



**SKILL PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE AND
JUST MIGRATION PATTERNS (SKILLS4JUSTICE)**

No. 101132435

**WP4 “Surveying Skilled Migrant Workers in the Countries of
Destination and Origin”**

NATIONAL REPORT 2025

UKRAINE

Edited by the INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL ANALYTICS at 2025

This is the "**Ukraine's** National Report" prepared for WP 4 within the scope of the SKILLS4JUSTICE Horizon Europe Project.

This report is a collaborative report produced by:

Sergiy Melnyk, Yulia Irynevych, Hanna Belinska, Valentyna Tkachenko, Hanna Tereshchenko, Andriy Lytvynchuk, Natalia Pron, Maksym Romanov, Andriy Kiryanov, Olga Anisimova

This publication is based on the results of the project "*Skill Partnerships for Sustainable and Just Migration Patterns (SKILLS4JUSTICE)*." It is co-funded with support from the European Commission (S4J-project Nr. 101132435-HORIZON-CL2-2023-TRANSFORMATIONS-01/ 03).



Funded by the Horizon Europe Programme of the European Union, this publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

December 2025

SUMMARY

This report aims to present the findings of the research for ‘Work Package 4’ of the Horizon Europe Project “Skill Partnerships for Sustainable and Just Migration Patterns (SKILLS4JUSTICE),” co-funded with support from the European Commission (S4J-project no. 101132435-HORIZON-CL2-2023-TRANSFORMATIONS-01/ 03). One of the objectives of this Project is to conduct a sociological study of the state, problems and prospects of the development of training and the usage of qualified personnel, their deficit and its components in the wartime and post-war periods, in particular, the impact of migration processes, primarily due to the forced displacement of citizens within the country. Our partners understand the features and huge resource losses of Ukraine in such a difficult time, so most of the questions are adapted to study the situation of internal displacement due to the war.

Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022 caused an unprecedented wave of forced migration and displacement. Millions of Ukrainians have found themselves in other countries, mostly European, in search of safety, housing, education for their children, and life opportunities. A new social reality has emerged before Ukrainian society and the state. It is the formation of a large diaspora, many of its representatives have no intention of returning in the near future, and some plan to never return.

In this context, studying the experiences of temporary refugees from war is particularly relevant. It includes the ways of adaptation, the challenges they face, the degree of integration in new communities, as well as intentions to return and the conditions that can ensure this. Knowledge of such attitudes is necessary for the formation of the state policy on the return and reintegration of citizens.

The methodological basis for surveying Ukrainian migrants and refugees includes the general approaches to respondent sampling, a standard questionnaire, ethical standards, and feedback, developed and adopted by 13 member institutions of the Project Consortium from 12 countries. Although, given the martial law in Ukraine, significant differences in the features of refugees from war from representatives of other categories of migrants, the low presence and availability for interviewing of persons who meet the selection criteria and have returned to their homeland, we were allowed to adapt the standard questionnaire and interview questions to Ukrainian realities, conduct a separate sociological study dedicated to the problems of internal migration and allocate a block of questions focused on respondents' assessment of the level of their support from key stakeholders. We also studied the refugees' motivation to return to their homeland and under what conditions.

Citizens of Ukraine who met all four criteria and/or requirements listed below were eligible to participate in the survey of Ukrainian migrants and refugees, namely:

- Citizenship of Ukraine;
- Age from 18 to 65 years;
- Stay in the destination country (permanent, temporary, episodic) not earlier than 2014;
- having any experience of work or employment with local employers or residents of other countries (without Ukraine) (full-time, temporary, occasional, legal, illegal, self-employment, etc.) for a total duration of more than 3 months during the period of stay in the destination country;
- motivation to return (under certain conditions) to their homeland.

In accordance with the above criteria, 86 people from 17 countries around the world were selected and surveyed. 22 respondents answered off-line (25.6%), and the rest answered on-line. The average duration of this “in-depth” survey was 90 minutes. The questionnaire consisted of 97 questions, organized into 4 thematic blocks/parts, namely:

- I. Personal and motivational (migration/displacement) information;

II. Knowledge, Skills, abilities, qualifications and their match with the requirements of employers and/or applicable standards of the country of destination;

III. Justice at work and social participation and civic rights;

IV. Motivation of refugees to return to the homeland.

The interview consisted of 6 thematic blocks, which included 24 questions. The interview covered 84 refugees to 13 countries around the world. The largest number of respondents were interviewed in the following countries of residence: Italy (35.7%), Germany (16.7%), and Lithuania (15.5%). Almost every third interviewee was interviewed in person.

Key results.

Support from organisations: Almost half of those surveyed indicated that they have contacts with volunteer or non-governmental organisations, but the quality and intensity of such assistance varies significantly.

Discrimination. Most respondents do not experience discrimination based on gender either in their host countries or in Ukraine, however, some respondents indicate discrimination against mothers with children or due to nationality.

Plans for returning home. The main conditions for the return of refugees are the end of the war, the security situation, and the availability of housing and work in Ukraine. A fairly large portion of respondents see no real prospects for return.

Using new knowledge and skills. Many of those interviewed plan to use new skills acquired abroad upon returning to their homeland, including language skills, work experience, and participation in community projects.

Support for returning. The majority of those surveyed believe that it is the state that should provide returnees with housing, work, access to education, and medical services.

Support differentiation. The majority of those interviewed support the idea that assistance should be provided in a differentiated manner, primarily to those who have lost their homes or suffered significant losses.

Labour market and training. Respondents pointed to the practical focus and effective interaction of education and the labour market in host countries, which contrasts with the theoretical/theorisation of Ukrainian education.

Recommendations.

- Develop a national program for the reintegration of returnees.
- Ensure transparent access to housing and support for self-employment.
- Support the recognition of qualifications obtained abroad.
- Communicate the state policy on returning home through dedicated platforms.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION 7
2. METHOD 8
2.1. RESEARCH MODEL 8
2.2. RESEARCH ETHICS 9
2.2.1. Ethical permissions 9
2.2.2. Consent and data security 9
2.3. INSTRUMENT DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION 9
2.3.1. Quantitative data collection: Questionnaire 9
2.3.2. Qualitative data collection: Interviews 10
2.4. DATA ANALYSIS 10
2.4.1. Analysis of quantitative data 10
2.4.2. Analysis of qualitative data 10
2.5. QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH RESULTS 11
2.5.1. Overview of demographics 11
2.5.2. What are the characteristics of the migration patterns of labour migrants? How do these impact their employment in the destination countries? (RQ1) 14
2.5.3. What are the characteristics of skill formation and employment of labour migrants? (RQ2) 25
2.5.4. What are the perceptions of migrant workers on social justice? (RQ3) 68
JUSTICE AT WORK 68
PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL LIFE AND CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS 77
OVERALL ASSESSMENT BY RESPONDENTS OF THEIR SUPPORT IN THE HOST COUNTRIES 96
2.5.5. Satisfaction with the decision to migrate and future plans 99
UNDER WHAT CONDITIONS DO YOU PLAN TO RETURN TO YOUR HOMELAND? 99
2.6. WHO IN UKRAINE SHOULD PROVIDE YOU WITH THE GREATEST SUPPORT WHEN RETURNING TO YOUR HOMELAND? 103
IS IT NECESSARY TO ADOPT A SEPARATE PROGRAM IN UKRAINE THAT WOULD PROVIDE FOR COMPENSATORY, FINANCIAL AND MATERIAL, SOCIAL, EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT, AND OTHER MEASURES AIMED AT THE RAPID ADAPTATION OF THOSE RETURNING TO THEIR HOMELAND? 106
SHOULD THERE BE A DIFFERENTIATION OF UKRAINIAN CITIZENS RETURNING TO THEIR HOMELAND TO DETERMINE THE PRIORITY AND AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE? 107
DO YOU PLAN TO APPLY IN PRACTICE THE NEW KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND ABILITIES ACQUIRED IN THE HOST COUNTRY? 108
2.7. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH RESULTS 110
2.7.1. Overview of demographics 110

2.7.2. What are the characteristics of the migration patterns of labour migrants? How do these impact their employment in the destination countries? (RQ1)	112
2.7.3. What are the characteristics of skill formation and employment of labour migrants? (RQ2)	115
2.7.4. What are the perceptions of migrant workers on social justice? (RQ3)	123
2.7.5. Satisfaction with the decision to migrate and future plans	128
3. DISCUSSION	136
4. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	139
A. X2	144
B. X3	156

1. Introduction

Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022 caused an unprecedented wave of forced migration and displacement. Millions of Ukrainians have found themselves in other countries, mostly European, in search of safety, housing, education for their children, and life opportunities. A new social reality has emerged before Ukrainian society and the state. It is the formation of a large diaspora, many of its representatives have no intention of returning in the near future, and some plan to never return.

In this context, studying the experiences of temporary refugees from war is particularly relevant. It includes the ways of adaptation, the challenges they face, the degree of integration in new communities, as well as intentions to return and the conditions that can ensure this. Knowledge of such attitudes is necessary for the formation of the state policy on the return and reintegration of citizens.

The methodological basis for surveying Ukrainian migrants and refugees includes the general approaches to respondent sampling, a standard questionnaire, ethical standards, and feedback, developed and adopted by 13 member institutions of the Project Consortium from 12 countries. Although, given the martial law in Ukraine, significant differences in the features of refugees from war from representatives of other categories of migrants, the low presence and availability for interviewing of persons who meet the selection criteria and have returned to their homeland, we were allowed to adapt the standard questionnaire and interview questions to Ukrainian realities, conduct a separate sociological study dedicated to the problems of internal migration and allocate a block of questions focused on respondents' assessment of the level of their support from key stakeholders. We also studied the refugees' motivation to return to their homeland and under what conditions.

Citizens of Ukraine who met all four criteria and/or requirements listed below were eligible to participate in the survey of Ukrainian migrants and refugees, namely:

- Citizenship of Ukraine;
- Age from 18 to 65 years;
- Stay in the destination country (permanent, temporary, episodic) not earlier than 2014;
- having any experience of work or employment with local employers or residents of other countries (without Ukraine) (full-time, temporary, occasional, legal, illegal, self-employment, etc.) for a total duration of more than 3 months during the period of stay in the destination country;
- motivation to return (under certain conditions) to their homeland.

In accordance with the above criteria, 86 people from 17 countries around the world were selected and surveyed. 22 respondents answered off-line (25.6%), and the rest answered on-line. The average duration of this “in-depth” survey was 90 minutes. The questionnaire consisted of 97 questions, organized into 4 thematic blocks/parts, namely:

- I. Personal and motivational (migration/displacement) information;
- II. Knowledge, Skills, abilities, qualifications and their match with the requirements of employers and/or applicable standards of the country of destination;
- III. Justice at work and social participation and civic rights;
- IV. Motivation of refugees to return to the homeland.

The interview consisted of 6 thematic blocks, which included 24 questions. The interview covered 84 refugees to 13 countries around the world. The largest number of respondents were interviewed in the following countries of residence: Italy (35.7%), Germany (16.7%), and Lithuania (15.5%). Almost every third interviewee was interviewed in person.

The study did not consider immigrants in Ukraine due to their absence.

2. Method

2.1. Research Model

The mixed (Quantitative & Qualitative) methodology prepared by Ankara University was used with several modifications. The methodological basis for surveying Ukrainian migrants and refugees includes the general approaches to respondent sampling, a standard questionnaire, ethical standards, and feedback, developed and adopted by 13 member institutions of the Project Consortium from 12 countries. Although, given the martial law in Ukraine, significant differences in the features of refugees from war from representatives of other categories of migrants, the low presence and availability for interviewing of persons who meet the selection criteria and have returned to their homeland, we were allowed to adapt the standard questionnaire and interview questions to Ukrainian realities, conduct a separate sociological study dedicated to the problems of internal migration and allocate a block of questions focused on respondents' assessment of the level of their support from key stakeholders. We also studied the refugees' motivation to return to their homeland and under what conditions.

Citizens of Ukraine who met all four criteria and/or requirements listed below were eligible to participate in the survey of Ukrainian migrants and refugees, namely:

- Citizenship of Ukraine;
- Age from 18 to 65 years;
- Stay in the destination country (permanent, temporary, episodic) not earlier than 2014;
- having any experience of work or employment with local employers or residents of other countries (without Ukraine) (full-time, temporary, occasional, legal, illegal, self-employment, etc.) for a total duration of more than 3 months during the period of stay in the destination country;
- motivation to return (under certain conditions) to their homeland.

In accordance with the above criteria, 86 people from 17 countries around the world were selected and surveyed. 22 respondents answered off-line (25.6%), and the rest answered on-line. The average duration of this “in-depth” survey was 90 minutes. The questionnaire consisted of 97 questions, organized into 4 thematic blocks/parts, namely:

- I. Personal and motivational (migration/displacement) information;
- II. Knowledge, Skills, abilities, qualifications and their match with the requirements of employers and/or applicable standards of the country of destination;
- III. Justice at work and social participation and civic rights;
- IV. Motivation of refugees to return to the homeland.

The survey was conducted using a semi-structured interview, which included 24 questions grouped into 6 thematic blocks. A total of 84 people living in the EU countries (including Poland, Germany, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Lithuania, Sweden, and Canada) were surveyed.

The responses, both closed and open, were arranged in tabular form; additionally, a content analysis of the open responses was conducted to identify typical patterns and quotation-illustrations.

A qualitative approach was used for interpretation: classification by topics, comparison of respondents' answers, identification of recurring motivations and barriers.

Example quotes with corresponding respondent numbers (#) provide an opportunity to trace individual trajectories - which is in line with methodological recommendations for survey-based reports. This approach is consistent with international standards for reports based on sociological research.

2.2. Research Ethics

2.2.1. Ethical permissions

This project aims to make a systematic analysis of skills shortages in five EU countries (France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Lithuania) and six non-EU countries (Turkey, United Kingdom, Norway, North Macedonia, Ukraine, Ethiopia). This survey is brought to you within the Work Package 4 titled "Surveying skilled migrant workers in the countries of destination and origin."

The survey aims to determine the skill formation of the migrant labour force in the source and destination countries, their relations with mobility patterns and skill formation, and the participation of migrants in the local development of the origin and destination countries. For more information, you can visit the project website: <https://skills4justice.eu/>

This study has been approved by the Temporary Ethics Committee of the SSI 'Institute of Educational Analytics' (Minutes No. 1 of 19 February 2025).

2.2.2. Consent and data security

All responses you provide for this study will be completely confidential. When the results of the study are reported, you will not be identified by name or any other information that could be used to guess your identity. In this survey, you will be referred to with interview codes, created to fully anonymize your answers.

In terms of the confidentiality of personal data, please do NOT share any personal information that will pose a risk to yourself and eliminate your anonymity, and do not make any written statements regarding this. If you give information that reveals your identity, either these statements will be deleted, and your survey data will not be used in the research.

The results of this research will be used only for scientific purposes.

2.3. Instrument Design and Data collection

2.3.1. Quantitative data collection: Questionnaire

2.3.1.1. Design of the questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of 97 questions, organized into 4 thematic blocks/parts, namely:

- I. Personal and motivational (migration/displacement) information;
- II. Knowledge, Skills, abilities, qualifications and their match with the requirements of employers and/or applicable standards of the country of destination;
- III. Justice at work and social participation and civic rights;
- IV. Motivation of refugees to return to the homeland.

2.3.1.2. Mode of delivery

86 people from 17 countries around the world were selected and surveyed. 22 respondents answered off-line (25.6%), and the rest answered on-line. The average duration of this "in-depth" survey was 90 minutes. The survey was conducted in April-August 2025.

2.3.1.3. Participants and recruitment strategies

Ukrainians who meet all four of the following criteria and/or requirements are invited to participate in this survey, namely:

- Citizenship of Ukraine;
- Age from 18 to 65 years;
- Being recognised as an internally displaced person (IDP) (permanently, temporarily, occasionally) during a period since 2014 to the present;

- having any work or employment (full-time, temporary, occasional, official, unofficial, self-employment, etc.) with a total duration of more than 3 months during the period of being recognised as an IDP.

2.3.1.4. Limitations and challenges

Certain problems arose when conducting the off-line survey, but they were resolved by interviewing refugees temporarily returning home, sending an expert to Lithuania, and engaging an expert in Italy.

2.3.2. Qualitative data collection: Interviews

2.3.2.1. Design of the interview

The interview consisted of 6 thematic blocks, which included 24 questions.

2.3.2.2. Mode of delivery

The interview covered 84 refugees to 13 countries around the world. The largest number of respondents were interviewed in the following countries of residence: Italy (35.7%), Germany (16.7%), and Lithuania (15.5%). Almost every third interviewee was interviewed in person. The interview was conducted in April-August 2025.

2.3.2.3. Participants and recruitment strategies

Ukrainians who meet all four of the following criteria and/or requirements were invited to participate in these interviews, namely:

- Citizenship of Ukraine;
- Age from 18 to 65 years;
- Being recognised as an internally displaced person (IDP) (permanently, temporarily, occasionally) during a period since 2014 to the present;
- having any work or employment (full-time, temporary, occasional, official, unofficial, self-employment, etc.) with a total duration of more than 3 months during the period of being recognised as an IDP.

2.3.2.4. Limitations and challenges

Certain problems arose when conducting the off-line interviews, but they were resolved by interviewing refugees temporarily returning home, sending an expert to Lithuania, and engaging an expert in Italy.

2.4. Data analysis

2.4.1. Analysis of quantitative data

The study used quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis, including questionnaires. Primary data collection was carried out anonymously using digital tools (Google Forms), data processing was carried out in the Microsoft Excel and Power BI software environments using descriptive and comparative statistics, grouping and clustering of indicators, as well as content analysis of qualitative responses.

2.4.2. Analysis of qualitative data

The responses, both closed and open, were arranged in tabular form; additionally, a content analysis of the open responses was conducted to identify typical patterns and quotation-illustrations.

A qualitative approach was used for interpretation: classification by topics, comparison of respondents' answers, identification of recurring motivations and barriers.

Example quotes with corresponding respondent numbers (#) provide an opportunity to trace individual trajectories - which is in line with methodological recommendations for survey-based reports. This approach is consistent with international standards for reports based on sociological research.

2.5. Quantitative research results

2.5.1. Overview of demographics

The data obtained indicate a certain geographical structure of the settlement of Ukrainian citizens abroad who participated in the survey. They reflect the main migration directions and the concentration of Ukrainians in the key EU host states. In total, 86 people participated in the survey, which allows us to trace a representative picture for the largest countries of residence of Ukrainians in Europe. The distribution of the participants shows that the vast majority of those surveyed live in countries that became the main centres of reception of Ukrainian refugees after the start of the full-scale invasion of Ukraine by the enemy, in particular, they include Germany, Italy, and Poland.

Germany is the main centre of residence for the Ukrainians we surveyed – 27 people, or 31.4% of all participants, live here. This indicator is fully consistent with European trends, as it was Germany that accepted the largest number of Ukrainian refugees within the EU and provided them with the broadest and highest social guarantees in material terms. The country has established an extensive system of integration support, including language courses, employment opportunities for persons with temporary protection, and professional retraining programs. Respondents living in Germany also demonstrate a high level of awareness, employment stability and satisfaction with their living conditions in other sections of the study.

Table 1.

Geographical distribution of Ukrainian refugees involved in the survey

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Germany	27	31.4 %
Italy	19	22.1 %
Poland	15	17.4 %
Spain	4	4.7 %
Denmark	3	3.5 %
Norway	3	3.5 %
Slovakia	3	3.5 %
Ireland	2	2.3 %
Netherlands	2	2.3 %
United Kingdom	1	1.2 %
Georgia	1	1.2 %
Canada	1	1.2 %
Portugal	1	1.2 %
Romania	1	1.2 %
United States	1	1.2 %
France	1	1.2 %
Switzerland	1	1.2 %

The second largest country is Italy, where 19 respondents live, or 22.1% of the total. This reflects the long history of Ukrainian labour migration to this country, primarily in the field of domestic service, care, and social protection. Italy is

characterized by a high proportion of informal employment, which is why some respondents note difficulties with recognition of qualifications or legalization of work. At the same time, they emphasise the significant social support from local communities, charitable organisations, and church structures.

Poland, chosen by 15 participants in our survey (17.4%), remains a strategically close migration destination. This is the first country to accept the majority of Ukrainian refugees after the war began. It provides simplified access to the labour market, educational and social programs, which promotes integration, however, competition in the labour market and uneven social support create certain challenges for Ukrainians.

Spain, where four respondents (4.7%) live, shows a trend of a new wave of migration. Ukrainians choose it due to its favourable climate, developed system of social services, and active activities of Ukrainian associations, although problems with the cost of housing and the language barrier remain significant.

Denmark, Norway and Slovakia each have three representatives in the survey (3.5% each). These countries are characterized by high social standards and stability, but Ukrainians face adaptation difficulties, including language and cultural ones. Two participants (2.3%) each live in Ireland and the Netherlands. They noted a high level of integration support, including the provision of housing, financial assistance, and the organisation of language courses.

Countries with single representatives (one respondent each) – United Kingdom, Georgia, Canada, Portugal, Romania, USA, France and Switzerland – represent individual migration histories that demonstrate the geographical breadth of the Ukrainian diaspora, but do not form statistically significant groups (Table 1).

Thus, the structure of respondents indicates the predominance of the European direction of migration, which covers over 95% of all study participants. Germany, Italy and Poland are the three main centres of residence, together covering over 70% of the sample. This indicates a balance between the countries of the so-called "old" Ukrainian migration (Italy, Spain) and the "new war wave" (Germany, Poland), which makes it possible to track the evolution of motives and strategies for staying abroad.

Thus, the geographical structure of the sample reflects the modern military model of spatial migration of Ukrainians, in which Germany, Italy, and Poland (as well as the Czech Republic and the Baltic countries) play a key role as leading destination countries. It is here that the main resources of social, professional and humanitarian integration are concentrated, which determines the main features and dynamics of the formation of the Ukrainian migration component in Europe.

Age structure of respondents

The age distribution of respondents reflects the structure of Ukrainian migration abroad and indicates the predominance of people of working age who have some experience of professional activity and higher (compared to older people) ability to socio-economic adaptation in new conditions. A total of 86 people participated in the survey, with the largest group being participants aged 35 to 54.

The most numerous age category is 35–44 years old — 30 people (34.9% of the sample). These are people of active working age who, as a rule, already have families, professional experience, and stable motivation to work abroad. They are the main social support of the Ukrainian migration segment, often combining employment with care (protection and support) for children or elderly relatives.

The second largest group is 45–54 years old — 29 people (33.7%). These respondents, as evidenced by the generalization of the results of other blocks of the survey, are characterized by increased social responsibility, stable employment, and at the same time certain difficulties in retraining or integration into new labour markets. It is among representatives of this group that the desire to return to Ukraine under favorable conditions is most often observed.

Table 2.
Age structure of respondents

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
35–44 years	30	34.9 %
45–54 years	29	33.7 %
25–34 years	17	19.8 %
55–60 years	6	7.0 %
18–24 years	4	4.7 %

The younger age category of 25–34 years old included 17 participants (19.8%). This is a generation that is actively adapting to the European environment, willingly participating in training, volunteering, or retraining programs. Young people aged 18–24 are represented by only four people (4.7%), which may be explained by the fact that most Ukrainian students have the status of temporary students or continue their studies remotely in Ukraine.

The smallest share is for the older age group of 55–60 years old — six people (7%). These respondents typically face limited employment opportunities, but report high levels of social assistance from host countries (Table 2).

The largest age contrasts are observed in Germany, Italy and Poland. In Germany, people aged 45–54 (11 people) and 35–44 (7 people) predominate, indicating a mature demographic structure of the migrant community. In Italy, the majority of respondents are aged 35–44 (11 people), while in Poland there is a more even distribution between the 25–34, 35–44 and 45–54 age groups.

Thus, the sample structure indicates that Ukrainian migration abroad has distinctly “mature” features: More than two-thirds of the participants belong to the middle generation, which is actively integrating into the economies of the host countries. At the same time, the small share of young people indicates the need to expand educational and cultural programs to engage younger migrants in long-term integration processes.

Respondents' status in host countries

The results of the survey of Ukrainian citizens of working age who are currently residing and working abroad demonstrate an extremely heterogeneous structure of their legal status, reflecting both the different reasons for migration and the specifics of the legislation of the host countries.

Table 3.
Distribution of respondents by their residence status

Choice	Number of responses	Share
Legal migrant	26	27.4 %
Recipient of temporary protection	58	61.1 %
Applicant for citizenship of the host country	5	5.3 %
Other	6	6.3 %

Out of 95 responses, 58 (61.1%) indicate that the respondents have the status of recipients of temporary protection. This indicator characterizes the fact that the majority of Ukrainians were forced to leave the country as a result of the war and took advantage of the possibility of legal residence provided by the EU humanitarian or anti-crisis mechanisms. This status gives them the right to residence, work, and social support, but it usually has a limited validity period. The highest concentration of recipients of temporary protection was recorded in Germany (24 people), Poland (9), Spain (4) and Italy (6) — countries that have become (along with the Czech Republic and the Baltic countries) the main centres for receiving Ukrainians after 2022.

26 people (27.4%) identified themselves as legal labour migrants, meaning they have work visas, work permits, or permanent contracts that ensure full legalization of their activities. This status is characteristic mainly for Ukrainians who left abroad before 2022 or work in areas with increased demand for labour (elderly care, hotel and restaurant business, construction, handicrafts, road transport, and the agricultural sector). The largest number of such respondents was recorded in Italy (10 people), Poland (6) and Germany (4).

At the same time, 5 people (5.3%) are applicants for citizenship of the host country. This indicates a high level of integration of individual Ukrainians into the social and professional environment of host countries, as well as a desire for long-term or permanent migration. Similar cases are recorded primarily in France (1 person), Spain (1) and Italy (2), that is, in countries where a certain part of Ukrainians has lived for more than five years.

A separate group consists of 6 respondents (6.3%) who indicated other options for their status — in particular, stay on the basis of study visas, family reunification, or humanitarian permits. Such cases are most common in Germany (3 individuals), Italy (1) and Slovakia (1) (Table 3).

The geographical distribution shows a certain pattern. In Western European countries (Germany, Italy, Spain, France), recipients of temporary protection predominate, while in Central and Eastern European countries (Poland, Slovakia, Romania) there is a larger share of legal labour migrants who arrived before the start of a full-scale war. In non-European countries — the USA and Canada — Ukrainians mostly have the status of official labour migrants, which indicates more formalized mechanisms of entry and employment.

Summarizing the above, several conclusions can be drawn. First, the structure of the legal status of Ukrainians abroad reflects the dual nature of modern migration—a combination of forced (due to war) and labour (due to the search for economic opportunities) forms. Secondly, a significant share of persons with temporary protection indicates both the massive nature of humanitarian migration and the potential for its transformation into long-term labour migration. Thirdly, the growth in the number of legal labour migrants and applicants for citizenship demonstrates the gradual institutional integration of Ukrainians into the socio-economic life of the host countries and the decline in motivation to return to their homeland.

Thus, the legal status of Ukrainians abroad is currently in a state of transitional stability. The majority have received temporary protection, which guarantees them basic rights, while other groups of migrants are actively moving towards full legalization, professional integration, or citizenship. This creates the prerequisites for the formation of a new type of Ukrainian diaspora, that is more stable, organised, and economically active.

2.5.2. What are the characteristics of the migration patterns of labour migrants? How do these impact their employment in the destination countries? (RQ1)

The impact of respondents' status on their employment

All respondents answered this question. The most common answer was "I am allowed to work" (84 people; 97.7%). This mono distribution of responses indicates a leading trend among respondents and at the same time emphasizes the diversity of experience. Comparing modal and secondary responses allows us to understand the balance between dominant practices and alternative behavioural scenarios of respondents (Table 4).

Table 4.
The impact of respondents' status on their employment

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
I am allowed to work	84	97.7 %
I am not allowed to work	1	1.2 %
Prefer not to say	1	1.2 %

In all major recipient countries—Germany, Italy, Poland, Spain, and Denmark—the share of people allowed to work is 100% or close to it. In particular:

- Germany — 27 persons (100%);
- Italy — 19 persons (100%);
- Poland — 14 out of 15 persons (93.3%);
- Spain — 4 persons (100%);
- Denmark — 3 persons (100%);
- Norway, Ireland, Slovakia, France, Portugal, Switzerland, Canada, and the USA also have full legality of employment.

The exceptions were one person in Poland, who indicated a lack of permission, and another respondent in the Netherlands, who chose the option "Prefer not to say".

The data obtained indicate a high level of legal integration of Ukrainians in the EU countries. Thanks to the introduction of the temporary protection regime, Ukrainian citizens have gained full access to the labour markets, social guarantees, and professional development.

This level of formal legalization is unprecedented in the history of labour migration from Ukraine. If previously a significant part of Ukrainian workers were in the "shadow" or "gray zone" (without official contracts or permits), now almost 98.0% of respondents work legally.

This increases their social protection, and also forms a new type of migrant worker - with a higher legal culture, greater economic confidence, and readiness for official employment.

At the same time, the presence of isolated cases of lack of permission indicates the need for continued institutional support for Ukrainians in the field of legal advice, in particular for those who are in the countries with complex procedural requirements.

As a result, it became obvious that:

1. Almost all Ukrainians surveyed have the legal right to work, which is evidence of the effectiveness of temporary protection policies in Europe.
2. The level of legal employment (97.7%) reflects the deep integration of our citizens into local economic systems.

3. This indicator has a double meaning. On the one hand, it ensures the economic self-sufficiency of migrants, and on the other hand, it creates a certain basis for future return, since the experience of official work increases professional standards and competitiveness in the Ukrainian labour market.

To summarize, it can be said that the legal status of Ukrainians abroad is no longer a barrier to employment. On the contrary, it has become an important condition for their socio-economic adaptation, which determines the character of the modern Ukrainian labour diaspora as a legitimate, professionally active, and socially responsible formation.

Respondents' employment

The survey results showed that the vast majority of Ukrainians abroad had official jobs and a stable source of income, which indicates their successful integration into the labour markets of host countries. Out of 86 respondents, 58 people (67.4%) reported that they worked and had an employment contract, that is, they were officially employed. This indicates a high level of legalization of employment of Ukrainians abroad and their desire to comply with legal norms and social standards. The highest rates of official employment were recorded in Germany (18 persons), Italy (13 persons) and Poland (12 persons). Those countries had systemic mechanisms to support workers from Ukraine, in particular simplified procedures for obtaining work permits. 7 persons (8.1%) worked without an employment contract, which indicates the presence of an informal employment sector, mainly in areas with seasonal or domestic nature of work - care, agriculture, construction, cleaning. The largest number of such cases was identified in Italy (3 individuals) and Germany (3 individuals), which is consistent with known trends regarding the prevalence of informal work among migrants in these countries.

7 respondents (8.1%) identified themselves as self-employed or business owners.

Table 5.

Respondents' employment forms

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Yes, I am employed and have a work contract	58	67.4 %
I am a refugee/recipient of temporary protection	8	9.3 %
Yes, I am working, but without work contract	7	8.1 %
I am self-employed/a business owner	7	8.1 %
I am unemployed now, but I was employed earlier for at least three months	5	5.8 %
Prefer not to say	1	1.2 %

These are specialists who have started their own business or work independently - in the services, crafts, IT, or consulting sectors. The largest number of such individuals is in Germany (1 person) and Georgia (1 person), which indicates the gradual economic stabilization of some Ukrainians and their desire for financial independence.

8 people (9.3%) indicated that they are refugees or recipients of temporary protection. In most cases, they are in the process of looking for a job or undergoing adaptation programs. This status is typical for respondents in Germany (4 persons), Italy (1) and Poland (1), where government programs allow Ukrainians to be officially employed immediately after receiving a temporary residence permit.

5 respondents (5.8%) reported that they were unemployed at the time of the survey, but had previous work experience abroad for at least three months. This indicates certain breaks in work activity, which may be related to childcare, studies, changing country of residence, or health conditions.

Only 1 person (1.2%) chose the option “Prefer not to say”, which indicates a high openness of respondents and willingness to share information about their employment status (Table 5).

Thus, the employment structure of Ukrainians abroad looks stable. More than two-thirds had formal employment, about 8.0% were self-employed, and the rest were in a transitional state between employment and seeking new opportunities. This picture indicates the high labour adaptation of Ukrainians, their competitiveness in the labour markets of European countries, and their desire for legal and stable activity.

At the same time, the presence of a certain share of informally employed persons highlights the need for additional mechanisms of support and legal protection for migrant workers, especially in countries where formalizing work remains a difficult or lengthy process. Thus, Ukrainian citizens abroad demonstrate a high level of socio-professional mobility and responsibility, gradually moving from temporary to permanent employment, which strengthens their position both at the individual and economic levels.

Length of stay of respondents by destination country

All respondents answered this question. The most common answer was “1–3 years” (63 persons; 73.3%). The second most common option was “more than 5 years” (13 persons; 15.1%). The third position was occupied by the choice “4–5 years” (8 persons; 9.3%). This distribution indicates a leading trend among the respondents (war refugees) and at the same time emphasizes the diversity of experience (Table 6).

Table 6.

Length of stay of respondents by destination country

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
1–3 years	63	73.3 %
More than 5 years	13	15.1 %
4–5 years	8	9.3 %
Less than a year	2	2.3 %

Geographical analysis shows some differences. In Germany, people who have lived in the country for one to three years prevail (22 out of 27 respondents), which confirms the war-related nature of the migration flow. In Italy, the structure is quite mixed: 12 respondents have been in the country for one to three years, and 7 for more than five years, which indicates a combination of new and older waves of labour migration. Poland is also characterized by a short period of stay: 10 persons have lived in the country for up to three years and another 4 persons for up to five years. In Spain, respondents are equally divided between those who have been in the country for up to three years and those who have been living longer. In the remaining countries – Norway, Denmark, Ireland, Canada, the USA, Portugal, France and Switzerland – the majority of respondents arrived within the last three years, which confirms the spread of Ukrainian migrants as refugees from the war over a wider geography.

The data obtained showed that current migration has a two-layer structure. The majority of respondents are a new wave of displaced refugees, for whom staying abroad is temporary and is primarily related to security reasons. At the same time, about a quarter of the participants are established migrants who have been living outside Ukraine for more than four years, are integrated into the economy of the host country and act as a potential resource of support for newcomers.

The short period of stay explains the partial fragmentation of integration processes: not everyone has the opportunity to find employment in their specialty or undergo regulatory procedures for verification/confirmation of their diplomas/professional qualifications. However, even in such a short period, most of them were able to legally find employment and adapt to new conditions.

Thus, the duration of Ukrainians' stay abroad demonstrates a combination of forced mobility and gradual stabilization. This allows us to conclude that current Ukrainian migration is both a reaction to the crisis of war and a manifestation of long-term adaptation processes that form the basis for the future reintegration of citizens after their return to Ukraine.

Gender structure of respondents

All respondents answered this question. Among them, 81.6% (71 persons) were women and 15 (17.4%) were men, respectively (Table 7).

Table 7.

Gender structure of respondents

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Female	71	82.6 %
Male	15	17.4 %

This distribution indicates the dominance of female migration, which is a feature in recent years, especially after the outbreak of full-scale war.

Women have become the main participants in labour and forced migration, since they most often left with children or elderly parents, ensuring the safety of their families and at the same time supporting them financially. The high proportion of refugee women in the sample also correlates with the trends of previous decades, when Ukrainian women massively left for the EU countries to work in the social, domestic, care and educational sectors.

The geographical structure of the distribution of respondents also confirms this general conclusion. In most countries, the share of women exceeds 70.0–80.0%, and in some cases it reaches 100.0%. The highest rates were recorded in Italy (16 out of 19), Germany (21 out of 27), Poland (11 out of 15), Spain (3 women out of 4 respondents, respectively) and Denmark, Norway, Ireland, where all respondents are women. This structure is explained not only by the migration policy of the host countries, but also by the nature of the demand for labour: these are mainly the areas of service, education, medicine, care for children or the elderly.

Men are a minority among the respondents — only 15 persons. Their presence is more noticeable in Germany (6), Poland (4) and Italy (3 persons, respectively). These countries have a more balanced labour market, which involves both men and women in the industrial or technical sectors. At the same time, in many other countries, men are represented in isolated cases or are completely absent from the sample, which confirms the feminization of modern Ukrainian migration.

In a broader sociological context, such a gender structure has several consequences. First, it indicates a change in the traditional model of labour migration, when the male presence was dominant. Second, the increased role of women in labour migration reflects a transition to a model of family responsibility, in which women perform not only a social but also an economic support function. Third, the feminization of migration processes creates new challenges for integration policies, including the need to expand access to social services, language courses, and professional adaptation programs for mothers with children.

Thus, the results indicate that Ukrainian labour migration today has a distinctly female face. This reflects both the humanitarian dimension of forced displacement and the economic survival strategy, within which women have become the main

agents of mobility, adaptation, and financial stability of families abroad. In addition, a key factor in this phenomenon is the ban on the departure of men aged 23-60 due to mobilization and military measures in Ukraine.

Marital status of respondents

All respondents answered this question, confirming that half of them (44 persons; 51.2%) were married. The rest of the respondents were either single (24 persons; 27.8%), or divorced (12 persons; 14.0%), or belong to other categories of the population by marital status (widowed, in a civil marriage (6 persons; 7.0%)) (Table 8).

Table 8.

Distribution of respondents by their marital status

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Married	44	51.2 %
Single	24	27.8 %
Divorced	12	14.0 %
Widowed	5	5.8 %
In a civil partnership	1	1.2 %

In geographical terms, the highest concentration of married respondents was observed in Italy (8 out of 19), Poland (12 out of 15) and Germany (12 out of 27 persons). These countries are traditional centres of Ukrainian labour migration, where stable family networks have been formed. In contrast, among singles, participants from Germany (10 persons) and Italy (3 persons) predominate, which may indicate greater regional mobility of representatives of this particular group.

In Denmark, Spain and Norway, where the number of respondents is smaller, a mixed type of structure is observed: the simultaneous presence of married, divorced and single persons. This confirms that Ukrainian migration has a mixed-age and socially diverse composition.

Thus, the socio-demographic portrait of the respondents indicates the dominance of mature people with experience of family life. Most of them are focused on stability and maintaining family ties, even while outside Ukraine. At the same time, a significant share of divorced and single respondents emphasized the complexity of adaptation processes, in which forced relocation was often accompanied by a change in family status.

Thus, Ukrainian migration is characterized by a combination of traditional family models with modern manifestations of individual mobility. This creates a complex social landscape, where families seeking reunification coexist with independent labour migrants for whom migration is a means of personal or professional self-realization.

Information on the employment/presence of respondents' partners in their countries of residence

The responses to this question indicate that the majority of Ukrainian migrants abroad have partners or spouses, but the nature of their employment varies significantly depending on the country of residence. In total, among the 86 respondents, 32 persons (37.2%) indicated that their husband or wife works in the country of residence, while 21 respondents (24.4%) reported that their partner is currently unemployed. A third of the participants — 33 persons (38.4%) — are not married or do not have a stable relationship (Table 9).

This distribution indicates a noticeable trend towards family migration, where both partners, if any, try to realize themselves in the labour market of the host country. This is particularly true for Italy, Poland and Spain, where there is a large share of couples



in which both adults work. In Italy, nine respondents (over 47.0% of those in a relationship) reported that their partner has a job, while only two indicated the opposite. A similar situation is observed in Poland, where seven people have a working partner. This indicates a significant level of integration of Ukrainian families into the local economic environment, in particular into the care, manufacturing and service sectors.

At the same time, a more diverse situation is observed in Germany: 8 respondents reported that their partner is not working, while 6 reported that they are working. This may be due to the fact that some migrants are under temporary protection status, which limits access to the labour market for family members, or to the fact that one of the partners focuses on childcare.

Table 9.

Information on the employment/presence of respondents' partners in their countries of residence

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
I am not married or in a relationship	33	38.4 %
Yes	32	37.2 %
No	21	24.4 %

A similar trend is observed in Norway, where out of three respondents only one partner has a job, while two do not. In Spain, the situation is more positive: three respondents reported an employed partner, while only one noted their absence. In the Netherlands and Slovakia, all participants who have partners indicated that they work, which indicates good opportunities for the integration of both family members.

In contrast, in some countries with small samples (Canada, France, Switzerland), the majority of respondents are either unmarried or have an unemployed partner. This may reflect the predominantly individual nature of migration to these countries, driven by educational or professional motives.

Overall, the analysis shows that the presence of a working partner is an important indicator of the level of integration of Ukrainian migrants into the socio-economic life of the host countries. Married couples where both partners have a job demonstrated higher stability, financial independence and willingness to stay for a long time. At the same time, the significant share of unemployed partners indicated the need for employment support programs, vocational training and language training, especially for women, who often remain outside the labour market due to family circumstances.

Number of children of respondents

Of 86 respondents, the majority are parents with one or two children. In particular, 29 persons (33.7%) indicated that they were raising two children, 24 (27.9%) named one child. Thus, over 60% of the study participants have children, which indicates the dominance of the family model of migration, rather than the individual labour model. This fact indicates a stable social structure of the Ukrainian diaspora, focused on a long stay abroad, creating conditions for raising children and access to education.

Another 7 persons (8.1%) had three children, and one person (1.2%) had four, which demonstrates the presence of large families even among migrants, who often face material and housing difficulties. 25 respondents (29.1%) were childless, mostly representatives of the younger generation or those who migrated without their families in search of employment (Table 10).

Table 10.

Number of children of respondents

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
--------	------------------	-------

1	24	27.9 %
2	29	33.7 %
3	7	8.1 %
4	1	1.2 %
Without children	25	29.1 %

The highest rates among respondents were recorded in Italy and Germany. In Italy, the majority of respondents have two children (9 persons) or one (7 persons), while in Germany, families with one or two children dominate (9 persons in each category). This indicates a fairly high level of stability of family structures and more favourable conditions for social security in these countries. In Poland, a more diverse picture is observed: the share of childless (5 persons) and large families (4 persons have three children) is higher, which may be due to the shorter period of stay of Ukrainians in this country and its border nature of migration processes.

In Spain, the majority of respondents have one or two children, which corresponds to Central European trends. In Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Norway), families with one child prevail, which is due to the high cost of living, but at the same time they have access to high-quality state support for parenthood. In other countries, such as the Netherlands, Ireland, Canada or France, the sample is small, but in most cases the respondents also have children, confirming the general trend towards family migration.

Thus, the demographic structure of Ukrainians abroad demonstrates a clear predominance of people with family obligations, for whom issues of education, childcare, stable income and social protection are decisive in the adaptation process. This factor also affects their intentions to return to Ukraine, since the decision to repatriate is in most cases made taking into account safety, living conditions and future opportunities for children.

The number of other family members of respondents living with them

The survey results show that the majority of Ukrainian migrants live abroad in small family or individual households. Of 86 respondents, more than a third (27 persons, 31.4%) live alone, without other family members. This indicator shows the prevalence of individual or labour migration, especially among those who left on their own for employment or study.

At the same time, 23 people (26.7%) live with one family member, which most often means living together with a partner or child. Another 22 respondents (25.6%) live with two family members, forming typical “core” families with two children or with parents. A smaller share of respondents — 10 people (11.6%) — live in families of three, while 4 participants (4.7%) indicated that five or more family members live with them (Table 11). This indicates the existence of extended family models characteristic of certain cultural groups or situations when Ukrainians moved in large families.

