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1. Summary of findings for round 1

Question 1: I feel safe and accepted by the community where I am now living.

Overall, people are quite positive about their acceptance in the local community. The only exceptions are Odeska, Rivnenska, Chernivetska, and Luhansa where people are distinctly negative.

Question 2 – I am ready to play my part in improving my circumstances.

People in all locations – across all age groups and both sexes – say they are ready to play their part in improving their circumstances.

Question 3 - I believe government reforms will lead to changes for the better in my life.

Respondents have low expectations that government reforms will have a positive impact on their lives.

Question 4 – I have access to the information I need on the government services for IDPs.

People do not feel they have access to the information they need about government services targeted at IDPs.

Question 5 – I feel the government listens to IDPs and takes our needs into account.

IDPs are seriously dissatisfied by the government’s track record in listening to them and taking their needs into account.

For this survey we have used a technique of feedback data analysis known as Net Promoter Analysis (NPA). It distinguishes between three constituent profiles: promoters, passives and detractors.

- Promoters are people who rate a question as 9 and 10 on the 0-10 point scale used in the survey.
- Passives are those who give ratings of 7 and 8.
- Detractors are people who rate the questions from 0-6.

The Net Promoter score is calculated by subtracting the detractors from the promoters while leaving aside the passives.
2. Variation of net promoter scores in round 1

1. I feel accepted by the local community where I am now living.
2. I am ready to play my part in improving my circumstances.
3. I believe government reforms will lead to changes for the better in my life.
4. I have access to the information I need on the government services for IDPs.
5. I feel the government listens to IDPs and takes our needs into account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 4</th>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Question 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Introduction

This report analyses data on the perceptions of people forced to leave their homes in Crimea, Donets and Luhansk who are now living in the oblasts of Dnipropetrovska, Donetsk, Zaporizka, Kyivska, Kharkivska, Odeska, Rivnenska, Chernivetska and Luhanska. It is the first of two surveys intended to inform the development and implementation of the government’s IDP communication strategy. The questions were formulated in consultation with the Prime Minister’s office, the Office of the Ombudsman and other departments. Draft questions were then tested in a focus group. Some interviews for the survey were conducted by phone, others face-to-face.

Data collection took place December 8-13 2014 with a representative sample of the displaced population asked to rank statements on: their acceptance by the local community; their readiness to play their part in getting back on their feet in their new surroundings; their confidence that government reforms will bring change for the better in their lives; access to information about services available to IDPs; and the government’s willingness to listen to the displaced people and act on what they hear.

4. Methodology

In analysing the data from this survey we have used a technique of feedback data analysis known as Net Promoter Analysis (NPA). It distinguishes between three constituent profiles: promoters, passives and detractors. This analysis provides the basis for the development of distinct strategies to work with each of the constituent profiles.

**Promoters** are people who rate a question as 9 and 10 on a 0-10 point scale. These are the champions. They are likely to be wholehearted and active enthusiasts and to recommend consistently the government’s IDP strategy to their friends and colleagues.

**Passives** are those who give ratings of 7 and 8. They do not have major concerns, but they are not particularly enthusiastic about the program. However, with the right incentives, they could well become Promoters.

**Detractors** are people who rate the questions from 0-6. They have fairly negative perceptions on the question and their views are likely to negatively affect the success of the IDP programme.

The Net Promoter Score (NPS) is calculated by subtracting the detractors from the promoters while leaving aside the passives. Successful programmes or organizations generally have high NP scores but it is not uncommon to have a negative NP score.

---

1 ‘Net Promoter’ is a registered trademark of Fred Reichheld, Bain & Company and Satmetrix. For more see: [www.netpromotersystem.com](http://www.netpromotersystem.com), as well as the open source net promoter community at [www.netpromoter.com](http://www.netpromoter.com).
5. Question by question analysis

Question 1 – I feel accepted by the local community where I am now living

Internally displaced people are notably positive about their acceptance in the places where they are currently living, with an overall NP score of 29. A very strong result.

Women are more positive than men – with more promoters and fewer detractors.

Age-wise, we see some variation in NP scores, with people aged 55 to 65 year notably negative followed by those over 66.

Respondents in Dnipropetrovsk are notably positive on this question, with an NP score of 84. Ratings are very low in Odessa, Rivnenska, Chernivetska, Luhanska (indicated in the chart as ‘other’) with 63% are in the detractor category.
Question 2 – I am ready to play my part in improving my circumstances

Responses suggest that people are keen to play their part in getting ahead with more than half of the respondents in the promoter category. People in private accommodation are more positive on this question than those in collective centres.

