



How to cite this article:

Khodadadian, H. & Taghizadeh Ansari, M. (2025). Evaluation and Ranking of the Legal Implications of Migration Using the Delphi and Kano Techniques (A Case Study of Iranian Nationals in Selected Countries: Sweden, France, Germany, Canada, the United States, and Australia). *Journal of Historical Research, Law and Policy*, 3(4), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.61838/jhrhp.93>



Article history:
Original Research

Dates:

Submission Date: 17 August 2025

Revision Date: 08 November 2025

Acceptance Date: 17 November 2025

First Publication Date: 19 November 2025

Final Publication Date: 29 December 2025

Evaluation and Ranking of the Legal Implications of Migration Using the Delphi and Kano Techniques (A Case Study of Iranian Nationals in Selected Countries: Sweden, France, Germany, Canada, the United States, and Australia)

1. Hamid. Khodadadian¹ : Department of Law, NT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
2. Mostafa. Taghizadeh Ansari^{2*}: Department of Law, NT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

*corresponding author's email: Mos.taghizadeh_ansari@iauctb.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

Today, in the context of globalization, one of the key issues that can be raised and that influences countries significantly is migration, as it represents a global phenomenon intertwined with various dimensions of the modern world. Migration not only affects both immigrant-receiving and emigrant-sending countries but also constitutes a topic increasingly discussed within the framework of globalization, becoming a shared concern among nations. States, as the principal subjects of international law, are bound by international rules and regulations. However, they remain highly sensitive to matters that fall within their domestic jurisdictions or that may affect their sovereignty. Migration is an issue that encompasses both domestic and international dimensions. It cannot be regarded solely as a national concern outside the scope of international legal frameworks. In fact, various international rules and regulations—particularly those established under human rights law—govern matters related to migration and migrants. Meanwhile, states, for different reasons (including security and economic considerations), have developed their own migration regulations and consider the admission and control of migrants as part of their sovereign and jurisdictional rights. The present study employed both field and library-based research methods. Its instruments included the preparation of practical questionnaires administered to Iranian migrants living abroad; interviews with Iranian migration applicants; examination of judicial cases involving Iranians residing overseas; review of court cases related to foreign migrants and aliens within Iran; and conducting interviews with judges, professors, lawyers, and legal experts. Additionally, note-taking from prior studies conducted in academic and research centers related to the topic was performed using a sampling approach. Given that the current study focuses on identifying and ranking the legal implications of migration—using Iranian nationals residing in the selected countries of Sweden, France, Germany, Canada, the United States, and Australia as the case study—the research can be categorized, based on its objectives, as both a field and a library-based investigation. The analysis of results indicates that the most significant priorities identified in ranking the criminal, civil, financial, and migration laws affecting Iranian nationals in the studied countries (Sweden, France, Germany, Canada, the United States, and Australia), based on the qualitative Delphi method, include: (1) the degree of familiarity with the migration policy framework of the destination country; (2) the degree of familiarity with the visa and residency regulations of the destination country; and (3) the degree of familiarity with the administrative misconduct laws and procedures of the destination country.

Keywords: Country, State, Migration, Iranian Nationals.



Introduction

The term *migrant* and *migration* have been defined by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) in one of its publications titled *Glossary on Migration*, and since this organization is the only specialized international body in this field, it is appropriate to consider its definitions. In this publication, a migrant is defined as:

“In general, the term *migrant* encompasses all cases where the decision to migrate is made freely by the individual concerned, for reasons of ‘personal convenience’ and without the intervention of an external compelling factor. Thus, this term applies to a person and family members who move to another country or region to improve their material and social conditions and secure a better future for themselves and their family” (1).

Another definition provided for *migration* is as follows:

“The movement of a person or a group of persons, either across an international border or within a State. It is a population movement, encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever its length, composition, and causes; it includes migration of refugees, displaced persons, economic migrants, and persons moving for other purposes” (2).

The impacts of international migration are considered from multiple perspectives; however, the most significant are those affecting the security of both the origin and destination countries. For example, the migration of educated Afghans to Pakistan and European countries—and some to Iran—demonstrates this phenomenon. Many of these migrants were in lower social positions in their own country and mostly engaged in manual labor upon migration. A number of them have become accustomed to the favorable conditions in the host countries and do not intend to return. This situation poses both financial burdens and potential threats to the national security of host countries (3).

According to estimates by human rights organizations, between 600,000 and 800,000 individuals are smuggled across borders each year, the majority of whom are women and girls coerced into exploitative and illegal labor, often subjected to abuse and mistreatment. This issue is inherently linked to the security concerns of the *countries of origin* and is addressed within the framework of migrant smuggling. Since migration—both legal and illegal—affects crime rates, it has drawn attention from policymakers. Migrants often experience weaker social control mechanisms, making them more vulnerable to criminal involvement. Therefore, international migration influences the security of destination countries through two main channels: (1) migrant smuggling and national security threats, and (2) crimes committed by migrants, which can endanger host country stability (4).

