



Regional Refugee Response
for the Ukraine Situation

POLAND

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC
INSIGHTS SURVEY**

Preliminary analysis

November 2025

Photo credit: Anna Liminowicz



Poland

OBJECTIVES & METHODOLOGY

OBJECTIVES

The Socio-Economic Insights Survey (SEIS) is a collaborative process which identifies the most pressing needs of refugees across various sectors with comprehensive and accurate data gathered

The 2025 SEIS, closely aligned with the 2024 SEIS, and Multi-Sector Needs Assessments (MSNAs) conducted in 2023 & 2022 assessed the following:

- Needs of refugees from Ukraine in Poland;
- Level of socio-economic inclusion and access to national systems;
- Service gaps.

The 2025 SEIS is a key source of information for the 2026 RRP which aims to capture funding and planning requirements for the response. The primary results cover the following areas:

- **DEMOGRAPHICS**
- **PROTECTION**
- **EDUCATION**
- **SOCIAL ECONOMIC INCLUSION AND LIVELIHOOD**
- **HEALTH & MHPSS**
- **SHELTER & ACCOMMODATION**

OVERVIEW



COMPLETED
VISITS

642 HH

1,368 individuals



POPULATION
COVERAGE

Refugees from Ukraine in Poland

- Arrived in Poland after the onset of the full-scale invasion
- At the age of 18 or above



DATA COLLECTION
BY

UNHCR, IOM and UNICEF



DATA COLLECTION

From 7 August to 3 September
2025



PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS
BY

UNHCR

METHODOLOGY & LIMITATIONS

Methodology

The interviews were conducted at the household level, with each respondent answering on behalf of all household members. Respondents were required to be at the age of 18 or above and have fled Ukraine following the onset of the full-scale invasion (24 Feb 2022).

Interview locations varied across the country, with the largest share conducted in public spaces such as parks and streets (42%), followed by shopping malls (21%) and distribution points (9%). Additional interviews were carried out in private accommodation (8%), other locations (9%), and transport hubs (7%), with fewer conducted in hotels/hostels, government-sponsored accommodation, and other forms of shelter. This range of locations ensured coverage of both formal and informal settings where refugees are present, capturing a diverse cross-section of respondents.

Sampling & Representativeness

The sample was purposively selected and is therefore not statistically representative, largely due to the absence of a comprehensive database identifying the exact residence locations of refugees in Poland. As a result, findings should be interpreted as indicative.

Limitations & Respondent Bias


- Data collection took place before September 2025 when several changes related to benefits and accommodation refugees were introduced with the amended Special Act into force.
- Most interviews were conducted outside collective sites and distribution points.
- There were high non-response rates for certain sensitive topics—such as protection or income and this may have resulted in under- or over-reporting.
- The need to align Poland's results with regional analysis requirements also influenced questionnaire wording.

DEMOGRAPHICS

AREA OF RESIDENCE



Number of interviews:




Interviews were conducted nationwide, across regions with the highest shares in **Mazowieckie (18%)**, **Śląskie (13%)**, **Dolnośląskie (11%)**, and **Wielkopolskie (10%)**, followed by **Małopolskie (9%)**, **Pomorskie (7%)**, and **Łódzkie (6%)**. Smaller proportions were recorded in the remaining voivodeships (2-5%), reflecting the broader geographical spread of the refugee population across Poland.


DEMOGRAPHICS

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

SEIS results Household Members by Age Group and Gender n=1,368



Active PESEL UKR holders by Age Group and Gender n=999,146



Poland


DEMOGRAPHICS

DEMOGRAPHICS

RESPONDENTS

Respondents by gender & age

n=642



Among the respondent, **83%** were **women**. The survey sample includes respondents aged 18 to 78, allowing us to capture a wide range of perspectives across different age groups. The largest respondents' age group is 35-59 years (55%), same as 2024 SEIS sample.

All respondents have Ukrainian citizenship.

*since this was a multiple-choice question, the results may not added up to 100%.

DEMOGRAPHICS

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS




Average HH size*

2.2


* compared to 2.7 reported in MSNA 2023 and 2.4 in SEIS 2024

Households by size



Household typology

n=642



Note: Dependents include children aged 0-17 and older individuals aged 60+

Average age of HH adult member

42

Average age of HH child member

10

% exclusively Female Headed HHs

60%

% of HH members below 18 years old

28%

% of HH of one person only

28%

% of female adults with children

29%

DEMOGRAPHICS

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS



% HHs with at least one older person (60+ years)

22%



% HHs with children

44%

% of HHs with employed members

84%

% of HHs with one or more older person with
or without children with employed members

26%

Number of children in HHs



% of children by age group



% of individuals with disability certificate issued in Ukraine


7%

% of individuals with disability certificate issued in Poland

4%

DEMOGRAPHICS

UKRAINIAN REFUGEES ORIGINS BY OBLAST



The largest shares of respondents originate from the following oblasts: **Kharkivska, Dnipropetrovska, and Khersonska - 1 out of 3 respondents came from those three oblasts of Ukraine**. Notable proportions also come from Kyiv City, Kyivska oblast, Donetsk, Mykolaivska, and Zaporizka.

