DOI https://doi.org/10.47310/jpms2025140104



# Climate Change Anxiety Symptoms in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq

# Shireen Jawhar Mohammed<sup>1</sup>, Sanger Muhammad Ahmed<sup>2</sup>, Muzhda Qasim Qadr<sup>3</sup>, Hazhar Blbas<sup>4</sup>, Ahmed Naif Ali<sup>5</sup> and

## Abdulmalik Fareeq Saber<sup>6\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Nursing, Erbil Polytechnic University, Erbil, Iraq

<sup>2.3</sup>Department of Public Health, College of Health Sciences, Hawler Medical University, Erbil, Iraq

<sup>2</sup>Department of Nursing, Faculty of Nursing, Tishk International University, Erbil, Iraq

<sup>4</sup>Department of Statistics, College of Administration and Economics, Salahaddin University-Erbil, Iraq

<sup>5,6</sup>Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing, College of Nursing, Hawler Medical University, Erbil, Iraq

<sup>6</sup>Department of Nursing, Safeen Technical and Vocational Institute, Erbil, Iraq

Author Designation: 1,3,5,6 Assistant Lecturer, 2,4 Assistant Professor

\*Corresponding author: Abdulmalik Fareeq Saber (e-mail: malikk1200k@gmail.com).

©2025 the Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

**Abstract Objectives:** Climate change anxiety, or eco-anxiety, is an emerging mental health concern worldwide, particularly in regions heavily impacted by environmental and socio-political challenges. This study aimed to explore the prevalence, correlates and underlying dimensions of climate change anxiety among residents of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI). **Method:** This cross-sectional study was conducted online from July 2nd to September 29th, 2024, across three main governorates of the KRI: Erbil, Sulaymaniyah and Duhok, using convenience sampling. The questionnaire included two parts: demographic data and the Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale (HEAS). Statistical analyses, including Chi-square tests, Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Pearson correlation, were conducted using IBM SPSS Version 26. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. **Results:** A total of 385 participants were enrolled in the study. Eco-anxiety levels were categorized as mild (38%), moderate (43%) and severe (19%). Significant associations were observed between eco-anxiety levels and type of residence (p = 0.021) and city of residence (p = 0.006). PCA identified four dimensions of eco-anxiety, explaining 80.613% of the variance. Strong correlations were found between the dimensions of the HEAS, with the highest correlation observed between behavioral symptoms and anxiety about personal impact (r = 0.854, p < 0.01). **Conclusions:** The study highlights that most participants experienced moderate levels of eco-anxiety. It is recommended that healthcare providers and policymakers prioritize strategies to address eco-anxiety and its impacts, particularly in urban areas and among vulnerable populations in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq.

Key Words Climate change anxiety, eco-anxiety, hogg eco-anxiety scale, mental health and climate change, sociodemographic factors, regional vulnerability to climate change, mental health impact

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Climate change has emerged as one of the greatest global challenges of the 21st century, with far-reaching impacts on the environment, economy and human well-being [1]. The rising awareness of climate change and its potential consequences has led to a new phenomenon known as climate change anxiety or eco-anxiety [2,3]. Climate change anxiety is the chronic fear of environmental doom, accompanied by feelings of helplessness, hopelessness and grief related to the climate crisis [4]. This anxiety is a reasonable response to the existential threat that climate change presents, compounded

by the inadequate global response to mitigate its effects. Recent studies document the rising prevalence of climate change anxiety across diverse populations worldwide. One global survey of 10,000 young people aged 16-25 years from 10 countries reported that 59% were very or extremely worried about climate change, while 84% were at least moderately concerned [5-7]. Another study involving 27,000 people across 26 countries found that 48% experienced a great deal of worry about climate change [8].

In a multinational study, Clayton and Karazsia [9] found that 17-27% of their US sample reported climate anxiety

significant enough to impact their daily functioning. In contrast, regions such as India and China reported higher levels of climate anxiety compared to Western nations like the USA and Japan, reflecting regional variations in vulnerability and perception [10]. Additionally, younger individuals, particularly those in their twenties, tend to report higher levels of anxiety about climate change, while older populations exhibit heightened concern in countries like China [11]. This underscores the importance of sociodemographic factors in shaping responses to climate change anxiety.

The psychological effects of climate change are not the same for everyone and are often worse for vulnerable people and areas most affected by climate-related disasters [12]. The Kurdistan Region of Iraq is one such area, exposed to considerable risks from climate change due to its semi-arid climate, water scarcity and dependence on agriculture [13]. The KRI has experienced rising temperatures, declining rainfall and an increasing frequency and severity of droughts and heatwaves over the past couple of decades [14]. These climatic impacts have resulted in crop failures, livestock losses and forced migration, all of which have undermined the livelihood and food security of rural communities. Moreover, air pollution is another critical concern in the KRI, with Erbil's PM2.5 levels reaching 162 micrograms per cubic meter ( $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup>), which is 1620% higher than the WHO's recommended limit of 10 µg/m<sup>3</sup> [15]. This pollution stems from vehicles, industrial activity, dust storms and private electricity generators, all of which contribute to heightened stress and anxiety related to climate change.

These vulnerabilities are further compounded by the fact that the KRI is rooted in a history of conflict, political instability and economic challenges that have eroded its adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change [16,17]. The region has suffered from decades of war, displacement and human rights abuses, leading to trauma, poverty and social fragmentation, among other issues [18]. Such preexisting stressors can increase psychological distress related to climate change and reduce the resources available for coping with or adapting to it [19]. The International Organization for Migration has emphasized the importance of assessing mental health in response to climate change impacts in the KRI [20], particularly given the region's lack of data on climate anxiety and related psychological effects.

Despite the growing recognition of climate change anxiety as a mental health concern, there remains a dearth of research on its prevalence, correlates and consequences within the KRI context. Most studies on climate change anxiety have been conducted in Western countries, with relatively little research exploring the experiences of communities in the Global South, including the Middle East. This gap in the literature is concerning, given the high level of vulnerability of the KRI to climate change and the fact that climate anxiety might exacerbate existing mental health challenges in this region. Moreover, the socio-cultural and context-specific aspects that shape the experience and expression of climate change anxiety in the KRI remain largely unexplored.

The KRI possesses a unique cultural heritage, religious beliefs and social norms that may influence individuals' perceptions, interpretations and responses to the risks of climate change [21]. For instance, cultural narratives tied to resilience and environmental stewardship rooted in the dominant Islamic faith emphasize the role of humans as vicegerents on earth and the principle of environmental conservation [22]. However, certain beliefs, such as fatalism and the perception that environmental disasters are an act of divine will, might contribute to passive attitudes toward climate change. Additionally, socio-political challenges in the region, including economic instability and limited public awareness of environmental issues, may further influence how individuals experience and respond to climate anxiety. Therefore, the present study aims to explore the prevalence and correlates of climate anxiety symptoms in a large, representative sample of the KRI population.

#### **Research Question**

How are the anxiety levels associated with climate change symptoms distributed among individuals in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq?

### **METHODS**

#### Study Design, Setting, Period and Sampling

This online cross-sectional study was conducted across three main governorates of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI): Erbil, Sulaymaniyah and Duhok. Data were collected from participants between the 2nd of July and the 29th of September 2024 using a convenience sampling method. While convenience sampling may introduce potential bias, this method was chosen due to its practicality in accessing a diverse sample quickly and efficiently in a resource-limited setting. Additionally, the selected study period coincided with significant public discussions about climate change, ensuring heightened participant engagement and relevance of the data collected. Furthermore, we acknowledge that the crosssectional design limits causal inference, but it provides valuable insights into the prevalence and correlates of climate change anxiety within this region.

#### Sample Size

To calculate the required sample size for this study, we used the parameters of a 5% margin of error, a 95% confidence interval and a population proportion of 50%. Based on the total population of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (6,556,752), the required sample size was determined to be 385 participants. The sample size was proportionally distributed across the three governorates: Erbil (n = 172), Sulaymaniyah (n = 138) and Duhok (n = 76), reflecting their population proportions.

