On the contrary if $s_{k,g}$ is high, the impact is more likely to be negative. Hence comparing people directed to different destination country we should expect migrants heading to closer and/or safer destinations to be living in larger households, compared to migrants from the same home country heading to far and unsafe destinations.

3 Data

Our empirical analysis uses data from an original database, which includes the result of a survey, conducted between October 2018 and March 2019, on a representative sample of asylum seekers hosted in the Province of Parma.

During the survey a questionnaire, which is provided in the Appendix, was submitted to asylum seekers in temporary reception centers, CAS is the Italian acronym. These centers are private enterprises funded by the central government and managed by Italian Prefectures (government offices at the province level) which were used when the number of migrants exceeded the reception capacity of ordinary centers run by local authorities.

Asylum seekers in temporary reception centers are a random sample of migrants entering in Europe through Italy (typically through the Central Mediterranean route or through the Western Balkan Route as defined by the EU Agency Frontex). Randomness is guaranteed by the quasi-experimental setting provided by the Italian Dispersal Policy (Piano Nazionale di Riparto) stating that the number of asylum seekers allocated to a given province depends on its resident population. Representativeness depends on the fact that temporary reception centers host between 75 to 80 per cent of all asylum seekers arriving in Italy.¹⁰

⁹On this see for instance Echeverría and Molina (2023), Logan (2011), and Nelson (1988).

¹⁰The strategy of the Italian government on the reception and dispersal of migrants is described in the decree D.Lgs. 142/2015, "Decreto Accoglienza". In this context, CAS centers re-

The representative subsample of this population included in our survey counts 188 asylum seekers, amounting to about 16.6% of those hosted in the province of Parma by the time of the survey (1132 individuals). The vast majority of them are men (176, corresponding to 93.6% of the total) of age between 18 and 48,¹¹ single and of Muslim religion (121 and 109 respectively, corresponding to 64.4% and 58% of the total). Among them, 51 asylum seekers (27.1%) declared to have at least one child.

If we focus on the country of origin, we count 23 different countries, mostly in Africa. In fact, only 20 asylum seekers are from Asia (10.6%). The countries that count the largest number of asylum seekers are Nigeria (57, 30.3%), Gambia (20, 10.6%) and Senegal (16, 8.5%). Table 6 reports a comparison between the population of the respondents to the survey and the universe of asylum seekers in Italy in the year 2017.

Based on the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, derived from the work by Gleditsch et al. (2002) and Petterson et al. (2019), which distinguish between countries with conflicts and country without conflicts, we classify asylum seekers in two groups: refugees and irregular migrants.

We focus on conflicts taking place in the period 2010-2016, which, based on the minimum length of the presence in Italy (16 months) and on the average length of this presence (43 months, about 4 years), is the period immediately before the departure of asylum seekers from their home country. People coming from countries plagued by major conflicts are refugees, while people coming from countries with minor or no conflicts are irregular migrants. Following the classification by the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, countries with major conflicts had at least 1000 battle-related deaths in one calendar year between 2010 and 2016.

Due to the large number of people from Nigeria, which amount to 78.1% of all refugees, we also adopt a different classification of asylum seekers which considers as refugees people coming from countries with major conflicts and people coming from countries with minor conflicts. Countries with minor conflicts had at least 25 but less than 1000 battle-related deaths in one calendar year.

Table 7 in the Appendix reports the distribution of the sample based on these two alternative classifications.

If we consider now socio-economic variables and focus on education, we observe that asylum seekers in the sample are mostly low educated, since more than a quarter of them report not holding any degree (26.1%), while only a small minority has tertiary education (4.2%). Average years of schooling are 7.44, while the median is 8 years. More details are reported in Table 8 in the Appendix.

Information on income is missing and can only be retrieved indirectly from questions concerning the use that asylum seekers made of their money in their home country (see Question A.20 in the questionnaire reported in the Appendix). Based on these answer we build an index which corresponds to the number of different uses of personal income.

ceive a vast majority of asylum seekers. By the date of June 17th 2019, which is the closest to the period of our survey for which data are available, the share of asylum seekers in temporary centers was 76.31%. Data are retrieved from the Italian Ministry of the Interior at this link: <http://www.libertaciviliimmigrazione.dlci.interno.gov.it/it/documentazione/statistica> .

¹¹The average age is 26,2 and the median age is 25.

This amounts to assuming that more affluent people could afford allocating their money to more purposes. Table 9 in the Appendix reports the main data on income allocation.

Better data are available for the employment status of asylum seekers and the prevailing activity performed by the family. A vast majority of asylum seekers were working before leaving their home country (80.8%). Only a few of them were studying (16.0%) or were not in education nor working (3.2%). Agriculture is the most largely performed activity in asylum seeker households (46.8%).

It is now important to highlight that asylum seekers hosted in CAS centers are not only randomly selected with regard to their home countries, but also with regard to their destination countries. This follows from the constraints imposed by the Dublin Regulation which require that migrants submit requests of asylum in the country of first arrival. As a consequence, if we consider the declared destination countries of the respondents to our survey, the distribution of answers should provide an unbiased description of the main destinations of migrants hosted in Italy.

In our subsample, we identify 3 main groups of equal size based on the declared destination: asylum seekers directed to Europe (65 out of 186 respondents, equal to 34.9% of the total), asylum seekers initially directed outside Europe (57, 30.6%), who were forced to remain in Italy, and asylum seekers with no specific destination (64, 34.4%). Within the first two groups, two countries are the main destination for most of them: Italy for people directed to Europe (40, 21.5%), and Lybia for people directed outside Europe (31, 16.7%). Table 10 in the Appendix reports this information.

Strictly related to the chosen destination country are asylum seeker motives to migrate. Data retrieved by our survey (see Question B8 in the questionnaire reported in the Appendix) report that a majority of respondents left the home country to seek peace (68 out of 182 respondents, equal to 37.4% of the total) or safety (39, 21.4%). The second main motive to migrate concerns food security, as 12.6% of respondents (23 out of 182) reported that they were looking for personal safety and food security, while a further 14.8% of them was looking for safety and food for the family. Only a minority of migrants declared that the migration motive was the quest for freedom or for better economic conditions. Table 11 in the Appendix reports this information.

4 Empirical strategy

The composition of our sample of asylum seekers is the result of two different processes of self-selection which are representative of those undergone by migrants reaching Italy. A first process is driven by push factors of migration, which we assume are summarized by the information concerning the home country of asylum seekers, and its classification as a country with (major) conflicts. A second process is driven by pull factors, which are summarized by the destination country of asylum seekers.

In our empirical strategy we leverage on the randomness of the population of respondents to the survey, both with respect to the countries of origin and with respect to the destination countries, to study the effects of self-selection. In particular, we estimate a series of multivariate regression models to check for statistically significant differences be-

tween specific groups of asylum seekers and the rest of the migrant population hosted in the temporary reception center of the Province of Parma. These differences are evidence of migrant self-selection, and result from the effects of push and pull factors.

In order to study the effects of push factors we focus on the difference which emerge between refugees and irregular migrants, defined on the basis of the classification of their countries of origin provided by the Uppsala Conflict Data Program. In particular, we estimate two regression models where the dependent variables are dummies. In one case the dummy *refugee* assumes value 1 if in the country of origin of the asylum seeker there were major conflicts between 2010 and 2016. The second dummy, *refugee(mild)*, has value 1 if in the same period, any conflict took place in the country of origin of the asylum seeker.

The effects of pull factors are studied adopting the same strategy as in Aksoy and Poutvaara (2021), and using as a dependent variable a dummy with value 1, if the intended destination of the migration was a specific country, and 0 otherwise. In particular we consider the following destinations: Europe, extra European countries, Italy and Lybia.

The joint effects of push and pull factors are investigated by means of dummies which result from the product of dummies related to the country of origin of the asylum seeker and dummies related to the destination country.

Using these variables we estimate linear probability models of self-selection which take the following general form:

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta_1 X_i + \beta_2 Z_i + \epsilon_i \quad (2)$$

where Y_i has value 1 if individual i has the characteristic investigated and 0 otherwise. X_i is a vector of demographic and social variables that include: a dummy variable indicating sex (*du_female*); a dummy variable identifying migrants whose age is below or equal to 25 years old (*du_below25*); a dummy variable indicating religion (*du_Christian*); a dummy variable indicating if the household includes children (*du_child*); the number of school years (*school years*); a dummy variable indicating if the migrants was living in a city before migration (*du_city*); a dummy variable indicating the labor market status before migration, which takes value 1 if the migrant was not working, and 0 otherwise (*du_not working*); an index of income level which ranges from 0 to 6 and is constructed as described in the previous section (*income*).

Z_i is a vector which includes dummy variables based on self-reported information on motivations to migrate. We focus on three of these: the quest for peace (*du_peace*), the pursuit of better economic conditions (*du_econ*) and the pursuit of personal aspirations which primarily concern freedom (*du_freedom*).¹²

In order to study the effects of migrant self-selection on their performances in terms of integration in the labor market, and in terms of proficiency in Italian, we run a probit regression and an ordered probit regression where the dependent variables are a dummy variable which takes value 1 if the migrant is employed and 0 otherwise (*du_job*), and a score for proficiency in Italian ranging from 1 to 10 respectively (*italian_score*). This score

¹²Variables related to other motivations like food security or the quest for safety are not included in the estimates due to collinearity problems. Beyond the pursuit of freedom migrants also list among the reasons to migrate experiencing problems in the household of origin and loneliness.

is calculated from migrant answers to two specific questions asking to give an assessment of the personal ability to understand and to speak Italian (see Questions H.6 and H.7 in the questionnaire). Summing the scores obtained from the answers to these questions, we obtain the synthetic score used in the estimates. Lastly, to analyze in more details migrant efforts to integrate in the labor market, we run another probit regression where the dependent variable captures the participation to training courses, and assumes value 1 if the respondent did participate and 0 otherwise (*du_labor_course_participation*).

These dependent variables are regressed against the dummy capturing the fact that the migrant is a refugee or not, and against the dummy identifying migrants whose final destination was Italy.

In this context we also control for the length of stay in Italy (*stay_in_italy_months*), for the completion of a course of Italian (*du_ita_course_end*), for the fact that this course included more than 10 hours of lessons per week (*du_more_than_10hours/week*), and for the level of ability of the respondents at writing a curriculum vitae, measured on a scale from 1 to 4 (*curriculum*). Controls presented above and concerning the socio-demographic characteristics of migrants and their motivations to migrate are also employed.

We also check for interactions among different aspects of integration in the host society, by including the scores for proficiency in Italian in the estimates concerning labor market integration, and viceversa.

5 Asylum seeker self-selection

In this section we analyze the self-selection process undergone by asylum seekers hosted in the temporary reception center of the Province of Parma by comparing different groups of migrants. In particular, we study separately push and pull factors affecting the decision to migrate, and their effects on the specific characteristics of asylum seekers, comparing refugees to irregular migrants and people with a specific country of arrival, with the rest of the sample. In the Appendix, we further discuss the joint impact of push and pull factors by separately considering refugees and irregular migrants heading to different destinations.

We initially consider push factors and run different regressions to compare refugees in a strict sense, i.e. migrants from countries with major conflicts, and refugees in a wide sense, i.e. migrants from countries with major conflicts, to the rest of the population. The results displayed in Table 1 highlight that three main features distinguish irregular migrants from refugees, no matter which of the previous two definitions is adopted: religion, age and income.

Refugees in fact are more likely to be Christian than irregular migrants. This suggests that, notwithstanding the intensity of the conflicts taking place in their home countries, asylum seekers are primarily motivated to migrate by religious issues. This evidence is surely affected by the large presence, among refugees, of people from Nigeria which is known to be plagued by ethno-religious conflicts (Tuki, 2024).

The second main characteristic which distinguishes refugees from irregular migrants is the fact that refugees are typically older, as shown by the negative and significant

coefficient associate to the dummy which identifies asylum seeker who are 25 years old or younger. A possible interpretation of this result, is that financial constraints may cause a delay in migration, which is only undertaken when sufficient means have been accumulated by potential migrants.

Income is a further element which distinguish refugees from the rest of asylum seekers. The coefficient associated with our measure of income in fact is always negative and statistically significant. A natural explanation for this evidence is that low earnings are a direct consequence of discrimination. This argument is strengthen by our next finding that refugees in a strict sense a positively self-selected in terms of education and thus should command high high wages in a properly working labour market.

