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# Sample surveys

## Sample survey overview

### Topics for migration studies

Over the past few decades surveying social phenomena through samples of selected respondents has continually increased and evolved in terms of methods and modalities of investigation. This has been particularly true of international migration, first in developed countries and later in developing countries, given the increase and diversification of migration patterns over this same period. These surveys represent the initiatives of governmental agencies (mainly NSOs), research and academic institutes, non-governmental organizations and other entities.

The scientific study of migration was initially based on population censuses and administrative registers and later adopted sample surveys. Compared with other data sources, in general samples surveys allow one to undertake more in-depth investigations and thus obtain more detailed results. If population censuses and administrative registers give quantitative measurements on levels, patterns and trends of migration phenomena, sample surveys mainly provide qualitative information useful for complementing knowledge of patterns and trends. In particular, given the repeatability of migration during the life of a person, its frequent and varying modalities and different and emerging forms over time, surveys allow for the measurement of migration histories and personal motivations, thus enable us to ascertain the determinants and consequences of migration. This improves the ability to define and implement policy measures relevant for migration and, more in general, for the development of individuals and their countries of reference.

Naturally, the level of information available from sample surveys varies depending on their type and other conditions. Furthermore, sample surveys are all faced with challenges of selection of units and generalisation of results to the total population, the sensitivity of asking questions on certain topics, and the involvement of more than one country in migration movements.

When categorising possible topics and measurements of migration, it is widely accepted that the number of migrants arriving to, living in, or departing from a country is of primary concern, which is normally represented by the measurement of **stocks** (number at a given moment in time) and **flows** (number during a period of time) of migrants.

Further information of interest are the main demographic and socio-economic characteristics of these migrants, with respect to features like sex, age, country of birth[[1]](#footnote-1) or previous residence, citizenship, place of residence, date of arrival, level of education, economic status and occupation. The provision of this information is often gained through population censuses and administrative data systems. However, where this information is collected infrequently (as with censuses) or partially (as with many administrative sources), sample surveys dealing with migration may provide these information more frequently and in greater detail, including detailed information about characteristics and timing of migration processes (including return migration).

Sample surveys are also able to collect information on a wide range of additional personal and collective characteristics of migrants and their households, including for instance their household and family composition (once again, in particular when other sources are rare or insufficient), aspects of living conditions, and the pre-migration situation and full employment, education, and family histories of migrants. In fact, these characteristics may be collected through in-depth interviews of either migrants themselves or other respondents on their behalf (called **proxy respondents**). Given the cost of and burden associated with collecting this information for an entire population, such data collection can only be obtained through samples of households and respondents.

The pre-migration situation and complete histories and trajectories of migrants are necessary to study the consequences (impact) and possible future trends of migration. The amounts and different types of **remittances** (financial and social) sent by migrants and associations and their use by households and communities in countries of origin, represent one of the main aspects of migration impact. However, there are a wide range of topics and issues that represent the effects of migration, including those less tangible, such as personal attitudes and behaviours resulting from having experienced, or not experienced, migration over a lifetime.

On the other hand, to completely assess the consequences of migration data need to also be collected from the **non-migrant population**. This can provide measurement of migration’s impact from both a material (e.g. remittances received) and non-material (e.g. intention to migrant) perspective. Thus, for example, the evaluation of consumption patterns, investments and attitudes of households receiving remittances from members who migrated abroad, remains incomplete until the conditions of households without migrants are also investigated. Sample surveys also allow these aspects to be analysed, through comparison of return migrants and households with migrants currently living abroad, with people living in the same country of origin who have never migrated nor have any household members living abroad.

Finally, specialized migration sample surveys allow for direct in-depth investigations on specific categories of migrants due to specific episodic circumstances, which are emerging with greater frequency throughout the world and CIS region. This may include a focus on people seeking asylum abroad, massive flows deriving from political crisis and conflicts (for instance as has occurred in recent years in some CIS countries),or the victims of trafficking of human beings.

### Types of sample surveys

#### Introduction

Sample surveys on international migration are generally based on direct data collection from migrants or non-migrants, normally through face-to-face interviews at country border points (so-called border or passenger surveys), within households residing in the territory or abroad (household surveys), or in other places and contexts, even using alternative methodologies (non-border and non-household surveys). The latter may include, among others, surveys conducted at workplaces or public places (e.g., religious or cultural centres), and self-compiled questionnaires sent via mail or made accessible on the Internet. Sample surveys may also be carried out via indirect data collection from people dealing with migrants and non-migrants such as national officers responsible of migration management, practitioners in the area of migration or private employers. A combination of methods may be considered for undertaking specific migration studies, utilizing a type of mixed data collection method targeting both migrants and key informant type respondents.

For each type of sample survey, the study of migration may in principle be conducted through different data collection tools, i.e. additional questions, or *ad hoc* modules attached to the questionnaires of more general surveys, or specialized questionnaires targeting specific groups of migrants or population. Further distinctions may be given by aspects like frequency of data collection (episodic versus continuous surveys) or approach of data collection (**cross-sectional** surveys versus **longitudinal surveys**, i.e. surveys based on **panels**of respondents, often rotating over time).

The following sub-sections review the main features, opportunities and challenges of sample surveys classified as follows:

* **Border surveys**
* **Household surveys** with migration questions or modules (or general household surveys)
* **Household migration-specialized surveys** (household migration surveys)
* **Other migration-specialized surveys**, including surveys on specific types of migrants undertaken outside of households or border points, indirect surveys, and mixed surveys (studies)

In addition, these sub-sections refer to methodological documentation and several individual surveys and survey programmes implemented worldwide, including the CIS region, over the last twenty years. Among the more recent initiatives, the monograph *International Migration and Remittances in Developing Countries: Using Household Surveys to Improve Data Collection in Eastern Europe and Central Asia,* prepared by Richard Bilsborrow and Mariam Lomaia for the World Bank (Bilsborrow2011), is a particularly important reference. Furthermore, in 2015 a repository of migration surveys was prepared within the framework of the EU-funded Project TEMPER (*Temporary versus Permanent Migration*) and made available online (http://www.temperproject.eu/research-areas).

Finally, sample surveys implemented in CIS countries are briefly described/reviewed and compared in general terms, on the basis of varying detail of information gathered while preparing this manual. Key methodological issues particularly relevant for household migration surveys are then later discussed.

#### Border surveys

As seen in the previous chapter, apart from some exceptions like between select CIS countries and within the EU Schengen Area, most countries run a system of controls at border crossings. However, these controls are implemented through varying procedures and tools (e.g. entry/exit cards) and levels of registration of individual passages, depending on practical arrangements and local conditions (e.g., border posts in desert areas, level of computerisation, etc.), the existence of bilateral agreements (which applies to some countries belonging to the CIS Region) and other circumstances.

Besides the collection of data from administrative procedures, national border crossing are also used for data collection operations aimed at learning about the movements of tourists, commuters, migrants and other categories of international travellers. Most of these statistical operations are based on gathering information from samples of travellers at the time of their arrival to or departure from the country, through face-to-face interviews and standardised questionnaires designed for specific purposes. These border or passenger surveys are ideal for countries where border points are fully controlled and relatively few in number, or even limited to a few air and sea ports, such as small countries/islands.

The registration of border crossing data through administrative procedures is intended for all travellers or a defined group of them (e.g., foreigners) and has the primary purpose of security control, and normally is the responsibility of police or state security services under the Ministry of Interior. Information collected is limited to basic personal data and some additional information, depending on the type of data collection tool (e.g., optical reading of passports or entry/exit cards). This information may include the type of document allowing entry to or exit from the country (e.g., a three month visa issued for tourism) and the purpose and expected duration of stay/absence (see previous chapter for more detail).

Compared with border administrative registration, border surveys have the main objective of collecting statistical information, by sampling people experiencing the same conditions (e.g. crossing an international border) and asking them relatively in-depth questions targeted to the specific purpose of the investigation. Therefore, respondents of these surveys may be able to provide more information than what could be provided by a border card or other administrative document. For instance, some people entering the country could be asked to report on their intention to stay beyond the period stated on their short-term visas, such as possibly finding work in the country. More general, border crossing respondents may provide at least some information reflecting their personal biographies, current conditions and prospects linked to migration, or simply the specific case of their current border crossing (e.g., if with or without family members). In general, given the limited time that passengers may have to answer questions, it is necessary to adopt short questionnaires for border surveys.

As well as the possibility raised above, the declaration of respondents about their intentions and expected duration of stay in the country or abroad may be itself a constraint. Thus, for surveys on immigration, as well as emigration, it may be useful to also collect contact information of the sampled people in order to conduct a follow-up survey at a later time. This provides a way to check the real outcome of the entry into or exit from the country, collecting information on future migration status, as well as creating a sample of respondents for future migration-specialized surveys.

Other disadvantages of border surveys mainly derive from sampling. In fact, though international migration is overall a rare event, it is likely enough migrants will be found where border movements are particularly intensive. However, in most countries only a very limited number of all passengers move to change residence at a given moment. Most international movers are tourists, business people and other visitors for short periods of time or even cross-border workers. Therefore, border surveys need to include large samples of passengers in order to find an adequate number of people eligible for migration-specific interviews and thus limit sampling errors. In the end, the number of migrants may represent a minimal percentage of all passengers in a survey.

As a second complication linked to sampling, in principle border surveys cannot utilize **sampling frames** of respondents. In a general way, potential tools like passenger lists of international carriers exist, however these may be difficult to access and will only provide information limited to the name and basic demographic data of passengers, which does not help target migrant passengers. In addition, international movements in principle occur at any moment during the year, regardless of reasons, while for cost purposes survey fieldwork needs to be conducted in hours useful to catch people frequently.

A detailed account of the problems and possible solutions in using border surveys is included in the guidelines on the production of migration statistics established by the International Labour Organization (ILO) in 1997 (ILO-1997). The International Passenger Survey (IPS) of the United Kingdom perhaps represents the major worldwide application of such a survey (MEDSTAT-2009). Some relevant border surveys have also been implemented in the CIS region, such as the *Survey on Studying of Migration Processes* in Azerbaijan of 2009 (see Annex X and SSCAZ-2014).

#### Household surveys with migration questions or modules (general household surveys)

Countries and NSOs often opt for measuring some aspects of migration phenomena through the introduction of specific questions or *ad hoc* modules on migration in their data collection questionnaires. For example, this can be applied to border surveys conceived for multi purposes, population censuses and especially household surveys.

In general terms, the use of questions and modules on migration in household surveys depends on several factors, such as the availability of alternative sources, the frequency of the surveys themselves and other national circumstances. This is the case for labour force surveys, as well as of other specific topics like income and living conditions, or multi-topic surveys carried out on a regular or ad hoc basis, usually adopting large nationally representative samples.

The advantages of utilizing these types of surveys lie in the recurrent and increasing demand for information about migration and the marginal costs associated with gathering this information. In fact, while migration-specialized survey requires specific settings and huge resources, a pre-existing general survey already has its own organization, infrastructure and budget. Other advantages come from the possibility to customize questions and follow internationally agreed definitions and to obtain relevant information on the socio-economic characteristics of migrants and on their patterns of migration. Finally, similarly to border surveys, specific questions in general surveys may also serve to assist in the design of sampling for successive migration-specialized surveys.

In order to obtain robust results, these surveys demand specific requirements and shrewd sample design and selection strategies in order to obtain adequate numbers of respondents and/or to cover specific groups of migrants. Therefore, they require at least a large general sample and/or a high incidence of the specific category of migrants subject to investigation[[2]](#footnote-2).

The measurement and study of migration in general household surveys is aimed through the adoption of the following tools:

* Questions useful to identify migrants and non-migrants belonging to households (e.g., **return migrants**, non-migrants / potential migrants, family members of current out-migrants left behind in the household of origin, current out-migrants from the same household) and general attitudes of households linked to migration.
* One or more modules for individual respondents or the household as a whole. Details on these aspects are presented in Section III.B.

In any case, due to their wide-ranging objectives and ability to ask a limited number of questions, thus reducing **response burden**, general household surveys may address specific aspects of migration, namely the determinants and consequences of the phenomenon.

Other features which should be addressed when using household surveys with migration questions or modules are:

* The provision of questions regarding absent or former members of the household answered by proxy respondents;
* The use of a reference period (**cut-off period**) before the time of survey, as well as the use of concepts and definitions adopted for defining different types of migrants;
* The coverage of households that have migrated in their entirety during the reference period.

These points are further addressed later in the chapter.

The inclusion of migration-related questions or modules occurs on different types of household surveys. Labour Force Surveys (LFSs) and other employment surveys certainly represent the main case, due to the relationship between migration and employment- or even unemployment-, their high prevalence and frequency, as well as their typically large (nationally representative) sample sizes . Household Budget Surveys (HBS) are often adopted as well, in particular to learn about the impact of migrant remittances on households. The World Bank-sponsored Living Standards Measurement Surveys (LSMSs) offer a good degree of flexibility and normally utilize nationally representative samples, though often of small size, which limits their usefulness for this exercise. Demographic and Health Surveys (DHSs), which are generally funded by the US Agency for International Development, are undertaken less frequently than LFSs or HBSs, though they adopt nationally representative samples large enough to elaborate results at the department and province level. However, it is worth noting that they have rarely measured international migration except in the case of health-related phenomena. All other general or multi-purpose household surveys, such as the Multiple Indicator Clusters Survey (MICS) promoted by UNICEF, are effectively -or may be in principle- adopted for international migration, although with limitations mainly linked to the size and representativeness of samples and the purpose of the investigation.