Smaller percentages are distributed across the remaining oblasts, reflecting displacement from a broad range of regions across Ukraine.


Poland

PROTECTION

PROTECTION

CIVIL STATUS


What is your current legal status in the country?



% of respondents who plan to apply for another legal status in the next 12 months

26%

% of individuals who intend to apply for another status in the next 12 months:




* Visa is not applicable in Polish context, but the questions were unified in regional approach


PROTECTION

SOCIAL COHESION

% of HHs reporting hostile behavior or attitudes from the local population



Type of hostile behavior reported (out of the 41% reporting tensions)




Compared to in 2024, in 2025 there was a **reported small increase (39% to 41%)** in hostile behaviour or attitudes towards refugees. Consequently, there was an increase in most of the reported hostile behaviours, with most notably **an increase in comments in news forums online and social media**. There was also a **4% increase in reported physical attacks**.

PROTECTION

CHILD PROTECTION

% HH reporting the three most serious perceived risks faced by girls under the age of 18*



The 3 most commonly mentioned risks for girls in 2025 are the same as in 2024:

(1) **psychological and physical violence in the community;**

(2) **increased vulnerability to violence online;**

(3) **increased vulnerability to abuse.**

*Please note that 20% of respondents who claimed to have no concerns were not excluded from the sample


Other responses in 2025: no concerns (20%), physical violence in the community (11%), **sexual violence in community (11%)**, worsened mental health and psycho-social wellbeing (11%), separation from family and/or placement into residential facility (4%), risks of trafficking (2%), psychological violence within home (2%), vulnerability to neglect at home (1%), physical violence within home (1%), sexual violence in home (0.0%)

PROTECTION

CHILD PROTECTION

% HH reporting the three most serious perceived risks faced by boys under the age of 18*

n=181



The 3 most commonly mentioned risks for boys in 2025:

- (1) psychological violence in the community;
- (2) increased vulnerability to violence online;
- (3) physical violence in the community.

In 2025, there has been a general increase in violence reported by boys, particularly in **psychological violence in the community**, important to note is **also increased risk of physical violence**.


*Please note that 17% of respondents who claimed to have no concerns were not excluded from the sample

Other responses in 2025: physical violence in the community (23.2%), no concerns (16.6%), vulnerability to abuse (15.5%), worsened mental health and psycho-social wellbeing (12.7%), separation from family and/or placement into residential facility (3.3%), psychological violence within home (2.2%), sexual violence in community (0.6%), physical violence within home (0.6%), vulnerability to neglect at home (0.0%), sexual violence in home (0.0%), risks of trafficking (0.0%)

PROTECTION


SAFETY AND SECURITY

Top 3 perceived safety and security concerns for women in their area*
n=585



*Please note that 28% of respondents who claimed to have no concerns were not excluded from the sample

Top 3 perceived safety and security concerns for men in their areas*
n=297



*Please note that 31% of respondents who claimed to have no concerns were not excluded from the sample

From 2024 to 2025, there was a shift in the safety concerns of both women and men. For women, the top 3 safety concerns still include **discrimination or persecution (19%)** and **verbal harassment (23%)**, this year including also **exploitation (7%)**.


For men, their primary concerns reflect the mobilization law, with **deportation** being one of primary concerns (**19%**). Other concerns for men include **discrimination of persecution (21%)** and **verbal harassment (14%)**.

PROTECTION

GBV


% of respondents who know how to access GBV services

n=616



% of respondents who identified main barriers for accessing GBV services (top 5)*

n=642



*Please note that 2% of respondents who claimed to have no concerns were not excluded from the sample

Knowledge of accessing GBV services has decreased throughout the years. Above half of respondents are familiar with **safety and security services (55%)**, as well as with **health services (59%)**.