#### Inclusion/Exclusion

The inclusion criteria for this study were individuals aged 13 years or older, residents of Erbil, Sulaymaniyah, or Duhok, proficient in Kurdish or Arabic and willing to provide informed consent. Exclusion criteria included individuals unable to complete the survey due to physical or mental incapacity.

# **Study Tools and Data Collection**

The questionnaire used in this study was divided into two main parts. The first part gathered demographic data, including age, gender, educational level, occupation, type of residence, ownership status and city of residence. The second part consisted of the Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale (HEAS), which included 13 items designed to assess climate change anxiety across four dimensions: affective symptoms, rumination, behavioral symptoms and anxiety about personal impact. The questionnaire was translated into Kurdish using the forwardbackward translation method to ensure both accuracy and cultural relevance. To further enhance validity, the translation process included consultation with local psychiatrists specializing in mental health to ensure that the scale's items were culturally appropriate and linguistically accessible. We also conducted a pilot test with a small sample to identify potential language or cultural barriers and made adjustments accordingly. Data collection was conducted through an online survey distributed via social media platforms, including Facebook, WhatsApp and Twitter, as well as email lists. To minimize the impact of internet access inequality, we ensured the survey was compatible with mobile devices and encouraged sharing among diverse networks to reach participants from various socioeconomic backgrounds. Participants were given 10-15 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

#### **Pilot Study**

The study questionnaire, which contained 13 items in the Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale (HEAS), was initially tested with a group of 32 participants. The pilot testing was conducted between the 1st of May 2024 and the 1st of June 2024 to assess the internal consistency and reliability of the questionnaire items before their application in the main study. The internal consistency of the items was calculated using Cronbach's alpha [23], resulting in an overall score of 0.82, indicating a very good level of reliability. For content validity, the questionnaire was reviewed and validated by a panel of psychiatrists. Data from the pilot study were excluded from the final analysis.

### Measures

#### Sociodemographic Characteristics

Some explanatory variables were measured during the study, including age, gender, marital status, number of children, educational level, employment status, type of residence, living situation, annual household income, duration of chemotherapy treatment, duration of suffering from cancer and any physical complications of chemotherapy.

# **Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale**

The second section of the questionnaire consisted of the Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale (HEAS); a validated instrument designed to assess eco-anxiety [9]. The scale includes 13 items grouped into four dimensions: affective symptoms, rumination, behavioral symptoms and anxiety about personal impact. Each item was rated on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (Not at all) to 3 (Almost all the time), with a total possible score of 39. The severity of eco-anxiety was categorized as mild (0-13), moderate (14-26), or severe (27-39). The internal consistency of the HEAS, assessed during the pilot study, showed a Cronbach's alpha of 0.82 [23], indicating very good reliability.

#### **Ethical Approval and Inform Consent**

This study adhered to the guidelines of the Institutional Research Ethics Board and the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical approval was granted by the Common Ethics Committee of Hawler Medical University on the 27th of June 2024, with the code number Sc.E.C.8B. Before filling the online survey, participants were asked to provide informed consent, ensuring their participation was voluntary and based on a clear understanding of the study's purpose and procedures.

#### **Statistical Analysis**

Data were summarized using descriptive statistics, where qualitative variables were presented as frequencies and percentages and quantitative variables with a normal distribution were summarized as means and standard deviations. The relationship between demographic variables and levels of eco-anxiety was analyzed using the Chi-square test. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was performed to identify factor loadings for the dimensions of the HEAS, including affective symptoms, behavioral symptoms, rumination and anxiety about personal impact. This method helped reduce the data into core components, allowing us to better understand the structure of eco-anxiety and identify the most influential factors contributing to it. By identifying these key dimensions, the study provides actionable insights that can guide tailored mental health interventions to address the specific aspects of eco-anxiety experienced in the region. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to examine the relationships among the dimensions of eco-anxiety. Data analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Version 26 (IBM SPSS Statistics, Armonk, NY), with significance levels considered at p<0.05.

# RESULTS

#### **Demographic Characteristics**

A total of 385 participants were included in the analysis, with a mean age of  $29.50\pm13.91$  years. The age distribution

racie in Dennograpi	ne characteriblieb of Farlieipanio			
Variables	Characteristics n=385	F	%	
Age (year)	Under 18	63	16.3	
	18-25	105	27.2	
	26-35	109	28.2	
	36-50	63	16.3	
	Over 50	46	11.9	
	Mean±SD	29.50±13.91		
Gender	Male	160	41.5	
	Female	226	58.5	
	Not able (read and write)	44	11.4	
Education Level	Basic school	29	7.5	
	High school	70	18.1	
	College/University	190	49.2	
	Graduate/Postgraduate	19	4.9	
	Others	34	8.8	
Occupation	Employed full time	66	17.1	
	Employed part time	102	26.4	
	Sel-employed	73	18.9	
	Student	76	19.7	
	Unemployed	69	17.9	
Residence	Urban	249	64.5	
	Suburban	104	26.9	
	Rural	33	8.5	
Type of residence	Single family house	263	68.1	
	Apartment or condominium	72	18.7	
	Townhouse or new house	51	13.2	
Ownership Status	Own with mortgage	125	32.4	
	Rent	160	41.5	
	Living with family/friends	101	26.2	
City	Erbil	173	44.8	
	Sulaymaniyah	136	35.2	
	Duhok	77	19.9	

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

F: Frequency, %: Percentage, SD: Standard deviation

showed that 16.3% (63) were under 18 years, 27.2% (105) were aged 18-25 years, 28.2% (109) were aged 26-35 years, 16.3% (63) were aged 36-50 years and 11.9% (46) were over 50 years. Gender distribution revealed that 41.5% (160) were male and 58.5% (226) were female. Regarding education level, 11.4% (44) were not able to read or write, 7.5% (29) had a basic school education, 18.1% (70) completed high school, 49.2% (190) held a college or university degree, 4.9% (19) were graduate/postgraduate and 8.8% (34) had other qualifications. In terms of occupation, 17.1% (66) were employed full-time, 26.4% (102) were employed part-time, 18.9% (73) were self-employed, 19.7% (76) were students and 17.9% (69) were unemployed. Most participants (64.5%, 249) resided in urban areas, while 26.9% (104) lived in suburban areas and 8.5% (33) in rural areas. The type of residence was predominantly single-family houses (68.1%, 263), followed by apartments or condominiums (18.7%, 72) and townhouses or new houses (13.2%, 51). Regarding ownership status, 32.4% (125) owned their home with a mortgage, 41.5% (160) rented and 26.2% (101) lived with family or friends. Finally, the participants were distributed among the three cities, with 44.8% (173) from Erbil, 35.2% (136) from Sulaymaniyah and 19.9% (77) from Duhok. (Table 1).



Figure 1: Eco-anxiety levels

#### **Eco-anxiety Items**

The distribution of eco-anxiety levels among participants revealed that 38% experienced mild eco-anxiety, 43% moderate eco-anxiety and 19% severe eco-anxiety. For a clearer visual presentation, refer to Figure 1.

# Association Between Demographic Characteristics and Eco-Anxiety Levels

The Chi-square analysis revealed no significant associations between gender and eco-anxiety levels (p = 0.64), although females reported slightly higher levels of mild and moderate anxiety compared to males. Age showed no significant relationship (p = 0.118), but severe anxiety was more common in participants aged over 50 years (20.5 percent). Education level was not significantly associated (p = 0.227), though participants with college or university education reported the highest levels of severe anxiety (60.3 percent). Type of residence was significantly associated with ecoanxiety levels (p = 0.021), with participants living in apartments reporting higher levels of severe anxiety (26.0 percent) compared to those in single-family houses (61.6 percent). Additionally, city of residence showed a significant association (p = 0.006), with residents of Erbil experiencing higher severe anxiety (58.9 percent) compared to Sulaymaniyah (19.2 percent) and Duhok (21.9 percent). For more details, refer to Table 2.