Table 11.

Distribution of respondents by number of family members living with them

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
0	27	31.4 %
1	23	26.7 %
2	22	25.6 %
3	10	11.6 %
5 or more	4	4.7 %

In Italy, Germany and Poland, families with two or three cohabitants are most common, which corresponds to the typical model of “parents with children”. In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway, Ireland), small family groups are more common - one or two family members. Such differences are explained both by economic factors (cost of housing, social policy) and by the duration of stay as in the countries with a longer migration history, Ukrainians are more likely to be reunited with their families.

The data obtained allow us to make several generalizations. First, the current Ukrainian military migration has a pronounced family feature: the majority of migrants have children and often seek family reunification. Second, the households of Ukrainians abroad are mostly small or medium-sized, which is due to both military and/or socio-economic realities and the temporary nature of the status of stay. Third, a significant share of individuals living without family members clearly reflects the forced separation of families due to war or economic circumstances.

Thus, Ukrainian migration is not only a labour but also a social and family phenomenon. It combines the desire for economic stability with the need to ensure the well-being and safety of children, which becomes one of the main motives for staying abroad or, conversely, returning home in the post-war period.

Short-term visits by respondents to Ukraine

The responses received indicate that a significant part of Ukrainians who are abroad maintain active ties with the Motherland. Of 86 respondents, 48 people (55.8%) return to Ukraine from time to time, while 38 respondents (44.2%) do not make such trips (Table 12). The corresponding distribution indicates that more than half of migrants maintain stable contacts with family, friends or business in Ukraine, and therefore consider their stay abroad as a temporary rather than a permanent relocation.

Among the countries with the highest level of periodic returns, it is worth noting Italy (13 people out of 19), Germany (15 out of 27) and Spain (all 4 respondents). These are traditional directions of Ukrainian labour migration, where stable communities with established ties with Ukraine have formed.

In contrast, in Poland, which is geographically closer, the share of those returning was lower (7 out of 15), which may be due to high employment and short vacations or the fact that many respondents are there with their families.

Table 12.

Short-term visit by respondents to Ukraine

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Yes	48	55.8 %
No	38	44.2 %

In the Nordic countries (Denmark, Norway, Ireland), the majority of respondents also reported periodic visits to Ukraine, which reflects not only the physical opportunity to travel, but also the emotional and social need to maintain contact with home.

Employment of respondents during temporary return to their homeland

The analysis of the responses received indicates that among those Ukrainians who return to their homeland from time to time, only a small share continues to work in Ukraine, even part-time or at a distance. Of the 48 respondents who confirmed their temporary trips, only 14 people (29.2%) indicated that they had some form of employment during their stay in Ukraine, while 34 people (70.8%) were not involved in professional activities in the country (Table 13).

Table 13.

Employment of respondents during temporary return to their homeland

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
No	34	70.8 %
Yes	14	29.2 %

The highest employment rates among those visiting Ukraine were recorded in Germany (6 out of 15, or 40.0%). This may indicate the spread of flexible work formats among these refugees/migrants, in particular remote work, freelancing or maintaining work projects in Ukraine. Such employment relationships are often maintained in the fields of education, ICT, journalism or the public sector, where work does not require constant physical presence.

Spain also has a relatively high level of maintaining employment contacts: half of those surveyed (2 out of 4) reported working in Ukraine during their returns.

This may be due to the seasonal nature of migration or the desire of some Ukrainians to combine temporary work abroad with continuing professional activities at home.

In Central European countries, in particular in Poland and Slovakia, 2 people each maintain a connection with the Ukrainian labour market, which indicates a partial reintegration of Ukrainians into the national economic space. At the same time, such a trend is also observed in Norway: one person out of two reported having a job in Ukraine, which may reflect employment flexibility in sectors that require highly qualified workers.

In contrast, in Italy, where a significant number of Ukrainian labour migrants live, only 2 out of 13 people indicated that they work in Ukraine, while the majority are fully integrated into the local work environment. A similar situation is observed in Denmark, Romania, and Switzerland, where all respondents answered negatively. This obviously indicates a reorientation of economic activity to the host country and/or stricter control by the migration/fiscal services of these countries over the income of refugees or labour migrants.

Thus, the general trend indicates that Ukrainians who periodically visit their homeland, for the most part, do not have permanent or formalized employment in Ukraine. This may be a consequence of both objective economic factors — in particular, limited opportunities for decent earnings in Ukraine — and administrative barriers that make it difficult to combine official work in two countries.

At the same time, the presence of even a small proportion of those who continue to work in Ukraine indicates the existing potential for a “reverse labour flow” — that is, the willingness of a certain proportion of migrants to maintain professional ties with Ukraine. This indicator can serve as a basis for the formation of state policies and strategies for involving the diaspora in the economic development of Ukraine, in particular through programs to support remote employment, entrepreneurship, scientific and cultural projects.

Reasons for respondents to leave the country, other than fleeing the war

A total of 123 marked answers were recorded among 86 participants (with multiple choice options). The most common reason, besides the war, is the economic crisis in Ukraine - it was noted by 39 people (31.7% of the total number of responses). This indicates that economic instability, the increase in the cost of living, and limited employment opportunities became significant factors in making a decision to leave even in the pre-war period.

Table 14.

Distribution of respondents' answers by reasons for leaving the country (except for fleeing war)

Row markers	Number (persons)	Share
Long-term work in the country where I live now	14	11.4 %
Temporary work in the country where I live now	11	8.9 %
Economic crisis in Ukraine	39	31.7 %
Education in the country where I live now	3	2.4 %
Fear of persecution in Ukraine	3	2.4 %
Climate/natural disaster in Ukraine	1	0.8 %
Family issues	8	6.5 %
Discrimination in Ukraine	5	4.1 %
Self-motivation	17	13.8 %
Only war	22	17.9 %

The second most common option is “only the war,” chosen by 22 people (17.9%). This means that almost every fifth respondent considers their own movement solely as a consequence of military actions and does not associate it with economic or social motives. Such a position is usually inherent in people who intend to return immediately after the end of the war.

The third reason in terms of frequency of responses was internal motivation — 17 respondents (13.8%). In this case, it is not only about the search for better living conditions, but also about the desire for self-realization, professional development, or psychological security. Such a motive indicates the evolution of Ukrainian migration from forced to consciously strategic, when the decision to move is the result of personal goals.

A fairly significant group is made up of those who indicated long-term or temporary employment abroad as one of the reasons. The option "long-term employment" was selected by 14 people (11.4%), "temporary employment" by 11 people (8.9%). These answers indicate that for some Ukrainians, the primary purpose of emigration was economic, namely the search for a stable income or short-term job.

Other reasons were mentioned less frequently, but also have social significance. Family problems were the motive for 8 people (6.5%), discrimination in Ukraine — for 5 people (4.1%), fear of persecution — for 3 (2.4%). Receiving education abroad was also mentioned by 3 respondents (2.4%). At the same time, only one person mentioned a climatic or natural disaster, which confirms the minimal impact of such factors on Ukrainian migration (Table 14).

Certain patterns can be traced in the geographical breakdown of respondents' answers to this question. For example, in Italy, Germany and Poland, economic motives are most often mentioned (from 7 to 12 people in each country).

In Germany and Poland, a combination of several factors is observed more often than elsewhere — war, economic crisis and employment opportunities. In Italy, the influence of family problems and internal motivation is additionally recorded, which is

consistent with the nature of long-term migration and the social structure of Ukrainian communities. In Spain and Denmark, economic and professional reasons dominate, while in Norway, personal or psychological motivation is more important.

The general analysis shows that Ukrainian migration has a rather mixed type of motivation. It combines forced and voluntary elements, and therefore is not just a reaction to the crisis, but also a manifestation of broader social transformations. If earlier the departure of Ukrainians mainly meant economic necessity - work, now it is increasingly a strategic decision aimed at security, development or professional self-realization.

Thus, although the war remains a key factor in migration, for a significant part of Ukrainians it only pushed forward a process that had deeper socio-economic roots. Modern Ukrainian migration appears as a multidimensional phenomenon, where the motives of security, work, education and personal growth are intertwined. This multifaceted nature explains the resilience of domestic migration flows even in times of uncertainty and emphasizes that the decision to move is increasingly becoming a conscious choice, rather than just a forced or coercive step.

2.5.3. What are the characteristics of skill formation and employment of labour migrants? (RQ2)

2.5.3.1. Education and recognition of diplomas

Distribution of respondents by the highest level of education in Ukraine or the Ukrainian equivalent of education received abroad (before the current displacement)

All respondents answered this question, which allows us to state that the vast majority of them have bachelor's and master's degrees of higher education. Thus, among the respondents, 51 people (59.3%) have a master's degree, and 17 people (19.8%) have a bachelor's degree, respectively. 6 and 7 people, respectively (7.0% and 8.1%) have received educational qualifications of professional pre-higher and vocational education.

The geographical structure of the educational level of respondents confirms the general pattern: the highest education indicators are recorded in countries with developed economies and extensive educational programs for migrants.

Table 15.

Distribution of respondents by highest level of education

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Higher education (Master's)	51	59.3 %
Higher education (Bachelor's)	17	19.8 %
Vocational education and training	7	8.1 %
Professional non-tertiary education (vocational upper secondary) education (technical school, college)	6	7.0 %
Complete secondary education (11 grades)	3	3.5 %
Basic secondary education (9 grades)	1	1.2 %
No answer	1	1.2 %

For example, in Germany, Italy and Poland, respondents with higher education predominate (from 70.0% to 80.0%). In particular, in Italy, 9 respondents have a master's degree and 6 have a bachelor's degree; in Germany, 16 have a master's degree and 4 have a bachelor's degree; in Poland, 11 have a master's degree and 3 have a bachelor's degree, respectively. Such a high level of education confirms the thesis that a significant part of Ukrainians who have gone abroad are people with university education, able to work not only/not so much in the labour market, but also in the highly qualified segment of the labour market.

In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway, Ireland), all respondents have higher education, mainly a master's degree, which is consistent with the profile of Ukrainians who have gone abroad for employment or professional development programs. In Spain, the structure is mixed: two respondents have a master's degree, one has a professional pre-higher education, and another has a complete secondary education, which may indicate a combination of different waves of migration - military, labour, and educational.

The presence of higher education for the majority of respondents does not always guarantee its recognition abroad, but it demonstrates the significant intellectual potential of the Ukrainian diaspora. This also explains the tendency for rapid adaptation of Ukrainians in the EU countries: educated people learn the language more easily, undergo retraining and quickly integrate into local professional communities.

At the same time, the presence of 7 people with vocational education and 6 with secondary specialized education indicates the preservation of a wide professional spectrum of migration: from skilled workers to specialists with higher education. Such a multi-level structure is typical for the Ukrainian labour market and is reproduced in the European countries.

The results obtained allow us to draw several conclusions. First, Ukrainian migration is distinguished by a high level of human capital, which creates significant potential for the post-war recovery of the Ukrainian economy. Second, the large share of people with master's and bachelor's degrees in higher education indicates the intellectualization of labor flows, which distinguishes modern war migration from its previous waves. Thirdly, this educated part of Ukrainians abroad can play an important role in shaping a positive image of Ukraine and developing international professional networks.

Thus, the high level of education of Ukrainian migrants reflects not only the desire for employment, but also the powerful intellectual potential of Ukrainian society, capable of competitive participation in the global European labour market.

Distribution of respondents by highest level of education received in the host country

The survey results showed that the majority of Ukrainian citizens currently abroad did not receive formal education there. The vast majority of respondents (65 people or 75.6%) responded that they did not receive any education in their host country, which is quite natural, since most of them left after the start of a full-scale war and have been abroad for a relatively short period.

At the same time, some of those surveyed still took advantage of educational or professional training opportunities. 7 people (8.1%) indicated that they had higher education obtained abroad (bachelor's or master's degree), 6 people (7.0%) had vocational or technical education, and another 3 respondents (3.5%) had vocational training at work. In addition, 1 person (1.1%) had completed basic secondary education (Table 16).

These results indicate that only about a fifth of migrants took advantage of the education system of the host country.

Table 16.

Distribution of respondents by highest level of education received in the host country

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
--------	---------------------	-------

I did not receive any education in the country where I live now	65	75.6 %
Higher education (Bachelor, Master)	7	8.1 %
Vocational education and training (Master, Craftsman's/ Technician)	6	7.0 %
No answer	4	4.7 %
Professional training at the workplace	3	3.5 %
Basic secondary education	1	1.2 %

These are mainly individuals who plan to stay for a long time or link their professional future with a new country. In most cases, these are short-term professional courses, vocational retraining or advanced training, or language training that facilitate employment but do not lead to obtaining an educational degree.

The distribution of respondents by this indicator by country of residence confirms the previous conclusion. In Germany, where numerous social integration programs for Ukrainians have been created, 23 out of 27 respondents (85.2%) did not receive education, 2 received higher education, and one received vocational training, which reflects some state support for professional adaptation. In Italy, the situation is somewhat different: 8 out of 19 people (42.1%) received various forms of education — from vocational to higher education. This indicates a longer-term nature of migration and the availability of opportunities for integration into the educational/training environment. A similar trend was observed in Poland: 5 people received some level of education or vocational training, while the rest (10 people) did not receive additional education.

In the remaining countries — in particular, Spain, Denmark, Norway, Canada, the USA, France and Switzerland — all or the vast majority of respondents did not receive education on the spot, which can be explained both by the short period of stay and the lack of need/motivation or resources for education.

Analyzing the results, several important conclusions can be drawn. First, the structure of education of Ukrainian migrants abroad is extremely passive: the majority of respondents did not indicate the need or opportunity to receive additional education. Secondly, a certain proportion of those who nevertheless received education indicates the gradual adaptation and professional growth of Ukrainians, especially in areas where authentic professional qualifications and confirmed language competence of a sufficient level are required. Thirdly, adult education programs and professional retraining are becoming an important element of integration policy in EU countries, where Ukrainians are gradually moving from the status of temporary migrants to full-fledged participants in the common European labor market.

Thus, most Ukrainians did not receive formal education in their host countries, but some of them actively use the opportunities for professional training, which is an indicator of adaptation readiness and orientation towards long-term social inclusion. This trend indicates the existing potential for the development of programs to support the education of adult Ukrainians abroad and the possibility of further converting the knowledge gained to the benefit of the Ukrainian economy after their return.

Distribution of respondents by fields of knowledge in which they have the highest level of educational or professional qualifications

Of the total sample of respondents, the largest share has qualifications in the field of business, administration and law — 26 people (30.2%). This direction is the most universal and in demand in the EU countries. It includes specialists in economics,

management, accounting, marketing, finance and law. The high share of representatives of this field of knowledge indicates the growth of the intellectual segment of migration, where not so much manual, but rather managerial, office and analytical professions prevail.

The second most common field of knowledge is engineering, production and construction — 10 people (11.6%). This group includes technical professionals and specialists, civil engineers, mechanics, electricians and specialists in industrial production.

Table 17.

Distribution of respondents by fields of knowledge in which they have the highest level of educational or professional qualifications

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
D Business, administration and law	26	30.2 %
A Education	17	19.8 %
G Engineering, manufacturing and construction	10	11.6 %
I Healthcare and social security	8	9.3 %
B Culture, arts and humanities	7	8.1 %
C Social sciences, journalism and information	5	5.8 %
E Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics	4	4.7 %
J Transport and services	4	4.7 %
F Information technologies	3	3.5 %
H Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary medicine	1	1.2 %
Without qualification	1	1.2 %

It traditionally constitutes an important part of Ukrainian labor migration, especially in Poland, Germany, and Italy, where the demand for qualified technical workers remains consistently high.

The third place in this hierarchy of knowledge areas is occupied by the education sector — 17 people (19.8%). These are teachers, lecturers, educators, and researchers in the field of pedagogical sciences who either continue their professional activities in a new environment or apply their competencies in related areas. The high share of teaching staff among migrants is explained by the specifics of the Ukrainian labor market, where a significant number of educators are looking for opportunities for professional realization outside the country (Table 17).

Eight respondents (9.3%) have qualifications in the field of health care and social security, which reflects the high level of demand for Ukrainian doctors and social workers in EU countries. Their participation in the health care systems of Italy, Germany, and Poland demonstrates not only labour integration, but also social contribution to local communities.

3 respondents (3.5%) have education in the field of information technology, 4 people (4.7%) in the field of natural sciences, mathematics and statistics, and 5 people (5.8%) in social sciences, journalism and information. Although these indicators are smaller

in number, they indicate the presence among Ukrainian migrants of representatives of new "intellectual" professions who are able to work remotely or integrate into the international information environment.

It is worth noting separately the presence in our sample of representatives of the cultural and humanitarian sphere - 7 people (8.1%), as well as specialists in the transport industry - 4 people (4.7%). These groups reflect traditionally important areas of applied work abroad for Ukrainians - transportation, the service sector, culture and services.

In the geographical dimension, the dominance of individual areas generally reflects the structure of the economy of the host countries. Thus, in Germany, the largest number of Ukrainian specialists is in business (9), engineering (3), medicine (2) and education (5 people, respectively). In Italy, a combination of educational, economic and technical areas of personnel training is observed, and in Poland - a high proportion of medical and transport workers.

The data obtained indicate that Ukrainian migration is no longer limited to workers with low qualifications, which was characteristic of the first migration waves in the early 2000s. On the contrary, it acquires the features of professional, educational and qualification mobility, when people with higher, professional pre-higher and professional education seek opportunities to apply their knowledge in a new socio-economic environment.

Thus, the sectoral structure of the educational and professional qualifications obtained by Ukrainian citizens abroad indicates their high diversification and the potential for the development of intellectual migration. Today, in war conditions, it covers both humanitarian and socially oriented fields of knowledge, as well as technical and medical specialties, which makes Ukrainian refugees and other migrants flexible, adaptive and promising in the context of further reintegration into the economy of Ukraine after their return.

Respondents' proficiency in the language of the host country

Of all respondents, 29 people (33.7%) stated that they fully agree with the statement that they have a good command of the language of the country of residence, and another 25 people (29.1%) partially agreed. Thus, almost two-thirds of the respondents (62.8%) feel confident in their language skills. This means that the majority of Ukrainians have successfully overcome the primary language barrier, which is a key condition for effective social integration and professional realization in the host country.

At the same time, 11 people (12.8%) took a neutral position, stating that they "neither agree nor disagree" with such a statement. This may indicate an intermediate level of language proficiency, sufficient for everyday needs, but insufficient for professional activity or full participation in public life.

Table 18.

Respondents' proficiency in the language of the host country

Choices regarding their sufficient command of the language of the host country	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly agree	29	33.7 %
Agree	25	29.1 %
Disagree	19	22.1 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	11	12.8 %
Strongly disagree	2	2.3 %

About 19 respondents (22.1%) disagreed with the statement about a sufficient level of language knowledge, and another 2 people (2.3%) strongly disagreed. That is, almost a quarter of respondents experience significant difficulties with language communication, which can create barriers for them in employment, receiving services or social interaction (Table 17).

The highest level of language confidence is observed in Italy (10 completely agree, 2 partially agree), Poland (5 completely and 5 partially agree) and Germany (3 completely and 11 partially agree). These are countries where Ukrainians live in large diasporas, actively use local educational/training programs and have constant contacts with local employers. In countries with a smaller Ukrainian community - such as Portugal, Romania or Switzerland - the share of people with a low level of language proficiency is higher, which is explained by the lower availability of language courses and a limited environment for communication.

It is significant that even among those who did not agree with the statement about a sufficient level of language proficiency, the majority are still integrated into work, which indicates communicative adaptability - the ability to compensate for language gaps with non-verbal or professional skills.

Summarizing the above, we can state the fact that the language integration of Ukrainians abroad is successful, although it remains uneven depending on the country of residence, age, profession and time of residence. It is important that the language competence of war refugees is a key factor in increasing their competitiveness in the labor market, facilitating social integration and contributing to the formation of a positive image of the Ukrainian diaspora.

Level of communication by respondents in the language of the host country when performing official/work duties

28 people (32.6%) fully agreed with the statement that they can communicate with locals at work at an adequate level, and another 32 respondents (37.2%) expressed partial agreement. A total of 60 people (69.8%) demonstrate sufficient language competence to effectively perform professional tasks and interact with colleagues and management. This indicator confirms that for most Ukrainians, language skills do not constitute a significant obstacle to work.

At the same time, 11 respondents (12.8%) took a neutral position - they believe that they speak the language at a basic level, sufficient for understanding everyday situations, but not always for professional communication.

Table 18.

Level of communication by respondents in the language of the host country when performing official/work duties

Choices regarding communication by respondents in the language of the host country when performing official duties	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	32	37.2 %
Strongly agree	28	32.6 %
Disagree	13	15.1 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	11	12.8 %
Strongly disagree	2	2.3 %



Another 13 people (15.1%) disagreed with the statement, and 2 people (2.3%) strongly disagreed. In total, 17.4% of respondents admit that they have some/significant difficulties with the language in the work environment (Table 18). This may be due to a short period of stay abroad, lack of systematic training, or work in teams where Ukrainian or Russian are used as auxiliary languages.

The highest level of confidence in professional language communication was recorded in Italy (15 fully or partially agree), Germany (13) and Poland (12). These are countries where Ukrainians have longer work experience, actively attend language courses and are more often faced with the need for daily contact with the local population. High indicators of language integration were also demonstrated by respondents from Norway, Spain and Denmark, where all survey participants assessed their level of knowledge as satisfactory or good.

On the other hand, the greatest difficulties with language adaptation are observed in Germany (8 people who disagree) and Italy (3 people). This may be due to the different level of educational background of migrants, the specificity of local dialects, or work in multinational teams where language communication is difficult.

The results obtained allow us to draw several important conclusions. First, the language competence of Ukrainian workers abroad is generally high, which indicates their adaptability, perseverance, and readiness for integration. Second, even among those who do not fully master the language, the majority work successfully, relying on practical training in the process of performing professional duties. Third, the problem of language barriers is selective and gradually decreases with increasing duration of stay abroad.

The ability of respondents to attend local language courses

52 people (60.5%) fully agreed with the statement that they can attend local language courses if necessary, and another 24 respondents (27.9%) partially agreed. In total, this is 76 people (88.4%), that is, the vast majority of Ukrainians surveyed confirm the availability of available opportunities for learning the language. This result indicates a developed system of educational/language support in most EU countries and beyond, where free or subsidized short-term language training programs are open to Ukrainian citizens.

6 people (7.0%) chose a neutral position, stating that they were not aware of such an opportunity or had not used the relevant courses, and 4 respondents (4.7%) disagreed with the statement (three “disagree” and one “strongly disagree”) (Table 2.3). This indicates that a very small part of Ukrainians does not have access to language training, which may be due to living in small settlements, lack of information or time constraints due to work. Another reason for this situation may be their low motivation to learn the language of the host country, for example, due to a planned short-term stay associated with moving to another, more “attractive” country.

Table 19.

Distribution of respondents by the possibility of attending local language courses

Choices for the question regarding the possibility of attending local language courses	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly agree	52	60.5 %
Agree	24	27.9 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	6	7.0 %



Disagree	3	3.5 %
Strongly disagree	1	1.2 %

The highest level of accessibility of language courses was recorded in Germany (25 people agreed or strongly agreed), Italy (16 people) and Poland (14 people). These countries have the most extensive infrastructure of integration programs, where language learning is often a mandatory element of social support for refugees and migrant workers. In Germany, in particular, there are state integration courses (Integrationskurse), and in Poland, Ukrainians are often offered courses at universities, community centers or their employers' enterprises.

In the countries of Northern Europe - Denmark, Norway and the Netherlands - the situation is also positive: all respondents confirmed the availability of language learning, which indicates the high quality of state programs for migrants. At the same time, in less developed areas of Ukrainian migration, such as Georgia or Portugal, the level of access is lower, which is explained by the limited number of educational initiatives or their low popularity among migrant workers.

It is also important to note that in some countries (in particular, in Italy and Germany) language courses are not only a form of education, but also a tool for socialization, which helps Ukrainians make new contacts, acquaintances, navigate the cultural space and integrate more easily into local communities.

Overall, the results indicate high availability and demand for language courses among Ukrainians abroad. The possibility of free or preferential training contributes to faster adaptation, improving qualifications and competitiveness in the labor market.

Respondents' access to training courses necessary for work

A third of respondents (30 people, 34.9%) fully agreed with the statement that they can, if necessary, enroll in training courses necessary for work. Another 34 respondents (39.5%) partially agreed with this. Thus, three quarters of respondents (74.4%) recognize the availability of opportunities for professional training/growth or retraining. Such a high indicator indicates the effectiveness of state and local programs in European countries that contribute to the development of professional competencies of labor migrants in general, and Ukrainian refugees in particular.

Table 20.

Level of respondents' access to training courses necessary for work

Choices regarding respondents' access to specialized training courses	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	34	39.5 %
Strongly agree	30	34.9 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	10	11.6 %
Disagree	9	10.5 %
Strongly disagree	3	3.5 %

10 respondents (11.6%) took a neutral position, possibly due to a lack of personal experience of participating in such programs or due to a lack of information about them. 9 people (10.5%) disagreed with the statement, and 3 people (3.5%) strongly disagreed, indicating that access to training remains limited in some countries or their regions (Table 20).

Geographical analysis shows that the highest level of accessibility of vocational training is observed in Germany (24 people agreed or strongly agreed), Italy (14 people) and Poland (7 people). These countries have a developed system of postgraduate education, vocational schools and integration programs for migrants, financed by the state or local authorities. In Germany, for example, retraining programs operate through Volkshochschule and specialized Berufsschule, in Poland - vocational courses at voivodeship employment services, and in Italy - regional training programs in cooperation with enterprises.

A high level of access to educational opportunities is also observed in Spain, Norway and Denmark, where all respondents confirmed the availability of opportunities to study. This is typical of socially oriented states, where education is considered an important part of integration policy. In contrast, in countries such as Portugal and Switzerland, individual cases of lack of access or difficulties with education were recorded, which may be due to the high cost of courses or lack of information for foreigners .

The results obtained allow us to draw a number of conclusions. First, Ukrainians demonstrate a high level of educational activity and readiness for professional development even in difficult migration conditions.

Second, EU countries create a fairly favourable educational environment that allows migrants to improve their qualifications and acquire new competencies in accordance with the requirements of the labour market. Third, the small proportion of those who do not have access to courses highlights the need to strengthen information support and expand language programs that open the way to professional training.

Respondents' need for ongoing training to use technological innovations

Only 12 respondents (14.0%) fully agreed with the statement that their work requires continuous training to use new technologies, and another 22 respondents (25.6%) partially agreed. That is, more than a third of the respondents (34 people, 39.5%) are actively involved in or ready for continuous professional development processes. Thus, every third Ukrainian worker abroad is employed in areas where technological changes are taking place - industry, logistics, healthcare, ICT, and partly the service sector.

At the same time, 28 respondents (32.6%) took a neutral position, that is, they recognize the importance of technological innovations, but, probably, their current work does not require direct training or work with new technologies. Such a position is typical for workers in areas based on manual labor, care, construction, or service, where changes occur quite gradually, if at all.

Table 21

Distribution of respondents by the need for ongoing training to use technological innovations

Choices regarding the need for respondents to undergo ongoing training to use technological innovations	Number (persons)	Share
Neither agree, nor disagree	28	32.6 %
Agree	22	25.6 %
Disagree	14	16.3 %
Strongly agree	12	14.0 %
Strongly disagree	10	11.6 %

Another 14 people (16.3%) disagreed with this statement, and 10 (11.6%) disagreed completely, meaning that more than a quarter of respondents (27.9%) do not consider their work to be technologically complex or require continuous training. This may indicate the segmentation of Ukrainian workers into two main groups — those who are integrated into modern technological processes and those involved in traditional, less dynamic areas of work (Table 21).

The largest number of positive responses was recorded in Germany (10 people agreed or completely agreed), Italy (7 people) and Poland (6 people). These are countries with active implementation of digital technologies in production, transport and services, where employees are expected to regularly update their knowledge and skills. In particular, in Germany, a significant part of Ukrainians work in industry and logistics, where, among other things, automated accounting, control and security systems are being implemented.

A high level of awareness of the need for training is also observed among respondents from Norway, Spain and Denmark, where the combination of modern technologies and high work standards stimulates continuous professional improvement.

On the other hand, in Poland and Italy there is also a significant proportion of those who disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement (7 and 8 people, respectively). This indicates that even in technologically advanced countries, Ukrainians often work in low-tech industries, where the requirements for digital or technical competencies are minimal.

In general, the distribution of responses demonstrates a tendency towards a gradual increase in the role of technological literacy among Ukrainian migrant workers. Younger professionals and those working in large companies are more likely to recognize the need for training, while individuals employed in physical or household types of work with a predominance of manual or monotonous labour perceive innovation as an optional aspect of their activities.

Thus, several conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, Ukrainians abroad demonstrate a readiness for technological adaptation, which is a prerequisite for their competitiveness in the international labour market. Secondly, the developed infrastructure of educational programs in most EU countries creates conditions for continuous professional development. Thirdly, the need for systemic support and information provision remains relevant for those working in less technological sectors of the economy.

Respondents' ability to receive on-the-job training

Only 16 respondents (18.6%) fully agreed with the statement that they can receive professional training on the job if necessary, while 33 respondents (38.4%) partially agreed with this. Thus, 57.0% of employed respondents are actually involved in formal or informal learning processes in their companies. This indicates that more than half of Ukrainian employees have access to an internal professional development system - from mentoring and coaching to short-term training or practical courses.

22 respondents (25.6%) took a neutral position, which may indicate the lack of such opportunities in their field of activity or insufficient awareness of the employer's policy on this issue. This group probably includes employees in low-paid or seasonal jobs, where advanced training is not part of the production process.

Table 22

Distribution of respondents by the possibility of receiving vocational training at the workplace

Choices for the possibility of receiving vocational training at the workplace	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	33	38.4 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	22	25.6 %

Strongly agree	16	18.6 %
Disagree	8	9.3 %
Strongly disagree	7	8.1 %

At the same time, 8 people (9.3%) disagreed and 7 people (8.1%) strongly disagreed with the statement that they have access to on-the-job training. That is, about 17.4% of respondents remain outside the vocational training system (Table 22). This indicates the existence of a certain segment of Ukrainian migrant workers who work in the informal sector or in companies where personnel development is not a priority.

The highest rates of access to on-the-job training were recorded in Italy (13 people agreed or strongly agreed), Germany (13 people) and Poland (8 people). These are countries with established practices of mentoring, coaching and continuous education in the workplace. In Germany, in particular, the Weiterbildung (professional development) system is a mandatory part of the work culture, allowing employees to regularly update their knowledge and skills.

High rates are also observed in Spain and Norway, where all respondents reported the possibility of receiving training, while in Portugal, the USA and Switzerland such cases are rare. This may be related to the employment sector - in Southern European countries, the majority of Ukrainians work in the service sector, where on-the-job training is often conducted informally .

The general trend shows that Ukrainians not only work in different industries/sectors of the economy, but also actively engage in various forms and systems of professional development. Receiving on-the-job training contributes to improving qualifications, improving language adaptation and increasing labour productivity.

Therefore, the following generalized conclusions can be drawn:

1. The majority of Ukrainian workers (over half) have real access to professional training in their host countries, which increases their competitiveness.
2. A quarter of respondents remain outside the professional development system, which indicates uneven access depending on the country, economic sector, or form of employment.
3. Systemic support and integration programs from the host countries create favorable conditions for the long-term adaptation of Ukrainians and reduce the risk of their marginalization in the labor market.

Thus, Ukrainian labor migrants are not only actively included in the work process, but also become participants in educational/training and qualification practices at the workplace, which contributes to their integration, career growth and the acquisition of experience that may be useful after a possible return to Ukraine.

Informing respondents by the enterprises (institutions, establishments, organizations) where they work about available opportunities for further education and career planning

10 respondents (11.6%) fully agreed that the enterprise where they work informs them about opportunities for education or career growth, and another 21 people (24.4%) partially agreed. Thus, a third of respondents (31 people, 36.0%) have some level of access to internal professional development programs, training courses or career counseling.

31 respondents (36.0%) chose a neutral position — “neither agree nor disagree” with this statement. This may mean that relevant programs formally exist in companies, but employees do not use them or do not receive sufficient information about their availability. This may also be a sign that a certain share of Ukrainians surveyed are employed in poorly formalized sectors, where HR policy is limited to only basic labor process management.

Table 23

Distribution of respondents according to information provided by the enterprises where they work regarding available opportunities for further education and career planning

Choices regarding available opportunities for respondents for further education and career planning	Number (persons)	Share
Neither agree, nor disagree	31	36.0 %
Agree	21	24.4 %
Strongly disagree	12	14.0 %
Disagree	12	14.0 %
Strongly agree	10	11.6 %

At the same time, 12 respondents (14.0%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, i.e. a quarter of respondents (28.0%) clearly stated that their employers do not provide information about training or development opportunities (T). This indicates the lack of a systematic policy of advanced training in a number of companies, especially those operating in the field of physical/manual labor, care, agriculture or seasonal services.

The geographical distribution of respondents by answers to the question shows that the best situation with information about professional opportunities is observed in Germany (9 people agreed or strongly agreed), Italy (9 people) and Poland (5 people). These countries have developed corporate training systems, where employers actively involve employees in internal development programs.

In Germany, in particular, companies often offer employees short-term courses, certifications or mentoring.

At the same time, in the Nordic countries of Norway, Denmark and the Netherlands, the level of awareness is also relatively high, while in Portugal, France, Romania and Switzerland, respondents mostly report the absence of such initiatives. This indicates that the level of corporate culture and investment in human capital depends largely on the industry and field of employment and the economic context.

General trends indicate that Ukrainians employed in large European companies have significantly higher opportunities for training and career planning than those working in small businesses or in the field of physical/manual labor.

However, even with limited employer involvement, many Ukrainians independently invest in their own development by participating in language courses or online professional training.

Thus, the results of the answers to this question indicate that institutional support for the career development of Ukrainians abroad is only forming, but is gradually strengthening. At the same time, there is a clear trend towards expanding opportunities for informal learning in the workplace and increasing the role of employers in ensuring the professional growth of migrant workers.

Respondents' motivation to open their own business in the host country

17 people (19.8%) fully agreed with the statement that they would like to open their own business under favorable conditions, and another 22 respondents (25.6%) partially agreed with this. That is, almost half of the surveyed Ukrainians demonstrate potential interest in their own entrepreneurial activity. This indicator is quite high and indicates that Ukrainians are not limited to hired labor,

but also consider the possibilities of self-employment or creating their own business as a path to personal socio-material stability and professional self-realization.

23 respondents (26.7%) took a neutral position - “neither agree nor disagree” with this statement. This may mean that opening their own business is not a priority for them at the moment, but such an opportunity is not ruled out in the future. These people probably assess business as a risky or complex area that requires time, material resources, and knowledge of the law.

8 people (9.3%) disagreed with this statement, and another 16 respondents (18.6%) strongly disagreed with it. Thus, a quarter of respondents (27.9%) do not consider entrepreneurship as a realistic or desirable option for their self-development (Table 24). Most often, this is due to satisfaction with their current job, lack of business experience, or high barriers to entry into entrepreneurship for foreigners and high risks of doing so.

The geographical distribution of respondents' answers to this question demonstrates quite clear trends.

The highest level of entrepreneurial readiness is observed in Germany (11 people agreed or completely agreed), Italy (9 people) and Poland (7 people). These countries have a developed environment for small businesses, accessible financial support programs for migrants, and favorable conditions for registering a business. For example, in Poland, Ukrainians often open coffee shops, shops, logistics companies, or beauty salons, while in Germany, they open ICT startups, cleaning, or transportation companies.

Table 24

Respondents' motivation to open their own business in the host country

Choices for the question about motivation to open their own business in the host country	Number (persons)	Share
Neither agree, nor disagree	23	26.7 %
Agree	22	25.6 %
Strongly agree	17	19.8 %
Strongly disagree	16	18.6 %
Disagree	8	9.3 %

In the countries of Northern Europe — Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands — the level of interest in entrepreneurship is moderate, which can be explained by high tax rates and complex regulatory procedures for foreigners. In Portugal, Canada and the USA, respondents also demonstrated a positive attitude, but their number is insignificant due to the small sample.

In contrast, the highest level of skepticism about starting your own business was recorded among respondents from Italy (7 people disagreed or strongly disagreed) and Germany (8 people). This is probably explained by the complex taxation system, high initial costs and the need for in-depth knowledge of the legal aspects of business activity.

The results obtained allow us to draw several important conclusions:

- Ukrainians abroad have high entrepreneurial potential, which can be realized in the presence of a favorable institutional environment;

- the motivation to start a business is mainly related to the desire for independence, stability and self-realization, and not only to economic factors;

- administrative barriers, language difficulties and lack of start-up capital remain the main obstacles to the implementation of entrepreneurial intentions.

Information on the presence of those among the respondents who came to the host country to improve their professional level

Only 4 people (4.7%) fully agreed that they came to the host country specifically for the purpose of professional training and growth, and another 14 people (16.3%) partially agreed with this. This, although a small share, indicates that Ukrainians are aware of the importance of investing in their own human capital and the desire to realize themselves in a new environment.

14 respondents (16.3%) took a neutral position - “neither agree nor disagree” with this statement. This indicates that for this group, improving their professional level was not the direct goal of leaving, but could be a side effect of their work abroad. For them, professional growth is more a consequence of work experience than a conscious choice.

At the same time, 22 people (25.6%) disagreed, and 32 respondents (37.2%) completely disagreed with the statement that they came to improve their skills. Thus, almost two-thirds of Ukrainian respondents clearly made it clear that the main motive for their migration was precisely to escape from the war and/or its consequences, and not career growth.

The ability of respondents to use the skills, abilities, and knowledge acquired at work in the host country upon returning to their homeland

With this issue, which is extremely important for the recovery of Ukraine, 23 people (26.7%) fully agreed, and another 22 respondents (25.6%) partially agreed. That is, half (52.3%) of the respondents demonstrate confidence in the practical applicability of the acquired work and professional experience. This indicator is indicative, as it indicates a high self-esteem of Ukrainians' professional growth, their understanding of international/European labor standards/qualifications, and readiness for further professional development in their homeland.

21 respondents (24.4%) chose a neutral position — “neither agree nor disagree” with this statement. Such a result may, for example, mean uncertainty in the possibilities of applying the acquired knowledge due to the difference in technological, organizational, or cultural labor standards between Ukraine and the host country. Some of the respondents may also have assessed the prospect of returning as uncertain or unlikely, which influenced such reserved answers.

At the same time, 10 people (11.6%) disagreed, and another 10 respondents (11.6%) strongly disagreed with this statement, meaning that approximately a quarter of respondents (23.2%) do not see opportunities to effectively use their foreign experience in Ukrainian conditions (Table 2.9). Most often, this is due to industry differences in their employment - in particular, in the field of production, service or care, where the technological base of Ukraine significantly lags behind the standards of EU countries, and accordingly, the acquired skills may be less in demand.

The geographical distribution of responses shows that the highest confidence in the application of professional skills upon return was expressed by respondents from Italy (11 people agreed or strongly agreed), Germany (12 people) and Poland (6 people). In these countries, Ukrainians work in various sectors - from industry and logistics to care services, construction and education - and, accordingly, gain experience that can be adapted to Ukrainian realities.

Table 25

Respondents' ability to use skills, abilities and knowledge acquired at work in the host country after returning to their homeland

Choices for the question regarding respondents' motivation to use skills, abilities and knowledge acquired at work in the host country after returning to their homeland	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly agree	23	26.7 %
Agree	22	25.6 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	21	24.4 %
Strongly disagree	10	11.6 %
Disagree	10	11.6 %

In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands), moderately positive or neutral assessments prevail. This is explained by the fact that Ukrainians in these countries are often involved in technologically complex activities, but the process of transferring such practices to the Ukrainian context may be difficult due to the lack of appropriate infrastructure or legislative mechanisms.

It is also indicative that even among those who do not plan to return, awareness of the value and importance of the acquired new work/professional experience prevails. Working in an international environment contributes to the development of intercultural communication, management skills, planning, teamwork, adherence to quality standards - that is, competencies that are universal and can be used in any country.

Thus, several generalized conclusions can be drawn:

- More than half of Ukrainians (52.3%) believe that their professional experience abroad has practical value for further work in Ukraine.
- This result demonstrates the presence of a strong human resource and potential, which can become the basis for rebuilding the Ukrainian labor market after the war, provided that a significant share of migrants return to their homeland.
- The key challenge remains to create conditions for the return of migrants, in particular by simplifying the procedures for recognizing/verifying foreign experience, certifying professional qualifications, and supporting self-employment.
- At the same time, it should be expected that even those who remain abroad will contribute to the transnational exchange of knowledge and skills, thus strengthening ties between the Ukrainian and European economies.

The matching of the education received by respondents in Ukraine to the requirements of their current job in the host country

Only 11 people (12.8%) fully agreed with the statement that their current job corresponds to the education received in Ukraine, and 21 people (24.4%) partially agreed. Thus, more than a third of respondents (37.2%) work in a field related or

corresponding to their previous education. This indicates that a significant part of Ukrainian labor migrants retain their previous professional profile/experience or at least partially use previous knowledge and skills in a new context.

18 people (20.9%) took a neutral position on this statement. They can be positioned as a group of employees who perform work that partially corresponds to the education they received, but is not its direct/immediate continuation. Often, these are employees who apply “soft” skills — communication, analytics, process organization, digital, “green” and language skills — in a new field, different from the one in which they received education at home.

At the same time, 12 respondents (14.0%) disagreed, and 24 people (27.9%) — completely disagreed with this statement. Thus, 41.9% of respondents indicated that their current professional activity does not correspond to their educational level or specialization (Table 2.10). This clearly indicates a rather significant problem of professional mismatch (deskilling) in Europe, when highly qualified migrant specialists are forced to work in positions that do not require their knowledge or experience at all.

The highest level of correspondence between the education received in their homeland and employment in the host country was recorded in Spain, Italy, Germany and Poland. In Germany, for example, 10 people (37.0% of the local sample) fully or partially agreed that they work in their specialty. This is explained by the high structure of the labor market and the presence of qualification recognition programs. A similar situation is observed in Italy (5 people agreed or fully agreed), where Ukrainians often work in areas that require the use of professional skills (care, education, services).

Table 26

Distribution of the respondents according to the compliance of education received in Ukraine with the requirements of current work in the host country

Respondents' choices regarding the compliance of education received in Ukraine with the requirements of current work in the host country	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly disagree	24	27.9 %
Agree	21	24.4 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	18	20.9 %
Disagree	12	14.0 %
Strongly agree	11	12.8 %

However, it is in these same countries that the largest share of those who completely disagree with this statement is observed: in Italy — 7 people (36.8% of the local group), in Germany — 8 people (29.6%), in Poland — 7 people (46.7%).

Such a contrast demonstrates the polarization of national labor markets: some Ukrainians find work in their specialty, while many others are forced to drop to a lower qualification level.

In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands), the situation is consistently negative or neutral. Here, high requirements for diploma certification, complex language barriers, and bureaucratic procedures do not allow Ukrainians to quickly confirm their education. .