Migration is also a dimension of development, leading to major transformations in economic and social structures. International migration influences development in two ways. First, positively—migrants working abroad send remittances to their home countries and may return with new skills, thus contributing to development, particularly in cases of temporary migration where return is intended. Second, negatively—migration can deprive origin countries of skilled labor through the so-called “brain drain.” This negative impact is generally associated with permanent migration. Host countries can also face structural changes and crises resulting from large-scale immigration. The use of foreign labor, especially through the migration of workers from less-developed countries, has recently been recognized as an integral aspect of globalization. Labor supply thus reflects the role of migrant-sending states in the global economy—for instance, Filipino nurses who now provide international services, demonstrating that their labor markets are no longer confined to domestic boundaries (5).

Consequently, migration can economically alleviate poverty; many nations owe part of their wealth to the massive influx of migrants. Moreover, migrants contribute to the development of their home countries through education, capacity building, technology transfer, and investment (6).

Another consequence of international migration—whether positive or negative—is *cultural diversity* in host countries. While cultural diversity may become a challenge when migrant groups form distinct communities and promote their own ideals and objectives, it also fosters cultural exchange and human interconnection. Such diversity enhances awareness, communication, and may even strengthen bilateral relations between countries. Migration thus not only transforms individuals but also reshapes both the environments they leave and those they enter (7).

With the rise of global migration, awareness of the challenges and problems faced by migrants has become essential. Increasing xenophobia, particularly discrimination in employment, fuels hostility and dehumanizing attitudes toward migrants. Despite international conventions supporting migrant rights, violations and anti-immigrant sentiments persist, even within domestic legal frameworks. To some extent, the lack of respect for migrants' rights stems from inadequate awareness of international human rights instruments.

Considering the far-reaching implications of migration for both sending and receiving countries, this study seeks to address the following questions:

- To what extent have current national laws and regulations contributed to the emigration of Iranian citizens abroad for economic, social, political, or cultural reasons?
- To what degree could reforms in these laws reduce migration rates?
- What legal consequences has the migration of Iranian nationals to Canada, the United States, Sweden, Germany, France, and Australia produced under the respective legal systems of Iran and those host countries?
- What recommendations can be made to revise and enact new laws to improve migrant conditions and mitigate emigration?

Analysis of Migration Challenges

Migration is one of the most debated global issues of the early 21st century. No country can claim immunity from human mobility. Migrant groups from diverse nations and cultures relocate for varied reasons, facing multiple challenges in their host societies. Although challenges differ among groups, many migrants share common difficulties, including discrimination and barriers to education and employment (8).

Socioeconomic Challenges of Migration

Migrants may be perceived as an economic and social burden due to the financial costs they impose on governments or because of perceived links to crime and social disorder. Host societies often fear that large numbers of migrants strain public services such as housing, education, and transportation. Consequently, many governments have adopted restrictive policies to limit migration (9).

Migrant Deprivation. In recent years, many anti-immigration measures have been introduced to restrict migrants' access to public benefits and services, especially targeting undocumented migrants. These policies have led to patterns of deprivation and racial discrimination in employment, education, and housing, resulting in family separation, poor living conditions, limited access to quality education, and social alienation (10).

Family Challenges. Migrants often face emotional stress due to separation from family members. Long working hours, dual-income households, high living costs, and related anxieties may weaken familial relationships, increase stress, and lead to health concerns (11).

Cultural Challenges of Migration

Violations of host-country norms are often perceived as threats to national security and core values. How host societies define themselves and determine who is accepted within them shapes citizenship rights and privileges. These norms are reflected in the citizenship laws of states (2). Regardless of how citizenship is obtained, when immigration levels are perceived as excessive, host societies often resist incorporating migrants into the national identity. Migrants are sometimes viewed as culturally inferior or unsuitable for citizenship. Cultural threat theorists argue that when people fail to share a common language, national unity deteriorates (12).

Language Barriers. Migrants and refugees often report that lack of language proficiency hinders their ability to build a better life and establish vital connections in society; even daily tasks can become overwhelming (1).

Parent–Child Gaps. Migrant families frequently work multiple jobs or long shifts, reducing parent–child interactions. Children often adapt more quickly to the host culture, which can create intergenerational conflicts. As children acquire the new language faster and perceive their parents' educational levels as outdated, they may emotionally detach from traditional family norms. This process contributes to cultural divergence within migrant families (13).

The Impact of Migration on Military and Political Security

This dimension of security has a direct effect on relations between the sending and receiving countries. When migrants and refugees oppose the regime of the host country, the situation can threaten relations between the sending and receiving states. Migrants originating from hostile countries can also serve as significant sources of intelligence that disrupt the national security of the host state, thereby affecting its political and military security (1).

The Impact of Migration on Military Security

This section refers to activities that threaten a country's security in relation to other states. Migrants may endanger a host country's military security from at least three perspectives. First, when migrants use the territory of the host state to conduct military or armed operations against their country of origin; in such cases, the host state may be held accountable for these activities. Second, refugees and political asylum seekers might persuade the host country to assume leadership in organizing such operations against their homeland. Finally, the host state may itself have a stake in these activities—particularly when it is in conflict with the political regime of the migrants' country of origin—thus potentially instrumentalizing migrants to achieve its objectives (12).

On the other hand, ideological differences between migrants and the host country can precipitate military or terrorist operations by migrants in pursuit of the political goals of a specific group or state. In the immediate aftermath of September 11, 2001, suspicions quickly focused on migrants associated with certain religions, countries, or regions. Consequently, the United States has pursued migration-related security issues with heightened rigor since then (8).