Different migration modules for general household surveys are made available through manuals and publications. In the cases of LFSs, LSMSs and other general surveys, modules are adopted worldwide, often with some adaptations due to national circumstances. As a main example, ILO created around 2005, and further developed in 2010, the **Labour Migration Module** (ILO LMM 2015). It was a set of comprehensive model questionnaires on labour migration and remittances, but flexible and customisable with long and short versions to be attached to existing LFSs or other general household surveys. It is made up of three sections, i.e. an individual questionnaire, a foreign-born section and a native-born section. The household roster collects data for all household members, with more details for those aged 15 years and older. Other *ad hoc* modules on the labour market situation of migrants and their immediate descendants were introduced in EU LFSs of 2008 and 2014 (EUROSTAT-2014). Other types of general surveys, in particular household budget surveys inspired by the World Bank, were largely introduced in different regions in recent years and particularly in Eastern Europe and CIS countries (Bilsborrow-2011).

In recent years many CIS countries have used migration modules in general household surveys. This includes the cases of LFSs of Armenia, Moldova and Ukraine, based on the ILO LMM since 2006, as well as HBSs of most countries in the region since 2000, as reported in Annexes X and Y.

#### Specialized migration surveys (household migration surveys)

The continuous administrative registration systems described in Chapter II are useful sources to inform about the numbers and a few other basic characteristics of migrants- either immigrants, emigrants or other categories, in terms of both stocks and flows. Similarly, this information may be provided by population censuses, either through traditional enumeration and other methods. However, censuses are not carried out frequently (every ten years), and the information provided depends on the definitions and coverage of the reference population, as well as on the migrant categories and the adoption of other specific requirements or questions. As an example, multiple citizenship is still often not measured on censuses in countries that allow it. Finally, as discussed earlier, border surveys and general household surveys are mostly useful to know about a few migration aspects of the sampled population and to help establish estimates of flows and stocks of migrants at the country level.

When regular migration is considered, household migration-specialized surveys represent the most suitable statistical operation to inform about complete migratory and employment histories, behavior, attitudes, and future plans of individuals and households. In other words, these surveys allow to ask more questions and thus to investigate the determinants and consequences of international migration. On the other hand, these surveys can be expensive.

These types of household surveys have, by definition, the constraint of deriving detailed information from a sample of respondents. However, several measures may be taken to reduce the distortive effects of sampling, such as using large samples of respondents or targeting eligible respondents after a wide listing operation. Furthermore, these surveys are flexible in content and may focus on specific components or aspects of migration, such as immigration of foreigners, emigration of nationals abroad, return migration, or the intention of people to emigrate abroad. They generally also include so-called control groups of individuals (e.g. non-migrants) and households (non-migrant households), which are relevant to study the impact of migration on socio-economic development, living conditions and cultural attitudes. Control groups are relevant because effective assessment of the determinants and consequences of migration also requires information about the different paths and evolutions of those who did not move. Finally, given methodological specificities and the generally high costs, household migration-specialized surveys are undertaken less frequently than other general household surveys.

Another important distinction between household migration-specialized surveys concerns whether they are implemented in one or more countries. As a matter of fact, any migratory movement implies one country of origin and one country of destination, in addition to the possibilities of countries of transit, successive moves and so on. At a local level, for each country of destination there are often several countries of origin, often linked by international trade, language, colonial ties or geographical proximity, which constitute interlinked systems, also known as **migration systems** (Kritz-1992). Specialized surveys are more frequently carried out in one country (**‘one-way survey’**), generally in the country of destination, than in both the countries of origin and destination or migration system(‘**both-way surveys’**). This mainly depends on the degree of relevance of migration in the countries of origin and destination, the combination of countries (for instance, an important immigration country may include flows originating from a variety of countries), the feasibility of bilateral or multilateral cooperation initiatives, methodological issues, and resources available for the project. These aspects are further elaborated in Section III.B. Here it is important to consider that there are a wide range of options mainly depending on the objectives of the investigation, the possibility of collaboration with institutions located in relevant partner countries, and on the availability of financial resources.

Given the specificity of investigation, the previously mentioned issues of cut-off period, proxy respondents and coverage of households migrating as a whole assume more relevance for specialized migration surveys than general household surveys. As will be seen in Section III.B.2, specialized migration surveys need some sort of conciliation between the aim of investigation and the practical conditions for carrying it out.

Several initiatives of migration-specialized surveys have been undertaken in the CIS region over the last twenty years. More recently these include proposed both-way household surveys advanced in 2012 under the framework of Project MiRPAL[[3]](#footnote-3) (see Box X), two surveys on emigration from Tajikistan undertaken in 2014, and comprehensive surveys recently undertaken in Armenia and Ukraine (Annex X and Section III.C). Furthermore, relevant experiences consist of a survey on return migration undertaken in Armenia (in parallel to Mali and Tunisia) in 2012 under the initiative CRIS[[4]](#footnote-4) and surveys on migration and skills implemented by the European Training Foundation (ETF) in Armenia, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine (as well as Albania, Egypt, Tunisia and Morocco) between 2007 and 2011 (<http://www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/PRJ_2011_WP11_40_33>).

Outside the CIS region, the more important survey initiatives of recent years concern the following:

* Specialized surveys undertaken in Egypt, Ghana, Morocco, Senegal and Turkey (as origin countries) and Italy and Spain (as destination countries) in 1997 in the framework of EUROSTAT/NIDI Project[[5]](#footnote-5) (EUROSTAT-2000);
* Surveys on emigration, return migration and forced migration undertaken in the framework of MED-HIMS Programme[[6]](#footnote-6) in Egypt (2013) and Jordan (2014) plus the 2010 Palestinian Migration Survey based on a preliminary version of MED-HIMS Model Questionnaires (MEDSTAT-2014);
* Surveys undertaken in Senegal, Ghana and the Democratic Republic of Congo (as origin countries) and France, Italy and Spain (as destination countries) around 2010 in the framework of the MAFE Project[[7]](#footnote-7) (<http://mafeproject.site.ined.fr/en>);
* Surveys on temporary, return and circular migration to be undertaken under TEMPER in a number of countries from four major geographic sending areas, namely Eastern Europe (Romania, Ukraine), Latin America (Colombia, Argentina), Sub-Saharan Africa (Senegal, Ghana, DR of Congo) and North Africa (Morocco) with France, Italy, Spain and United Kingdom as destinations ([www.temperproject.eu](http://www.temperproject.eu)).

**Box 3.1 – The 2012 proposal for studying international migration and remittances in the CIS countries**

In the last few decades, and particularly since 2006, the increased interest in international migration and its potential value for migrants, as well as countries of origin and destination at the global, regional and national level, generated a series of proposals and initiatives for investigations using household surveys. This has been particularly the case in countries with limited or unreliable data on migration flows, which also lacked appropriate sample surveys for the study of the determinants and consequences of phenomenon.

A proposal for a round of household migration-specialized surveys in CIS countries emerged under the auspices of the World Bank MiRPAL Project around 2010, coming from an assessment on measuring migration through general household surveys in the region and other Eastern European countries (Bilsborrow-2011). This proposal was discussed at the international level, and its goal was to undertake new data collection via specialized surveys in both origin and destination countries of migrants in the CIS region, similar to the EUROSTAT/NIDI Push-Pull Project. In fact, CIS countries constitute an almost ideal migration system, given their shared cultural ties and frequent use of Russian, as well as shared flows of capitals, goods and services, and labour migration.

The key condition for such a survey programme is adoption of the same target population and the use of similar definitions and methodologies in two types of countries, i.e. of origin and destination.

Identification of international migrants was proposed to focus on changes of permanent residence involving a change of country occurring within the past 10 years. While a 5-year cut off point is often preferable for the sake of data quality and policy making purposes, a 10 year cut-off point was used to increase the number migrants present in the sample. The study was further limited to those 15 years and older, since intention to migrate was also of interest.

The survey programme aimed to cover the following population groups:

- *Out-migrant*: a person who at age 15 or older, migrated from the sample household to live in another country within the past 10 years (regardless of duration of emigration, as the purpose was to capture those who may have just left months or days ago to live abroad);

- *Immigrant:* someone who came to live in the household from another country during the past 10 years, but was at least 15 years of age at the time of immigration.

***-*** *Return migrant*: a member of the household who left to live abroad at any time in the past but returned within the past 10 years (again without a time requirement for living abroad).

- *Non-migrant*: any members of sample households who are not migrants as defined above, thus includes household members who emigrated longer than 10 years ago, return migrants who returned over 10 years ago and immigrants who arrived more than 10 years ago.

Finally, related to sampling, in countries of origin a stratified sample was to be used, followed by two-phase sampling of units, as will be described in Section III.B. In the end around 10,000 households would be interviewed.

To date, the proposal has only found application in Tajikistan in 2014, with data collected on return migrants and non-migrants in that country, as well as among Tajik migrants in Russia – as partially reported in Annex X on the basis of gathered information.

#### Other migration-specialized surveys

This residual category of sample surveys relevant for migration (both international and internal) includes a wide range of operations having at least one of the following features:

* Implementation in places different from households and border points, such as workplaces, public places or refugees camps;
* Data collection from respondents or other informants different from migrants, but linked to them; and
* Adoption of data collection methods different from interviews or in their combination (mixed surveys and studies).

Therefore, this group primarily includes surveys on specific categories of migrants or descendants of migrants, such as the following:

* Migrant workers or international students;
* Second generation descendants of migrants;
* Irregular migrants;
* People living in collective households;
* Migrants receiving some form of social protection or assistance;
* Migrants disproportionately concentrated in specific geographic areas;
* Members of diaspora communities abroad.

Apart from that, there may be surveys on related aspects of migration; such as remittances sent by various hometown associations to organizations and communities in their countries of origin or even social remittances (basically ideas, practices and social capital) issued by migrants abroad.

Given the wide and evolving range of specific migration phenomena and the need for related information, the modalities of implementing such surveys significantly vary. Thus, the classical data collection method of interviewing individuals is complemented or replaced by methods like respondent **self-administered questionnaires**, **in-depth interviews with experts**, as well as **focus group discussions**. In all these cases, any method adopted for selecting respondents to interview or participants in discussions underlines a non-probabilistic sampling method and thus opens questions about its representativeness. These surveys are often part of larger studies and are undertaken outside of NSOs, which is why they are given limited consideration here..

These other migration-specialized surveys generally provide qualitative measurements of migration-related phenomena. Their main advantages derive from their targeted approach and adoption of more pertinent strategies for data collection. In fact, first they directly address the specific category of migrants or people that are most relevant in order to inform about their topic of interest. Moreover, these studies may be composed of different data collection operations, thus are more flexible and innovative with respect to practical modalities of data collection. Hence, for instance, a specific sample of foreign students can be immediately selected as respondents using the enrolment register of a given university, and they can further be interviewed via self-administered Internet based questionnaires. All this is crucial for effective measurement in terms of quality and detailed results regarding measurement of complex issues, while making best use of limited financial resources.

Obviously, the vary variety, flexibility and subjectiveness of these surveys come with their own risks and may produce biased results. Therefore, it is recommended to use these methods carefully, adopting best practices from other examples of these surveys. Given the wide range of methods and topics which can be covered by these surveys, it is especially important that if they are going to be used, statisticians and other practitioners apply a rigorous approach.

Among examples of these type of surveys in the CIS region, it is useful to refer to the mapping of Moldovan diaspora in selected EU countries undertaken on behalf of IOM in 2012 (IOM-2013b). Based on data collected through this survey, several interviews with experts and focus-groups discussions were further carried out.

In other regions several surveys on irregular migration have been conducted by the Foundation for Initiatives and Studies on Multi-ethnicity (ISMU) in Italy, (Blangiardo-2011), and an online survey among EU Blue Card holders in Germany was undertaken in 2014 by the German Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (Hanganu-2015). Another example is the study *Mixed Migration: Libya at Crossroad. Mapping of Migration Routes from Africa to Europe and Drivers of Migration in Post-revolution Libya* prepared in 2013 for UNHCR. This study was based on new data collection from interviews with migrants, representatives of national institutions and international organizations, and other key respondents in Libya and abroad (Altai-2013). Finally, the Mexican Migration Project (MMP), launched in 1982, aimed at gathering data on the characteristics and behaviour of regular and irregular Mexican migrants to the United States using a number of mixed methodological approaches ([http://mmp.opr.princeton.edu](http://mmp.opr.princeton.edu/)).

### Choosing the most useful surveys

The specific data collection that a country should implement through sample surveys on international and/or internal migration depends on a series of circumstances. These mainly include the migration profile of the country, information needs for migration management and development, the current availability of information, the availability of technical capabilities and financial resources, as well as the degree governmental services understand the usefulness of evidence-based policy-making.

The use of sample surveys relies on what information is already available on a regular or irregular basis, in terms of flows and stocks of migrants, as well as more in-depth topics. As a matter of fact, important and mainly quantitative information may already be available through administrative sources or, less frequently, from population censuses. The absence of such information, or even the lack of accessibility to data sources, may necessitate use of sample surveys to collect this information. This is illustrated by an increased number of NSOs implementing surveys to collect information missing or inaccessible from other sources, particularly though the integration of migration questions onto pre-existing general household surveys. On the other hand, sample surveys, namely migration-specialized surveys, constitute the ideal method for collecting qualitative information on the determinants and consequences of migration, or to profile specific categories of migrants (see III.A.1), though many countries do not have the resources needed to conduct this type of work.

In more general terms, the choice of the most useful surveys, as well as the specific modalities of investigation, should follow the specific needs and evolution of the individual country. To give an example, consider a country with an unchanging migration profile, with significant permanent inflows of labour migrants, with good levels of integration with local population, and irrelevant outflows over the same period. Such a country may find it viable to monitor the phenomenon of foreign immigration on an annual basis through administrative sources, a population census undertaken every ten years, and implementing comprehensive household specialized surveys every five years (between censuses) to address qualitative aspects linked to immigration and integration of foreigners. On the other hand, if the same country cannot rely on administrative sources to measure migration, then perhaps it would be useful to use general household surveys to monitor annual migration flows. Furthermore, this country could use the addition of modules to the same general survey to investigate topics that would have been covered by the specialized survey.

