Ukraine
Country and Research Areas Report

Final Version, 2010-11-09

Responsible institution: Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS)
Centre of Sociological Research (CSR)

Authors¹:
Bastian Vollmer
Yuriy Bilan
Iryna Lapshyna
Svitlana Vdovtsova

¹ Bastian Vollmer is responsible for the chapter ‘Migration’ while the CSR team (Yuriy Bilan, Iryna Lapshyna and Svitlana Vdovtsova) is responsible for the chapters ‘Country Background’ as well as ‘Background on Research Areas’.
Contents

Introduction ................................................................................................................................. 4

Country Background .................................................................................................................. 5
  Geography ................................................................................................................................. 5
  Past and Present Socio-Economic Situation in Ukraine ......................................................... 6
Demographic Background ......................................................................................................... 8
  Population/depopulation .......................................................................................................... 8
  Ethnicities ................................................................................................................................. 10
Ukrainian Political System and Landscape ............................................................................... 10
Socio-Economic Parameters ..................................................................................................... 12
  Economy/Labour Market ......................................................................................................... 12
  Education ................................................................................................................................. 13
  Health care ............................................................................................................................... 14
Rights .......................................................................................................................................... 14
Social Issues: Corruption, Crime, Drugs .................................................................................. 15
Culture ......................................................................................................................................... 16
  Religions and Minorities .......................................................................................................... 16
  Language ................................................................................................................................ 16

Migration .................................................................................................................................... 18
  Migration Patterns and Flows ................................................................................................. 18
    Migration History .................................................................................................................. 18
    Net-Migration ....................................................................................................................... 20
    Emigration ............................................................................................................................ 20
    Immigration .......................................................................................................................... 23
    Refugees and Return Migration ............................................................................................ 24
    Irregular Migration and Transit Migration ............................................................................. 25
    Gendered Migration Patterns ............................................................................................... 26
    Two Outstanding Features of Contemporary Migration in Ukraine .................................... 27

Politics and Discourses in Ukraine ........................................................................................... 27
  Policy and Legislative Developments - Internal Affairs ......................................................... 27
  External Affairs/EU Politics ..................................................................................................... 30
  Discursive Themes .................................................................................................................. 31
  Emigration – Ambiguous Discursive Elements: Dangers, Human Losses or Heroic Act ....... 31
  Immigration, Identity, Security ............................................................................................... 33
  EU – Ukraine Relations ......................................................................................................... 35

Background on Research Areas ................................................................................................. 37
  Kharkivska Oblast and the Research Area Novovodolaz’ka ..................................................... 37
    Geography: Climate, Agro-Ecological Conditions ................................................................ 37
    Demography .......................................................................................................................... 37
    Education ............................................................................................................................... 38
    Economic/Industrial Structure ............................................................................................... 38
    Social Issues: Corruption, Crime, Drugs ............................................................................... 39
    Ethnicity ................................................................................................................................ 39
Migration
Discursive Elements - Emigration to the East as a ‘Survival Strategy’ and Growing Xenophobic Landscapes

Research Area - Novovodolaz'ka Rayon

Kyiv City and the Research Area Solomyansky Rayon
Geography: Climate, Agro-Ecological Conditions
Demography
Economic/Industrial Structure
Social Issues: Corruption, Crime, Drugs
Ethnicity
Migration
Discursive Elements – unsafe Environment

Research Area – Solomyansky Rayon of Kyiv

Kirovogradskaya Oblast and the Research Area Znamyanska Rayon
Geography: Climate, Agro-Ecological Conditions
Demography
Economic/Industrial Structure
Education
Social Issues: Corruption, Crime, Drugs
Ethnicity
Migration
Discursive Elements – The Concern over Orphans

Research Area – Znamyanska Rayon

Ternopilska Oblast and the Research Area Zbarazh Rayon
Geography: Climate, Agro-Ecological Conditions
Demography
Economic/Industrial Structure
Education
Social Issues Problems: Corruption, Crime, Drugs
Ethnicity
Migration
Discursive Element – A Monument for Labour Migrants

Research Area - Zbarazh Rayon

Conclusion
References
Contents of Annexes
Annexes
Introduction

This report provides factual background information on migration and human rights of the case of Ukraine. In addition, it focuses on four regions and the research areas selected for the Eumagine project. These are:

- Novovodolaz’ka rayon in Kharkivska oblast, a high-emigration area with a specific human rights situation;
- Solomyansky rayon in Kyiv city, a high-immigration area;
- Znamyanska rayon in Kirovgradska oblast, a low-emigration area; and
- Zbarazh rayon in Ternopil oblast, a high-emigration area.