# Principal Component Analysis of the Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale

The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) revealed four components explaining a total variance of 80.613 percent, with affective symptoms contributing 23.655 percent,

<u>)| 1]</u>

#### Table 2: Association Between Hogg Eco-Anxiety Levels and Demographic Characteristics Hogg Level

Hild         Moderate         Searce         Chi-square $p_1$ Male         N         57         70         33         0.893         0.6           Fenale         N         90         96         40         1         1           Outper 18         N         90         96         40         1			Hogg Level				
Gender         Instant of the second sec			Mild	Moderate	Severe	Chi-square	p-value
Male     N     57     70     33     0.893     0.6       Female     N     90     96     40     42.2%     5.2%     5.2%     5.3%       Female     N     90     96     40     40     47     8.3%       Age     N     25.3%     7.3%     24.3%     41.3%     0.1       18-25     N     40     47     18     5     12.813     0.1       26.35     N     40     47     18     5     5     5       56.50     N     21.43%     16.5%     12.2%     4.4%     5       66.70     N     10.9%     9.0%     20.5%     7     0.2%       70.8     10.9%     9.0%     20.5%     7     0.2%       8asic school     N     11     17     1     1       11     17     1     1     1     1       11     17     1     1     1     1       11     17     1     1     1     1       11     17     1     1     1     1       11     17     1     1     1     1       11     17     1     1     1     1    <	Gender						-
6         38.8%         4.2.%         45.3%           Fendle         6         0.2%         51.8%           Under 18         N         25         3.3         5         12.81.3         0.1           18-25         N         10.0         47         8         1         1           2-35         N         27.2%         28.3%         24.7%         2         2         3         5         5         1 <t< td=""><td>Male</td><td>Ν</td><td>57</td><td>70</td><td>33</td><td>0.893</td><td>0.64</td></t<>	Male	Ν	57	70	33	0.893	0.64
Fanda       N       90       96       40 $e$ 61.245       57.875       54.87 $der$ 73.87       12.81.3       0.1         18-25       N       10.05       19.95       64.37       12.81.3       0.1         26-35       N       45       33.3       21       21.3       23.35         36-50       N       45       33.4       21.3       23.35       23.3		%	38.8%	42.2%	45.2%		
%         0.1.2%         57.8%         54.8%           Under 18         N         25         33         5         12.813         0.1           18-25         N         40         47         18         11         17         18         18         18         11         12         18         11         18         18         18         11         18         18         18         18         18         11         19         19         11         18         18         11         11         17         18         11         19         11         11         19         11         13         13         13         13 </td <td>Female</td> <td>Ν</td> <td>90</td> <td>96</td> <td>40</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Female	Ν	90	96	40		
Age Under 18         N         25         3         5         1.2.813         0.1           16-25         N         40         47         6.8%         1         0.1           18-25         N         40         47         8.8%         24.7%         2.8.1%         24.7%         2.8.1%         24.7%         2.8.1%         24.7%         2.8.1%         24.7%         2.8.1%         24.7%         2.8.1%         24.7%         2.8.1%         24.7%         2.8.1%         24.7%         2.8.1%         24.7%         2.8.1%         2.9.5%         2.7.5%         2.9.5%         2.7.5%         2.9.5%         2.7.5%         2.9.5%         2.7.5%         2.9.5%         2.9.47         2.2.8%         2.9.5%         2.9.47         2.2.8%         2.9.47         2.2.9.5%         2.2.9.5%         2.9.47         2.2.9.5%         2.9.47         2.2.9.5%         2.9.47         2.2.9.5%         2.9.47         2.2.9.5%         2.9.47         2.2.9.5%         2.9.47         2.2.9.5%         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47         2.9.47		%	61.2%	57.8%	54.8%		
Under 18         N         25         33         5         12.81.3         0.1           18-25         N         40         47         18         1         1           26-35         N         45         43         21         1	Age						
18-25       N       40       47       18         26-35       %       27,2%       28,3%       24,7%         26-35       N       45       43       24,7%         26-35       N       45       43       24,7%         26-50       N       10       28,9%       28,9%         36-50       N       11       28       10,9%         Over 50       N       14,3%       15       15         Station Level       N       16,9%       20,9%       20,9%         Station Level       N       10,9%       10,9%       10,2%         Not able (recal and write)       N       18       8       8       12,947       0,2         Basic school       N       11       17       1 </td <td>Under 18</td> <td>N</td> <td>25</td> <td>33</td> <td>5</td> <td>12.813</td> <td>0.118</td>	Under 18	N	25	33	5	12.813	0.118
18-25       N       40       47       18         6-35       N       45       43       21         26-35       N       45       43       21         36-50       N       21       28       28.3%       21         36-50       N       21       28       44       36       0.2%       36         Over 50       N       16       15       15       35       36       36       32%       36       36       32%       36		%	17.0%	19.9%	6.8%		
6         27.2%         28.3%         24.7%           26-35         N         45         43         21           36-50         N         21         28         14           Over 50         N         16         15         15           Education Level         N         16         15         15           Education Level         N         18         8         1.0%         0.2%           Basic school         N         12.2%         10.8%         1.0%         0.2%           Basic school         N         12.5%         10.8%         1.0%         0.2%           Gollego/University         N         68         75         4.4%         0.2%         0.3%         0.2%           Graduate/Postgraduate         N         0.0%         2.0%         0.3%         0.0% <td>18-25</td> <td>Ν</td> <td>40</td> <td>47</td> <td>18</td> <td></td> <td></td>	18-25	Ν	40	47	18		
26-35       N       45       43       21       28.8%         36-50       N       21       28.4%       14.3%       16.9%       19.2%         Over 50       N       16.9%       19.2%       15.9%       28.8%       12.947       0.2         Cover 50       N       16       15       15       15       15       15       15       15       16.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       10.9%       11       17       1       1       17       1       11       17       1       16       10.9%       10		%	27.2%	28.3%	24.7%		
36-50       N       21       25.96       28.84 $0er 50$ N       16       15       15         Education Level       N       18       18       8       1.0%       0.2         Basic school       N       11       17       1       1.0%       0.2         Basic school       N       11       17       1       1.0%       1.0%       0.2         Basic school       N       11       17       1       1.0%	26-35	Ν	45	43	21		
36-50       N       21       28       14         6       14.3%       16.9%       19.2%         700       %       10.9%       9.0%       20.5%         Etheration Level       Nortable (read ownine)       %       12.2%       10.8%       11.0%       0.2         Basis school       N       11       17       1		%	30.6%	25.9%	28.8%		
	36-50	Ν	21	28	14		