In general, the structure of responses reflects the professional and structural deformation of Ukrainian labor migration. A significant part of qualified workers performs less complex jobs that do not correspond to their level of education and previous professional experience. This, in turn, leads to a temporary decrease in the efficiency of using human capital, but at the same time creates conditions for the accumulation of new — practical labor/professional, intercultural and organizational experience.

Respondents' sufficiency of skills, abilities and knowledge to perform their work

32 people (37.2%) fully agreed with the statement that they have enough knowledge, abilities and skills to perform their work, and another 33 respondents (38.4%) partially agreed with this. Thus, three quarters of the respondents (75.6%) demonstrate confidence in their professional abilities. This result indicates that the majority of Ukrainians have adapted well to the labor requirements of the host countries, regardless of the level of complexity and nature of the work tasks performed or the field of employment.

15 people (17.4%) took a neutral position on this issue — “neither agree nor disagree.” This answer may mean that respondents are still in the process of adaptation, or they work in positions where their professional potential is not fully utilized. This is often due to the fact that Ukrainian employees perform work of a lower level of qualification, but at the same time retain awareness of their existing professional qualifications.

Negative answers make up a small proportion. Only 3 people (3.5%) disagreed, and another 3 respondents (3.5%) strongly disagreed with this statement. In total, 6 people (7.0%) feel that they lack professional skills or knowledge to perform their duties (Table 27). This may be due to professional/industry differences, language barriers, or lack of experience working in a new production environment and/or team.

Table 27

The level of sufficiency of the respondents' skills, abilities and knowledge to perform their work

Respondents' choices to the question about the sufficiency of their skills, abilities and knowledge to perform their work	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	33	38.4 %
Strongly agree	32	37.2 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	15	17.4 %
Strongly disagree	3	3.5 %
Disagree	3	3.5 %

Geographical analysis shows that the highest level of confidence in their professional skills is among Ukrainians working in Germany, Italy, Poland and Spain. For example, in Germany, 20 people (74.1%) fully or partially agreed that they have enough skills to perform the job, which indicates their successful adaptation to the high professional and qualification requirements/standards typical of the German labor market.

In Italy, 15 people (78.9%) expressed similar confidence, in Poland — 12 (80%), and in Spain — all 4 respondents (100.0%).

These results demonstrate that Ukrainians are quickly integrating into the European work environment even with differences in labor standards, technological requirements and language features.

In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands), positive assessments also prevail. For example, in Denmark, all three respondents reported a high or sufficient level of skills, although one of them partially doubts his own professional readiness.

This confirms that even in countries with strict standards and high requirements for employees, Ukrainians demonstrate good professional training.

In turn, uncertainty or partial inconsistency of their own skills was most often noted by respondents from Poland (2 people), Germany (1 person) and Denmark (1 person). This may be due to the involvement of Ukrainians in jobs that require special certifications or confirmation of qualifications, or with the performance of physical/manual labor, where the key role is not education, but the production environment.

Thus, the survey results obtained on this question indicate a fairly high level of professional self-sufficiency of Ukrainian labor migrants. Despite the difficult conditions, most of them remain confident in their existing, primarily professional, competencies, which are an important prerequisite for their integration into the labor market of the host countries and their potential contribution to the reconstruction of the Ukrainian economy after their return.

The need for additional professional training

Only 5 people (5.8%) fully agreed with the statement that they need additional training, and another 17 respondents (19.8%) partially agreed with this. Thus, every fourth employed respondent objectively recognizes the need to improve their qualifications or acquire new knowledge, skills and abilities. This may indicate a desire for professional development, a willingness to invest in their own competencies and an understanding of the dynamics of the modern labor market.

The largest group of respondents — 27 people (31.4%) — took a neutral position (“neither agree nor disagree”). This means that for a third of respondents, the issue of additional training is not relevant at the moment, but they do not exclude its importance in the future. Presumably, these employees are satisfied with their current level of professional training or work in positions that do not require formal and fixed by the employer advanced training.

At the same time, 15 people (17.4%) disagreed, and another 22 respondents (25.6%) completely disagreed with this statement. Thus, almost half of the respondents (43.0%) believe that their knowledge and skills fully meet the employer's requirements and do not require additional training (Table 28).

Table 28

Distribution of respondents by need for additional professional training

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Neither agree, nor disagree	27	31.4 %
Strongly disagree	22	25.6 %
Agree	17	19.8 %
Disagree	15	17.4 %
Strongly agree	5	5.8 %

This indicates a fairly high self-assessment of professional competence of Ukrainians and confirms the results of previous questions, where most respondents stated confidence in their own skills.

The greatest willingness to receive additional training was shown by respondents from Italy (7 people agreed or completely agreed) and Germany (5 people). This is explained by the fact that it is in these countries that Ukrainians often work in sectors where there is a need to obtain special certificates, good knowledge of the local language and compliance with the requirements of professional/qualification standards - in particular, in the field of care, construction, logistics and production.

In Poland (3 people agreed, another 3 took a neutral position), there is moderate interest in additional training, and 6 people (40.0%) consider it unnecessary, which indicates adaptation to local working conditions.

In the Nordic countries — Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands — neutral or moderate/negative responses prevail, indicating employees' confidence in their skills due to practical experience, or a lower need for formal retraining in the relevant field of employment or profession .

Summarizing the above, several trends can be identified. First, every fourth Ukrainian abroad recognizes the need for professional improvement, which indicates openness to learning and understanding of the importance of continuous education. Second, over 40.0% of respondents feel confident in their competencies, which is a sign of successful professional integration. Third, a third of respondents take a neutral position, indicating the presence of a potential group for involvement in educational/training programs — provided that accessible opportunities for learning in the language of the host country are created.

The ability of respondents to use their existing knowledge and skills to the extent necessary for the successful performance of their current work in the host country

25 respondents (29.1%) fully agreed with the statement that they can use their own knowledge and skills to the full extent, and another 28 respondents (32.6%) partially agreed with this. Thus, almost two-thirds of respondents (61.7%) believe that the competencies they acquired in Ukraine find their practical application in their current professional activities. This group demonstrates a high level of adaptability of Ukrainian migrants, confidence in their own qualifications and ability to integrate the results of the Ukrainian vocational school into new employment conditions.

20 people (23.3%) took a neutral position (“neither agree nor disagree”). This may mean that some respondents experience partial use of their knowledge and skills, for example, in cases where the work is not directly related to the profession, but certain skills ("soft, cross-cutting, key, etc.) still find their application.

Table 29

Distribution of respondents according to the possibility of using their existing knowledge and skills to the extent necessary for the successful performance of their current work in the host country

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	28	32.6 %
Strongly agree	25	29.1 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	20	23.3 %
Disagree	7	8.1 %
Strongly disagree	6	7.0 %

At the same time, 7 respondents (8.1%) disagreed with this statement, and 6 people (7.0%) completely disagreed. Thus, every seventh survey participant (15.1%) is unable to fully realize their qualification potential (Table 29). This may be a consequence of

factors such as bureaucratic barriers in the recognition of qualifications, restrictions for foreign workers, insufficient language skills or specific employment conditions that do not require high qualifications, etc.

The highest level of feeling of professional self-realization was recorded in Germany (18 people agreed or completely agreed), Italy (8 people), Poland (9 people) and Spain (4 people). These countries are key centers of Ukrainian labor migration, where a stable environment for employment and professional integration has been formed.

Positive assessments also prevail in the countries of Northern Europe — Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands — although the share of neutral responses is higher. This indicates both successful adaptation and the fact that for some Ukrainians their potential is not fully revealed due to language or administrative barriers.

The largest number of people dissatisfied with their own professional realization was recorded in Italy (5 people disagreed or strongly disagreed) and Poland (4 people). These indicators indicate partial underutilization of the qualification potential of Ukrainian workers, especially in areas where physical/manual labor or limited career development prevails.

In general, more than half of the respondents are convinced that they are able to effectively implement their knowledge in foreign or international labor markets, which is evidence of the high level of professional mobility and adaptation potential of Ukrainians. At the same time, approximately every sixth respondent feels professional limitations, which indicates the need for additional educational and certification opportunities.

Based on the above, the following generalizations can be made:

- 61.7% of respondents feel that their knowledge and skills are fully realized in the professional environment of the host countries;
- 23.3% demonstrate neutrality, which may reflect partial realization of potential or uncertainty in their professional status;
- 15.1% are unable to fully use their competencies, which indicates the problem of underutilization of human capital among Ukrainian migrants.

Respondents' availability of work that requires a lower level of education and qualifications

19 respondents (22.1%) fully agreed that their work requires a lower level of education than they have, and another 23 people (26.7%) partially agreed with this. That is, almost half of respondents (48.8%) admit to being employed in positions and workplaces that do not correspond to their level of qualifications. This confirms the trend identified in the answers to the previous questions: highly qualified specialists often perform less complex or physical/manual work due to difficulties with recognition of qualifications, language barriers, or the need for quick employment in difficult conditions of forced resettlement.

19 respondents (22.1%) took a neutral position (“neither agree nor disagree”). This result indicates the existence of an intermediate group of respondents, in which the educational level partially corresponds to the conditions of their current employment. These may be Ukrainians abroad who work in related fields or are gradually undergoing professional adaptation, for example, from entry-level positions to more qualified ones.

At the same time, 12 people (14.0%) disagreed, and another 13 (15.1%) completely disagreed with this statement, i.e. almost a third of respondents (29.1%) believe that their current work corresponds to their existing education and qualifications. This is evidence of their successful professional integration, when Ukrainian workers were able to find a job according to their qualifications or adapt their competencies to new conditions.

At the same time, 12 people (14.0%) disagreed, and another 13 (15.1%) strongly disagreed with this statement, i.e. almost a third of respondents (29.1%) believe that their current job corresponds to their existing education and qualifications (Table 30).

Table 30
Distribution of respondents by the availability of work that requires a lower level of education and qualifications than the current one

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	23	26.7 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	19	22.1 %
Strongly agree	19	22.1 %
Strongly disagree	13	15.1 %
Disagree	12	14.0 %

This is evidence of their successful professional integration, when Ukrainian workers were able to find work according to their qualifications or adapted their competences to new conditions.

The highest level of "downskilling"/de-skilling is observed among Ukrainians in Italy (11 people agreed or strongly agreed that they currently have a lower-level job), Germany (13 people) and Poland (8 people). These countries host the largest number of migrant workers, most of whom are involved in sectors that do not require a high level of education and qualifications, in particular in construction, logistics, care and services.

In Spain, all four respondents also confirmed the presence of a mismatch between available education and work, which may be a consequence of the specifics of the labor market, which is oriented towards seasonal or manual work.

In contrast, in the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands), the situation looks more balanced: along with those who feel a certain inadequacy, there are also those who are completely satisfied with their professional status .

In general, it can be argued that the problem of professional underutilization of Ukrainians abroad is systemic. Even those with higher education or significant professional experience are often forced to accept work that does not require their competencies, both due to administrative barriers and due to lack of verification or limited access to the specialized labor market.

Along with this, the positive aspects of such a process should not be ignored. Experience working even in less qualified positions in developed countries gives Ukrainians the opportunity to master modern labor, professional/qualification standards, technological practices, language, and production culture, which can be successfully used by them upon returning to their homeland.

Summarizing the results of the responses to this question, several key conclusions can be drawn:

- Almost half of Ukrainian workers abroad (48.8%) admit that the requirements for their employment are lower than their educational level.

- This confirms the imbalance between the supply of qualified Ukrainian labor and the highly specialized demand of the labor markets of European countries for workers.

- At the same time, about 30.0% of respondents maintain the relevance of their existing qualifications, which indicates a gradual and successful professional integration and an increase in the share of Ukrainians abroad who can implement their previous competencies in practice.

- The experience gained, even in the lower/simpler segments of the structure and form of employment, has the potential to form a flexible, adaptive labor resource, which will become an important component of Ukraine's post-war recovery.

Thus, the results of the analysis of the answers to this question confirm that Ukrainian migrants are highly qualified, but not always in demand for their level of education and qualifications, employees who are able to make a significant contribution to the modernization of the Ukrainian labor market in the future.

2.5.3.2. Occupation and skill alignment

Distribution of respondents by recognition of their professional qualifications by employers in the host country

34 people (39.5%) answered that they did not undergo any professional training in the host country. This is almost two-fifths of the sample, which indicates the predominance of labor adaptation through practical experience, rather than through formal training. For the majority of respondents, this situation is explained by the short period of stay abroad and the focus on current work, which does not require additional verification.

At the same time, 52 respondents (60.5%) in one form or another obtained or recognized qualifications in the host countries. Among them, 19 people (22.1%) indicated that they had completed full training, and another 18 people (20.9%) indicated that they had completed partial training. Thus, about two-fifths of the respondents are already involved in the vocational training system in their host countries, which indicates active adaptation and a desire to legalize their professional qualifications.

Another 13 people (15.1%) responded that their work is not related to the education received in Ukraine, but at the same time they probably underwent some adaptation training without formal training. This is a typical situation for Ukrainian workers who are forced to change their professional field due to the difference in the requirements for competencies in the labor markets of the host countries. Only 2 respondents (2.3%) indicated that they need to confirm their diploma or take advanced training courses.

Table 31

Distribution of respondents by recognition of their professional qualifications by employers in the host country

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
No	34	39.5 %
Yes, fully	19	22.1 %
Partly	18	20.9 %
The job is not related to the education I received in Ukraine	13	15.1 %
Yes, but you need to confirm your diploma or take advanced training courses	2	2.3 %

This may indicate both a limited number of people who have started the process of official recognition of their qualifications and a lack of awareness of relevant opportunities in the host countries (Table 31).

In geographical terms, the highest level of participation in vocational training is observed in Germany: among 27 respondents, 13 people indicated that they had completed training in full or in part. Such activity is explained by the developed system of integration programs and support from German training centers and employers (chambers of industry, commerce and crafts). In

Italy, 8 people (5 partially, 3 fully) underwent vocational training, which indicates a combination of formal and informal training typical of the care, maintenance and construction sectors.

In Poland, 5 respondents underwent vocational training (3 fully, 2 partially), and another 3 indicated that they work in a profession other than the one they obtained in Ukraine. Similar trends are observed in Spain, Norway and the Netherlands, where a significant proportion of respondents have completed partial training or professional courses. On the other hand, in Denmark, Canada, the USA, France and Portugal, the majority of participants did not undergo training, which is explained either by the short period of stay or by stable employment without the need for verification of qualifications.

In general, the structure of the responses shows that Ukrainian migration is gradually moving from the stage of temporary employment to the stage of professional integration. Studying abroad and verification/assignment of professional qualifications — full or partial — are becoming an important tool for securing a foothold in the labor market, adapting to local requirements and increasing competitiveness in host countries.

The data obtained allow us to draw several conclusions:

- over 60.0% of Ukrainians abroad are already involved in various forms of professional training, which indicates a high motivation for self-development;
- refugees note the effectiveness of vocational training in countries such as Germany, Italy and Poland, where training programs for migrants are offered;
- a significant part of the surveyed refugees does not work in their primary profession, which requires the host countries to more actively develop training programs for professional retraining and requalification;
- there is a small number of people who undergo official confirmation of diplomas, which indicates the need for state support from both Ukraine and the countries of arrival, appropriate procedures and informing Ukrainian migrants about the possibilities of recognizing their education and/or professional qualifications.

Thus, Ukrainians abroad demonstrate high adaptability and readiness for professional growth, which is an important factor not only for their socio-economic development, but also for the potential contribution to the restoration of Ukraine's labor potential after their return.

Distribution of respondents by forms of vocational training and providers of educational services in the host countries

Among the 94 recorded responses (the survey provided for several options), those who did not undergo any vocational training prevailed - 44 such people (46.8%). This confirms the conclusion that almost half of Ukrainian migrants are at the stage of initial adaptation or work in areas where there is no need for additional verification of professional qualifications.

At the same time, a fairly significant proportion of respondents (53.2%) noted that they had undergone training in one form or another. Most often, Ukrainian migrants received vocational training services directly at the workplace - 19 people (20.2%). This format is most common in the areas of care, service, production and logistics, where professional skills are learned practically. This indicates a high level of adaptability and readiness of Ukrainians to quickly integrate into the labor process.

The second most common form was language courses, which were attended by 4 respondents (4.3%). Although this share of respondents is insignificant, the indicator itself is of strategic importance, since proficiency in the language of the host country is a key condition for successful integration. Ukrainians are particularly active in such courses in Germany, Norway, and Italy.

Vocational training in vocational education centers or advanced training courses from private providers was attended by 5 (5.3%) and 3 (3.2%) respondents, respectively. These programs are usually focused on practical skills — caring for people, cooking, maintenance, logistics — and are an important part of the adaptation policy for migrants.

University education (bachelor's or master's degree) was chosen by 7 people (7.4%), which indicates the presence of a group of highly qualified specialists among Ukrainians who continue their education to confirm their diplomas or obtain a new specialty. This is especially characteristic of younger respondents and those planning long-term residence.

Table 32
Distribution of respondents by forms of vocational training and providers of educational services in the host countries

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Training at the direction of the employment centre (service)	9	9.6 %
At university (master's, bachelor's or junior bachelor's degree)	7	7.4 %
Apprenticeship (formal system)		
At an upper secondary vocational technical school	3	3.2 %
At a vocational training centre	5	5.3 %
Continuous vocational education /course or VET provider	3	3.2 %
At the workplace	19	20.2 %
Language courses	4	4.3 %
I did not receive any vocational training.	44	46.8 %

9 people (9.6%) received training through employment centers, mainly in Germany, Italy, and Poland. This indicates the effectiveness of state employment programs in EU countries aimed at integrating Ukrainians into local labor markets through official employment institutions.

Slightly fewer participants (3 people, or 3.2%) studied in higher vocational schools, and there are still isolated cases of apprenticeship in formal systems — that is, participation in dual education programs, where education is combined with practical work (Table 32).

Geographical differences confirm the dependence of migrants' participation in vocational training on the national policies of the host countries. Germany, which has the most developed retraining system for migrants in general and Ukrainians in particular, recorded the highest participation — 16 out of 30 people underwent various forms of training (language courses, on-the-job training, university programs). In Italy, 14 people received vocational training, mainly in the form of work placements or courses in vocational education centers. In Poland, 6 respondents obtained a new qualification, while in Norway, Denmark and Ireland there were only isolated cases of formal training .

The results obtained provide grounds for several generalizations. First, Ukrainian migrants demonstrate a high level of pragmatic adaptation - almost every fifth one masters new skills directly in the work process. Second, the spread of short-term forms of training indicates a change in the structure of professional development: preference is given to practical and applied courses, rather than long-term academic training. Third, EU countries, especially Germany, Italy and Poland, have created effective mechanisms for involving migrants in general, and Ukrainians in particular, in educational/training programs, which increases their competitiveness and contributes to the legalization of employment.

Thus, although almost half of the respondents did not receive professional education abroad, the rest of them actively use educational opportunities, which indicates the gradual professionalization of Ukrainian migration. This process not only facilitates integration into a new society, but also forms valuable human capital, which can become a resource for the restoration of the Ukrainian economy after the return of migrants.

Employers' participation in the professional and labor adaptation of refugees

In total, 165 references to measures aimed at facilitating the adaptation of employees were recorded in the respondents' responses, while more than a third of the respondents (31 respondents or 36.0%) reported that no actions of a corresponding direction were taken by the employer.

Most often, Ukrainian migrants noted practical and short-term forms of assistance directly related to the work process. Among them, mentoring schemes (26 cases or 30.2%) and on-the-job training (21 cases or 24.4%) prevail, which allow employees to more quickly master production requirements, safety rules and features of collective interaction. Such forms as work control (23 cases or 26.7%) and providing individual feedback/advice (10 cases or 11.6%) are quite common, which indicates a pragmatic European model of personnel management, focused on results, rather than long-term professional training, as can often be observed in Ukraine.

Internal professional training was recorded in 11 cases (12.8%) and is most often practiced in large companies where there are personnel training programs. External professional training, which involves training outside the enterprise, was only attended by individual employees, mainly in Germany, Italy and Poland. Less common, but important for labor integration, are changes in working methods (3 cases), redistribution of job responsibilities (5 cases) and job rotation (6 cases), which allows Ukrainian workers to more actively adapt to different production situations and work regimes and work areas.

A noticeable feature is the active position of Ukrainian workers in matters of advanced training. 11 respondents (12.8%) underwent independent (informal) training or online courses without the help of an employer, and another 5 people (5.8%) received general education for adults outside of work/work. This indicates a high level of self-organization and a desire for professional development even in difficult socio-economic and living conditions that fall to the lot of a migrant/refugee from war (Table 33).

Table 33

Measures for professional and labor adaptation in production or outside it among surveyed Ukrainian migrants

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Internal vocational courses	11	6.7 %
Guided on-the-job training	21	12.7 %
Mentoring/buddying scheme	26	15.8 %
Performance monitoring	23	13.9 %
Providing individual feedback	10	6.1 %
Changing work practices	3	1.8 %
Reallocating work	5	3.0 %
Workplace/job rotation	6	3.6 %

Exchanges or study visits	2	1.2 %
Conferences/workshops	10	6.1 %
Learning or quality circles	1	0.6 %
I attended self-directed learning/e-learning, private lessons without an employer's help.	11	6.7 %
I received lifelong learning education or general adult education without an employer's help.	5	3.0 %
Nothing	31	18.8 %

The geographical distribution of respondents according to their answers to the question shows that the issues of professional and labor adaptation are most systematically resolved in Germany (62 recorded cases), where mentoring programs, internal training and participation in collective forms of advanced training are actively implemented. Italy occupies the second position (30 cases), which is marked by the predominance of informal mentoring, on-the-job training and mutual support between employees. In Poland (21 cases), the adaptation process is mainly based on collective experience, knowledge exchange and practical instruction. In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway) and English-speaking countries (Canada, USA, Great Britain), individual forms of support prevail - personal mentoring, short instruction and assessment of work results. At the same time, in some countries, in particular in Portugal, Switzerland and Romania, adaptation measures were not noted by the respondents.

The answers to this question give grounds to assert that more than half of Ukrainian migrants abroad receive some assistance in the process of their professional and labor adaptation at the workplace, however, this support is mostly limited to practical aspects and does not translate into systematic training or advanced training. Formal educational programs at work cover a small proportion of employees, while the majority of them learn directly on the job or independently. At the same time, a third of respondents did not receive any specialized assistance from employers, which emphasizes the need to create pan-European programs for the integration of labor migrants/refugees of working age.

Thus, the professional and labor adaptation of Ukrainians in foreign labor markets is mainly practical and informal in nature and is based on the initiative of the employees themselves and their gradual involvement in the production process. Ukrainian workers demonstrate high work capacity, inclination and ability to learn, responsible attitude to work/job duties, which forms a positive image of the Ukrainian workforce in European countries and beyond. Despite the absence of a single European system of professional integration, Ukrainian workers actively overcome language, cultural and administrative barriers, which indicates their flexibility and ability to long-term professional activity.

Distribution of respondents by profession

The distribution of surveyed Ukrainian migrants by types of professional activity in which they are employed in the host countries or were employed in Ukraine before going abroad shows a high level of professional diversity and at the same time reflects the structural features of the labor integration of Ukrainians abroad. Among all respondents, the largest number of representatives was found in the field of working professions and production (14 people, 16.3%), healthcare, care and other types of social sphere (11 people, 12.8%), as well as in business, management, finance and economics (9 people, 10.5%) (Table 34). This ratio

demonstrates the fact that Ukrainian migrants are actively integrating precisely into those sectors of the economy and types of economic activity where there is a stable demand for labor, especially in EU countries.

Table 34
Distribution of respondents by profession

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Unemployed / temporarily unemployed	3	3.5 %
Business, management, finance, economics	9	10.5 %
Catering	7	8.1 %
Civil service, law	3	3.5 %
ICT, engineering, technology	6	7.0 %
Creative, fashion, design	5	5.8 %
Healthcare, care and social security	11	12.8 %
Service, cleaning, hotels	2	2.3 %
Education, upbringing, psychology	8	9.3 %
Working professions, manufacturing	14	16.3 %
Service sector, cleaning, hotels	7	8.1 %
Trade, marketing, communications	6	7.0 %
Transport, logistics	5	5.8 %

Thus, the most numerous occupational groups — blue-collar occupations and employment in the care sector — reflect the general trends of Ukrainian labour migration. In particular, work in the manufacturing sectors (construction, installation, maintenance) is typical for men, while women are more often involved in caring for the elderly, working in hospitals, children's or social institutions. These sectors are key in countries such as Germany, Italy, Poland and Spain, where a socially oriented economy creates a demand for low- and/or medium-skilled labour, which also does not require additional confirmation of qualifications.

In Germany, which has the largest number of respondents (27 people), a clear occupational polarization is observed. Here, workers in the manufacturing sector prevail (9 people), but specialists in business, management, healthcare, technical specialties and trade are also represented. This indicates that Ukrainians in Germany are not only filling the low-skilled labour market, but are also partially integrating into professional sectors that require a higher level of qualification and language proficiency.

In Italy, where 19 people were interviewed, representatives of the care and social support professions, education, the service sector, trade and blue-collar occupations dominate. This distribution is typical of the Italian labor market, where Ukrainian women often work in home care for the elderly, children, people with disabilities, etc., or in the domestic sector, and men in construction or in the field of repairs ordered by households.

In Poland, the employment structure of the surveyed Ukrainians is more balanced: respondents are represented in the fields of healthcare, engineering and technical professions, trade, transport and logistics, which reflects the mobility of labor flows and wider opportunities for legal employment .

At the same time, there is a small share of migrants involved in the creative industries, education, civil service and ICT sector. Of the respondents, 6 people are employed in the field of technology and engineering, and 8 in the field of education and provide psychological and rehabilitation services. This is explained by the fact that such areas of professional activity require a high level of language proficiency, confirmation of qualifications or retraining, which creates additional barriers for newcomers.

Employment of respondents by type of subordination and ownership of the enterprise (institution, establishment, organization)

Of all respondents, 54 people (62.8%) reported that they work in private companies. This is the most common type of employment among the surveyed Ukrainian migrants. This indicator shows a high demand for Ukrainian workers in the field of non-state services, construction, logistics, trade, care for people, as well as in industry. The private sector provides wider access to jobs, flexible working conditions and opportunities for temporary or seasonal employment, which is important for people who do not plan to stay abroad on a permanent basis, have communication (language) problems and are unable to apply for a job in the specialty they received in Ukraine.

In second place were self-employed individuals (13 respondents (15.1%). This group includes entrepreneurs, freelancers, small business owners or those who provide services on an individual basis. Mostly these are Ukrainians who have been living abroad for a long time, speak the language well and have an established client base. Such cases prevail in Germany (5 people) and Poland (2 people), as well as in Italy, where self-employment is often associated with the provision of social and household or care services. This type of employment indicates the gradual integration of Ukrainians into local economic structures and the growth of their financial independence.

Table 35

Distribution of employed respondents by type of subordination and ownership of the enterprise (institution, establishment, organization)

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Private sector (e.g. a company)	54	62.8 %

Self-employed	13	15.1 %
Public sector (e.g. the local government or a state hospital)	10	11.6 %
Unemployed	5	5.8 %
A non-profit organisation (e.g. a charity, an organisation)	4	4.7 %

The public sector, which includes work in state or municipal institutions, is represented by a much smaller share — 10 people (11.6%). These are mainly employees of educational, medical or social institutions who were able to confirm their qualifications or were hired after completing local adaptation programs. The largest number of Ukrainians in the public sector works in Germany (3 people), Poland (5 people) and Italy (1 person). The limited number of such cases is explained by the complex bureaucratic procedures for recognizing diplomas, the need for a high level of language proficiency and competition in the local labour market.

Non-profit organizations (in particular, charitable foundations, public and international structures) became a place of work for 4 people (4.7%). This group is mainly represented by specialists in the social sphere, education and humanitarian projects, often related to supporting Ukrainian communities abroad (Table 35).

The geographical distribution of respondents by answers shows that the largest share of those employed in the private sector falls on Italy (16 people out of 19 respondents), Germany (15 out of 27) and Poland (8 out of 15, respectively).

The results obtained allow us to draw several conclusions. First, Ukrainian labour migration is predominantly market-based, since the majority of our compatriots work in private companies or for themselves, that is, in conditions where flexibility and mobility are key advantages. Second, the relatively small number of those employed in the public sector indicates that the process of professional integration of Ukrainians into the public sphere is still limited. Third, the high proportion of self-employed is a sign of the gradual socio-economic stabilization of Ukrainians abroad, who are transforming from employees into small business entities.

Thus, the structure of employment of Ukrainians abroad is dominated by their work in the private sector, which is characterized by the individualization of labour strategies. Ukrainian workers are gradually moving from short-term labour migration to long-term economic presence, which forms a new type of migrant - active, entrepreneurial and professionally flexible, able to adapt to the dynamic conditions of the modern European labour market.

Sectoral affiliation of enterprises (institutions, establishments, organizations) where respondents are employed

The obtained survey results indicate a fairly high professional diversity of Ukrainians abroad, which reflects the complex structure of labor migration and adaptation processes in the host countries. The largest number of respondents works in the field of providing other types of services (19 people, 22.1%), which covers a wide range of employment - from household services and care to auxiliary work in the hotel business, trade and logistics. This indicator is typical for Ukrainian labor migration, especially in Italy, Germany, and Poland, where such activities remain consistently in demand.

The second largest group among the respondents is employed in the field of health care and social assistance (10 people, 11.6%). It includes both qualified medical workers and caregivers who provide services to the elderly or people with disabilities.

The largest number of representatives of this sector is recorded in Italy and Germany, where Ukrainians traditionally occupy a significant place in the social care system.

A significant share of Ukrainians also work in the fields of education (8 people, 9.3%) and administrative and support services (6 people, 7.0%). Educators, psychologists, and child development specialists are mainly integrated into local educational institutions or informal educational initiatives/programs of Ukrainian communities. In contrast, administrative sector workers are often involved in office or organizational work that does not require high language proficiency or special confirmation of qualifications.

Technical and "intellectual" professions/occupations of migrants also play a certain role. In the processing industry (4 people), construction (3 people), transport industry (4 people) and trade (3 people), Ukrainians mainly perform practical tasks aimed at physical labour or technical maintenance.

Table 35
Distribution of enterprises (institutions, establishments, organizations) where respondents are employed, by type of economic activity

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
C Manufacturing	4	4.7 %
D Supply of electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning	2	2.3 %
E Water supply; sewerage, waste management	1	1.2 %
F Construction	3	3.5 %
G Wholesale and retail; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	3	3.5 %
H Transport, warehousing, postal and courier services	4	4.7 %
I Hospitality and catering	8	9.3 %
J Information and telecommunications	1	1.2 %
K Finance and insurance	3	3.5 %
L Real estate transactions	1	1.2 %
M Professional, scientific and technical activities	3	3.5 %

N Administrative and support services activities	6	7.0 %
P Education	8	9.3 %
Q Healthcare and social support	10	11.6 %
R Arts, sports, entertainment and recreation	5	5.8 %
S Other services	19	22.1 %
T Household activities	2	2.3 %
Unemployed	3	3.5 %

At the same time, only a few respondents (from 1 to 3 people in each category) work in the fields of information technology, finance, professional and scientific activities, which indicates a limited integration of highly qualified professionals and specialists into the intellectual sectors of the host countries' economies (Table 35).

The greatest professional diversity is observed in Germany (27 respondents), where almost all specific types of economic activity are represented - from the processing industry and transport to healthcare, education and services. This indicates a high flexibility of the German labor market, which provides employment opportunities for both specialists with levels 5-8 of the European Qualifications Framework and for persons performing practical work that requires professional qualifications of lower levels.

A similar industry structure is also characteristic of Italy, where Ukrainians are employed in construction, social assistance, education and services .

Distribution of respondents by duration of work abroad at current workplace/position

Among all respondents, 27 people (31.4%) have been working in their current position for less than a year, and another 33 respondents (38.4%) have been working for one to two years. Together, these two groups make up almost 70.0% of all respondents. This indicates that the majority of Ukrainian migrants are at the stage of primary or intermediate adaptation to a new place of work. This indicator reflects both the relatively recent arrival of a significant part of Ukrainians abroad after the start of the active phase of the war at the end of February 2022, and a certain specificity of temporary or contract forms of work common in European countries.

Table 36

Distribution of respondents by duration of work abroad at current workplace/position

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
1–2 years	33	38.4 %
Less than a year	27	31.4 %
3–5 years	19	22.1 %



More than 5 years	7	8.1 %
-------------------	---	-------

19 people (22.1%) have longer work experience abroad — from three to five years — and 7 respondents (8.1%) have been employed at the same workplace for more than five years. These indicators indicate the presence of a fairly stable core of almost a third of Ukrainian workers who have integrated into local teams, speak the language of the country of residence and, most likely, consider their presence abroad as long-term or permanent (Table 36).

The largest number of respondents with short work experience (up to a year) is observed in Germany (10 people) and Italy (5 people) — countries that have accepted the largest or large number of Ukrainian migrants after the war. In Poland, a significant share of workers also has short-term experience (5 people up to a year and 7 — from one to two years), which corresponds to the general profile of seasonal and temporary employment.

At the same time, among those who have worked at one job for more than three years, Germany (7 people), Italy (6 people) and Spain (3 people) dominate. These countries have greater employment stability, which is explained both by more developed labor guarantees and the presence of established Ukrainian communities that help compatriots keep jobs and improve their qualifications.

It should be noted separately that long work experience (over five years) was recorded in 7 cases (8.1%) and is mainly characteristic of people who left since the very beginning of the war, that is, after 2014. These respondents, as a rule, already have an established social position, legalized status and a stable professional niche.

Thus, the results of the answers to this question allow us to outline several key trends. First, the vast majority of Ukrainians are at the initial or intermediate stages of labour integration, which indicates a dynamic, but not yet completed adaptation process. Secondly, the presence of a significant group with work experience of over three years indicates the formation of a stable core of the Ukrainian diaspora, which ensures professional consolidation in the host countries. Thirdly, the short term of work of the majority of respondents is not evidence of instability, but rather reflects the mobility and desire of Ukrainians to find optimal working conditions, in particular better earnings, living conditions or opportunities for professional growth.

Thus, modern Ukrainian labour migration is characterized by high employment dynamics: the majority of workers are still in the process of adaptation, but already demonstrate a tendency to gradually consolidate in their places of work. Such mobility indicates the flexibility and competitiveness of Ukrainians in the international labour market, which in the future may become an important factor in both their personal success and the socio-economic potential of Ukraine in the future.

Distribution of respondents by job change over the past 5 years in the host countries

Of all respondents, 56 people (65.1%) reported that they had worked at the same job for the past five years. This indicates a tendency to maintain a job for a long time, which is typical for those Ukrainians who were able to find stable employment, integrate into the team and obtain the necessary documents for official work. This share is an indicator of successful labour adaptation, because maintaining a job for several years indicates the trust of employers and high responsibility of employees.

Table 37

Distribution of respondents by job change over the past 5 years in the host countries

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
1	56	65.1 %
2	20	23.3 %
3	5	5.8 %

4 or more	5	5.8 %
-----------	---	-------

Another 20 people (23.3%) indicated that they had changed two jobs. This can be considered a sign of the search for optimal working conditions or a consequence of the seasonal nature of employment. Five respondents (5.8%) changed three jobs, and the same number (5.8%) changed four or more, that is, they belong to the more regionally or professionally mobile part of the Ukrainian workforce abroad (Table 37). This category of workers, as a rule, reacts more quickly to changes in the economic situation, employer offers or remuneration conditions, demonstrating flexibility and adaptability in the labour market. The distribution of the results of the responses by the countries of residence of the respondents also emphasizes these trends. The highest share of workers employed in one job is observed in Germany (21 out of 27 people), Italy (10 out of 19) and Spain (all 4 respondents). In these countries, Ukrainians tend to work for a long time at the same enterprises, which is due to the presence of large Ukrainian communities, legalized labour relations, and stable demand for labour.

At the same time, in Poland (where 7 people work at one place, but 8 had two or more) and Denmark (1 person at one, 2 at two places), a higher dynamics of job changes is recorded, which is typical for seasonal work or contract employment.

A relatively small share of those who worked at three or four or more places (5 people in each category) indicates the existence of a mobile group of Ukrainians who change jobs more often. This may be due to the search for better conditions, the need to combine several short-term contracts, or the desire for professional growth.

In general, the analysis shows that the employment of Ukrainians over the past five years demonstrates the advantage of stable forms of work over temporary ones. Most respondents are not only officially employed, but also hold their jobs for a long period, which indicates a high level of trust from employers and proper professional training of employees. At the same time, the share of those who often change jobs reflects the natural mobility of labour migrants who adapt to the requirements of the economic environment, living conditions and personal circumstances.

Thus, the majority of Ukrainians abroad have already achieved a certain professional stability, have experience of long-term work and form a positive reputation of the Ukrainian workforce as reliable, responsible and qualified. This factor is important for understanding the potential for reintegration of Ukrainian labour migrants after their return, because the experience they have gained in systematic work, discipline and professional development can become a valuable resource for the economic recovery of Ukraine.

Distribution of respondents by level of professional mobility

Among the surveyed Ukrainian citizens who are currently abroad, a fairly high level of labour and professional activity is observed. According to the data obtained, more than half of the respondents — 47 people (54.6%) — have a current professional employment different from the one they had in Ukraine before leaving, while 39 people (45.4%) have maintained their professional profile abroad. This distribution reflects the high level of professional integration of Ukrainians in the host countries (Table 38).

Table 38

Distribution of respondents by level of professional mobility

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
No	39	45.3 %
Yes	47	54.7 %

The highest level of employment with a change of professional activity was recorded among Ukrainians living in countries with developed mechanisms of labour integration - Germany, Italy and Poland. In Germany, 15 out of 27 respondents did so. Italy demonstrates an even higher relative indicator - 12 out of 19 people, and in Poland, 9 out of 15 respondents changed their professional profile. A similar situation is characteristic of Denmark and Spain .

The results obtained indicate that a significant part of Ukrainians currently living abroad had previous professional experience that was different from their current activity. Among the 47 respondents who confirmed a change of profession, a wide industry diversity is observed, covering both highly qualified and applied areas of work.

The most common areas of change of professional activity among respondents were business, management, finance and economics (7 people). A significant number of respondents previously worked in the field of education, upbringing and psychology (8 people), which may be a sign of migration of the educational environment, as well as adaptation of teachers to related professions - in particular, in the field of social care or services (Table 38).

Table 38
Distribution of respondents by groups of changing professions

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Business, management, finance, economics	7	14.9 %
Catering	2	4.3 %
IT, engineering, technology	4	8.5 %
Creative, art, design, advertising	3	6.4 %
Healthcare, care, social sphere	5	10.6 %
Education, upbringing, psychology	8	17.0 %
Working professions, manufacturing	3	6.4 %
Trade, marketing, communications	2	4.3 %
(empty)	13	27.7 %

A separate group consists of working professions and technical specialists - electricians, production operators, packers, cooks, engineers and others. Changes in these professions are characteristic of respondents from Germany, Poland, Denmark and Italy, which corresponds to the structure of demand for labour in these countries. Along with this, examples of reorientation to highly qualified employment were identified: accountants, specialists in management, tourism, marketing, ICT and tender documentation. Several respondents noted new creative professions for themselves - artist, designer, photographer, which indicates a gradual expansion of the presence of Ukrainians in the cultural and creative sectors of the host countries.

Geographical distribution shows that the largest number of people who changed their profession live in Germany, Italy and Poland, because it is in these countries that employment programs for migrants are best developed, which creates conditions for professional retraining. At the same time, in Denmark (3 people) there is an example of a change in professional orientation in the field of public catering, while in Spain and the Netherlands the transition to business or office professions prevails .

The change of profession recorded among the respondents indicates a high adaptive mobility of Ukrainians, their ability to adapt to the needs of local labour markets and readiness to master new roles. Often such a transformation is accompanied by vertical or horizontal mobility - from intellectual to applied professions or vice versa.

Thus, it can be argued that labor migration of Ukrainians during the war was not only a forced step, but also a powerful factor in professional restructuring and retraining. This experience is of considerable value in the context of the further reintegration of specialists into the Ukrainian labour market after their return, as it combines knowledge of several labour systems - national and European - and forms a new quality of the labour potential of the Ukrainian community.

Distribution of respondents by type of employment

Among the respondents, 56 people (65.1%) work under fixed-term, trial or permanent contracts. This indicates a high level of legalization of the Ukrainian workforce in the EU countries, where formal registration of work is a necessary condition for social protection, access to health insurance and other legal guarantees. Typically, such contracts are concluded in the private sector - industry, services, construction, logistics and care for people. At the same time, 17 respondents (19.8%) reported that they work without a formal contract. This is typical for workers employed in the informal sector - in seasonal work, domestic service, agriculture or care.

Table 39

Distribution of respondents by type of employment

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Fixed-term (full-time or part-time)//probationary period/permanent (full-time or part-time)	56	65.1 %
No contract	17	19.8 %
Seasonal/periodic/unstable/temporary contract (e.g. work during the tourism season, seasonal agricultural work, on-call work)	7	8.1 %
Self-employed	3	3.5 %
Unemployed	3	3.5 %

This form of employment, although it provides temporary income, deprives workers of social guarantees and creates risks of exploitation. The largest number of such cases was recorded in Italy (4 people) and Germany (7 people), which reflects the realities of the shadow segment of the European labour market, where Ukrainians often act as a low-paid but reliable workforce.

Another 7 people (8.1%) work under seasonal, periodic or temporary contracts. This type of employment is typical for the tourism industry, agriculture, the food industry and the logistics sector. It allows Ukrainians to quickly adapt to new conditions, but does not provide long-term stability. Such contracts are most common in Spain (2 people), Italy (3 people) and Germany (2 people).

3 respondents (3.5%) are self-employed, working for themselves or running their own business. These are mainly specialists in the service sector, ICT or crafts, who were able to create their own business or provide services independently of employers (Table 40).

The distribution of responses by country of residence confirms the general trends. The largest share of officially employed Ukrainian migrants is recorded in Germany (15 people with fixed-term or permanent contracts), Poland (12 people) and Italy (12 people). At the same time, the share of workers without contracts is also the largest in these countries - due to the simultaneous presence of legal and informal employment sectors. In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands), all respondents have official employment contracts, which reflects a high level of compliance with labor legislation.

The responses obtained allow us to draw several conclusions. First, Ukrainians generally demonstrate a high level of legalization of labour, which indicates successful adaptation to the legal norms of the host countries. Secondly, the presence of almost a fifth of respondents without contracts confirms the existence of a shadow employment segment that requires regulation and increased control over workers' rights. Thirdly, the spread of temporary contracts indicates the flexible nature of migration employment, which allows Ukrainians to quickly respond to economic changes, but does not guarantee stability.

Thus, the structure of labour contracts of Ukrainian migrants reflects a transitional stage between temporary mobility and long-term integration. Ukrainian workers are gradually moving from informal to legal employment, acquiring legal protection and labour stability, which is an important indicator of their socio-economic adaptation in European countries and the potential for returning to Ukraine with new professional and organizational skills and competencies.

Distribution of employed respondents by work regime

The survey results indicate that the majority of Ukrainians currently working abroad are full-time employed, which is an indicator of their professional stability and high level of integration into the labor markets of the host countries. At the same time, a significant part of the respondents work part-time, which is often related to the peculiarities of their status, family circumstances, or the specifics of employment in certain industries.