First, foundational or contextual information on Ukraine will be offered while a second part will go into more specific locations of Ukraine which are the selected research areas in four Ukrainian oblasts. In both parts, demographic, socio-economic as well as migratory processes and their contemporary discursive themes will be presented.
Country Background

Geography

Geographically, Ukraine is situated in the middle between Atlantic and Ural and thus in the centre of Europe. Ukraine’s territory is 603,628 km². The land borders of Ukraine are 4,558 kilometers long. Ukrainian shares borders with Russia (1576 km) in the east and northeast, with Belarus (891 km) in the north and in the southwest and west it shares borders with Moldova (939 km), the autonomous region of Transnistria, Romania (169 km in the south, 362 km in the west), Hungary (103 km), Slovakia (90 km) and Poland (428 km). The southern border is constituted by the Black Sea (3,783 kilometers of coastline).

Geopolitically, Ukraine, because of its central situation in EurAsia by is perceived by the western countries “buffer state” between Russia and NATO countries and its borders as “sanitary borders”; keeping out the ‘threat from the east’ (Mikhel’, 2009).

Ukraine is divided into 25 oblasts (administrative counties) (see figure 1 below; most of the following figures and tables will be displayed in the annex). The largest city and capital is Kyiv with an official population of 2.82 million; however, estimates range from 4-6 million. Other major cities are Kharkov (1.46 million), Dnepropetrovsk (1.04 million), Donetsk (1 million.), Odessa (1.08 million) and Lviv (735.000).

Figure 1: Map of Ukraine

Past and Present Socio-Economic Situation in Ukraine

On 24th of August 1991 Ukraine gained its independence. The world community positively accepted the results of all-Ukrainian referendum in December 1991. Since then, Ukraine has lived through several political crises: Presidential elections of 1994, adoption of the Constitution in 1996, the ‘Orange Revolution’ of 2004 and the political stalemate from 2008-9. And yet, it has kept its unity and avoided to fall apart.

In the beginning to the mid 1990s the Ukrainian economy suffered a collapse, from which it is only slowly recovering. GDP has decreased by 40.8 percent; only 74.1 percent of its scope of 1990 was recovered by 1999. In this period (1990-1999) real income decreased by 32.9 percent, but has increased by 101.3 percent between 1999-2008 (Åslund, 2002; Heyts et al. 2009). The year 2000 set a turning point in Ukraine’s economic history. In 2000, the country’s economy took off with growth rates of 5.9 percent and accelerated in the following years (ICPS, 2005). GDP grew more than 12 percent in 2004; in 2005 the expansion was only 2.7 percent, however, this trend has changed again in 2006 and 2007 when GDP growth exceeded 7 percent each year (IMF, 2008). Likewise promising was the situation of the government budget showing a surplus as well as the developments at the financial sector.

At the same time Ukrainian economy has been increasingly integrated into the world’s economy and thus becoming dependent on its dynamics. Therefore the global financial-economic crisis in 2008 influenced Ukrainian economy drastically and suddenly. First, the balance of payment got under pressure and inflation of the Ukrainian currency was inevitable; secondly, exports fell and worsened the current accounts; thirdly, liquidating the banks debts and other sectors of economy were an additive problem; industrial decline, inflation and the decrease of real income as well as the breakdown of the global banking system made this also a Ukrainian crisis (Heyts et al. 2009). In the fourth quarter of 2008, GDP fell by 8 percent; a reduction of industrial production (25 percent) and exports (16 percent) only in November and December (World Bank, 2009b). This trend continued and the annual GDP growth rate for 2009 was projected at -9.0 percent (Ibid.). The trade shock affected the Ukrainian economy, exports slumped due to a sharp decline in the price of steel, which is one of the most significant export goods of Ukraine, while import were hit negatively due to the increase in the price of gas. Nevertheless, the economic downturn set in after a period of high economic growth, which has raised living standards substantially.

Initially, Ukraine was amongst the most prosperous countries within the ‘Eastern block’ despite relatively poor resources. In the early 1990s, Ukraine was ranked at 45th place on the UN Human Development Index (HDI) and was categorised among the countries with high HDI. In 2009, Ukraine is on rank 85th of the HDI, the second highest amongst the medium human development group (UNDP, 2009) (Table 1). From 2000-2007 the trend of the human development index is tentatively positive (UNDP, 2010) (Figure 2). Its GDP per capita (in current international $US) in 2008

Figure 2: Human Development Index of Ukraine, 1994-2009


In 2008, Ukraine's index of GDP per capita was ranked 97th place worldwide. But not only among high-income countries the GDP as well as the GDI demonstrate low standards in comparison to neighbouring countries (Figure 3, see annex).