Consider in fact the effects of self-selection on education, and focus initially on people who escaped form major conflicts. We observe that refugees are positively self-selected, since people with more years of schooling are more likely to be in this group rather than in the group of irregular migrants.

It is worth noting that the variable years of education is not significant when also people from countries with minor conflicts are included among refugees. We can thus conclude that asylum seekers coming from countries with major conflicts are positively selected with respect to education compared both to illegal migrants and refugees from countries with minor conflicts. This evidence on the human capital of asylum seekers is coherent with the findings of Aksoy and Poutvaara (2021) who show that the intensity of the conflict in the home country determines whether migrants are positively or negatively self-selected.

The place of residence in the home country plays a role in determining the probability of being a refugee in a wide sense. Refugees in fact are more likely to come from rural areas than irregular migrants. This result holds for both the definitions adopted in the analysis, but it is only statistically significant in the case of refugees in a wide sense. A possible explanation is that, specially in countries were countries are less intense, peripheral areas are more likely to be plagued by episodes of violence of discrimination due to lower control by the central authority.

Significantly, migration motives are not important in the distinction between refugees and irregular migrants. They in fact impact more on the choice of the destination country, as shown in the proceeding of the analysis.

Consider in fact the pull factors related to the country of planned arrival, which beyond affecting the decision to migrate, also affect the self-selection process undergone by asylum seekers. In our analysis, we only focus on asylum seekers who declared to have a specific destination, when they left their home countries. We don't analyze instead, those who left their country with no destination because in this case no self-selection process can happen based on the destination country.¹³

When asylum seekers are classified according to their declared final destinations, some empirical regularities emerge in the comparison between different groups. Migrants di-

¹³This is confirmed by our estimates, reported in the Appendix in Table 12, which show that migrants without a specific destination have no characteristics which clearly differentiate them from the rest of asylum seekers.

Table 1: Push factors, refugees

	(1) Refugee basic	(2) Refugee motivations	(3) Refugee income	(4) Refugee (minor) basic	(5) Refugee (minor) motivations	(6) Refugee (minor) income
du_female	0.125 (0.447)	-0.301 (0.633)	-0.350 (0.665)	0.329 (0.498)	0.101 (0.697)	0.00405 (0.718)
du_below25	-0.697*** (0.261)	-0.716** (0.321)	-0.764** (0.339)	-0.403 (0.245)	-0.534* (0.294)	-0.529* (0.312)
du_child	-0.492* (0.284)	-0.404 (0.319)	-0.349 (0.335)	-0.302 (0.269)	-0.353 (0.295)	-0.368 (0.313)
du_Christian	1.615*** (0.244)	1.994*** (0.312)	2.028*** (0.326)	0.910*** (0.237)	1.210*** (0.286)	1.255*** (0.291)
school years	0.0296 (0.0284)	0.0701** (0.0349)	0.0659* (0.0360)	0.0185 (0.0258)	0.0133 (0.0300)	0.0233 (0.0309)
du_city	-0.345 (0.235)	-0.210 (0.281)	-0.255 (0.300)	-0.684*** (0.210)	-0.583** (0.247)	-0.582** (0.257)
du_not_working	-0.365 (0.315)	-0.791 (0.569)	-0.776 (0.634)	0.0355 (0.291)	0.770 (0.495)	0.878* (0.532)
income		-0.289*** (0.105)	-0.337*** (0.112)		-0.142* (0.0826)	-0.162* (0.0860)
du_peace			0.498 (0.311)			0.166 (0.270)
du_freedom			0.720 (0.576)			-0.686 (0.538)
du_econ			0.944 (0.716)			0.287 (0.613)
Constant	-0.516 (0.325)	-0.260 (0.432)	-0.369 (0.465)	0.495 (0.301)	0.909** (0.391)	0.811* (0.424)
Observations	182	146	142	182	146	142
r^2	0.331	0.437	0.456	0.159	0.217	0.242

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

rected to Europe seem to be pulled by the prospect of leaving in a society where both religious and gender discrimination are lower than in their home country, since they are more likely to be women and Christian. In the case of women, since they are mostly from Nigeria (7 out of 16), there could be an effect due to human trafficking.¹⁴ For what concern religion, this evidence is mirrored in the results of the estimates concerning migrants initially directed to an extra European destination, who are less likely to be Christian.

A further element that characterizes migrants heading to Europe is their labor market status as they are more likely not to be working before leaving the home countries. Moreover, if we consider the motivations to migrate, we observe that the quest for freedom is at the roots of the choice of Europe as the final destination country. Also in this case the evidence concerning asylum seekers initially directed outside Europe support this finding, since the probability of being directed outside Europe is negatively affected by declaring that the pursue of freedom was a motive for migration.

¹⁴According to IOM, approximately 11,000 women arrived via the Mediterranean Sea into Italy in 2016. IOM estimated that 80% of those arriving from Nigeria were sex trafficking victims.

We can thus summarize the attitude of migrants having Europe as their final destination as the attitude of people mostly in search of freedom in a wide sense, in terms of less religious and gender discrimination, and in terms of their personal life, but also in search of a job.

If we consider people whose destination was outside Europe, i.e. secondary movers, we observe some differences with the previous group of migrants. However, the estimates concerning this people are not very informative, because, beyond the effect of religion and of migration motives discussed above, the only robust evidence is about the negative effect of having childrens.

This fact could be interpreted in terms of our theoretical model, as evidence that extra European destinations grant higher probability of successful migration, intended as the actual possibility to work and earn in the destination countries. This is possibly due to the fact that many asylum seekers come from Subsharian Western Africa and are mostly directed to Lybia which is geographically closer to their country of origin and more easily reached. Since the increase in the size of the household favors cost mutualization, the effect on "safe" destination is negative.

The classification of the final destinations of asylum seekers provided above is quite general and might hide information on the actual self-selection process undergone by this people. In order to explore in more details this issue we now focus on two countries where a non trivial number of migrants declared to be heading to: Italy and Lybia.

If we initially consider the characteristics of people who left their home country to reach Italy, we find some support for the results previously obtained in the larger group of people heading to Europe.¹⁵ Also in this case the quest for a job and for freedom appear to be important pull factors. Indeed these migrants are significantly more likely not to be employed when they left their country, and significantly more likely to declare that freedom is among the motives for migration.

No effect is recorded, however, for gender and religious issues, differently from the case of the larger group of migrants heading to Europe.¹⁶ A last feature which characterizes asylum seekers directed to Italy is the fact that they are more likely to have children. This is again interpreted as the effect of Italy being a "risky" destination which is only chosen when the expected loss of a failure can be mutualized with a big household of origin.

The picture which emerges considering the subsample of people heading to Lybia is less coherent with the evidence regarding the larger group of asylum seekers initially directed to an extra European country.¹⁷ The reason is probably that the set of extra European countries is less homogeneous than the set of European countries.

In this context, an element which has a good predictive power with respect to the choice of Lybia as the destination of migration is income. These people, are more likely to have a level of income significantly lower than the income of asylum seekers directed to Europe. This might be related to the fact that liquidity constraints only allow this people

¹⁵People heading to Italy are 40 out of 65 in the group of migrants heading to Europe.

¹⁶Being female only predicts choosing Italy as the final destination of migration at a 10% confidence interval in the estimates where migration motives are considered.

¹⁷People heading to Lybia are 31 out of 57 in the group of migrants heading to extra European destinations.

Table 2: Pull factors - Europe and Extra Europe

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Europe basic	Europe motivations	Europe income	Extra Europe basic	Extra Europe motivations	Extra Europe income
du_female	0.841** (0.428)	1.286** (0.644)	1.362** (0.676)	-0.587 (0.585)	-0.339 (0.670)	-0.318 (0.699)
du_below25	0.0970 (0.235)	0.112 (0.278)	0.209 (0.294)	-0.158 (0.238)	-0.171 (0.268)	-0.212 (0.279)
du_child	0.218 (0.256)	0.216 (0.275)	0.321 (0.286)	-0.647** (0.271)	-0.660** (0.280)	-0.724** (0.290)
du_Christian	0.503** (0.221)	0.677*** (0.252)	0.700*** (0.259)	-0.507** (0.233)	-0.551** (0.257)	-0.522** (0.260)
school years	-0.0143 (0.0245)	-0.0334 (0.0281)	-0.0322 (0.0292)	0.0184 (0.0252)	0.0155 (0.0278)	0.0129 (0.0284)
du_city	-0.248 (0.202)	-0.263 (0.233)	-0.216 (0.239)	0.174 (0.206)	0.242 (0.230)	0.211 (0.237)
du_not_working	0.193 (0.274)	0.718* (0.403)	0.559 (0.429)	-0.542* (0.296)	-0.461 (0.432)	-0.288 (0.455)
income		0.0876 (0.0796)	0.0912 (0.0826)		-0.0892 (0.0786)	-0.0942 (0.0805)
du_peace			0.404 (0.257)			-0.261 (0.254)
du_freedom			0.794* (0.451)			-0.940* (0.571)
du_econ			0.197 (0.530)			-0.305 (0.561)
Constant	-0.578** (0.283)	-0.781** (0.361)	-1.145*** (0.402)	-0.187 (0.293)	0.103 (0.363)	0.327 (0.395)
Observations	180	144	141	180	144	141
r^2	0.0683	0.104	0.128	0.0753	0.0815	0.0986

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

to reach a destination which is not too far from their country of origin. This might be an initial step on the way of a later migrate to a further destination, to be reached once the necessary financial means will be available.

A second element which seems to matter when it comes to the choice of Lybia as the final destination of migration, is the fact of living in a city in the home country. This element probably eases migration because it guarantees an easier access to the network which organizes migrants in the journey to their final destination.

A last issue to be investigated is the interaction between push and pull factors. This analysis raises some empirical problems which are hardly solved due to the limits posed by a relatively small number of observations. However, we report in the Appendix, the results of estimates where the dependent variable is a dummy which results from the product between the dummy identifying refugees and the dummy related to the final destination country.

Table 3: Pull factors - Italy and Lybia

	(1) Italy basic	(2) Italy motivations	(3) Italy income	(4) Lybia basic	(5) Lybia motivations	(6) Lybia income
du_female	0.535 (0.420)	0.823 (0.562)	1.139* (0.627)	-0.396 (0.598)	-0.243 (0.702)	-0.338 (0.767)
du_below25	0.357 (0.265)	0.333 (0.312)	0.319 (0.332)	-0.356 (0.264)	-0.346 (0.307)	-0.448 (0.319)
du_child	0.723** (0.284)	0.743** (0.305)	0.757** (0.321)	-0.409 (0.291)	-0.323 (0.307)	-0.417 (0.319)
du_Christian	0.235 (0.244)	0.234 (0.281)	0.232 (0.287)	0.0290 (0.249)	0.0221 (0.280)	-0.0303 (0.283)
school years	0.0136 (0.0273)	-0.00377 (0.0313)	-0.0162 (0.0330)	-0.00494 (0.0282)	0.00614 (0.0313)	0.00269 (0.0318)
du_city	-0.239 (0.228)	-0.0563 (0.261)	0.0213 (0.269)	0.305 (0.230)	0.477* (0.260)	0.506* (0.267)
du_not_working	0.531* (0.291)	0.786* (0.427)	0.861* (0.445)	-0.429 (0.348)	-0.451 (0.584)	-0.404 (0.606)
income		0.0642 (0.0880)	0.0890 (0.0925)		-0.243*** (0.0918)	-0.241*** (0.0933)
du_peace			0.0849 (0.290)			-0.235 (0.289)
du_freedom			0.889** (0.453)			
du_econ			-0.694 (0.682)			0.0936 (0.606)
Constant	-1.462*** (0.326)	-1.612*** (0.410)	-1.720*** (0.454)	-0.711** (0.325)	-0.279 (0.410)	-0.0837 (0.437)
Observations	180	144	141	180	144	141
r^2	0.0900	0.0957	0.132	0.0440	0.0999	0.112

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

6 Integration outcomes

In this section we analyze the process of integration of asylum seekers in the host society. In particular we focus on two specific aspects: proficiency in host country language and integration in the labor market.