The Impact of Migration on Political Security

Political threats endanger the stability of the state at its core. In such circumstances, a country may face external or internal threats. Internal threats can stem from restrictions imposed by the government on groups or individuals. The continuation of such restrictions fuels efforts to change these policies, which may lead to movements for autonomy and independence and thus imperil political stability (2).

Externally, a country can be threatened by the ideologies of other states. When migrants and the host country share similar ideologies, the host state may frame this as a political threat to the ideology of the sending country. Conversely, ideological differences between migrants and the host society can be perceived as a political threat to the host state. Moreover, external threats can transform into internal threats over time (1).

The Impact of Migration on Socio-Cultural Security, Economic Security, and Environmental Security

Social, cultural, and economic disruptions—as well as environmental consequences—resulting from international migration constitute potential threats to the foundations of national security. These outcomes not only undermine national security domestically but, in the long term, indirectly affect political relations between host and sending countries, thereby influencing regional and international security (10).

The Impact of Migration on Socio-Cultural Security

Security frequently pertains to social identities such as religion and nationality, which can play a decisive role in state sovereignty. In inter-state relations, external threats operating at the social level can be more dangerous than political or military threats (9).

Language, religion, and cultural traditions each shape state ideology; consequently, cultural “influxes” associated with migration are often resisted. In the long term, one of the most visible social effects of migration is the formation of ethnic minorities in the host country. The arrival of migrants with distinct cultures and ethnicities can transform homogeneous societies into multiethnic and multicultural ones, altering key social indicators and characteristics. At the same time, migrants may provoke public anger by violating the cultural values and social norms of the host society, eliciting reciprocal reactions (1).

Societies appear to possess a limited capacity for absorbing migrants; if this capacity is exceeded, the foundations of political and social cohesion are jeopardized. Xenophobic and anti-immigrant sentiments typically intensify during economic recessions marked by rising unemployment. During such periods, migrants who are culturally and socially more similar to the host society are more readily accepted than those perceived as racially or culturally more distinct (12).

In addition to issues arising from cultural differences, undocumented migrants are sometimes associated with various social crimes, including drug trafficking, sexual assault, street violence, and similar offenses; some individuals do not migrate for work but flee their countries to evade punishment for crimes already committed (8).

Large criminal networks around the world exploit migrants who fail to integrate into host societies. Notorious examples include transnational syndicates that have historically recruited migrants to expand their operations; regional conflicts and geopolitical upheavals have further facilitated the mobilization of migrant groups as drivers of organized criminal activity (9).

The Economic Security Consequences of Migration

Economic threats—whether external, internal, regional, or international—can undermine a country's economic foundations and target its welfare and economic power. Migrants can impose constraints on the host state. Frequently positioned at the lower strata of the labor market, they may generate significant public expenditures for housing, education, health care, transportation infrastructure, communications, and similar services. To meet these costs, host governments may increase taxes on their citizens, provoking social backlash—especially against economically inactive migrants and political refugees (11). Many migrants also join low-income segments of society, directly reinforcing patterns of structural deprivation (7).

Moreover, because migrants may accept lower wages, they can displace local workers in hiring processes; alternatively, undocumented workers may perform jobs that native workers are unwilling to do, which in many cases still translates into perceived losses of employment opportunities for citizens (10).

The combination of increased public expenditures, higher taxes, and perceived reductions in job opportunities attributed to migration can inflame public sentiment in the host country. The resulting economic pressures exacerbate social hostility, weaken community cohesion and social integration, and ultimately jeopardize national security (11).

A study conducted across 71 developing countries indicates that international migration intensifies poverty in developing contexts: on average, a 10% increase in international migration within a given country is associated with a 2.1% reduction in the share of household subsistence—approximately USD 1 per person per day (6).

Research Method

The research method is both field-based and library-based, and the instruments include preparing practical questionnaires for Iranian migrants living abroad; conducting interviews with Iranians applying for migration; examining judicial case files of Iranians residing outside the country; reviewing judicial case files of migrants and foreign nationals inside the country; conducting interviews with judges, faculty members, attorneys, and legal experts; and systematic note-taking (excerpting) from studies conducted in academic and research centers related to the topic, using sampling procedures. Given that the present study concerns the identification and ranking of the legal effects of migration, with a case study of Iranian nationals in the countries under study (Sweden, France, Germany, Canada, the United States, and Australia), the research can, in terms of its objective, be considered a “field and library-based” study. In this research, we intend—within a descriptive framework—to explain the study variables and ultimately, based on this analysis, to evaluate the identification and ranking of the legal effects of migration using the Delphi and Kano techniques, focusing on Iranian nationals as the case study.

Statistical Population of the Study

Statistical population; sampling method and sample size:

Questionnaire and interview with Iranians residing in Sweden— $n = 50$; stratified random sampling.

Questionnaire and interview with Iranians residing in France— $n = 50$; stratified random sampling.

Questionnaire and interview with Iranians residing in Germany— $n = 50$; stratified random sampling.

Questionnaire and interview with Iranians residing in Canada— $n = 50$; stratified random sampling.

Questionnaire and interview with Iranians residing in the United States— $n = 50$; stratified random sampling.