In any case, the comprehensive data collection system should be prepared to adapt surveys to collect information on both a continuous and ad hoc basis, so that newly arising questions can be answered, such as massive movements of migrants or refugees. In these cases entities should use the experiences of other countries or contexts. Furthermore, they should also try to apply new methodologies and modalities useful to enhance the coverage and sampling of surveys, as well as data collection itself.

## Survey design and implementation

### The complete survey process (introduction)

The execution of any general or specialized survey may be seen as a complex process composed of a series of successive and interrelated activities, as shown in the following schema.

**Figure 3.1 – Flowchart of the complete survey process**



Source: *Household Sample Surveys in Developing and Transition Countries* (UNSD-2005)

After discussing this important reference schema, this section further develops some aspects linked to the design and coverage of sample surveys relevant for studying migration, such as the definition of target population and place of data collection for household based migration-specialized surveys. Second, it covers some aspects, methods and challenges linked to the development of survey questionnaires and planning and selecting valid samples of respondents for household migration and other types of surveys. The final sub-sections briefly review issues applicable to other key stages of preparation or implementation applicable to almost any type of survey.

### Survey design and coverage

#### Conditions for surveying migration

As previously mentioned, people may be classified as international migrants on the basis of place of birth, country of citizenship or place of previous residence. In case of specialized surveys, the objective mainly consists of studying the determinants and consequences of migration. Hence, choosing the **place of previous residence** appears to be the most useful option, both for identifying migrants and members of migrant households or non-migrants belonging to control groups.

**Migration paths** may vary significantly, with, for instance, people born abroad and then immediately moving to the country of citizenship of their parents, people moving to a new country once reaching adulthood, or people alternating between long stays in their country of birth and one or more countries of successive residence. Moreover, despite the usefulness of knowing about the determinants and consequences of migration over the life course of individuals and households, their **most recent migration** is usually most relevant from a policy perspective.

Thus consideration needs to be given to the whether the survey will identify migrants by considering moves from any time over a person’s life (an open period), or whether to use a finite point from which to measure migration (e.g. a cut-off point of x years prior to the survey). Use of an open period can include migrants who left from or arrived in the country very far back in time, thus might not be of interest to the study. On the other hand, having no cut-off point increases the likelihood that the respondent will be considered a migrant, thus will importantly expand the sample size of migrants found.

Optimally a survey should focus on migratory flows which have occurred in the previous one to five years, to a maximum of ten years. Though respondent recall is better when shorter time periods are referenced, the ten year option is perhaps more recommended, since it helps increase the number of migrants within the sample. Among the main practises reported in Section III.A, the EUROSTAT/NIDI Project adopted a 10-year period, while the MiRPAL proposal for surveys in the CIS region used the same period. The MED-HIMS surveys adopted a period of 12-13 years, although the cut-off date adopted (i.e. 1 January 2000) was chosen to facilitate the memory of respondents while approximating the 10-year period for which the Model Questionnaires had been drafted. In the case of Armenia’s Integrated Migration Survey of 2013, no threshold was used to define current emigrants, though a reference period of six years was used for return migrants. In other surveys in the CIS region, the cut-off periodsused vary depending on several conditions, with considerable concentration towards periods of 12-36 months, in particular with general household surveys (see Section III.C and Annex Y).

In any case, when a threshold of *x* years before the survey is used for identifying migrants, a cut-off period of *x/2* years before the survey date should be taken into account when looking at the characteristics of non-migrants or non-migrant households, in order to have a control group to compare with migrants, based on the average time between the migrant reference date and the survey date (Bilsborrow-2007).

In addition, surveys depend on the concepts and definitions adopted for measuring migration (see previous chapter regarding international definitions), including **migration duration**, the period of effective or expected absence from the household for a current out-migrant or the effective residence abroad for a member who returned to the household within the given reference period. This allows for defining flows based on period of residence prior to the survey and actual or expected duration of migration.

Another key aspect in survey research methodology addressing migration concerns people responding to the interviews. In fact, in the case of a household survey undertaken in a country of origin, information about current out-migrants can be gathered directly from them only if they are present within the household at the time of the interviewers’ visit, which is very rare in practice. The usual method to overcome this limitation is to gather data on current out-migrants (as well as household members temporary absent) using proxy respondents, i.e. heads of household, spouses left behind or other reference persons. Given proxy respondents need to answer questions about people other than themselves, the quality of responses can vary, particularly with regards to questions on personal attitudes or behaviors, as well as post-migration experiences. This limits the amount of detail that can be accurately collected via proxy respondents in origin countries, and survey questionnaire design should take this into consideration, when conducting both specialized and general household surveys. On the other hand, when investigation on emigration is carried out in countries of destination the answers are more likely to be provided directly by out-migrants themselves and so in principle will be more reliable.

Concerning coverage issues, surveys dealing with immigration, as well as emigration, should in principle include both citizens and foreigners. However, in the case of emigration there may be less interest in foreigners, since they usually return to their country of origin or move on to a another country. Furthermore, key migration variables should be collected for all household members, either resident within the household or living abroad, including all changes of residence (and timing) as well as eventual changes of citizenship (and timing).

The target population of migrants, as well as non-migrants as a control group, the size and spatial distribution of the sample of households used in the survey, and even the place of data collection change according to the purpose of the survey, whether it is to estimate the number and basic characteristics of migration flows and stocks or if it is to study the determinants and consequences of migration.

#### Defining the target population for studying the determinants and consequences of migration

One possible way of collecting data on the determinants and consequences of migration is based on making a distinction between countries of origin (O) and countries of destination (D) of migrants, as the impact and results can differ for each (ILO-1997, Billsborrow-2007).

Considering first the determinants of emigration from a country of origin O, it is possible to apply the following:

1. To collect data in the main countries of destination (D1, D2, D3) on samples of people who migrated there from O in the previous *x* years, and data from non-migrants in O – as was adopted in the EUROSTAT/NIDI project and MAFE surveys;
2. To collect data in the main country of destination (D) on samples of people who migrated there from O, including data from non-migrants in O;
3. To collect data in O only, in households with and without migrants, on former members of households who are current out-migrants (via proxy) and on potential migrants, i.e. adult people who did not migrate from both types of households (via direct interview) – as implemented for instance in MED-HIMS surveys or the *Integrated Migration Survey* of Armenia (2013).

In order to assess determinants efficiently, all the surveys above should collect data on the characteristics of migrants at the time of migration, or just before, as well as on the composition and characteristics of households at that time (retrospective data). Moreover, the third case should also collect data on the situation of households at the time of emigration for each of their members during the considered migration period, as well as the situation of households without out-migrants **at the mid-point** of that interval of time.

The first two approaches above mean the implementation of two or more different surveys and then joint analysis of results. In general, the first option demands a large screening exercise for locating and identifying migrants from a single country of origin in several countries of destination. Therefore, the second case may be more feasible, given data collection is from one destination country only. However, this may cause the results to be affected by selecting only one direction of outflows. Naturally, the second approach could be also more appropriate when emigration concentrates disproportionately towards one country of destination, as for instance in the case of migrants from CIS countries to Russia.

The third approach demands the adoption of specific criteria of household selection and eligibility of individuals for interviews, but it is a unique survey thus will only need one sample of households. On the other hand, weaknesses include lack of detailed information and lower quality responses through the use of proxy respondents and the emigration of entire households, which will be discussed later. Despite these limitations, this approach is the less expensive, more feasible and thus the most frequent type of survey conducted to collect this information.

Different frameworks apply for studying the determinants of migration flows or potential migration from the point of view of the country of origin. In the case of the determinants of return migration, it is opportune to interview migrants who had left O for D, but returned to country O, along with out-migrants from O to D remaining in country D, since the latter constitute the population at risk (of return migration). When it is not feasible to implement the survey in both O and D, data on out-migrants still residing in D can be obtained from proxy respondentsresiding in O, but obviously with fewer detailed questions.

In the case of measuring determinants of potential migration, it is necessary to ask all adult members of households of origin (households with and without out-migrants) if they intend to migrate or not. Survey results should be then analyzed in order to understand why some people migrate, some intend to migrate, and others do not. Finally, if the sample size is sufficiently big, it could also look at main possible destinations for future migrants.

Moving to the **consequences of migration**, reference to the population at risk is less evident by definition, as migration impacts migrants, households and communities in countries of origin, as well as of destination. Considering here just the case of consequences on individual migrants, it is generally possible to adopt the following:

1. To collect data on non-migrants in country O and data on migrants from O residing in country D;
2. To collect data on non-migrants in several countries of origin (O1, O2, O3, …) and data on migrants from O1, O2, O3, … residing in D;
3. To collect data on the current status of out-migrants from O to D, interviewing proxy respondents belonging to their households of origin and non-migrants in country O;
4. To collect data on non-migrants in D, as well as migrants from O, by direct interview undertaken in country D.

The first two approaches have the advantage of collecting data directly from the populations of interest. The second method takes into account the effect differences in individual, household and community factors, as well as differences related to countries of origin (including emigration policies, macroeconomic conditions, etc.), have on the international migration of persons. On the other hand, these two approaches are constrained respectively by the need to select a representative sample of migrants from a single country of origin O (which is a relatively rare event) and the higher costs and challenges associated with implementing surveys in multiple countries.

Despite several limitations the third and fourth approaches are often adopted, since the methodology is simpler and they are generally less expensive to implement than the first two methods. Among other limitations, the third approach of interviewing households in countries of origin must select a representative sample of migrants in a single country of destination, which could be difficult due to the rarity of such flows within a limited time period (excluding possible exceptions with high concentrations of nationals moving into one single destination country). On the other hand, the fourth approach considers the wrong population groups, as migrants in destination countries should be compared with the population at risk (e.g. non-migrants) remaining in country O. Thus, this method can only represent the level of integration of migrants in the country of destination - with respect to employment, income, health status and other aspects, compared to the native population.

The description above makes evident that the settings and number of places of data collection for studying the determinants and consequences of international migration, for both individuals and households, should be considered at the planning stage. Moreover, jointly applying more than one method can produce enormous benefits in terms of efforts and financial resources necessary for planning and implementing specialized surveys. Even when the primary interest of study is for just one specific group, the determinants and consequences of migration are often studied in combination through household specialized surveys for informing policy decisions.

Finally, due to funding and operational reasons, household migration-specialized surveys are easier and more frequently implemented in a single country of origin or country of destination or, alternatively, in a combination of these two places. However, a knowledgeable study aiming at both the determinants and consequences of migration from a origin country O to a country destination D, should foresee a survey in O covering both non-migrant households and migrant households, in parallel with a survey in D covering households with migrants, allowing for appropriate comparison groups. Initiatives are decidedly recommended along this direction.

#### The coverage of migration of entire households

One of the main challenges of general or migration-specialized household surveys is catching households that have migrated in their entirety. In principle, this applies to both immigration and emigration surveys, but affects out-migration in particular.

In the case of immigration surveys, as well as any survey, it is important to use up-to-date sampling lists so that new housing units which include immigrants are present. The more prevalent case of missing households is when emigration surveys are carried out in countries of origin, and entire households migrate leaving no one left behind. Thus, it is in principle very difficult to obtain information about this component of emigration using household surveys as they might be underestimating the phenomena. This was particularly evident in the Integrated Migration Survey of Armenia of 2013, where empty dwellings due to household members absent abroad resulted in about 20% of cases, though this was certainly exacerbated by use of an outdated sampling frame from the Population Census (IOM-2014). Among possible solutions to this problem, is to gather information on these missing households from main destination countries in order to adjust estimates of emigration (Bilsborrow-2007). However, this method may be constrained by small samples of migrants and be successful only in cases of broad both-way surveys involving two main countries of origin and destination. In origin countries, some estimate of complete households which have emigrated could be garnered from survey non-response information (vacant households and information from neighbours). In addition, a limited number of very basic questions about the emigrated household, such as family composition, the country of destination and date of departure, could be asked using proxy respondents (e.g., neighbours, custodians, new occupants of house or local police). Finally, the process could introduce a panelapproach (re-interviewing specific households or migrants over time) within a regular survey in order to monitor future migration flows, hence reducing undercounts (MEDSTAT-2014).

### Questionnaire design

#### Main requirements

The usefulness of sample surveys depends strictly on the quality of results, which is dependent on the appropriateness of both questionnaire design and data collection. Thus, structuring and completing questionnaires requires a large and careful effort. The requirements for developing appropriate strategies are widely discussed in international handbooks, even if those works specifically address the organization of surveys in developing and transition countries (e.g., UNSD-2005).

The same series of general principles for developing survey questionnaires also apply to the case of sample surveys dealing with migration. In general, the set of questionnaires should be used for the following:

* + - To identify current and former household members relevant for the aim of survey, as well as the family nuclei, including the reference person and relationships between all household members;
		- To identify persons eligible for answering different survey sections and modules;
		- To collect basic information on each household member according to needs;
		- To collect more detailed information on specific types of respondents or data collection topics through separate modules;
		- If no or limited information is available from existing data sources, to collect data on the contexts where sampled households and individuals live, such as the social conditions of local communities or districts.

Furthermore, it is important to also apply the following general requirements:

* + - To order the modules and questions in a way reasonable for conducting the interview as well as managing the data;
		- To adopt skips patterns throughout the interview to save time and better orient the interview;
		- To first ask for general and then specific information;
		- To avoid redundancy and repetition of questions;
		- To formulate questions as neutral as possible, concisely and without ambiguities, although in some cases only pre-testing of questionnaires will reveal the real efficacy of wording and other issues;
		- To preferably put sensitive questions towards the end of the questionnaire;
		- To possibly keep the interviews as short as possible (minimize respondent burden).