Over 50         N         16         15         15           Education Level         N         18         18         8         12.947         0.2           Not able (read and write)         N         18         18         8         12.947         0.2           Basic school         N         11         17         1           Basic school         N         0.30         31         9           Fducation Level         N         0.2 %         1.2 %         1.4 %           High school         %         0.2 %         1.2 %         1.4 %           Graduate/Postgraduate         N         0.6 %         3.0 %         5.5 %         1.0 %           Graduate/Postgraduate         N         0.0 %         1.7 7         7         7         7           Graduate/Postgraduate         N         0.0 %         1.0 %         1.0 %         2.0 %         2.0 %           Collego/University         N         0.8 %         1.0 %         1.0 %         1.0 %         2.0 %           Graduate/Postgraduate         N         0.1 %         2.3 %         2.0 %         2.0 %           Employed full time         N         2.3 %         2.0 %         2.0 % </td <td></td> <td>%</td> <td>14.3%</td> <td>16.9%</td> <td>19.2%</td> <td></td> <td></td>		%	14.3%	16.9%	19.2%		
%         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           Education (read and write)         N         18         18         18         8         1.0%           Basic school         N         18         18         18         8         1.0%         0.2           Basic school         N         11         17         1           %         0.0%         0.3%         1.4%           High school         N         0.0         31         9           College/University         N         68         75%         10.2%         4.4           Graduate/Postgraduate         N         0.0         5         4           Others         N         10         17         7           Others         N         10.02%         21.9%         0.182         0.2           Employed full time         N         45.6%         10.2%         21.9%         0.2           Employed part time         N         45.6%         16.3%         21.9%         20.5%         20.5%           Student         N         21.1%         22.3%         11.0%         20.4%           Unemployed         N         24.3%         15.5%         10.0	Over 50	Ν	16	15	15		
Education Level           It is is is is in the second of the second		%	10.9%	9.0%	20.5%		
Not able (read and write)         N         18         18         8         12.947         0.2           Basic school         N         11         17         1           Basic school         N         11         17         1           Basic school         N         10         10.2%         1.4%           High school         N         30         31         9           College/University         N         68         78         44           College/University         N         68         78         44           Graduate/Postgraduate         N         10         5         4           Graduate/Postgraduate         N         10         7         7           Others         N         10         17         7           Description         6.8%         10.2%         21.9%         21.9%           Employed fullime         N         24.4         21.9%         20.5%           Sel-employed         N         25         28         20.5%           Sudent         N         21.1%         22.3%         11.0%           Unemployed         N         24         31         37         8	Education Level						
basic school         %         12.2%         10.8%         11.0%           Basic school         %         7.5%         10.2%         1.4%           High school         %         20.4%         18.7%         12.3%           College/University         %         20.4%         18.7%         12.3%           Graduat/Postgraduate         %         46.3%         47.0%         60.3%           Graduat/Postgraduate         %         10         5         4           Graduat/Postgraduate         %         10         17         7           Others         %         68.7%         10.02%         9.6%           Others         %         15.6%         16.3%         21.9%         0.2           Employed part time         %         15.6%         16.3%         21.9%         0.2           Scl-employed         %         23.9%         22.9%         23.5%         0.5%           Scl-employed         %         21.6%         16.3%         1.9%         1.0%           Icemployed         %         21.1%         22.3%         1.0%         1.0%           Scl-employed         %         21.1%         22.3%         1.0%         1.1%	Not able (read and write)	Ν	18	18	8	12.947	0.227
Basic school         N         1         17         1           High school         N         30         31         9           High school         N         30         31         9           College/University         N         68         78         44           Graduat/Postgraduate         N         10         5         4           Graduat/Postgraduate         N         10         5         4           Graduat/Postgraduate         N         10         17         7           Others         N         10         17         7           Cotagation		%	12.2%	10.8%	11.0%		
bit control $\bar{n}$ $7.5\%$ $10.2\%$ $1.4\%$ High school         N         30         31         9           College/University         N         68         78         44           Graduate/Postgraduate         N         10         5         4           Graduate/Postgraduate         N         10         5         4           Others         N         10         17         7           Others         N         10.2%         9.6%           Others         %         6.8%         10.2%         9.6%           Otters         %         15.6%         16.3%         21.9%         0.182           Employed part time         N         24         31         15         1.5%         1.10%         1.0.82         0.2%           Scl-employed         N         25         28         0.05%         2.5%         0.5%         1.10%         1.16%         1.10%         1.16%         1.10%         1.16%         1.10%         1.16%         1.10%         1.10%         1.10%         1.10%         1.10%         1.10%         1.10%         1.10%         1.10%         1.10%         1.10%         1.10%	Basic school	N	11	17	1		
High school       N       30       31       9         College/University       N       68       78       44         Conduct/Postgraduate       N       10       5       4         Graduate/Postgraduate       N       10       5       4         Graduate/Postgraduate       N       10       5       4         Graduate/Postgraduate       N       10       17       7         Graduate/Postgraduate       N       23       27       16       10.182       0.2         Graduate/Postgraduate       N       24       31       15       11       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14		%	7.5%	10.2%	1.4%		
College/University $\%$ $20.4\%$ $18.7\%$ $12.3\%$ College/University $\%$ $46.3\%$ $47.0\%$ $60.3\%$ Graduate/Postgraduate         N         10         5 $4$ $\%$ $68.\%$ $3.0\%$ $5.5\%$ Others         N         10         17         7 $\%$ $68.\%$ $10.2\%$ $9.6\%$ Corepation         Employed full time         N         23         27         16 $10.182$ $0.2$ Employed full time $\%$ $15.6\%$ $16.3\%$ $21.9\%$ $25$ $28$ $0.5\%$ Sel-employed $\%$ $25.9\%$ $20.5\%$ $25.5\%$ $28$ $0.5\%$ Sel-employed $\%$ $17.0\%$ $16.9\%$ $27.4\%$ $11.0\%$ Unemployed $\%$ $21.1\%$ $22.3\%$ $10.2\%$ $29.5\%$ Urban $\%$ $66.7\%$ $60.8\%$ $68.5\%$ $0.1$ Urban         N $36$ $54$ 14 $14$	High school	Ň	30	31	9		
College/University         N         68         78         44 $\%$ 46.3%         47.0%         60.3%           Graduate/Postgraduate         N         10         5         4 $\%$ 6.8%         3.0%         5.5%         0           Others         N         10         17         7 $\%$ 6.8%         10.2%         9.6%         0.2%           Cecupation         Employed full time         N         23         27         16         10.182         0.2           Employed part time         N         44         43         15         <	ingh benedi	%	20.4%	18.7%	12.3%		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	College/University	N	68	78	44		
Graduate/Postgraduate       N       10.0       5 of $0$ 6.0.0 $%$ 6.8%       3.0%       5.5%         Others       N       10       17       7 $%$ 6.8%       10.2%       9.6%       0.2%         Occupation       Employed full time       N       23       27       16       10.182       0.2         Employed part time       N       44       43       15         Sel-employed       N       25.0%       20.5%       21.0%       20.5%         Sel-employed       N       25.2%       20.5%       20.5%       21.0%       20.5%       21.0%       20.5%       21.0%       20.5%       21.0%       20.5%       21.0%       20.5%       21.0%       20.5%       21.0%       20.5%       21.0%       20.5%       21.0%       20.5%	conegerentiversity	0/0	46 3%	47.0%	60.3%		