Of the 83 people who had a job at the time of the survey, 52 respondents (62.7%) reported that they worked full-time, while 31 people (37.3%) reported working part-time. This distribution reflects the European-wide trend towards combining stable full-time employment with flexible forms of work, which is especially relevant for Ukrainian migrants who are adapting to new socio-economic conditions.

Full employment prevails in most countries, in particular in Germany (13 out of 25 respondents), Italy (10 out of 19), Poland (11 out of 15) and Norway (all 3 respondents). These are countries where Ukrainian workers are mostly involved in stable sectors of the economy - industry, construction, logistics, care and the service sector. Full employment in these cases indicates not only official employment, but also economic integration, when the employee is a full participant in labour relations and has access to social guarantees.

Table 40

Distribution of employed respondents by work regime

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Full-time employment	54	62.8 %
Part-time employment	32	37.2 %

Part-time employment is typical for more than a third of employed respondents (31 people). The highest rates were recorded in Germany (12 people), Italy (9 people) and Poland (4 people). Such cases are explained by several factors. First, some Ukrainians consciously choose a flexible schedule due to the need to combine work with childcare or study. Second, in many cases part-time

employment is forced - due to restrictions on residence status or difficulties with recognition of professional qualifications. Third, in certain industries (care, cleaning, seasonal services) this form is also typical for local workers.

Interestingly, in some countries, in particular in Spain and Denmark, there is an almost equal distribution between full-time and part-time employment (two people in each category). This indicates that Ukrainians actively use the opportunities for part-time work, typical of European labor markets with high flexibility of work schedules.

At the same time, in countries with stricter labor policies, such as Norway or the Netherlands, all respondents work full-time, which indicates a stricter adherence to the employment standards of these countries.

Analysis of the responses allows us to draw several conclusions. First, full-time employment is the main form of work of Ukrainians abroad, which indicates their professional responsibility, work capacity and demand in the labour market. Second, part-time employment is not a sign of marginalization, but rather a manifestation of flexibility, which allows Ukrainians to combine work, family responsibilities and personal development. Third, the coexistence of both models of work — full-time and part-time — forms an adaptive structure of Ukrainian labor migration, which corresponds to the European trends of the post-industrial economy.

Thus, the majority of Ukrainians abroad have already achieved stable professional integration, working full-time and having stable social and labour relations. At the same time, there is also a noticeable share of those who work part-time, demonstrating the desire for a balance between work, family life and self-realization. Such flexibility and high adaptability of Ukrainian workers is their competitive advantage in European labor markets and confirms their ability to effectively integrate into the socio-economic environment of the host countries.

Distribution of employed respondents by length of workweek

The survey results showed that the vast majority of Ukrainian workers abroad have a standard working week of 20 to 40 hours, which corresponds to typical European labour standards. At the same time, some of the respondents either work overtime or have reduced working hours, which indicates the flexibility of the Ukrainian workforce and adaptation to different economic conditions and employment models.

Of the 83 employed respondents, 53 people (63.9%) reported working between 20 and 40 hours per week. This is the most common work format, typical for officially employed people in the industry, services, construction, trade and care sectors. This share demonstrates the stability of employment and confirms the high level of legalization of Ukrainian workers in the host countries.

18 people (21.7%) work less than 20 hours per week. This category includes both students or part-time workers, and employees who have deliberately chosen a flexible schedule due to family circumstances or studies.

Table 41

Distribution of employed respondents by length of workweek

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
20–40 hours	53	63.9 %
Up to 20 hours	18	21.7 %
More than 40 hours	12	14.4 %

This form of work is particularly common among women and people who combine work with family responsibilities. The largest number of such respondents was recorded in Germany (9 people), Italy (5 people) and Poland (2 people).

12 respondents (14.4%) reported that they work more than 40 hours a week, i.e. they have exceeded the standard working hours. This indicates a high level of workload and is often associated with work in physically demanding or seasonal work regimes, in particular in agriculture, construction, logistics or care. Exceeding the standard working hours may also indicate a desire for higher earnings or a shortage of labor in the relevant sectors.

The geographical distribution of respondents' responses by country of residence shows that the largest number of full-time employees work in Germany (14 people), Italy (10) and Poland (11). At the same time, it is in these countries that cases of excessive workload, when employees work more than 40 hours, are also observed. This situation is typical for migrants who agree to overtime work in order to increase their earnings. In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway), the working week clearly corresponds to official norms, and exceeding the limit is practically not observed.

Analysis of the responses received indicates that the forms of employment and work regimes of Ukrainians abroad are balanced: a standardized work schedule prevails, while partial or overtime forms of work are of secondary importance. Such a distribution demonstrates a high adaptation of Ukrainian workers to the labour standards of the EU countries.

Thus, the vast majority of Ukrainians abroad have integrated into a stable employment system with a typical working week of 20–40 hours. Some employees who have a reduced work schedule indicate the presence of flexible work models that allow them to combine work with family or educational responsibilities. Those who work overtime demonstrate a willingness to work harder and strive for economic independence. Overall, this situation confirms the high work discipline, adaptability, and professional motivation of Ukrainian workers, who are confidently integrating into European labor markets while maintaining flexibility and competitiveness.

Availability of additional work among employed respondents

The survey on this issue showed that the majority of Ukrainians working abroad receive payment for additional work, which indicates proper regulation of labour relations and the gradual integration of Ukrainians into European labour standards. However, some of them, despite performing overtime duties, do not receive proper compensation, which reflects the uneven observance of labour rights between countries and employment sectors.

Half of all respondents (44 people, 51.2%) noted that their additional work is paid by the employer. This indicates the prevalence of the formal nature of labour relations and the presence of contractual obligations that provide for compensation for overtime work. This situation is characteristic primarily of countries with a high level of labour regulation and social responsibility of employers - Germany (16 people out of 27), Italy (10 out of 19) and Poland (8 out of 15). This indicates the inclusion of Ukrainian workers in formal systems of control over working hours, where overtime work is not only recorded, but also financially rewarded.

At the same time, 7 people (8.1%) reported that overtime work is not paid, which indicates the presence of cases of exploitative nature of work or informal agreements between the employee and the employer. Such situations occur most often in Italy (3 people) and Germany (2 people), that is, even in countries where there are clear legal mechanisms for protecting employees

Table 42

Availability of additional work among employed respondents

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Yes	44	51.2 %
Not applicable	35	40.7 %
No	7	8.1 %

This may be a consequence of the fact that Ukrainians often agree to additional workloads without formal registration, perceiving them as a means of strengthening the employer’s trust or an opportunity to increase overall income informally.

In addition, 35 respondents (40.7%) chose the option “not applicable”, which means that they do not have additional working hours or secondary responsibilities. This share mainly includes those who have a clearly defined work schedule or perform their functions within standard working hours. Such answers prevail in countries with strict compliance with labour standards - Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands and Canada (Table 42).

An analysis of the geographical distribution of respondents’ answers shows that the highest level of overtime compensation is observed in Germany, where over 60.0% of respondents have paid additional work. High rates are also recorded in Italy and Poland, where a significant share of Ukrainians are employed in manufacturing and service sectors of the economy with clear accounting of working hours.

At the same time, in countries with a more informal labor market, such as Spain or Romania, compensation for additional work is less common .

The results obtained indicate several trends. First, Ukrainian workers are gradually moving into the sphere of formalized labour relations, where basic principles of labor remuneration are observed, including compensation for overtime work. Second, more than a third of respondents work without additional loads, which indicates clear compliance with labor standards. Third, the existence of a small share of unpaid work indicates the need to strengthen institutional protection of the rights of migrant workers, especially in informal sectors of the economy.

In general, it can be noted that Ukrainian workers abroad demonstrate a high level of work ethics and responsibility, while most employers recognize and adequately pay their efforts. At the same time, the persistence of individual cases of unpaid additional work indicates the need to further strengthen labor guarantees, inform migrants about their rights, and expand opportunities for formalizing employment relationships. This will contribute to increasing the social stability of Ukrainians abroad and strengthening their professional status in the international labor market.

Distribution of enterprises (institutions, establishments, organizations) where respondents work, by the number of employees

The survey results on this issue indicate that Ukrainian workers abroad are employed in enterprises of various scales, among which medium and small businesses dominate, which is typical of the structure of the European labour market. Such a distributed employment structure indicates the flexible adaptation of Ukrainians to various organizational forms of work - from self-employment to work in large corporations.

Of the 83 respondents who had a job at the time of the survey, 31 people (37.3%) work in companies with a staff of 10 to 250 people. These are medium-sized enterprises - mainly firms in the field of production, services, construction, logistics, care or the food industry. This form of employment is the most common among Ukrainians, because it is medium-sized businesses that provide stability of labor relations, the possibility of flexible work schedules and gradual professional integration. The largest number of employees in medium-sized enterprises was recorded in Poland (8 people), Germany (7 people) and Italy (6 people).

19 respondents (22.9%) work in large companies with more than 250 employees.

Table 43

Distribution of enterprises (institutions, establishments, organizations) where respondents work, by the number of employees



Choice	Number (persons)	Share
10–250	31	38.4 %
More than 250	19	23.3 %
I am self-employed/working in my own.	17	19.8 %
1–10	16	18.6 %

This indicates the involvement of Ukrainians in large European and international corporations operating in the fields of industry, transport, medicine, education, hotel business or services. The highest share of such employees is observed in Italy (5 people), Germany (5 people) and Poland (3 people). Working in large structures requires an appropriate level of language competence, confirmed qualifications and experience, which indicates a relatively high level of professional integration of some Ukrainians.

Another 16 people (19.3%) indicated that they work in small enterprises with 1 to 10 employees. Such companies are typical for local service industries - minor repairs, trade, care services, gastronomy or private transport. The largest number of such employees is in Italy (5 people), Germany (6) and Poland (3). This segment often provides Ukrainians with their first job abroad, especially in cases where the level of language proficiency or legal status does not yet allow them to apply for prestigious or certain positions in large structures.

17 respondents (20.5%) reported that they are self-employed or work individually. This indicator reflects the growing trend towards individual entrepreneurship among Ukrainians who open their own small businesses or provide services privately - in the field of care, design, ICT, repair, translation or education. The largest number of self-employed people is recorded in Germany (7 people) and Italy (3 people). This indicates a gradual transition of Ukrainians from the status of an employee to economic independence (Table 44).

An analysis of geographical trends shows that in Central and Western European countries - such as Germany, Italy and Poland - Ukrainians are represented in all segments of the labor market, from small businesses to large corporations. In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands), employment in medium and large companies prevails, which is due to the high formalization of labor relations. At the same time, in countries with more flexible labor markets, such as Spain or Italy, small businesses and self-employment are more common .

Overall, the data obtained indicate that Ukrainians are successfully integrating into various organizational structures, demonstrating a high level of flexibility and ability to adapt to different work formats. The combination of a significant share of self-employed and employees of medium-sized businesses shows that Ukrainian labor migration is gradually acquiring signs of sustainable economic roots. Ukrainians not only work in the wage sector, but also create their own economic niches, which contributes to the development of local economies and at the same time forms the socio-professional potential for the future return and reconstruction of Ukraine.

Distribution of respondents by period/time of finding the first job in the country of residence

The vast majority of Ukrainians surveyed — 75 people (87.2%) — found their first job after arriving in the country of residence, while only 11 respondents (12.8%) had an agreement on employment in advance, even before leaving Ukraine. This distribution reflects the real picture of labor migration of Ukrainians, where the majority of forced (fugitives from war) or economic

migrants look for work immediately after arrival, focusing on local opportunities, recommendations from acquaintances or support from Ukrainian communities.

The highest share of those who found work after arrival was recorded in Italy (all 19 respondents), Germany (22 out of 27) and Poland (13 out of 15). These countries are traditional centers of labor migration of Ukrainians, and their labor markets have a significant number of vacancies available even without prior employment. Finding a job locally is often associated with simpler admission procedures, labor market flexibility, and the presence of Ukrainian intermediary networks that help find a job without bureaucratic delays (Table 44).

Table 44
Distribution of respondents by period/time of finding the first job in the country of residence

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
After arriving in this country	75	87.2 %
Before arriving in this country	11	12.8 %

At the same time, 11 respondents (12.8%) reported that they found their first job before arrival — that is, they had a preliminary agreement or an official invitation from an employer. This indicates the presence of organized forms of labor migration, characteristic mainly of qualified specialists or those who left within the framework of employment programs. The largest number of such cases was recorded in Germany (5 people), Spain (3 people) and Poland (2 people).

In countries with stricter visa control and legalization procedures — in particular, in Denmark, Norway, Canada, France and Switzerland — all respondents looked for work after arrival. This is explained by the fact that in these countries foreigners, especially citizens of Ukraine, often receive a work permit only after obtaining temporary protection or residence status .

An analysis of these respondents' answers allows us to draw several conclusions. First, the spontaneous type of employment prevails among Ukrainian labor migrants, which indicates their flexibility and ability to quickly adapt to new socio-economic conditions. Second, the relatively small proportion of individuals who found work before departure indicates limited institutional support for labor migration and the dominance of informal employment channels. Third, this situation shows that most Ukrainians rely on their own efforts, network connections, or assistance from the diaspora, which confirms their high adaptability.

Thus, most Ukrainians integrate into the labor market of the host country without prior contracts, demonstrating initiative and independence in finding work. This trend simultaneously indicates the potential of Ukrainian workers for rapid professional adaptation, but also the need to create official employment programs that could reduce the risks of informal employment and increase the level of social protection for migrants.

Finding and getting a first job in the host country by respondents

The results of the answers to this question showed that the vast majority of Ukrainians currently working abroad found their first job thanks to personal contacts, acquaintances or family ties. This indicator indicates the key role of informal social networks in the employment of Ukrainians outside the country and at the same time reflects the limitations of official channels of labor migration.

Of all respondents, 39 people (45.3%) noted that they found a job through acquaintances. This method is the most common, as Ukrainian migrants often rely on existing diaspora networks, friends or relatives who help find vacancies, provide recommendations or assist in contacting an employer. The largest number of such cases was recorded in Italy (16 people), Germany (11 people) and Poland (5 people) - countries where strong Ukrainian communities have formed and informal mutual aid systems operate.

The second most common way to find a job was to apply to employers on their own — 15 people (17.4%) reported that they found a job this way.

Table 45
Distribution of respondents by ways of finding and getting their first job in the host country

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Acquaintances	39	45.3 %
Contacting employers	15	17.4 %
Job advertisements	13	15.1 %
Company invitation	6	7.0 %
I established my own business.	5	5.8 %
NGOs	2	2.3 %
Official employment agency	2	2.3 %
Private employment company	2	2.3 %
No response	2	2.3 %

This indicates the initiative of Ukrainian workers, their willingness to independently search for opportunities and the ability to navigate local labor markets. This method was most often used in Germany (6 people) and Poland (4 people), that is, in countries with open labor markets and a developed system of public vacancies.

Vacancy announcements became a source of employment for 13 respondents (15.1%). This indicates the gradual integration of Ukrainians into formal job search mechanisms, in particular through official websites, labor exchanges, social networks or local information resources. The largest number of such cases was recorded in Poland (5 people) and Germany (3 people), where foreigners have access to numerous online platforms with job postings.

Another 6 people (7.0%) received a job through an official invitation from a company, which indicates the existence of organized forms of employment. Most often, these are highly qualified specialists or employees invited within the framework of international recruitment programs - such cases occurred in Germany (3 people), Italy, the Netherlands and Portugal.

5 respondents (5.8%), mostly in Poland, Germany and Spain, opened their own business. This indicates the growth of self-employment among Ukrainians and the transition of some labor migrants from hired labor to entrepreneurship. Such cases are an indicator of high adaptation and financial stability.

Non-governmental organizations became a source of work for 2 people (2.3%), another 2 respondents (2.3%) turned to official employment agencies or private companies. These data indicate that formal employment institutions remain secondary compared to informal channels (Table 45).

The geographical distribution of answers to this question confirms that Ukrainians actively use those employment channels that are most effective in a particular social environment. In Italy and Germany, family or acquaintance networks prevail, in Poland - a combination of independent search and official advertisements, in the Nordic countries - direct appeal to employers. This indicates the adaptive behavior of Ukrainians, who quickly adapt to the rules and opportunities of different labor markets .

Summarizing the above, several conclusions can be drawn. First, Ukrainians abroad demonstrate high social activity and mutual support, which helps them find work without official intermediaries. Second, informal employment channels remain key, especially for newcomers and those who do not speak the language of the host country at a sufficient level. Third, there is a tendency to an increase in the role of official job search mechanisms, which indicates the gradual professionalization of Ukrainian labor migration.

Thus, the main mechanism for employment of Ukrainians abroad is social capital - trust, mutual assistance and community support. At the same time, with the expansion of language competence, legalization of status and accumulation of experience, Ukrainians are increasingly using official and digital channels for job search, which indicates their deep integration into the European economic space.

Overall level of satisfaction of respondents with their current job

The results of the survey of respondents on this block of questions indicate that the vast majority of Ukrainians currently working abroad are satisfied with their current job, and the level of professional and emotional comfort among the respondents is relatively high. Overall, the obtained questionnaire data demonstrate a tendency towards a positive perception of work experience, despite the presence of certain problematic aspects related to social adaptation, language barrier or working conditions.

Of the 83 employed respondents, 39 people (47.0%) stated that they were satisfied with their job, and another 13 people (15.7%) indicated that they were very satisfied. Together, these two categories account for almost two-thirds of respondents (62.7%), which indicates a high level of labor integration of Ukrainians in host countries. Such results reflect not only financial stability, but also a sense of self-confidence, mutual respect with employers, and a comfortable professional environment.

At the same time, 20 people (24.1%) chose a neutral position — “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.” This group includes those who probably have stable jobs but face certain difficulties: unstable pay, a difficult schedule, insufficient language skills, or limited career prospects.

A smaller share of respondents demonstrated a negative attitude towards work: 9 people (10.8%) stated that they were dissatisfied, and 2 people (2.4%) — that they were very dissatisfied (Table 46). The main reasons for such dissatisfaction, as similar studies show, may be low wages, excessive workload, discrimination, or difficulties in communicating with employers.

Table 46

Distribution of respondents by overall level of satisfaction with current job

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Satisfied	39	47.0 %
Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied	20	24.1 %
Extremely satisfied	13	15.7 %

Dissatisfied	9	10.8 %
Extremely dissatisfied	2	2.4 %

The geographical distribution of this assessment demonstrates certain patterns. The highest level of satisfaction was recorded among Ukrainians working in Poland (11 out of 15 satisfied), Germany (10 out of 25 satisfied) and Italy (8 out of 19 satisfied). Such indicators can be explained by the long experience of Ukrainians living in these countries, the presence of established diasporas and the relatively stable legal status of employees. A high level of satisfaction was also noted in the countries of Northern Europe - in particular in Norway, where all three respondents answered positively.

In contrast, the largest number of cases of job dissatisfaction is observed in Germany (6 people) and Italy (2 people), which is partly related to high requirements for productivity and labor intensity, workloads or stressful working conditions in manufacturing sectors.

The obtained assessment results indicate several key trends. First, Ukrainian employees have generally successfully integrated into the work environment of European countries, which is reflected in their high job satisfaction ratings. Secondly, a positive attitude towards work is often formed on the basis of a combination of material stability and social support that Ukrainians receive in communities and teams. Thirdly, even in cases of neutral or negative attitudes, a pragmatic approach dominates - most Ukrainians perceive work abroad as a means of providing for their family and an investment in their own future.

Thus, the level of satisfaction of Ukrainian workers abroad can be assessed as high and stable. The vast majority feels confident in new professional conditions, which indicates successful adaptation to European labor standards. At the same time, even a small proportion of dissatisfied respondents confirms that the main problems are not systemic, but situational in nature. Thus, Ukrainians demonstrate not only high work capacity, but also psychological resilience, motivation and the ability to achieve professional self-realization in difficult conditions of labor migration.

2.5.4. What are the perceptions of migrant workers on social justice? (RQ3)

2.5.4.1. Justice and Work Conditions

Justice at work

Respondents' assessment of their income from work

15 people (17.4%) fully agreed with the statement that their labor income corresponds to the effort expended, and another 32 respondents (37.2%) partially agreed with this. This indicates that the majority of Ukrainians abroad have a sense of financial fairness in the context of remuneration for work, especially in the context of comparison with the opportunities they would have in Ukraine.

At the same time, 19 people (22.1%) took a neutral position - "neither agree nor disagree". Such a share is indicative: it may indicate ambivalence in the perception of remuneration for work, when employees are not completely satisfied with the payment, but recognize that it is stable or at least higher than in Ukraine. For many Ukrainians abroad, under current conditions, stable income is a more important factor than its absolute size.

At the same time, 15 respondents (17.4%) disagreed with the statement, and another 5 people (5.8%) strongly disagreed. Thus, every fifth respondent (23.2%) feels some financial injustice or believes that the level of pay does not correspond to the efforts expended (Table 47).

This may be due to overload at work, lack of career growth, low pay for physical labor, or difficult employment conditions.

Table 47
Distribution of respondents by their assessment of their income from work

Respondents' choices regarding the matching of their labor income to the efforts expended and qualifications	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	32	37.2 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	19	22.1 %
Disagree	15	17.4 %
Strongly agree	15	17.4 %
Strongly disagree	5	5.8 %

In geographical terms, the highest level of satisfaction with income was recorded among the surveyed Ukrainians working in Germany (15 people agreed or completely agreed), Italy (8 people), Poland (9 people) and Spain (3 people). These are countries where Ukrainians are mostly legally employed, receive stable wages and have social guarantees. At the same time, it is in Germany (8 people disagreed or completely disagreed) and Italy (5 people) that the highest level of dissatisfaction with wages was recorded. Such ambivalence indicates socio-economic polarization among Ukrainian migrants - some of them are successfully integrated into the labor market, while others work in less prestigious or low-paid sectors.

In the countries of Northern Europe - Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands - respondents are mostly satisfied with income or demonstrate moderate neutrality. This is due to the high social standards and general standard of living in these countries.

In general, the results obtained allow us to draw several conclusions:

First, more than half of Ukrainians (54.6%) feel that their work is fair in the relationship between their work and their remuneration, which is evidence of successful economic integration.

Second, every fifth (23.2%) believes that their work is undervalued. This can be a potential source of social tension or an incentive to change jobs.

Third, almost a fifth of respondents (22.1%) also demonstrate a neutral attitude, which may indicate a pragmatic acceptance of conditions under which stability is more important than full financial compliance.

Thus, Ukrainians abroad generally evaluate their work experience positively from a material point of view, but retain a critical view of the value of their own work. This indicates a high level of professional self-awareness and, at the same time, the potential for further development, in particular through advanced training, transition to more stable forms of employment, or opening their own business.

Respondents' employment in workplaces with harmful and dangerous working conditions

Only 4 people (4.7%) fully agreed that their workplace poses a high risk to safety, and another 14 respondents (16.3%) partially agreed with this. Thus, every fifth respondent (21.0%) feels in dangerous or potentially risky working conditions. This group is important from the point of view of social protection of employed Ukrainians, since these workers are most often involved in the construction, manufacturing, logistics or agricultural industries, where the risk of injury is objectively higher. The rather high level of occupational hazards at enterprises in European countries is also striking.

19 people (22.1%) took a neutral position - “neither agree nor disagree”. This may indicate that some Ukrainians perceive working conditions as moderately risky, but not dangerous, or consider the level of risk to be usual and acceptable. For many migrant workers, especially in professions with a high level of physical and/or manual labor, “risk” is part of the work routine, so the subjective feeling of danger in such situations is reduced.

At the same time, 17 respondents (19.8%) disagreed, and another 32 people (37.2%) strongly disagreed with this statement.

Table 48
Distribution of respondents' employment in workplaces with harmful and dangerous working conditions

Choices of respondents regarding their employment in workplaces with harmful and dangerous working conditions	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly disagree	32	37.2 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	19	22.1 %
Disagree	17	19.8 %
Agree	14	16.3 %
Strongly agree	4	4.7 %

Thus, more than half of the respondents (57.0%) consider their working conditions safe or such that they do not pose a threat to their health (Table 48). This result indicates a generally high level of compliance with occupational safety standards in most countries where Ukrainians are located, as well as their adaptation to local occupational health and safety requirements.

In terms of geography, the largest number of those who consider their work risky is concentrated in Italy (11 people agreed or partially agreed), Germany (8 people) and Poland (3 people). In these countries, the Ukrainians surveyed are most often employed in construction, agriculture and manufacturing, where the risk of physical injuries, occupational injuries or overwork is quite high.

In Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway and Spain, a moderate level of concern about safety is observed - neutral or relatively positive answers prevail.

This is explained by the high standards of occupational health and safety, typical of Scandinavian and Western European countries.

The largest share of those who completely disagree with the statement about unsafe conditions is recorded in Poland (9 people), Germany (8 people) and Italy (5 people), which indicates a significant differentiation of employment and working conditions by positions and jobs within the labor market even within the same country: conditions depend not only on the industry, but also on the specific employer, type of contract and status of the employee .

The results obtained indicate that more than half of Ukrainians feel that they have safe working conditions, but almost every fifth one encounters risk factors or works in conditions that require increased attention to safety.

Among the main conclusions, we highlight:

1. Ukrainian workers demonstrate high tolerance for working conditions and production risks, which is often a forced compromise between the choice of earnings or job safety.

2. The need to expand measures for occupational health and safety, occupational hygiene and sanitation, and other forms of protection of migrant workers in countries of arrival is obvious and urgent — both in the host countries (through participation in trade unions, legal support) and in Ukraine (through consular services, information campaigns).

3. Increasing awareness of rights, accident insurance, and opportunities for occupational health and safety training will help reduce risks.

Respondents' awareness of occupational health and safety at work

31 people (36.0%) fully agreed with the statement that they have enough information about occupational safety at work, and another 36 respondents (41.9%) partially agreed with this. That is, more than three-quarters of survey participants confirmed that they have the necessary knowledge for safe work. This result demonstrates a fairly high level of compliance with occupational safety standards in most European countries where employed Ukrainians were surveyed, and indicates an effective system of briefing and training of workers in the workplace.

12 respondents (14.0%) took a neutral position when answering this question - “neither agree nor disagree”. This may mean that they have been formally briefed, but do not feel sufficiently confident in their awareness or work in an environment where safety rules are not emphasized. This situation is often characteristic of temporary or informal employment, when formal safety training is minimal or symbolic.

Table 49

Distribution of respondents by awareness of safety and health at workplace

Respondents' choices regarding awareness of safety and health at work	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	36	41.9 %
Strongly agree	31	36.0 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	12	14.0 %
Disagree	4	4.7 %
Strongly disagree	3	3.5 %

Only 4 people (4.7%) disagreed, and 3 people (3.5%) completely disagreed with this statement, that is, they feel a lack of information on occupational safety issues (Table 49). This is a small proportion of respondents, but it is quite important, because it is precisely the lack of awareness of safety rules that is often the cause of occupational injuries, especially among newly arrived migrants who have not yet fully adapted to local production and labor standards of time and work.

The highest level of relevant awareness was demonstrated by respondents from Poland (15 people agreed or completely agreed), Germany (19 people) and Italy (13 people). In the countries of Northern Europe - Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands. In Spain and Ireland, the results are relatively positive: the majority is satisfied with the level of awareness, but there are isolated cases when employees note a lack of instruction .

Thus, three-quarters of the surveyed Ukrainian workers abroad feel that they have sufficient information about safety, which is a sign of successful professional integration into the new work environment. The low level of dissatisfaction with information indicates the effectiveness of European standards on occupational safety, to which employed Ukrainians are gradually adapting. The presence of a neutral group indicates an urgent need for employers to deepen their work with new migrants, who may underestimate the importance of the occupational safety system or have difficulty understanding instructions in a foreign language.

In the context of the general topic of fairness at work, this indicator demonstrates that information security of employees is an important component of social and labor justice. When an employee knows his rights, understands production risks and ways to avoid them, he feels more confident, responsible and fairly evaluated by the employer.

Respondents' position regarding their hypothetical dismissal due to their migrant status

24 people (27.9%) fully agreed with the statement that they are not worried about possible dismissal due to their immigrant status, and another 26 respondents (30.2%) partially agreed with this. Thus, a total of 50 people (58.1%) feel protected at work and do not perceive their migrant status as a threat to losing their current job. This indicator generally indicates a positive attitude of employers towards Ukrainians and their successful adaptation to local social and labor standards.

21 respondents (24.4%) took a neutral position, indicating the answer — “neither agree nor disagree”. This share of respondents indicates a hidden sense of instability: employed Ukrainians admit that they formally have the same rights as local workers, but may feel dependent on their employer or on bureaucratic nuances related to work or residence permits.

At the same time, 8 people (9.3%) disagreed, and 7 people (8.1%) strongly disagreed with this statement.

Table 50

Distribution of respondents by answers regarding their hypothetical dismissal due to migrant status

Choices of respondents to the question that they are not worried about possible dismissal due to immigrant status	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	26	30.2 %
Strongly agree	24	27.9 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	21	24.4 %
Disagree	8	9.3 %
Strongly disagree	7	8.1 %

That is, 17.4% of respondents admitted that they were afraid of being fired precisely because of their migrant status (Table 50). This group is particularly vulnerable, as the fear of losing a job may be associated with temporary contracts, informal employment, or language barriers that reduce the ability to defend themselves in labor disputes.

The highest level of confidence in their own stability was demonstrated by Ukrainians working in Germany (17 people agreed or completely agreed), Italy (8 people), and Poland (9 people). These are countries with large Ukrainian communities, where employers already have experience working with Ukrainian employees, which helps reduce discriminatory risks.

At the same time, in the same Italy and Germany, there are also cases of concern: 6 people (in two countries together) disagreed or completely disagreed with the statement indicating the unevenness of working conditions depending on the region, type of activity, or legal status of employees.

Moderately positive or neutral responses prevail in Denmark, Spain and Norway - there the labor law system fully protects employees regardless of their citizenship.

In Portugal, the USA, France and Switzerland, there are isolated responses from respondents who demonstrate neutrality or caution in their assessments, which may be due to the small number of respondents in these countries.

Overall, the data obtained allow us to draw several conclusions:

- The majority of Ukrainians (58.1%) feel protected and do not feel threatened by dismissal due to their origin, which is an important indicator of successful socio-professional integration.
- Almost a quarter of respondents (24.4%) demonstrate uncertainty, indicating the instability of their employment positions or dependence on the employer, typical of short-term contracts or informal employment.
- 17.4% of respondents are actually afraid of being fired because of their immigrant status - this indicates the presence of elements of structural vulnerability, when even legally employed Ukrainians do not always feel equal.

Thus, Ukrainian labor migrants in general demonstrate a high level of confidence in their professional stability, but some of them remain socially unprotected due to factors related to language, legalization or regimes and forms of work.

Distribution of respondents by respect for them at work

28 respondents (32.6%) fully agreed with the statement that they are respected at work, and another 41 people (47.7%) partially agreed with this. Thus, four out of five respondents declare respect for them from colleagues and management. This is an extremely positive indicator, which indicates a very high level of social acceptance of Ukrainians in the labor markets of host countries and that they are not only integrated into the labor process, but are also perceived as its equal participants.

15 respondents (17.4%) took a neutral position, stopping at the answers - "neither agree nor disagree." This may indicate emotional distance or cultural barriers, when these Ukrainian migrants, even working in a favorable environment, do not always have deep social ties with local employees. In such cases, respondents may not feel open disrespect, but they do not perceive the relationship as completely partnership.

Table 51

Distribution of respondents by respect for them at work

Choices of respondents about respect for them at work	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	41	47.7 %
Strongly agree	28	32.6 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	15	17.4 %
Disagree	2	2.3 %

Only 2 people (2.3%) responded that they disagreed with the statement about respect at work (Table 51). Such a small number indicates a low level of conflict and discrimination in the work environment where Ukrainians work, as well as a generally positive image of Ukrainian workers among employers in host countries.

The highest level of positive responses is observed in Germany (21 people agreed or completely agreed), Italy (14 people) and Poland (13 people) - three countries where the largest share of Ukrainian labor migrants is traditionally concentrated. This indicates the successful professional integration of Ukrainians into labor markets, which have long become a familiar environment for them.

In Denmark, Spain, Ireland and the Netherlands, all respondents also mostly reported positive experiences - these countries have clear standards of equal treatment at work and a developed culture of corporate ethics.

Only isolated cases of partial disagreement were recorded in Poland and Norway, which may be related to individual situations, for example, differences in the attitude towards seasonal workers or language difficulties.

In general, several key conclusions can be identified:

- The level of feeling of respect is extremely high (80.3%), which demonstrates not only the tolerance of the societies of the host countries, but also the high reputation of Ukrainian workers as responsible, qualified and disciplined.
- The neutral group of respondents (17.4%) requires additional attention, since it is in this category that individuals who have not yet passed the stage of full social adaptation are most likely concentrated.
- The absence of systemic discrimination is recorded in almost all countries, which confirms the fact that Ukrainians are mainly employed in a legal environment with European standards of social and labor relations.

Respondents' ability to freely express their opinion regarding working conditions and employment at the workplace

27 people (31.4%) fully agreed with the statement that they can freely express their opinion, and another 26 respondents (30.2%) partially agreed with this. Thus, two-thirds of respondents (61.6%) feel a real opportunity to communicate with their employer or immediate supervisor regarding working conditions and employment. This indicates a high quality of work culture in the countries where Ukrainian workers are based, where transparency, dialogue, and employee participation in decision-making are part of corporate norms.

23 respondents (26.7%) took a neutral position (“neither agree nor disagree”), which may indicate a passive position of employees or the presence of formal opportunities to express their opinion without real influence on the situation. This result is typical for large companies or manufacturing enterprises, where communication with management is often carried out through intermediate links, and the feeling of individual weight of an employee’s opinion is limited.

At the same time, 7 people (8.1%) disagreed, and 3 people (3.5%) strongly disagreed with the statement that they can speak openly about working conditions.

Table 52

Distribution of respondents by the possibility of freely expressing their own opinion regarding working conditions and employment at the workplace

Respondents' choices to the question regarding the possibility of freely expressing their own opinion regarding	Number (persons)	Share

working conditions and employment at the workplace		
Strongly agree	27	31.4 %
Agree	26	30.2 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	23	26.7 %
Disagree	7	8.1 %
Strongly disagree	3	3.5 %

Collectively, these 10 respondents (11.6%) actually feel a lack of voice in their work (Table 52). This situation may be a consequence of hierarchical work organization, short-term contracts, or migrants’ fear of losing their jobs — especially among workers with temporary protection or informal employment.

Respondents from Poland (12 agreed or strongly agreed), Germany (12) and Italy (8) are most confident in their ability to express their opinions. These are countries where Ukrainians work in labor “diasporas” and already have established social support networks — including Ukrainian trade union branches or migrant advisory centers.

Positive affirmative responses are also observed in Denmark, Spain, Ireland and Norway: the vast majority of employees confirm open communication with the employer, which is typical of Northern and Western European models of labor relations, where dialogue and collective representation are the norm.

The least confident in their freedom of expression are respondents from Germany (5 people disagreed) and Italy (2 people disagreed) . This indicates a certain segmentation of labor relations, where the conditions of openness depend on the field of professional activity: workers in manual labor or in the service sector more often avoid open criticism, unlike office clerks or highly qualified employees.

Respondents' confidence in the objectivity of the assessment of their work results

24 people (27.9%) fully agreed with the statement that their work is assessed objectively, and another 27 people (31.4%) partially agreed with this. Thus, almost two-thirds of respondents (59.3%) generally believe that the system of evaluating their work is fair, transparent and impartial. This positive result confirms that the majority of Ukrainians are employed in an environment where work ethic is based on merit and performance, rather than on origin or social status.

At the same time, 25 respondents (29.1%) took a neutral position (“neither agree nor disagree”). This indicates a certain distance between the employee and management when evaluation is perceived as a formal process or when performance criteria are not sufficiently transparent. This situation is typical for large enterprises or temporary employment, where individual contribution is more difficult to objectively assess.

A small part of the respondents expressed a critical attitude to this issue: 4 people (4.7%) did not agree, and 6 people (7.0%) did not agree at all with this statement (Table 53). That is, they believe that their work is undervalued or evaluated unfairly.

These are likely individuals who face obstacles in communicating with management, bureaucratic restrictions, or hidden discrimination due to their migrant worker status.

Among the countries of residence of respondents, the highest level of satisfaction with job evaluation is in Germany (15 people agreed or strongly agreed), Italy (8 people), and Poland (11 people). These are countries where Ukrainians are often involved in production or service processes with clearly defined performance indicators, which reduces the risk of subjective evaluation.

Table 53
Distribution of respondents by confidence in the objectivity of the assessment of their work results

Respondents' choices regarding confidence in the objectivity of the assessment of their work results	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	27	31.4 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	25	29.1 %
Strongly agree	24	27.9 %
Strongly disagree	6	7.0 %
Disagree	4	4.7 %

In Denmark, Spain, Ireland and the Netherlands, a positive perception prevails, reflecting the high level of corporate culture and ethical standards in these countries.

At the same time, in Italy and Germany, there are also isolated cases of disagreement (5 people in total), which can be explained by professional and industry differences, for example, in the agricultural sector or in the field of care for the elderly, the assessment conditions are often less formalized .

Summarizing the results of the responses to this question, several conclusions can be drawn:

- The majority of Ukrainian workers abroad believe that their work is assessed fairly, which indicates the effectiveness of the system of objective assessment of work results in European countries.

- The neutral position of almost a third of the respondents indicates the need for a better understanding of the assessment criteria, transparent reward and feedback mechanisms.

- Every tenth working respondent feels unfair or biased at work, which requires individual employers in host countries to strengthen labor guarantees for foreign workers and increase the intercultural competence of managers in companies.

The ability of respondents to devote enough time to their personal life and family

24 people (27.9%) fully agreed with the statement that they can devote enough time to their own life and family, and another 28 people (32.6%) partially agreed with this. Thus, almost two-thirds of respondents (60.5%) are satisfied with the balance between work and personal time, which indicates a sufficient level of employment flexibility in the host countries of Ukrainians.

21 respondents (24.4%) took a neutral position, which may indicate fluctuations between professional stability and fatigue or the instability of the schedule inherent in temporary and/or seasonal work. For some migrants, working abroad is associated with the need for intensive work to provide for their family in Ukraine, which often limits time for personal life.

However, 10 people (11.6%) disagreed with this statement, and another 3 people (3.5%) completely disagreed. That is, 13 respondents (15.1%) believe that work takes up too much time, depriving them of opportunities for rest or communication with loved ones (Table 54). Most often, such answers are given by migrants employed in areas with a high level of physical and/or psycho-emotional stress (employed in construction, logistics, care or service).

In terms of countries of residence, the level of satisfaction with the balance between work and private life is the highest in Germany (16 people agreed or completely agreed), Italy (7 people) and Poland (11 people).

Table 54
Distribution of respondents by ability to devote enough time to their personal life and family

Choices regarding respondents' ability to devote enough time to their personal life and family	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	28	32.6 %
Strongly agree	24	27.9 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	21	24.4 %
Disagree	10	11.6 %
Strongly disagree	3	3.5 %

In these countries, the Ukrainians surveyed often have official employment with a clear schedule, which allows them to plan their personal time.

In Denmark, Spain, and Ireland, the results are also positive — most respondents noted that they have enough time for themselves.

At the same time, in Germany (4 people), Italy (6 people), and Norway (1 person), there were cases when respondents felt a shortage of personal time, which may be due to excessive work intensity or employment aimed at obtaining several sources of income .

Summarizing the above, several key conclusions can be drawn:

- Almost two-thirds of Ukrainian workers abroad feel that they can devote enough time to their personal life, which is a positive sign of professional stability and social adaptation.

- Every fourth respondent remains in a zone of uncertainty — they do not always have a stable schedule or the opportunity to plan vacation, which is a typical phenomenon for labor migration.

- Every seventh respondent feels an imbalance between work and private life, which requires attention from both employers and in the context of developing state programs to support the reintegration of migrants in order to avoid “professional burnout” upon returning to Ukraine.

2.5.4.2. Social Participation and Citizenship Rights
Participation in social life and citizenship rights
Distribution of respondents by the level of feeling of freedom in the local community where they live

23 people (26.7%) fully agreed with the statement that they feel free in the local community, and another 29 people (33.7%) partially agreed with this. Thus, almost two-thirds of respondents (60.4%) have a high level of feeling of freedom and acceptance

in the society where they live. This confirms the fact that Ukrainians have mostly integrated into the social environment of the host countries without facing systemic isolation or prejudice.

21 people (24.4%) took a neutral position — “neither agree nor disagree.” This result may indicate caution in self-assessment of the level of freedom, which is associated with a limited range of social contacts or insufficient knowledge of the language. Some Ukrainians live in cultural “diaspora bubbles,” where communication and social activity take place mainly within the Ukrainian community, which reduces interaction with the local population.

At the same time, 10 respondents (11.6%) disagreed, and 3 people (3.5%) completely disagreed with the statement that they feel free in the community. By doing so, they demonstrate a sense of social limitation or alienation. This may be related to their legal status (temporary protection, uncertain position on the labor market), cultural and/or language barriers, and fear of discrimination (Table 55).

Table 55
Distribution of respondents by the level of feeling of freedom in the local community where they live

Choices of respondents regarding the level of feeling of freedom in the local community where they live	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	29	33.7 %
Strongly agree	23	26.7 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	21	24.4 %
Disagree	10	11.6 %
Strongly disagree	3	3.5 %

Among the host countries, the highest level of feeling of freedom was recorded in Italy (15 people agreed or completely agreed), Germany (13 people) and Poland (7 people). These are countries where Ukrainians have large communities, active cultural activities and numerous organizations supporting migrants.

In Denmark, Spain, Ireland and Norway, the results of the answers to the question are also mostly positive, which indicates that there are inclusive policies and local integration initiatives aimed at involving foreigners in community life.

At the same time, in Germany (4 people), Poland (3 people) and Italy (2 people), there are respondents who disagree with this statement, which may indicate uneven integration processes depending on the region or professional environment .

Respondents' participation in events organized by Ukrainians abroad

17 people (19.8%) fully agreed with the statement that they participate in events organized by other Ukrainians, and another 24 respondents (27.9%) partially agreed with this. That is, almost half of the respondents support participation in the life of Ukrainian communities abroad. This indicates a fairly high level of internal solidarity, the desire for cultural self-preservation and national self-identification.

20 people (23.3%) took a neutral position, which may mean limited participation or passive observation of the activities of Ukrainian associations abroad without active personal involvement. This is often due to time constraints, intensive work, or living in small cities where there are few or no such organizations.

Table 56
Distribution of respondents by participation in events organized by Ukrainians abroad

Respondents' choices regarding their participation in events organized by other Ukrainians abroad	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	24	27.9 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	20	23.3 %
Strongly agree	17	19.8 %
Disagree	16	18.6 %
Strongly disagree	9	10.5 %

At the same time, 16 respondents (18.6%) disagreed, and 9 people (10.5%) strongly disagreed with this statement (Table 56). Thus, almost a third of respondents do not participate in Ukrainian public events. This may be explained by the desire for individual integration into local society, the desire to distance themselves from diaspora life, or simple fatigue after long work.