#### Questionnaires for border surveys and general household surveys

All **border surveys** relevant for international migration build on the following:

* Screening questions to identify, within the selected sample, passengers eligible for the interview on international migration, tourism or other topics of investigation. Such questions might include country of residence, country of birth, and reason for travel;
* One or more modules of questions to be addressed to individual respondents identified as migrants or other topics being considered, such as tourism. The migration module includes further personal data such as age, marital status, educational attainment and economic status, information about the reasons, status or intentions of migrants, as well as information on the composition and residence of family members.

In any case, as already highlighted in Section III.A.2, border survey questionnaires have to be concise and only a limited number of questions can be asked.

Similar to border surveys, the measurement and study of migration through **general household surveys** uses the following approaches:

1. The adoption of one or more questions on the household roster to identify migrants or some features of the household linked to migration. These questions may concern place of birth[[8]](#footnote-8), country of citizenship, place of current or previous residence or, more interestingly, place of residence at a specific time in the past (for instance 2 or 5 years previously) and time of arrival at permanent residence[[9]](#footnote-9). Furthermore, for the study of emigration abroad or internal migration, other questions may allow identification of former household members who have moved away. Finally, other questions may concern the household as a whole, for instance reception of remittances or goods prior to the survey.
2. The adoption of one or more separate modules for individual household members or migration aspects of households, depending on the migration profile of the country, the purposes of investigation and the possibility to identify different categories of data collection units and respondents.

For an example of identifying country of birth, a typical sequence of questions may be the following (with modification if asked of proxyrespondents):

* Case (a)
* *Where were you born?*
* *When did you most recently arrive to live in this country?*
* Case (b)
* *Where were you born?*
* *Where were you living on (a specific past date)?*
* *(If in same country) When did you arrive at your current residence?*
* *(If in another country) When did you most recently come to live in this country?*
* Case (c)
* *Where were you born?*
* *Are you a citizen of this country?*
* *When did you arrive at your current residence?*

Questions in the main questionnaires, or specific modules, about the date of most recent arrival to, or departure from, the household may be open (at any time) or refer to a specific period preceding the date of survey, generally between one and ten years. The **open period** option is more promising because it obtains more migrants within the sample of respondents, but the longer the time period the greater the problem with respondent recall. On the other hand, a pre-defined cut-off point may improve the quality of answers, but may limit the number of migrants identified, thus impact the representativeness of the sample. In any case, the appropriate solution depends on the purpose of the survey and country context, thus there is no definitive best method to use.

A further distinction concerns whether to ask specific questions to all people belonging or linked to the household or only to respondents of the individual questionnaires, which again depends on the purpose and design of each survey. Thus, for instance, information on country of birth may be collected for all household members, while place of residence a number of years before the survey may be asked only of respondents to the individual questionnaires.

In the example above, a **minimal household roster** should collect the name, sex, age, marital status, relationship with the head of household, country of birth and education level of all household members. Moreover, in the case of emigration, the same information should be collected for previous household members or even relatives[[10]](#footnote-10) who live abroad. Further, one or more specific modules may collect information on specific categories of people linked to the household (for instance, modules on work activity of emigrant prior to departure or in destination countries) or the household itself (for instance, a module on remittances received by the household).

#### Questionnaires for migration-specialized surveys[[11]](#footnote-11)

Following the identification of migrants, questionnaires for specialized surveys conducted within households, as well as outside them**,** could aim to collect detailed data on many of the following aspects, depending on what questions would like to be answered.

1. **The modality and migration history of individual migrants:**
* Timing of migration, reasons and processes of departure or arrival
* Possession of citizenship and efforts to seek documents and requirements necessary to migrate to the planned country of destination or make arrangements to migrate without documents
* Role of migration networks, sources of information, previous contacts and visits to the country of destination
* Experiences in additional countries of destination (and departure), that is intermediate movements or countries of transit
1. **The demographic, economic and social situation of the migrant, household and community of origin immediately prior to migration**:
* Full household composition
* Personal characteristics in terms of marital status, health, language ability, education and expectations
* Health status
* Migration of relatives prior to migration as potential factors of stimulation or choice of destination
* Previous experience abroad (or in other regions, in the case of internal migration), for example as a student or tourist
* Work history and experience
* Availability of money from remittances or encouragement from prior migrants from the household
* Employment situation just prior to migration, nature of work, workplace, level of pay, number of usual working hours, benefits, land ownership, etc.
* Experience looking for work and any episodes of unemployment, plus efforts to find work
* Involvement in (non-work) community activities
* Contacts with migrants and other household members in other countries
* Experiences with labour recruiters prior to migration
* Expectations of receiving assistance in potential countries of destination
* Attitudes towards risk-taking, change, gender roles, religion, etc.
* The migration decision-making process
1. **The initial situation of the migrant in the country of destination**:
* Means of travel and place of arrival
* Assistance received at time of arrival (at border crossing, airport arrival, etc.)
* Nature of first job or work experience, experience of finding work (how long it took, methods used), the labour contract terms, the number of working hours and wages, etc.
* The knowledge of language of country of destination upon arrival
1. **The current situation of the migrant and his/her current household in the country of destination, as well as in the household of origin**:
* Household size and composition
* Language ability
* Citizenship acquisition from country of destination
* Health status
* Sources of household income
* Current job situation, workplace, number of working hours, labour contract terms, sense of job security, wages, income, benefits, etc.
* Housing conditions and ownership of assets
* The reception or provision of remittances, their value and use, modalities for sending/receiving and effects on household
* Self-perception of adequacy of income and life in general, including social, religious and cultural aspects
* (Further) migration intentions

Furthermore, for the study of either the determinants or consequences of migration, data useful for comparison should be gathered for non-migrant individuals and households, within households with and without migrants. For this part of survey, data should be collected on the full range of personal characteristics, antecedents to migration, household composition, previous migration experience, migration networks, work activity, including wages and time worked, education, marital status, etc., being gathered for emigrants, non-migrant and their households of reference. Having individual characteristics of migrants prior to migration, immediately after migration, and at the present time allows for measurement of the impact of migration on these individuals. Further comparisons can be made between migrants and natives in countries of destination, individual migrants and non-migrants living in countries of origin, as well as between households with and without migrants in countries of origin, in order to further assess the impact of migration.

### Sampling

#### General issues[[12]](#footnote-12)

The sample design is fundamental for surveying migration. Special sampling methods are often necessary when conducting general and specialized surveys on migration, because international migrants often constitute rare elements within the population. In general terms, surveying migration increases the likelihood of needing to sample hard to find populations and/or utilizing imperfect sampling frames. However, the topic of sampling elusive populations has been readily addressed in the methodological literature.[[13]](#footnote-13)

Regardless of data limitations and budgetary or personnel constraints, the sample of households to be selected for interview should ideally be a **probability sample***,* one in which every element in the sample has a known probability of selection when the sample is drawn. In fact, probability samples are what allow statistically valid inferences to be made from the analyses of survey results. However, common deviations from probability sampling occur during fieldwork when interviewers or supervisors choose respondents apparently more willing to answer questions or choose substitutes in case it is difficult to get enough respondents. Moreover, migration-specialized surveys often adopt **non-probability samples**, i.e. need to determine samples without knowing the likelihood of selection of any element of their reference populations, which makes the generalisation of results difficult. As will be seen later, often it is helpful to combine both probability and non-probability samples to overcome these difficulties.

Sampling frames provide the basis for drawing a sample of units for analysis- i.e. migrant (and non-migrant) individuals and households, in the case of surveys based on households. The quality of a **sampling frame** determines the representativeness of the population of interest in the domain of interest. A sampling frame is perfect if every element appears on the list once, separately and refers to a unique address. A perfect frame could be a complete list of all migrants living in a country at time *t* who had arrived in that country after *t*-10 years (considering a 10-year cut-off periodin the definition of migrant).

**Sampling lists**, of either individuals or households,are generally derived from the following sources:

* Population registers
* Registers of foreigners
* Household surveys
* Population censuses
* Expert opinion

The possibility of using population registers is practical only for countries with high-quality registers as well as, in principle, few undocumented migrants, so that coverage is high. Registers of foreigners may be useful even though they only list those arriving legally and may not be kept up to date, upon the condition that they indicate where migrants reside in administrative areas (provinces, districts, etc.) In the case of geography, the presumption is that migrants with the same origin tend to cluster in the same geographic areas. Despite the existence of registers in some CIS countries, they are believed to have poor coverage of international migrants and undocumented migrants in particular.

The population census can provide a sampling frameif it includes a question on country of birth or, preferably, on arrival from a foreign country in the past 5 to 10 years. For emigration, the situation is much more difficult, although some countries include a question on emigrants from the household in the last 5 or 10 years: this provides some data on recent flows, but gives no information about emigration of entire households. In the end, even if occurring every 10 years in most the countries, censuses often provide the most useful sampling frames, as they provide data at low levels of geography, while also usually including (in theory) undocumented migrants as part of their coverage

Recent household surveys, with national coverage and large samples often derived from census information, can be useful for identifying where migrants tend to live even when only country of birth information is collected. Thus, the use of household surveys is feasible in principle, but still depends on the context for each country. Indeed, a review of general household surveys in the CIS region (Bilsborrow-2011) showed no country to have such working conditions, though the inventory for this manual showed an improvement in the region (see Section III.C).

When no other sampling lists exist, **expert opinion** represents a final resource for sampling. This method significantly depends on the degree to which NSOs and/or migration specialists have a good sense of which geographical areas tend to have more (recent) migrants. Use of expert opinion to define sampling frames has been used in Africa, such as in Ghana under the EUROSTAT/NIDI project in 1997, as well as in Nigeria for the World Bank’s Africa Migration Project (2009-2010). Both these efforts led to reasonable strata for sampling. However, this method would seem to have limited applicability in the CIS region, as other sampling lists exist for most countries.

Areas with relatively high or low prevalence of migrants can usually be identified, and thus be used to improve random sampling for migration-related surveys. Otherwise, random selection of areas for the first or successive stages of sampling can be simply based on the (estimated) population size of areas or PPES (probabilities of selection proportional to estimated population size). PPESs have the modest advantage of yielding a self-weighted sample. In other words, using this method the final elements (e.g., individuals) do not have to be weighted to adjust for different chances of having been selected in the sample. So, each element has the same probability of selection as any other. However, for migration surveys, where migrants are rare elements, it is highly desirable to find some way of determining where migrants are concentrated in order to classify areas into strata with varying proportions of migrants so as to sample more from those areas, thereby making fieldwork more efficient for finding migrants to interview.

**Stratification** is the division of the population of interest into sub-groups or strata according to objective criteria or variables. Stratification helps to eliminate variation between strata from the computation of total variation in the sample, thus reducing total variance. For a survey on international migration, the logical basis for stratification is the proportion of the population in the area that are international migrants, or the proportion of households in the area containing one or more qualified international migrants. Stratification also allows the use of different sampling frames, and even different sampling procedures, among different strata.

#### Disproportionate sampling of area units and two-phase sampling of households[[14]](#footnote-14)

As noted above, international migrants, or households containing migrants, especially recentmigrants, are relatively rare in both countries of origin and destination. The two more relevant procedures used to address this problem (Kish-1965) consist of the following:

1. **Stratified sampling** with disproportionate probabilities of selection of area units, and
2. **Two-phase sampling** in the selection of household units.

These procedures are discussed briefly below under the assumption that a population frame exists and can be used to create a sampling frame to select a sample of international migrants (and non-migrants, depending on the survey purpose). This allows the classification and subsequent stratification of all areas of the country into strata based on the proportion of international migrants, viz., the prevalence of migrants.

A second assumption is the interest in investigating emigration - i.e. the characteristics of emigrants and their households, the prevalence and use of remittances, differences between non-emigrant individuals and households, among others – collecting data in the country of origin, which appears relevant in most CIS countries.

For constructing a sampling frame in such context, it is necessary to determine if data useful to identify households containing emigrants are already available. If not, the only possible sampling of first-stage area units or **Primary Sampling Units** (PSUs, for example provinces) is based on PPES (e.g. estimated population sizes from the most recent population census). This would also be the procedure for selecting second stage area units, and so on, down to the **Ultimate Area Units** (UAUs).[[15]](#footnote-15) The survey on emigration undertaken in Tajikistan in 2014 represents an application of such methodology, although adapted somewhat (Bilsborrow 2015). In the Tajik case, after excluding the capital city of Dushanbe because of the small percentage of households with emigrants identified in the last census, the remaining first-stage administrative areas (regions) did not differ greatly enough in their proportion of emigrant households to require stratification. Instead, the number of micro-areas selected from each of the country’s seven regions was proportional to its estimated population size or PPES, retaining the self-weighted sample at this stage. Thus a total of 40 UAUs were selected, with the goal to complete 25 household interviews per UAU.

Following the selection of UAUs, it is then necessary to identify which households contain emigrants in the sampled UAUs, where they will usually still be rare elements. It is desirable to select a sample of households without emigrants, as well as those with emigrants. Thus, the recommended procedure is to first conduct a complete **screening** or **listing operation**in order to identify and list households with and without emigrants. The second step is to then sample from each list, oversampling households with recent emigrants compared to non-emigrant households, followed by interviews. In the survey in Tajikistan referred to above, two-phase sampling was used in sample UAUs, in order to first identify and list households with and without migrants. This was necessitated by lack of data at the micro-area level on households with and without emigrants, as well as on return migrants.

Other ways to tackle the mechanics of two-phase sampling and facilitate fieldwork, including sample listing sheets, as well as other procedures applicable to sampling households for other types of migration surveys, are discussed in ILO-1997 and other works reported in this chapter.