The development of the Ukrainian economy (measured in GDP) in the period 1999-2008 clearly illustrates the economic crises (1990s and 2009) and dynamic cyclical developments (Figure 4). An inconstant development can be observed, for instance between 2000-2004 GDP growth fluctuated from 5.9 percent in 2000 to 12.1 percent.

Figure 4: Development of GDP: 2000–2010* (% change to previous year)


*data for January-March 2010
Economic growth starting in 2000 was caused by several factors (Heyts et al. 2009), for instance:

- Global economic growth; Ukrainian exports increased\(^2\), especially in the metal and pharmaceutical and chemical industries\(^3\);
- Increasing volumes of investment\(^4\);
- 1.2 times higher income levels.

Inflation rates improved over the years, and yet prices fluctuated heavily, which hampered further economic developments as shown below (Figure 5). During 2004-2006 inflation increased dramatically (average 11.4 percent per year) which affected prices of food products, public utilities etc. According to State Committee of Statistics data, inflation index during the period of January-March 2010 was 4.7 percent.

**Demographic Background**

*Population/depopulation*

Ukraine has a population of 45.9 million in January 2010. This number has been decreasing for almost two decades. In 1990, the population of Ukraine was 51.8 million.\(^5\) Broadly-speaking the combined effects of a reduction in the birth rate, an increase in the death rate, and the state and access to the health care system in the country as well as negative net-migration has led to a substantial decrease in Ukrainian population (Heyts et al. 2009; Shanghina 2002). This trend continues and from January-February 2010 the population size decreased by a further 39.7 thousand people.

This however might be looked at in more detail. After a long decrease in the 1990s, birth rates coefficient has started to increase gradually from 2002 onwards. The highest increase took place in 2008 (see Table 2). From a historic perspective, birth rates, death rates and population growth can be looked at by going back to Soviet times, i.e. looking at the development from the 1950 to 2008 (Figure 6). Symbolically, at the year of Ukrainian independence in 1991, the line of death rates and birth rates cross each other.

---

\(^2\) Main destinations of Ukrainian export: Russia Federation, Kazakhstan, Germany, Italy, Poland, Belorussia, Egypt: [http://www.ukrexport.gov.ua/ukr/vnishno_t_balans/3513.html](http://www.ukrexport.gov.ua/ukr/vnishno_t_balans/3513.html), accessed 1.08.2010.

\(^3\) Investment into the main product groups of Ukrainian export as stated above.

\(^4\) The biggest investors (without offshore zones) in the Ukrainian economy (January-March 2010) are Germany (16.6 percent), Netherland (9.6 percent), Russia Federation (6.7 percent), Austria (6.4 percent), UK (5.6 percent), France (4.2 percent), Sweden (3.2 percent), USA (3.1 percent): [http://www.me.gov.ua/control/uk/publish/article/info_boxes?art_id=38501&cat_id=38506](http://www.me.gov.ua/control/uk/publish/article/info_boxes?art_id=38501&cat_id=38506), accessed 01/08/2010.

At the regional level, Table 3 provides a closer insight on the oblasts’ development between 2000 and 2010 and figure 6 illustrates the birth rates for the Ukrainian sub-regions in 2009. The lowest levels can be found in the northern and eastern oblasts (Sumy, Chernihiv, Luhans’k, Donetsk) and the highest in the western regions (Rivne, Volyn’, Zakarpattya).\(^6\)

Main reasons for the declining birth rate in Ukraine could be the following:

- the worsening economic situation in Ukraine, i.e. decrease of living standards, especially in small towns and rural areas;
- transformation of the social unit of ‘the family’, older traditional models of ‘the family’ substituted by modern style of living;
- worsening health conditions of the population as such and the access to health services (Makarova, 2007);
- the development of women’s higher levels of education has led to shifted preferences of family planning; less children but providing better opportunities for child’s education and career perspectives (Aksyonova, 2007).