In geographical terms, the highest level of participation in public events is demonstrated by Ukrainians in Italy (12 people agreed or completely agreed), Germany (10 people), and Poland (9 people). These are countries with the largest Ukrainian communities, where a network of cultural centers, churches, educational initiatives, and volunteer associations is developed.

In Spain, Ireland, and Denmark, the majority of respondents are also involved in similar events, which indicates institutional support for integration processes in these countries.

The lowest level of such participation is observed in Norway, Slovakia and the USA, where the majority of respondents either do not attend such events or do not have access to them .

In general, several important trends can be identified:

- Almost half of Ukrainians abroad actively maintain contacts with diaspora communities, which indicates the preservation of national identity even after a long stay outside Ukraine.
- About a third of respondents are not involved in public activity, which indicates the individualization of their social behavior and orientation towards their own professional integration.
- The high activity of Ukrainians in countries with large communities shows that a developed diaspora infrastructure contributes to social cohesion, psychological support and cultural adaptation.

Respondents' participation in local social and cultural events

15 people (17.4%) fully agreed with the statement that they participate in local events, and another 26 people (30.2%) partially agreed with this. Thus, almost half of the respondents noted active or moderate involvement in the cultural life of the local communities in which they live. This result demonstrates the growing level of social integration, the willingness of Ukrainians to participate in joint events, and the openness of host societies.

21 respondents (24.4%) took a neutral position, which may indicate limited opportunities or limited time resources to participate in such events, especially among those who work overtime or live in smaller settlements.

In contrast, 18 people (20.9%) disagreed with this statement, and 6 (7.0%) disagreed completely. Thus, a quarter of the respondents (27.9%) do not participate in the cultural life of local communities. The main reasons for this may be the language barrier, professional employment, fear of discrimination, or psychological distance (Table 57).

The highest geographical level of participation is observed in Italy (13 people agreed or strongly agreed), Germany (9 people) and Poland (7 people) - countries where Ukrainians make up a significant share of the migrant population and have a developed system of public organizations and cultural centers. At the same time, higher rates of dissatisfaction or lack of participation are also recorded in Germany (12 people), Poland (6 people) and Norway (3 people), which may be a consequence of professional isolation or social isolation due to intensive work. .

Table 57
Distribution of respondents according to their participation in local social and cultural events

Respondents' choices regarding their participation in local social and cultural events	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	26	30.2 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	21	24.4 %
Disagree	18	20.9 %
Strongly agree	15	17.4 %
Strongly disagree	6	7.0 %

Summarizing the results of the study, several conclusions can be drawn.

- Almost half of Ukrainian migrants are actively involved in social and cultural life, which indicates gradual integration into local communities.
- A quarter of respondents are not involved in cultural activities, which may indicate structural barriers or a low level of social capital in individual host countries.
- The presence of positive experience of participation in events indicates that Ukrainians seek not only to preserve their identity, but also to actively interact with local society, forming new social ties and intercultural contacts.

Thus, it can be stated that Ukrainian labor migrants are gradually integrating into the cultural environment of host countries, although the level of their involvement depends on linguistic, economic and social factors. Further support for intercultural programs and public initiatives can become an important factor in deepening their participation in the public life of the countries of arrival.

Respondents' participation in volunteer activities and in the work of charitable or non-profit organizations

18 people (20.9%) fully agreed with the statement that they engage in volunteer activities at least once a month, and another 19 people (22.1%) partially agreed with this. Thus, 37 respondents (43.0%) regularly or periodically participate in volunteer or charitable initiatives. This indicates a fairly high level of civic awareness and social responsibility of Ukrainians, even when living outside their native country.

12 respondents (14.0%) took a neutral position, which may indicate their episodic or indirect participation in volunteer activities, for example, through donations, online assistance, or one-time actions.

Table 58
Distribution of respondents by their participation in volunteer activities and in the work of charitable or non-profit organizations

Respondents' choices regarding their participation in volunteer activities and in the work of charitable or non-profit organizations	Number (persons)	Share
Disagree	21	24.4 %
Agree	19	22.1 %
Strongly agree	18	20.9 %
Strongly disagree	16	18.6 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	12	14.0 %

At the same time, 21 people (24.4%) disagreed, and 16 people (18.6%) completely disagreed with this statement, that is, almost the same proportion as those who actively “volunteer” (Table 58). This demonstrates a clear differentiation of Ukrainian migrants into an active civic and passive individualistic group, for the latter of which the main priority remains professional or material stability.

The highest level of volunteer activity among the host countries is observed in Germany (13 people agreed or completely agreed), Italy (10 people) and Poland (7 people) - countries where numerous Ukrainian initiatives to help fellow citizens, support the Armed Forces of Ukraine and work with refugees operate. It is there that volunteering often becomes a form of social self-identification and a manifestation of solidarity with the Ukrainian community.

In Western European countries with a smaller share of Ukrainian migrants, such as Denmark, Spain, Ireland, and Norway, the positive response rates are also relatively high: about a third of respondents are involved in volunteering. This indicates that Ukrainians are actively involved in local civic initiatives, going beyond the boundaries of national diaspora structures.

At the same time, in countries such as France, Switzerland, the USA, and Romania, isolated cases of volunteering have been recorded. This may be a consequence of the smaller size of the Ukrainian community or the weaker infrastructure of non-governmental associations .

Based on the results, several generalized conclusions can be formulated:

- Almost half of Ukrainian migrants are actively involved in volunteering, which indicates a high level of their social maturity and civic responsibility.
- Almost half of respondents also stay away from these activities, usually due to employment, time constraints, or the lack of organized forms of involvement.
- Volunteering for Ukrainians abroad serves a dual function - it is both a means of self-identification in a new society and a tool for supporting the Motherland.

In general, the results obtained show that volunteering has become an important element of social integration and civic activity of Ukrainians abroad, strengthening not only ties between them, but also a positive image of Ukraine in the eyes of the international community.

The availability of opportunities for respondents to invite family members to move in with them to live together

17 people (19.8%) fully agreed that they have such an opportunity, another 22 people (25.6%) partially agreed. Thus, almost half of the respondents (45.4%) feel a certain stability of their situation and the ability to initiate family reunification. This indicates that they have achieved a sufficient level of legalization and social integration, which allows them to think about family arrangement.

18 respondents (20.9%) took a neutral position, which may indicate uncertainty in their legal status, temporary residence permits or economic instability, due to which the decision on family reunification remains open or is postponed.

At the same time, 16 respondents (18.6%) disagreed with this statement, and 13 (15.1%) strongly disagreed with it (Table 59). That is, a third of respondents do not have the opportunity to invite family members to their place. Most likely, this is due to the temporary nature of their stay, the lack of permanent housing or employment sufficient to support the household.

The highest level of reunification opportunities by country of residence is observed in Germany (14 people agreed or strongly agreed), Italy (7 people) and Poland (8 people). These countries have clear legal mechanisms for the reunification of migrant families and a developed social support infrastructure. Especially Germany, where Ukrainians with temporary protection can legally issue documents for the relocation of close relatives.

In Western European countries — such as Spain, Ireland and Denmark — there is a certain balance between positive and negative responses, which may indicate that this possibility depends on the type of visa or the income level of migrants.

The most difficult situation is observed in France, the USA, the Netherlands and Norway, where a significant part of the respondents indicated the lack of possibility of family reunification. This may be due to stricter requirements for legalization and financial support of family migrants .

Table 59

Distribution of respondents by the possibilities of inviting family members to move in with them for co-living

Respondents' choices regarding the possibilities of inviting family members to move in with them for co-living	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	22	25.6 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	18	20.9 %
Strongly agree	17	19.8 %
Disagree	16	18.6 %
Strongly disagree	13	15.1 %

Summarizing the results of the answers to this question, several conclusions can be drawn:

- Almost half of Ukrainian migrants have a real opportunity to reunite with their family, which indicates a certain stabilization of their socio-economic situation.

- A third of respondents do not have such an opportunity, which reflects inequality in access to social and legal guarantees between EU countries and other regions.

- The presence of family housing abroad is an important marker of integration, which often correlates with long-term employment, sufficient level of material security, language adaptation and legal status of the migrant.

Thus, the answers to this question show that the processes of reunification of Ukrainian families in the host countries occur gradually, but unevenly, and depend not only on the individual efforts of migrants, but also on the state policy of European countries regarding temporary protection and migration integration.

Availability of parental leave for respondents

18 people (20.9%) fully agreed that mothers and fathers-migrants can take parental leave, another 26 people (30.2%) partially agreed with this. Thus, half of the respondents (51.1%) recognize the existence of this opportunity in one form or another. This indicates that in most countries of residence, Ukrainians are faced with legal guarantees of social protection for families with children, in particular, within the framework of temporary protection programs or labor legislation focused on equal rights of labor migrants.

34 respondents (39.5%) took a neutral position, which may indicate insufficient awareness of local legislation, or situations when the respondents themselves did not need such leave. Such a group of uncertainty is typical for people with unstable employment status or those working in the informal sector of the economy.

Only 8 people (9.3%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, which may reflect less systemic violations or restrictions in the area of migrants' social rights, particularly in individual countries with more stringent labor market regulation (Table 60).

Table 60

Distribution of respondents by the availability of parental leave for parents

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Neither agree, nor disagree	34	39.5 %
Agree	26	30.2 %
Strongly agree	18	20.9 %
Disagree	6	7.0 %
Strongly disagree	2	2.3 %

Geographically, the highest level of positive responses was recorded in Germany (11 people agreed or strongly agreed), Italy (10 people) and Poland (9 people). In these countries, there are clear legislative guarantees for parents, regardless of citizenship, if they have official employment. In particular, in Germany, Ukrainians with temporary protection received the right to paid Elternzeit (parental leave), and in Italy and Poland, similar social mechanisms are in place.

In the Scandinavian countries — Denmark and Norway — respondents also demonstrated relatively high awareness and confidence in their rights, which is consistent with the general social policy of these states aimed at gender equality and support for families with children.

In contrast, in countries such as France, the USA, Switzerland, Romania and Portugal, there were isolated positive responses, which is probably explained by the small number of Ukrainian respondents or differences in social insurance systems that do not always apply to foreign citizens .

Summarizing the responses, several conclusions can be drawn:

- Half of Ukrainian migrants acknowledge the possibility of taking parental leave, but the practical use of this right remains limited due to bureaucratic or financial factors.
- A high proportion of neutral responses (over a third) indicates the need for information support for Ukrainian families regarding social rights in the host countries.
- Positive results in Germany, Italy and Poland indicate the effectiveness of the integration policies of these countries, while in other countries Ukrainians still face difficulties in exercising family rights.

Accessibility of respondents' children to early childhood development services (preschool education

17 people (19.8%) strongly agreed and 42 people (48.8%) agreed with the statement that early childhood development and preschool education for immigrant children are sufficient. Thus, more than two-thirds of respondents (68.6%) expressed general satisfaction with access to kindergartens, development centers, and primary education programs for migrant children. This indicates that in most host countries, Ukrainian families have the opportunity to use early childhood education services on an equal basis with local residents.

23 people (26.7%) took a neutral position — they either do not have preschool children or have not directly encountered the issue of access to childcare facilities. This group may also reflect some uncertainty about the quality or cost of educational services, especially in countries where the preschool education system is partially private.

Only four respondents (4.6%) expressed some dissatisfaction with the state of affairs with these services in the host countries (3 — “disagree” and 1 — “strongly disagree”). This indicates that systemic problems with access to preschool education for Ukrainian children in most host countries have not been identified (Table 61).

Table 61

Distribution of respondents by availability of early childhood development (preschool education) services for their children

Respondents' choices regarding availability of early childhood development (preschool education) services for their children	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	42	48.8 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	23	26.7 %
Strongly agree	17	19.8 %
Disagree	3	3.5 %
Strongly disagree	1	1.2 %

In terms of host countries, the highest satisfaction rates were recorded in Germany (17 people agreed or completely agreed), Italy (11 people) and Poland (11 people). These countries have developed state support systems for migrant children, including free or subsidized places in kindergartens, integration programs, and language courses for children and parents. Respondents were particularly positive about the inclusive approach to refugee children from Ukraine, introduced after 2022.

In the countries of Northern Europe — Denmark and Norway — the results are also consistently high, which reflects the traditionally high social policy of these states in the field of preschool education. In the countries of Western Europe (Spain, Ireland, the Netherlands), Ukrainians mostly expressed satisfaction, although some respondents noted the limited number of places in kindergartens or the difficulty of placing children due to language barriers .

At the same time, in countries such as France, Romania, the USA, and Switzerland, the number of responses is minimal, which makes generalization difficult, but indicates a lower involvement of Ukrainians in state educational programs or a small community size.

Summarizing the above, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- More than two-thirds of the surveyed Ukrainians positively assess the availability of preschool education for immigrant children, which confirms the effectiveness of the integration policy of most European countries.
- The key factors of satisfaction are the availability of places in kindergartens, the tolerant attitude of staff, and financial support for families with children.
- Neutral or negative responses indicate the need for better informing Ukrainian families about local preschool education opportunities and simplifying bureaucratic procedures for enrolling their children.

Respondents' assessments of the adequacy of childcare services

15 people (17.4%) completely agreed, and 33 people (38.4%) agreed that childcare services for immigrant children are sufficient. Thus, more than half of the respondents (55.8%) expressed satisfaction with the quality and access to childcare services, which indicates a rather positive perception of the social policy of the host countries regarding the support of migrant families.

At the same time, 31 people (36.0%) took a neutral position, that is, every third Ukrainian could not clearly assess the situation. This may indicate that some of the respondents either do not have preschool children or have not used such services. In addition, this may indicate insufficient awareness of state and municipal support programs that Ukrainian families could use.

Negative assessments (6 people (7%) disagreed and one person (1.2%) completely disagreed) are insignificant, which confirms the absence of systemic barriers to access to childcare among Ukrainian migrant families (Table 62).

Table 62

Respondents' assessments of the adequacy of childcare services

Respondents' assessments choices of the adequacy of childcare services	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	33	38.4 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	31	36.0 %
Strongly agree	15	17.4 %
Disagree	6	7.0 %
Strongly disagree	1	1.2 %

Analysis of responses by country of residence shows that the highest level of satisfaction is observed in Germany (13 people agreed or strongly agreed), Italy (10 people) and Poland (11 people). These countries provide relatively wide access to kindergartens and municipal care centers, and Ukrainian parents have the opportunity to receive support through local social services or state assistance programs.

In the Scandinavian countries (Denmark and Norway), which are traditionally distinguished by high standards in the field of social policy, Ukrainians also mostly assessed the services provided positively, although they pointed to the limited number of places in specialized institutions and difficulties with language adaptation of children.

Neutral and mixed assessments in countries such as Spain, Ireland, the Netherlands and Canada may be due to the difference between public and private forms of care, as well as the high cost of some services for low- and middle-income families.

In contrast, in countries with small Ukrainian communities — such as Switzerland, France, the USA, Romania, Portugal — only a few respondents were surveyed, which does not allow for broad generalizations, but hints at a somewhat lower level of involvement of Ukrainians in the system of local social services.

Overall, the results obtained allow us to formulate the following conclusions:

- The majority of Ukrainian migrants positively assess the level of childcare services, which indicates their integration into the social system of the host countries.
- A high proportion of neutral responses indicates information gaps or a lack of direct experience or need to use such services.
- The most favorable conditions for Ukrainian families are observed in Germany, Italy, and Poland, where the social infrastructure is adapted to support migrants with children.
- The development of information campaigns for Ukrainian parents regarding childcare options could increase their level of awareness and social confidence.

Respondents' access to elder care services

13 people (15.1%) fully agreed that elder care services available to immigrants are sufficient, and 29 people (33.7%) partially agreed. Thus, almost half of the respondents (48.8%) demonstrated a positive attitude towards this aspect of social policy in the host countries.

35 people (40.7%) answered this question neutrally, which may indicate their lack of personal experience using such services, since most migrant workers are abroad without elderly family members or their parents remained in Ukraine. This group of uncertainties may also partly indicate a lack of information about social programs that support the elderly in the host countries.

Only 9 people (10.4%) expressed their dissatisfaction with this issue (7 — “disagree” and 2 — “strongly disagree”). This suggests that there are no large-scale barriers to access to such services, although there are some challenges, especially in countries where social programs have limited coverage for foreigners or require official residency status or other bureaucratic formalities (Table 63)

Table 63

Distribution of respondents by assessment of accessibility to care services for elderly family members

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Neither agree, nor disagree	35	40.7 %
Agree	29	33.7 %

Strongly agree	13	15.1 %
Disagree	7	8.1 %
Strongly disagree	2	2.3 %

Analysis by the host countries shows that the highest level of satisfaction with this issue was found in Germany (13 respondents agreed or strongly agreed), Italy (8 people) and Poland (8 people). These countries have a developed system of public and private care for the elderly, covering both residents and immigrants. In Germany, for example, there is a Pflegeversicherung program (care insurance), available to officially employed foreigners. In Italy, the form of care through private care services (badanti) is traditionally widespread, where Ukrainians themselves work, so they are well familiar with it.

In the countries of Northern Europe, in particular in Denmark and Norway, respondents also mostly expressed satisfaction, which is consistent with the model Scandinavian social system, which provides a wide range of assistance to the elderly regardless of origin.

At the same time, a significant proportion of neutral responses in countries such as Spain, Ireland, the Netherlands, Canada, and the USA may be due to the fact that Ukrainian communities are not yet faced with the issue of elderly care on a large scale, since most labor migrants from Ukraine are people of working age.

In countries such as Romania, Portugal, and Switzerland, the number of responses is insignificant, but isolated positive assessments indicate some accessibility of state or municipal assistance programs for the elderly.

Summarizing the results of the responses to this question, several characteristics can be distinguished:

- Almost half of the respondents are satisfied with elderly care services, which reflects a sufficient level of social inclusion of Ukrainians in the host countries.
- The high level of neutral assessments (over 40.0%) indicates that the issue of elderly care is not yet a priority among Ukrainian labor migrants, but may become relevant in the future.
- The most favorable conditions are recorded in countries with a developed social insurance system (Germany, Italy, Poland), while in less socially oriented states the level of access to such services is lower.
- For the further integration of Ukrainians abroad, it is important to ensure that citizens are informed about the possibilities of supporting elderly relatives, in particular through social services and diaspora communities.

Respondents' protection of their own rights

12 people (13.9%) fully agreed, and 18 people (20.9%) agreed that they actively defend their rights as immigrants. That is, a third of respondents (34.8%) demonstrate an active civic position, which indicates the gradual formation of a legal culture among Ukrainians and an understanding of their own opportunities in the legal field of the host countries.

The largest share of responses falls on the position “neither agree nor disagree” (33 people (38.4%)), which indicates a mostly neutral or undecided position on this issue. This may be a result of a lack of need for legal protection, especially among those who work legally and do not face discrimination, or a lack of awareness about mechanisms to protect immigrants' rights.

Table 64

Distribution of respondents by protection of their own rights

Respondents' choices regarding protection of their own rights	Number (persons)	Share
Neither agree, nor disagree	33	38.4 %
Disagree	18	20.9 %
Agree	18	20.9 %
Strongly agree	12	14.0 %
Strongly disagree	5	5.8 %

However, 18 respondents (20.9%) disagreed with this statement, and another 5 people (5.8%) disagreed completely, which indicates a feeling of powerlessness or distrust of legal institutions, or dependence on employers, which makes it difficult to openly defend one's own rights, or on other life circumstances (Table 64).

Analysis by the host countries shows that Ukrainians are most active in the legal field in Italy (9 people agreed or completely agreed), Germany (7 people) and Poland (4 people). In these countries, there are active Ukrainian communities, migrant associations and trade union structures that provide legal assistance, in particular in matters of employment, housing and legalization of status.

In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway), the level of self-organization of Ukrainians is somewhat lower, but respondents noted the high availability of official channels for appeals in case of violation of rights, which reduces the need for their own active human rights protection activities.

Neutral or passive responses in countries such as Spain, Ireland, the Netherlands, and Canada reflect different integration conditions and low legal activity of labor migrants, who are mainly focused on economic rather than socio-civic aspects of life.

At the same time, in countries with smaller Ukrainian communities — France, the USA, Switzerland, Portugal, and Romania — the level of self-organization of Ukrainians is still low, which also affects weaker legal activity.

Summarizing the results of the responses, the following conclusions can be formulated:

- Only a third of Ukrainians abroad take an active position in protecting their rights, which indicates the formation, but not yet established, of the legal awareness of this group of migrants.

- A high proportion of neutral responses (over a third) demonstrates a lack of information about legal protection mechanisms or limited involvement in civic activities.

- The highest level of legal activity is in countries with strong Ukrainian diasporas (Italy, Germany, Poland), where public associations and cultural centers that promote social integration operate.

- Further development of legal support programs for Ukrainians abroad, in particular through embassies/consulates, diaspora organizations and online consultations, is an important condition for strengthening the civic position of Ukrainian labor migrants.

Distribution of respondents by membership in professional chambers or trade unions

Only 2 people (2.3%) fully agreed, and 7 people (8.1%) agreed with the statement that they are members of a professional chamber or trade union. That is, only every tenth of the respondents has some level of formal participation in professional

associations. This indicator reflects the extremely low involvement of Ukrainians in collective forms of representation of labor interests, even though most of them are legally employed.

16 people (18.6%) took a neutral position on this issue, which can be interpreted as uncertainty or lack of awareness regarding membership in such organizations. Often, employees, especially in large companies, do not realize that they are automatically members of industry unions or have the right to participate in them.

Table 65
Distribution of respondents by membership in professional chambers or trade unions

Choices of respondents regarding their membership in professional chambers or trade unions	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly disagree	36	41.9 %
Disagree	25	29.1 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	16	18.6 %
Agree	7	8.1 %
Strongly agree	2	2.3 %

The largest group of respondents (25 people, 29.1%) disagreed, and another 36 people (41.9%) completely disagreed with the statement that they are members of a professional chamber or trade union (Table 65). Thus, almost three quarters of respondents (71.0%) directly stated that they do not participate in any form of trade union activity, which indicates a very low level of collective self-organization among Ukrainians abroad.

Analysis by host country shows that the most noticeable trade union activity among respondents is observed in Germany (5 people agreed or completely agreed), where there are powerful trade union structures (in particular, Ver.di, IG Metall, IG BAU), to which migrant workers also have access. The German system provides for a high culture of social dialogue, so even a small share of involved Ukrainians reflects better conditions for inclusion in such organizations.

In Italy, where many Ukrainian caregivers and service workers work, union membership is rare (2 out of 19), although most respondents expressed indifference or a negative attitude towards it (over 70% do not participate in union initiatives). This may be due to the fact that informal employment relationships often prevail in the care or domestic work sector, in which union protection is ineffective.

In Poland, despite the large number of Ukrainian workers, the level of union participation is one of the lowest - only 1 person (6.7%) out of 15 respondents admitted such affiliation. This indicates distrust in the institutions of the trade union movement or a lack of incentives for participation among temporary workers.

In Scandinavian countries (in particular, Denmark, Norway), where the trade union culture is traditionally strong, Ukrainians still show moderate involvement, but mostly remain outside such institutions, both due to language barriers and short-term contracts.

In contrast, in countries with small Ukrainian communities — such as France, the USA, Switzerland, Portugal, Romania — membership in professional associations is practically absent .

The results obtained give grounds to draw the following conclusions:

- Ukrainian migrants mostly remain outside institutional mechanisms for collective protection of rights, which limits their influence on working conditions and the level of social security.
- The low level of participation in trade unions (approximately 10.0%) is due to a combination of several factors — short-term employment contracts, lack of information, fear of losing their job, and uncertainty about the benefits of membership.
- Positive examples from Germany, Italy and partly from Scandinavian countries show that, given a developed trade union infrastructure, Ukrainians are potentially ready for greater participation in such associations.
- It is obvious that trade union organizations in host countries should strengthen information and educational initiatives and efforts among Ukrainians abroad in order to increase understanding of the benefits of trade union participation and opportunities for legal protection at the collective level.

Respondents' assessments of discrimination against them as immigrants

26 people (30.2%) completely agreed, and 28 people (32.6%) agreed with the statement that there is no discrimination against them as immigrants. Thus, almost two-thirds of respondents (62.8%) expressed a clearly positive assessment of their own non-discriminatory experience of staying abroad. This suggests that in most cases they do not encounter systemic manifestations of prejudice, and their presence in host societies is generally perceived neutrally or favorably.

At the same time, 19 people (22.1%) took a neutral position (“neither agree nor disagree”), which may indicate episodic or hidden forms of discrimination that are not always easy to identify. This group probably includes those who do not have an explicit negative experience, but are aware of certain social barriers - for example, in access to prestigious jobs, housing or public services.

13 respondents (15.1%) reported feeling discriminated against, 7 people (8.1%) disagreed and 6 people (7.0%) strongly disagreed with this statement. This group of respondents accounts for almost a third of respondents, which indicates the presence of individual cases of biased attitudes, which may be due to temporary protection status, language barriers, cultural differences, or competition in the labor market with both local labor and labor migrants from other countries (Table 66).

Table 66

Respondents' assessments of discrimination against them as immigrants

Respondents' choices regarding assessment of discrimination against them as immigrants	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	28	32.6 %
Strongly agree	26	30.2 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	19	22.1 %
Disagree	7	8.1 %
Strongly disagree	6	7.0 %

Among the host countries, the highest level of positive perception of the surveyed Ukrainians was recorded in Germany (19 respondents agreed or completely agreed), Poland (9 people) and Italy (9 people). In these countries, the Ukrainian communities are the most numerous and socially recognizable, which contributes to the reduction of prejudices due to more frequent contacts

between migrants and the local population. This is especially characteristic of Germany, which is confirmed by the positive assessments combined with the presence of state integration programs and language support.

In Southern Europe (Italy, Spain, Portugal), respondents also mostly noted a friendly attitude at the everyday level, however, some respondents feel a sense of social distance or professional inequality, in particular among women employed in the care sector.

In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway), a mixed picture is observed: although the majority do not face discrimination, some respondents mention formal barriers related to bureaucratic procedures or recognition of qualifications.

Interestingly, even in countries with small Ukrainian communities (USA, Canada, France, Switzerland), respondents' assessments remain positive, which may indicate an individualized, tolerant approach to labor migrants from Ukraine in these societies .

So, summarizing the results of the responses, several key conclusions can be drawn:

- The majority of Ukrainians abroad do not feel discriminated against, which confirms the positive experience of their integration.

- The neutral position of almost a quarter of respondents may indicate the existence of hidden elements of discrimination related to social status or language barrier.

- The most favorable environment for Ukrainian migrants is created in countries with developed integration policies and large Ukrainian communities - primarily in Germany, Poland, and Italy.

- Cases of discrimination against Ukrainian migrants, although few in number, still require the authorities of individual host countries to strengthen legal support and information programs, in particular for persons with temporary status.

Cases of discrimination based on gender

Only one person (1.2%) fully agreed, and 7 people (8.1%) agreed that they experience discrimination based on gender. Thus, every 12th respondent has experience or perception of gender inequality in the host country. This may indicate, among other things, individual cases of biased attitudes or restrictions in access to career opportunities, especially among women employed in the care sector or low-paid services.

In terms of countries, the clearest evidence of gender inequality was recorded in Italy (9 respondents reported discrimination) and Germany (4 respondents). In both countries, Ukrainians are often employed in areas where gender roles are traditionally divided - women in care and domestic services, men in jobs with a predominance of physical/manual or technical labor. This creates conditions for informal stereotypes about “female” or “male” work, which, in turn, can affect the level of pay, career opportunities or work responsibilities.

Thus, the majority of Ukrainian migrants surveyed do not experience discrimination on the basis of gender, a fifth of them remain undecided, which may indicate the existence of indirect or hidden forms of discrimination related to social expectations or cultural norms.

Cases of discrimination on cultural or religious grounds

Only one person (1.2%) completely agreed and 5 people (5.8%) agreed that they experience discrimination on cultural or religious grounds. This indicates that the majority of Ukrainians surveyed do not encounter cultural or religious prejudice, especially in countries where the level of multiculturalism is high or the attitude towards foreigners is tolerant.

By country, the largest number of cases of potential discrimination was noted in Italy (3 respondents agreed or strongly agreed) and Germany (4 respondents). In these countries, Ukrainians often face social segregation on professional and cultural

grounds, especially in the domestic services or care sectors, where workers from Ukraine may be perceived as an “ethnic” work group.

In Poland, where there is a significant number of Ukrainian workers, 9 people categorically denied discrimination, but 4 indicated the partial presence of prejudice. This may be due to the mixed nature of Polish public attitudes - from sincere support to individual manifestations of competition in the labor market.

In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway), as well as in Western Europe (Great Britain, France, the Netherlands), the feeling of discrimination is practically absent. This is explained by the high level of legal culture, the secular nature of society and the acceptance of cultural diversity as the norm.

It is significant that in the USA, Canada and Switzerland discrimination on cultural or religious grounds is not recorded - respondents here completely deny the presence of any prejudices, which confirms the high integration capacity of these countries.

Cases of discrimination based on ethnicity

4 persons (4.7%) fully agreed, and 6 persons (7.0%) agreed that they experience discrimination based on ethnicity.

The largest number of cases of feelings of ethnic discrimination were recorded in Italy (4 respondents agreed or strongly agreed) and Germany (4), which is explained both by the high concentration of Ukrainian workers in certain sectors (care, construction, agriculture) and by the ethnic "marking" of Ukrainians in public consciousness. In these countries, where immigration flows are significant, social tensions sometimes arise related to competition in the labour market or media stereotypes.

In the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway) and Western Europe (Great Britain, France, the Netherlands), respondents mostly do not experience ethnic prejudice, which corresponds to high standards of equality policy and multiculturalism. The situation is similar in Canada and the USA, where all respondents categorically denied any manifestations of ethnic discrimination. In the countries of Central and Eastern Europe (in particular, Poland, Slovakia, Romania), the indicators are heterogeneous: although the majority deny prejudice, a small proportion of respondents admit to episodes of hostility or social distance, which may be due to everyday prejudices or a low level of cultural awareness of the local population.

Cases of discrimination due to belonging to the country of origin

5 people (5.8%) completely agreed and 9 people (10.5%) agreed with the statement that they experience discrimination because of the country of origin. Thus, a total of 14 people (16.3%) reported experiencing discrimination on this basis.

The vast majority — 52 people (60.5%) — deny the existence of this form of discrimination, of which 23 “disagreed” and 29 “strongly disagreed”. This is evidenced by the fact that in most receiving countries Ukraine in general and Ukrainians in particular are not perceived as a socially undesirable or stigmatized group.

Another 20 respondents (23.3%) took a neutral position (“neither agree nor disagree”), which may indicate the presence of implicit, situational or contextual forms of prejudice, for example, due to language, accent, or socio-economic status of migrants from Eastern Europe (Table 67).

In terms of host countries, the most noticeable manifestations of this form of discrimination are observed in:

- Italy - 5 people agreed or completely agreed;
- Germany - 6 people;
- Poland - 2 people.

Table 67

Distribution of respondents by cases of discrimination due to belonging to the country they came from

Respondents' choices regarding cases of discrimination due to belonging to the country they came from	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly disagree	29	33.7 %
Disagree	23	26.7 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	20	23.3 %
Agree	9	10.5 %
Strongly agree	5	5.8 %

These countries have the largest communities of Ukrainian migrant workers, which creates both conditions for social integration and risks of some distancing between locals and newcomers. In the case of Italy and Poland, this may also be due to economic segregation - the concentration of Ukrainians in the care, agriculture or construction sectors, which are traditionally considered “migrant labour”.

In the UK, Spain, France, the Netherlands, as well as in Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway), discrimination based on country of origin is practically not recorded, which is consistent with a policy of high levels of intercultural tolerance and legal protection of foreigners.

In the USA and Canada, where Ukrainian diasporas have a long history, no respondent reported feeling prejudiced, which indicates a high level of acceptance of Ukrainians in a multicultural environment.

In Slovakia and Romania, isolated mentions of this form of discrimination may be due to local socio-economic factors or historical prejudices against new migrants.

Summarizing the results of the responses to the question, several key conclusions can be identified:

- The majority of Ukrainian migrants do not feel discriminated against because of their origin from Ukraine, which indicates a general positive perception of Ukrainians in the host countries, especially after 2022, when their international support has increased incomparably.

- About 16.0% of respondents still experience prejudice, mainly in countries with a large share of Ukrainian workers, primarily those engaged in physical and manual labor, which can form the associativity of the locals as a “secondary” workforce.

- A quarter of respondents remain neutral - this indicates the presence of hidden forms of prejudice that are not overt in nature, but can affect the sense of belonging and equality.

- Countries with developed inclusion policies (Canada, Netherlands, Great Britain) demonstrate the almost complete absence of this form of discrimination, which confirms the effectiveness of social integration of Ukrainian migrants in multicultural societies.

Cases of biased attitude towards respondents due to historical events between countries

4 people (4.7%) completely agreed and 9 people (10.5%) agreed with the statement that they are treated with prejudice due to historical events between Ukraine and the host country.

This indicates that for most Ukrainians, the historical past does not affect their social status or interpersonal communication in the host countries. In terms of countries, the largest number of cases of partial or full agreement with the statement about historical bias was recorded in:

- Germany (9 people) - some respondents may have felt a certain social distance or stereotypes due to the post-Soviet past and complex historical heritage in Eastern Europe;
- Italy (3 respondents) - possible ethno-cultural stereotypes regarding people from Eastern Europe;
- Poland (2 respondents) - where the historical relations between the two peoples are deep, sometimes contradictory, although today they are generally of a partnership nature.

It is particularly telling that even in countries where Ukraine's interstate relations have previously experienced difficult periods (such as in Poland or Germany), the absolute majority of respondents do not believe that the historical past affects the attitude towards them personally. This may indicate the maturity of modern European society, which is mostly focused on the present, rather than on political or historical prejudices.

The presence of a sense of danger among respondents due to a possible negative attitude towards them, as immigrants, by certain individuals

3 people (3.5%) completely agreed and 15 people (17.4%) agreed with the statement that they do not feel safe due to prejudice against immigrants. That is, every fifth respondent experiences varying degrees of social tension or distrust from individual members of local communities in the host countries.

At the same time, almost two-thirds of respondents (55 people, 63.9%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This confirms the fact that in most host countries Ukrainians feel socially protected and accepted, including from individual individuals, even despite the existence of broader European discussions on migration.

13 respondents (15.1%) remained neutral, which can be interpreted as a certain caution in their statements or experience of situational rather than systemic manifestations of prejudice (Table 68).

Table 68

Distribution of respondents regarding feelings of danger due to possible negative attitude towards them, as immigrants, by certain individuals

Respondents' choices regarding feelings of danger due to possible negative attitude towards them, as immigrants, by certain individuals	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly disagree	34	39.5 %
Disagree	21	24.4 %
Agree	15	17.4 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	13	15.1 %
Strongly agree	3	3.5 %

In geographical terms, the greatest concern about the personal safety of migrants and possible aggression from individuals is recorded in the following countries:

- Poland — 7 people (“strongly agree” or “agree”),
- Germany — 5 people,
- Italy — 2 people.

These countries have a high concentration of Ukrainian labor migrants, which naturally increases the number of social contacts with the local population and, accordingly, the likelihood of encountering biased views of individuals. At the same time, institutional mechanisms for supporting migrants are actively operating in these countries, so the mentioned cases are mainly local and non-systemic in nature.

On the other hand, in the countries of Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands) and Western Europe (Great Britain, France), as well as in Canada and the USA, the level of feeling of security among Ukrainians is much higher — respondents mostly disagree with the statement about the threat, which is consistent with the high standards of legal protection, equality and non-discrimination in these societies.

Interestingly, even among those who report being treated with prejudice by individuals, most do not report direct aggression or danger, but rather psychological discomfort, social distance, or prejudiced comments.

Distribution of respondents’ place of residence by territorial concentration of immigrants

17 people (19.8%) completely agreed and 34 people (39.5%) agreed with the statement that there is a high concentration of immigrants in their area. Thus, almost two-thirds of respondents (59.3%) confirmed that they live in communities with a significant presence of representatives of other nationalities.

At the same time, 10 respondents (11.6%) disagreed and 6 people (7.0%) completely disagreed with this statement, i.e. approximately every sixth survey participant lives in relatively homogeneous communities where the share of migrants is low. Another 19 people (22.1%) took a neutral position, possibly due to the mixed social and ethnic composition of the settlements or the difficulty in determining the share of immigrants in the local context (Table 69).

The highest level of concentration of immigrants was noted in Germany (20 people out of 27 — 74.0%), which corresponds to the country’s status as one of the main centers of reception of Ukrainians after 2022. In Italy (10 people out of 19 — 53.0%) and Poland (13 out of 15 — 87.0%), the belief that there are a lot of immigrants in local communities also prevails, which reflects the high migration dynamics, in particular of Ukrainians, in these countries.

In Spain and Denmark, the situation is similar — most respondents indicate a noticeable ethnocultural diversity among the population, which is typical for large cities and coastal regions.

In contrast, in countries with smaller Ukrainian communities—such as Georgia, Romania, Portugal, the United States, Canada, and France—migrants perceive their environment as predominantly local. Here, integration is individual rather than "community" in nature, and the formation of "Ukrainian districts" or "ethnic centers" is virtually absent.

Table 69

Distribution of respondents’ place of residence by territorial concentration of immigrants

Choices of respondents regarding place of residence by	Number (persons)	Share
--	------------------	-------

territorial concentration of immigrants		
Agree	34	39.5 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	19	22.1 %
Strongly agree	17	19.8 %
Disagree	10	11.6 %
Strongly disagree	6	7.0 %

It is important to note that a high concentration of immigrants does not necessarily mean isolation or alienation. In many cases, this creates a favorable environment for adaptation, mutual assistance and the formation of informal support networks. At the same time, excessive ethnic segregation can slow down the process of integration into local communities if newcomers communicate mainly within their diaspora.

Thus, the results of the answers to this question allow us to draw several conclusions:

- About two-thirds of the surveyed Ukrainian migrants live in communities with a high concentration of other immigrants, which is typical, first of all, for large European cities such as Berlin, Milan, Warsaw, Barcelona, etc.
- Countries with long-standing diasporas (Germany, Italy, Poland) demonstrate a high density of migration communities, where Ukrainians form noticeable social clusters.
- Countries with less migration intensity (Georgia, Portugal, Canada) have a more dispersed nature of settlement, which stimulates individual adaptation and contact with local communities.
- In general, it can be argued that the spatial localization of Ukrainians in European countries contributes to the strengthening of social cohesion of the diaspora, but at the same time requires additional mechanisms of cultural exchange to prevent the formation of "parallel" communities.

Overall assessment by respondents of their support in the host countries

These assessment results are purely subjective in nature, reflecting Ukrainians' assessment of the level of support they receive in host countries, in particular from state and regional authorities, as well as from public and volunteer organizations. Analysis of the results obtained allows us to clearly determine the level of satisfaction with assistance, the sources of the most effective support, and vulnerable areas of social interaction between Ukrainian migrants/refugees and host societies.

The overall level of support is moderately high, with a predominance of medium and high scores. In the overall assessment of support, the largest share of respondents (25 people, or 29.1%) rated it 8 out of 10 points, another 15 people (17.4%) — 7 points, 11 people (12.8%) — 10 points, 8 people — 9 points (9.3%). In total, this amounts to 68.6% of respondents who believe that they received significant or sufficient assistance from the host country.

The lowest scores (1–4 points) were given by only 13 people (15.0%), which indicates a limited negative perception of support for Ukrainians abroad (Table 70).

The highest assessment results (9–10 points) are characteristic of respondents from Germany, Italy, Poland, Norway and Spain, countries where, among other things, there are systemic state programs to support Ukrainian refugees. On average, the level of overall support can be estimated at 7.6 out of 10 points, which reflects a very positive balance between the expectations of Ukrainian migrants and the actual conditions of stay in the respective country.

Table 70
Overall level of support as assessed by respondents

Number of points (on a 10-point scale)	Number (persons)	Share
8	25	29.1 %
7	15	17.4 %
10	11	12.8 %
6	11	12.8 %
9	8	9.3 %
1	7	8.1 %
5	3	3.5 %
2	2	2.3 %
3	2	2.3 %
4	2	2.3 %

Support from state authorities is effective but formalized assistance. Respondents' ratings of support from state authorities were distributed similarly to the general trend, but with a slightly lower average level of 7.2 out of 10 points. The highest scores ("8–10") were given by 39 respondents (45.4%), and another 27 (37.2%) gave average scores ("5–7"). This indicates that state assistance is perceived as systemic, but not always individually oriented (Table 3.25).

The countries with the best scores include Germany, Italy, Poland, and Spain, where Ukrainians have access to social insurance, housing, education, and medical care.

However, in some responses (mainly in France, Portugal, the USA) there is a score level of 4–5 points, which indicates the formal nature of the support or the complexity of bureaucratic procedures in these countries, or their subjective perception of reality after moving .

Table 71
Respondents' assessment of support from government authorities in the host countries

Number of points (on a 10-point scale)	Number (persons)	Share
7	17	19.8 %
8	17	19.8 %
10	12	14.0 %
6	10	11.6 %
9	10	11.6 %
1	9	10.5 %
5	5	5.8 %

2	2	2.3 %
3	2	2.3 %
4	2	2.3 %

Support from regional authorities is important, but uneven in terms of involvement.

Support from local or regional authorities is rated slightly lower by respondents, with an average score of 6.8 points.

37 respondents (43.0%) gave a score of “8–10”, but at the same time 16 people (18.6%) noted a low level (1–4 points). This indicates uneven assistance at the local level - in many countries regional administrations have different resources and policies towards migrants (Table 72).

For example, in Germany, Poland, Italy and Spain it was municipal and state authorities that organized social programs, which explains the high scores. At the same time, in countries with a more centralized model (France, Romania, USA) the regional level of support is practically not felt .

Table 72
Respondents' assessment of the level of support from regional authorities

Number of points (on a 10-point scale)	Number (persons)	Share
8	18	20.9 %
7	14	16.3 %
10	13	15.1 %
6	11	12.8 %
1	8	9.3 %
5	8	9.3 %
9	6	7.0 %
2	3	3.5 %
3	3	3.5 %
4	2	2.3 %

Support from public organizations and volunteers is the highest level of trust and effectiveness. Volunteer and community initiatives received the highest average score from respondents - 8.0 out of 10. 40 respondents (46.5%) rated the assistance at 8–10 points, and another 22 people (25.5%) - at 5–7 points.

Thus, almost three quarters of respondents (72.0%) expressed high appreciation for volunteer and community structures.

Table 73
Respondents' assessment of support from public organizations and volunteers

Number of points (on a 10-point scale)	Number (persons)	Share
10	16	18.6 %
8	16	18.6 %

1	13	15.1 %
7	8	9.3 %
9	8	9.3 %
5	7	8.1 %
6	7	8.1 %
4	5	5.8 %
2	3	3.5 %
3	3	3.5 %

This result is indicative: in most countries, civil society has become the first line of assistance to Ukrainians — organizing housing, language courses, social connections, children's activities and integration projects.

Respondents from Poland, Italy, Germany, Spain and Norway — countries with an extensive network of Ukrainian and international humanitarian organizations — had particularly high corresponding assessments .

Key findings on this issue:

- Overall satisfaction with support is very high — most Ukrainians feel real help from the countries that have accepted them.

- Volunteers and public organizations have the highest level of trust, which confirms the key role of civil society in crisis support from host countries.