Questionnaire and interview with Iranians residing in Australia—n = 50; stratified random sampling.

Questionnaire and interview with Iranians applying to migrate to Sweden—n = 25; stratified random sampling.

Questionnaire and interview with Iranians applying to migrate to France—n = 25; stratified random sampling.

Questionnaire and interview with Iranians applying to migrate to Germany—n = 25; stratified random sampling.

Questionnaire and interview with Iranians applying to migrate to Canada—n = 25; stratified random sampling.

Questionnaire and interview with Iranians applying to migrate to the United States—n = 25; stratified random sampling.

Questionnaire and interview with Iranians applying to migrate to Australia—n = 25; stratified random sampling.

Review of case files of Iranians residing abroad: 15–20 case files under review or adjudicated; stratified sampling.

Review of case files of foreign nationals residing in or migrating to the country: 30 case files under review or adjudicated; stratified sampling.

Interviews with judges: 5 judges with experience adjudicating cases involving Iranians residing abroad; cluster sampling.

Interviews with judges: 5 judges with experience adjudicating cases involving foreign nationals residing in or migrating to the country; cluster sampling.

Interviews with faculty members, attorneys, and legal experts.

International law domain: 3 persons.

Private law domain: 3 persons.

Public law domain: 3 persons.

Research Implementation Procedure

In this regard, after coordination with Iranian nationals in the countries under study (Sweden, France, Germany, Canada, the United States, and Australia), and coordination with the management of the study area (the locality where Iranian nationals reside), a research assignment letter is prepared from the university and research permits are obtained from Iranian nationals in the countries under study (Sweden, France, Germany, Canada, the United States, and Australia). With the agreement of personnel—including those concerned with human rights effects, civil law effects, criminal law effects and implementation, current national laws and regulations, etc.—the statistical sample of the study is approached for the distribution of the questionnaire for research purposes.

Then, statistics and information relevant to the subject of this study—regarding the extent of identification and the ranking of the legal effects of migration, with a case study of Iranian nationals in the countries under study (Sweden, France, Germany, Canada, the United States, and Australia)—and comparison with optimal conditions in relation to the quantity and quality of services provided and verified in the study area of Iranian nationals (including human rights effects; operations; level of facilities; quality of the study area; level of expertise and skills of personnel in human rights, civil law, criminal law, and current national laws and regulations vis-à-vis Iranian nationals; and views regarding the management of the study area, such as maintaining order, welfare amenities, etc.) are collected, and through distributing questionnaires among those in charge, existing problems are identified.

Research Findings

Descriptive statistics of the study variables

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the “destination countries” variable

Percent	Frequency	Group
10.66	50	Iranians residing in Sweden
10.66	50	Iranians residing in France
10.66	50	Iranians residing in Germany
10.66	50	Iranians residing in Canada
10.66	50	Iranians residing in the United States
10.66	50	Iranians residing in Australia
5.33	25	Iranians applying to migrate to Sweden
5.33	25	Iranians applying to migrate to France
5.33	25	Iranians applying to migrate to Germany
5.33	25	Iranians applying to migrate to Canada
5.33	25	Iranians applying to migrate to the United States
5.33	25	Iranians applying to migrate to Australia
1.03	5	Judge—experience adjudicating cases of Iranians residing abroad
1.03	5	Judge—with experience adjudicating cases of foreign nationals
0.63	3	Faculty/attorneys—international law domain
0.63	3	Faculty/attorneys—private law domain
0.63	3	Faculty/attorneys—public law domain
469	469	Total

Descriptive statistics for the age variable

The results of the descriptive statistical analysis for the age variable of personnel and experts concerning Iranian nationals showed that, out of a total of 469 persons among personnel and experts concerning Iranian nationals, 4,686 persons were under 25 years of age, 175 persons were 25–35 years old, 107 persons were 36–45 years old, and 61 persons were 46–55 years old.

Descriptive statistics for gender

The results of the descriptive statistical analysis for the gender variable of personnel and experts concerning Iranian nationals showed that, out of a total of 469 personnel and experts concerning Iranian nationals, 9 persons were female and 4 persons were male. The largest age group was men and the smallest was women.

Descriptive statistics for educational level of personnel and experts concerning Iranian nationals

The results of the descriptive statistical analysis for the educational level variable in the statistical sample showed that, out of a total of 469 personnel and experts concerning Iranian nationals, 78 persons held a high-school diploma or less, 82 persons held an associate degree, 203 persons held a bachelor's degree, and 106 persons held a master's degree or higher.

Inferential statistics

Table 2. Results of the normality test (Kolmogorov–Smirnov test)

Kolmogorov–Smirnov Variable	Test Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p)
The role of current national laws and regulations as a cause of the migration of Iranian nationals	0.039	468	0.077

Legal effects and consequences for migrants based on the laws and regulations of Iran and the destination countries	0.044	468	0.085
Degree of familiarity with criminal laws of the destination countries	0.035	468	0.069
Degree of familiarity with civil laws and other laws of the destination countries	0.038	468	0.075

To test the normality of residuals, the valid Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was used. For the four variables, the Kolmogorov–Smirnov statistics yielded p-values greater than 0.05; therefore, it can be stated that the residuals of the tests follow a normal distribution.