Throughout the time, there has been no major changes in respondents identifying barriers for accessing GBV services. The top 5 barriers for accessing GBV services in 2025 changed slightly from 2024 results, with **lack of awareness (47%)** and **language cultural barriers and legal institutional barriers (40%)**, being the greatest barriers, followed stigma (33%), fear of retaliation (21%), and lack of trust in host country services (21%)

PROTECTION

AAP – SATISFATION AID RECEIVED

2025 Share of HHs dissatisfied with the aid they received in the last 3 months


n=129



■ Satisfied ■ Dissatisfied ■ Don't know/ Prefer not answer

2024 Share of HHs dissatisfied with the aid they received in the last 3 months

n=590



■ Satisfied ■ Dissatisfied ■ Don't know/ Prefer not answer

Aid includes:


Humanitarian financial aid (Cash), Humanitarian financial aid (Vouchers), Humanitarian distributions (non-food items, clothing, food etc), Humanitarian protection services, Government social protection, Government assistance programmes, Government housing programmes, Other type of ai

PROTECTION

BEHAVIOR OF AID WORKERS


2025 Share of HHs satisfied with aid workers' behavior in the area

n=645



2024 Share of HHs satisfied with aid workers' behavior in the area

n=1,290




PROTECTION

BEHAVIOR OF AID WORKERS


2025 Preferred channels to report inappropriate behavior of aid providers

n=645



2024 Preferred channels to report inappropriate behavior of aid providers


n=1,290



PROTECTION

UNMET NEEDS

2025 top priority needs (single-choice)*



Other aggregates: sanitation and hygiene products (0.6%), transport support (0.6%), food (0.5%), winter clothes (0.3%), feeding children (0.3%), information on country of origin (0.2%), communication (0.2%)

* Please note that needs were claimed before the changes in the Special Act related to accommodation. 18% of respondents who claimed to have no unmet needs were not excluded from the sample.

2024 top priority needs (multi-choice)




Additionally, 'Other' was claimed by 4%

PROTECTION

VISITS TO UKRAINE


% of HH where 1 or more household members visited Ukraine after 24 Feb 2022

n=642



Reasons for visiting Ukraine (top 10)

n=302



Other answers: to access benefits (2%), to prepare for return (1%), other (0.3%), was asked by employer (0.3%), to continue studying (0.3%), to register birth (0.0%)

In 2025, many HHs indicated they had been back to Ukraine, at least once (14%) or more than once (33%). Slightly higher share of HHs haven't been able to visit Ukraine (20%) or have not considered the need to visit Ukraine (31%). This data highlights the increase of pendular movements between Ukraine and Poland.

The main reasons for visiting Ukraine was to visit relatives (65%), access healthcare (38%), take care of family matters (17%) and to obtain documentation (10%) or check/repair property (10%).




EDUCATION

EDUCATION

ATTENDANCE /ENROLMENT – REPORTED BY PARENTS

% of school-aged children **reported** attending
2023/2024/2025 school year in host country
n=544



In 2025, 77% were enrolled in school in Poland in the school year 2024/25.

Please note limitation of the SEIS data on education: it relies on self-reported responses, which may introduce respondent bias.

% of children who attended school but did not sit for exams

9%

% of children who attended school but did not pass exams

10%

% of children who experienced bullying by peers at school

17%

% of children who experienced bullying by peers and teachers at school


8%

EDUCATION

COMMUNICATION IN POLISH

Level of language knowledge

n=1048




% of individuals who can communicate effectively in Polish

84%

Poland

LIVELIHOOD & SOCIO-ECONOMIC INCLUSION

LIVELIHOOD AND INCLUSION



Comparing the data on labor force participation to results of previous years, we can see an **increase of employment rate**, simultaneously with a **decrease of individuals outside labor market**.

Data suggests that population of Refugees from Ukraine is consistently more active on labor market, however, may face barriers while looking for a job.

Unemployed: a person who currently is not hired, leading a business or supporting family business, but is actively looking for a job and is ready to start working in 2 weeks if offered with a position.


Inactive on labor market: person not involved in money-earning activity and not ready to start work in 2 weeks.

% of youth (18 to 24) who are Not in Education, Training or Employment (NEET):

8%

LIVELIHOOD AND INCLUSION – DIFFICULTIES

Difficulties HHs members encountered while finding work in Poland over the last 12 months*




The top five difficulties in finding a job were: lack of knowledge of the local language (15%), limited employment opportunities for their age group (8%), lack of decent payment (8%), lack of flexible schedule (7%), and lack of required skills (5%)

*Please note that respondents (16.2%) claiming no barriers, (13%) no looking for work or (0.9%) not planning to stay in country were not excluded from the sample

LIVELIHOOD AND INCLUSION – INCOME

% of HHs by income source in the 30 days prior to data collection

n=642



Employment income remains the main source for most households, with **85% reporting earnings from work within last 30 days.**

About one-third receive social protection benefits from the Polish government, while 20% rely on support from Ukraine.

Over the past year, half of households said their income stayed stable, 30% saw an increase, however about **20% experienced a decrease.**

Overall, most households either maintained or improved their income situation

% of HHs reporting a change in household income in the past 12 months

n=642



■ Income decreased
■ Income increased
■ Income remained more or less the same

SOCIO-ECONOMIC INCLUSION & LIVELIHOOD

LIVELIHOOD AND INCLUSION – ECONOMIC CAPACITY

% of respondents reporting access to financial services (bank account)

94%


% respondents in age 60+ reporting access to financial services (bank account)

77%

The percentage of respondents with access to financial services, such as a bank account, is very high at 94%. However, among people aged 60 and above, this rate is almost 20 percentage points lower.