Chalance is a constrained of signalance is a constreal constrained of signalance is a constrained of	Graduate/Postgraduate	N	10	5	1		
Others $n$ $0.0 n$ $17$ $7$ $\kappa$ $6.8\%$ $10.2\%$ $9.6\%$ Cocupation $\kappa$ $23$ $27$ $16$ $10.182$ $0.2$ Employed full time       N $23$ $27$ $16$ $10.182$ $0.2$ Employed part time       N $44$ $43$ $15$ Employed part time       N $25$ $28$ $20$ Sel-employed       N $25$ $28$ $20$ Student       N $31$ $37$ $8$ $(herror)^{10}/10\%$ $16.9\%$ $27.4\%$ $11$ $(herror)^{10}/10\%$ $16.9\%$ $27.4\%$ $11$ $(herror)^{10}/10\%$ $16.9\%$ $27.4\%$ $11$ $(herror)^{11}/10\%$ $11.0\%$ $11.0\%$ $11.0\%$ $(herror)^{11}/10\%$ $11.0\%$ $11.0\%$ $11.0\%$ $(herror)^{11}/10\%$ $12.4\%$ $31$ $11$ $(herror)^{11}/10\%$ $12.4\%$ $32.5\%$ $12.0\%$ $(herror)^{11}/10\%$ $10.2\%$ $22.9\%$ $66.\%$	Graduate/1 Ostgraduate	0%	6.8%	3.0%	5 5 %		
Odd S       N       10	Others	70 N	10	17	5.5 /0 7		
No.         10.2 %         10.2 %         9.0 %           Employed full time         N         23         27         16         10.182         0.2           Employed full time         N         23         27         16         10.182         0.2           Employed part time         N         44         43         15         5           Sel-employed         N         25         28         20         5           Sel-employed         N         25         28         20         5           Sudent         S1         37         8         10         5           Sudent         6         21.1%         22.3%         11.0%         10           Unemployed         N         24         31         14         14         10           Urban         6         67%         60.8%         68.5%         11.5%         0.0           Suburban         N         36         54         14         14         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10	Oulers	IN 07-	10 6.90/-	10 20%	0.6%		
Occupation         7         16 $0.182$ $0.2$ Employed full time         % $15.6\%$ $16.3\%$ $21.9\%$ $0.182$ $0.2$ Employed part time         % $29.9\%$ $25.9\%$ $20.5\%$ $0.5\%$ Sel-employed         % $29.9\%$ $25.9\%$ $20.5\%$ $0.5\%$ Sel-employed         N $25$ $28$ $20.5\%$ $0.5\%$ Student         N $31$ $37$ $8$ $0.16.9\%$ $27.4\%$ $0.10.5\%$ Unemployed         N $24$ $31$ $14$ $0.10.5\%$ $0.453$ $0.1$ Unemployed         N $24$ $31$ $14$ $0.2\%$ $0.10.5\%$ $0.453$ $0.1$ Unemployed         N $98$ $101$ $50$ $6.453$ $0.1$ Suburban         N $36$ $54$ $14$ $13$ $11$ $9$ $0.2\%$ $0.2\%$ $0.2\%$ $0.2\%$ $0.2\%$ $0.2\%$ $0.2\%$ $0.2\%$	Occupation	70	0.0%	10.2%	9.0%		
Employed untrime $R$ 25 27 10 10 10.162 0.2 Employed untrime $R$ 15.6% 16.3% 11.9% 10.162 0.2 Employed part time $R$ 15.6% 16.3% 11.9% 10.162 0.5% Employed $R$ 12.9% 25.9% 20.5% Sel-employed $R$ 17.0% 16.9% 27.4% 10.5% Student $R$ 31 37 8 10.6% 21.1% 22.3% 11.0% 10.6% Residence $R$ 16.3% 18.7% 19.2% Residence $R$ 101 50 6.453 0.1 R 66.7% 60.8% 68.5% Suburban $R$ 66.7% 60.8% 68.5% Suburban $R$ 8.8% 6.5% 10.2% Rural $R$ 24.5% 32.5% 19.2% Rural $R$ 24.5% 32.5% 19.2% Rural $R$ 24.5% 32.5% 10.2% Single family house $R$ 101 50 6.453 0.1 R 74.8% 65.1% 60.6% 12.3% Type of residence $R$ 10.1 92% Type of residence $R$ 10.1 92% Rural $R$ 10.1 10 108 45 11.557 0.0 R 74.8% 65.1% 61.6% Single family house $R$ 10.1 10 108 45 11.557 0.0 R 74.8% 65.1% 61.6% Purce $R$ 10.2% 22.9% 26.0% R 74.8% 65.1% 60.7% Single family house $R$ 10.2% 22.9% 26.0% R 74.8% 65.1% 60.7% R 74.8% 65.1% 60.7% R 74.8% 65.1% 60.6% R 74.8% 65.1% 70.00 R 74.8% 74.8% 74.8% 74.8% R 74.8% 74.8% 74.8% 74.8% 74.8% R 74.8% 74.8% 74.8% 74.8% 74.8% R 74.8% 74.8	Employed full time	N	22	27	16	10 192	0.252
$\infty$ 10.5%         10.5%         21.9%           Employed part time         N         44         43         15 $\infty$ 29.9%         25.9%         20.5%         20.5%           Sel-employed         N         25         28         20 $\%$ 17.0%         16.9%         27.4%         50.5%           Student         N         31         37         8 $\%$ 12.1%         22.3%         11.0%         14           Unemployed         N         24         31         14           Residence	Employed full time	IN C/	23 15 (0)	27	10	10.182	0.232
Emproyed part time $\begin{tabular}{ c c c } & N & 44 & 45 & 15 \\ & & 29.9\% & 25.9\% & 20.5\% \\ Sel-employed N & 25 & 28 & 20 \\ & \% & 17.0\% & 16.9\% & 27.4\% \\ & Student N & 31 & 37 & 8 \\ & & 21.1\% & 22.3\% & 11.0\% \\ & & 16.3\% & 18.7\% & 19.2\% \\ \hline Residence & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Encelance damage there	% N	13.0%	10.5%	21.9%		
Sel-employed       N       25       28       20         %       17.0%       16.9%       27.4%         Student       N       31       37       8         %       21.1%       22.3%       11.0%       10         Unemployed       N       24       31       14         %       16.9%       18.7%       19.2%         Residence        101       50       6.453       0.1         Wrban       N       98       101       50       6.453       0.1         %       66.7%       60.8%       68.5%       0.1	Employed part time	IN 07	44 20.007	43	15		
Sel-employed       N       25       28       20         %       17.0%       16.9%       27.4%         Student       N       31       37       8         Unemployed       N       21.1%       22.3%       11.0%         Unemployed       N       24       31       14         %       16.3%       18.7%       19.2%         Residence       Utran       %       66.7%       60.8%       68.5%       0.1         Suburban       N       36       54       14       14         %       66.7%       60.8%       68.5%       0.1         Suburban       N       36       54       14         %       24.5%       32.5%       19.2%       7         Rural       N       13       11       9       9         Single family house       N       110       108       45       11.557       0.0 $Apartment or condominium       N       15       38       19       7         Working Condominium       N       15       38       19       7         Own whouse or new house       N       22       20       9       9 $		%	29.9%	25.9%	20.5%		
Student $\%$ $1/.0\%$ $16.9\%$ $27.4\%$ Student       N $31$ $37$ $8$ Unemployed       N $24$ $31$ $14$ Unemployed       N $24$ $31$ $14$ W $16.3\%$ $18.7\%$ $19.2\%$ Residence       U       U       W $16.3\%$ $101$ $50$ $6.453$ $0.1$ Suburban       N $98$ $101$ $50$ $6.453$ $0.1$ % $24.5\%$ $32.5\%$ $19.2\%$ $7.2\%$	Sel-employed	N ci	25 17 00	28	20		
Student       N       31 $31$ $37$ 8 $M$ 21.1%       22.3%       11.0%       Unemployed         W       16.3%       18.7%       19.2%         Residence       Utran       %       66.7%       60.8%       68.5%       0.1         Urban       N       98       101       50       6.453       0.1         Suburban       N       98       01       50       6.453       0.1         Kural       N       98       01       50       6.453       0.1         Suburban       N       86       54       14       9         Kural       N       13       11       9       9         Kural       N       13       11       9       9         Single family house       N       110       108       45       11.557       0.0         Apartment or condominium       N       15       38       19       9         Cownership Status       Q       12.0%       12.3%       Q       0.0         Weith family/friends       N       40       60       25       8.237       0.0         %       27.		%	17.0%	16.9%	27.4%		
	Student	N ~	31	37	8		
Unemployed       N       24       31       14         %       16.3%       18.7%       19.2%         Residence		%	21.1%	22.3%	11.0%		
%       16.3%       18.7%       19.2%         Residence $36$ 101       50       6.453       0.1         Urban $%$ 66.7%       60.8%       68.5%       0.1         Suburban       N       36       54       14       14 $%$ 24.5%       32.5%       19.2% $32.5%$ 19.2%         Rural       N       36       54       14 $32.5%$ 19.2%         Rural       N       13       11       9 $32.5%$ 19.2%         Rural       N       13       11       9 $32.5%$ 11.57       0.0         Single family house       N       110       108       45       11.557       0.0 $%$ 74.8%       65.1%       61.6%       1.57       0.0 $%$ 10.2%       22.9%       26.0%       1.57       0.0 $%$ 10.2%       22.9%       26.0%       1.50%       12.0%       12.3%         Ownership Status $32.5%$ 12.0%       12.3%       2.2       2.0%       2.2       2.0%       2.2       2.0%       2.3       2.3%       3.1% <td>Unemployed</td> <td>N</td> <td>24</td> <td>31</td> <td>14</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Unemployed	N	24	31	14		