#### Other methods of sampling for migration surveys

Given the difficulty of finding a sufficient number of migrants using regular probabilistic sampling techniques, a number of other non-probabilistic methods are discussed in this section. These are particularly useful when trying to survey hard-to-find groups like irregular migrants or other migrants groups considered to be highly mobile or an elusive part of the population. While these methods are advantageous in finding harder to find migrant groups, as with any non-probabilistic method, they suffer from generalizability of results. As discussed later, some methods try to combine both probabilistic and non-probabilistic methods to overcome this disadvantage.

As a first example, general *Time and Space Sampling* or *Intercept Point Sampling* is shortly referred to here. This method is based on the likelihood of migrants to attend aggregation points for social contacts, health care, religion, leisure or simply everyday needs, where they can be approached and selected for interview. When migrants are a rare element in the population, intercepting them at these places is a cost-efficient procedure and allows reaching individuals who could be only occasionally found within their households or may not even be living in a classical housing situation (McKenzie-2007). A similar method applying this approach is called the *Center Sampling Technique* (CST), which was developed in Italy in the nineties and has since that time been continually adapted (including the EUROSTAT/NIDI Push-Pull Project) (Blangiardo-2011). This method selects samples of migrants representing both legal and irregular foreign immigration, without use of lists of households or registers, but rather referral sampling techniques.

Another case of use of references is called **Snowball Sampling**, a kind of chain-referral method suitable when the units of a rare reference population are difficult to locate but know each other. Often applied in the field of health and criminology, it is also widely used as a method to survey migrant households. In Snowball Sampling based on individuals (migrants in a country of destination), one member of the population of interest is asked to identify *k* known associates of a similar characteristics (e.g. a migrant), and each of these are then asked to identify *k* different members, and so on. This method was adopted in sampling a rare ethnic group in a project in Brazil, as well as permanent Mexican migrants in the United States in the framework of MPP (McKenzie-2007). Furthermore, it was used to survey immigrants in Spain in the framework of the EUROSTAT/NIDI Project (Groenewold-2004).

**Adaptive Cluster Sampling** is another technique useful to locate large concentrations of migrants by increasing the chance of their appearing in the sample. In fact, this is a technique designed to obtain more adequate and efficient samples for a population which is rare and very unevenly distributed (ILO 2013). It starts by using a conventional sample and determines the selection of subsequent samples from where a high concentration of the population of interest is found. This technique is particularly effective when the population of interest tends to be concentrated in relatively few and large clusters, while there is little information available on the extent, location and patterns of its concentration.[[16]](#footnote-16) In other words, this technique represents a combination of probabilistic and non-probabilistic methods, which is often the best way for undertaking research in migration, with the initial use of a probability sample and then the expansion and definition of a definitive sample using non-probabilistic methods (Thompson 1996).

### Other key phases of survey preparation

As seen in Figure 3.1, survey preparation, i.e. all steps to be implemented before launching data collection, consists of the following activities:

* 1. Definition of target population and objectives of the survey;
	2. Draft a project document, including tentative timeframe and budget, and secure financing;
	3. Establish a group to supervise and a core team of experts to be in charge of preparing and implementing all aspects of the survey;
	4. Develop a work plan for all remaining activities;
	5. Design data collection questionnaires
	6. Draw and select a sample of households and respondents to be screened or interviewed;
	7. Prepare survey manuals and materials for training;
	8. Train field and data entry staff;
	9. Prepare a fieldwork and a data entry plan;
	10. Conduct a pilot test;

Defining the target population and survey objectives, questionnaire development, and sample selection have already been considered earlier in this section. Additional issues to discuss are related to manual preparation, staff training, and conducting a pilot test. Data collection and management will be discussed in the following section.

A key tool to prepare for any survey is a manual on survey design and organization. Furthermore, separate instruction manuals are necessary for all people who will be trained and actively participate in survey operations. These are generally survey coordinators, data coders, data entry staff, supervisors and interviewers. These manuals include clarification for unusual cases and anticipation of possible problems arising from respondent selection procedures or data collection during interviews (e.g. questions the interviewees might have regarding survey questions).

The conditions and requirements for staff training may vary widely, depending on the type of survey and experience of the interviewers. In general, little training is necessary for surveys carried out routinely and by the same team or where little changes (e.g. modules) over time. Conversely, new or complex specialized surveys demand more training effort, even for more experienced staff who have previously worked on surveys. Therefore, in the case of migration specialized surveys, training of three to four weeks, including a number of practice interviews, may be necessary to allow both supervisors and interviewers to effectively carry out their fieldwork.

Conducting a **pilot survey** or **pre-test** is crucial to assess the survey’s organizational framework and the effectiveness of proposed sampling and questionnaire wording, especially for surveys implemented only occasionally. A household migration survey pre-test should involve at least one hundred households, or at least a number useful to sort out a minimum quota for each category of respondents, i.e. migrant and non-migrant households. Among other things, a broad number of interviews may identify topics or questions that are more sensitive for respondents and help make adaptations to the questionnaires to reduce non-response. In fact, despite several solutions available at the data editing stage, particularly for a rare event such as migration, it is highly preferable to avoid the application of corrections *a posteriori*. In any case, **non-response issues** should also be kept in mind at the level of questionnaire design, utilizing questions that facilitate response, in particular when proxy *respondents* are involved.

The outcomes of the pre-test help determine the final version of the questionnaire and allow for adjustments in fieldwork and data entry plans before full implementation of the survey. However, if needed, it may be helpful to conduct a second pre-test, probably smaller and more targeted to particular aspects, as discovered during the initial pre-test.

### Data collection

The fieldwork team, both interviewers and supervisors, is a critically important component for conducting surveys. In addition to adequate transportation, fieldwork teams should have fully reliable means to communicate with survey management, as well as among themselves, in order to report timely on progress and respond immediately to problems. At the same time, proper means of communication are crucial for contacting heads of households and individuals eligible for interviews, in order to facilitate meetings and maintain schedules. In this regard, modern technologies such as the Internet and cell phones may prove to be greatly beneficial, though in rural or remote areas of several countries this might be less applicable depending on coverage of services.

Quality assurance of fieldwork data collection is another important issue and has to be pursued through different means. First of all, fieldwork supervisors should be assigned to groups of a maximum of four or five interviewers. Supervisors should implement a series of control measures, what may consist mostly of the following:

* Carefully monitor the selection of respondents eligible for interview in each selected household and the conduction of interviews by interviewers;
* Review questionnaires as soon as possible after compilation, in order to provide immediate feedback and remedy in case of deviations from instructions or high levels of non-response; and
* Randomly revisit some already interviewed households to check the outcomes of interviewers’ jobs.

In turn, the main survey managers, or even regional coordinators, should monitor the fieldwork supervisors.

To improve the quality and the overall processing of surveys, data collection should ideally be undertaken using laptops or hand devices allowing for immediate checking of inconsistencies. However, this depends on the availability of financial resources, human resource capabilities, and practical conditions available in fieldwork areas (e.g., availability of electricity or Internet coverage). In general terms, it is clear that the more complex the organization and articulation of fieldwork, the more challenging ensuring its quality will be.

As seen in Section III.A.2, data collection for specific migration surveys can be implemented through online compilation of survey questionnaires directly from respondents. Among other cases, the recent experience of the German Federal Office for Migration and Refugees described earlier, demonstrated the applicability of such data collection. Online surveys are interactive, particularly efficient with respect to technical and practical solutions (for instance the absence of paperwork, check-box questions, drop-down answers, the possibility to immediately switch to other languages and in particular responses immediately entered to the dataset) and are easy to distribute. Therefore, online surveys are applicable under particular cases and conditions, where there are adequate technical infrastructures, Internet access is prevalent, and eligible respondents may be targeted in a systematic way. In fact, the online self-compilation of questionnaires increases both likelihood of undercoverage and non-response, generating refusals when privacy statements are not trustworthy (Couper-2008).

### Data management

The registration of survey data is usually performed through data entry from questionnaires collected in the field, with further checking and coding from hard copies. Centralising data entry means respondents cannot be followed-up with regarding data corrections, but allows survey staff to edit responses according to specific requirements and rules. Checks for logical consistency and other features are generally adopted at this stage. The entire data management system must promptly register initially collected data from questionnaires, in order to check data and progressively inform ongoing data collection in the event of problems, and to release survey results to policy makers and other users as soon as possible (UNSD-2005).

The next step of data management consists of recoding data in a **standard reformatted file**useful for further processing and better understanding, i.e. converting variables and files from a form that is most convenient for data collection to one more appropriate for tabulation and analysis. Furthermore, data should be cross-checked and validated (for instance, data coming from different parts of the questionnaire) and amended for errors and possible non-response.

**Weighting sample data and estimation from the sample** (i.e. drawing inferences about the population from which the sample was selected), are the next essential steps in survey analysis. This represents a set of complex procedures based on the computation of design weights, calculation of sampling errors, adjustment for non-response and under-coverage of survey units, calibration against external standards, and trimming and scaling of weights (ILO-2013). In certain circumstances it is necessary to correct design weights for known exclusion or under-coverage of some parts of the study population, which may have occurred from sampling error.[[17]](#footnote-17) Non-response weights based on known characteristics for responding and non-responding units are introduced in order to reduce the effect of differences in response rates in different parts of the sample. This is particularly important when rates of non-response are high and vary within the sample. Non-response and under-coverage may be significant in migration surveys and demand solutions at the weighting stage, such as adjusting estimates to take this into consideration. These adjustments may be particularly time-consuming and need several stages of elaboration, tabulation and results assessment. A typical result of non-response may be amending categories of the questionnaire’s variables when presenting tabulated results.

Once survey data have been definitively arranged and tabulated, data analysis and report writing should occur, in view of what originally motivated the survey. Although the analysis and dissemination of survey results should be conducted as soon as possible, this is often not the case, especially for migration-specialized surveys. Specialized surveys, since they are normally conducted on an ad hoc basis, often encounter problems with data management due to their lack of familiarity. Therefore, survey takers should plan for extra time for carrying out this phase.

In addition, according to UNSD (2005), the main advice for the management and analysis of survey results consists of the following:

* Provide a complete accounting of eligible/ineligible households and individuals and respondents/non-respondents, which is necessary for weighting results;
* Apply rigorous checks and evaluations of data to discover and solve errors and abnormalities;
* Ensure that no households and individuals have been mistakenly excluded or included more than once;
* Conduct first analysis of results as soon as possible and produce a publically accessible public dataset (micro-data) for further analysis.
* Plan for different forms of data outputs, which represent different interests; and
* Provide detailed metadata for use by potential users, which should include any deviations between the planned and implemented samples, non-response rates, and copies of adopted questionnaire and manuals.

## Assessment of sample surveys in the CIS Region and recommendations for improvement

This section presents a general assessment of major sample surveys, mixed data collection operations and studies on migration topics implemented in CIS countries since around 2000. In particular, it shows what can be stated through analysis of available documents and participation in a regional workshop organized by UNECE in Minsk in May 2015. All inventoried operations are listed and summarized in Annex X.[[18]](#footnote-18) Special attention is given to general household surveys implemented by NSOs in these countries. Afterwards, these surveys are summarized in a set of tables presented in Annex Y.

The reference material consists of the following:

* Methodological documents and publications of national surveys or studies;
* Methodological reports and presentations prepared by NSOs for international meetings such as Joint UNECE / EUROSTAT Work Sessions on Migration Statistics;
* Assessment reports of national systems on migration undertaken in recent years;[[19]](#footnote-19) and
* Publications prepared by international organizations.

As a conclusion of this broad assessment, a series of general and specific recommendations for improving the use of sample surveys in the region are provided.

### Broad assessment of relevant sample surveys in CIS countries

The **inventory** presented in Annex X shows clearly that some countries are more likely than others to use sample surveys to investigate migration and its related phenomena. This applies in particular to Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Tajikistan and Ukraine, where a high number of survey-based initiatives can be found. The inventory also shows increased attention to measuring migration in recent years, as well as a diversification of topics for investigation, including internal migration, emigration (mainly for labour purposes), the conditions of people left behind in households of origin, return migration and in particular remittances. Conversely, data collection on specific categories of migrants, such as irregular migrants, asylum seekers and refugees, and trafficked persons, seem less represented. Occasionally surveys cover subnational geography, such as regions, districts or main cities, as in the case of an emigration study from the region of Tianeti (Georgia) to Athens and remittances and living standards in the region of Kathlon (Tajikistan), although the inventory may be incomplete regarding these types of studies.

Most survey initiatives are initiated for policy, development and planning reasons, as well as to enhance awareness and national dialogue on migration issues and capacity building on data collection and research. Among the main examples, an ongoing IOM survey project on migration and remittances in Ukraine intends to create awareness between key stakeholders on the nature, use and impact of remittances entering the country and to support development of a Migration and Development Action Plan. Furthermore, some initiatives aim at fostering relationships and evidence-based decision-making within foreign countries and international organizations. This applies to the IOM-Ukraine project mentioned above, as well as to the Extended Migration Profile and other recent operations in Moldova to assist the establishment of a Mobility Partnership with the EU.

It is worth noting that most specific surveys and studies in region were a result of support and cooperation from international organizations such as UNECE, IOM, ILO, the World Bank, CIS-Stat, the EU (also with ETF and EUI) and the Asian Development Bank. International organizations play an important role in the implementation of sample surveys and other studies in the region, including countries of origin and destination of migrants (e.g., both-way surveys). Examples are given by the World Bank and IOM, in the cases of recent migration surveys of Tajikistan and Ukraine, and by IOM in the case of mapping Moldovan diaspora.