Table 3. Weights of the research questions

Title	Abbreviation	Level weight	Criterion weight	Final weight
1– How familiar are you with the civil laws of the country to which you are migrating?	A1	0.756	0.386	0.115
2– How aware are you of the criminal laws of the country to which you intend to migrate?	A2	0.744	0.251	0.102
3– Degree of familiarity with residency restrictions in the migration process of the destination country	A3	0.725	0.255	0.099
4– Degree of familiarity with citizenship restrictions in the migration process of the destination country	A4	0.687	0.298	0.081
5– Degree of familiarity with administrative misconduct procedures in the destination country	A5	0.639	0.261	0.074
6– Degree of familiarity with administrative regulations in the destination country	A6	0.606	0.189	0.069
7– Degree of familiarity with hiring regulations in the destination country	A7	0.579	0.146	0.087
8– Degree of familiarity with the migration policy framework of the destination country	A8	0.525	0.158	0.103
9– Degree of familiarity with visa and residency regulations in the destination country	A9	0.511	0.132	0.071
10– Degree of familiarity with asylum laws in the destination country	A10	0.494	0.098	0.026
11– Degree of familiarity with legal procedures for obtaining 5-year, 10-year, and permanent residency in the destination country	A11	0.481	0.069	0.055
12– Degree of familiarity with education and training laws in the destination country	A12	0.469	0.055	0.036
13– Degree of familiarity with labor laws in the destination country	A13	0.442	0.049	0.042
14– Degree of familiarity with company registration laws in the destination country	M1	0.593	0.463	0.162
15– Degree of familiarity with housing rental laws in the destination country	M2	0.559	0.158	0.132
16– Degree of familiarity with legal rules on purchasing personal and household items in the destination country	M3	0.516	0.084	0.099
17– Degree of familiarity with legal rules on purchasing or renting a car in the destination country	M4	0.487	0.126	0.092
18– Degree of familiarity with legal rules for obtaining a driver's license in the destination country	M5	0.452	0.094	0.084
19– Degree of familiarity with banking regulations in the destination country	M6	0.440	0.114	0.070
20– Degree of familiarity with environmental laws in the destination country	M7	0.416	0.158	0.061
21– Degree of familiarity with civil rights regulations in the destination country	M8	0.394	0.115	0.058
22– Degree of familiarity with regulations concerning the risk of human trafficking in the destination country	M9	0.375	0.095	0.055
23– Degree of familiarity with regulations concerning violations of human rights in the destination country	M10	0.342	0.081	0.049
24– Degree of familiarity with regulations on living in camps in the destination country	M11	0.327	0.136	0.045
25– Degree of familiarity with threats to life and property and the possibility of filing criminal complaints in the destination country	M12	0.308	0.179	0.039
26– Degree of familiarity with how to draft and submit a petition to civil courts in the destination country	M13	0.287	0.091	0.037

27– Degree of familiarity with trade and commercial laws in the destination country	V1	0.612	0.532	0.226
28– Degree of familiarity with inheritance laws in the destination country	V2	0.592	0.282	0.202
29– Degree of familiarity with family law—marriage and divorce—in the destination country	V3	0.573	0.244	0.187
30– Degree of familiarity with family law—child guardianship—in the destination country	V4	0.541	0.365	0.151
31– Degree of familiarity with family law—neighbor rights—in the destination country	V5	0.527	0.088	0.132
32– Degree of familiarity with election laws in the destination country	V6	0.479	0.189	0.115
33– Degree of familiarity with civil affairs laws—health and hygiene—in the destination country	V7	0.425	0.127	0.097
34– Degree of familiarity with civil affairs laws—children's education—in the destination country	V8	0.377	0.097	0.083
35– Degree of familiarity with the constitution in the destination country	V9	0.342	0.089	0.076
36– Degree of familiarity with anti-racial discrimination laws in the destination country	V10	0.318	0.135	0.052
37– Degree of familiarity with child-related laws in the destination country	V10	0.322	0.139	0.048
38– Degree of familiarity with laws on retaining legal counsel in the destination country	V11	0.347	0.152	0.055
39– Degree of familiarity with tax laws in the destination country	V12	0.395	0.173	0.051
40– Degree of familiarity with the framework for implementing international migration laws in the destination country	V13	0.313	0.130	0.058

Table 4. Mean Percentage of Criteria in Criminal, Civil, Financial, and Migration Laws Using the Qualitative Delphi Method

Mean percentage of criterion	Description of stated needs
92%	Degree of familiarity with residency restrictions in the migration process of the country to which you plan to migrate
100%	Degree of familiarity with procedures for addressing administrative violations in the destination country
88%	Degree of familiarity with administrative regulations in the destination country
100%	Degree of familiarity with the migration policy framework of the destination country
100%	Degree of familiarity with visa and residency regulations in the destination country
72%	Degree of familiarity with education and training laws in the destination country
88%	Degree of familiarity with labor laws in the destination country
73%	Degree of familiarity with company registration laws in the destination country
85%	Degree of familiarity with housing rental laws and the purchase or rental of vehicles in the destination country
93%	Familiarity with legal rules for obtaining a driver's license and with banking activities in the destination country
52%	Familiarity with civil rights regulations and with human rights violations in the destination country
79%	Familiarity with regulations concerning the risk of human trafficking in the destination country
81%	Familiarity with inheritance laws and with family law—marriage and divorce—in the destination country
78%	Familiarity with family law—child guardianship—and with child-related laws in the destination country
94%	Familiarity with how to draft and submit a petition to civil courts in the destination country
90%	Familiarity with asylum and criminal laws and with citizenship restrictions in the destination country
86%	Familiarity with civil affairs laws—health and hygiene—children's education—and neighbor rights
79%	Familiarity with trade and commercial laws, anti-racial discrimination laws, and laws on retaining legal counsel in the destination country
92%	Familiarity with the constitution, family law, and tax laws in the destination country
77%	Familiarity with labor laws and hiring regulations in the destination country
75%	Familiarity with residency restrictions and citizenship restrictions in the migration process