Residence           Urban         N         98         101         50         6.453         0.1           Suburban         N         36         54         14         14         14         14         14         14         14         14         14         14         16		%	16.3%	18.7%	19.2%		
Urban       N       98       101       50       6.453       0.1         %       66.7%       60.8%       68.5%       60.8%       68.5%       60.8%       68.5%       60.8%       68.5%       60.8%       68.5%       60.8%       68.5%       60.8%       68.5%       60.8%       68.5%       60.8%       68.5%       60.8%       68.5%       60.8%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       69.2%       60.6%       69.2%       <	Residence						
%       66.7%       60.8%       68.5%         Suburban       N       36       54       14         %       24.5%       32.5%       19.2%         Rural       N       13       11       9         %       8.8%       6.6%       12.3%         Type of residence $33$ 110       108       45       11.557       0.0         %       74.8%       65.1%       61.6% $45$ $15.57$ $0.0$ Apartment or condominium       N       15       38       19 $40$ $60.6\%$ $22.9\%$ $26.0\%$ Townhouse or new house       N       22 $20$ $9$ $60.6\%$ $23.5\%$ $70.00$ Own with mortgage       N $40$ $60$ $25.5\%$ $8.237$ $0.0$ % $72.2\%$ $36.1\%$ $34.2\%$ $40.4\%$ $79.\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$ $50.5\%$	Urban	Ν	98	101	50	6.453	0.167
Suburban       N       36       54       14 $\%$ 24.5%       32.5%       19.2%         Rural       N       13       11       9 $\%$ 8.8%       6.6%       12.3%         Type of residence		%	66.7%	60.8%	68.5%		
% $24.5\%$ $32.5\%$ $19.2\%$ Rural       N $13$ $11$ $9$ % $8.8\%$ $6.6\%$ $12.3\%$ Type of residence $74.8\%$ $6.6\%$ $11.557$ $0.0$ % $74.8\%$ $65.1\%$ $61.6\%$ Apartment or condominium       N $15$ $38$ $19$ $\%$ $10.2\%$ $22.9\%$ $26.0\%$ Townhouse or new house       N $22$ $20$ $9$ $\%$ $15.0\%$ $12.0\%$ $12.3\%$ Ownership Status $77.2\%$ $36.1\%$ $34.2\%$ Rent       N $58$ $67$ $35$ $\%$ $39.5\%$ $40.4\%$ $47.9\%$ $58$ Living with family/friends       N $49$ $39$ $13$ $\%$ $39.5\%$ $43.4\%$ $58.9\%$ $57$ $14$ Sulaymaniyah       N $65$ $57$ $14$ $92.\%$	Suburban	Ν	36	54	14		
Rural       N       13       11       9 $%$ 8.8%       6.6%       12.3%         Type of residence		%	24.5%	32.5%	19.2%		
% $8.8%$ $6.6%$ $12.3%$ Type of residence $110$ $108$ $45$ $11.557$ $0.0$ Single family house       N $110$ $108$ $45$ $11.557$ $0.0$ Apartment or condominium       N $15$ $38$ $19$ $%$ $10.2%$ $22.9%$ $26.0%$ Townhouse or new house       N $22$ $20$ $9$ $%$ $15.0%$ $12.0%$ $22.3%$ $70.0%$ Ownership Status $22$ $20$ $9$ $74.8%$ $70.0%$ $72.3%$ $8.237$ $0.0$ $%$ $27.2%$ $36.1%$ $34.2%$ $8.237$ $0.0$ $%$ $27.2%$ $36.1%$ $34.2%$ $8.237$ $0.0$ $%$ $39.5%$ $40.4%$ $47.9%$ $34.2%$ $79.5%$ $8.237$ $0.0$ $%$ $39.5%$ $40.4%$ $47.9%$ $34.2%$ $79.5%$ $14.583$ $0.0$ $%$ $39.5%$ $32.5%$ $14.583$ $0.0$ $58.5%$ $57.5%$	Rural	N	13	11	9		
Type of residence         Single family house       N       110       108       45       11.557       0.0         %       74.8%       65.1%       61.6%       61.6%       60.0%       6		%	8.8%	6.6%	12.3%		
Single family house       N       110       108       45       11.557       0.0 $\%$ 74.8%       65.1%       61.6%	Type of residence						
% $74.8%$ $65.1%$ $61.6%$ Apartment or condominiumN153819 $%$ $10.2%$ $22.9%$ $26.0%$ Townhouse or new houseN $22$ $20$ $9$ $%$ $15.0%$ $12.0%$ $12.3%$ Ownership StatusOwn with mortgageN $40$ $60$ $25$ $8.237$ $0.0$ $%$ $27.2%$ $36.1%$ $34.2%$ RentN $58$ $67$ $35$ $%$ $39.5%$ $40.4%$ $47.9%$ Living with family/friendsN $49$ $39$ $13$ $%$ $33.3%$ $23.5%$ $17.8%$ CityErbilN $58$ $72$ $43$ $14.583$ $0.0$ $%$ $39.5%$ $43.4%$ $58.9%$ SulaymaniyahN $65$ $57$ $14$	Single family house	Ν	110	108	45	11.557	0.021
Apartment or condominium       N       15       38       19 $\%$ 10.2%       22.9%       26.0%         Townhouse or new house       N       22       20       9 $\%$ 15.0%       12.0%       12.3%         Ownership Status       U       U       U       U         Own with mortgage       N       40       60       25       8.237       0.0 $\%$ 27.2%       36.1%       34.2%       8       9       9       10.2%       10.0%<		%	74.8%	65.1%	61.6%		
%       10.2%       22.9%       26.0%         Townhouse or new house       N       22       20       9         %       15.0%       12.0%       12.3%         Ownership Status $27.2\%$ 36.1%       34.2%         Rent       N       58       67       35         %       39.5%       40.4%       47.9%       40.4%         Living with family/friends       N       49       39       13         %       33.3%       23.5%       17.8%       7.2%         City       Erbil       N       58       72       43       14.583       0.0         %       39.5%       43.4%       58.9%       58.9%       14	Apartment or condominium	Ν	15	38	19		
Townhouse or new house       N       22       20       9 $%$ 15.0%       12.0%       12.3%         Ownership Status         Own with mortgage       N       40       60       25       8.237       0.0 $%$ 27.2%       36.1%       34.2%         Rent       N       58       67       35 $\%$ 39.5%       40.4%       47.9%       40       40.4%       47.9%         Living with family/friends       N       49       39       13       40       58       67       58       65       57       14       43	-	%	10.2%	22.9%	26.0%		
	Townhouse or new house	Ν	22	20	9		
Ownership Status           Own with mortgage         N         40         60         25         8.237         0.0 $\%$ 27.2%         36.1%         34.2%         9.2%		%	15.0%	12.0%	12.3%		
Own with mortgage       N       40       60       25 $8.237$ 0.0         %       27.2% $36.1\%$ $34.2\%$ $8.237$ 0.0         Rent       N       58 $67$ $35$ $40.4\%$ $47.9\%$ Living with family/friends       N       49 $39$ $13$ $6000000000000000000000000000000000000$	Ownership Status						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Own with mortgage	Ν	40	60	25	8.237	0.083
Rent         N         58         67         35 $\%$ 39.5%         40.4%         47.9%           Living with family/friends         N         49         39         13 $\%$ 33.3%         23.5%         17.8%           City         Sulaymaniyah         N         58         72         43         14.583         0.0 $\%$ 39.5%         43.4%         58.9%         58.9%         14	00	%	27.2%	36.1%	34.2%		
%     39.5%     40.4%     47.9%       Living with family/friends     N     49     39     13       %     33.3%     23.5%     17.8%       City       Erbil     N     58     72     43     14.583     0.0       %     39.5%     43.4%     58.9%       Sulaymaniyah     N     65     57     14	Rent	N	58	67	35		
Living with family/friends N 49 39 13 % 33.3% 23.5% 17.8% City Erbil N 58 72 43 14.583 0.0 % 39.5% 43.4% 58.9% Sulaymaniyah N 65 57 14 % 44.2% 34.3% 19.2%		%	39.5%	40.4%	47.9%		
City     33.3%     23.5%     17.8%       Erbil     N     58     72     43     14.583     0.0       %     39.5%     43.4%     58.9%       Sulaymaniyah     N     65     57     14       %     44.2%     34.3%     19.2%	Living with family/friends	N	49	39	13		
City         Erbil         N         58         72         43         14.583         0.0           %         39.5%         43.4%         58.9%           Sulaymaniyah         N         65         57         14           %         44.2%         34.3%         19.2%	6 ·······	%	33.3%	23.5%	17.8%		
Erbil         N         58         72         43         14.583         0.0           %         39.5%         43.4%         58.9%           Sulaymaniyah         N         65         57         14           %         44.2%         34.3%         19.2%	City		20.070	2010 /0	11.070		
N         30         72         15         14.05         0.0           %         39.5%         43.4%         58.9%           Sulaymaniyah         N         65         57         14           %         44.2%         34.3%         19.2%	Erbil	Ν	58	72	43	14,583	0.006
Sulaymaniyah         N         65         57         14           %         44 2%         34 3%         19 2%		0%	30 5%	43 4%	58.9%	11.000	0.000
% 44.2% 34.3% 19.2%	Sulaymaniyah	N	65	57	14		
(1) $(1)$ $(1)$ $(1)$ $(1)$ $(1)$ $(1)$	Suraymaniyan	0%	11 70%	31 30%	10.2%		
Dubok N $24$ $37$ 16	Dubok	N	74 24	37	19.270		
Durion         11         24         37         10           Ø         16.30%         20.20%         21.00%	DUIIOK	1 N 0%	2 <del>4</del> 16.2 <i>0</i> /-	27 302	21 00/-		