Amount of savings to live on reported by HHs


n=642



Additionally, 25% of households report having no savings or only enough to cover up to two weeks of expenses. This share increases to 59% among older respondents. Still, over 60% of all households have enough savings to sustain themselves for at least one month.

Correlation between age and lack of savings or available saving up to two weeks

n=158




SEVERE MATERIAL AND SOCIAL DEPRIVATION (SMSD)

The **severe material and social deprivation rate (SMSD)** is an [EU-SILC](#) indicator that shows an enforced lack of necessary and desirable items to lead an adequate life. The indicator, adopted by the [Indicators' Sub-Group \(ISG\)](#) of the [Social Protection Committee \(SPC\)](#), distinguishes between individuals who cannot afford a certain good, service or social activities. It is defined as the proportion of the population experiencing an enforced lack of at least 7 out of 13 deprivation items (6 related to the individual and 7 related to the household).


Severe material and social deprivation rate among refugees from Ukraine
n=600

- % of HHs affected by SMSD
- % of HHs not affected by SMSD



Severe material and social deprivation rate among host community in Poland*

- % of HHs affected by SMSD
- % of HHs not affected by SMSD



* according to Eurostat in 2024

Among refugees from Ukraine, **13% of surveyed households are affected by severe material and social deprivation (SMSD)**, meaning they cannot afford many essential needs, material or social items. This level of deprivation is **significantly higher** than the **2% SMSD rate observed in the host community in Poland**, according to [Eurostat](#).

The difference highlights the distinct challenges refugees face in achieving basic economic stability and social inclusion, even when living in the same national context. While the host population shows relatively low levels of severe deprivation even in comparison to the average EU level (6%).

Many refugee households continue to struggle with meeting essential needs due to disrupted livelihoods, limited financial resources, and ongoing barriers to integration.

Refugee households reported substantial financial pressure in meeting the following basic and social needs:

% of HHs cannot afford paying for one-week annual holiday away from home

58%

% of HHs cannot afford replacing worn-out furniture

67%

% of HHs cannot afford to pay an unexpected expenses

31%

% of HHs cannot afford paying rental payment


17%

% of HHs cannot afford paying utility bills

10%

LIVELIHOOD AND INCLUSION – EDUCATION LEVEL

% of HH members by highest education level achieved



The educational profile of households remains similar to last year. Just over half of household members hold higher education degrees (53%), while one-quarter have technical or vocational education (25%).

Secondary school education accounts for 17%. Only a small share of respondents report primary education or doctoral-level studies.


Overall, the education levels of households in 2025 are almost identical to those observed in 2024 and remain on the very high level.

Poland


HEALTH

HEALTH ACCESS

% of HHMs who are chronically ill : **27%**



% of individuals by self-reported all barriers to accessing health care in the last 30 days



Other barriers: Could not afford transport (4.5%), Do not trust local provider (3%), Wanted to wait and see if problem got better on its own (3%), Lack of health insurance in host country (1.5%), Disability prevents access to health facility. (1.5%), Lack of knowledge of how to access health services (0.0%)

HEALTH

MHPSS

% of HH members (5y.o. or older) who experienced mental health or psychosocial problems:

18%


% of individuals who received MHPSS services (of those that needed support and tried to access it):

75%

% of individuals who accessed MHPSS and reported improved well being:

89%

% of individuals who received each type of service*



Psychotherapy continues to be the most commonly used service, and the percentage of this type of service increased among the respondents comparing to last year from 42 % to 53%.

*since this was a multiple-choice question, the results may not added up to 100%.


HEALTH

MHPSS

% of individuals who received mental health and psychosocial support services and report improvement in wellbeing

n=135

■ 2024 ■ 2025



When evaluating the effectiveness of the services received, **49% of individuals reported slight improvements** which is less than year before (54%), **40% experienced significant improvements after accessing MHPSS**, which is higher than in 2024 (29%).

Poland


SHELTER/ ACCOMMODATION

SHELTER/ACCOMMODATION

SECURITY OF TENURE, LIVING CONDITIONS


% of HHs by accommodation arrangement

n=642



% of HHs by accommodation payment arrangement

n=641




SHELTER/ACCOMMODATION

SECURITY OF TENURE, LIVING CONDITIONS


% of HH by perceived length they could stay in current accommodation

n=642



% of HHs who faced discrimination on housing

n=645



Poland

Contact:

Edyta Reczkowska, Assistant Information Management Officer: reczkows@unhcr.org
Iliia Markowski, Information Management Associate: markowsk@unhcr.org