Survey on displacement patterns, needs and intentions

Data collected: 01 October – 30 November 2022

**466 INTERVIEWS**

4 TRAIN STATIONS
1 BUS STATION
3 COLLECTIVE ACCOMMODATIONS

**MAIN FINDINGS**

- Women constituted 82% of respondents
- The largest age group was between 18-29 years old (33%)
- TCNs (13% of the sample) mostly were from India (32%), Nigeria (24%)
- The most common areas of origin were Zakarpatska (23%), the City of Kyiv (14%) and Kharkivska (10%)
- 80% of respondents returned to the same area in Ukraine
- Among the 20% crossing back to different locations, the preferred destinations were Zakarpatska (63%), the City of Kyiv (8%) and Zaporizka (8%)
- Out of Ukraine, respondents stayed in Hungary (52%), Europe (44%), and other locations (4%)
- 65% went back to Ukraine alone and most respondents (57%) had crossed back to Ukraine only once since the start of the war
- 72% declared staying in their homes in Ukraine
- 55% returned for a short visit, mostly to meet with family (58%) and collect personal belongings (56%)
- 40% planned to stay in Ukraine, mostly for family reunification (28%), improved situation in the place of origin (28%) and care responsibilities (24%)
- Medical/financial support were the main needs of respondents (18% each)

**BACKGROUND**

Since 24 February 2022, refugees from Ukraine and Third-Country Nationals (TCNs) have been fleeing to neighbouring countries as a result of the war. 32,628 refugees from Ukraine and TCNs were registered in Hungary as of 21 December 2022, according to UNHCR and the Hungarian Government.

This report is based on a survey on profiles, displacement patterns and needs, launched by IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) with adult refugees and TCNs crossing back to Ukraine. All interviews were conducted face-to-face by IOM’s DTM trained enumerators. The analysis is based on 466 surveys collected between 01 October and 30 November 2022.

Interviews were carried out in various locations, such as Budapest (96) and Záhony – Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg County (370), and in various settings, including transit points (e.g., train/bus stations) and collective accommodations.

This sample is not representative of all persons crossing back to Ukraine from Hungary, and results should only be considered as indicative.

**DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES**

**Figure 1: Ukrainian refugees and TCNs**
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- 65% went back to Ukraine alone and most respondents (57%) had crossed back to Ukraine only once since the start of the war
- 72% declared staying in their homes in Ukraine
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- Medical/financial support were the main needs of respondents (18% each)

**Figure 2: Respondents by gender and age groups**

Women constituted 82% of the interviewed population, while men represented 18% per cent. Among the age groups, survey respondents between 18-29, 30-39 and 40-49 years old were at 33, 26 and 21 per cent each, while interviewees aged 50-59 and 60 and above were 11 and 9 per cent respectively.
Areas of origin in Ukraine

Twenty-three per cent of interviewees (107 people) declared Zakarpatska as their area of origin in Ukraine. Other relevant places of habitual residence were: the City of Kyiv (14%); Kharkivska (10%); and Kyiska (9%).

When respondents left Ukraine and where they stayed

Respondents who left Ukraine for war/pre-war-related events (81%), mostly exited the country in September and October 2022 (namely, 17% and 14%). For those who didn’t leave due to the conflict (19%), the average month of departure was July 2022.

Once exited Ukraine, 52 per cent of respondents declared staying in Hungary. Forty-four per cent remained in Europe, mostly Germany (27%) and Austria (21%), and four per cent went to other countries, such as the Republic of Türkiye and Morocco (4 and 3 people respectively).

In Hungary, fifty-four per cent stayed in Budapest, followed by Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg County (19%).

Map 1: Regions of origin before leaving Ukraine

Note: The boundaries, names and designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by IOM.

IOM Hungary – https://hungary.iom.int/
Displacement Tracking Matrix – https://displacement.iom.int/hungary
Eighty per cent of respondents mentioned returning to the same area in Ukraine, while 20 per cent stated going to different locations, with Zakarpatska being the main preference (63%), followed by, among all, the City of Kyiv (8%) and Zaporizka (8%). One per cent was not sure about their destination.

For those not returning to the same area, the following patterns were reported: from Kharkivska (18 people) to Kyivska (1), Lvivska (1), Poltavska (1), City of Kyiv (4), and Zakarpatska (11); from the City of Kyiv (13) to Zakarpatska (12), and Zhytomyrska (1); from Khersonska (11) to Cherkaska (1), Dnipropetrovska (2), Kyivska (2), Lvivska (1), City of Kyiv (1) and Zakarpatska (4); from Donetska (8) to Kyivska (1), City of Kyiv (1), Zakarpatska (4), Zaporizka (2); from Dnipropetrovska (7) to Kirovohradska (1) and Zakarpatska (6); from Kyivska (7) to Ivano Frankivska (1), Mykolaivska (1), Zakarpatska (4), and Zaporizka (1); from Mykolaivska (7) to Dnipropetrovska (1), Ivano Frankivska (1), Kyivska (1), Lvivska (1), and Zakarpatska (3); from Sumsa (4) to Zakarpatska (4); from Ivano Frankivska (3) to City of Kyiv (1) and Zakarpatska (2); from Luhanska (3) to Zakarpatska (2), and Zaporizka (1); from Odeska (3) to Zakarpatska (1), and Zaporizka (2); from Kirovohradska (2) to Zakarpatska (2); from Zaporizka (2) to Zakarpatska (1) and Vinnitska (1); from Khmelnytska (1) to Zakarpatska (1); from Lvivska (1) to Zaporizka (1); from Zhytomyrska (1) to Zakarpatska (1); and from Zaporizka (1) to Lvivska (1).