- State institutions are perceived as stable, but with elements of formalism, especially in large bureaucratic systems.

- The regional level of assistance needs to be strengthened, as it is closest to people's needs, but has different effectiveness in different countries.

- Germany, Italy, Poland and Spain have become examples of the most systematic support, combining state, municipal and volunteer efforts.

Ukrainians highly appreciate the assistance received during their forced stay abroad, especially the interaction with volunteers and public initiatives, which provided humanity, efficiency and support at the level of personal contact. At the same time, the state structures of the host countries act as the main guarantor of stability and social protection, which forms a balanced, albeit heterogeneous system of support for Ukrainian refugees in Europe.

2.5.5. Satisfaction with the decision to migrate and future plans

2.5.5.1. Satisfaction with the decision to migrate, expectations and outcomes

Under what conditions do you plan to return to your homeland?

This is one of the key questions in this sociological study, which provides the most complete picture of the motivation, expectations and conditions under which Ukrainian migrants are ready to return to their homeland. The analysis of the data in Table 4.1 demonstrates a clear hierarchy of factors that determine the decision of our compatriots to return - from security to economic stability and social guarantees.

Security - the main and unconditional condition for return

The absolute majority of respondents “fully agree” and “agree” (48 and 16 people, respectively), that is, 74.4% of those surveyed indicated that they would return only if the war completely stopped, there were no threats, and there was a stable/long-term ceasefire. Only 22 people (25.5%) took a neutral or negative position (Table 74).

Table 74
Distribution of respondents by their motivation for return under conditions of security guarantees

Respondents' choices regarding consent to return under conditions of security	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly agree	48	55.8 %
Agree	16	18.6 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	10	11.6 %
Disagree	7	8.1 %
Strongly disagree	5	5.8 %

Thus, this factor is a key and determining motivational element among all the conditions for return: people are not ready to consider it (return) without security guarantees.

Among the countries of residence of the respondents, the highest level of their agreement was recorded in:

- Germany (21 out of 27),
- Italy (13 out of 19),
- Poland (13 out of 15),
- Spain (3 out of 4 people).

Availability of housing is the second most important motivational condition for returning to the homeland

45 respondents (52.3%) completely agreed and another 17 (19.8%) agreed that it is necessary to have one's own housing to which one can return.

Table 75
Distribution of respondents by their motivation to return, provided that housing is available for residence

Respondents' choices by their motivation to return, provided that housing is available for residence	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly agree	45	52.3 %
Agree	17	19.8 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	12	14.0 %

Disagree	8	9.3 %
Strongly disagree	4	4.7 %

Thus, almost three quarters of respondents testify to the presence of huge losses in their homeland from mass destruction, occupation, theft of property by looters, etc. as a result of the war (Table 75).

This factor is a clear material and psychological “anchor” and marker: people want to return only to where they can feel stability and control over their own lives, gain independence from housing and household problems and circumstances.

The highest motivational indicators are again among the surveyed Ukrainians from Italy, Poland, Germany and Spain, where the majority of respondents expressed “full agreement” .

Availability of work is a determining economic factor

Respondents were asked to determine two groups of conditions related to employment: a) availability (upon return to Ukraine) of work in the previous (before leaving) profession; b) employment in a new profession acquired in the country of residence.

a) 52 respondents (60.5%) indicated a desire to find employment in their previous profession upon returning home (in Ukraine). This option is prevalent among highly qualified individuals who want to return to their usual fields of activity, but need economic incentives and stable employment (Table 76).

Table 76

Distribution of respondents by their motivation to return, provided they are employed upon returning home in their previous profession

Respondent choices by their motivation to return, provided they are employed upon returning home in their previous profession	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly agree	36	41.9 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	17	19.8 %
Agree	16	18.6 %
Strongly disagree	10	11.6 %
Disagree	7	8.1 %

b) Work in a new profession acquired in the host country. 35 respondents or 40.7% agreed with this condition for returning to their homeland (Table 77).

Table 77

Distribution of respondents by their motivation to return, provided they are employed upon returning home in a new profession

Respondents' choices by their motivation to return, provided they are employed in a new profession	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly agree	24	27.9 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	22	25.6 %
Strongly disagree	16	18.6 %
Disagree	13	15.1 %
Agree	11	12.8 %

This indicator is significantly lower than the previous one, but it is very important for the country's economy, as it indicates the emergence of an adaptive group of migrants who are ready to integrate new skills acquired abroad into Ukraine.

Compensation for moving expenses is an important but secondary motivational incentive

Although material incentives are not primary, 31 people (36.0%) fully or partially agreed that compensation for return expenses (moving, settling in, housing) would influence their decision (Table 78).

Table 78

Distribution of respondents by their motivation to return under the condition of compensation for moving expenses

Respondents' choices by their motivation to return under the condition of compensation for moving expenses	Number (persons)	Share
Neither agree, nor disagree	27	31.4 %
Strongly agree	23	26.7 %
Strongly disagree	16	18.6 %
Disagree	12	14.0 %
Agree	8	9.3 %

This factor is more significant for:

- families with children;
- those who have lost their homes;
- planning to return from distant countries (Canada, Ireland, Great Britain, etc.).

At the same time, 30 respondents (34.9%) took a neutral position, which indicates: money is not the main motive, but it facilitates the decision to return.

Dual/multiple citizenship is a debatable but strategic option

The question of the possibility of dual/multiple citizenship received the most mixed support:

- only 34 people (39.6%) fully or partially agreed with it;
- 30 respondents (34.9%) took a neutral position;
- 22 people (25.5%) did not support this innovation at all (Table 79).

Table 79

Respondents' attitudes towards the introduction of multiple citizenship for Ukrainians

Respondents' choices regarding their attitudes towards the introduction of multiple citizenship for Ukrainians	Number (persons)	Share
Neither agree, nor disagree	30	34.9 %
Strongly agree	17	19.8 %
Agree	17	19.8 %
Disagree	12	14.0 %
Strongly disagree	10	11.5 %

This reflects a fairly clear division of Ukrainians' attitudes towards legal duality/plurality: some Ukrainians see it as a guarantee of mobility and protection, while others see it as a potential complication of the return process.

Respondents from Germany, Italy, Poland and Norway, where dual/plural citizenship is a common practice or a legal option, expressed the greatest support for this innovation .

The information presented above gives grounds to draw the following generalized conclusions:

- Security, housing and work are the three pillars without which most Ukrainians are not ready to return.
- Ukraine should focus on economic and reintegration incentives, rather than patriotic motivation.
- Housing reconstruction and employment programs are key instruments of repatriation policy.
- Compensation mechanisms and dual/plural citizenship can become additional motivational tools for active migrants and young families.
- Ukrainians abroad demonstrate a rational and pragmatic approach: they want to return, but only when they have real guarantees of security, stability and opportunities for self-realization.

Thus, the answers to the questions about the conditions for the return of Ukrainian migrants to their homeland clearly outline a realistic roadmap for the conditions for the return of Ukrainian migrants — “Security → Housing → Work → Social guarantees”. It is on this sequence that the state strategy for the reintegration of the population after the end of the war should be built.

2.6. Who in Ukraine should provide you with the greatest support when returning to your homeland?

State authorities — the main expected guarantor of support

The absolute majority of respondents (61 persons, 70.9%) believe that the greatest support should come from the state authorities of Ukraine (Table 80).

The highest level of expectations from Ukraine is observed among respondents from Germany (21 out of 27 people), Italy (12 out of 19) and Poland (10 out of 15) - countries where a significant part of Ukrainians already has experience of interaction with Ukrainian state structures through consular services or programs of assistance to displaced persons .

Table 80
Distribution of respondents' opinions regarding their support from Ukrainian state bodies

Respondents' choices regarding their support from Ukrainian state bodies	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly agree	33	38.4 %
Agree	28	32.6 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	11	12.8 %
Disagree	8	9.3 %
Strongly disagree	6	7.0 %

This result indicates the expectation of a systemic, centralized reintegration policy, which would include compensatory, financial, housing and professional support mechanisms. This is a manifestation of the demand for the state's responsibility in restoring human capital after the war.

Regional authorities are an important but secondary level of assistance

A significantly smaller but still significant part of the respondents (51 people, 59.3%) supported the thesis that local or regional authorities should play a significant role.

At the same time, 35 people (40.7%) expressed neutrality or disagreement, which may indicate a low level of trust in the effectiveness of local governance or concerns about uneven support in different regions of Ukraine (Table 81).

Table 81
Distribution of respondents' opinions regarding their support from regional authorities of Ukraine

Respondents' choice regarding their support from regional authorities	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	27	31.4 %
Strongly agree	24	27.9 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	17	19.8 %
Disagree	11	12.8 %
Strongly disagree	7	8.1 %

Respondents from Germany, Italy, Poland and Norway most often noted that it is regional authorities in European countries that play a key role in the implementation of integration programs, and therefore a similar model in Ukraine would be appropriate .

Public organizations and volunteers - trust, but with caution

Interestingly, the lowest level of agreement (30.2%) was received by the position regarding the leading role of public organizations and volunteers. Only 9 people (10.5%) completely agreed and 17 (19.7%) agreed with this, while 34 respondents (39.5%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement (Table 82).

Table 82

Distribution of respondents' opinions regarding their support from public organizations and volunteers

Choice	Number (persons)	Share
Neither agree, nor disagree	26	30.2 %
Disagree	21	24.4 %
Agree	17	19.8 %
Strongly disagree	13	15.1 %
Strongly agree	9	10.5 %

Despite this, a significant part of the respondents recognize the important supporting role of civil society, especially in matters of humanitarian support, social adaptation, consultations and psychological support.

This trend demonstrates the expectations of the partnership model “state + communities + volunteers”, where the state should be the strategic coordinator, and public structures - implementers of specific measures and projects.

2.6.1.1. Considering return migration and reasons, future plans

Self-sufficiency or lack of expectations of assistance

A small part of the respondents - 27 people (31.4%) - partially or fully agreed with the statement that “no one should provide assistance”, that is, they consider the return to the homeland to be their personal responsibility (Table 83). However, the majority of these answers belong to the categories of “neutral” or “disagree”, which indicates not a refusal of assistance, but rather a desire for independence and distrust of bureaucratic mechanisms and managerial influences.

Table 83

Respondents' orientation towards their own strength and responsibility when making a decision to return to their homeland

Respondents' choices	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly disagree	32	37.2 %
Strongly agree	19	22.1 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	16	18.6 %
Disagree	11	12.8 %
Agree	8	9.3 %

The largest number of such respondents is in Germany (12 people) and Italy (9 people), which can be explained by the higher level of self-employment and economic stability among some Ukrainians in these countries.

Thus, an analysis of the respondents' answers to this question shows their expectation of a comprehensive, multi-level system of support for repatriates, where the central government sets the strategic direction, local government implements specific programs, and public structures provide targeted assistance. Such an approach can become the basis of a sustainable model of reintegration and social justice in post-war Ukraine.

Is it necessary to adopt a separate program in Ukraine that would provide for compensatory, financial and material, social, educational support, and other measures aimed at the rapid adaptation of those returning to their homeland?

43 people (50.0%) completely agreed, and 27 (31.4%) agreed with the statement that a special program to support repatriates is needed in Ukraine. Thus, the overall share of support reaches 81.4%, which is actually a consensus position among Ukrainians abroad.

Table 84

Distribution of respondents regarding their attitude to the need to develop a separate program to support repatriates in Ukraine

Respondent choices regarding their attitude to the need to develop a separate program to support repatriates in Ukraine	Number (persons)	Share
Strongly agree	43	50.0 %
Agree	27	31.4 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	15	17.4 %
Strongly disagree	1	1.2 %

15 respondents (17.4%) took a neutral position, which may reflect their cautious attitude or lack of awareness of the possibilities of implementing such initiatives. Only one person (1.2%) disagreed, and no participant chose the option “strongly disagree”, which emphasizes almost absolute support for the concept of a systematic state return policy (Table 84).

Among the host countries, the highest level of support for the program was recorded in Germany (23 out of 27 people, or 85.2%), Italy (16 out of 19 people, 84.2%) and Poland (12 out of 15 people, 80.0%). These are the countries where the largest number of Ukrainian migrants live, often with a high level of involvement in labor activity and at the same time with a expressed desire to return home, provided that favorable socio-economic conditions are created.

High support for the development of a specialized program is also demonstrated by respondents from Spain, Norway, Slovakia, Ireland, and the Netherlands, which indicates a common understanding of the need for a state reintegration mechanism.

In countries with smaller Ukrainian communities (Canada, the USA, France, Switzerland), opinions are more restrained, but even there, respondents do not deny the need for such a program.

Such results reflect the conscious readiness of a significant part of migrants to return, but on condition that the state provides clear support mechanisms - in particular:

- compensation for property lost as a result of the war;
- preferential conditions for employment, retraining, or starting a business;
- social adaptation of children and families, including access to education and medicine;
- mentoring or advisory programs for integration into communities;
- targeted assistance for individuals from vulnerable regions or groups (IDPs, veterans, women with children, etc.).

In fact, Ukrainians abroad demonstrate expectations for a comprehensive state approach to reintegration, which would not be limited to one-time payments or compensations, but would include a strategy for the socio-economic post-war recovery of the country as a whole and its human capital in particular.

The vast majority of respondents consider the adoption of a special program for the return of migrants to be a necessary and urgent task.

Citizens abroad expect the Ukrainian authorities to take a comprehensive approach that would cover economic, social, psychological and educational components.

The high level of support among Ukrainians in Germany, Italy and Poland emphasizes that the potential for return migration is significant, but its implementation depends, among other things, on state policy.

Should there be a differentiation of Ukrainian citizens returning to their homeland to determine the priority and amount of assistance?

34 people (39.5%) completely agreed, and 41 respondents (47.7%) agreed with the statement about the expediency of categorizing persons returning to their homeland. In total, this amounts to 87.2% of all respondents, which indicates a very high level of support for the concept of targeted assistance.

Only 3 people (3.5%) disagreed with such differentiation (1 - “disagree”, 2 - “strongly disagree”), and another 8 respondents (9.3%) took a neutral position (Table 85). Thus, there was practically no resistance to the idea of a targeted approach to reintegration programs, which indicates that respondents are aware of the realistic needs of post-war reconstruction and adherence to the principles of social justice.

Table 85

Distribution of respondents regarding their attitude towards the differentiation of Ukrainian citizens returning to their homeland

Respondent response options regarding their attitude towards the differentiation of Ukrainian citizens returning to their homeland	Number (persons)	Share
Agree	41	47.7 %
Strongly agree	34	39.5 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	8	9.3 %



Strongly disagree	2	2.3 %
Disagree	1	1.2 %

The highest level of support for differentiated assistance was recorded among respondents from Germany (24 out of 27 people, 88.9%) and Italy (all 19 respondents), reflecting the influence of European social policy models focused on targeting and transparency of resource allocation.

In Poland (13 out of 15 people) and Spain (all respondents), support was also almost unanimous, indicating general trust in the principle of fair differentiation of assistance according to the level of losses and needs.

In Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands), respondents also express support for this approach, although they more often note the need for more transparent mechanisms for assessing the proposed criteria.

A small number of skeptical responses (less than 5.0%) may be related to concerns about the bureaucratization of the process or possible abuses in determining priorities. Some respondents with a neutral position probably do not have a clear idea of the future models of return and social support, or do not plan to return home in the near future.

Thus, the answers received to this question allow us to draw several generalized conclusions:

- The vast majority of Ukrainians abroad (over 85.0%) support a targeted approach to providing assistance to those returning to their homeland.

- Respondents believe that the distribution of state or international support should take into account the degree of loss of housing, income, access to education, and the regional situation.

- The idea of social justice and proportionality of assistance is key for Ukrainian migrants, which indicates a high level of civic maturity and understanding of the complexity of the post-war recovery process.

- In the future, such a position may become the basis for forming a system of reintegration programs that combine an individual approach, transparent criteria for assessing needs, and the social responsibility of the state.

Do you plan to apply in practice the new knowledge, skills, and abilities acquired in the host country?

20 people (23.3%) completely agreed, and another 34 people (39.5%) agreed with the statement that they plan to use the acquired competencies in practical activities. Thus, the total share of those who demonstrate readiness for professional application of new knowledge is almost two-thirds (62.8%), which indicates a high level of desire for self-realization and successful integration into the domestic labor market.

21 respondents (24.4%) took a neutral position (“neither agree nor disagree”), which may be due to uncertainty about professional status, plans to return or change the field of employment.

Table 86

Distribution of respondents regarding their planning, upon possible return to their homeland, to apply in practice new knowledge, skills and abilities obtained in the host country

Respondents' answer options regarding their planning, upon possible return to their homeland, to apply in practice	Number (persons)	Share

new knowledge, skills and abilities obtained in the host country		
Agree	34	39.5 %
Neither agree, nor disagree	21	24.4 %
Strongly agree	20	23.3 %
Strongly disagree	6	7.0 %
Disagree	5	5.8 %

However, 5 people (5.8%) disagreed, and 6 respondents (7.0%) completely disagreed with this statement, i.e. only 12.8% of respondents have no intention of using the knowledge gained abroad in practice (Table 86). This probably applies to people whose work does not require specific qualifications or whose activities are temporary (for example, seasonal employment), or who have already firmly decided to stay abroad under any circumstances.

Among the host countries, the highest level of interest in the practical application of new knowledge, skills and abilities was recorded in Germany (18 people out of 27, or 66.7%), which reflects the structured nature of the labor integration of Ukrainians in the German economy and the understanding of Ukrainian migrants of the importance of their new qualification capital.

In Italy (8 people) and Poland (11 people), positive responses also prevail, indicating the active inclusion of Ukrainians in the professional environment and the appreciation of the professional competencies they have acquired.

In Norway, Spain, the Netherlands and Denmark, there is also a stable trend towards the conscious use of new skills in the future, especially among respondents employed in the service, logistics, IT or healthcare sectors.

At the same time, in some countries (in particular, in France, the USA, Canada and Portugal) the share of neutral or negative responses is higher, which is probably due to the low level of access to formal employment or limited linguistic integration, or the predominance of migrants who have already firmly decided to stay abroad under any circumstances .

These responses allow us to draw several generalized conclusions:

- Almost two-thirds of Ukrainian labor migrants (62.8%) plan to use the knowledge and skills acquired abroad, which indicates the high potential of return migration as a resource for the development of Ukraine's human capital.

- A significant part of those who took a neutral position is in a state of uncertainty about their future - both professional and geographical.

- The high level of positive responses in EU countries indicates the effectiveness of European mechanisms for professional integration, on-the-job training and support for labor migrants.

- The data obtained can be interpreted as an indicator of the formation of a new generation of Ukrainian workers with foreign professional and labor experience, who are capable of becoming a driving force for the modernization of the Ukrainian labor market upon their return.

2.7. Qualitative research results

2.7.1. Overview of demographics

Preconditions for migration related to the war in Ukraine.

Analysis of the respondents' responses demonstrates an extremely wide range of experiences that shaped the decision to migrate. These testimonies reflect not only individual traumatic experiences, but also the collective social reality of the first days and months of a full-scale war. They outline the key motives for leaving, among which the following dominate: direct threat to life, fear for children, destruction of social ties, psychological shock, and violation of basic living conditions.

1.1. Experience of direct danger: explosions, shelling, occupation

For a significant part of the respondents, the impetus for migration was events accompanied by an immediate threat to life. The first minutes and hours of the invasion were described as a state of deep shock:

- «First shelling» – [№ 2](#)
- «Waking up to explosions, life in a bomb shelter» – [№ 9](#)
- «When the city of Kharkiv began to be bombed from the sky...» – [№ 15](#)

In the occupied territories, the traumatic experience was even more intense, as the war was accompanied by the systematic destruction of everyday life and violent control:

- «Occupation, shelling, document checks... a destroyed apartment» – [№ 13](#)
- «Occupation of the city, rage, hopelessness» – [№ 63](#)
- Many responses describe prolonged stays in basements, which became the norm in the first weeks:
- «Nights in the basement to the sounds of explosions and machine guns» – [№ 29](#)

Such evidence indicates that the decision to migrate in many cases is not so much strategic as reflexive and protective in nature.

1.2. Fear for children as the main mobilizing factor

One of the strongest motives for leaving, which runs through dozens of responses, is the need to keep children safe. This factor appears as a constant, regardless of the region of residence:

- «Danger to children» – [№ 6](#)
- «Fear for children, uncertainty» – [№ 10](#)
- «It was very scary for the children, which was actually the main reason for going abroad» – [№ 64](#)

The respondent's answer is particularly telling: [№ 21](#): “My first and only thought was to get the children to safety. The fear was paralyzing...”

Thus, it is children's safety that acts as a central determinant of migration decisions in wartime.

1.3. Psychological shock and a state of disorientation

The psychological dimension of the experienced crisis is clearly visible in the answers, where respondents describe a state of confusion, panic and alienation:

- «The first day and a panic attack in the bomb shelter» – [№ 8](#)
- «Dissociation state» – [№ 32](#)
- "Woke up to endless explosions, panic, the question: What to do?" - [№ 40](#)

Such evidence emphasizes that forced migration was not only a physical reaction to danger, but also a response to the emotional unsuitability of the environment for survival.

1.4. Dangerous evacuation routes and escape in extreme conditions

Numerous respondents describe difficult, sometimes life-threatening, evacuation routes:

- «Departure in the trunk of a car (9 people)» – [№ 17](#)
- «A train that came under fire... And all this with a chinchilla» – [№ 69](#)
- «Difficult road on the way out, explosions...» – [№ 56](#)

Such examples illustrate the absolute lack of evacuation routes prepared by the authorities and the chaotic nature of rescue strategies.

1.5. Humanitarian crises: lack of water, food, communication

A number of responses show elements of humanitarian collapse:

- «Famine in the city of Mariupol due to lack of food and water» – [№ 30](#)
- «No communication, no electricity... rumours that the Russians have entered the city» – [№ 75](#)

These descriptions demonstrate how quickly basic survival conditions disappeared in certain regions.

1.6. Personal Loss and the Breakdown of Social Ties

Tragic events related to the loss of loved ones have in many cases become a turning point:

- «Deaths of family and friends» – [№ 4](#)
- «Death, chaos» – [№ 27](#)
- «Loss of loved ones and acquaintances» – [№ 54](#)

Another part of the respondents emphasizes the loss of home, the impossibility of returning to the destroyed personal space:

- «Feeling of loss of home; inability to see father in occupied territory» – [№ 36](#)
- «The house is destroyed» – [№ 61](#)

1.7. Neutrally distant cases: Moving before war or no impact

For a small group of respondents, war was not a major factor in migration:

- «Migrated before war» – [№ 1](#)
- «Arrived long before the war» – [№ 79](#)
- «Not related to war» – [№ 47](#)

Such cases are important for the correct interpretation of the sample, as they form a more complete picture.

Analytical generalization

Based on the material, several systemic conclusions can be identified:

1. The predominance of a threat to life as a motivation for migration. The respondents' decision is not migration in the classical socio-economic sense; it is a reaction to an existential danger.
2. The dominance of the child safety factor. This aspect stands out as a central argument — it emphasizes the need for special state policies focused on families with children.
3. The huge scale of psychological trauma. Many answers contain elements of post-traumatic experience, which is important for integration and reintegration policies.
4. The structural crisis of state institutions at the beginning of the war. The lack of evacuation routes, lack of resources, communication collapse - all this and much more formed an atmosphere of chaos, which accelerated the departure.
5. The multidimensional nature of losses. It's not just about the loss of homes, but also the destruction of social ties, family structures, and career trajectories.

2.7.2. What are the characteristics of the migration patterns of labour migrants? How do these impact their employment in the destination countries? (RQ1)

Deciding on the country of displacement and difficulties on the way to evacuation

The decision to choose the country of displacement is one of the key stages in the process of forced migration. Unlike classic economic migrations, in a situation of military danger this choice is often spontaneous, fragmented and dependent on existing social ties or logistical circumstances.

Analysis of the respondents' answers allows us to outline the main patterns in the choice of country, identify common barriers and emotionally coloured aspects of displacement.

2.1. Family and friendship ties as the basis for choice

Most often, migrants went to places where there were already relatives or acquaintances who could help in the first stages of adaptation:

- «Having relatives in this country» – [№ 2](#)
- «Relatives lived in this country» – [№ 6](#)
- «My mother has been living in Italy for a long time» – [№ 80](#)
- «My husband's relatives live in Poland, they invited us» – [№ 64](#)
- «Sister in Canada. She helped with housing» – [№ 69](#)

This pattern is reinforced where migrant communities were already established (Italy, Poland, Germany, Lithuania), creating peculiar migration chains.

2.2. Heading “to nowhere”: chaotic choices under the pressure of events

Many respondents emphasized that they did not have the time or opportunity to consciously choose a country as their decisions were made in a state of shock or depended on open borders and available transport:

- «We didn't know which country we were going to» – [№ 7](#)
- «I made the decision emotionally. I didn't choose the country.» – [№ 20](#)
- «I did not choose to emigrate. I was forced to flee to save my life» – [№ 34](#).

In such cases, the security factor became the only guideline, and the movement could occur in several stages, changing the country of residence several times (see [№ 21](#), [№ 57](#)).

2.3. Social and humanitarian initiatives as the key to choice

Some respondents were able to emigrate thanks to support programs:

- «Friends told me about the competition for the position of visiting professors from Ukraine» ([№ 8](#))
- «There was an offer for families with people with disabilities to go to Italy» – [№ 30](#)
- «Sports organizations invited their daughter» – [№ 15](#), [№ 54](#)
- «The religious community helped» – [№ 43](#), [№ 44](#)
- «Partners invited. Offered a job» – [№ 76](#)

These responses demonstrate the important role of institutional support - particularly for individuals who have had no previous contacts in EU countries.

2.4. Practical considerations: language, logistics, legal status

Some migrants focused on countries with simpler legalization procedures, linguistic convenience, or geographical proximity:

- «Ability to communicate in English...» – [№ 23](#)
- «Poland was closer and clearer» – [№ 31](#)
- «The Netherlands is a multinational country, English is the official language» – [№ 68](#)
- «This is a nuclear country in the centre of Europe, there were no conflicts with Ukraine» – [№ 41](#)

The availability of an English-speaking environment, legal benefits for Ukrainians (Poland, Germany, Lithuania), and social assistance systems played an important role in making the decision.

2.5. Barriers along the way: physical, emotional, bureaucratic

Although the move was often spontaneous, respondents recall a number of difficulties:

- «The road was long through customs, a long line of buses» – [№ 9](#)
- «Problems from writing a resume in the basement for not understanding the Italian accent» ([№ 8](#))
- «They rode on an evacuation train, completely packed with people, amid explosions and sirens» ([№ 51](#))
- «Problems with documents, had to change country» ([№ 78](#))
- «Bureaucracy: slow processing of financial benefits» ([№ 38](#))

Such obstacles indicate the lack of a coordinated European mechanism for the movement of Ukrainians in the first weeks of the invasion.

2.6. Multimigration and secondary movements

Some respondents describe multiple waves of migration or changing country of residence depending on the circumstances:

- [№ 21](#)- from Poland to another country due to lack of housing
- [№ 57](#)– first Romania, then Portugal, finally Spain
- [№ 60](#) – Estonia → France → Poland

These cases demonstrate that even after evacuation, the choice of final residence remained open and depended on a combination of residential, economic, and social factors.

Analytical generalization

Based on the respondents' answers, several systemic conclusions can be drawn:

1. The country as a “refuge” - not as a strategy. In most cases, migration was reactive, and the country was chosen not as a long-term place of residence, but as a temporary safe space.
2. Social capital is a major factor. Networks of acquaintances, relatives, religious or professional communities had a decisive influence on the evacuation route and subsequent adaptation.
3. The need for systematic support. The lack of information, psychological support, logistical support at an early stage created chaos, disorientation and excessive load on social networks.

The intention to return to Ukraine: motivations, barriers, conditions

The issue of returning home for Ukrainians who were forced to leave the country due to the war appears as emotionally complex and strategically uncertain. The respondents' answers indicate the polarity of positions - from a confident intention to return at the first opportunity to a categorical "no" with deep skepticism about the future of Ukraine.

3.1. The group with a clear intention to return: "I will return when there is peace"

More than a third of respondents express a clear and emotionally rich intention to return, with the condition of ending the war:

- "Yes. I want to live at home in my country. The end of the war» – [№ 43](#)
- «I plan to. My husband and elderly mother stayed home» – [№ 31](#)
- «I plan to return after completing my education, the main condition is peaceful skies.» – [№ 82](#)
- «Return is possible if the safety of the civilian population is ensured in Ukraine» – [№ 1](#)

The factor of emotional attachment to the Motherland stands out especially clearly:

“I am sure that sooner or later we will return. I have a strong emotional attachment to the Motherland» – [№ 75](#)

3.2. Conditional or deferred return: “Maybe someday”

A significant portion of respondents admit that they do not reject return, but under certain circumstances or in the long term:

- “I plan to return, but not soon. Even if the war ends, I will still stay» – [№ 19](#)
- «Maybe, 50/50. Depends on the security situation» – [№ 65](#)
- «I don't plan to now, maybe for retirement.» – [№ 77](#)

Practical considerations are important in these answers: age of children, availability of work abroad, loss of housing in Ukraine, new social environment.

3.3. A decisive “No”: integration abroad and disappointment in Ukraine

Another part of the respondents declares a clear refusal to return, citing socio-economic, political and personal factors:

- “I don't plan to. Because there is no future there anymore because of the war» - [№ 7](#)
- “I don't plan to. Security and guarantees that war will not start again» - [№ 22](#)
- «Been abroad for a very long time... Ukraine in a combat zone» - [№ 29](#)
- “I don't plan to. A decent wage is more important» - [№ 83](#)

Some responses indicate deep disappointment in Ukraine's institutions:

- «I don't see a future in Ukraine with this level of corruption...» - [№ 25](#)
- «A lot of conditions. Judicial reform, mentality, freedom of speech» - [№ 34](#)

3.4. Socio-emotional paradoxes: integration vs. feeling of "alienation"

The low number of responses indicates an internal conflict between successful integration abroad and a sense of emotional belonging to Ukraine:

- «I am adapting, learning the language, building a life. But in Ukraine I am already a bit of a stranger, and here I am not yet my own.» - [№ 21](#)
- «I would like to come back. But there was nothing left there, no work, no housing» - [№ 24](#)

This indicates the formation of a transcultural identity, when return is no longer an automatic scenario.

3.5. Key conditions for return: security, economy, housing

Among the main conditions for return, respondents most often mention:

- End of the war - in almost every second answer (e.g. [№ 5](#), [№ 42](#), [№ 66](#))
- Availability of work/income - [№ 2](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 48](#)
- Safety for children - [№ 48](#), [№ 58](#)
- Housing - [№ 6](#), [№ 13](#), [№ 73](#)
- Rebuilding the economy and institutions - [№ 12](#), [№ 34](#), [№ 70](#)
- In answers [№ 13](#), [№ 57](#), [№ 69](#) the emphasis shifts to the long-term perspective of restoring statehood and guarantees of non-recurrence of war.

Analytical generalization

Based on the analysis of the responses, several conclusions can be drawn:

1. Return is not only an act of patriotism, but also a social choice. Respondents clearly articulate that return requires not only a desire, but a system of guarantees that provide basic needs: housing, security, work, a future for children.
2. The threat of losing demographic potential. Many migrants, especially those who have integrated, no longer consider Ukraine as their main country of residence. This creates the risk of a long-term loss of the working-age population.
3. The war is the decisive factor - but not the only one. After the end of hostilities, dozens of other factors will influence the decision to return: stability, opportunities, the state's readiness to re-integrate citizens.

2.7.3. What are the characteristics of skill formation and employment of labour migrants? (RQ2)

2.7.3.1. Education, skill development, and skill recognition

Education and professional skills of respondents: level, areas, ways of acquiring

The educational profile of the study participants represents a high level of academic and professional capital of Ukrainian citizens who were forced to leave the country after the war. This fact is of key importance for analyzing the potential for reintegration, shaping labor mobility policies, and adaptation in new countries.

4.1. Educational level: domination of higher education

The absolute majority of respondents have higher education (educational levels of bachelor, master or specialist:

- «Master's in Applied Mechanics» - [№ 1](#)
- «Higher technical education» - [№ 10](#)
- «I have two higher educations - pedagogical and personnel management.» - [№62](#)
- «Three higher educations: technical, economic, tourism» - [№ 41](#)

Some respondents have scientific degrees - candidate or doctor of sciences:

- «Candidate of Technical Sciences, 17 years of experience» - [№ 29](#)
- «Doctor of Technical Sciences, Professor» - [№ 13](#)
- «Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor» - [№ 14](#)

Only a small share of respondents have secondary or incomplete secondary education ([№ 2](#), [№ 82](#)), which indicates a high educational qualification of the sample.

4.2. Sectoral structure of education: from technical sciences to art

The following areas are most represented:

- Technical and engineering specialties - [№ 1](#), [№ 6](#), [№ 13](#), [№ 48](#)
- Pedagogy and Humanities - [№ 31](#), [№ 42](#), [№ 60](#), [№ 74](#)
- Economics, finance, management - [№ 22](#), [№ 69](#), [№ 71](#)
- Healthcare and social services - [№ 15](#), [№ 64](#), [№ 76](#)
- IT and programming - [№ 16](#), [№ 32](#)
- Creative industries and arts - [№ 36](#), [№ 78](#)

This spectrum demonstrates the high diversity of respondents' education and indicates the presence of prospects for integration into various segments of the economy both in Ukraine and abroad.

4.3. Ways of acquiring professional competencies

In addition to formal education, respondents mention numerous forms of non-formal and informal learning:

- Courses and professional training - [№ 22](#) (project management courses), [№ 36](#) (Kyiv School of Photography), [№ 38](#) (courses for sales managers)
- Self-education and online courses - [№ 30](#), [№ 23](#)
- Practical training on the job- [№ 49](#) (reorientation to cosmetology), [№ 18](#) (artistic skills after vocational school)
- Advanced training and retraining - [№ 55](#), [№ 68](#), [№ 57](#)

Such answers indicate a highly dynamic professional trajectory: many respondents changed their major, retrained, or learned new professions in adulthood.

4.4. Advantages and barriers in educational experience

Advantages:

- Systematic academic training ([№ 11](#), [№ 14](#))
- Interdisciplinarity - respondents with multiple educations ([№ 34](#), [№ 41](#), [№ 57](#))
- High adaptability - retraining, change of profession, freelancing ([№ 30](#), [№ 36](#))

Barriers:

- Low quality of training in some specialties ([№ 76](#) - criticism of medical teachers)
- Unequal access to quality courses
- Lack of state support for self-development

Analytical conclusions

1. Respondents have high educational and professional potential, which creates significant opportunities for employment both in Ukraine and abroad.
2. Flexibility and the ability to retrain are key features of Ukrainian specialists that should be taken into account in migrant policies.
3. The need to support informal learning should be integrated into state programs: education vouchers, grants, access to courses - especially for women, people with children and people with disabilities.
4. Educational policy in Ukraine should review models of specialist training, taking into account the new reality of mass migration, the requirements of the global labor market and the need to protect the country's educational capital.

Recognition of Ukrainian education abroad: Experience, barriers and consequences

One of the key aspects of the integration of Ukrainian citizens into host societies is the recognition of their education obtained in Ukraine. Based on the responses of 84 respondents, a complex and heterogeneous picture of this process is outlined, which varies depending on the host country, field of education, level of language competence and policies of the host country.

5.1. Partial and/or full recognition of education

Less than a third of respondents (approximately 25 out of 84) reported full or partial recognition of their education. In some cases, recognition took place automatically:

- “Yes, the diploma was recognized by the Central Office for Foreign Education in Germany without further questions” - [№ 1](#)
- "Yes, the level of education was recognized. They even recognized the profession with a specialist diploma" - [№ 12](#)
- «It was recognized, there were no problems» - [№ 55](#)

However, in most cases this only concerned basic education (bachelor's or certificate), and academic degrees and teaching professions were often not recognized or required complicated procedures:

- "I did not confirm my master's degree because such positions require knowledge of the language" - [№ 61](#)
- "Confirmation required. Profession inaccessible to migrants due to bureaucracy" - [№ 30](#)

5.2. Barriers to the recognition process

Respondents most often pointed to the following main difficulties:

1. Language requirements

Most respondents indicate that insufficient language skills (mainly German, Italian, French) are becoming a key barrier:

- "I won't be able to apply for a job in my specialty because I don't know the language" - [№ 48](#)
- «My diploma is not valid... 4 years of study and language skills are required» - [№ 20](#)

2. Bureaucratic obstacles

Includes translation of diplomas, apostille, retraining:

- "Recognition of a diploma requires significant financial costs and about a year of time" - [№ 30](#)
- "I had to get confirmation from the university, then apply to a special institution. It takes a lot of time and money" - [№ 69](#)

3. Non-recognition or limited recognition of specialties

Some specialties do not have a direct correspondence in the education system of the host country or require certification:

- "There is no equivalent profession in the host country" - [№ 83](#)
- «My education is not recognized, so I work in a low-skilled job.» - [№ 6](#)

5.3. Alternatives to formal recognition

Many respondents did not undergo the recognition procedure because:

- or they did not need to work in their specialty ([№ 35](#), [№ 77](#)),
- or changed their field of activity ([№ 36](#) - photography, [№ 30](#) - graphic design),
- or focused on practical skills, not diplomas ([№ 21](#), [№ 29](#)).

This indicates the adaptability of Ukrainian specialists, who are able to retrain, change professional trajectories and compete in the labor market without formal recognition of diplomas.

5.4. Analytical conclusions

1. The system of recognition of Ukrainian education in Europe is fragmented, often opaque and overly bureaucratic.
2. The language barrier is the main challenge for educational and professional integration. It is necessary to develop a national program to support academic mobility of Ukrainians, in particular:

- vouchers for language learning,
- support for retraining,
- partnership with foreign universities.

3. Ukraine, with the assistance of international institutions, should initiate the creation of a Single Portal for Recognition of Education and Certification for Ukrainians Abroad.

Educational and Professional Trajectories after Relocation: Continuation of Studies or Forced Break

Education is a key factor in social mobility and integration into a new society. Despite this, the analysis of the respondents' answers demonstrates that the majority of Ukrainians abroad were unable or did not take advantage of the opportunity to continue their education or undergo professional training after forced displacement.

6.1. Statistics and general trends

Out of 84 respondents, only approximately 10 respondents reported receiving formal education or professional training in their host countries. In most cases, these were language courses or short-term certification programs that do not guarantee full-fledged professional integration:

- "I only had the opportunity to complete language courses" - [№ 6](#)
- «I just finished German language courses to level B2 (passed the exam successfully)» - [№ 38](#)
- «Oxford Financial Business English Language Improvement Course» - [№ 68](#)

6.2. Formal higher education and professional training

A few examples demonstrate successful completion of higher education or professional programs:

- "Received a master's degree in Engineering Logistics at Otto von Guericke University" - [№ 1](#)
- «Started to receive a Ph.D. degree for the second time under the national program» - [№ 8](#)
- «Full-time form of study, sometimes online lectures (university)» - [№ 25](#)

Some respondents had completed specialized regional programs or professional courses adapted to the social demand in the host country:

- "OSS course (something like junior nurse in Ukraine)" - [№ 4](#)
- «Autonomy and Communication Operator for a Disabled Child, Regional Level Certificate» - [№ 30](#)

6.3. Reasons for low levels of engagement in education

The lack of continuing education or professional development is explained by:

1. Financial constraints

- "The course costs 900 euros... I don't have the finances to go through this procedure" - [№ 30](#)

2. Language barriers

- "Couldn't get advanced training courses - job center refused" - [№ 16](#)
- «I don't know much Danish» - [№ 26](#)

3. Focus on survival and work

- "Work came first" - [№ 14](#)
- «Didn't get it because I didn't have time» - [№ 31](#)

4. Distrust or lack of need

- "No, I already have an education" - [№ 22](#)
- «Training is not relevant at the moment» - [№ 60](#)

6.4. Analytical conclusions

1. Only 1 in 10 displaced Ukrainians engage in formal education or vocational training abroad. The rest are focused on domestic and work challenges.

2. Language and financial barriers, as well as the lack of personalized educational pathways for adults, significantly limit integration opportunities.

3. Host countries mostly offer language courses as the only available form of education, leaving aside professional retraining or academic development.

6.5. Recommendations.

- Implement adapted short-term training programs taking into account the professional experience and age characteristics of migrants.
- Create cross-border advanced training programs together with Ukrainian higher education institutions to avoid problems with education recognition.
- Introduce educational vouchers to cover the cost of courses, including language, professional and certification courses.

2.7.3.2. *Occupation in origin country and in destination country*

Employment before migration: structure, professional groups, challenges

Analysis of respondents' responses indicates a wide professional palette among Ukrainians who left the country after the start of a full-scale war. Prior to the start of forced migration, most survey participants were involved in active professional life, which reflects the high level of education, work capacity and social integration of the population of Ukraine.

1. Academic and educational sphere

A powerful group of representatives of higher education stands out - teachers, associate professors, professors of technical and pedagogical specialties ([№ 6](#), [№8](#), [№ 10](#), [№ 12](#), [№13](#), [№ 41](#), [№66](#)). Some of them performed administrative functions at universities. This indicates the presence of highly qualified personnel, significant for the education system both in Ukraine and potentially in the host countries.

2. Healthcare

Respondents include doctors, nurses, psychologists, including specialists in oncopsychology and pathological anatomy ([№15](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 54](#), [№ 57](#), [№64](#), [№ 76](#)). Some of them noted difficulties with recognizing their professional status abroad, despite the critical social significance of their specialties.

3. IT and technical specialties

A certain proportion of respondents represent modern and in-demand areas - programmers, engineers, designers, digital design specialists ([№ 16](#), [№ 23](#), [№ 26](#), [№29](#), [№ 30](#)). Such professions have high potential for adaptation in new conditions, especially in remote employment or freelancing.

4. Educators, teachers, caregivers.

A large group of respondents worked in secondary schools as teachers (including foreign languages, history, Ukrainian), educators, deputy directors ([№ 31](#), [№40](#), [№ 55](#), [№ 60](#), [№ 61](#), [№62](#), [№72](#), [№ 74](#)). For them, moving often meant a loss of professional fulfillment due to language or regulatory barriers in the education systems of host countries.

5. Small business leaders, entrepreneurs and managers

Some of the respondents were engaged in their own business ([№3](#), [№28](#), [№ 38](#), [№ 79](#)), worked in management positions in the private sector, construction, financial or tourism companies ([№ 21](#), [№ 34](#), [№37](#), [№ 71](#)). Their experience often transformed into flexible adaptation skills in new economic conditions.

6. Working professions and service

Among the answers there are representatives of traditional professions - drivers, electricians, salespeople, masseurs, cooks ([№ 44](#), [№45](#), [№46](#), [№50](#), [№84](#)). In many cases, it is these workers who face a lack of formal recognition of qualifications or limited access to formal employment abroad.

7. Individuals who had no work experience

Some of the respondents indicated that they had no formal employment prior to migration ([№1](#), [№2](#), [№ 25](#), [№ 32](#), [№81](#), [№ 82](#)). These include, in particular, young people who were students or housewives, cared for children, or were minors.