Several surveys were carried out jointly in two or more CIS countries, and/or introduced as pilot practices worldwide or within the CIS region. Main examples include the study on children and elderly population left behind by migrants in Georgia and Moldova, the programme of the Asian Development Bank on remittances and poverty in four CIS countries, and the survey programme of the World Bank on return migration implemented in parallel in three CIS countries and three Eastern European countries. Furthermore, ILO initiatives for preventing forced labour and child labour contributed to the implementation of specific ad hoc surveys, which were relevant for the study of migration. Given the specificities of national migration profiles, some countries frequently participated in pilot international exercises. Thus, Armenia adhered to standard surveys implemented under the CRIS initiative, while Armenia, Moldova and Ukraine introduced successive versions of ILO’s LMM. Finally, Tajikistan adhered to the proposal of both-way surveys which emerged under the MiRPAL Project, while Ukraine also followed the same general approach. However, some regional experts found the setting of specialized migration surveys proposed under MiRPAL to be too complex, which in fact has reduced comparability of results in these countries to date (see Annex X, under Tajikistan).

The funding and partnership of international projects also reveal the involvement of national ministerial agencies and research centres such as the Russian Armenian (Slavonic) University in Armenia, the Center of Sociological Investigation and Marketing “CBS/AXA” in Moldova, the Higher School of Economics (HSE) of National Research University in Russia, and the Sharq Research Center in Tajikistan. Furthermore, a number of countries from outside the CIS region have made direct contributions to these studies, such as Germany, Italy, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, USA and Canada. This involvement often depends on the prevalent destinations of migrants, such as for mapping Moldovan diaspora communities in EU countries, but also for the establishment of cooperation initiatives involving entities. This was the case for Italian Cooperation, the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), the Maastricht Graduate School of Governance, the Carolina Population Center (CPC) of the University of North Carolina and Georgetown University. Among outcomes, international collaboration increases dissemination and visibility of survey results, as for example the *Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey* (RLMS) of the HSE which can be found on CPC’s website.[[20]](#footnote-20)

Among other features, recent experiences show a good level of synergy and integration of means for surveys carried out within the same countries. This mainly involves adoption of official sampling frames from survey and research programmes undertaken outside of NSOs (for instance in Armenia or Moldova) or the use of existing samples for longitudinal surveys (e.g. the *Tajikistan Household Panel Survey* of 2011). Still regarding technical aspects, there was a prevalence of household surveys conducted outside of NSOs. Many specialized studies collected primary data and information through different means and then exploited available secondary data. Longitudinal studies have also been implemented to a limited extent, as with the RLMS.

Most specialized surveys, as well as some general household surveys, inventoried for this manual are particularly rich in content, since they integrate a wide range of characteristics of households, migrants and non-migrants. However, the extent of utilisation by outside users is difficult to ascertain. Certainly, as anticipated by IOM-2010a and others, these important surveys demand adequate dissemination of results, full methodological documentation made available to the public and adequate financial resources for reproduction, which is often not the case in the CIS region.

In general, CIS countries aim towards reproducing best practices of other sample surveys and complying with international requirements relevant for surveying migration, which would help ensure international comparability of results. This is helped by the participation and coordination of activities by international organizations and national assessments in these countries, as long as international recommendations and practices are followed. This is true when model surveys are implemented in multiple countries, and also when surveys are inspired by the experiences of other countries and methodologies are adapted to national circumstances (IOM-2003). In any case, despite slow progress, several NSOs are progressively introducing key adaptations to their regular general surveys. The continuous evolution of the migration section of the *Integrated Living Condition Survey* (ILCS) of Armenia from 2010 to 2013 is a good example of this. Some initiatives desire to ensure the sustainability of data collection operations in the medium to long-term, thus for instance, the proposal of the IOM sponsored migration survey in Ukraine includes provisions to regularly collect a standard set of migration-related data via existing surveys (IOM-2013a).

Among the difficulties reported by national statistical institutions, a main, common issue concerns the lack of adequate financial resources for the purposes of specific sampling requirements or specialized surveys. Some countries have had difficulties measuring some specific categories of population and migrants, such as foreigners in Moldova through the LFS (IOM-2011b). The under-coverage of remittances has also been seen from the experiences of countries like Kyrgyzstan and Moldova (UNECE-2012b and IOM-2010b). Also non-response is seen as a prevalent, common problem when implementing sample surveys, in particular where information on sources of income and remittances are asked (UNECE-2012b). Finally, NSOs in the region seem aware of the opportunities and challenges of using new data collection methods such as the self-compilation of online questionnaires via the Internet (UNECE-2015).

The set of **summary tables** in Annex Y provide a deeper analysis of the coverage of migration data collected by NSOs in CIS countries, though these are mainly general household surveys (LFSs, HBSs and LSMSs) and a few household migration surveys (indeed, only two specialized cases in Armenia in 2013 and Tajikistan in 2010). Overall, the inventory is neither exhaustive nor up-to-date, in particular for some countries. Moreover, it does not take into account what was/is effectively measured through administrative sources, population censuses or other specialized surveys undertaken during the same period. Therefore, these limitations should be taken into consideration when evaluating the situation in CIS countries. However, it does provide a general view of the current state of migration survey research in the region, and the prevalent approaches adopted by different countries, as well as what is measured through household surveys, with respect to the following topics:

* **General and recent immigration,** including internal migration (summarised respectively in Tables 2 and 3);
* **Recent or current emigration,** including internal migration (Tables 4 and 5); and
* **The sending or reception of remittances**, other monetary transfers and goods by households residing in the country of data collection (Tables 6 and 7).

Focusing on most recent surveys from the summary overview presented in Table 1, about half of all national surveys do not cover at all, or cover only marginally, the identification of specific categories of migrants, especially immigrants, given emigration is more prevalent for countries in the region. The topics of remittances sent and received between households of origin and former household members abroad is better covered, though with many differences between countries.

At the level of individual countries, Armenia, Moldova and Ukraine have better measures of immigration (mainly return migration), emigration and transfers of remittances and goods through the use of dedicated migration modules (excluding specialized household surveys). In two cases, this applies through the combination of different types of surveys, i.e. the ILCS and LFS in Armenia and the LFS and HBS in Moldova. Indeed, as reported in Annex X, some detailed modules addressed to individuals or households are or were occasionally added to national surveys. These examples represent a cluster of best practices of data collection on the process and main features of migration (e.g., the destination/origin) and qualitative information linked to the determinants and intentions of migration, implemented through general surveys. The following were reported:

* Armenia ILCS
* Module on migration
* Module on monetary and commodity flows between households
* Moldova LFS (for year 2012)
* Questionnaire for absent migrants
* Questionnaire for return migrants
* Questionnaire for potential migrants
* Ukraine LFS (for year 2012)
* Section on categories of labour migrants (both current emigrants and return migrants)
* Section on characteristics of labour migrants
* Section on plans and initiatives of non-migrants for moving abroad
* Section on income from abroad and household welfare

Furthermore, the summary table in Annex Y shows countries like Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan measured immigration through their 2007 HBS and 2007 LSMS, respectively. As far as one can see, the few migration surveys reported in this annex, i.e. the *Integrated Migration Survey* of 2013 of Armenia and the *Survey on the Impact of Migration and Remittances on Welfare* of 2010 of Tajikistan, were particularly successful in terms of their ability to measure migration histories, migrants’ intention, remittances, as well as other migration topics, thus measuring the determinants and consequences of migration. Finally, the cut-off periods for identifying immigrants and emigrants varied between countries (for instance, from one month to ten years, in the case of immigration, and from one month to seven years, in the case of emigration). The same variants apply to migration durations, according to detailed methodological information of most surveys.

Tables 2 and 3 provide concretes example of immigration, such as the 2007 HBS of Kyrgyzstan which asked for country of birth, citizenship, previous residence abroad and the country, and in the event the person arrived in the past 10 years, age at time of move and reason for migration, while also distinguishing between internal and return migrants. On the other hand, the same survey did not include level of education and work status prior to migration. Considering the measurement of emigration in Tables 4 and 5, the Moldovan 2008 and 2012 LFS (which both included migration modules) identified former household members who had gone abroad and collected data on their demographic and socio-economic profiles, as well their most recent migration episode, using a cut-off periodof 12 and 24 months respectively.

However, in general, the situation of migration data collection through household surveys undertaken by NSOs of the region appears to vary greatly and is not harmonized in content or definitions.

### Proposals and recommendations for improvement

Despite the lack of sufficient information about some surveys in the region, it is possible to make the following set of proposals and recommendations on the use of sample surveys for measuring migration in CIS countries, making distinctions between general and specific levels.

#### General level

 At a general level, it would be advantageous to;

1. Improve the link between policy making and data collection, by coordinating the use of sample surveys with comprehensive national policy strategies at the regional, national and local levels.
2. Conduct more in-depth assessments of national migration data systems, such as done in Armenia, Georgia, Moldova in recent years.
3. Strengthen collaboration between international organizations, foreign countries, research institutions and projects/programmes available for enhancing national systems for migration
4. Continue sharing and discussing national practices through international and regional meetings and fora.
5. Improve the comparability of migration data derived from sample surveys by following international standards and recommendations.
6. Increase the visibility and usefulness of survey results by reporting fully on methodological procedures and provide metadata via publications and websites at both the national and international level

#### Specific level of survey implementation

Specific recommendations for the use of sample surveys to measure migration should take into account what data on stocks and flows are already available at the national level using administrative data sources and population censuses, while at the same time consider needs from specific national experiences.

* Countries with unsatisfactory or partial measurements of yearly flows and stocks of migrants should:

**Adapt pre-existing national general household surveys to include basic questions to measure migration.** This could be as simple as adding information to the household roster, including country of birth and/or places of previous residence and timing of moves. This will allow countries to make estimates of flows and stock of migrants on a regular basis. Given their prevalence in the region, LFSs and/or HBSs are recommended for such utilisation. Additional cost will be limited, mainly attributed to additional sampling that may need to be done to reach migrants.

1. **Implement or adapt border-crossing surveys to measure migration, through the addition of a few questions.** Such as the case with the 2009 border survey of Azerbaijan, which combined the measurement of migration with other interests, namely tourism and international mobility.
* Countries that have recently undertaken surveys with relevant partial or ad hoc measurements of migration, in particular general household surveys with modules on topics like labour migration and remittances adapted from model tools, should:
1. **Increase the frequency and use of sample surveys to measure migration, including finding methods to make data collection more sustainable and comply with users’ needs and international standards.**

This would include the addition of migration modules on a regular, as opposed to ad hoc, basis, such as the current practice in the region (e.g. Moldova and Ukraine). This would be particularly important to measure the determinants and consequences of migration on a regular basis. Limited funding is always a consideration when other important topics need to be measured as well, but efforts should be made at both the national and international level to collect migration data on a regular basis.

These recommendations apply both to countries with regular survey operations, or those planning to implement surveys in the future. For those without regular surveys, future planned surveys should include basic migration questions or include more in-depth migration modules. Even if only done on an ad hoc basis, serious consideration should be given to collecting this information on a more regular basis in the future.

* All countries should:
1. **Increase harmonization and comparability of migration information collected on sample surveys throughout the CIS region.** This could be done by asking identical basic questions to identify migrants, and using the same cut-off period or migration durations, on surveys conducted it the region, such as a LFS. In addition, standard migration modules could be used throughout the region, which could help standardize measurement of the size, characteristics, and impact of migration and remittances. Ideally, a common CIS-survey on migration could be conducted among all countries in the region to collect comparable information, which could be coordinated by an organization like CIS-Stat, with the help of other international organizations.
2. **Search for ways to carry out more migration-specialized surveys in the region.** These specialized surveys could be either “intensive” or “light,” carried out on an irregular basis (between three and ten years), depending on what other information on migration is available. It may be more efficient to implement these surveys in single countries of origin or destination, though reproducing both-way surveys, such as proposed by the MiRPAL project would be ideal. Even if these specialized surveys are conducted outside the NSO, NSO’s are strongly encouraged to follow-up and support any kind of specialized surveys and studies relevant to the national policies on migration and development in their countries. As above, perhaps CIS-STAT could support a joint initiative towards such an aim and approach.

# Recommendations for improvements

1. xxxxxxxxxxx
2. xxxxxxxxxxx

### xxxxxxxxxxx

### xxxxxxxxxxx
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# Annexes

1. Inventory of sample surveys and studies relevant for migration undertaken by CIS countries

#### Armenia

* ***Integrated Living Conditions Survey* (ILCS, continuous survey)**

The ILCS, which has been implemented by the National Statistical Service of the Republic of Armenia (NSSRA) since 2001, traditionally collects information on the place of birth of household members (with partial detail on locations within the country or abroad) and the case and main reasons for absence during the survey month. Furthermore, it collects place of current residence of household members living abroad. Since 2009, it also includes a migration module (with information on migration to other regions or countries in the last 3 years, for a period of at least 3 months, the year/month, main reason and economic status of most recent migration, and the sending of remittances in the last 12 months) and a module on monetary and commodity flows between households (with a set of questions for both the shipment and reception of money or goods). The survey is based on a monthly rotation of settlements and households and is nationally representative at the *marz* level (regions, administrative division).

The investigation on migration through the ILCS represents progressive enhancements in line with international recommendations reflecting suggestions issued from an assessment carried out by IOM in 2010, which referenced duration of migration and adaptation question wording and response categories for several questions. However, it still does not allow determination of long-term migrants who left before and returned within the reference period of the last 3 years (IOM-2010a, EUROSTAT-2015 and NSSRA-2015).