With respect to these aspects of integration, we check the power of our grouping procedure, based on the countries of origin and on countries of destination, to predict the performances of asylum seekers. This allow us to shed light on the effects of the self-selection processes undergone by migrants on integration outcomes, and to test the efficacy of our classification of migrants for practical purposes. These may concern, for instance, the actions to take to favour the integration of different types of migrants. As pointed by Cortes (2004) and Chin and Cortes (2015), indeed, the distinction between refugees and illegal migrants is specially relevant for the integration in the host society.

Consider initially the learning of Italian by asylum seekers. People hosted in reception centers in Italy must attend an Italian course, but this is not any guarantee of success. Proficiency in facts depends both on the characteristics of the course and on the characteristics of the migrants.

We investigate this issue by regressing a synthetic score of proficiency in the Italian language (*italian_score*) against the dummies *du_refugee* and *du_refugee_mild* which respectively capture the restrictive definition of refugee and the wide definition of refugee. In addition to that we also include the dummy identifying migrants whose final destination was Italy, (*du_italy*). We run an ordered probit regression and control for the specific features of the Italian course followed by migrants in different reception centers. We further control for the length of staying in Italy, for socio-demographic characteristics and for asylum seeker motivations to migrate.

Lastly, we analyze the interaction between proficiency in Italian and integration in the labor market. We thus include as regressors the dummy which identifies people who have a job (*du_job*) and the dummy identifying those who took part to training course aimed a promoting migrant employment (*du_labor_course_participation*).

The results of the analysis are reported in Table 4 and show that the classification of a migrant as a refugee has a significant negative impact on proficiency in the Italian language. This is true both for the restrictive definition and for the wide definition of refugees, and can be explained by the fact that refugees are less favourably selected in terms of the specific human capital required for successful integration in the host country (Chiswick and Miller, 1999), also in terms of previous knowledge of the host country language. Moreover, many refugees experienced traumatic events that affected their mental and physical health (Warfa et al., 2006), thus impairing their ability to learn.

In this context, the fact that the final destination of asylum seekers was Italy has no significant effects, showing the prevalence of push factors over pull factors in the self-selection process undergone bymigrants.

Among controls variables the length of staying in Italy and school years have the expected positive effects on proficiency in the Italian language. Also the dummy capturing the fact that the migrant is below the age of 26 has the expected positive sign.

The employment condition of the migrant before leaving the home country is another

important element since people who were not working are more likely to perform better in learning Italian. This can be easily explained by the fact that most of them were not working because they were students.

Importantly, the characteristics of the Italian course attended by migrants matter. In fact only courses where classes took more than 10 hours per week, have a positive impact on Italian proficiency.

Our results further provide support for the view that integration is in fact a multi-faceted phenomenon where several factors interact. The participation to a training course aimed at favoring employment and labor market integration has a strong positive effect on the learning of the host country language. Not relevant is instead, the fact of having a job. This may be the case because the participation to a course is a signal of the will of a migrant to be integrated in the host country more reliable than having a job. This circumstance in fact is affected by many additional elements, as, for instance, the location of the reception center, beyond the control of the migrant.

Consider now a different aspect of integration, i.e. integration in the labour market. This issue can be investigated from two different perspectives: in terms of outcomes and in terms of effort. We focus here on this latter perspective since, as noted above, the participation to a course is a direct evidence of the will of a migrant to integrate in the hosting society.

This argument finds support from the results of the probit regression where the dummy *du.job* is regressed against a set of regressors, which largely coincides with those used in the analysis of proficiency in the Italian language. These results are reported in the Appendix, and show that most regressors have not a statistically significant impact on the dependent variable, suggesting that the finding of an employment is mostly the results of exogenous factors, other than the characteristics of the migrant.

The results of the estimates where the dependent variable is the dummy capturing participation to a labour course confirm that the grouping procedure based on the distinction between refugees and illegal migrants is in fact appropriate, specially if the restrictive definition of refugee is adopted. It is the case indeed that the dummy *du.refugee* is in fact the main explanatory variable in the estimates, and has a negative and statistically significant impact on the probability that migrants takes part to a labour course. As in the case of proficiency in the Italian language, we can interpret the negative impact of being a refugee on participation to labour courses as the result of traumatic experiences suffered by these migrants which reduce integration efforts.

Other variables such as the years of schooling and the age of the migrants have an effect. More specifically both being below 26 years old and having more years of schooling improve the probability of participation. However these effects disappear when we control for income.

As in the analysis above, interactions between different aspects of integration are of major importance. The score in the Italian language in fact, is the only significant variable when it is included in the regression and has a positive coefficient. This is further evidence that integration outcomes are jointly determined, and suggest a supplement of the empirical analysis in this direction.

Table 4: Italian language scores

VARIABLES	(1) Italian basic	(2) Italian background	(3) Italian motivations	(4) Italian interaction	(5) Italian basic	(6) Italian background	(7) Italian motivations	(8) Italian interaction
du_refugee	-0.932*** (0.196)	-1.047*** (0.229)	-1.036*** (0.235)	-0.934*** (0.239)				
du_refugee_mild					-0.299 (0.189)	-0.525** (0.227)	-0.500** (0.232)	-0.438* (0.234)
du_italy	-0.199 (0.217)	-0.316 (0.255)	-0.345 (0.258)	-0.394 (0.265)	-0.263 (0.216)	-0.302 (0.254)	-0.328 (0.257)	-0.374 (0.264)
stay_in_italy_months	0.0234** (0.0105)	0.0322*** (0.0117)	0.0312*** (0.0119)	0.0284** (0.0121)	0.0210** (0.0104)	0.0277** (0.0116)	0.0289** (0.0119)	0.0261** (0.0120)
du_ita_course_end	0.144 (0.186)	0.246 (0.220)	0.236 (0.225)	0.208 (0.240)	0.159 (0.185)	0.314 (0.219)	0.304 (0.225)	0.269 (0.240)
du_more_than_10hours/week	0.210 (0.199)	0.391* (0.234)	0.374 (0.237)	0.434* (0.244)	0.259 (0.197)	0.433* (0.232)	0.421* (0.236)	0.488** (0.243)
du_female	0.470 (0.352)	0.324 (0.495)	0.444 (0.531)	0.335 (0.536)	0.248 (0.347)	0.185 (0.495)	0.345 (0.530)	0.232 (0.535)
du_below25	0.539** (0.211)	0.347 (0.249)	0.384 (0.255)	0.345 (0.259)	0.630*** (0.210)	0.418* (0.249)	0.452* (0.256)	0.397 (0.260)
du_child	-0.266 (0.232)	-0.259 (0.252)	-0.239 (0.256)	-0.231 (0.263)	-0.175 (0.231)	-0.201 (0.250)	-0.186 (0.254)	-0.190 (0.261)
school years	0.0760*** (0.0212)	0.0683*** (0.0250)	0.0683*** (0.0251)	0.0605** (0.0254)	0.0528*** (0.0205)	0.0415* (0.0239)	0.0413* (0.0240)	0.0351 (0.0242)
du_city	-0.101 (0.178)	-0.00468 (0.202)	0.0185 (0.207)	-0.0556 (0.211)	-0.128 (0.179)	-0.105 (0.202)	-0.0961 (0.208)	-0.169 (0.212)
du_not_working	0.331 (0.244)	0.858** (0.410)	0.846** (0.418)	0.737* (0.426)	0.408* (0.241)	1.042** (0.407)	1.069*** (0.414)	0.905** (0.424)
income		0.0524 (0.0695)	0.0548 (0.0707)	0.0460 (0.0709)		0.0714 (0.0687)	0.0805 (0.0698)	0.0671 (0.0702)
du_peace			0.0292 (0.224)	-0.0488 (0.227)			-0.0435 (0.222)	-0.123 (0.224)
du_freedom			0.397 (0.430)	0.450 (0.462)			0.128 (0.430)	0.246 (0.464)
du_econ			-0.216 (0.484)	-0.0665 (0.488)			-0.427 (0.480)	-0.234 (0.485)
du_job				0.106 (0.245)				0.123 (0.243)
du_labor_course_participation				0.635*** (0.220)				0.708*** (0.217)
Constant cut1	-1.633*** (0.455)	-1.334*** (0.510)	-1.315** (0.520)	-1.257** (0.515)	-1.436*** (0.456)	-1.257** (0.512)	-1.207** (0.520)	-1.159** (0.518)
Constant cut2	-0.353 (0.376)	-0.0238 (0.434)	0.0107 (0.446)	0.0403 (0.449)	-0.261 (0.392)	-0.0760 (0.452)	-0.0128 (0.462)	0.0223 (0.465)
Constant cut3	0.0199 (0.376)	0.338 (0.435)	0.380 (0.449)	0.419 (0.452)	0.0883 (0.392)	0.257 (0.453)	0.327 (0.465)	0.375 (0.468)
Constant cut4	0.739* (0.378)	1.020** (0.439)	1.072** (0.456)	1.119** (0.459)	0.769* (0.394)	0.898** (0.457)	0.983** (0.470)	1.046** (0.475)
Constant cut5	1.298*** (0.385)	1.658*** (0.448)	1.688*** (0.463)	1.786*** (0.469)	1.306*** (0.400)	1.515*** (0.465)	1.581*** (0.477)	1.703*** (0.483)
Constant cut6	1.946*** (0.394)	2.356*** (0.463)	2.387*** (0.476)	2.533*** (0.483)	1.903*** (0.407)	2.166*** (0.475)	2.235*** (0.486)	2.412*** (0.495)
Constant cut7	2.319*** (0.397)	2.588*** (0.467)	2.622*** (0.480)	2.781*** (0.487)	2.236*** (0.410)	2.374*** (0.479)	2.445*** (0.490)	2.636*** (0.498)
Observations	150	117	116	115	150	117	116	115
r ²	0.106	0.126	0.129	0.149	0.0705	0.0909	0.0948	0.122
version	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 5: Participation to labour course

VARIABLES	(1) Participation basic	(2) Participation background	(3) Participation motivations	(4) Participation interaction	(5) Participation basic	(6) Participation background	(7) Participation motivations	(8) Participation interaction
du_refugee	-0.566** (0.233)	-0.564** (0.265)	-0.576** (0.275)	-0.288 (0.300)				
du_refugee					-0.218 (0.227)	-0.361 (0.265)	-0.331 (0.274)	-0.205 (0.288)
du_italy	0.278 (0.279)	0.205 (0.318)	0.173 (0.321)	0.226 (0.331)	0.232 (0.276)	0.214 (0.314)	0.178 (0.317)	0.240 (0.330)
stay_in_italy_months	0.0157 (0.0126)	0.0221 (0.0139)	0.0214 (0.0143)	0.0159 (0.0149)	0.0144 (0.0125)	0.0206 (0.0139)	0.0209 (0.0143)	0.0151 (0.0149)
curriculum	0.139 (0.0895)	0.0963 (0.102)	0.0795 (0.107)	0.0501 (0.110)	0.132 (0.0892)	0.100 (0.103)	0.0769 (0.107)	0.0516 (0.111)
du_female	0.364 (0.416)	-0.111 (0.584)	0.231 (0.632)	-0.0140 (0.649)	0.235 (0.408)	-0.164 (0.572)	0.190 (0.620)	-0.0453 (0.643)
du_below25	0.431* (0.255)	0.0874 (0.293)	0.0897 (0.305)	-0.00800 (0.317)	0.511** (0.249)	0.147 (0.289)	0.158 (0.300)	-0.00924 (0.319)
du_child	-0.0776 (0.280)	-0.216 (0.301)	-0.236 (0.311)	-0.0547 (0.328)	-0.0204 (0.276)	-0.177 (0.298)	-0.190 (0.306)	-0.0381 (0.325)
school years	0.0497* (0.0259)	0.0269 (0.0299)	0.0298 (0.0311)	0.0130 (0.0328)	0.0394 (0.0252)	0.0165 (0.0291)	0.0197 (0.0302)	0.00647 (0.0317)
du_city	0.195 (0.215)	0.278 (0.242)	0.351 (0.249)	0.355 (0.256)	0.169 (0.216)	0.211 (0.243)	0.292 (0.250)	0.314 (0.260)
du_not_working	-0.0930 (0.304)	0.327 (0.469)	0.418 (0.489)	0.161 (0.502)	-0.0142 (0.295)	0.474 (0.460)	0.588 (0.478)	0.228 (0.500)
income		0.101 (0.0856)	0.0853 (0.0877)	0.0664 (0.0907)		0.112 (0.0851)	0.0967 (0.0874)	0.0708 (0.0908)
du_peace			0.332 (0.265)	0.303 (0.272)			0.279 (0.261)	0.272 (0.270)
du_freedom			0.326 (0.537)	0.216 (0.568)			0.187 (0.542)	0.126 (0.576)
du_econ			-0.800 (0.726)	-0.689 (0.733)			-0.890 (0.707)	-0.712 (0.725)
italian_score				0.227*** (0.0782)				0.245*** (0.0743)
Constant	-1.404*** (0.475)	-1.479*** (0.574)	-1.551*** (0.595)	-2.860*** (0.780)	-1.395*** (0.487)	-1.412** (0.584)	-1.506** (0.601)	-2.896*** (0.779)
Observations	159	127	125	124	159	127	125	124
r ²	0.102	0.0930	0.118	0.171	0.0786	0.0771	0.100	0.168

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

7 Final Remarks

In this paper we study the process of self-selections undertaken by asylum seekers hosted in temporary reception center in Italy, in the Province of Parma. In particular, by differentiating migrants on the basis of their countries of origin and of their countries of destination, we identify different groups in the sample population: refugees and illegal migrants, people directed to Europe and people directed outside Europe. Leveraging on the randomness of the sample with regard to both the dimensions mentioned above, we compare these groups to identify their specific characteristics.