Conclusions

The large-scale war interrupted the stable professional trajectories of thousands of Ukrainians. The survey demonstrates that a significant part of migrants had stable employment, a high level of qualification and social integration in Ukraine. At the same time, in the countries of temporary residence, many of them face difficulties in verifying diplomas, language barriers and bureaucratic restrictions. This highlights the need to create adaptive programs to support highly qualified migrants.

Employment of Ukrainian citizens in countries of displacement: professional adaptation, challenges and prospects

The analysis of the responses gives grounds to assert a profound transformation of the employment of Ukrainian migrants who were forced to integrate into new labor markets after the start of the full-scale invasion. The majority of respondents (over 75.0%) were involved in some type of work activity at the time of the survey, both formal and informal.

The main areas of employment are dominated by:

- service sector (hotel business, cleaning, care for the elderly or children) - more than 30 respondents;
- education sector - at least 10 people remain active as teachers, psychologists or assistants;
- technical and engineering professions, particularly in IT or industry - 5–7 responses (e.g., [№ 1](#), [№ 8](#), [№13](#), [№29](#), [№ 69](#));
- entrepreneurial activity, including freelancing, crafts, photography, sales - at least 6 answers (e.g., [№ 24](#), [№ 36](#), [№ 38](#), [№ 57](#)).

The most characteristic challenges that respondents see are:

- the mismatch between employment and their professional qualifications ([№ 10](#), [№ 12](#), [№ 20](#), [№ 30](#));
- low pay and lack of career growth ([№ 6](#), [№ 20](#), [№ 80](#));
- the need for a high level of knowledge of the language of the host country as a critical condition for employment in the specialty ([№ 30](#), [№37](#), [№ 64](#)).

At the same time, some respondents recorded positive dynamics related to professional growth, retraining, or expansion of potential ([№13](#), [№ 21](#), [№28](#), [№ 69](#)). It is worth noting that some respondents achieved an even higher level of professional fulfillment than before emigration - in particular, this applies to analysts, IT specialists, and managers.

Symptomatic are the responses of respondents who emphasize the need for adaptation programs, in particular, language and professional adaptation programs ([№ 12](#)), as well as discriminatory practices, in particular age barriers or bureaucratic restrictions ([№ 30](#)).

Thus, the obtained interview data indicate that:

- Ukrainians demonstrate high labor mobility and flexibility;
- Barriers to employment by profession are systemic and require a targeted integration policy;
- Support from host countries is crucial for the sustainable inclusion of Ukrainians in new labor markets.

Based on these findings, it is appropriate to formulate recommendations for:

1. Expanding state and interstate programs for the recognition of qualifications;
2. Supporting retraining and language training;
3. Creating conditions for social dialogue and non-discriminatory access to labor.

The experience of Ukrainian refugees in finding work: Barriers, resources, and effective strategies

The responses indicate a complex and heterogeneous picture of the integration of Ukrainian migrants into the labor markets of host countries. Despite the significant professional and educational potential of the majority of respondents (see paragraphs 1, [№13](#), [№29](#), [№69](#)), Finding a job was often accompanied by difficulties and sometimes months of uncertainty.

Search Timeframe:

- Quick employment (up to 1 month) recorded in 30+ respondents (e.g., [№ 1](#), [№ 2](#), [№ 14](#), [№28](#), [№ 42](#), [№ 63](#), [№ 65](#)), which indicates the effectiveness of personal contacts and their demand for simpler professions.
- The average period (1–3 months) is typical for a significant number of responses (e.g., [№ 21](#), [№ 32](#), [№ 60](#), [№ 75](#)).
- Long-term search (4–12 months) or multi-year uncertainty is indicated in more than 20 responses (e.g., [№ 6](#), [№ 10](#), [№15](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 56](#)), which indicates barriers of both a subjective and systemic nature.

Main job search channels:

- Internet and specialized platforms - the most common channel (over 50 responses, e.g. [№ 1](#), [№ 9](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 63](#), [№ 74](#));
- Dating and social networks are an effective but unevenly accessible tool ([№ 2](#), [№ 4](#), [№ 7](#), [№50](#), [№66](#), [№84](#));
- State employment centers - with mixed reviews: someone got help ([№ 41](#), [№62](#)), others - faced with formality or low efficiency ([№ 1](#), [№ 16](#), [№ 30](#));
- Private agencies or direct employers - less common, but mentioned ([№ 38](#), [№81](#)).

Search Barriers:

- Language barrier appears as the most common problem (over 40 mentions, e.g., [№ 9](#), [№ 10](#), [№ 16](#), [№ 43](#), [№ 67](#));
- Requirement of additional qualifications or experience - e.g. [№ 30](#) (lack of a car, language level, additional experience);
- Formal attitude towards Ukrainian diplomas and experience - underestimation or ignoring of qualifications ([№29](#), [№ 56](#));
- Social and psychological barriers - including insecurity, isolation, depression (indirectly mentioned in [№ 24](#), [№ 43](#), [№ 57](#)).

Interestingly, some respondents did not actively search, getting a job "through the environment" or as a result of internal rotation ([№ 34](#), [№ 38](#), [№ 76](#)), or had a job outside the country of residence ([№ 23](#), [№ 57](#)).

Conclusions

1. The professional integration of Ukrainian migrants takes place in a context of unequal opportunities, where language skills, social capital, and familiarity with local institutions are crucial.
2. The passivity of some state structures in providing effective assistance forces reliance on private connections.

It is recommended to expand state and public initiatives aimed at:

- intensive language training;
- mentoring programs for employment;
- expanding the work of state employment centers with a focus on foreigners.

The relevance of education and vocational training to the labor market requirements in host countries: assessments of Ukrainian refugees from the war

A survey of Ukrainian migrants shows that in most cases the available education is sufficient to perform the current job in the host countries. At the same time, the relevance of education does not always mean the realization of professional potential, as it often concerns low-skilled types of employment that do not require specialized knowledge ([№ 6](#), [№ 10](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 48](#), [№ 58](#), [№ 80](#)).

General trends:

— The vast majority of respondents (over 60 responses) indicate that their education is fully or even more than sufficient to perform their current duties (e.g., [№ 1](#), [№ 2](#), [№ 6](#), [№ 12](#), [№ 21](#), [№ 32](#), [№ 41](#), [№ 51](#), [№ 57](#), [№ 72](#)).

— A significant part admits that they work outside their specialty, so their education is not relevant to their current activities. ([№ 10](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 26](#), [№ 59](#), [№ 80](#), [№ 83](#)).

Key barriers to the implementation of the specialty:

— Language barrier is the most common reason for not working in the specialty ([№ 8](#), [№ 16](#), [№ 22](#), [№ 28](#), [№ 37](#), [№ 54](#), [№ 67](#)). In most cases, this limits the ability to obtain appropriate employment or professional certification.

— The need for recognition of the diploma ([№ 30](#), [№ 70](#)) and the presence of local qualification requirements (e.g., experience, car, certificates).

— The cost of additional education or retraining is also mentioned as a serious barrier ([№ 24](#), [№ 69](#), [№ 30](#)).

Attitude towards self-education and development:

— Several respondents actively point out the need for continuous learning, even with existing education ([№ 1](#), [№ 14](#), [№ 29](#), [№ 36](#), [№ 57](#)).

— Others are considering additional education, especially in cases of changing professional direction ([№ 13](#), [№ 64](#), [№ 69](#)).

Conclusions

1. Despite their education, many Ukrainians are forced to work in positions that do not require professional knowledge, which indicates untapped potential.

2. Systemic barriers (language, documents, cost of education) do not allow for the full realization of professional qualifications.

3. Expanding language support programs, professional certification, and adaptive training could contribute to better integration of highly qualified migrants into local labor markets.

Barriers to the use of professional skills of Ukrainian migrants in the labor market of host countries

Analysis of respondents' responses shows that the key factor limiting the effective use of their own skills in a new workplace is the language barrier. This factor is mentioned in the absolute majority of relevant responses ([№ 4](#), [№ 6](#), [№ 8](#), [№ 9](#), [№ 10](#), [№ 11](#), [№ 13](#), [№ 14](#), [№ 15](#), [№ 17](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 21](#), [№ 22](#), [№ 26](#), [№ 29](#), [№ 32](#), [№ 34](#), [№ 36](#), [№ 40](#), [№ 43](#), [№ 44](#), [№ 45](#), [№ 54](#), [№ 60](#), [№ 64](#), [№ 66](#), [№ 67](#), [№ 68](#), [№ 69](#), [№ 71](#), [№ 74](#), [№ 75](#), [№ 76](#), [№ 78](#), [№ 79](#), [№ 83](#)).

Key barriers:

Language competence – most often, respondents indicate insufficient knowledge of the host country's language as the main obstacle to professional development or even to performing basic duties (e.g. [№ 19](#): «When you don't understand what they want from you...», [№ 64](#): "knowledge of Polish is insufficient to move to a higher position").

Differences in professional culture – several participants mention the difficulties associated with a different work organization, different business ethics, and new requirements for the profession ([№ 29](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 69](#)). For example, respondent [№ 29](#) notes that "the level of work requires a higher level of knowledge, every day," which indicates adaptive pressure from the new professional environment.

Psychological barriers and integration challenges – some participants note not only technical but also psychological difficulties, in particular – lack of experience in international work ([№ 8](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 36](#)). The difficulty of entering a new environment is pointed out, especially without the support of colleagues or mentoring.

Problems with recognition or transfer of skills – some responses highlight that skills acquired in Ukraine are not always directly transferable to a new workplace, especially when it comes to specific professions or new digital platforms ([№ 30](#), [№ 68](#), [№ 69](#)).

Absence of problems – a positive trend is that a significant part of respondents did not face a skills shortage (over 30 responses, in particular [№ 1](#), [№ 3](#), [№ 5](#), [№ 7](#), [№ 12](#), [№ 23](#), [№ 28](#), [№ 31](#), [№ 33](#), [№ 38](#), [№ 41](#), [№ 42](#), [№ 47](#), [№ 48](#), [№ 49](#), [№ 56](#), [№ 58](#), [№ 63](#), [№ 80](#), [№ 84](#)). This may indicate both the correspondence of the acquired skills to the tasks performed, and employment in positions that do not require in-depth professional knowledge.

Conclusions

1. The language barrier is a major challenge to integration in a new workplace. Overcoming it is critical for the implementation of migrants' professional skills.
2. Cultural, structural and institutional differences also create additional difficulties.
3. Mentoring, language training and professional adaptation programs should be supported, in particular with a focus on understanding the local work context.

2.7.4. What are the perceptions of migrant workers on social justice? (RQ3)

2.7.4.1. Justice and Work Conditions

Perception of the scale of informal employment among migrants: Contexts and assessments

The issue of informal employment is sensitive both for states regulating the labor market and for workers themselves, especially vulnerable categories, which include forced migrants. The survey allowed us to assess not only the facts, but also the perception and attitude towards informal employment among Ukrainian migrants in the EU countries, Canada and other locations.

Respondents demonstrate a polarized view: Some of the respondents are convinced that migrants work informally less often, since legal employment is a prerequisite for legalization, obtaining documents, access to social guarantees, etc. (e.g., [№ 10](#), [№ 12](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 23](#), [№ 55](#), [№ 69](#)). For example, one of the respondents notes:

“Migrants need legal employment to obtain residency status” ([№ 18](#)).

At the same time, a significant number of responses indicate frequent cases of informal work among migrants, especially in areas that do not require high qualifications (cleaning, caretaking, warehouse work, etc.). The key reasons are:

- Language barrier ([№ 15](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 70](#));
- Bureaucratic difficulties with work permits ([№ 67](#), [№ 30](#));
- Low pay in official positions ([№ 43](#), [№ 44](#), [№ 45](#));
- High taxes ([№ 48](#), [№ 58](#), [№ 60](#)).

Typical comment:

“Yes, unofficially you can pay less for work” ([№ 31](#)), or
“Migrants create jobs for themselves. Migrants with large businesses often employ other migrants” ([№ 24](#)).

Interestingly, some participants compare the experiences of informal work between locals and migrants, noting that locals are more likely to engage in “shadow” employment due to their knowledge of the system and existing contacts, while migrants are less knowledgeable and more cautious ([№ 12](#), [№ 41](#), [№ 68](#), [№ 69](#)).

Summary: The vast majority of respondents understand the connection between legal employment and stability of stay in the country. At the same time, informal work is often a forced compromise in a situation where legal ways are difficult or unavailable.

Working hours and overtime: between integration and exploitation

Respondents' responses show a high degree of flexibility and variability of work schedules, which often depends on the specifics of the work, the type of employment (official/informal), as well as the country of residence.

Normal working week

The vast majority of respondents work from 35 to 40 hours per week, which meets European standards ([№1](#), [№ 5](#), [№ 19](#), [№28](#), [№29](#), [№ 38](#), [№ 63](#), [№ 64](#), [№ 74](#), [№ 80](#), [№84](#)). Some respondents have a reduced schedule - 15–30 hours per week ([№11](#), [№ 16](#), [№ 20](#), [№ 32](#), [№50](#), [№ 65](#), [№ 77](#)), sometimes due to restrictions from employers due to language level:

— “I was told that because I don’t have the required language level C1-2, I’m only hired for 30 hours, even though I perform all my duties without any problems” ([№ 16](#)).

There are also cases of significantly exceeding the standard workload - 50, 60, even up to 70 hours per week ([№ 22](#), [№33](#), [№ 34](#), [№№ 36](#), [№ 55](#), [№ 79](#)), especially among the self-employed, entrepreneurs, or those with multiple sources of income.

Are conditions equal for migrants and local workers?

The majority of participants noted that the working hours are generally equal for all - migrants and local workers ([№ 2](#), [№ 9](#), [№13](#), [№ 19](#), [№29](#), [№ 42](#), [№62](#), [№ 69](#)). At the same time, there are other notes in the answers: migrants are more likely to work in more flexible, less stable conditions or are forced to agree to non-standard schedules:

— “Locals work 40 hours. I’m only hired for 30 hours” ([№ 16](#)),
“Locals have a pretty normal schedule... There were times when I was forced to work more and on weekends” ([№ 24](#)).

Overtime work, work on holidays

A significant proportion of respondents work overtime or on holidays - either on their own initiative (to earn more) or at the request of the employer ([№1](#), [№ 3](#), [№ 10](#), [№ 14](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 24](#), [№ 42](#), [№ 60](#), [№ 69](#)). In many cases, overtime is paid at higher rates, especially in countries with a developed system of worker protection ([№ 14](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 42](#), [№ 64](#), [№ 69](#), [№ 74](#)). At the same time, cases of informal agreements or pressure are not uncommon:

— “Not paid” [№ 73](#)),

— “Forced to work on weekends” ([№ 24](#)).

Salary satisfaction: between dignity and survival

The distribution of responses to the question about salary satisfaction reveals a deep heterogeneity in the financial situation of migrant workers. This indicator is not only an indicator of well-being, but also a marker of social integration, professional recognition and stability.

Dissatisfaction with earnings dominates among those surveyed. More than half of respondents expressed dissatisfaction with their income (for example, [№ 3](#), [№ 4](#), [№11](#), [№ 12](#), [№ 16](#), [№ 17](#), [№ 20](#), [№ 21](#), [№ 26](#), [№ 36](#), [№46](#), [№ 49](#), [№ 54](#), [№ 61](#), [№62](#), [№ 63](#), [№ 68](#), [№ 77](#), [№ 78](#), [№ 79](#), [№84](#)). The reasons are often structural - low rates, temporary employment, part-time work or minimum wages:

— “No, it is minimal, of course it is not enough” ([№ 16](#)),

— “My salary doesn't even cover basic needs” ([№ 36](#)).

Those who are the sole breadwinner in the family or have additional burdens - children, elderly parents, disabilities in the family - seem especially vulnerable ([№ 6](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 57](#), [№ 65](#), [№ 80](#)):

— “The salary is not enough for the survival of a family where I will be the only working person” ([№ 30](#)).

There is also moderate satisfaction or partial sufficiency. Some respondents point out that their salary is only enough for basic personal needs, but it does not allow them to save or support their family ([№ 2](#), [№ 5](#), [№ 10](#), [№ 24](#), [№ 25](#), [№ 48](#), [№ 58](#), [№ 60](#), [№ 64](#), [№ 72](#)). This is often combined with the need for additional income:

— “Both the man and the woman should work in the family. If there is a possibility, I will find a part-time job” ([№ 58](#)).

At the same time, about a third of those surveyed say that their salary is sufficient or even higher than expected ([№ 1](#), [№ 13](#), [№ 14](#), [№ 18](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 23](#), [№ 29](#), [№ 33](#), [№ 34](#), [№ 41](#), [№ 50](#), [№ 51](#), [№ 52](#), [№ 55](#), [№ 73](#), [№ 74](#), [№ 75](#), [№ 76](#)):

— “More than satisfied. Enough not only for needs, but also for desires” ([№ 19](#)),

— “Better than it was in Ukraine” ([№ 13](#)).

These responses demonstrate the positive adaptation of some refugees to the conditions of the host country, often accompanied by a lack of need for social assistance.

Inequality and discrimination. A number of responses clearly articulate the issue of discrimination in wages - migrants receive lower wages for the same work as local workers ([№ 21](#), [№ 16](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 69](#)):

— “I get paid significantly less for the same work done by local workers” ([№ 21](#)),

— “I was told that they only take 30 hours due to lack of C1, although I perform my duties without any problems” ([№ 16](#)).

Conclusions. Financial (dis)satisfaction is closely related to the nature of employment, level of education, language skills, family status and employer policies. The main challenge is the gap between qualifications and pay, which often leads to the dequalification of Ukrainian workers in the labor market of the country of arrival.

Living conditions and family burden: the challenge of migration life

Respondents' answers demonstrate that housing conditions and the presence of dependents are critical factors that determine not only the quality of life, but also the possibility and effectiveness of migrants' work. The gap between desired and real conditions often complicates adaptation to a new social environment.

Housing satisfaction: prevails positively. Most survey participants indicate that they are satisfied with their living conditions (for example, [№ 1](#), [№ 2](#), [№ 5](#), [№ 13](#), [№ 14](#), [№ 18](#), [№ 23](#), [№ 24](#), [№ 25](#), [№ 26](#), [№ 33](#), [№ 34](#), [№ 39](#), [№ 41](#), [№ 43](#), [№ 50](#), [№ 51](#), [№ 52](#), [№ 55](#), [№ 60](#), [№ 65](#), [№ 67](#), [№ 70](#), [№ 73](#), [№ 75](#), [№ 77](#), [№ 78](#), [№ 79](#), [№ 80](#), [№ 81](#), [№ 82](#), [№ 83](#), [№ 84](#)). However, this satisfaction is often relative and based on contrast with initial conditions or expectations:

— “Yes, I am satisfied. No, I have no dependents” ([№ 65](#)),

— “I am satisfied with the living conditions, I have a family that lives with me” ([№ 83](#)).

Housing dissatisfaction: lack of privacy and security. At the same time, a significant proportion of respondents indicate serious housing difficulties (e.g. [№ 6](#), [№ 8](#), [№ 10](#), [№ 12](#), [№ 15](#), [№ 16](#), [№ 17](#), [№ 20](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 49](#), [№ 61](#), [№ 62](#), [№ 63](#)). The main problems include:

- Overcrowding;
- High rent;
- Inadequate sanitation (e.g., dampness, old premises);
- Emotional discomfort from living with strangers:

— “I was living in the same room with people I didn’t know at all. This caused stress” ([№ 20](#)).

Dependents: children, relatives, disabled people. More than a third of respondents have dependent children or other family members (e.g., [№4](#), [№8](#), [№11](#), [№ 12](#), [№13](#), [№ 14](#), [№ 16](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 23](#), [№28](#), [№29](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 41](#), [№46](#), [№ 48](#), [№ 51](#), [№ 54](#), [№ 57](#), [№ 64](#), [№72](#), [№ 73](#), [№ 74](#), [№ 75](#), [№ 80](#), [№84](#)). It is:

- limits working hours;
- requires flexible working hours;
- forces you to look for additional work;
- causes psychological pressure:
 - “I have four children. Forced to look for additional sources of income” ([№ 12](#)),
 - “I need a flexible schedule because of my children” ([№ 57](#)).

Invisible challenges. Several responses indicate that social services partially compensate for the difficulties, but uneven access to assistance still remains ([№ 26](#), [№ 38](#), [№ 54](#), [№ 74](#)). Some respondents are forced to work overtime to provide for their families, while others refuse full-time employment due to a lack of kindergartens or support.

Conclusions. Housing conditions and the presence of dependents are key factors affecting the stability, productivity and level of integration of migrants. Governments of host countries, as well as international organizations, should take these challenges into account when developing social housing programs, supporting families with children and flexibilizing the labor market for migrants.

Community support and self-help: the role of non-governmental organizations in the lives of Ukrainian migrants

After the start of the full-scale Russian invasion in 2022, Ukrainian refugees found themselves in conditions where community support became a critical resource for survival, adaptation and social integration. The responses of the survey participants demonstrate a variety of experiences, ranging from a complete lack of contact with organizations to active volunteering and community leadership.

Limited contact with trade unions. The vast majority of respondents have no connections with trade unions or are unaware of their activities in the host country (for example, [№1](#), [№7](#), [№9](#), [№11](#), [№ 14](#), [№ 20](#), [№ 26](#), [№28](#), [№37](#), [№ 38](#), [№45](#), [№46](#), [№47](#), [№ 54](#), [№62](#), [№ 67](#), [№ 68](#), [№ 70](#), [№ 71](#), [№ 78](#), [№84](#)). This may indicate both the inaccessibility or low visibility of the trade union movement and the low level of awareness among migrants about their labor rights.

Volunteer organizations are a key helper at the beginning of adaptation. A significant part of the participants admits that volunteer structures provided important initial assistance - clothing, food, hygiene products, moral support, language courses (for example, [№ 2](#), [№ 6](#), [№ 10](#), [№ 12](#), [№ 17](#), [№29](#), [№ 31](#), [№ 41](#), [№ 55](#), [№72](#), [№81](#), [№ 83](#)):

- “They helped with clothes, food, hygiene products. Thank you very much.” ([№ 31](#))
- “Caritas gives rations once a month” ([№ 17](#)).

Often these organizations were the first to lend a helping hand when official services were slow or lagging behind.

Inclusion in community activities. Some respondents not only receive support, but also participate in volunteer or information work, supporting others:

- [№ 21](#): actively works at the Ukrainians Foundation in the Netherlands;
- [№ 41](#): is a member of a Ukrainian volunteer organization;
- [№ 35](#): created a women's support club;
- [№ 75](#), [№ 56](#), [№ 82](#): participants or organizers of volunteer initiatives.

This indicates a gradual transformation of the refugee status from a passive recipient of assistance to a responsible agent of social change.

Psychosocial support in migrant communities. Some responses mention the importance of informal connections with other Ukrainians in the diaspora. Such communities create an environment of emotional support, information exchange, and adaptation resources (e.g., [№8](#), [№ 23](#), [№29](#), [№ 36](#), [№ 64](#), [№69](#)):

- “This is primarily psychological support” ([№ 36](#));
- “We help each other - with advice, things, services” (No. 69).

Low involvement or distrust. Some respondents have no connections and do not see any sense in them, considering the help superficial or insufficient (for example, [№3](#), [№13](#), [№ 16](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 24](#), [№39](#), [№ 49](#)):

- “I don’t have such connections. I didn’t apply for or receive help” ([№48](#)),
- “On the contrary - you will get more negativity than benefit” ([№13](#)).

This skepticism may indicate disappointment in the experience of assistance or isolation in the host society.

Conclusions. Interaction with non-governmental organizations is extremely important for Ukrainian migrants at the stage of initial adaptation, but is not systematic in the long term. The lack of contacts with trade unions is a challenge that needs to be addressed at the institutional level. In parallel, local self-help initiatives should be developed to transform refugee communities into agents of support and change.

2.7.4.2. Social Participation and Citizenship Rights

Gender equality in the labor market: the experience of Ukrainian women abroad and in Ukraine

The problem of gender discrimination in the sphere of labor and education remains one of the key issues on the global human rights agenda. At the same time, the experience of Ukrainian migrant women demonstrates the multidimensionality and complexity of this phenomenon, which depends on the personal, social and cultural context. The responses of the respondents indicate both the absence of tangible discrimination and the presence of systemic barriers, in particular at the level of wages, career growth or attitude during interviews.

The absence of personal experience of discrimination is the most common answer. The majority of respondents (for example, [№1](#), [№3](#), [№ 5](#), [№ 6](#), [№8](#), [№ 10](#), [№11](#), [№ 12](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 22](#), [№ 23](#), [№ 24](#), [№28](#), [№ 32](#), [№ 33](#), [№ 34](#), [№ 35](#), [№ 38](#), [№39](#), [№40](#), [№ 43](#), [№44](#), [№45](#), [№46](#), [№ 49](#), [№50](#), [№51](#), [№52](#), [№53](#), [№54](#), [№ 55](#), [№ 58](#), [№ 61](#), [№62](#), [№63](#), [№66](#), [№ 65](#), [№ 67](#), [№69](#), [№ 71](#), [№ 73](#), [№ 74](#), [№ 75](#), [№ 77](#), [№ 78](#), [№ 80](#), [№ 82](#), [№ 83](#), [№84](#)) have not faced discrimination and are convinced that women have equal access to work and education:

- “No, I didn’t notice it either in Ukraine or Lithuania. But I work in a field where there are more women” ([№ 55](#)),
- “I don’t experience. I didn’t experience gender discrimination either in Ukraine or in Lithuania” ([№ 75](#)).

These answers may indicate both the real absence of oppression and the normalization of gender inequality - when prejudice is perceived as a “normal thing”.

Women are active and in demand: foreign practices. Some participants express the opinion that women's professional opportunities abroad are even wider than in Ukraine:

- “There is more balance between work and personal life here, and I see how this has a positive impact on women's self-realization in various areas” ([№ 21](#)),
- “I feel more free and confident here than in Ukraine” ([№ 76](#)).

This may indicate a higher level of gender culture in host countries, where women's work is highly valued and protection mechanisms are more effective.

Indirect manifestations of discrimination: children, maternity leave, salary. A number of respondents report latent forms of discrimination - in particular, those related to motherhood, salary level, prejudices:

- [№ 16](#): “Women receive lower salaries”;
- [№ 17](#): “They don't want to hire women because of the children”;
- [№ 25](#): “I've heard stories of women being asked about their marital status in interviews”.

Such evidence emphasizes the importance of gender justice not only in theory, but also in practice - in terms of hiring, daily communications and company policies.

Comparison with Ukraine: criticism and self-awareness. Several responses indicate that the level of gender discrimination in Ukraine is assessed as higher than in EU countries:

- “In Ukraine it is higher” ([№ 64](#)),
- “I felt more discrimination in Ukraine. Here there is absolute respect for everyone and equality” ([№69](#)),
- “In Poland, there is a certain prejudice against Ukrainian women regarding career growth” ([№ 60](#)).

On the other hand, several people (for example, [№9](#), [№37](#), [№ 59](#)) refer to statistical or sociological data on gender pay imbalances.

Conclusions. The vast majority of Ukrainian migrants do not exhibit overt discrimination against women based on gender, but a significant portion respond from a personal experience that does not take into account systemic factors. At the same time, negative manifestations - although rare - indicate the presence of deeper structural problems related to work-life balance, stereotypes in job interviews, and unequal pay.

2.7.5. Satisfaction with the decision to migrate and future plans

2.7.5.1. Satisfaction with the decision to migrate, expectations and outcomes

Returning home: conditions and barriers for Ukrainian migrants

The ongoing war in Ukraine has led to mass migration of the population, creating new social and humanitarian challenges. The issue of returning to the homeland is becoming ethically, emotionally and practically complex, as evidenced by the answers of Ukrainians currently living abroad. Analysis of this question allows us to identify the main conditions under which return is possible, as well as the factors that prevent it.

1. *Security is the most important prerequisite.* The absolute majority of respondents (for example, [№1](#), [№ 2](#), [№ 5](#), [№ 6](#), [№ 10](#), [№11](#), [№16](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 21](#), [№22](#), [№ 23](#), [№ 24](#), [№ 26](#), [№28](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 31](#), [№ 36](#), [№37](#), [№ 38](#), [№ 41](#), [№ 43](#), [№ 44](#), [№45](#), [№46](#), [№ 48](#), [№ 49](#), [№ 51](#), [№53](#), [№ 54](#), [№ 55](#), [№ 57](#), [№ 58](#), [№ 59](#), [№ 60](#), [№ 61](#), [№ 64](#), [№ 65](#), [№66](#), [№ 70](#), [№ 71](#), [№ 73](#), [№ 74](#), [№ 75](#), [№ 80](#), [№81](#), [№ 82](#)) point to the end of the war, peace and stability as key conditions for return:

- “Peaceful skies, decent working conditions, decent pay” ([№ 82](#)),
- “The end of the war and peaceful skies over Ukraine” ([№81](#)),
- “After the cessation of hostilities” ([№ 54](#)).

The security factor concerns not only the absence of hostilities, but also emotional peace, a sense of stability, the reconstruction of infrastructure, and public order.

2. *Housing, work and decent wages*

The second most frequent condition is the availability of housing, professional opportunities and a decent level of income. The participants emphasize that without resolving housing issues and guarantees of stable employment, return is impossible:

- “With the availability of housing or a salary that would allow renting housing” - [№ 75](#),
- “End of the war and good work” ([№ 26](#)),
- “I will return if Ukraine creates decent living conditions” ([№ 77](#)),
- “Stable security situation. Availability of skilled work” ([№ 48](#), [№ 58](#)).

It is important that some participants emphasize not only the physical availability of work, but also the correspondence of the position to their qualifications, which emphasizes a conscious approach to professional self-realization.

3. Socio-political and ethical aspects

Some responses address the deeper structural changes needed for return. These include:

- overcoming corruption ([№ 12](#), [№ 13](#), [№ 25](#), [№ 34](#)),
- renewal of power ([№ 70](#)),
- “cool” attitude of Ukrainian society towards those who left ([№ 21](#)),

Such answers demonstrate not only professional exactingness, but also a deep loss of trust in the institutions that were formed even before the war.

4. Irreversible sentiments: "I don't plan to return"

Several people clearly stated their unwillingness to return even after the end of hostilities:

- "None, I have anyone and nothing there" ([№ 4](#)),
- “I don't plan on returning” ([№ 15](#), [№ 46](#), [№ 67](#), [№ 68](#), [№ 79](#), [№ 83](#)),
- “I will return if there is no other choice” ([№ 84](#)).

These answers indicate a deep disintegration of individual refugees with Ukrainian society, loss of personal resources, faith in the capabilities of the state, or a complete reformatting of life in a new country.

Conclusions. For most respondents, returning to their homeland is not only an act of patriotism, but also a rational decision that depends on a whole range of factors: from the end of the war to guarantees of economic stability. At the same time, a significant part of those surveyed does not plan to return or sets extremely high demands, including political and ideological ones. This indicates the need for long-term state strategies for the reintegration of citizens who are currently abroad.

Intellectual capital of migration: how Ukrainians plan to apply the knowledge acquired abroad

Migration of Ukrainians as a result of a full-scale war is not only a loss of labor resources for the state, but also an opportunity for the growth of human potential. Staying abroad opens up access to new professional environments, educational systems, languages and practices. Answers to questions about intentions to apply the acquired experience indicate the potential for migrants to reintegrate into the socio-economic life of Ukraine - or its loss.

1. A significant proportion of respondents intend to apply new knowledge and skills

A large number of survey participants (e.g. [№ 1](#), [№ 2](#), [№ 6](#), [№ 8](#), [№ 12](#), [№ 13](#), [№ 14](#), [№ 16](#), [№ 21](#), [№ 25](#), [№ 27](#), [№ 28](#), [№ 34](#), [№ 36](#), [№ 38](#), [№ 39](#), [№ 40](#), [№ 41](#), [№ 45](#), [№ 50](#), [№ 51](#), [№ 52](#), [№ 53](#), [№ 54](#), [№ 55](#), [№ 59](#), [№ 61](#), [№ 69](#), [№ 73](#), [№ 74](#), [№ 75](#), [№ 76](#), [№ 77](#), [№ 79](#), [№ 81](#), [№ 84](#)) clearly expressed the intention to apply the knowledge and skills acquired in the country of displacement:

- “Yes, I plan to further develop in the IT field” ([№ 1](#)),
- “I plan to continue to apply my new knowledge of data analysis, either in my professional career or while teaching at the university” ([№ 13](#)),

— “An interesting approach to working with children, similar to NUS, but with its own tools” ([№ 75](#)).

The answers highlight the following areas of practical use of knowledge:

- education and teaching ([№13](#), [№40](#), [№ 74](#), [№ 75](#)),
- language and communication ([№5](#), [№11](#), [№37](#), [№ 41](#), [№ 70](#)),
- social, volunteer and management activities ([№ 12](#), [№ 21](#), [№40](#)),
- business and entrepreneurship ([№ 6](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 59](#)).

2. Some respondents do not see the benefits or do not have the appropriate skills

Quite a large group of respondents ([№3](#), [№4](#), [№7](#), [№ 17](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 20](#), [№ 24](#), [№ 32](#), [№ 35](#), [№46](#), [№ 48](#), [№ 49](#), [№ 56](#), [№ 58](#), [№ 60](#), [№63](#), [№ 64](#), [№ 65](#), [№ 67](#), [№ 71](#), [№ 70](#), [№72](#), [№ 78](#), [№ 80](#), [№ 82](#), [№ 83](#)) does not plan or is unable to apply knowledge gained abroad:

— “I don’t plan to”, “I don’t have such skills”, “I don’t know what I can use”, “I’m not ready”.

This may indicate:

- lack of a conscious professional trajectory;
- limited access to education or experience in the host country;
- general lack of motivation to return.

3. Language competences are the main universal resource

The answers often mention knowledge of a foreign language as the main thing that will remain with Ukrainians after staying abroad:

— “Knowledge of the language is the main thing” ([№ 5](#), [№11](#), [№37](#), [№ 41](#), [№ 70](#)).

This resource can be universally applied in both professional and personal life. At the same time, knowledge of languages increases the professional chances of migrants in the global labor market.

4. Potential for the transfer of European practices to Ukraine

Some respondents (e.g., [№ 12](#), [№ 21](#), [№40](#)) demonstrate a deep understanding of the possibility of implementing modern approaches obtained abroad in Ukraine:

— “I want to use European approaches to advocacy, community engagement, and creating an inclusive environment” ([№40](#)),

— “I have already taken a course on political activism, studying how local politics works in the Netherlands” ([№ 21](#)).

This indicates the presence of active civic capital that can be involved in the processes of reconstruction, reform and European integration of Ukraine.

Conclusions. A significant part of Ukrainians living abroad show a willingness to apply the acquired knowledge and skills in professional, social or public life. This indicates a high level of mobility, flexibility and intellectual capital of this group. At the same time, a significant part of the respondents either do not have such knowledge or do not see ways to implement it - which requires increased educational, professional and integration support from the state and international partners.

Linguistic capital of Ukrainian migrants: plans for using learned languages

One of the key intangible achievements of forced migration is mastering foreign languages. This opens up opportunities for professional, educational and communicative implementation both in the country of residence and in the event of returning to the homeland. However, the survey results indicate moderate intentions of respondents to use language skills in Ukraine.

1. *Some respondents declared their readiness to use the language professionally.* About a quarter of respondents (e.g., [№1](#), [№2](#), [№3](#), [№12](#), [№13](#), [№15](#), [№16](#), [№25](#), [№35](#), [№37](#), [№38](#), [№39](#), [№41](#), [№47](#), [№51](#), [№53](#), [№66](#), [№69](#), [№70](#), [№77](#), [№79](#), [№80](#), [№81](#), [№82](#), [№84](#)) declared plans or openness to using the language in professional activities:

- “Yes, I have a sufficient level of language to teach it” ([№2](#)),
- “I plan to work as a translator or language teacher” ([№82](#)),
- “My company's main office is in Germany, so the language will be useful” ([№38](#)).

The following possible ways of implementing language competencies were most often mentioned:

- tutoring and teaching,
- technical or oral translations,
- using the language in business contacts,
- communication with foreign partners.

2. *A large proportion of respondents do not have such plans or do not speak the language at the proper level.* A significant number of respondents (about 50%, in particular [№4](#), [№6](#), [№7](#), [№10](#), [№17](#), [№19](#), [№20](#), [№22](#), [№23](#), [№24](#), [№28](#), [№30](#), [№31](#), [№32](#), [№33](#), [№34](#), [№40](#), [№43](#), [№44](#), [№45](#), [№46](#), [№48](#), [№49](#), [№50](#), [№52](#), [№54](#), [№55](#), [№56](#), [№57](#), [№58](#), [№60](#), [№61](#), [№63](#), [№64](#), [№67](#), [№72](#), [№74](#), [№75](#), [№76](#), [№78](#), [№80](#), [№83](#)) do not plan to use the language or directly indicate an insufficient level of proficiency:

- “My language proficiency level does not allow me to teach” ([№10](#), [№57](#)),
- “Did not master the language at a sufficient level” ([№48](#), [№58](#)).

This indicates a need for more intensive language training or a lack of interest in a linguistic career.

3. *Some respondents hesitate or consider the use of language to be contextual.* Many participants (e.g., [№5](#), [№11](#), [№18](#), [№25](#), [№26](#), [№36](#), [№42](#), [№60](#), [№65](#), [№71](#), [№73](#)) have no clear plans, but do not rule out the possibility:

- “Maybe if there is such a need” [№11](#)),
- “With my level of language, it's possible, but I don't know if it will work” ([№25](#)),
- “I didn't even think about this” ([№60](#)).

Thus, there is potential for mobilizing language resources, provided that proper support is provided, and for increasing respondents' confidence in their own language abilities.

4. *The focus is on practical, rather than academic, language use.* Even among those who plan to use the language, pragmatic approaches dominate:

- “For working with international clients” ([№38](#)),
- “For communications with foreigners” ([№29](#)),
- “For the translation of technical documentation” (implicitly in a number of answers).

This indicates that Ukrainians see language knowledge as a tool for professional mobility and adaptation, and not just a means of cultural exchange or academic development.

Conclusions. The interview results demonstrate the fact that a significant part of Ukrainian migrants has (or can potentially develop) language competencies that can be used for professional realization or economic activity after returning to Ukraine. At the same time, a barrier to this is low confidence in one's own level of language training, which indicates the need to expand access to language education and advanced training both in the host countries and upon return.

Entrepreneurial potential among Ukrainian migrants: between possibility and uncertainty

Migrant experience, skills acquired abroad, as well as observations of business models in the host countries - all this can form an important resource for the recovery of the Ukrainian economy after the war. However, the survey results show that the majority of Ukrainian citizens abroad do not have clear plans to open their own business upon their return.

1. A small share of respondents declared their intentions to open a business.

Approximately only one in six participants directly or implicitly indicated plans to engage in entrepreneurship in the future (eg., [№ 6](#), [№ 10](#), [№15](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 23](#), [№28](#), [№ 34](#), [№ 36](#), [№40](#), [№ 59](#), [№ 60](#), [№ 64](#), [№66](#), [№ 73](#)). The motivations are as follows:

- previous business experience ([№ 12](#), [№ 34](#), [№ 36](#), [№40](#), [№ 57](#)),
- desire to realize oneself in a familiar field ([№ 10](#) – hotel business, [№ 19](#) – holiday goods store),
- awareness of the tourist and economic potential of post-war Ukraine ([№ 10](#) “Ukraine became famous in the world due to the war, and many foreigners will want to come. I want to open a hotel.”).

2. *The vast majority of respondents do not plan to open their own business.* About 70.0% of respondents directly answered negatively or expressed doubts about the possibility of starting a business. The main reasons are:

- lack of financial resources ([№ 31](#), [№ 48](#), [№ 58](#)),
- fear of responsibility and uncertainty ([№ 25](#), [№ 32](#), [№ 63](#)),
- lack of experience or knowledge in the field of entrepreneurship ([№18](#), [№ 30](#), [№ 65](#)),
- uncertainty about returning to Ukraine ([№3](#), [№ 14](#)“, [№ 33](#), [№79](#)).

3. *Some of those surveyed are hesitant or do not yet have a clear answer.* About 20.0% of respondents indicated that they had not thought about this issue or did not currently have a clear decision ([№1](#), [№4](#), [№ 5](#), [№11](#), [№ 26](#), [№ 35](#), [№37](#), [№39](#), [№46](#), [№ 49](#), [№53](#), [№ 56](#), [№69](#), [№ 70](#), [№ 71](#), [№ 74](#), [№81](#)).

This may indicate not only a lack of information or resources, but also a low level of the general entrepreneurial climate and confidence in future economic stability in Ukraine.

4. *There is interest in alternatives to entrepreneurship: social initiatives, volunteering, etc.* Some respondents do not plan a traditional business, but are open to creating social, educational or volunteer projects ([№ 21](#), [№ 55](#)).

- “I’m thinking about starting a volunteer organization, but I haven’t thought about starting my own business” ([№ 55](#)).

Also, some participants noted that they already have the status of an individual entrepreneur ([№ 12](#), [№ 36](#), [№40](#), [№ 57](#)), and plan to continue their activities if there are favorable legislative conditions and economic support from the state.

Conclusions. Although entrepreneurial potential among Ukrainian citizens abroad is present, its implementation is currently hampered by a number of factors - economic instability, lack of start-up capital, distrust of the business environment in Ukraine, as well as uncertainty about returning. This indicates the need for targeted state programs to support small businesses, in particular for those returning from abroad.

Training in Ukraine and abroad: rethinking through the experience of migration

The focus of the comparative analysis was the quality of training and the relationship between education and the labor market in Ukraine and the countries of residence of Ukrainian migrants. The majority of respondents who answered the question point to significant differences that allow not only to form a critical assessment of the Ukrainian system, but also to identify potential vectors for its reform.

1. *Theory versus practice.* One of the most frequent topics is the theoretical nature of Ukrainian education as opposed to the practical orientation of the EU training system:

— “In Ukraine, education is often theoretical, students rarely have practice. In Germany, there is a dual system: study is combined with work” ([№1](#), [№ 12](#), [№28](#), [№40](#), [№ 65](#)).

— “In Poland, students have a chance to get a job in their specialty immediately after studying. In Ukraine, no.” ([№ 25](#)).

— “Here people learn right on the job. This makes finding a job much easier” ([№40](#)).

2. Openness to retraining and adult education. In most host countries, the system of retraining and integration of adults into the labor market functions well. This direction is absent or poorly developed in Ukraine:

— “In Germany, the state supports the desire to work, offers training and retraining programs” ([№28](#), [№40](#));

— “In Poland, even people waiting for work can learn new professions for free” ([№ 14](#)).

3. *Cooperation with the labor market.* European education systems are characterized by a close connection with the needs of the labor market. This is achieved through cooperation between universities and enterprises and adaptation of programs to the requirements of the economy:

— “Higher education in Europe is more integrated with business. Universities adapt programs to current needs” ([№ 23](#), [№ 25](#), [№ 64](#)).

— “The funding of education in the host country depends on local employers’ associations. This ensures rapid adaptation to the market” ([№ 12](#)).

4. *Work culture and balance.* Respondents point out not only technical or academic differences, but also values and attitudes towards work:

— “In the Netherlands, there is a clear division of responsibilities, respect for the employee, and mental health is extremely important” ([№ 21](#)).

— “In Ukraine - insults from management. Here is work-home balance, no bullying” ([№ 20](#)).