* ***Labour Force Survey* (continuous)**

This survey is undertaken by the NSSRA with occasionally support by ILO and the World Bank. The 2006 survey introduced a migration module, which was one of the first exercises carried out worldwide for testing the first version of ILO LMM. It had a nationally representative sample of 1,985 households, with separate modules on immigration, emigration and return migration for a total of 40 questions. The LFS currently collects data on persons who have worked abroad, whether persons intend to emigrate for work abroad, as well as absent household members, including the duration of their absence, the reason for absence and the region or country of destination(EUROSTAT-2014 and Annex Y).

* ***Survey on Remittances and Poverty* (2006-2007)**

This survey was implemented under a regional research project on remittances and poverty, funded by the Asian Development Bank, jointly undertaken in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.

* ***Survey on External and Internal Migration of the Republic of Armenia* (2007)**

Implemented under the joint initiative of NSSRA, the Ministry of Labour and Social Issues and UNFPA, this survey aimed to evaluate changes in migration trends from 2002 to 2007, following recent social and economic reform. It assessed the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of migration flows, the socio-demographic and economic characteristics of migrants and future migration plans of different population groups (UNFPA-2008).

* ***Return Migration to Armenia in 2002-2008*(2008)**

Implemented by the Advanced Social Technologies, with funding from the Organization for Security and Co-operation (OSCE), it aimed to contribute to policy-making for return migration, thus facilitating reintegration of returnees and their migration experience for home country development (EUI-2013).

* ***Migration Survey on the Relationship between Skills, Migration and Development* (2011-2012)**

A national specialized survey focusing on potential migrants and return migrants, organised by the European Training Foundation (ETF) and implemented by the Caucasus Research Center, in parallel with Georgia and Morocco. The sample included 2,630 potential migrants and 1,426 return migrants. However, the latter sample was inevitably not representative for the entire return migrant population (ETF-2013).

* ***Survey on Return Migration* (2012)**

Survey organized by EUI under the CRIS initiative and implemented by Advanced Social Technologies, focusing on the factors and conditions determining return migration and explaining why some return migrants contribute to the development of places of origin, while others do not. It was based on 349 interviews undertaken mainly in Yerevan and a few other cities and regions (EUI 2015).

* ***Household Survey on Migration, Impact and Remittances or Integrated Migration Survey* (July-August 2013)**

A joint initiative of NSSRA, the Russian Armenian (Slavonic) University (RAC), State Migration Service, the Ministry of Education and Science, IOM, EU, UNECE and Georgetown University on behalf of Mac Arthur Foundation. The surveyinterviewed a sample of 2,200 households in the city of Yerevan, using a multi-stage sampling technique based on a NSSRA Sampling Frame, with at first stage the selection of PSUs (survey areas) from the strata based on *marzes* according to the population size, and then the systematic random selection of households.

The survey focused on internal migration, immigration, return migration, emigration, savings and remittances of migrants and the development effect of migration on population and households. It intended to profile different migrant categories and establish priorities for evidence-based planning and decision-making on the demographic and socio-economic skills of the population and impact of migration (e.g. remittances and health and career wellbeing) IOM-2014.

#### Azerbaijan

* ***Household Budget Survey* (2003)**

Implemented by the State Statistical Committee (SSC) of Azerbaijan, and included some information on the reception of money or goods from abroad (see Annex Y).

* ***Demographic and Health Survey*(2006)**

Implemented by SSC in collaboration with Macro International, USAID and UNICEF, asked some questions on refugees and IDPs (SSCAZ-2008).

* ***Living Standard Measurement Survey*(2008)**

Also implemented by the SSC, included information on household members who left for abroad or within the country in the last 12 months and whether the household receives remittances or other contributions from abroad (Annex Y).

* ***Survey on Remittances and Poverty* (2006-2007)**

This survey was implemented under a regional research project on remittances and poverty, funded by the Asian Development Bank, jointly undertaken in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.

* ***Survey* on Studying Migration Processes (2009)**

Jointly implemented by the SSC, Migration Service and Border Service with the support of UNFPA and IOM, it was a large-scale sample survey (about 15,000 respondents) implemented at border crossing points for studying the situation of migration processes in the country, validating existing data on migration flows and trends and identifying the reasons of migration. The questionnaire contained 17 questions covering: sex, marital status, age, country of birth, nationality, citizenship, country of arrival/departure, main reason for entry/exit, availability of permission for labour activity, period of staying, occupation and branch of economy in the last place of residence, education, whether the person was accompanied by people under 15 years old, plans to work in Azerbaijan and whether the person lived earlier in Azerbaijan/abroad more than 12 months (UNECE-2011 and SSCAZ-2014). Unfortunately, there are no plans for reproducing this operation in the following years due to technical and financial constraints.

* ***Labour Migration Survey* (December 2008 - February 2009)**

Survey conceived and funded by IOM and undertaken by the Olea Consulting Group (OCG) based on a small sample of foreign migrant workers settled in the cities of Baku and Mingachevir. This survey focused on six components, i.e. the demographic profile, country of origin, transit routes and reasons, living and working conditions, future intentions and need of information for migration (SSCAZ-2009).

#### Belarus

* ***Household Budget Survey* (2008)**

Implemented by the SSC, it included information on whether households sent money to former household members or other persons (Annex Y).

* ***Ad-hoc Survey of External Labour Migration* (2015)**

Survey under preparation by SSC for implementation in the final quarter of 2015, it intends to study the socio-demographic characteristics and extent of Belarus labour migrants (return migrants and short-term and long-term labour emigrants, including the type of activity and earnings and the volume and transmission of remittances to households of origin while abroad). Plans for this operation were shortly documented through the workshop held in Minsk in May 2015 (see reference SSCBY-2015).

#### Georgia

* ***Household Budget Survey* (2008)**

Implemented by GeoStat, it identified people who ever lived abroad or in different regions (within Georgia), members of households who left abroad in the last 3 months, their main demographic variables, the reason of emigration, as well as some information on the dispatch or receipt of remittances (Annex Y).

* ***Survey on Return Migration* (2005-2006)**

Part of a World Bank survey programmecovering Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Romania and Tajikistan, it addressed a full range questions on return migrants’ experiences before, during and after migration. It also addressed the financial, social, domestic and personal aspects of migration experiences both during and after migration (WorldBank-2007).

* ***National Public Opinion Survey on Remittances* (January 2007)**

Implemented by Bendixen &Associates, on behalf of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), to profile remittances’ recipients and inquiring on the remittances process, how public opinion sees the Georgian banking system and relations between Russian and Georgian remittances (EBRD-2007).

* ***Tianeti Household Census & Tianeti Emigration to Greece Survey* (2008)**

This IOM-supported operation included surveys of both remittance recipients in Tianeti (rural region of Georgia) and remittance senders in Athens (the most popular emigration destination). It investigated channels for money transfer, the interest of local population in new money transfer channels, the assessments given by emigrants and population on the economic situation in the community of origin, as well as their evaluation of the use of remittances and investment opportunities for development (IOM-2009).

* ***Survey on Children and the Elderly Left Behind* (2008)**

Operation implemented in most regions of the country by Maastricht Graduate School of Governance (UNU-MERIT) and other partner institutions under the EC-funded project “*The effects of migration on children and the elderly left behind in Moldova and Georgia*.” It collected data on the demographic profiles of household members, the living conditions of households, the migration histories of all household members and specific information on the daily lives of children and the elderly population (Waidler-2013).

* ***Migration Survey on the Relationship between Skills, Migration and Development* (2011-2012)**

See Armenia –(ETF-2013).

#### Kazakhstan

* ***Household Budget Survey* (2008)**

Implemented by the Committee on Statistics of Kazakhstan with support from the World Bank, it collected data on whether the household sends money to former members or other people abroad or vice versa if former household members worked abroad (Annex Y).

* ***Labour Force Survey* (2008)**

Implemented by the Committee on Statistics, it collected information on country of birth, citizenship and previous residence abroad of household members (distinguishing between Kazakhstan, other CIS countries and non-CIS countries) and whether the household receives money from former members or other people abroad (Annex Y).

#### Kyrgyzstan

* ***Labour Force Survey* (continuous)**

Implemented annually by the National Statistical Committee (NSCKG) since 2002, it includes some information on labour migration (UNECE-2012a).

* ***Employment and Unemployment Survey* (2006)**

Implemented by NSCKG, in collaboration with the Ministry of Labour, it includes several questions relevant to migration (UNECE-2012a).

* ***Household Budget Survey* (2007)**

Survey funded by the World Bank, it is particularly useful for informing about immigration, as its household roster collects data on country of birth, citizenship, country of previous residence or area of previous residence within Kyrgyzstan, when the migrant arrived and the reason for coming. It uses a cut-off date of 10 years before the survey to measure migration (Annex Y).

* ***Survey on Return Migration* (2005-2006)**

Part of a survey programme of the World Bank covering Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Romania and Tajikistan - see Georgia.

* ***Survey on Remittances and Poverty* (2006-2007)**

Implemented under a regional research project on remittances and poverty funded by the Asian Development Bank, and was jointly undertaken in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. In the case of Kyrgyzstan, 4,200 households were surveyed with the primary objective of determining the impact of remittances on household welfare. This survey faced problems of poor response from more affluent households (most likely to receive remittances) and, more in general, availability for interviews (UNECE-2012b).

#### Moldova

* ***Household Budget Survey* (2008 and 2014)**

Survey implemented by the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS),targeting all household members, including people temporary absent or absent for long periods of time if they keep relations with the household and contribute towards the household budget(NBS-2015). This survey provides some information on recent and current emigration, as well as reception of remittances and goods from people abroad.

* ***Labour Force Survey* (continuous)**

NBS introduced a migration module to the 2nd Quarter of its 2008-LFS in the framework of a project implemented by ICMPD and other partner institutions under the ILO’s *Special Action Programme for Combating Forced Labour* (NBS-2012). This module collected data on country of destination, duration of the stay abroad, reason for leaving, channels for labour migration, migration costs, methods used to look for a job, working conditions, residence status abroad, occupation, employment status, working relations, social protection, problems faced, assistance sought, and remittances. Overall, 12,430 households took part in the survey, as part of the regular quarter sample and a sub-sample of households that in 2007 declared at least one household member working or looking for work abroad . In total, individual data were collected on 5,730 people abroad at the time of survey or in the previous 12 months.

The Moldovan LFS provided an opportunity to estimate the number of emigrants abroad and their characteristics, apart entire households which had emigrated. However, despite information on duration of absence, it was ineffective for estimating annual emigration flows.[[21]](#footnote-21) Furthermore, the sample was not sufficient to measure immigration of foreigners to Moldova[[22]](#footnote-22).

In the 4th quarter of the 2012 LFS, in order to design labour migration schemes and implement result-based monitoring and evaluation systems,, NBS further developed a specific migration module with support from several national and international agencies*.* In accordance with ILO’s LMM, the revised module integrated information on some aspects of labour migration and its related skills composition, while the threshold for identifying emigrants was changed from 12 to 24 months. The sample size was of 12,000 households. Different individual questionnaires were adopted for household members who were current emigrants, return migrants or potential migrants (NBS-2015).

The 2014 LFS excluded migration modules but collected information on recent emigration of household members (those who moved within the last 12 months) (Annex Y).

* ***Survey on the Impact of Migration and Remittances* (July-August 2006)**

A nationally representative survey of Moldovan households conducted by the Center of Sociological Investigation and Marketing “CBS/AXA,” with support of IOM, EU and SIDA, built upon a similar survey conducted in 2004. It mainly focused on why people migrate – or do not migrate – and how this decision affects the well-being of household members. It provided a comprehensive picture of migration and remittances, countries of destination, transfer channels and the direct effects of remittances (IOM-2007a).

* ***Migration Survey on the Relationship between Skills, Migration and Development* (2007)**

Similar to the surveys undertaken later in Armenia and Georgia - see ETF-2015.

* ***Panel Household Survey on Labour Migration and Remittances 2006-2008* (2008)**

Implemented by CBS/AXA and IOM, this survey built upon similar surveys in 2004 and 2006 referred to above, by re-interviewing approximately 4,000 households surveyed in 2006. It provided detailed information on patterns of labour migration and remittances in Moldova and their impact on individual households and communities (IOM-2009b).

* ***Survey on the Socio-Economic Impact of the Economic Crisis on Migration and Remittances* (March 2009)**

A household specialized survey covering the indicated topic above. It was implemented in Moldova by IOM, with support from the EC and Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and based on a sample of 2,027 persons aged 18 years and more. This research investigated various subjects such as the perceptions on the Moldovan business environment, entrepreneurship, banking system, economic crisis as well as, strictly regarding migration, the perceptions of the population on the migration phenomena and their experiences with emigration and remittances (IOM 2009a).

* ***Survey on Migration and Development* (2010)**

This was implemented by the Centre of Sociological, Politological and Psychological Analysis and Investigations of the International Agency for Source Country Information (IASCI-CIVIS, Moldova) and the World Bank, within the framework of the MiRPAL Project.

* ***Survey on Children and the Elderly Left Behind* (2011)**

Survey implemented in parallel with a survey already referred to earlier (see Georgia), based on a nationally representative sample of 3,553 households with either elderly or children, in all regions of Moldova except for Transnistria.

* ***Mapping of the Moldovan Diaspora in Italy, Portugal, France and the United Kingdom* (May-August 2012)**

A study undertaken by IOM within the framework of the Project “*Support the Implementation of the Migration and Development Component of the EU-Moldova Mobility Partnership*.” This study had the specific objectives to identify the demographic, socio-economic and cultural profile of Moldovan migrants, assess their integration in host countries, analyze the relationship migrants have with both diaspora organizations and the home country, and to assess the Moldovan diaspora’s development and cohesion (IOM- 2013b). Relevant existing data were complemented by primary data collected through quantitative and qualitative methods in Moldova and the four countries of destination. Quantitative research was based on a survey addressed to 760 respondents among Moldovan migrants. The qualitative research consisted of 44 in-depth individual interviews with experts and 16 focus-groups discussions with Moldovan migrants abroad.