We find that refugees are more likely to be Christian, older and poorer than illegal migrants suggesting that they are pushed outside their home country by religious discrimination which also affects their income. In this context older asylum seekers are more likely to be able to afford the migration costs. Moreover, in accordance with previous results in this field of the literature (Aksoy and Poutvaara 2021), refugees are positively self-selected in terms of human capital if compared to illegal migrants.

When asylum seekers are grouped on the basis of their final destination, we find results that support previous evidence. People initially directed to Europe in fact, are more likely to be women and Christians, compared to people directed to outside Europe. This again highlights the role of religious and gender discrimination, in triggering migration. Reaching a European country in fact, should provide asylum seekers the chance to leave in a society where the weight of discrimination is lower and where they can freely pursue their personal realization. The fact that these migrants are more likely to mention the quest of freedom or personal issues among the main reasons to migrate points in the same direction.

The relevance of the distinctions introduced in the population of asylum seekers based on these two dimensions is then tested with respect to integration outcomes. In particular, we consider the proficiency in the Italian language and the effort exerted by migrants for labour market integration.

In both areas, refugees obtain performances which are worse than those of illegal migrants. This is probably the effect of traumatic events occurring to these people that affected their mental and physical health (Warfa et al., 2006), thus impairing their ability to learn as well as their will to exert an integration effort. There is evidence thus that push factors are key in the migration project.

This result has potentially sizable policy implications. Information about the country of origin of asylum seekers is recorded soon after arrival, and can be promptly used to design integration policies which are different for refugees and illegal migrants. While people in the latter group can be quickly directed to activity which promote integration, such as courses of language of the hosting country or training courses, refugees might be initially, included in programs which aim at restoring the psychological well-being of these people or at building specific human capital to favour integration in the host country.

This diversified approach to integration policies can help mitigating the impact of the time spent waiting for a decision on the asylum application. An early classifications of asylum seekers could avoid that people who migrated to Italy primarily for economic reasons suffer the negative effects documented by Hartog and Zorlu (2009), concerning

the integration on the labor market¹⁸, or that migrants fleeing their country of origin to reach any safe destination, are not offered an adequate and prompt psychological support.

References

- [1] Aksoy, C. G., and Poutvaara, P. (2021). Refugees' and irregular migrants' self-selection into Europe. *Journal of Development Economics*, 152, 102681.
- [2] Aksoy, C. G., Poutvaara, P., and Schikora, F. (2023). First time around: Local conditions and multi-dimensional integration of refugees. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 137, 103588.
- [3] Borjas, G. J. (1987), "‘ Self-Selection and the Earnings of Immigrants’", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 77, pages 531-553.
- [4] Brell, C., Dustmann, C., and Preston, I. (2020). The labor market integration of refugee migrants in high-income countries. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 34(1), 94-121.
- [5] Brücker, H., Rother, N., Schupp, J., von Gostomski, C.B., Böhm, A., Fendel, T., Friedrich, M., Giesselmann, M., Kosyakova, Y., Kroh, M. and Kühne, S. (2016). Forced migration, arrival in Germany, and first steps toward integration. *DIW Economic Bulletin*, 6(48), 541-556.
- [6] Chin, A., and Cortes, K. E. (2015), "The Refugee/Asylum Seeker, *Handbook of the Economics of International Migration*, North-Holland, Vol. 1, pages 585-658.
- [7] Chiswick, B. R., and Miller, P. W. (1999), "Language Skills and Earnings among Legalized Aliens", *Journal of Population Economics*, Vol. 12, Issue 1, pages 63-89.
- [8] Cortes, K. E. (2004), "Are Refugees Different from Economic Immigrants? Some Empirical Evidence on the Heterogeneity of Immigrant Groups in the United States", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 86, Issue 2, pages 465-480.
- [9] Echeverría, L., and Molina, J. A. (2023). Food consumption in Argentina: The Deaton-Paxson puzzle beyond mean effects. *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis and Policy*, 23(3), 605-631.
- [10] Fasani, F., Frattini, T., and Minale, L. (2022). (The Struggle for) Refugee integration into the labour market: evidence from Europe. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 22(2), 351-393.
- [11] Gleditsch, N. P., Wallensteen, P., Eriksson, M., Sollenberg, M., and Strand, H. (2002). Armed conflict 1946-2001: A new dataset. *Journal of peace research*, 39(5), 615-637.

¹⁸These authors report a negative effect of this waiting period on the probability of finding a job once obtained a valid permit to stay

- [12] Guichard, L. (2020). Self-selection of asylum seekers: evidence from Germany. *Demography*, 57(3), 1089-1116.
- [13] Hartog, J., and Zorlu, A. (2009), "How important is homeland education for refugees' economic position in The Netherlands?", *Journal of Population Economics*, Vol. 22, Issue 1, pages 219-246.
- [14] IOM (2011), "World Migration Report", International Organization for Migration.
- [15] IOM (2022), "World Migration Report", International Organization for Migration.
- [16] Lange, M., and Pfeifer, F. (2019), "The human capital selection of young males seeking asylum in Germany", *Journal for Labour Market Research*, Vol. 53, Issue 1, pages 1-14.
- [17] Logan, T. D. (2011). Economies of scale in the household: Puzzles and patterns from the American past. *Economic Inquiry*, 49(4), 1008-1028.
- [18] Nelson, J. A. (1988). Household economies of scale in consumption: theory and evidence. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 1301-1314.
- [19] Nikolov, P., and Salarpour Goodarzi, L. (2022) "Skill Downgrading among Refugees and Economic Immigrants in Germany: Evidence from the Syrian Refugee Crisis", mimeo.
- [20] Pettersson, T., Höglbladh, S., and Öberg, M. (2019). Organized violence, 1989–2018 and peace agreements. *Journal of Peace Research*, 56(4), 589-603.
- [21] Roy, A. D. (1951), Some Thoughts on the Distribution of Earnings, *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol. 3, Issue 2, pages 135-146.
- [22] Spitzer, Y., and Zimran, A. (2018). Migrant self-selection: Anthropometric evidence from the mass migration of Italians to the United States, 1907–1925. *Journal of Development Economics*, 134, 226-247.
- [23] Tuki, Daniel. "Violent conflict and hostility towards ethnoreligious outgroups in Nigeria." *Terrorism and Political Violence* (2024): 1-23.
- [24] UNHCR (1951), *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*, Geneva. Available here:<http://www.unhcr.org/3b66c2aa10>. (Accessed 10 April 2023).
- [25] Warfa, N., Bhui, K., Craig, T., Curtis, S., Mohamud, S., Stansfeld, S., ... and Thornicroft, G. (2006). Post-migration geographical mobility, mental health and health service utilisation among Somali refugees in the UK: a qualitative study. *Health and place*, 12(4), 503-515.
- [26] World Bank Group. (2018). *Asylum Seekers in the European Union: Building Evidence to Inform Policy Making*. World Bank.

8 Appendix

8.1 Summary Statistics

Table 6: Comparison between the composition of asylum seekers in Italy in the year 2017, and the composition of the sample of respondents to survey.

Country	Italy, 2017		Sample		Sex	Italy, 2017	Sample
Albania	492	0.38%	0	0.00%	Male	83.82%	93.62 %
Bangladesh	12731	9.78%	11	5.85%	Female	16.18%	6.38%
Colombia	223	0.17%	0	0.00%			
Coté d'Ivoire	8374	6.44%	11	5.85%			
Egypt	829	0.64%	0	0.00%			
El Salvador	1407	1.08%	0	0.00%			
Eritrea	4979	3.83%	1	0.53%			
Gambia	9085	6.98%	20	10.64%			
Georgia	550	0.42%	0	0.00%			
Ghana	5575	4.28%	11	5.85%			
Guinea	7777	5.98%	14	7.45%			
India	519	0.40%	0	0.00%			
Iraq	1661	1.28%	0	0.00%			
Kosovo	631	0.48%	0	0.00%			
Mali	7757	5.96%	9	4.79%			
Morocco	1852	1.42%	0	0.00%			
Nigeria	25964	19.95%	57	30.32%			
Pakistan	13510	10.38%	10	5.32%			
Perù	131	0.10%	0	0.00%			
Senegal	8680	6.67%	16	8.51%			
Somalia	2055	1.58%	2	1.06%			
Sri Lanka	335	0.26%	0	0.00%			
Tunisia	436	0.34%	0	0.00%			
Ukraine	2862	2.20%	0	0.00%			
Venezuela	544	0.42%	0	0.00%			
Other	11160	8.58%	26	13.83%			
Total	130119	100%	188	100%			
Pearson correlation	0.9247						

Table 7: Asylum seeker classification based on their country of origin

Country of origin	nr.	Conflict	Conflict (minor)	Conflict		Conflict (minor)		Irregular		Irregular (minor)	
				nr.	%	nr.	%	nr.	%	nr.	%
Afghanistan	3	yes	yes	3	4.1%	3	2.5%	-	-	-	-
Bangladesh	11	no	yes	-	-	11	9.3%	11	9.6%	-	-
Burkina Faso	1	no	no	-	-	-	-	1	0.9%	1	1.4%
Cameroon	4	no	yes	-	-	4	3.4%	4	3.5%	-	-
Chad	1	no	yes	-	-	1	0.8%	1	0.9%	-	-
Coté d'Ivoire	11	no	no	-	-	-	-	11	9.6%	11	15.7%
Eritrea	1	no	yes	-	-	1	0.8%	1	0.9%	-	-
Ethiopia	1	no	yes	-	-	1	0.8%	1	0.9%	-	-
Gambia	20	no	no	-	-	-	-	20	17.4%	20	28.6%
Ghana	11	no	no	-	-	-	-	11	9.6%	11	15.7%
Guinea	14	no	no	-	-	-	-	14	12.2%	14	20.0%
Guinea Bissau	3	no	no	-	-	-	-	3	2.6%	3	4.3%
Kenya	1	no	yes	-	-	1	0.8%	1	0.9%	-	-
Liberia	1	no	no	-	-	-	-	1	0.9%	1	1.4%
Mali	9	no	yes	-	-	9	7.6%	9	7.8%	-	-
Niger	1	no	yes	-	-	1	0.8%	1	0.9%	-	-
Nigeria	57	yes	yes	57	78.1%	57	48.3%	-	-	-	-
Pakistan	10	yes	yes	10	13.7%	10	8.5%	-	-	-	-
Sierra Leone	3	no	no	-	-	-	-	3	2.6%	3	4.3%
Senegal	16	no	yes	-	-	16	13.6%	16	13.9%	-	-
Somalia	2	yes	yes	2	2.7%	2	1.7%	-	-	-	-
Sudan	1	yes	yes	1	1.4%	1	0.8%	-	-	-	-
Togo	6	no	no	-	-	-	-	6	5.2%	6	8.6%
Total	188			73 (38.8%)	100%	118 (62.8%)	100%	115 (61.2%)	100%	70 (37.2%)	100%

Table 8: Asylum seeker: years of schooling and school degree

Years of schooling		School degree		
Min	0	None	49	26.1%
Max	17	Primary	37	19.7%
Average	7.44	Lower secondary	37	19.7%
Median	8	Upper secondary	39	20.7%
Mode	0	Vocational	2	1.1%
Std. error	4.63	University	7	3.7%
		Master	1	0.5%
Missing	3	Missing	16	8.5%
		Total	188	100%

Table 9: Uses of income and income measurement

Uses of income	yes	no	misssing	total
Basic needs	133	14	41	188
Investment	46	100	42	188
Personal consumption	88	59	41	188
Education	60	87	41	188
Debt	33	114	41	188
Income index	nr.	%		
0	2	1.4%	-	-
1	38	26.0%	-	-
2	24	16.4%	-	-
3	41	19.9%	-	-
4	38	26.0%	-	-
5	7	4.8%	-	-
6	8	5.5%	-	-
Total	146	100%	42	188

- 8.2 Asylum seeker with no specific destination
- 8.3 Combined push and pull factors
- 8.4 Employment outcomes
- 8.5 Survey questionnaire

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI PARMA
DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE ECONOMICHE E AZIENDALI

L'indagine, realizzata dal Dipartimento di Economia dell'Università degli Studi di Parma, è finalizzata ad esplorare e approfondire la conoscenza dei fattori favorevoli all'integrazione dei rifugiati accolti nel sistema dei CAS della Prefettura di Parma.