N: Number, %: Percentage; chi-square was used to determine the relationship between anxiety levels and demographic data and statistical significance was set at p<0.05

#### Table 3: Factor Loadings from Principal Component Analysis of the 13-Item Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale

ity
_

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was used to measure sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity was used to assess the suitability of the data for factor analysis. Statistical significance was set at p<0.05

Table 4: Pearson Correlation Coefficients Among Dimensions of the Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale

Pearson Correlation	Rumination	Behavioral symptoms	Anxiety about personal impact				
Affective Symptoms	0.743**	0.768**	0.767**				
Rumination		0.822**	0.815**				
Behavioral Symptoms			0.854**				

\*\*: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), Significance was set at p<0.05. Pearson Correlation was used

behavioral symptoms 21.591 percent, rumination 18.411 percent and anxiety about personal impact 16.956 percent. Key items loaded strongly onto their respective components, such as "Not being able to stop or control worrying" (loading = 0.796) under affective symptoms and "Difficulty working and/or studying" (loading = 0.805) under behavioral symptoms. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was excellent at 0.951 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant (Chi-Square = 4161.738, p<0.05), confirming the appropriateness of the PCA. For more details, refer to Table 3.

# Correlation Among Dimensions of the Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale

Pearson correlation analysis demonstrated strong positive correlations among the four dimensions of the Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale. Affective symptoms were significantly correlated with rumination (r = 0.743), behavioral symptoms (r = 0.768) and anxiety about personal impact (r = 0.767). Similarly, rumination showed significant correlations with behavioral symptoms (r = 0.822) and anxiety about personal impact (r = 0.815). Behavioral symptoms also had a strong positive correlation with anxiety about personal impact (r = 0.854). All correlations were significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) (Table 4).

#### DISCUSSION

The present study aimed to explore the prevalence and correlates of climate anxiety symptoms in a large, representative sample of the KRI population. Overall, the results revealed that most participants experienced moderate levels of eco-anxiety, highlighting the widespread psychological impact of climate change in this region.

Climate change poses a significant threat to mental health, with increasing reports of eco-anxiety and related psychological distress worldwide [24]. In the KRI, the unique socio-political context and environmental challenges make it crucial to understand the prevalence and factors associated with eco-anxiety. However, there is a lack of research on this topic in the region. Given the importance of addressing the mental health implications of climate change, we aimed to bridge this gap by conducting a comprehensive study on ecoanxiety in the KRI population. The diverse demographic profile of our study participants, spanning different age groups, genders, educational levels, occupations and residential areas, provides a representative snapshot of the KRI population. This broad representation aligns with the global recognition of the pervasive nature of eco-anxiety, which affects individuals from various backgrounds [25,26]. Moreover, the inclusion of participants from urban, suburban and rural areas enhances our understanding of how ecoanxiety may differ across living environments.

Our findings indicate that the majority of participants experienced moderate levels of eco-anxiety, with a smaller proportion reporting severe levels. These results are consistent with previous studies conducted in other countries, which have identified a high prevalence of eco-anxiety among the general population [24,27]. The congruence between these findings and global patterns suggests that ecoanxiety is a shared human experience, but the specific dynamics within the KRI highlight the interplay of local cultural and environmental factors. Interestingly, our study did not find significant associations between eco-anxiety levels and demographic variables such as gender, age and education level. This lack of strong demographic correlates contrasts with some previous studies that have reported higher levels of eco-anxiety among females, younger individuals and those with higher educational attainment [28,29]. However, the slight tendencies observed in our data-such as higher levels of mild and moderate anxiety among females and severe anxiety among older participants-indicate the need for further nuanced exploration of these trends.

The significant association between residence type and eco-anxiety levels in our study is a noteworthy finding. Apartment dwellers reported higher levels of severe anxiety compared to those living in single-family houses. This difference may be attributed to various factors, such as limited access to green spaces, reduced sense of control over living environments and heightened exposure to urban stressors in apartment settings [30]. Furthermore, the higher prevalence of eco-anxiety among urban residents underscores the psychological strain of urbanization in the face of climate change, pointing to the importance of integrating mental health considerations into urban planning. In particular, prioritizing access to green spaces, reducing urban pollution and incorporating climate-resilient designs into cities could help alleviate eco-anxiety and improve residents' overall wellbeing.

The regional variations in eco-anxiety levels observed in our study, with participants from Erbil reporting higher prevalence of severe anxiety compared to those in Sulaymaniyah and Duhok, suggest the presence of localized factors influencing the psychological response to climate change. These variations highlight the need for regionspecific interventions that address the unique environmental and socio-economic conditions of each governorate. Developing tailored public awareness campaigns and mental health programs that reflect local needs and cultural contexts is critical for reducing eco-anxiety across the region.

The dimensions of eco-anxiety identified through the Principal Component Analysis in our study provide valuable insights into the psychological manifestations of climate change concern. The four dimensions-affective symptoms, rumination, behavioral symptoms and anxiety about personal impact-collectively explain a substantial portion of the variance in eco-anxiety levels. These findings align with previous research that has highlighted the multifaceted nature of eco-anxiety, encompassing emotional, cognitive and behavioral components [26]. The strong correlations among these dimensions, particularly between behavioral symptoms and anxiety about personal impact, underscore the interconnected nature of individuals' emotional responses and their perceptions of personal agency in addressing climate change.

While our study provides valuable insights into the prevalence and correlates of eco-anxiety in the KRI

population, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. The cross-sectional design limits our ability to establish causal relationships between the studied variables and eco-anxiety levels. Additionally, the self-reported nature of the data may be subject to response biases. Future research should adopt longitudinal designs and incorporate objective measures to capture the dynamic and evolving nature of eco-anxiety over time. Exploring the causal pathways between environmental stressors and eco-anxiety could provide deeper insights into the underlying mechanisms. Moreover, qualitative studies could provide a deeper understanding of the lived experiences and coping strategies of individuals grappling with ecoanxiety in the KRI context. Such research would further enrich our understanding of this pressing issue and inform more targeted and effective interventions. In addition, interdisciplinary approaches that combine psychological, environmental and socio-political perspectives could offer actionable recommendations for addressing eco-anxiety and fostering resilience in vulnerable communities.