In the table above, various needs related to the components of criminal, civil, financial, and migration laws concerning Iranian nationals (the statistical sample) were examined. By presenting these components to the

sample, the mean percentage of respondents' answers to the criteria was measured, and ultimately, the identification and ranking of the legal effects of migration are conducted using the qualitative Delphi method.

Table 5. Ranking of Criminal, Civil, Financial, and Migration Laws for Iranian Nationals in the Countries Under Study (Sweden, France, Germany, Canada, the United States, and Australia) Using the Qualitative Delphi Method

Rank	Description of stated familiarities
4	Degree of familiarity with residency restrictions in the migration process of the country to which you plan to migrate
1	Degree of familiarity with procedures for addressing administrative violations in the destination country
6	Degree of familiarity with administrative regulations in the destination country
1	Degree of familiarity with the migration policy framework of the destination country
1	Degree of familiarity with visa and residency regulations in the destination country
15	Degree of familiarity with education and training laws in the destination country
6	Degree of familiarity with labor laws in the destination country
14	Degree of familiarity with company registration laws in the destination country
8	Degree of familiarity with housing rental laws and the purchase or rental of vehicles in the destination country
3	Familiarity with legal rules for obtaining a driver's license and with banking activities in the destination country
16	Familiarity with civil rights regulations and human rights violations in the destination country
10	Familiarity with regulations concerning the risk of human trafficking in the destination country
9	Familiarity with inheritance laws and with family law—marriage and divorce—in the destination country
11	Familiarity with family law—child guardianship—and with child-related laws in the destination country
2	Familiarity with how to draft and submit a petition to civil courts in the destination country
5	Familiarity with asylum and criminal laws and with citizenship restrictions in the destination country
7	Familiarity with civil affairs laws—health and hygiene—children's education—and neighbor rights
10	Familiarity with trade and commercial laws, anti-racial discrimination laws, and laws on retaining legal counsel in the destination country
4	Familiarity with the constitution, family law, and tax laws in the destination country
468	Familiarity with labor laws and hiring regulations in the destination country
469	Familiarity with residency restrictions and citizenship restrictions in the migration process

The most important priorities identified in ranking the criminal, civil, financial, and migration laws for Iranian nationals in the countries under study (Sweden, France, Germany, Canada, the United States, and Australia) using the qualitative Delphi method include:

Familiarity with the migration policy framework of the destination country;

Familiarity with visa and residency regulations in the destination country;

Familiarity with procedures for addressing administrative violations in the destination country;

Familiarity with how to draft and submit a petition to civil courts in the destination country;

Familiarity with legal rules for obtaining a driver's license and with banking activities in the destination country.

Table 6. Level of Importance of Legal Variables

Title	Abbreviation	DM1 Migrants	DM2 Academic Elites	DM3 Judges
Industry complexity	A1	H	VH	VH
Degree of familiarity with residency restrictions in the migration process of the country to which you plan to migrate	A2	VH	M	VH
Degree of familiarity with procedures for addressing administrative violations in the destination country	A3	H	VH	H
Degree of familiarity with administrative regulations in the destination country	A4	M	M	L
Degree of familiarity with the migration policy framework of the destination country	A5	H	VH	H
Degree of familiarity with visa and residency regulations in the destination country	A6	M	H	M
Degree of familiarity with education and training laws in the destination country	A7	H	M	L
Degree of familiarity with labor laws in the destination country	A8	VH	VH	H

Degree of familiarity with company registration laws in the destination country	A9	H	M	H
Degree of familiarity with housing rental laws and with the purchase or rental of vehicles in the destination country	A10	H	M	VH
Familiarity with legal rules for obtaining a driver's license and with banking activities in the destination country	A11	H	M	M
Familiarity with civil rights regulations and with human rights violations in the destination country	A12	L	L	M
Familiarity with regulations concerning the risk of human trafficking in the destination country	A13	VH	VH	VH
Familiarity with inheritance laws and with family law—marriage and divorce—in the destination country	M1	H	VH	M
Familiarity with family law—child guardianship—and with child-related laws in the destination country	M2	H	H	VH
Familiarity with how to draft and submit a petition to civil courts in the destination country	M3	M	VH	VH
Familiarity with asylum and criminal laws and with citizenship restrictions in the destination country	M4	VH	H	VH
Familiarity with civil affairs laws—health and hygiene—children's education—and neighbor rights	M5	VH	VH	VH
Familiarity with trade and commercial laws, anti-racial discrimination laws, and laws on retaining legal counsel in the destination country	M6	H	H	H
Familiarity with the constitution, family law, and tax laws in the destination country	M7	M	M	L
Familiarity with labor laws and hiring regulations in the destination country	M8	M	M	M
Familiarity with residency restrictions and citizenship restrictions in the migration process	M9	H	H	M

For determining the importance of the objectives (WHATs) in the “usage pattern of the legal effects of migration on Iranian nationals,” opinions were collected and their averages calculated; the results are shown in the following table.