I dati raccolti con questa indagine potranno contribuire a migliorare le politiche a sostegno della gestione del sistema dei CAS.

Ci piacerebbe chiederLe di contribuire all'indagine rispondendo alle domande del seguente questionario.

Il questionario è completamente anonimo, il trattamento dei dati avviene esclusivamente per fini di ricerca scientifica, sotto la supervisione scientifica della Prof.ssa Nadia Monacelli (nadia.monacelli@unipr.it) e del Prof. Marco Magnani (marco.magnani@unipr.it).

La ricerca verrà realizzata da Nicoletta Del Franco, Laura Maritano, Giuseppina Tomasello, Giancarlo D'Antonio, Maria Ciaramella, borsisti di ricerca presso l'Università degli Studi di Parma.

Nelle pagine successive è riportato il questionario, a cui Le chiediamo di rispondere in tutte le sue parti. Non vi sono risposte giuste o sbagliate. Le chiediamo quindi di rispondere tranquillamente e liberamente poiché ci interessa conoscere le Sue opinioni.

I dati acquisiti saranno inseriti in un programma di elaborazione statistica che non consentirà in alcun modo di risalire alla Sua identità; essi verranno trattati secondo il D.L. 101/2018 sulla privacy, e utilizzati solo ed esclusivamente per scopi di ricerca, senza alcun altro utilizzo. Pertanto, la invitiamo a rispondere il più sinceramente possibile.

La compilazione del questionario richiede in media 90 minuti.

QUESTIONARIO

Num. (inserire iniziali nome e cognome e numero in ordine crescente): _____

Giorno intervista: ___/___/_____ Luogo intervista: _____

SEZIONE A: DATI SOCIO-ANAGRAFICI

A.1	<i>Tu sei</i>		Una donna <input type="checkbox"/> 1	Un Uomo <input type="checkbox"/> 2
A.2	La tua età _ _			
A.3	Qual è il tuo paese d'origine? _____			
A.4	Quale lingua parlavi in famiglia? _____			
A.5	Quale è la lingua ufficiale del tuo paese? _____			
A.6	Conosci altre lingue? 1: _____ 2: _____ 3: _____ 4: _____			
A.7	<i>Tu sei:</i>			
	Single <input type="checkbox"/> 1	Divorziato/separato <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
	Fidanzato/a <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Vedovo/a <input type="checkbox"/> 5		
	Sposato/a <input type="checkbox"/> 3	Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 (specificare) _____		
		Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999		
A.8	Se sposato/fidanzato dove vive attualmente tua moglie/marito/fidanzata/o? _____			
A.9	<i>Tu hai figli?</i>	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
A.9.1	Se sì, quanti figli hai? _ _			
A.9.2	Quanti hanno meno di 18 anni? _ _			
A.9.3	In questo momento in che paese vivono? _____			
A.10	<i>Di che religione sei?</i>			
	Nessuna <input type="checkbox"/> 1	Sciita <input type="checkbox"/> 7		
	Cattolico <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Sunnita <input type="checkbox"/> 8		
	Protestante <input type="checkbox"/> 3	Hindu <input type="checkbox"/> 9		
	Ortodosso <input type="checkbox"/> 4	Sikh <input type="checkbox"/> 10		
	Ebreo <input type="checkbox"/> 5	Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 11 (specificare) _____		
	Animista <input type="checkbox"/> 6	Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999		
A.11	<i>Come descriveresti il posto in cui sei cresciuto?</i>			
	Città <input type="checkbox"/> 1	Campagna <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
	Periferia città <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 (specificare) _____		
	Piccolo paese <input type="checkbox"/> 3	Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999		
A.12	<i>Come era la tua casa?</i>			
	Un appartamento in un palazzo <input type="checkbox"/> 1	Una capanna (fango, paglia etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> 3		
	Una casa in muratura (mattoni, cemento) <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Una stanza in una baraccopoli <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
		Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 (specificare) _____		
		Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999		
A.13	<i>Sei andato a scuola?</i>	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
A.13.1	Se sì, per quanti anni? _ _			

A.14	Titolo di studio:			
	Nessuno <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Licenza Primaria <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Licenza Medie Inferiori <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Licenza Medie Superiori <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Professionali <input type="checkbox"/> 5		Laurea 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Master <input type="checkbox"/> 7 PhD <input type="checkbox"/> 8 Titolo Post-Laurea <input type="checkbox"/> 9 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 10 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
A.15	In che materia/disciplina/professione ti sei formato? O: Quale mestiere hai imparato? _____			
A.16	Con chi vivevi nel tuo paese di origine?			
	Genitori <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Genitori, fratelli e sorelle <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Genitori, fratelli, sorelle e altri parenti <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Moglie/marito <input type="checkbox"/> 4		Moglie/marito e figli <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Moglie/marito, figli e altri parenti <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 7 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
A.17	Di cosa viveva principalmente la tua famiglia?			
	Agricoltura <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Commercio <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Piccolo business <input type="checkbox"/> 3		Lavoro impiegatizio <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
A.18	Prima di partire dal tuo paese d'origine, cosa facevi?			
	Studiavo <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Lavoravo <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Aiutavo nei lavori domestici <input type="checkbox"/> 3		Niente <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
A.19	Se lavoravi, qual era il tuo lavoro nel tuo paese d'origine?			
	Contadino <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Pescatore <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Operaio/Muratore <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Commerciante <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Artigiano <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Professionista (Medico, avvocato, ingegnere) <input type="checkbox"/> 6		Impiegato pubblico <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Impiegato privato <input type="checkbox"/> 7 Poliziotto/Militare <input type="checkbox"/> 8 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 9 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
Cosa riuscivi a fare con il tuo reddito?				
A.20.1	Contribuivo al mantenimento della famiglia nell'acquisto di beni essenziali	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
A.20.2	Contribuivo agli investimenti della famiglia	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
A.20.3	Usavo il mio reddito per i miei consumi personali	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
A.20.4	Finanziavo i miei studi e/o quelli dei miei fratelli/sorelle	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
A.20.5	Risparmiavo	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
A.20.6	Pagavo i debiti	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
A.20.7	Altro: _____	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
A.21	La tua memoria in preparazione all'audizione in commissione territoriale (BOLOGNA) è stata raccolta?	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
A.22	Sei già stato ascoltato dalla commissione territoriale?	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
A.22.1	Se sì, quando? _ _ _ _ _ _ (Mese e anno)			
A.23	Hai avuto la risposta?			
		Sì positiva <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Sì negativa <input type="checkbox"/> 2	No <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999	

A.23.1	Se Sì, quando? _ _ _ _ _ _ (Mese e anno)		
A.24	Se la risposta è stata negativa, in quale situazione ti trovi adesso?		
	Ho fatto appello in Tribunale ma non sono stato convocato <input type="checkbox"/> 1	Ho fatto appello in Tribunale e il mio ricorso ha avuto esito positivo <input type="checkbox"/> 3	
	Ho fatto appello in Tribunale, sono stato convocato e in attesa di giudizio <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Ho fatto appello in tribunale con esito negativo Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
A.25	Se l'esito è stato negativo, hai fatto ricorso in secondo grado?		
	No <input type="checkbox"/> 1	Sì, sono già stato convocato e ho ricevuto risposta positiva <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	Sì, ma non sono ancora stato convocato <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Sì, sono già stato convocato e ho ricevuto risposta negativa Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
	Sì, sono già stato convocato ma non ho ancora il risultato <input type="checkbox"/> 3		

SEZIONE B: VIAGGIO

B.1	Quando hai lasciato il tuo paese di origine (mese e anno)? _ _ _ _ _ _ (Mese e anno)		
B.2	Quando sei arrivato in Italia (mese e anno)? _ _ _ _ _ _ (Mese e anno)		
B.3	Dove? _____		
B.4	Come sei arrivato in Italia?		
	Barcone <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Gommone <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Camion <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Treno <input type="checkbox"/> 4	Bus <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Aereo <input type="checkbox"/> 6 A piedi <input type="checkbox"/> 7 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 8 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
B.5	Quando sei partito quale era la tua meta finale?		
	Un qualsiasi paese in Europa <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Italia <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 3 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
B.6	Quali paesi hai attraversato per arrivare in Italia?		
	1. _____	2. _____	
	3. _____	4. _____	
	4. _____	6. _____	
B.7	Sapevi di essere arrivato in Italia, quando sei arrivato?	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2
B.8	Cosa ti mancava nel tuo paese d'origine?		
	Vivere in pace <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Avere sicurezza e cibo <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Dare sicurezza e cibo a me e alla mia famiglia <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Sentire di essere libero <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Vivere in una condizione economica soddisfacente <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Poter studiare <input type="checkbox"/> 6	Poter fare esperienze importanti per me <input type="checkbox"/> 7 Poter viaggiare e vivere all'estero <input type="checkbox"/> 8 La mia famiglia è qui <input type="checkbox"/> 9 La mia famiglia è in un altro paese fuori dall'Italia <input type="checkbox"/> 10 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 11 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999	

SEZIONE C: ARRIVO IN CASA/CENTRO (PROVINCIA DI PARMA)

C.1	Quando sei arrivato in questa casa/struttura/centro? _ _ _ _ _ _ (Mese e anno)		
C.2	Sei stato in altra/o struttura/centro prima di questa/o?	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2

C.2.1	Se sì, dove? _____					
C.2.2	Per quanto tempo? _ _ (mesi) _ _ (mesi)					
	Quando sei arrivato in casa/struttura/centro:					
C.3	Era presente un mediatore linguistico-culturale al tuo incontro con chi ti ha accolto?		SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2		
C.4	Ti sono stati chiesti documenti di identità e hai firmato per registrarti?					
	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1 NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Non subito Rifiuta di rispondere	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 999			
C.4.1	Se non subito, dopo quanto tempo? _ _ (mesi)					
	Quali delle seguenti informazioni ti sono state date, al tuo arrivo?		No, per niente	Si, ma non ha capito nulla	Si, ma ho capito poco	Si, è stato tutto molto chiaro
C.5.1	Tuoi diritti e doveri e regole base di comportamento in casa/struttura/centro:		1	2	3	4
C.5.2	Servizi primari che ti sarebbero stati offerti (cibo, vestiario, pocket money, etc.):		1	2	3	4
C.5.3	Servizi secondari che ti sarebbero stati offerti (corso di lingua, assistenza sanitaria, etc.):		1	2	3	4
C.5.4	Altro (specificare) _____:		1	2	3	4
C.6	Quando sei arrivato in casa/struttura/centro, hai avuto modo di fare richieste e di esprimere eventuali problemi?					
	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1 NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Non subito Rifiuta di rispondere	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 999			
C.6.1	Se sì, con chi hai potuto parlare?					
	Operatore del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Altro richiedente asilo <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Volontario <input type="checkbox"/> 3	Medico <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Psicologo <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 6 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999				
C.7	La tua presenza viene controllata tutti i giorni?					
	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1 NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Non subito Rifiuta di rispondere	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 999			
C.7.1	Se sì, in che modo?					
	Firma <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Appello <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Badge <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999				



	Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza	Per niente	Poco	Così così	Molto	Totalmente
C.8	Quando sei arrivato in questa casa, ti sei sentito in un luogo sicuro e/o protetto?	1	2	3	4	5
C.9	Nel complesso sei soddisfatto di come sei stato accolto?	1	2	3	4	5

SEZIONE D: LA STRUTTURA

D.1	Quante sono le persone che vivono con te in casa/struttura/centro? _ _ _				
D.2	Attualmente nella/nel casa/struttura/centro in cui sei accolto sono regolarmente erogati i servizi di acqua, gas, elettricità e riscaldamento?				
	Sì No	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Non so Rifiuta di rispondere	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
D.3	Chi fa le pulizie in casa/struttura/centro?				
	Puliamo noi a turno Puliscono gli operatori del centro	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Viene un'impresa di pulizia esterna Altro Rifiuta di rispondere	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 (specificare) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
D.4	Attualmente con quante persone condividi la tua stanza? _ _				
	Chi sono?				
D.5.1	Familiari	Sì <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2		
D.5.2	Stesso sesso	Sì <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2		
D.5.2	Coetanei	Sì <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2		
D.5.4	Connazionali	Sì <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2		
D.5.5	Stessa lingua	Sì <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2		
		No, per niente	Sì, ma non sufficiente	Sì, appena sufficiente	Sì, completamente soddisfacente
D.6	Esiste uno spazio comune, al di là delle vostre stanze, dove passare il tempo con i vostri compagni? (televisione, tempo libero, etc.)?	1	2	3	4
D.7	Dove si trova la/il casa/struttura/centro?				
	Città Piccolo paese	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Lontano da altre case Altro Rifiuta di rispondere	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 (specificare) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
		No, per niente	Più no, che sì	Più sì, che no	Sì, totalmente
D.8	La struttura è ben collegata con i servizi essenziali: negozi, servizi sanitari, scuole?	1	2	3	4



	<i>Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza</i>	Per niente	Poco	Così così	Molto	Totalmente
D.9	In questa casa di solito andate d'accordo fra voi senza bisogno che intervenga l'operatore?	1	2	3	4	5
D.10	Sei in grado di aiutare o dare consigli agli altri se hanno dei problemi tra loro o nella casa?	1	2	3	4	5
D.11	Nel complesso sei contento di vivere in questa casa?	1	2	3	4	5

SERVIZI PRIMARI

SEZIONE E: BENI E SERVIZI DI PRIMA NECESSITA'

	In questa/o casa/struttura/centro, quale di queste cose ti vengono date?	No, per niente	Sì, ma non sufficiente	Sì, appena sufficiente	Sì, completamente soddisfacente
E.1.1	Vestituario invernale	1	2	3	4

E.1.2	Vestiaro estivo	1	2	3	4
E.1.3	Lenzuola, cuscino, coperte	1	2	3	4
E.1.4	Cibo	1	2	3	4
E.1.5	Kit igienico personale	1	2	3	4
E.1.6	Tessera telefonica	1	2	3	4
E.1.7	Pocket money (mensile)	1	2	3	4
E.2	Se si la tessera telefonica, di quanto viene caricata al mese? _ _ _ euro				
E.3	Se si il pocket money, quanto viene erogato al mese? _ _ _ euro				
Come spendi il pocket money?					
E.4.1	Tempo libero	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1		NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
E.4.2	Invio familiari	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1		NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
E.4.3	Acquisto di beni di prima necessità (cibo, farmaci...)	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1		NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
E.4.5	Acquisto di beni di seconda necessità (vestiti, cura personale...)	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1		NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
E.4.6	Lo conservo	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1		NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
E.4.7	Altro (specificare) _____	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1		NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
E.5	Come prepari i pasti qui?				
	Cucino io <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Cucino insieme ad altri <input type="checkbox"/> 2 C'è un servizio mensa <input type="checkbox"/> 3	C'è un cuoco <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999			
	Quali di questi servizi sono presenti nella struttura?	No, per niente	Si, ma non sufficiente	Si, appena sufficiente	Si, completamente soddisfacente
E.6.1	Connessione internet	1	2	3	4
E.6.2	Servizio lavanderia/lavatrice	1	2	3	4



	Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza	Per niente	Poco	Così così	Molto	Totalmente
E.7	Sei in grado di utilizzare la cucina e tenere bene la casa, senza l'aiuto degli operatori?	1	2	3	4	5
E.8	Pensi che quando uscirai dal centro sarai in grado di utilizzare una cucina e di tenere bene la tua casa?	1	2	3	4	5
E.9	I pasti e i vestiti forniti rispettano le tue abitudini e la tua religione?	1	2	3	4	5
E.10	Sei nel complesso contento di quanto ti viene offerto qui?	1	2	3	4	5

SEZIONE F: ASSISTENZA MEDICA

F.1	Quando sei arrivato nella casa/struttura/centro hai visto un medico (apertura cartella sanitaria, visita medica, esami generali)?				
	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1 NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Non subito Rifiuta di rispondere	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 999		
F.1.2	Se non subito, dopo quanto tempo? _ _ (specificare giorni o mesi) _____				

F.2	Da quando sei arrivato nel centro hai mai avuto bisogno di assistenza medica?			
	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1 NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2		Non so <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999	
F.2.1	Se si, a chi ti sei rivolto?			
	Responsabile del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Operatore del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Medico <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Volontario <input type="checkbox"/> 4	Altro richiedente nel centro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Connazionale fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Amico fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> 7 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 8 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999		
F.2.2	Dove sei stato mandato?			
	Spazio salute immigrati <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Medico generico <input type="checkbox"/> 2		Ospedale <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 4 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999	



	<i>Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza</i>	<i>Per niente</i>	<i>Poco</i>	<i>Così così</i>	<i>Molto</i>	<i>Totalmente</i>
F.3	Pensi che una volta uscito dal centro saresti in grado di rivolgerti al medico o ai servizi sanitari, in caso di bisogno?	1	2	3	4	5
F.4	Sei in grado di aiutare gli altri quando hanno bisogno di informazioni o consigli rispetto ai servizi sanitari?	1	2	3	4	5
F.5	Quando sei dal medico ti senti rispettato nelle tue abitudini e nella tua religione?	1	2	3	4	5
F.6	Nel complesso sei soddisfatto di come sei stato/sei curato?	1	2	3	4	5

SERVIZI SECONDARI

SEZIONE G: ASSISTENZA LEGALE, PREPARAZIONE DELLA MEMORIA PERSONALE E AUDIZIONE

		<i>No, per niente</i>	<i>Sì, ma non ha capito nulla</i>	<i>Sì, ma ho capito poco</i>	<i>Sì, è stato tutto molto chiaro</i>
G.1	Ti hanno spiegato i principali diritti e doveri della legge italiana?	1	2	3	4
G.2	Ti hanno dato informazioni sul tuo status di richiedente asilo (cosa significa, percorso giuridico)?	1	2	3	4
G.3	Quanto tempo dopo il tuo arrivo hai ricevuto queste informazioni? _ _ (specificare giorni o mesi) _____				
G.4	Quale è stata la tua principale fonte di informazione?				
	Responsabile del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Operatore del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Ho fatto ricerche da solo <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Volontario <input type="checkbox"/> 4	Altro richiedente nel centro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Connazionale fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Amico fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> 7 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 8 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999			



	<i>Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza</i>	<i>Per niente</i>	<i>Poco</i>	<i>Così così</i>	<i>Molto</i>	<i>Totalmente</i>
G.5	<i>Hai capito la procedura per l'ottenimento della protezione/visto/permesso di soggiorno?</i>	1	2	3	4	5
G.6	<i>Hai capito quali possono essere le conseguenze se la protezione ti venisse negata?</i>	1	2	3	4	5
G.7	<i>Una volta uscito dal centro, in caso di bisogno, ti sentiresti in grado di rivolgerti a un'associazione esperta di cose legali/avvocato?</i>	1	2	3	4	5
G.8	<i>Quando hai preparato la memoria e hai parlato con un avvocato, ti sei sentito protetto e sicuro?</i>	1	2	3	4	5
G.9	<i>Sei soddisfatto di come sei stato assistito nel preparare la memoria personale e l'audizione dinanzi alla commissione territoriale (ed eventualmente gli altri passi legali)?</i>	1	2	3	4	5

SEZIONE H: LINGUA ITALIANA

H.1	Stai studiando/hai studiato la lingua italiana?				
	Sì, ho frequentato un corso <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Sì, sto frequentando un corso <input type="checkbox"/> 2	No, per niente <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999			
	Se stai studiando o hai studiato l'italiano:				
H.2.1	Dove?				
	CPIA <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Nel centro <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Associazioni di volontariato del territorio Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 4 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999			
H.2.2	Quante ore alla settimana/Per quanto tempo? _ _ (specificare ore o mesi) _____				
		No, per niente	Più no, che sì	Più sì, che no	Sì, totalmente/ sempre
H.2.3	Ti viene fornito/è stato fornito gratuitamente materiale di studio (libri, fotocopie etc.)?				4
H.2.4	L'insegnante prende/prendeva nota delle presenze?				4
H.3	Quale livello hai raggiunto? _____				
H.4	Quali sono le difficoltà che incontri nello studio?				
	Nessuna <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Fatica di concentrazione (se necessario, specificare) <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Ho poco interesse perché penso che non mi servirà <input type="checkbox"/> 3	Fatica perché non so leggere e scrivere Non riesco a partecipare regolarmente alle lezioni (se necessario, specificare) <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 6 (specificare) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 999			
H.5	Con chi parli la lingua italiana al di fuori delle ore di lezione?				
	Responsabile del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Operatore del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Volontario <input type="checkbox"/> 3	Altro richiedente nel centro <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Amico fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 6 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999			



	Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza	Per niente	Poco	Così così	Molto	Totalmente
H.6	Capisci quando qualcuno ti parla in italiano?	1	2	3	4	5
H.7	Riesci a farti capire quando parli in italiano?	1	2	3	4	5
H.8	Sei contento quando riesci a parlare in italiano, in classe o fuori?	1	2	3	4	5
H.9	Sei soddisfatto del corso di italiano e delle opportunità che hai di impararlo?	1	2	3	4	5

SEZIONE I: SOSTEGNO PSICOSOCIALE

I.1	Hai mai avuto la possibilità di parlare con qualcuno di te, della tua storia, delle tue difficoltà?				
	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1 NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Non so <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999			
I.1.1	Se sì, con chi?				
	Responsabile del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Operatore del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Psicologo <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Volontario <input type="checkbox"/> 4	Altro richiedente nel centro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Connazionale fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Amico fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> 7 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 8 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999			
	Se hai parlato con uno psicologo:				
I.2.1	Dove vi siete incontrati?				
	Nel centro <input type="checkbox"/> 1	In un luogo esterno (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999			
I.2.2	Per quanto tempo? _ _ (specificare giorni o mesi) _____				
		No, per niente	Più no, che sì	Più sì, che no	Sì, totalmente
I.2.3	Pensi che ti sia stato utile? Ti ha aiutato a stare meglio?	1	2	3	4



	Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza	Per niente	Poco	Così così	Molto	Totalmente
I.3	Sei hai bisogno di aiuto o hai problemi personali, riesci a rivolgerti a qualcuno nel centro o al di fuori?	1	2	3	4	5
I.4	Ti sei sentito ascoltato e capito quando ti sei rivolto a qualcuno per parlare dei tuoi problemi?	1	2	3	4	5
I.5	Nel complesso sei soddisfatto dell'aiuto ricevuto, quando hai avuto bisogno di parlare con qualcuno dei tuoi problemi?	1	2	3	4	5

SEZIONE J: LAVORO

		No, per niente	Più no, che sì	Più sì, che no	Sì, totalmente
J.1	Hai imparato a scrivere un curriculum vitae?	1	2	3	4

J.2 Qualcuno ti ha aiutato a scriverlo?			
Responsabile del centro	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Altro richiedente nel centro	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Operatore del centro	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Connazionale fuori dal centro	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
Ho fatto da solo	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Amico fuori dal centro	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
Volontario	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	Altro	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 (specificare) _____
		Rifiuta di rispondere	<input type="checkbox"/> 999
Quali di queste strutture del territorio per trovare lavoro conosci?			
J.3.1	Centro per l'impiego	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2
J.3.2	Agenzie interinali	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2