There are slightly more female promoters than men.

People aged 18 to 34 years and 45 to 54 years are especially motivated.

People in Kyivska oblast are most ready to play their part, with an NP score of 89. Donetska has the lowest NP score (11).
Respondents have low expectations of the likely impact of government action. Ratings across all demographic groups are negative. People living in the private accommodation are more disenchanted than those accommodated in collective centres or camps.

Men are marginally more positive than women. Age-wise, people over 65 are the least negative, with an NP score of –37. People aged 35 to 44 year olds are especially the disenchanted.

IDPs in Kharkivska are especially unimpressed by government reform efforts with an NP score of -80. This is also the oblast where the economic situation of IDPs is most difficult, with almost 80% of the respondents saying they are forced to economize on food.
People do not feel they have access to the information they need on government services for IDPs. Some 45% of respondents are negative and the overarching NP score is -19.

Male and female respondents are equally dissatisfied, although there are slightly more male detractors than women in this category.

Respondents in Dnipropetrovska are the only demographic group with a positive NP score (26); Some 34% of the respondents in this oblast are promoters (against 26% overall). Here we also see the highest trust in media compared to other oblasts. Respondents in the regions of Odessa, Rivnenska, Chernivetska, Luhanska (indicated as ‘other’) are least satisfied with the information provided. Some 77% of people in these locations are detractors.
IDPs are very negative about the government’s commitment to listening to their needs and taking them into account. Scores across all demographic groups are extremely negative. People living in the private accommodation are more negative than people living in collective centres or camps.

Women are more negative than men and the highest levels of dissatisfaction are among people aged 35-44 years. People over 66 are the least negative – although still unhappy.

Respondents in the oblasts of Odeska, Rivmenska, Chernivetska, Luhanska (indicated as ‘other’) and Kharkivska are particularly negative. Trust in the media in these oblasts is also very low. Some 76% of respondents in Kharkivska and 63% in the ‘other’ oblasts say that they don’t watch the news regularly or don’t trust any news source.
6. Sample size, demographics and more

Some 69% of the respondents would like to return to their former homes, but 23% of the total say they will only go back if their area of origin remains part of Ukraine. Some 12% of the respondents do not want to go back under any circumstances.
**Financial status:**
Everyone covered by the survey says s/he is financially stressed. Some 63% of respondents say they must save to cover their basic food requirements. Another 23% say they have enough food but must save to buy other things.

**Education:**
Most of the people in the survey are quite well educated. A third have graduated with a bachelor’s, specialist’s or master’s degree. IDPs in the oblasts Kyivska and Kharkivska have the highest levels of educational attainment, with 46% and 42%, respectively, holding a degree of some kind. The graph (left) describes respondents’ maximum level of educational achievement.

**Occupation:**
Overall 39% of all respondents are unemployed. Some people in this category are looking for work; others are not. Homemakers and people on maternity leave are also in this category.

Those that have jobs mostly work in the private sector (70%). Highest levels of employment are in Dnipropetrovska, where 56% of the respondents say they have a job. In Kyivska and Donetska employment levels are low with, respectively, 38% and 48% of people saying they don’t have a job. Pensioners constitute, respectively, 37% and 35% of respondents in these 2 oblasts. No one in Odeska, Rivnenska, Chernivetska, and Luhanska describes her/himself as unemployed and 62% are pensioners.
7. Recommendations on survey themes

1. Sense of welcome and inclusion: The evidence from the survey and the follow-up focus group shows that people displaced by the conflict in the east of the country continue to suffer from what they feel are ambivalent attitudes on the part of host communities. These negative attitudes are compounded by difficult economic conditions that affect everyone. Negative stereotypes are widespread making it hard to get a job or find accommodation.

Goal: Provide an alternative narrative to prevailing negatives:

- Statements from key government spokespeople that IDPs have an important role to play, through their skills, determination and courage, in rebuilding Ukraine.
- Encourage respected third parties in Ukrainian society (especially entrepreneurs and other job-creators) to echo these positive sentiments.
- Stimulate TV, radio, newspaper and social media coverage that under scores the contribution of IDPs – especially the success of entrepreneurs ‘making it’.
- Arrange media round tables/public discussions to underscore government messages on IDPs.
- Supplement free media coverage of these issues with government funded advertising campaign along the same lines.

2. Readiness: A central message from the survey and focus group is that IDPs are ready and willing to play their part in building a future from themselves and, in so doing, to re-create a sense of normality in their lives that can make them active, self-supporting citizens.