— “In Italy, without specialized education, you will not be allowed to enter the profession” ([№ 30](#)).

5. *Recognition of the reputation of Ukrainian personnel.* A certain part of the respondents indicates that Ukrainian workers were initially perceived as unskilled labor, but the situation is changing:

— “Ukrainians were compared to workers from the Middle East. Now they have realized that there are many specialists among us” ([№13](#)).

6. *Criticism of the Ukrainian system.* Several respondents provide in-depth analytical criticism of the training system in Ukraine, drawing attention to:

— remnants of the Soviet model ([№ 12](#)),

— weak connection with the labor market ([№28](#)),

— low quality of teaching ([№29](#)),

— corruption and diploma buying ([№ 36](#), [№ 75](#)).

“The education financing system ignores the labor market. Analysis is one thing, budget is another” ([№ 12](#)).

“It is impossible to buy a diploma here. Practice is the basis of education” ([№ 36](#)).

7. *Positions without a clear answer.* About a third of respondents (e.g., [№3](#), [№4](#), [№ 5](#), [№ 17](#), [№ 38](#), [№ 42](#), [№ 43](#), [№ 55](#), [№ 57](#)) either have no experience or avoid direct comparison, which may indicate limited awareness or emotional distance.

Conclusions. Most respondents testified to the systemic superiority of educational models of host countries in the following areas:

— integration with the labor market,

- practical training,
- transparency and standardization,
- the value of vocational education,
- humane attitude towards employees.

These factors, combined with the experience of Ukrainian migrants, can become the basis for a thorough reform of Ukrainian education, focused not only on knowledge, but also on professional competencies, professional mobility and decent work.

2.7.5.2. Considering return migration and reasons, future plans

Institutional responsibility and social expectations: Who do Ukrainian refugees see as responsible for their return home

In the context of a potential return to Ukraine after a forced stay abroad, a key question arises – who should take on the function of supporting returnees? The analysis of the responses indicates a high level of demand from the state, but also demonstrates a significant number of respondents who do not expect any help at all.

1. The state as the main entity of expected support. The largest number of respondents (over 40.0%) directly or indirectly indicated the state as the main source of assistance during return (e.g. [№ 2](#), [№ 6](#), [№ 10](#), [№ 12](#), [№ 15](#), [№ 25](#), [№ 28](#), [№ 40](#), [№ 43](#), [№ 52](#), [№ 63](#), [№ 77](#), [№ 78](#), [№ 81](#), [№ 82](#)).

Among the forms of support that respondents believe the state should provide are:

- housing or compensation for destroyed property ([№ 12](#), [№ 53](#), [№ 74](#)),
- job creation, decent wages ([№ 28](#), [№ 65](#), [№ 72](#)),
- tax breaks, small business support ([№ 40](#)),
- infrastructure restoration and demining ([№ 29](#)).

2. *Personal responsibility is the dominant mood among some of the respondents.* At the same time, about 30.0% of respondents directly stated that no one should help them, because returning is their own choice, and they take responsibility for integration themselves ([№ 3](#), [№ 4](#), [№ 19](#), [№ 20](#), [№ 21](#), [№ 22](#), [№ 32](#), [№ 34](#), [№ 37](#), [№ 42](#), [№ 47](#), [№ 48](#), [№ 49](#), [№ 58](#), [№ 64](#), [№ 79](#), [№ 83](#)).

3. *Partial support or conditional assistance*

Some respondents indicated the need for support exclusively for the most affected categories ([№ 23](#), [№ 59](#), [№ 75](#)), or noted that assistance should be targeted, not general.

4. The role of family, community, and social environment. A separate category of respondents (about 10.0%) mentioned family, local community, or society in general as potential sources of support ([№ 18](#), [№ 24](#), [№ 35](#), [№ 40](#), [№ 43](#), [№ 44](#), [№ 45](#), [№ 66](#), [№ 73](#)).

5. *Distrust, apathy, disappointment.* Some of the answers (e.g. [№ 13](#), [№ 24](#), [№ 84](#)) indicates a deep distrust of the state or even a sense of betrayal, which may hinder the success of the reintegration process.

Conclusions. Respondents express conflicting expectations: on the one hand, a high level of hope for the state, and on the other, skepticism or readiness for independent integration. This demonstrates the heterogeneity of migration experience and the high importance of institutional trust for the formation of sustainable conditions for return.

Return should be accompanied by a comprehensive state policy: from economic support to social adaptation, as well as the active participation of communities and local initiatives. For certain categories of citizens, in particular those who have lost their homes or have vulnerable dependents, support should be mandatory, systematic and fair.

Social justice and resource rationality: is it appropriate to differentiate assistance for returnees

The issue of fair distribution of resources after large-scale forced migration caused by war is particularly urgent. The respondents' answers clearly show a high level of public demand for a differentiated approach in providing assistance to citizens returning to their homeland.

1. *Differentiation is a moral necessity and a logistical obligation.* The majority of respondents (over 75.0%) clearly support the idea of priority assistance to those who have suffered the greatest losses (lost their homes, relatives, were under occupation or in regions of intense fighting) (e.g. [№1](#), [№2](#), [№6](#), [№11](#), [№12](#), [№13](#), [№28](#), [№29](#), [№30](#), [№36](#), [№55](#), [№64](#), [№72](#)).

— “Those who have lost everything should be the first to receive. It is a question of justice” ([№12](#))

— “Occupation of cities, loss of property - these are the most vulnerable categories. They need to be helped first and foremost” ([№35](#))

2. *Objective criteria: what to consider.* Respondents identify key criteria for differentiation:

— Extent of property loss ([№1](#), [№28](#), [№36](#), [№48](#), [№57](#)),

— Origin from frontline or occupied territories ([№13](#), [№25](#), [№29](#), [№72](#)),

— Social status - children, pensioners, people with disabilities ([№35](#), [№64](#)),

— Loss of loved ones or traumatic experiences ([№8](#), [№30](#)).

3. *A minority of opinions favor equal conditions.* About 10.0% of respondents expressed the opinion that all citizens should receive the same support regardless of region or losses (e.g. [№22](#), [№66](#), [№67](#), [№69](#), [№77](#), [№84](#)). The argument is based on the idea of equality before the state, or the unwillingness to exacerbate differences between citizens.

— “Conditions should be equal for all” ([№77](#), [№84](#))

— “I am against discrimination - no matter who is from where” ([№66](#))

4. *Skepticism and uncertainty.* Some of the answers are marked by uncertainty or lack of opinion ([№3](#), [№17](#), [№19](#), [№33](#), [№34](#), [№68](#), [№71](#)). This may indicate both a low level of awareness and emotional exhaustion, which blocks the ability to rationally understand such topics.

5. *Proposals for specific solutions.* Some respondents ([№30](#), [№40](#), [№64](#)) point to the need for official recognition of individual statuses, the creation of compensation funds, and the development of regional support programs.

— “Mariupol should be officially recognized as a city whose residents survived a blockade and a humanitarian catastrophe” ([№30](#))

— “Priority - the most affected areas, the scale of losses, social status” ([№64](#))

Conclusions. Analysis of the responses demonstrates a high public consensus on the need for differentiation of state assistance for citizens returning from abroad. This is positioned not only as a logical mechanism for the effective distribution of resources, but also as a moral imperative for fair treatment of citizens who have suffered the greatest losses as a result of the war.

At the same time, the implementation of such an approach requires a clear system of accounting for losses, transparent assessment procedures, and avoidance of abuse.

3. Discussion

The results of the survey allow us to identify the main trends that characterize the socio-demographic portrait of Ukrainian citizens abroad, as well as their motives for migration and orientation towards returning to their homeland.

The vast majority of respondents are people of working age, among whom the largest share falls on the age groups 35–44 and 45–54, which together account for more than two-thirds of those surveyed. This distribution indicates the dominance of migration of the economically active population, capable of integrating into the production, educational, and social processes of the host countries. The younger category (under 34 years old) is represented by a smaller number of respondents, which may be a consequence of both educational and family factors.

Most participants have families with one or two children, which indicates the prevalence of family migration and orientation towards a longer period of residence outside Ukraine. A significant share lived with two or three other family members, which may reflect the process of gradual adaptation of family communities in a new environment, but also the preservation of close family ties and mutual support.

It is significant that more than half of the respondents returned to Ukraine from time to time, and some of them even worked remotely or partially in Ukrainian enterprises (institutions, establishments, and organizations). This indicates a mixed format of labour mobility, when citizens combine economic activity in two countries while maintaining professional and social ties with their homeland.

The main motivational factors for migration remain the search for security, stability, and economic opportunities. However, the survey results also show that a certain number of Ukrainians seek to return to their homeland after the war ends, provided that a safe environment is restored, housing is available, and employment opportunities are available in their specialty. At the same time, almost 80% of those surveyed supported the idea of creating a state program to support repatriation, which would include financial, educational, and social adaptation mechanisms.

Interestingly, most respondents tend to believe that priority in state assistance should be given to citizens who have suffered the most from the war, which indicates a high level of social solidarity among Ukrainians abroad.

Therefore, the migration behaviour of Ukrainians within the framework of this study is characterized by a combination of rational economic motives with deep patriotic and social orientations. Most of the participants seek to return provided the situation in Ukraine stabilizes, which opens up prospects for the return of human capital after the end of hostilities.

The survey results showed that the majority of Ukrainian citizens abroad remained economically active, seeking to find employment and adapt their professional skills to the requirements of new labour markets. In general, more than half of the respondents currently have permanent or temporary employment in their host countries, while the rest are in the process of looking for a job, professional retraining, or are taking a temporary break from work due to objective circumstances (language, verification of competencies/qualifications, childcare, etc.).

The professional structure of the surveyed employed Ukrainians is characterized by a high level of diversification. Most of them were recorded in the areas of education, medicine, manufacturing, ICT and trade, as well as in the service and catering industries. These results demonstrate the flexibility and adaptability of the labour potential of Ukrainians, their ability to adapt to new conditions and at the same time maintain a high level of professional activity.

A significant share of respondents (over 40.0%) noted that they changed their profession after moving, moving into new areas of activity, often unrelated to their previous education or work experience in Ukraine. This reflects a trend towards forced labour mobility, where economic circumstances and language barriers forced migrants to accept available jobs outside their

qualifications. At the same time, this adaptation indicates high social resilience and readiness of Ukrainians for professional self-improvement.

It is particularly significant that a certain share of respondents combined work abroad with remote work for Ukrainian companies, which indicates a new format of cross-border labour interaction. Such forms of employment create the basis for the future “reverse transfer” of knowledge, skills, and innovative experience to the domestic economy after Ukrainians return home.

Most of the survey participants also indicated that they planned to apply the new skills they had learned in their host countries upon returning home. This demonstrates a high level of readiness for professional reintegration and the potential for developing the domestic labour market by drawing on experience gained abroad.

Employment conditions, team relations, and the attitude of employers in most countries were assessed by respondents as fair and friendly, although some participants pointed to individual elements of discrimination or professional restrictions due to migrant status. This experience emphasizes the need to form a system of psychological, legal and informational support for Ukrainian workers abroad with the mandatory participation of relevant institutions of the Ukrainian state.

Thus, the results of the second part of the study confirmed that Ukrainian labour migration is predominantly of an adaptation and economic nature, but retains a powerful resource for intellectual and professional return. Knowledge and skills acquired abroad can become a key factor in Ukraine's economic recovery in the post-war period.

The results obtained showed that Ukrainian migrants in the host countries are gradually integrating into the social, cultural, and public environment, although the level of this integration is uneven and largely depends on the host country, length of residence, language proficiency, and the availability of support from local institutions.

Most respondents feel comfortable in their local communities and have access to basic social services, education, and healthcare. At the same time, a significant share of survey participants noted that they participated in cultural or social events only occasionally, and volunteer activity or membership in public organizations remained limited. This indicates the formation of an adaptive, but not fully integrated type of participation, when Ukrainians prefer to preserve their own identity rather than strive for complete fusion with local communities.

It is indicative that respondents demonstrated the greatest activity in communities organized by immigrants from Ukraine or other countries of origin, which confirms the trend towards ethnocultural solidarity. Such networks play an important role in mutual support, preservation of language, traditions, and psychological comfort, but at the same time partially limit the speed of full integration into local social structures.

Among socially important areas, respondents noted that childcare services and early childhood education were generally adequate, but there were significant differences between countries. The highest level of satisfaction was recorded in Germany, Italy, Poland and the Scandinavian countries, while in Southern Europe and some Baltic countries there was a noticeable lack of accessible services for migrant families. A similar situation is observed in the field of elderly care, where the majority of Ukrainians assess the available services as insufficient.

At the same time, the survey results indicated a high level of trust among Ukrainians in civil legal mechanisms in the host countries.

However, their actual civic activity, in particular participation in professional associations or trade unions, remains low. This is partly due to the fact that some Ukrainians do not plan to live abroad for a long time and consider their stay as temporary or conditional.

Thus, the social integration of Ukrainian migrants is characterized by a high level of adaptation and preservation of national identity, but with limited participation in the public life of the host countries. The main challenges remain the need to support families, improve access to social services and expand opportunities for participation in local initiatives. In the long term, this creates the basis for dual loyalty - to the country of residence and to Ukraine, which is a strategic resource in the processes of post-war reconstruction of the state.

Research on the issue of discrimination and the sense of security among Ukrainian migrants shows that, in general, the majority of respondents do not encounter direct manifestations of prejudice or open hostility due to their national or cultural status. At the same time, some results indicate the presence of a certain level of latent discrimination (its elements), which manifests itself in the form of social distance, everyday stereotypes and differences in the attitude towards migrants by certain groups of the population.

More than half of those surveyed agree with the statement that they are treated without prejudice, which indicates a positive level of social tolerance in most countries of residence, in particular in Germany, Poland, Italy and the Scandinavian countries. At the same time, a certain part of the respondents (up to 20.0%) noted that they experienced discriminatory manifestations on ethnic, cultural or religious grounds, in particular in the professional environment, in the housing rental market or when going through administrative procedures. The most common sources of discrimination were origin from Ukraine and cultural differences, as well as historical prejudices that sometimes persist at the level of public consciousness. This is especially noticeable in regions where immigrants are a minority and where the information field forms a simplified idea of Eastern European migrants. Such sentiments, although not systemic in nature, still affect the emotional comfort and sense of security of Ukrainians abroad, who often react to them by self-limiting social contacts.

It is also interesting that in many host countries there is a spatial concentration of Ukrainians in certain areas, which respondents interpret ambiguously: on the one hand, this creates an atmosphere of mutual support and trust, and on the other, it can increase the feeling of isolation from the wider local society.

Despite individual cases of discrimination, the overall level of feeling safe among the surveyed Ukrainian migrants is quite high. The majority of respondents do not believe that their stay in the country is accompanied by risks due to their nationality. However, a small proportion (approximately 15.0–20.0%) report that they sometimes do not feel safe due to the aggressive attitude of individuals or political discussions about immigration.

Thus, it can be argued that Ukrainian migrants are mostly integrated into a socially stable and tolerant environment, but remain vulnerable to institutional and everyday forms of discrimination. This situation requires systematic monitoring, as well as the development of legal aid networks, information campaigns and community support aimed at strengthening the sense of security, legal awareness and trust in local institutions.

Ukrainian labour migrants in European countries constitute high-quality human capital (with professional education, experience, skills, and a willingness to invest in the future).

But a significant part of this potential is currently unused. It is mostly due to non-recognition of qualifications, adaptation barriers, informal employment, low wages, which undermines their educational and professional motivation, which in turn leads to professional degradation.

Answers to questions about motivations to return home indicated a certain attachment to the Motherland and a willingness to apply the knowledge acquired abroad, but only if there are minimal and mandatory guarantees. They include safety, housing, work, social support.

Gender aspects (especially the needs of women with children) regarding return home require a special approach from the Ukrainian authorities.

Systemic inequality in access to official employment, working conditions, housing, support shows that without state, public and international coordination, a large part of migrants will remain socially vulnerable.

4. Conclusion and suggestions

A comprehensive survey of Ukrainian citizens temporarily living abroad allowed us to form a holistic picture of the social, economic and psychological characteristics of the life of Ukrainian migrants, their adaptation strategies, as well as their vision of the future and the conditions for a possible return to their homeland. The results obtained reflect a high level of mobility, flexibility and social maturity of Ukrainian society in the conditions of forced displacement caused by the war.

Motivational and personal aspects

The vast majority of respondents left abroad due to security risks and threats to life, which determined the forced nature of migration, rather than a voluntary search for economic benefits. Ukrainians demonstrate high emotional resilience and a desire for self-realization, while maintaining a close connection with their homeland. The structure of motivations is dominated by the need for security, social stability, access to education for children and the opportunity to continue professional development.

Employment and professional fulfilment

The survey shows that Ukrainian citizens remain extremely active in the labour markets of the host countries. Most respondents work, although often outside their specialty, profession or qualification. Cases of changing profession or field of professional activity are common, which demonstrates a high level of their adaptive flexibility and professional mobility. At the same time, a significant part of migrants express a desire to return to professional activity in Ukraine, using the experience gained abroad. This creates a powerful potential for the return transfer of knowledge, skills, abilities and innovations after returning home.

Social integration and civic engagement

The survey results showed that the integration of Ukrainians into the social life of the host countries is gradual but effective. Most respondents feel free in their communities, have access to educational and medical services, but participation in local socio-cultural events remains moderate. Orientation towards their own ethno-cultural networks prevails, which strengthens identity but slows down full integration. At the same time, Ukrainians demonstrate a high level of legal awareness, respect for the laws of the host country, and a willingness to participate in volunteer or charitable initiatives.

Sense of justice, discrimination and safety

In the vast majority of the countries, respondents do not experience systematic discrimination, but individual cases of biased treatment are recorded on ethnic or cultural grounds. Despite this, the general level of feeling safe and fair treatment remains very high. The vast majority of Ukrainians positively assess the working environment, living conditions and social support. However, the presence of hidden forms of discrimination indicates to the host countries the need to strengthen the institutional protection of migrants, their legal awareness and support programs during the adaptation period.

Intention to return home and vision of the future

The majority of respondents plan to return to Ukraine under favourable conditions, primarily after the end of the war and the provision of stability. They consider the availability of housing, work in their specialty/profession, social support from the state and security guarantees from the authorities to be important prerequisites. A significant share of the survey participants believe it is

necessary to create a national program for the reintegration of Ukrainians, which would include compensatory, financial, and educational support mechanisms.

Thus, the results of the study reflect a high level of adaptation, professional activity and civic consciousness of Ukrainians abroad. Ukrainian migrants integrate into new societies, they also form a model of a mobile, educated and responsible diaspora that maintains close ties with the Motherland.

The most important conclusion is that the Ukrainian community abroad does not lose the potential for return. On the contrary, the experience gained in host countries can become a strategic resource for the economic, social and cultural post-war recovery of Ukraine. The reintegration of these citizens requires a comprehensive state policy aimed at creating decent conditions for return, employment, education, social support and support for entrepreneurial initiative.

Thus, Ukrainian migration during the war is not only a challenge, but also an opportunity for national renewal, as it forms a new type of citizen that is open to the world, competent, worthy and aware of their roots.

1. Create a national program for the return and reintegration of refugees, taking into account the recognition of skills, certification, employment and business support.
2. Implement mechanisms for the recognition of international professional experience and informal skills through a “skills portfolio”, short recertification programs, state adaptation courses.
3. Provide returnees with housing and social guarantees, with special attention to families, women, children and socially vulnerable groups.
4. Introduce gender-sensitive reintegration policies, including support for female workers, flexible working hours, access to education and kindergartens, grants for entrepreneurial activity.
5. Create an intersectoral platform for coordinating return policies to the Motherland (state, communities, NGOs, business), necessary to provide comprehensive support to returnees.
6. Develop differentiated assistance programs taking into account property losses, region of origin, specialty, and social status.

APPENDICES

FORM 1

Informed Consent Form - Questionnaire**Dear Volunteer!**

You have been invited to participate in a Horizon Europe Project survey. Before agreeing to take part in this research, you should understand the purpose of the research and make your decision. Please read the following information carefully. If you have questions, you can ask for answers.

Brief Information About the Research

This project aims to make a systematic analysis of skills shortages in five EU countries (France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Lithuania) and six non-EU countries (Turkey, United Kingdom, Norway, North Macedonia, Ukraine, Ethiopia). This survey is brought to you within the Work Package 4 titled "Surveying skilled migrant workers in the countries of destination and origin."

The survey aims to determine the skill formation of the migrant labour force in the source and destination countries, their relations with mobility patterns and skill formation, and the participation of migrants in the local development of the origin and destination countries. For more information, you can visit the project website: <https://skills4justice.eu/>

This study has been approved by the Temporary Ethics Committee of the SSI 'Institute of Educational Analytics' (Minutes No. 1 of 19 February 2025).

Please read the following statements fully and carefully. By clicking 'Yes' below, you are giving your consent to take part in the questionnaire.

Title of Research: Skills 4 Justice HORIZON EUROPE Project SKILL PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE AND JUST MIGRATION PATTERNS (SKILLS4JUSTICE) HORIZON-CL2-2023-TRANSFORMATIONS-01-03 No. 101132435.

1. Please read the content of the Questionnaire beforehand. Completing the survey takes approximately 45-60 minutes.
2. If you have any questions before/after you complete this survey, please contact Work Package 4 Leader for Ukraine Sergiy Melnik (smelnikur@gmail.com).
3. All responses you provide for this study will be completely confidential. When the results of the study are reported, you will not be identified by name or any other information that could be used to guess your identity. In this survey, you will be referred to with interview codes, created to fully anonymize your answers.
4. In terms of the confidentiality of personal data, please do NOT share any personal information that will pose a risk to yourself and eliminate your anonymity, and do not make any written statements regarding this. If you give information that reveals your identity, either these statements will be deleted, and your survey data will not be used in the research.
5. The results of this research will be used only for scientific purposes.
6. **By clicking "Yes" below, you acknowledge that you have read and understood that:**
 - You have been given enough time to think about whether you want to join the survey or not.
 - You read and understand this consent form. If you have questions, you know that you can ask them to the person whose mail address was given above.
 - You are free to stop your participation in the survey at any time, without reason. Your refusal to participate will not in any way affect you negatively. If you withdraw from the research or are removed from the research by the researcher, your data will not be used.

- You have given consent to respond to the survey as truly and sincerely as possible.
- You understand that all data provided will be treated in strict confidence, and that your personal information will be anonymised.
- You agree not to give any information about your identity (e.g. your name, phone number, address, etc.).
- You confirm that you read and fully understood this form and agree to take part.

7. **Do you wish to participate in this study? (Please underline your choice)**

Yes, I am consenting to participate.

No, I am NOT consenting to participate.

Date:

Informed Consent Form - Interview**Dear Volunteer!**

You have been invited to participate in a Horizon Europe Project interview. Before agreeing to take part in this research, you should understand the purpose of the research and make your decision. Please read the following information carefully. If you have questions, you can ask for answers.

Brief Information About the Research

This project aims to make a systematic analysis of skills shortages in five EU countries (France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Lithuania) and six non-EU countries (Turkey, United Kingdom, Norway, North Macedonia, Ukraine, Ethiopia). This survey is brought to you within the Work Package 4 titled "Surveying skilled migrant workers in the countries of destination and origin."

The interview aims to determine the skill formation of the migrant labour force in the source and destination countries, their relations with mobility patterns and skill formation, and the participation of migrants in the local development of the origin and destination countries. For more information, you can visit the project website: <https://skills4justice.eu/>.

This study has been approved by the Temporary Ethics Committee of the SSI 'Institute of Educational Analytics' (Minutes No. 1 of 19 February 2025).

Please read the following statements fully and carefully. By clicking 'Yes' below, you are giving your consent to take part in the interview.

Title of Research: Skills 4 Justice HORIZON EUROPE Project SKILL PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE AND JUST MIGRATION PATTERNS (SKILLS4JUSTICE) HORIZON-CL2-2023-TRANSFORMATIONS-01-03 No. 101132435.

1. Please read the content of the Questionnaire beforehand. The interview lasts approximately 60 minutes.
2. If you have any questions before/after you complete this interview, please contact Work Package 4 Leader for Ukraine Sergiy Melnik (smelnikukr@gmail.com).
3. All responses you provide for this study will be completely confidential. When the results of the study are reported, you will not be identified by name or any other information that could be used to guess your identity. In this survey, you will be referred to with interview codes, created to fully anonymize your answers.
4. In terms of the confidentiality of personal data, please do NOT share any personal information that will pose a risk to yourself and eliminate your anonymity, and do not make any written statements regarding this. If you give information that reveals your identity, these statements will be deleted, and your interview data will not be used in the research.
5. The results of this research will be used only for scientific purposes.
6. The interview will be voice-recorded. The recording will become transcribed (written), and your voice will NOT be shared anywhere and will be deleted.
7. **By clicking "Yes" below, you acknowledge that you have read and understood that:**
 - You have been given enough time to think about whether you want to join the interview or not.
 - You read and understand this consent form. If you have questions, you know that you can ask them to the person whose mail address was given above.
 - You are free to stop your participation in the interview at any time, without reason. Your refusal to participate will not in any way affect you negatively. If you withdraw from the research or are removed from the interview by the researcher, your data will not be used.

- You have given consent to respond to the interview as truly and sincerely as possible.
- You understand that all data provided will be treated in strict confidence, and that your personal information will be anonymised.
- You agree not to give any information about your identity (e.g. you name, phone number, address, etc.).
- You confirm that you read and fully understood this form and agree to take part.

8. **Do you wish to participate in this study? (Please underline your choice):**

Yes, I am consenting to participate.

No, I am NOT consenting to participate.

Date:

A. X2

QUANTITATIVE SURVEY OF THE INTERNALLY DISPLACED CITIZENS OF UKRAINE OF WORKING AGE

INTRODUCTION

Dear respondents!

The State Scientific Institution ‘Institute of Educational Analytics’ is a member of the Consortium consisting of 12 institutions from 11 countries (Lithuania, Norway, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Poland, Italy, North Macedonia, Turkey, Ethiopia, and Ukraine) focused on the implementation in 2023-2026 of the tasks of the Project 101132435 - SKILLS4JUSTICE. Topic: HORIZON-CL2-2023-TRANSFORMATIONS-01-03 “SKILL PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE AND JUST MIGRATION PATTERNS”. One of the objectives of this Project is to conduct a sociological study of the state, problems and prospects of the development of training and the usage of qualified personnel, their deficit and its components in the wartime and post-war periods, in particular, the impact of migration processes, primarily due to the forced displacement of citizens within the country. Our partners understand the features and huge resource losses of Ukraine in such a difficult time, so most of the questions are adapted to study the situation of internal displacement due to the war. The survey is anonymous and does not require any statistical information. Please read the consent form. If you decide to join the questionnaire, please mark the ‘Yes’ box on the paper-based questionnaire during the off-line survey.

Ukrainians who meet all four of the following criteria and/or requirements are invited to participate in this survey, namely:

- Citizenship of Ukraine;
- Age from 18 to 65 years;
- Being recognised as an internally displaced person (IDP) (permanently, temporarily, occasionally) during a period since 2014 to the present;
- having any work or employment (full-time, temporary, occasional, official, unofficial, self-employment, etc.) with a total duration of more than 3 months during the period of being recognised as an IDP.

-

PART I: Personal and motivational (migration/displacement) information
Please indicate one option that suits you, unless it's possible to select several options

Item Nr.	Question	Choices
	Region of Ukraine where you currently live	_____ (City, region or oblast)
	The region of Ukraine where you lived before displacement (if necessary, indicate all regions where you were recognised as an IDP)	_____ (City, region or oblast)
	What is your age?	<input type="checkbox"/> 18–24 years <input type="checkbox"/> 25–34 years <input type="checkbox"/> 35–44 years <input type="checkbox"/> 45–54 years <input type="checkbox"/> 55–65 years
	What is your present status (it is possible to choose several options)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Internally displaced person (IDP) <input type="checkbox"/> Displaced person without IDP status <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say
	Does your legal status allow you to work in the new place?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> I do not work to avoid losing social support <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say
	Are you currently employed at the new place of residence?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, I am employed and have a work contract. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, I am working, but without work contract. <input type="checkbox"/> I am unemployed now, but I was employed earlier for at least three months. <input type="checkbox"/> I am self-employed/a business owner. <input type="checkbox"/> I receive social support as an IDP and do not work. <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say
	How long have you been recognised as an IDP or a person without this status in the new region (total period in several regions of residence)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than a year <input type="checkbox"/> 1–3 years <input type="checkbox"/> 4–5 years

		<input type="checkbox"/> More than 5 years
	What is your gender?	<input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say
	What is your marital status?	<input type="checkbox"/> Single <input type="checkbox"/> Married <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced <input type="checkbox"/> Widowed <input type="checkbox"/> In a civil partnership
0	If you are married or in a relationship, does your spouse/partner work at your new place of residence?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I am not married or in a relationship.
1	How many children do you have?	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more
2	How many other family members do you live with?	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more
3	Do you return from time to time to your homes in the government-controlled areas of Ukraine?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4	Apart from the war and its aftermath, what other reasons prompted you to be internally displaced? You may select more than one option, check them all.	<input type="checkbox"/> Long-term employment with much better remuneration conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Getting an education in the region where I currently live <input type="checkbox"/> Better housing and living conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Family issues <input type="checkbox"/> Self-motivation <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify: <hr/> <hr/>

		<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
5	What was your highest level of educational attainment ?	<input type="checkbox"/> Basic secondary education (9 grades) <input type="checkbox"/> Complete secondary education (11 grades) <input type="checkbox"/> Vocational education and training <input type="checkbox"/> Professional non-tertiary education (vocational upper secondary) education (technical school, college) <input type="checkbox"/> Higher education (Bachelor, Master) (please underline) <input type="checkbox"/> No answer
6	What is your highest level of educational attainment in the region where you live now?	<input type="checkbox"/> Basic secondary education (9 grades) <input type="checkbox"/> Complete secondary education (11 grades) <input type="checkbox"/> Vocational education and training (Master, Craftsman's/ Technician) <input type="checkbox"/> Professional training at the workplace <input type="checkbox"/> Higher education (Bachelor, Master) (please underline) <input type="checkbox"/> No answer <input type="checkbox"/> I did not receive any education in the region where I live now.
7	What is the field of study of your highest level of qualification ? (Please circle one option)	Please indicate your field of study: A Education B Culture, arts and humanities C Social sciences, journalism and information D Business, administration and law E Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics F Information technologies

		<p>G Engineering, manufacturing and construction</p> <p>H Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary medicine</p> <p>I Healthcare and social security</p> <p>J Transport and services</p> <p>K Security and defence</p> <p>() Could not be determined. Write in any form</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>If you received your latest vocational education, professional non-tertiary or higher education diploma in the HEIs at the temporarily occupied territories, is this diploma recognized in the region where you live now?</p>	<p>() Yes, fully</p> <p>() Partly</p> <p>() No</p> <p>() Other. Please explain:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>If you received any vocational training in the region where you live now, where did you receive this training? You can select more than one option.</p>	<p>() At university (master's, bachelor's or junior bachelor's degree)</p> <p>() At a professional pre-higher education institution (professional junior bachelor, junior specialist)</p> <p>() At a vocational education and training institution</p> <p>() At the vocational training centre of the State Employment Service</p> <p>() Apprenticeship (formal system)</p> <p>() Continuous vocational education /course or VET provider</p> <p>() At the workplace</p> <p>() Other. Please specify:</p> <p>_____</p>



		<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>() I did not receive any vocational training.</p>
0	What has your employer done for your adaptation to your job in the new region of your temporary stay? You can select more than one option.	<p>() internal vocational courses</p> <p>() external vocational courses</p> <p>() guided on-the-job training</p> <p>() mentoring/buddying scheme</p> <p>() performance monitoring</p> <p>() providing individual feedback</p> <p>() changing work practices</p> <p>() reallocating work</p> <p>() workplace/job rotation</p> <p>() exchanges or study visits</p> <p>() conferences/workshops</p> <p>() learning or quality circles</p> <p>() I attended self-directed learning/e-learning, private lessons without an employer's help.</p> <p>() I received lifelong learning education or general adult education without an employer's help.</p> <p>() nothing</p>
1	What is your current occupation (e.g. mechanic, construction worker, nurse, baker, caregiver, engineer, etc.)?	<p>Occupation (you may identify several in free form):</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
2	Where are you employed now by the type of form and ownership of the company?	<p>() Public sector (e.g. the local government or a state hospital)</p> <p>() Private sector (e.g. a company)</p> <p>() A non-profit organisation (e.g. a charity, an organisation)</p>



		<p><input type="checkbox"/> Self-employed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I don't know.</p>
3	<p>What industry or type of economic activity does your enterprise (institution, establishment, organisation) belong to (circle one option)?</p>	<p>A Agriculture, forestry and fisheries</p> <p>B Mining and quarrying</p> <p>C Manufacturing</p> <p>D Supply of electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning</p> <p>E Water supply; sewerage, waste management</p> <p>F Construction</p> <p>G Wholesale and retail; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles</p> <p>H Transport, warehousing, postal and courier services</p> <p>I Hospitality and catering</p> <p>J Information and telecommunications</p> <p>K Finance and insurance</p> <p>L Real estate transactions</p> <p>M Professional, scientific and technical activities</p> <p>N Administrative and support services activities</p> <p>O Public administration and defence; compulsory social security</p> <p>P Education</p> <p>Q Healthcare and social support</p> <p>R Arts, sports, entertainment and recreation</p> <p>S Other services</p> <p>T Household activities</p> <p>U Activities of extraterritorial organisations and bodies</p>



		<input type="checkbox"/> Could not be determined. Write in any form <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
4	How long have you been doing your current job in the region where you live now?	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than a year <input type="checkbox"/> 1–2 years <input type="checkbox"/> 3–5 years <input type="checkbox"/> More than 5 years
5	In the last 5 years, in how many different workplaces/companies/organisations have you worked in the region where you live now?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 or more
6	Did you have a different occupation before your present occupation in the region where you live now?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Please write your previous occupation(s) (in any form you like): <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <input type="checkbox"/> No
7	What is the type of your employment contract in the region where you live now?	<input type="checkbox"/> Permanent/fixed period/long-term/stable contract <input type="checkbox"/> Seasonal/periodic/unstable/temporary contract (e.g. work during the tourism season, seasonal agricultural work) <input type="checkbox"/> No contract <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify: <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
8	Do you work full-time or part-time?	<input type="checkbox"/> full-time employment <input type="checkbox"/> part-time employment



9	What is the number of employees in the company/organization you are employed?	<input type="checkbox"/> More than 250 <input type="checkbox"/> 10–250 <input type="checkbox"/> 1–10 <input type="checkbox"/> I am self-employed/working in my own.
0	When did you find your first job in the region where you live now?	<input type="checkbox"/> Before arriving in this region <input type="checkbox"/> After arriving in this region
1	How long did it take to find your first job?	Duration (in years, months, weeks, or days): _____
2	How did you find your first job in this region?	<input type="checkbox"/> Regional employment center <input type="checkbox"/> Private employment company <input type="checkbox"/> Contacting employers <input type="checkbox"/> Company invitation <input type="checkbox"/> Job advertisements <input type="checkbox"/> NGOs, volunteers <input type="checkbox"/> Unions <input type="checkbox"/> Acquaintances <input type="checkbox"/> I established my own business. <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify: _____ _____ _____
3	Overall, how satisfied are you with your current job?	<input type="checkbox"/> Extremely satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied <input type="checkbox"/> Dissatisfied <input type="checkbox"/> Extremely dissatisfied
4	Overall, how satisfied are you with your work conditions?	<input type="checkbox"/> Extremely satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied <input type="checkbox"/> Dissatisfied <input type="checkbox"/> Extremely dissatisfied

PART II: Justice at work and social participation and civic rights

Please put an X to mark your opinion.



Sphere	Item Nr.	Question	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree, nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
		Please answer all questions in this part according to the enterprise (institution, organization) where you work now, and the region where you live now.					
Justice at work		The income I receive for my work is appropriate to the effort I spend for the job.					
		I work in high-risk jobs in terms of occupational health.					
		I feel adequately informed about occupational safety.					
		I am NOT worried about being laid off from my job because of being an IDP.					
		I feel respected in the workplace.					
		I feel comfortable when expressing my views on working conditions in the workplace.					
		I think my job performance is evaluated objectively.					
		I can devote enough time to my everyday life and my family.					
Social participation and civic rights	0	I feel free in the local society where I live.					
	1	I participate in activities organized by people from the region I come from.					
	2	I participate in local social and cultural activities.					
	3	I participate in voluntary work for charity or non-profit organisations at least once a month.					
	4	I have the possibility to invite my family members to come here and live with me.					



	5	I'm a union member.					
	6	I think that early childhood education/pre-school education available for the IDPs are sufficient.					
	7	I think that childcare services provided to the IDPs are sufficient.					
	8	I think that care services for elderly family members available for the IDPs are sufficient.					
	9	I actively seek my rights as an IDP.					
Discrimination	0	I am NOT discriminated against as an IDP.					
	1	I experience discrimination against my language.					
	2	I experience discrimination against my cultural (clothing, eating habits, etc.) or religious characteristics.					
	3	I experience discrimination against my ethnicity.					
	4	I experience discrimination because of the geographical region I come from.					
	5	The area where I live has a high concentration of IDPs.					

PART III: The level of protection of IDPs and their motivation to return home

Question	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
1. Under what conditions do you plan to return home, if at all, in the future?					



No threat of war and its consequences. Signing and maintaining a ceasefire, accepting and ensuring other security conditions by partners					
Having your own home to return to					
Compensation of relocation costs, housing and social arrangements					
Availability of a job in the occupation held before displacement					
Availability of a job in the occupation held in the region of displacement					
Availability of acceptable living, transport and other conditions for staying in the region of return					
I do not plan to return under any circumstances					
2. Who should provide you with the most support as an IDP?					
Government authorities					
Regional authorities					
NGOs and/or volunteers					
No one					
3. Is it necessary to adopt a separate programme in Ukraine that would provide compensation, financial, material, social, educational support and other measures aimed at rapid adaptation of IDPs to new living conditions?					
4. Should there be a differentiation (categorization) of citizens with IDP status to determine the priority and amount of assistance? For example, by region of the country, by the degree of property loss, etc.					
5. Do you plan to put into practice the new knowledge, skills and abilities you have acquired in the region of displacement after returning home?					
6. Please rate the overall level of support for you as an IDP on a 10-point scale, where 1 is the lowest and 10 is the highest.					
The social protection side of IDPs		Points			
Total score					
Government authorities					
Regional authorities					
NGOs and/or volunteers					
Others (please specify) _____					

--	--	--

Thank you very much for your participation!

B. X3

QUALITATIVE SURVEY FOR INTERVIEWING OF THE INTERNALLY DISPLACED CITIZENS OF UKRAINE OF WORKING AGE

Dear respondents!

The State Scientific Institution ‘Institute of Educational Analytics’ is a member of the Consortium consisting of 12 institutions from 11 countries (Lithuania, Norway, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Poland, Italy, North Macedonia, Turkey, Ethiopia, and Ukraine) focused on the implementation in 2023-2026 of the tasks of the Project 101132435 - SKILLS4JUSTICE. Topic: HORIZON-CL2-2023-TRANSFORMATIONS-01-03 “SKILL PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE AND JUST MIGRATION PATTERNS”. One of the objectives of this Project is to conduct a sociological study of the state, problems and prospects of the development of training and the usage of qualified personnel, their deficit and its components in the wartime and post-war periods, in particular, the impact of migration processes, primarily due to the forced displacement of citizens within the country. Our partners understand the features and huge resource losses of Ukraine in such a difficult time, so most of the questions of the Questionnaire are adapted to study the situation of internal displacement due to the war. The survey is anonymous and does not require any statistical information. Please read the consent form. If you decide to join the questionnaire, please mark the ‘Yes’ box on the paper-based questionnaire during the off-line interview.

Ukrainians who meet all four of the following criteria and/or requirements are invited to participate in this interview, namely:

- Citizenship of Ukraine;
- Age from 18 to 65 years;
- Being recognised as an internally displaced person (IDP) (permanently, temporarily, occasionally) during a period since 2014 to the present;
- having any work or employment (full-time, temporary, occasional, official, unofficial, self-employment, etc.) with a total duration of more than 3 months during the period of being recognised as an IDP.



Respondents who also took part in the sociological survey using the Questionnaire for the survey of internally displaced persons of Ukraine of working age may be involved in the interview. To do this, you need to obtain additional consent from them to be interviewed.

Sphere	Item Number	Question
Migration pathways	1	Preconditions for migration related to the war in Ukraine. Please list your most emotional memories of the war.
	2	How did you decide which region of Ukraine to go to? Describe the main reasons for your choice and the key challenges you faced (if any). Why did you decide to move to this particular region of the country?
	3	Do you plan to return home after the war? Explain the possible reasons and motives for this future decision. From your point of view, what are the main prerequisites for returning?
Skill Formation	4	Tell us briefly about your education and skill formation paths before displacement.
	5	If you received your education while living in the temporarily occupied territory of the country, were there any problems with its recognition in the territories controlled by Ukraine where you moved?
	6	After arriving in the region of displacement, did you receive any vocational training or higher education? If you did, what kind of education (level, degree, etc.) it was, in what form (full-time, part-time, dual, etc.), in what type of educational institution?
	7	Your previous employment before you moved. Briefly describe your last job or professional activity (before migration).
	8	You work or have recently worked in the region where you live now. Tell us what you do for a living. What do you think about your employment and its progress (if any, including other regions of your displacement)?
Skill mismatch	9	How much time did you spend looking for a job in the region where you live now? What problems did you encounter? How did you look for a job (online, private employment agency, employment centre, etc.)?
	10	Is your education sufficient for the work you are doing now in this region of displacement? What are the reasons? If not, can you get any kind of additional education or training to get the necessary knowledge and practical skills?
	11	What are the main problems you experience in terms of skills at the workplace/job?



Justice	1 2	Do you have the impression that IDPs work informally more often than local workers? If yes, please provide reasons.
	1 3	How many hours do you work per week? Is it the same for local workers? Did you encounter practices such as overtime or working on vacation days and holidays (before february 2022)?
	1 4	Does your salary cover all your needs?
	1 5	Are you satisfied with your living arrangements? Do you have dependants? How do they affect your work?
	1 6	Are you in contact with trade unions, NGOs, including volunteers, and IDP groups from the home region before the war? In what ways are they helpful?
Gender	1 7	Do you think women experience any gender-related discrimination about education and occupation? Could you please compare your experiences here and in the region where you come from before the war?
Motivation for a possible return home	1 8	Please describe the specific conditions under which you can return home.
	1 9	Do you plan to use the new knowledge, skills and abilities you have acquired in the region of displacement after returning home? Which ones and how?
	2 0	Do you plan to start your own business after your return? Please explain your positive or negative decision.
	2 1	Who should provide you with the most support when you return home (if anyone)? Please explain.
	2 2	Should IDPs returning to their pre-war region be differentiated to determine the priority and amount of assistance? For example, the region of the country, the extent of destruction and loss of property, the level of access to social, transport and educational infrastructure, etc.
	2 3	In your opinion, what is the difference in the training and usage of personnel in the region of your pre-war residence and in the settlement where you live now?

Thank you very much for your participation!