J.3.3	Informagiovani	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2
J.3.4	Altro (specificare): _____	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2
J.4 Stai frequentando o hai frequentato un corso di formazione professionale?			
	Sì, ho frequentato e terminato un corso	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Sì, sto frequentando un corso
	Sì, ho frequentato ma non ho terminato un corso	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	No, per niente
			Rifiuta di rispondere
			<input type="checkbox"/> 3
			<input type="checkbox"/> 4
			<input type="checkbox"/> 999
J.4.1	Se sì, dove? _____		
J.4.2	Quante ore alla settimana/Per quanto tempo? _ _ (specificare ore o mesi) _____		
		No, per niente	Più no, che sì
		Più sì, che no	Sì, totalmente
J.4.3	Il corso di formazione che hai frequentato/stai frequentando è in linea con la tua formazione/il lavoro che facevi prima di arrivare qui?	1	2
		3	4
J.4.5	Perchè hai scelto questo corso?		
	Suggerito dall'operatore del centro	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Mi hanno detto che avrei trovato facilmente lavoro
	Mi interessa	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Altro
	E' in linea con le mie competenze	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Rifiuta di rispondere
	Era l'unico disponibile	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
			<input type="checkbox"/> 6 (specificare) _____
			<input type="checkbox"/> 999
J.5	Attualmente stai lavorando?		
	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1	Rifiuta di rispondere	<input type="checkbox"/> 999
	NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2		
J.5.1	Se sì, quante ore a settimana? _ _		
J.5.2	Sapresti dire che tipo di contratto hai?		
	A tempo indeterminato	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Tirocinio formativo
	A tempo determinato	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Senza regolare contratto
	Occasionale	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Altro
			Rifiuta di rispondere
			<input type="checkbox"/> 4
			<input type="checkbox"/> 5
			<input type="checkbox"/> 6 (specificare) _____
			<input type="checkbox"/> 999
		No, per niente	Più no, che sì
		Più sì, che no	Sì, totalmente
J.5.3	Il lavoro che fai è in linea con la tua formazione/il lavoro che facevi prima di arrivare qui?	1	2
		3	4
J.5.5	Perchè hai scelto questo lavoro?		
	Avevo già esperienze/competenze in questo ambito	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Mi piace ed ero interessato a fare questo
	Ho sentito dire che era facile trovare lavoro	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	E' successo per caso
	Ho sentito dire che si guadagnava bene	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Altri hanno scelto per me
			Altro
			Rifiuta di rispondere
			<input type="checkbox"/> 4
			<input type="checkbox"/> 5
			<input type="checkbox"/> 6
			<input type="checkbox"/> 7 (specificare) _____
			<input type="checkbox"/> 999

J.5.4	Chi ti ha aiutato a trovare e scegliere lavoro?			
	Responsabile del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Operatore del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Ho fatto ricerche da solo <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Volontario <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Altro richiedente nel centro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Connazionale fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> 6	Amico fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> 7 Centro per l'impiego <input type="checkbox"/> 8 Agenzia interinale <input type="checkbox"/> 9 Tramite il corso di formazione <input type="checkbox"/> 10 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 11 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999		



	<i>Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza</i>	<i>Per niente</i>	<i>Poco</i>	<i>Così così</i>	<i>Molto</i>	<i>Totalmente</i>
J.6	Saresti in grado di aiutare e dare consigli agli altri richiedenti nella ricerca di un lavoro?	1	2	3	4	5
J.7	Sei contento del percorso lavorativo e formativo che stai costruendo qui?	1	2	3	4	5
J.8	Sei soddisfatto dell'aiuto ricevuto dal centro nel cercare lavoro?	1	2	3	4	5

SEZIONE K: MEDIAZIONE CULTURALE

		<i>No, per niente</i>	<i>Più no, che sì</i>	<i>Più sì, che no</i>	<i>Sì, sempre</i>
K.1	Ti è mai stato fornito un servizio di traduzione linguistica?	1	2	3	4
K.1.1	Se sì, in quali occasioni questo servizio è attivato/puoi parlare la tua lingua?				
	Ogni volta che lo richiedo io <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Quando devo comunicare con gli operatori del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Quando devo comunicare con operatori esterni (medico, avvocato, psicologo...) <input type="checkbox"/> 3	Quando devo comunicare con gli altri richiedenti asilo Quando devo comunicare con istituzioni e autorità italiane Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 6 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5		



	<i>Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza</i>	<i>Per niente</i>	<i>Poco</i>	<i>Così così</i>	<i>Molto</i>	<i>Totalmente</i>
K.2	Quando gli altri hanno problemi con la lingua, gli consigli di chiedere aiuto ad un mediatore?	1	2	3	4	5
K.3	Con la presenza di un mediatore ti senti più compreso nelle tue abitudini e nella tua cultura?	1	2	3	4	5
K.4	Nel complesso, sei soddisfatto del servizio di mediazione/traduzione attivato?	1	2	3	4	5

SEZIONE L: ORIENTAMENTO AL TERRITORIO E TEMPO LIBERO

	Ti sono state date le seguenti informazioni sul territorio in cui vivi?	
L.1.1	Associazioni presenti	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1 NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2
L.1.2	Centri sportivi	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1 NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2
L.1.3	Teatri, cinema	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1 NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2
L.1.4	Attività di volontariato	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1 NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2
L.1.5	Corsi da frequentare (teatro, artigianato...)	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1 NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2

L.1.6	Comunità religiose	SI <input type="checkbox"/> ₁	NO <input type="checkbox"/> ₂		
L.1.7	Luoghi di aggregazione (bar, centri, piazze...)	SI <input type="checkbox"/> ₁	NO <input type="checkbox"/> ₂		
L.1.8	Negozi e attività commerciali principali	SI <input type="checkbox"/> ₁	NO <input type="checkbox"/> ₂		
L.1.9	Altro: _____	SI <input type="checkbox"/> ₁	NO <input type="checkbox"/> ₂		
		No, per niente	Più no, che si	Più sì, che no	Sì, totalmente
L.2	Sei mai stato accompagnato o aiutato nel conoscere il territorio/la città in cui vivi e i suoi servizi?	1	2	3	4
L.3	Chi ti ha dato informazioni e aiutato a conoscere il territorio/la città in cui ora vivi?				
	Responsabile del centro <input type="checkbox"/> ₁ Operatore del centro <input type="checkbox"/> ₂ Ho fatto da solo <input type="checkbox"/> ₃ Volontario <input type="checkbox"/> ₄	Altro richiedente nel centro <input type="checkbox"/> ₅ Connazionale fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> ₆ Amico fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> ₇ Altro <input type="checkbox"/> ₈ (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> ₉₉₉			
L.4	Cosa fai nel tuo tempo libero? (pensa alle cose che fai più frequentemente)				
	Sport <input type="checkbox"/> ₁ Comunità religiosa/prego <input type="checkbox"/> ₂ TV o radio <input type="checkbox"/> ₃ Social media/internet <input type="checkbox"/> ₄ Leggo <input type="checkbox"/> ₅ Studio italiano <input type="checkbox"/> ₆ Esco con gli altri richiedenti <input type="checkbox"/> ₇	Mi vedo con altre persone fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> ₈ Vado a cinema/teatro <input type="checkbox"/> ₉ Frequento corsi artistici <input type="checkbox"/> ₁₀ Frequento laboratori di attività manuali <input type="checkbox"/> ₁₁ Volontariato <input type="checkbox"/> ₁₂ Altro <input type="checkbox"/> ₁₃ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> ₁₄ (specificare) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> ₉₉₉			
L.5	Come ti sposti per raggiungere i luoghi che frequenti al di fuori del centro?				
	Autobus <input type="checkbox"/> ₁ Bici <input type="checkbox"/> ₂ Mi accompagnano in auto <input type="checkbox"/> ₃ Guido un'auto <input type="checkbox"/> ₄	Treno <input type="checkbox"/> ₅ A piedi <input type="checkbox"/> ₆ Altro <input type="checkbox"/> ₇ (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> ₉₉₉			
		No, per niente	Più no, che si	Più sì, che no	Sì, totalmente
L.6	Riesci facilmente a raggiungere i luoghi che di solito frequenti, dove trascorri il tuo tempo libero?	1	2	3	4
		No, per niente	Sì, ma non ha capito nulla	Sì, ma ho capito poco	Sì, è stato tutto molto chiaro
L.7	Ti sono state date informazioni su come avere accesso a una casa in futuro?	1	2	3	4
L.8	Secondo te, com'è l'atteggiamento della popolazione locale nei confronti tuoi e degli altri richiedenti asilo?				
	Negativo <input type="checkbox"/> ₁ Né positivo, né negativo <input type="checkbox"/> ₂	Positivo <input type="checkbox"/> ₃ Altro <input type="checkbox"/> ₄ (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> ₉₉₉			



	Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza	Per niente	Poco	Così così	Molto	Totalmente
L.9	Nel tuo tempo libero riesci a fare quello che ti piace o che desideri?	1	2	3	4	5
L.10	Conosci connazionali con cui passare del tempo?	1	2	3	4	5
L.11	Conosci italiani con cui passare del tempo?	1	2	3	4	5
L.12	Conosci altri stranieri con cui passare del tempo?	1	2	3	4	5
L.13	Sei in grado di aiutare e dare consigli agli altri su servizi/opportunità della città e come raggiungerli?	1	2	3	4	5
L.14	Sei soddisfatto di luoghi d'incontro, attività ricreative e sportive presenti nel territorio in cui ora vivi?	1	2	3	4	5

SEZIONE M: RAPPORTO CON GLI OPERATORI



	Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza	Per niente	Poco	Così così	Molto	Totalmente
M.1	Ti sembra che gli operatori ti dedichino abbastanza tempo?	1	2	3	4	5
M.2	Riesci ad esporre come vorresti i tuoi problemi e le tue richieste agli operatori?	1	2	3	4	5
M.3	Quando hai dei problemi/difficoltà con gli operatori, riesci a risolverli?	1	2	3	4	5
M.4	Ti senti ascoltato e capito dagli operatori?	1	2	3	4	5
M.5	Quando sei con gli operatori, ti senti rispettato nelle tue abitudini e nella tua religione?	1	2	3	4	5
M.6	Nel complesso, sei soddisfatto del rapporto con gli operatori all'interno del centro?	1	2	3	4	5

SEZIONE N: PROGETTO INDIVIDUALIZZATO

		No, per niente	Più no, che sì	Più sì, che no	Sì, totalmente
N.1	Ti è mai stato chiesto di partecipare a incontri dove parlare di te, di come organizzare la tua vita qui, delle tue scelte e necessità (corsi di formazione, lavoro, famiglia, etc.)?	1	2	3	4
N.2	All'interno della casa/struttura/centro, esiste una persona a cui tu ti possa rivolgere per parlare di te, dei tuoi bisogni, desideri, problemi o decisioni da prendere sul tuo progetto di accoglienza (salute, questioni legali, psicologo, corso di lingua, corso di formazione, ricerca del lavoro, tempo libero)?	SI <input type="checkbox"/> 1 NO <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Non so <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999			
		No, per niente	Più no, che sì	Più sì, che no	Sì, totalmente
N.2.1	Se sì, pensi sia utile avere una persona di riferimento per poter discutere del tuo progetto di accoglienza?	1	2	3	4
N.3	Qual è la prima persona all'interno del centro o al di fuori del centro con cui preferisci condividere momenti di felicità, ansie, paure, preoccupazioni o con cui parli se devi prendere una decisione importante per la tua vita?	Responsabile del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Operatore del centro <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Nessuno, conto su di me <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Volontario <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Altro richiedente nel centro <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Connazionale fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Amico fuori dal centro <input type="checkbox"/> 7 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 8 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999			



	Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza	Per niente	Poco	Così così	Molto	Totalmente
N.4	Pensi che se volessi, potresti cambiare alcune cose del tuo progetto nel centro?	1	2	3	4	5
N.5	Se pensi alle tue aspettative, sei soddisfatto delle tue scelte e del tuo progetto in questo centro?	1	2	3	4	5
N.6	Nel complesso sei soddisfatto di come viene costruito il tuo progetto di accoglienza?	1	2	3	4	5