Goal: Create the conditions for IDPs to become productive members of society and demonstrate, through active communications efforts, how they are meeting the challenges.

- Regularize registration arrangements so that all IDPs are in the same legal situation and able to get on with their lives.
- Underline the readiness of the people to contribute to their own and the country’s welfare through government pronouncements, media briefings on measures aimed at assisting IDPs, and in paid advertising.
- Draw attention to the relative success of IDPs in Kyiv, Dnipropetrovsk and other places where they have done relatively well.

3. Government reforms: There appears to be a significant trust deficit. People in the FGD say they see few results of government action and a general failure to fulfill promises. The contagion effect is significant, with general lack of confidence in the reforms translating into broader distrust of the government. Furthermore, there is very little awareness of what the government has done. What awareness there is relates essentially to the perceived negatives of reform in the areas of health, education, cost of public transport etc. And confusion prevails about proposed tax and business reforms.
**Goal:** Clarify and contextualize the intent and nature of the government’s reform program to address trust deficit, suspicions and low levels of awareness of what the government has done or plans to do.

- Communicate reform: Arrange some kind of orchestrated and publicized declaration by the government of its plans for IDPs. Proposed actions should match priorities as seen by IDPs (see list on page 4 of FGD report – but further research is also warranted).
- Reforms must be framed in a way that explicitly addresses concerns.
- Set up a monitoring system of a ‘reform index’ that will allow the government to publically track its record in implementing the reforms – and the impact of doing so. This should preferably include a scorecard based on the views of the IDPs themselves.
- Make sure the reforms are presented in the context of a pre-established time frame and then institute regular reporting on key landmarks over time.
- Harness the spirit of *Maidan* by taking action on key promises: lifting of deputies’ immunity, screening of officials, and ending officials’ benefits (see Page 4 of FGD summary).

4. **Access to information:** People are divided into those who say they have access to enough information and others who say they have too little. Behind these general (and divided) perceptions, there seems to be a desire for more reliable information on issues of importance to the ID community. Fragmentation of information is clearly a problem and would seem to relate to the fragmented institutional arrangements and responsibilities

**Goals:** Audit existing information systems, and align arrangements and messaging with government policy on IDPs.

- Audit what is now being done to communicate with IDP and determine whether negative perceptions of current efforts are justified.
- Establish central IDP communications office to coordinate action on all issues related to IDPs. Director the communications hub will report to the Minister responsible for IDP affairs, with a direct link to the communications director in the PM’s office. There should be close links also to the government’s ‘hotline’ service.
- Develop a practical communications strategy explaining the government’s approach to IDPs that is articulated around what IDPs consider to be priority issues, as identified on Page 5 of FGD summary.
- Central communications office should undertake regular three-monthly light-touch surveys of IDP opinion to guide implementation of the communications strategy.
- Develop a strategy that uses all relevant communications channels, included media targeted specifically at IDPs.
- Institute close coordination between communications activities linked to IDPs and those of the government more broadly – perhaps through weekly meetings of communications heads of all ministries chaired by Prime Minister’s director of communication.

5. **Listening to IDPs:** It is no surprise that IDPs do not feel as though they are being listened to. This is a ‘tracking’ question and, over the months to come, answers will provide an important indicator as to whether IDPs feel that things are improving for them and that their views are being taken on board.
This will happen EITHER when their priority concerns are addressed (housing, jobs, etc.) OR when they feel that their views are being considered. The former is more difficult and this suggests, at least initially, focusing on the latter. It does not require the immediate resolution of problems; merely the sense that there they are being seriously considered.

This will come about over time through a ‘dialogic’ process whereby representatives of the government establish a two-way process of communication/deliberation with representatives of IDPs. This process, in turn, must be publicized so that the broader IDP community is aware of the dialogue and gets the sense that solutions are in the works.

Goal: *Establish trust with IDPs through action on their grievances and through confidence-building dialogue.*

- Consider priority actions to address IDPs’ most urgent concerns (housing, jobs, etc.) and publicize this process.
- Establish a consultative process, both at the level of the central government and at the provincial level, to discuss problems and find commonly-arrived at solutions.
- Publicize process and outcomes.
- Continue to track perceptions on this question (relating to overall trust) as the IDP reform and communications program move forward.
8. ANNEX

To which source of news do you turn at least once a week?

Which sources of news do you trust the most?

News on which channel do you most often watch?

News in which newspaper or magazine do you most often read?