### **CONCLUSION**

The study indicates that a majority of participants reported moderate levels of eco-anxiety, underscoring the necessity for healthcare providers and policymakers to formulate targeted interventions aimed at addressing eco-anxiety and its psychological repercussions, particularly within urban environments and among vulnerable populations in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. Policymakers should integrate mental health considerations into environmental and urban planning policies, prioritize access to green spaces and launch public awareness campaigns to mitigate eco-anxiety. Additionally, healthcare systems should develop culturally tailored mental health programs to support individuals affected by eco-anxiety. Future research should prioritize the examination of the long-term effects of eco-anxiety and the exploration of culturally relevant strategies to alleviate its impact on mental health. Longitudinal studies and intervention trials are particularly needed to better understand the evolving nature of eco-anxiety and to evaluate the effectiveness of targeted interventions in reducing its psychological burden.

#### Acknowledgments

Thanks to all the peer reviewers and editors for their opinions and suggestions and for their support of this research.

## REFERENCES

- Pecl, Gretta T., et al. "Biodiversity redistribution under climate change: Impacts on ecosystems and human well-being." *Science*, vol. 355, no. 6332, March 2017. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.aai9214.
- Léger-Goodes, Terra, *et al.* "Eco-anxiety in children: A scoping review of the mental health impacts of the awareness of climate change." *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 13, no. 2022, July 2022. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.872544.
- Pihkala, Panu. "Anxiety and the ecological crisis: An analysis of ecoanxiety and climate anxiety." *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 19, September 2020. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su12197836.

- Budziszewska, Magdalena and Sofia Elisabet Jonsson. "From climate anxiety to climate action: An existential perspective on climate change concerns within psychotherapy." *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, February 2021. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022167821993243.
- Hickman, Caroline, et al. "Climate anxiety in children and young people and their beliefs about government responses to climate change: A global survey." The Lancet Planetary Health, vol. 5, no. 12, December 2021, pp. e863-e873. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196(21)00278-3.
- Ahmed, Sangar M, et al. "Exploring young adults' reluctance to engage with psychiatric hospitals in erbil, Iraq: Identifying barriers to psychiatric care." *Cureus*, vol. 16, no. 6, June 2024. http://dx.doi.org/10.7759/cureus.62164.
- Hamad, Abdulqader H, *et al.* "Assessment of anxiety, stress and depression among COVID-19 survivors after 40 months in the kurdistan region of Iraq: An online cross-sectional study." *Cureus,* vol. 16, no. 7, July 2024. http://dx.doi.org/10.7759/cureus.63739.
- Barchielli, Benedetta, et al. "Climate changes, natural resources depletion, COVID-19 pandemic and russian-ukrainian war: What is the impact on habits change and mental health?." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, vol. 19, no. 19, September 2022. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19191929.
- Clayton, Susan and Bryan T. Karazsia. "Development and validation of a measure of climate change anxiety." *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, vol. 69, June 2020. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/ j.jenvp.2020.101434.
- Clayton, Susan D., et al. "Psychological and emotional responses to climate change among young people worldwide: Differences associated with gender, age and country." *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 4, February 2023. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su15043540.
- 11. Asgarizadeh, Zahra, *et al.* "Predicting climate change anxiety." *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, vol. 90, no. 202020, September 2023. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2023.102087.
- Hayes, Katie, et al. "Climate change and mental health: Risks, impacts and priority actions." *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, vol. 12, no. 1, June 2018. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13033-018-0210-6.
- Adamo, Nasrat, et al. "Climate change: consequences on Iraq's environment," Journal of earth sciences and geotechnical engineering, vol. 8, no. 3, 2018, pp. 43-58. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/ record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1199705&dswid=5461.
- 14. Gaznayee, Heman Abdulkhaleq A., *et al.* "Drought severity and frequency analysis aided by spectral and meteorological indices in the kurdistan region of Iraq." *Water*, vol. 14, no. 19, September 2022. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/w14193024.
- Hama-Aziz, ZANIST. "Assessment of air pollution in kurdistan region of Iraq." *Pollution Research*, vol. 14, no. 2, June 2022, pp. 457-466. http://dx.doi.org/10.53550/pr.2022.v41i02.011.
- Noori, Nyaz Najmalddin. "The failure of economic reform in the kurdistan region of Iraq (1921-2015): The vicious circle of uncivic traditions, resource curse and centralization." *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 45, no. 2, September 2016, pp. 156-175. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13530194.2016.1225258.
- Hamad, Abdulqader Hussein, *et al.* "Psychosocial and sexual aspects of female genital circumcision in a sample of kurdish women in the kurdistan region of Iraq." *Cureus*, vol. 17, no. 7, July 2024. http://dx.doi.org/10.7759/cureus.64881.

- Munoz, Alex and Kelsey Shanks. "The impact of internal displacement in the kurdistan region of Iraq.." Routledge Handbook on Middle East Cities, edited by Haim Yacobi, Mansour Nasasra, England, Routledge, 2019, pp. 334-351. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315625164-22.
- Lawrance, Emma L., *et al.* "The impact of climate change on mental health and emotional wellbeing: A narrative review of current evidence and its implications." *International Review of Psychiatry*, vol. 34, no. 5, July 2022, pp. 443-498. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/ 09540261.2022.2128725.
- Dapporto, G., "Rethinking Narratives on Environmental Migration: The Case of Iraqi Marshes," 2024. https://dspace.unive.it/handle/ 10579/26298.
- Harun, Rezhen, *et al.* "Attitudes and perceptions of the local community towards sustainable tourism development in kurdistan regional government, Iraq." *Sustainability*, vol. 10, no. 9, August 2018. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su10092991.
- Abdullah, Salar Ziro. "Islamic and muslim environmentalism." International journal of Rural Development, Environment and Health Research, vol. 3, no. 5, January 1970, pp. 158-167. http://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijreh.3.5.2.
- Taber, Keith S. "The use of cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education." *Research in Science Education*, vol. 48, no. 6, June 2017, pp. 1273-1296. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2.
- 24. Cosh, Suzanne M., et al. "The relationship between climate change and mental health: A systematic review of the association between ecoanxiety, psychological distress and symptoms of major affective disorders." *BMC Psychiatry*, vol. 24, no. 1, November 2024. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12888-024-06274-1.
- Lalal, N. *et al.*, "Eco-Anxiety: Impact on Generation Z's Mental Health and the Contemporary Significance of Environmental Awareness and Education," *International Journal of Policy Sciences and Law*, vol. 2, no. 02, 2022, pp. 3313-3331.
- Brophy, Hailie, *et al.* "Eco anxiety in youth: An integrative literature review." *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, vol. 32, no. 3, December 2022, pp. 633-661. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/inm.13099.
- Boluda-Verdú, Inmaculada, *et al.* "Fear for the future: Eco-anxiety and health implications, a systematic review." *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, vol. 84, no. 202222, December 2022. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jenvp.2022.101904.
- Sampaio, Francisco, *et al.* "Validating a measure for eco-anxiety in portuguese young adults and exploring its associations with environmental action." *BMC Public Health*, vol. 23, no. 1, October 2023. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-16816-z.
- Kankawale, S.M. and C.L. Niedzwiedz, "Eco-anxiety among children and young people: systematic review of social, political and geographical determinants," *MedRxiv*, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1101/ 2023.12.19.23300198.
- Peters, Terri and Anna Halleran. "How our homes impact our health: Using a COVID-19 informed approach to examine urban apartment housing." *Archnet-IJAR: International Journal of Architectural Research*, vol. 15, no. 1, December 2020, pp. 10-27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/arch-08-2020-0159.