SEZIONE O: PIANI FUTURI

		No, per niente	Sì, ma non ha capito nulla	Sì, ma ho capito poco	Sì, è stato tutto molto chiaro
O.1	<i>Ti è stato spiegato, una volta uscito da questa casa/struttura/centro, quali forme di sostegno istituzionale e legale potrai ricevere?</i>	1	2	3	4
O.2	<i>Quali sono i tuoi piani per il futuro?</i>				
	Rimanere in Italia <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Tornare a casa <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Spostarsi in un altro paese <input type="checkbox"/> 3	Far venire la mia famiglia qui <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Non so <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999			
O.2.1	<i>Se si vuole spostare in altro paese (3), in quale nazione pensi o hai pianificato di andare dopo l'Italia?</i>				

	<i>Se vuole tornare a casa (2) o spostarsi in altro paese (3), per quale motivo?</i>				
O.2.3	Familiari vivono lì <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Amici vivono lì <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Molti connazionali vivono lì <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Conosco la lingua <input type="checkbox"/> 4	Migliori condizioni economiche e sociali <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Ho la prospettiva di un lavoro <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Altro <input type="checkbox"/> 7 (specificare) _____ Rifiuta di rispondere <input type="checkbox"/> 999			

SEZIONE P: SODDISFAZIONE E BENESSERE GENERALE



	<i>Indica per ciascuna domanda il grado che meglio rappresenta la tua esperienza</i>	Per niente	Poco	Così così	Molto	Totalmente
P.1	<i>Nel complesso sei contento dell'accoglienza avuta in Italia?</i>	1	2	3	4	5
P.2	<i>Nel complesso sei soddisfatto di come sei accolto in questa casa/struttura/centro?</i>	1	2	3	4	5

Ci sono altre cose di cui non abbiamo parlato, che ti interessa dirci a proposito della tua esperienza?

SEZIONE Q: COMMENTI DELL'INTERVISTATORE

Compilare la seguente sezione quando ancora le impressioni sull'intervistato sono recenti, prima di archiviare il questionario o di procedere alla prossima intervista.

Q.1 Quanti minuti è durata l'intervista? [] [] [] []

Q.2 Esprima la sua opinione sull'attendibilità delle risposte dell'intervistato:

1. Molto affidabile 2. Nel complesso affidabile 3. Nel complesso inaffidabile 4. Molto inaffidabile

Q.3 Ci sono state delle domande che non hanno ricevuto risposta? Elencare e spiegarne la ragione (es. l'intervistato ha rifiutato di rispondere, non ha compreso la domanda, l'intervistato non è stato disponibile per l'intera intervista o parte di essa)

Q.4 Ci sono risposte che non compaiono tra le scelte nel questionario e che sono state suggerite dall'intervistato? Se sì, per quali domande? Quale risposte sono state suggerite?

Q.5 Per favore, menzioni altri eventi o fattori che hanno influenzato la somministrazione del questionario e potrebbero avere influenzato la qualità dei dati raccolti (per esempio la presenza di altre persone, interruzioni, ecc).

Table 10: Asylum seeker destination countries

Destination country		nr.	%	sub.%
Europe		65	34.9%	-
	Italy	40	21.5%	61.5%
	Other Europe	25	13.4%	38.5%
Extra Europe		57	30.6%	-
	Lybia	31	16.7%	54.4%
	Other	26	14.0%	45.6%
None		64	34.4%	-
All destinations		186	100%	-
Missing		2		
Total		188		

Table 11: Asylum seeker migration motives

Migration motive	yes	% yes (on respondents)	no	Missing	Total
Peace	68	37.4%	114	6	188
Safety and food for myself	23	12.6%	159	6	188
Safety and food for me and my family	27	14.8%	155	6	188
Freedom	5	2.7%	177	6	188
Better economic conditions	11	6.0%	171	6	188
Personal safety	39	21.4%	143	6	188
Other	9	4.9%	173	6	188
Total respondents	182	-	-	6	188

Table 12: Asylum seeker with no specific destination

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	None basic	None income	None motivations
du_female	-0.724 (0.470)		
du_below25	0.0554 (0.230)	0.0772 (0.266)	0.0238 (0.272)
du_child	0.351 (0.251)	0.375 (0.265)	0.328 (0.268)
du_Christian	-0.0350 (0.215)	-0.194 (0.242)	-0.211 (0.244)
school years	-0.00585 (0.0237)	0.0103 (0.0269)	0.00701 (0.0271)
du_city	0.0864 (0.199)	-0.00400 (0.228)	0.0207 (0.231)
du_not_working	0.287 (0.268)	-0.258 (0.435)	-0.206 (0.451)
income		0.0136 (0.0765)	0.0125 (0.0776)
du_peace			-0.136 (0.244)
du_econ			-0.214 (0.522)
du_freedom			0.0432 (0.475)
Constant	-0.525* (0.275)	-0.662* (0.346)	-0.531 (0.367)
Observations	180	144	141
r^2	0.0220	0.0185	0.0192

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 13: Push-Pull factors - Europe: refugees and illegal migrants

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Basic Refugee Europe	Income Refugee Europe	Motivations Refugee Europe	Basic Illegal migrants Europe	Income Illegal migrants Europe	Motivations Illegal migrants Europe
du_female	0.614 (0.423)	0.500 (0.554)	0.907 (0.607)	0.432 (0.465)	1.021* (0.596)	0.893 (0.618)
du_below25	-0.230 (0.287)	-0.362 (0.345)	-0.377 (0.366)	0.309 (0.282)	0.412 (0.335)	0.611* (0.370)
du_child	0.138 (0.296)	0.126 (0.322)	0.209 (0.342)	0.265 (0.306)	0.313 (0.338)	0.481 (0.358)
du_Christian	1.170*** (0.270)	1.319*** (0.319)	1.458*** (0.355)	-0.532* (0.283)	-0.322 (0.320)	-0.338 (0.335)
school years	0.0264 (0.0318)	0.0335 (0.0365)	0.0208 (0.0389)	-0.0312 (0.0283)	-0.0649* (0.0341)	-0.0503 (0.0350)
du_city	-0.367 (0.257)	-0.351 (0.293)	-0.241 (0.307)	-0.0178 (0.238)	-0.0196 (0.277)	-0.0385 (0.291)
du_not_working	0.108 (0.339)	0.0587 (0.542)	-0.101 (0.605)	0.151 (0.313)	0.953** (0.447)	0.756 (0.497)
income		-0.0398 (0.101)	-0.0450 (0.110)		0.136 (0.0944)	0.123 (0.0976)
du_peace			0.390 (0.335)			0.370 (0.305)
du_freedom			1.279** (0.542)			-0.0423 (0.649)
du_econ			-0.641 (0.766)			0.732 (0.584)
Constant	-1.608*** (0.370)	-1.606*** (0.469)	-1.905*** (0.525)	-0.880*** (0.337)	-1.246*** (0.426)	-1.655*** (0.498)
Observations	180	144	141	180	144	141
r ²	0.220	0.244	0.293	0.0703	0.137	0.149

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 14: Push-Pull factors - Extra Europe: refugees and illegal migrants

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Basic Refugee extra Europe	Motivations Refugee extra Europe	Income Refugee extra Europe	Basic Illegal migrants extra Europe	Motivations Illegal migrants extra Europe	Income Illegal migrants extra Europe
du_female	-0.0142 (0.701)	-0.115 (0.796)	-0.299 (0.909)			
du_below25	-0.914*** (0.324)	-0.712* (0.364)	-0.744** (0.375)	0.397 (0.277)	0.230 (0.314)	0.242 (0.330)
du_child	-1.003** (0.397)	-0.880** (0.410)	-0.835** (0.412)	-0.141 (0.313)	-0.176 (0.332)	-0.172 (0.344)
du_Christian	0.522* (0.306)	0.739** (0.346)	0.711** (0.353)	-1.124*** (0.290)	-1.383*** (0.357)	-1.351*** (0.361)
school years	-0.0108 (0.0338)	0.00615 (0.0370)	0.00465 (0.0368)	0.0306 (0.0284)	0.0155 (0.0322)	0.00913 (0.0327)
du_city	0.660** (0.304)	0.766** (0.336)	0.752** (0.345)	-0.153 (0.229)	-0.163 (0.262)	-0.231 (0.268)
du_not_working				-0.329 (0.318)	-0.177 (0.452)	-0.0877 (0.480)
income		-0.244** (0.122)	-0.267** (0.124)		0.0157 (0.0888)	0.0245 (0.0909)
du_peace			0.251 (0.351)			-0.303 (0.288)
du_freedom						-0.351 (0.566)
du_econ			0.498 (0.676)			
Constant	-1.255*** (0.410)	-0.965* (0.509)	-0.978* (0.539)	-0.764** (0.333)	-0.532 (0.421)	-0.383 (0.464)
Observations	180	144	141	180	144	141
r ²	0.188	0.240	0.254	0.131	0.165	0.181

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 15: Employment

VARIABLES	(1) Employment basic	(2) Employment background	(3) Employment motivations	(4) Employment interaction	(5) Employment basic	(6) Employment background	(7) Employment motivations	(8) Employment interaction
du_refugee	-0.155 (0.253)	-0.245 (0.284)	-0.246 (0.290)	-0.156 (0.318)				
du_refugee_mild					0.300 (0.258)	0.120 (0.287)	0.119 (0.295)	0.153 (0.301)
du_italy	0.110 (0.298)	-0.0992 (0.323)	-0.0941 (0.322)	-0.0843 (0.324)	0.0252 (0.304)	-0.154 (0.329)	-0.149 (0.329)	-0.123 (0.330)
curriculum	0.0959 (0.0999)	0.145 (0.110)	0.132 (0.113)	0.121 (0.114)	0.0786 (0.100)	0.125 (0.110)	0.111 (0.113)	0.0995 (0.114)
du_laborcourse_end	0.558** (0.246)	0.385 (0.270)	0.314 (0.280)	0.254 (0.285)	0.595** (0.247)	0.429 (0.269)	0.346 (0.279)	0.263 (0.286)
du_female	-0.882 (0.593)				-0.968 (0.597)			
du_below25	0.266 (0.291)	0.148 (0.324)	0.131 (0.329)	0.118 (0.330)	0.363 (0.291)	0.244 (0.319)	0.227 (0.325)	0.187 (0.329)
du_child	0.413 (0.299)	0.318 (0.311)	0.312 (0.315)	0.378 (0.324)	0.465 (0.299)	0.365 (0.311)	0.353 (0.314)	0.421 (0.322)
school years	0.00868 (0.0295)	-0.0230 (0.0333)	-0.0165 (0.0339)	-0.0190 (0.0345)	0.00240 (0.0292)	-0.0293 (0.0325)	-0.0225 (0.0331)	-0.0240 (0.0334)
du_city	-0.343 (0.238)	-0.196 (0.259)	-0.143 (0.264)	-0.137 (0.266)	-0.287 (0.242)	-0.188 (0.262)	-0.131 (0.267)	-0.121 (0.269)
du_not_working	-0.279 (0.347)	0.848* (0.483)	0.863* (0.492)	0.797 (0.495)	-0.265 (0.351)	0.866* (0.483)	0.885* (0.492)	0.772 (0.499)
income		0.0586 (0.0882)	0.0490 (0.0893)	0.0378 (0.0907)		0.0626 (0.0876)	0.0537 (0.0886)	0.0346 (0.0909)
du_peace			0.0703 (0.276)	0.0606 (0.276)			0.0481 (0.274)	0.0495 (0.275)
du_freedom			0.0349 (0.563)	-0.00494 (0.567)			0.0621 (0.575)	0.0265 (0.577)
du_econ			-0.178 (0.662)	-0.191 (0.665)			-0.301 (0.653)	-0.278 (0.660)
italian_score				0.0675 (0.0821)				0.0894 (0.0760)
Constant	-1.520*** (0.526)	-1.769*** (0.595)	-1.762*** (0.604)	-2.150*** (0.787)	-1.774*** (0.555)	-1.886*** (0.613)	-1.873*** (0.618)	-2.385*** (0.781)
Observations	159	127	125	124	159	127	125	124
r^2	0.0893	0.0952	0.0879	0.0917	0.0948	0.0914	0.0841	0.0918

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1