Table 7. Results of Opinions

	Constitutional & election laws	Laws on retaining counsel & filing complaints	Traffic & road safety laws	Environmental laws	Tax laws	Civil rights laws	Human rights laws	Labor laws	Financial laws	Asylum laws	Inheritance laws	Family laws	Civil law	Criminal law
DM1	H	L	M	VH	M	H	M	H	M	H	VH	M	VH	H
DM2	H	M	M	H	M	VH	M	H	H	M	H	VH	VH	VH
DM3	M	L	M	H	M	VH	M	H	H	H	M	VH	VH	H
Weight of each WHAT	(5.33, 6.33, 7.33)	(2.67, 3.67, 4.67)	(4, 5, 6)	(6.67, 7.67, 8.67)	(4, 5, 6)	(7.33, 8.33, 9.33)	(4, 5, 6)	(6, 7, 8)	(5.33, 6.33, 7.33)	(5.33, 6.33, 7.33)	(6, 7, 8)	(6.67, 7.67, 8.67)	(8, 9, 10)	(6.67, 7.67, 8.67)
Sym bol	H2	V3	M4	H1	A4	M3	M2	V2	A3	H!	M1	V1	A2	A1

Ultimately, the relative importance of each development plan in the “usage pattern of the legal effects of migration on Iranian nationals” was obtained for use in subsequent stages. The matrix of this usage pattern together with the calculations is presented in Table (11). To enable better comparison and ranking, the weighted values obtained from the table of the “usage pattern of the legal effects of migration on Iranian nationals” were normalized. The plan with the highest crisp value should be prioritized. If $M(a, b, c)$ is a triangular fuzzy number, the defuzzified value by the Yager method is computed as:

$$(L + 2M + U) / 4$$

Table 8. Matrix of the Usage Pattern of the Legal Effects of Migration on Iranian Nationals

WHATs weight	View of faculty & experts	View of judges	View of attorneys	View of migrants	HOWs / Plans
Criminal law	A1	A4		A5	A7
Civil law	A2	A4		A7	A10
Family law	V1	A3	A7	A1	A2
Inheritance law	M1	A4	A10		A3
New customers	H1	A5	A4		
Financial laws	A3		A8		A3
Added value	V2	A3			A4
Product development	M2				A5
Civil rights laws	M3	A10		A3	A2
Tax laws	A4			A2	
Environmental laws	H1	A10		A3	A4
Traffic & road safety laws	M4			A2	
Laws on retaining counsel & filing complaints	V3			A11	
Constitutional & election laws	H2			A7	
(200.87, 296.54, 398.21)	(125.75, 174.4, 231.06)	(157.71, 246.91, 355.03)	(196.3, 252.63, 319.96)	Importance of each plan	
295.54	176.4	251.64	255.38	Weighted values	
0.1314	0.0784	0.1118	0.1135	Normalized (W)	

– Selection of implementable development plans using the “usage pattern of the legal effects of migration on Iranian nationals”

When selecting a development plan, one cannot rely on a single objective. In fact, models that have addressed this topic using mathematical programming techniques have pursued multi-objective optimization. One such technique is goal programming, which is the most appropriate method for the simultaneous use of multiple objectives. Goal programming is formulated to solve problems with multiple conflicting goals. Moreover, to incorporate the study's constraints, zero–one goal programming is a very useful tool for finding the optimal solution. At this stage, all computed data were integrated to formulate the zero–one goal programming model to determine which development plans should be prioritized in the organization's performance-improvement process. Given the multiple objectives and existing constraints in this study, implementable development plans are selected with zero–one goal programming. The objective of the goal-programming model is to select plans with the lowest implementation cost, the highest levels of migrants' familiarity with the laws, and the greatest relative importance (final result from the House of Quality table). The levels of migrants' familiarity with the laws for each plan are determined on a five-point scale from “very high” to “very low.” To use the objectives (defuzzified values from the House of Quality matrix and migrants' familiarity levels for each plan) in the “usage pattern of the legal effects of migration on Iranian nationals” model, they must be normalized.

Table 9. Actual (plan score) and normalized (w) values, and levels of migrants' familiarity with laws for each plan

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
0.0257	0.1135	0.1118	0.0784	0.1314	0.0584	0.1383	0.075	0.077	0.0361	0.0466	0.0304	0.0769
6.5	7.5	25	11	21	10	9	4.6	4	4	7	10	4.2
0.068	0.09	0.022	0.045	0.09	0.068	0.045	0.113	0.113	0.113	0.113	0.0686	0.068

Table 10. Results of the Usage Pattern of the Legal Effects of Migration on Iranian Nationals

View of faculty & experts	View of judges	View of attorneys	View of migrants	Development plans
4	2	3	1	Rank
Accept (1)	Accept (1)	Accept (1)	Accept (1)	Usage pattern of the legal effects of migration on Iranian nationals

Based on the normalized weights, plan scores, and migrants' familiarity levels with laws in the step of selecting implementable development plans using the "usage pattern of the legal effects of migration on Iranian nationals," for the four main research factors—1) migrants' view, 2) attorneys' view, 3) judges' view, and 4) faculty & experts' view—and the performance evaluation system component examined during the study to assess performance levels across the following four steps:

Step 1: Constructing the usage pattern of the legal effects of migration on Iranian nationals and drafting plans; Step 2: Determining the weights of aspects, strategies, and key factors; Step 3: Determining the importance of each plan using the Quality Function Deployment (QFD) method; Step 4: Selecting implementable development plans using the usage pattern of the legal effects of migration on Iranian nationals.