The main reasons for returning to a different area were: insecurity of the locations of origin (50%); damage or destruction of houses (28%); displacement of families to other areas (13%); and other factors (5%), such as wanting to stay next to the border with Hungary. Three per cent of respondents preferred not to answer.
TRAVELLING CONDITIONS

Sixty-five per cent of respondents reported going back to Ukraine alone, while 36 per cent with a group, with changes compared to their initial exit from the country as shown in Figure 6 (e.g., crossed back with different people).

Who travelled in a group (36%), crossed back with immediate family members (67%), friends and neighbours (28%) and other relatives (7%).

Ninety-six per cent declared travelling back to Ukraine by train, while buses and cars were less popular choices (namely, 3% and 1%).

FREQUENCY OF TRAVEL TO UKRAINE

Most respondents (57%) had crossed back to Ukraine only once since the start of the war, followed by 24 and 17 per cent, who had returned more than twice or twice, respectively.

Only two per cent of interviewees had never crossed back since their exit from the country.

PLACES AND LENGTH OF STAY IN UKRAINE

Once back to Ukraine, seventy-two per cent of respondents declared staying in their homes, while nine per cent in private accommodations, i.e., hotels or private/civic initiatives.

Fifty-five per cent of interviewees returned for a short visit, while 40 per cent planned to remain in Ukraine. The rest were not sure or preferred not to answer (5% and 1% respectively).

Most respondents estimated short visits to be around one week (40%) or a few days (35%). Fewer planned to return for a month or more (20% respectively). One per cent preferred not to answer.
REASONS FOR CROSSING BACK TO UKRAINE

Figure 12: Reasons for who intends to stay in Ukraine

- Reunite with family members: 28%
- Improved situation in origin place/region: 28%
- Care responsibilities: 24%
- Not enough resources/money for living costs: 9%
- Couldn’t access education: 7%
- Work in essential services: 4%
- Couldn’t get humanitarian assistance: 3%
- Couldn’t get a job: 3%
- Take own family to safety: 3%
- Defend Ukraine: 3%
- Experience of discrimination/integration challenges: 3%
- Couldn’t find shelter/accommodation: 2%
- Improved situation in Ukraine: 1%
- Prefer not to answer: 4%
- Other: 11%

Note: Respondents could select multiple replies. Hence, the total is higher than 100%.

NEEDS OF PEOPLE CROSSING BACK TO UKRAINE

Most respondents declared needing medical (18%) financial (18%), and transportation (17%) support. Thirty-five per cent had no needs.

Figure 14: Main needs

- Medicines and health services: 18%
- Financial support: 18%
- Transportation support: 17%
- Documentation, consular and legal services: 13%
- Accommodation: 11%
- Employment/Job: 8%
- Food: 8%
- Communication & information: 7%
- Personal safety and security: 6%
- Family tracing: 6%
- Water: 5%
- Support to return home: 5%
- Psychological counseling: 3%
- NFI/ hygiene items: 2%
- None: 1%
- Prefer not to answer: 1%
- Other: 5%

Note: Respondents could select multiple replies. Hence, the total is higher than 100%.

For who planned to remain in Ukraine, family reunification (28%), improved situation in the place of origin (28%) and care responsibilities (24%) were the most relevant factors for returning.

For who intended to go back for a short visit, the most relevant considerations were, again, family (58%) and the collection of personal belongings (56%). Thirteen per cent of respondents mentioned other reasons, such as access to medical services or renewal/collection of documents.

Note: N=XX, 55% of sample planning a short visit in Ukraine. Respondents could select multiple replies. Hence, the total is higher than 100%.
METHODOLOGY

IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) is a system to track and monitor displacement and population mobility. It is designed to regularly and systematically capture, process and disseminate information to provide a better understanding of the movements and evolving needs of displaced populations, whether on site or en route.

This survey is part of IOM’s DTM activities to monitor the profiles, displacement patterns and most immediate needs of the Ukrainian refugees and TCNs crossing back to Ukraine since 24 February 2022. Surveys are collected, among others, in selected exit and transit locations, and in information and collective centres, identified to be the most frequently used by refugees and TCNs returning to Ukraine.

In Hungary, surveys were conducted in Ukrainian, Russian and English by IOM’s DTM trained teams of enumerators on a mobile application. The interviews are anonymous and carried out one-on-one with respondents, provided they consent to be interviewed after a brief introduction. Enumerators trained on ethics of data collection, information provision and protection principles, approached people crossing back to Ukraine, to verify their willingness to conduct the survey, which was only addressed to adults (18+).

The survey form was designed by IOM to capture the main displacement patterns for refugees and TCNs crossing back to Ukraine following the outbreak of the war. It analyses the demographic profiles of respondents and of the group they are travelling with, if any; it asks about intentions relatively to the permanence in Ukraine; and it gathers information regarding a set of main needs.

Various settings were identified to conduct surveys (see page 1 for specific locations), to maximise the number of interviews, and reach out to different profiles of individuals. While in transit points, such as train/bus stations, the flow of people was higher and interviewees were randomly surveyed (having the same likelihood compared to others to be selected), in other settings, such collective accommodations, respondents were intentionally identified.

Among the limitations encountered during data collection were the reduced time to carry out surveys at transit points and the presence of only eight enumerators.

To address the aforesaid shortcomings, and cover different viewpoints, a mixed sampling strategy guided the data collection exercise. Consequently, this analysis does not proportionally represent the whole population and results cannot be deemed representative of a full picture of mobility towards Ukraine from Hungary.