#### Russian Federation

* ***Labour Force Survey* (continuous)**

The Federal State Statistics Service of the Russian Federation (ROSSTAT) has carried out LFSs with migration questions since 1992, on a quarterly basis from January 1999 to August 2009, and monthly since September 2009. This survey may be particularly relevant for measuring migration, as it involves a large sample of respondents residing in private households and aged 15-72. Among the main results, the survey conducted in the first quarter of 2010 showed about 80,000 foreigners employed in private households (UNECE-2012).

* ***Household Budget Survey* (2005)**

The only HBS conducted in the Russian Fedreation is inventoried in Annex Y, thoug the only relevant information collected is on whether households send/receive money to/from former members or other persons.

* ***Russia Longitudinal Monitoring Survey* (RLMS) (1993-2003)**

This survey measures the economic well-being of the Russian population by monitoring their health , expenditures and service utilization of households, prices, and infrastructure status at the regional and community level. Since 2008 it has collected some migration data, with information on country of birth of household members, whether people ever lived abroad by main countries or region, and whether each household sends money to or receives money from former household members (Annex Y). The 2013 the survey was implemented by the Higher School of Economics (HSE) of the National Research University, and ZAO Demoscope, together with CPC of University of North Carolina and the Sociological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences (SIRAS).

* ***Microcensus* (2015)**

ROSSTAT is in the process of organising a microcensus in October 2015, on the basis of new legal provisions, methodologies and technologies ROSSTAT-2015.This operation will use usual residence and households as units of data collection and provide some information relevant for migration, in particular for people permanently residing in Russia.

#### Tajikistan

* ***Labour Force Survey* (2009)**

The Tajik LFS of 2009 allowed for the identification of return migrants, as well as some information on immigrants and emigrants (TAJSTAT-2014 and Annex Y). Thesurvey was based on a sample of 4,000 households.

* ***Living Standards Measurement Survey* (2007 and 2009)**

Supported by the World Bank and UNICEF, since 2007 the LSMS has included a module with general questions about the migration process, plus another module regarding transfers and social assistance (Bilsborrow-2011 and Annex Y).

* ***Tajikistan Household Panel Survey* (THPS, 2011)**

Initiated by the Institute for East-and Southeast European Studies (IOS, Germany) and implemented in cooperation with the Sharq Research Center, this survey explores the phenomena of migration and remittances. It re-interviewed 1,503 households randomly selected from samples from the 2007 and 2009 LSMS, representative at national and regional levels (four regions and Dushanbe) and of urban/rural zones. The THPS included two detailed modules on migration, i.e. Module 2: Migration (with data collection on internal migration, international migration and family members living away from the household) and Module 7: Transfers and social assistance (for data collection on transfers from another household, transfers to another household and social assistance). This survey generated a unique panel database on migration topics revealing useful information for analyzing the medium-run consequences of the global financial crisis of 2009 (IOS-2013).

* ***Study on Labour Migration* (2002-2003)**

Conducted by the Sharq Scientific Research Center with the financial support from Sharq and IOM, this study consisted in two focus groups and two nationwide surveys. The focus groups were held in Dushanbe and Isfara in 2002 among Tajik migrant workers, labour recruitment intermediaries, employees of travel agencies that organize employment abroad and Tajik community activists in Russian cities. The first survey (February-March 2002)identified migrant households and estimated the extent to which the population was involved in labour migration. Conversely, the second survey (January-February 2003) aimed to verify the data obtained during the previous research and estimate the scale of emigration between 2000 and 2003 IOM-2003.

* ***Khatlon Remittances and Living Standards Survey* (KLSS, 2005)**

This was the first study of remittances based on a representative sample survey of Tajik households, providing quantitative data at the individual, household and community level in the Khatlon *oblast* (region) andto help develop policy to best harness migrant remittances for development. The survey generated a panel database on households interviewed in Khatlon for the 1999 LSMS, to shed light on the dynamics of migration and remittances and assess changes in the living standards of people since 1999(IOM-2007b).

* ***Survey on Return Migration* (2005-2006)**

Part of a survey programme of the World Bank covering Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Romania and Tajikistan- (see Georgia).

* ***Survey on Remittances and Poverty* (2006-2007)**

Regional research on remittances and poverty funded by the Asian Development Bank, jointly undertaken in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.

* ***Study on Migration and Development– Emigration, Return and Diaspora (2008)***

A study prepared by ILO, in collaboration with the Sharq Research Center, in the framework of the EU-funded Project “*Towards Sustainable Partnerships for the Effective Governance of Labour Migration in the Russian Federation, the Caucasus and Central Asia*.” The study was based on the results of recent specialized surveys, as well as some specific data collection. The latter was based on a survey with of1,000 labour migrants who returned in 2003-2007, and used Snowball Methods, an additional survey of 100 employers, and focus groups with returnees, college graduates, local authorities and businessmen, key informants and other local agencies (ILO-2010).

* ***Survey on the Impact of Migration and Remittances on Welfare* (2010)**

Survey undertaken by TAJSTAT, with support from the EU and the Federal Statistical Office of Germany (DESTATIS)TAJSTAT-2010. This operation gathered information on sending and receiving of remittances and goods by the households (see Annex Y).

* ***Survey on Emigration & Survey of Tajik Migrants in Russia* (2014)**

Part of the MiRPAL Project to create an integrated system of household surveys on international migration for CIS countries, implemented on a pilot basis in Tajikistan and Russia (a as main country of destination) by the World Bank. The survey in Tajikistan was conducted in March-May 2014, starting from a list of about 3,500 households, and ultimately interviewing about 1,000 households effectively interviewed. The survey in Russia was executed in December using an initial sample of about 2,000 Tajik migrant households and 500 households of non-migrant Russians as control group. In both surveys, the investigation of emigration, return migration and related topics were considered, using reference to the previous 10 years.

This survey constitutes one of the few experiences surveying migration at both origin and destination in the region. The surveys implemented in Tajikistan and Russia adopted similar definitions, concepts and questionnaires, with the latter including modules on housing quality, assets and expenditures, and health and income of households and individuals. However, the two surveys had significant differences in periods of execution, sample design and especially population coverage due to financial constraints, which limit the comparability of results. In fact, both surveys deviated from the ideal sampling combination of stratification of areas, disproportionate sampling and two-phase sampling of households, as described in Section III.B. In addition, the survey in Tajikistan had limited non-response follow up, thus resulted in a disproportionate selection of female and unemployed respondents. Further, the survey in Russia had a very low response rate and had bias at the level of sampled dwellings and households. Furthermore, the reliance on proxy respondents to answer questions led to additional bias and the differentcoverage for households who emigrated as a whole.

#### Ukraine

* ***Household Budget Survey* (2003)**

Implemented by the State Statistics Service of Ukraine (UkrStat), this survey asks whether households send/receive money to/from former members or other persons (see Annex Y).

* ***Labour Force Survey* (2008 and 2012)**

To study of international migration UkrStat adopted specific modules attached to their LFS of 2008 and 2012,supported by international organizations such as ILO, IOM, UNDP, UN Women, UNFPA and UNICEF UkrStat-2012. These surveysprovided information on the incidence, composition and destination of labour migration of nationals. Both surveys were based on nationally representative samples of 25,000 and 27,800 households, respectively, and covered a reference period for migration of respectively the 3,5 and 2,5 years prior to the survey. Focusing on the most recent survey of 2012, the coverage was quite detailed in terms of categories and characteristics of labour migrants, their income abroad and welfare of households of origin, as well as possible emigration plans of the population. The survey also investigated training activities taken to work abroad and coherence between the level of education acquired in Ukraine and the level necessary for working in the country of destination.

* ***Study on Migration and Remittances* (2014)**

Implemented by IOM in cooperation with the World Bank,, UkrStat, the National Bank of Ukraine, the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, IASCI and support of a local research institute, as a part of the *Research and Policy Dialogue Initiative on Migration and Remittances in Ukraine* and long-term inter-institutional cooperation. This study is based on both primary and secondary data and is intended to increase awareness among key stakeholders on the nature, use and impact of remittances entering Ukraine. Primary data were collected through a survey based on 20,000 households in Ukraine, as well as corresponding surveys of targeted samples of Ukrainian migrants in Russia, Italy and Canada, in addition to a border survey based on 2,000 interviews of migrants. This survey will cover the scale of labour migration and remittance flows, the demographic and socio-economic profile of Ukrainian migrants and households and their main countries of destination, transfer channels, the use and impact of remittances on the households of origin and savings patterns and factors which affect the decision of migrants to invest in Ukraine. In addition, focus groups, key informant interviews and a review of secondary literature/data were used to triangulate the primary data (IOM-2013).

#### Uzbekistan

* ***Household Budget Survey* (2000)**

Implemented by the State Committee on Statistics, it only includes questions relevant for the exchange of money and goods between households and their members away, with limiting conditions such as a one month recall period or the partial reporting of countries of origin/destination of transfers (Annex Y).

* ***Population Sample Survey* (2011)**

A survey covering recent and current emigration of nationals abroad. It does not use a cut-off period to identify former household members that left abroad, but records if they left within the past 12 months, together with some socio-demographic data and the reason and destination of emigration (Annex Y).

1. Summary overview on topics and contents of migration data collection in selected household surveys of CIS countries since 2000

SEE SEPARATE FILE

1. In the population census, place of birth and place of previous/next residence generally allow to derive respectively country of birth and country of previous/next residence. Place of birth and place of previous/next residence are particularly important because they allow us to know an exact region, province, district and/or location, so both international and internal migration can be studied. However, given the focus of the manual on international migration, ‘country of birth’ and ‘country of previous/next residence’ are used more frequently hereafter. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In fact, Bilsborrow (2007) considers a sample of 5,000 households (about 20,000 individuals), an adequate size for a general survey in a medium size country. An incidence of foreign-born population living in the given country of 5% may presumably sample only around 1,000. This may become irrelevant for studying immigration if an important number of these potential respondents arrived in the country many years earlier, are minors, or do not belong to the economically active population. On the other hand, adopting a sample of 50,000-100,000 households in a country with a higher proportion of people born abroad, the numbers of relevant adult migrants within the sample should be easily sufficient for studying migration, namely for making conclusions about the size and basic characteristics of migrants at both the national and regional level. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *Migration and Remittances Peer-Assisted Learning*, an initiative aiming to deepen knowledge and understanding, as well as strengthening cross-country collaboration on migration policies and practices in the CIS region – see at [www.mirpal.org](http://www.mirpal.org). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. ***Cross-Regional Information System on the Reintegration of Migrants in their Countries of Origin*)**of the European University Institute (EUI) / *Return migration and Development Platform* (RDP, <http://rsc.eui.eu/rdp>, an initiative aiming to address the socio-economic, legal and institutional factors and conditions shaping returnees’ patterns of reintegration in their countries of origin. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *Push and Pull Factors of International Migration.* [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. *Mediterranean Household International Migration Surveys.* [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. *Migration between Africa and Europe.* [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Questions on place of birth and place of previous residence generally allow deriving respectively country of birth and country of previous residence. The place of birth and place of previous residence are particularly important because they identify exact region, province, district and/or location, so as to study international migration as well as internal migration. Place of birth information is particularly important in the CIS region due to the breakup of the Soviet Union and subsequent creation of numerous countries. Current country borders should be used to collect country of birth information. Persons whose country of birth and current country differ due to changing borders should not be considered to be international migrants (UN 1998). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The combination of questions may vary. They may also include information on immigration (questions on country of birth and citizenship) and emigration (questions on persons who have moved abroad, the duration of their absence, the reason and country of emigration).)

. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. For more information about collecting information on relatives of household members to estimate emigration see Billborrow (2007). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. This section is adapted from Bilsborrow-2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. This section is adapted from Bilsborrow (2012). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. For more information on this topic refer to *Survey Sampling,* prepared by Leslie Kish (Kish-1965), *Surveying Migrant Households: A Comparison of Census-Based, Snowball, and Intercept Point Surveys,* by David J. McKenzie and Johan Mistiaen (McKenzie-2007) and more recent works on sampling elusive populations prepared by Vijay Verma (ILO-2008 and ILO-2013). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. This part is adapted from Bilsborrow-2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. An alternative way of selecting area units is to select them based on expert or informed judgment, that is, people knowledgeable about where emigrants mostly originate from could be asked to stratify areas according to expected intensity of emigration, then oversampling would occur in these areas. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. ILO (2013) discusses a number of theoretical and implementation issues for this technique, including the criteria and rules for its adoption, the choice of initial sample, unequal unit selection probabilities, and stratification and estimation procedures. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. It may be useful to recall that under-coverage and non-response may derive from the following:

• The nature of data collection units,

• The type of information sought in the survey, and

• The particular conditions under which the survey is conducted.

Given the decisions on the selection of survey units and contents of questionnaires, constraints ensued after the end of data collection have to be solved during data management (ILO-2013). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. The Bibliography fully reports and provides links to all works referred to in this sub-section and Annex X, as well as a series of studies on migration in CIS countries that did not use sample surveys. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Assessments of migration systems of Armenia, Georgia and Moldova were recently undertaken on behalf of IOM and made publicly available. In addition, an assessment of measurement on labour migration was carried out in Tajikistan under the EC-funded MIEUX (Migration EU Expertise) programme. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. <http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/rlms-hse/project>. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. In fact, from the assessment undertaken on behalf of IOM in 2010/2011 (IOM-2011b), the number of persons abroad for more than one year includes all persons ever emigrated and still living abroad, while persons living abroad for less than one year will also include short-term migrants who will return within 12 months. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Foreigners were included in the LFS sample based on dwelling addresses, however due to their small number the results were not statistically significant (IOM-2011b). [↑](#footnote-ref-22)