It was shown that, across all examined items (13 items for the first three views and 7 items for the fourth view), only the migrants' view and the judges' view possessed suitable normalized weights, plan scores, and migrants' familiarity levels with laws, and they obtained first and second rank, respectively.

Discussion and Conclusion

For this purpose, the model of functional requirement expansion for the implementable plans was ranked, and the results obtained from solving the models of the "usage pattern of the legal effects of migration on Iranian nationals" and the "Quality Function Deployment (QFD)" are presented in the table below.

The analysis of results indicates that the most important priorities identified in ranking the criminal, civil, financial, and migration laws affecting Iranian nationals in the countries under study (Sweden, France, Germany, Canada, the United States, and Australia), using the qualitative Delphi method, include:

1. the degree of familiarity with the migration policy framework of the destination country,
2. the degree of familiarity with visa and residency regulations of the destination country, and
3. the degree of familiarity with the procedures for addressing administrative violations in the destination country.

The main ranking of specialized criteria related to criminal, civil, financial, and migration laws using the qualitative Delphi method includes:

1. familiarity with the migration policy framework of the destination country,
2. access to ambulance services, and
3. permissible outpatient medical treatments.

The most important priorities identified in ranking the *civil law* frameworks affecting Iranian nationals in the countries under study (Sweden, France, Germany, Canada, the United States, and Australia) through the qualitative Delphi method include:

1. familiarity with the migration policy framework of the destination country,
2. retirement pension, and
3. disability pension.

4. Additionally, the most important specialized criteria within civil law, based on the Delphi analysis, include:
5. hospital services,
6. medical consultation and medication, and
7. dentistry services.

The most important priorities in ranking *criminal law* frameworks for Iranian nationals in the studied countries, using the qualitative Delphi method, include:

1. familiarity with the migration policy framework of the destination country,
2. permanent pension, and
3. total disability pension.

Today, migration has generated complex legal issues on a global scale, leading to the emergence and gradual development of international rules and regulations. These frameworks, alongside pre-existing laws governing migration management and migrant protection, have collectively provided the foundation for a new branch of international law known as *International Migration Law*. Although states are not yet fully prepared to adopt this new legal system comprehensively, it appears that, in the near future, the necessity of such a legal framework will be acknowledged and accepted by the international community.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our appreciation and gratitude to all those who helped us carrying out this study.

Authors' Contributions

All authors equally contributed to this study.

Declaration of Interest

The authors of this article declared no conflict of interest.

Ethical Considerations

All ethical principles were adhered in conducting and writing this article.

Transparency of Data

In accordance with the principles of transparency and open research, we declare that all data and materials used in this study are available upon request.

Funding

This research was carried out independently with personal funding and without the financial support of any governmental or private institution or organization.

References

1. Vietti F. Human Insecurity: Understanding International Migration from a Human Security Perspective. *Journal on Migration and Human Security* (JMHS). 2013;1(1):17-31. doi: 10.14240/jmhs.v1i1.6.

2. Kritz M. International migration . Improving International Migration Governance. Center for Migration Studies special issues. 2009;22(1):56-67. doi: 10.1111/j.2050-411X.2009.tb00413.x.
3. Anisi F. Afghan Refugee Women: Doubts and Realities. Payam-e Zan Magazine. 2004;13(7):28-9.
4. Sajjadpour MK. Conceptual and Operational Frameworks in International Migration Management. Geographical Research Journal. 2005(78):9-30.
5. Kosar K. International Migration, a Very Short Introduction. New York: Oxford University Press; 2007.
6. Adams RH. Do International Migration And Remittances Rduce Poverty In Developing Countries? World Development. 2005;33(1):31-43. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2005.05.004.
7. Balbo M, Marconi G. International Migration, Diversity And Urban Governance In Cities Of The South. Habitat International. 2007(30):87. doi: 10.1016/j.habitatint.2005.04.004.
8. Rudolph C. National Security and Immigration in the United States after 9/11. 2009.
9. Ceccorulli M. Migration as a security threat: internal and external dynamics in the European Union. 2009.
10. Feinleib J, Warner D. The Impact of Immigration on Social Security and the National Economy. 2005.
11. Hanson GH. The EconomicLogic of Illegal Immigration. 2007.
12. Zarghami H, Musavi Z. International Migrations and National Security. Strategic Studies Quarterly. 2013(59):17-xx.
13. Suárez-Orozco C, Suárez-Orozco MM. Structuring Opportunity for immigration origin children, Bread and Brain, Education and Poverty. Vatican City2014.