Kyiv is a special case not experiencing a process of depopulation, but the opposite. Table 4 underlines the constantly growing population of the city of Kyiv. The number of Kyiv population as of 1 February 2010 was 2.785 million. In January 2010 the population size grew by 158 people, mostly due to immigration processes.\(^7\) The capital’s higher standard of living and cosmopolitan lifestyle

---


are some of the factors that make Kyiv different from the rest of the country. It also attracts international migrants and people from more than 130 countries can be found in Kyiv which is unique for Ukraine (also see section on Kyiv below) (Pylynsky, 2009).\textsuperscript{8}

The death rate coefficient reached 15.3 in 2000 in comparison to the average coefficient of 10.6 in the European Union. In the 1990s, an increase of the death rate has particularly increased among the population of working age. The rate grew eightfold in the period of 1991-2000 (Shanghina 2002). Kurylo (2006) as well as Prybytkova (2008) predicted such opposite trends of birth and death rates to continue. An additional phenomenon is the aging Ukrainian society. Ukraine is among the world’s 20 oldest populations. Concerning the share of people older than 60, Ukraine is on the 11\textsuperscript{th} place, considering that the average life duration is on 66\textsuperscript{th} place (see Table 5).\textsuperscript{9}

Importantly, the de-/population process differs in rural areas and urban areas (Terets 2009). Rural area’s population gradually become older and high immigration areas (mostly in bigger cites) become younger.

\textit{Ethnicities}

The population consists of 77.8 percent Ukrainians and 17.3 percent Russians; Crimea oblasts is an exception where Ukrainians are a minority group (24.3 percent) (Figure 8).

But Ukraine is becoming increasingly diverse and over one hundred different minority groups can be found such as Armenians, Azerbajiani, Chuvashes, Czechs, Gagauz, Georgians, Germans, Greeks, Roma, Kazakhs, Lithuanians, Mordvins, Slovaks and Uzbeks (see Table 6). Ethnic Ukrainians and Russian are unequally dispersed across the oblasts as shown in table 7.

\textbf{Ukrainian Political System and Landscape}

After independence in 1991, a new democratic constitution was adopted on the 28\textsuperscript{th} of June 1996. It provides the framework for a pluralistic political system that formally guarantees the protection of basic human rights and liberties. Ukraine is a republic administered by a mixed semi-parliamentary/semi-presidential system. The President is elected by popular vote for a five-year term; executive power is exercised by the Cabinet, in particular the head of the Cabinet; the Prime Minster is nominated by the President, who must be confirmed by parliament. The parliament, the Verkhovna Rada (450 seats), is elected likewise for a five-year term and constitutes of members elected by proportional representation and by single-seat constituencies (50 percent each).


A large number of political parties can be found in Ukraine, 176 in April 2010\textsuperscript{10}. Over the past five years this number has grown 1.5 times (in 2004 there were only 102 parties). Smaller parties often join in multi-party coalitions (called ‘electoral blocks’), which allow them to participate in parliamentary elections. In the 2007 elections, representatives of 17 political parties had gained seats in the Ukrainian parliament (Tyshchenko, 2010) (see Table 8).

The reciprocal relationship between party politics and the public has an evident impact of the political landscape of Ukraine. The results of presidential elections in 2010 illustrate a clear-cut division (with only some exceptions) of the Ukrainian political landscape into two parts: west and east. Often, this is assumed to illustrate divergent geopolitical and cultural orientations, East and Russia looking versus West and EU looking (Figure 9).

Figure 9: Results of Presidential elections in Ukraine in 2010

![Map of Ukraine showing presidential election results]


An absence of transparent funding and support system of political parties, the need of reforming the present public administrations, an increasing corruption and the economic crisis are complicating the already complex issues of the Ukrainian political system. Corrupt funding of representatives of politics, public administration and industry deepens political apathy among members of the public debate. Therefore, corruption represents a severe problem and undermines the ‘rule of law’. A study conducted in 2009 demonstrates that the respondents believe that the most corrupt institutes were the Ukrainian parliament (65 percent), the President and his secretariat (59 percent) and the

government (57 percent). As regards people’s everyday-life experiences the reported corrupt officers/institutions were: traffic wardens (63 percent), judicial system (59 percent), police (58 percent) and the medical system (54 percent)\(^{11}\) (see also section below). The overall trust in Ukrainian executive powers is very low among members of civil society.\(^{12}\)

**Socio-Economic Parameters**

*Economy/Labour Market*

In 1999, the unemployment rate in Ukraine peaked (11.9 percent) but to decrease gradually in the following years. The development of unemployment rates in Ukraine (ILO definition) between 2000 and 2009 can be consulted in table 9. Among them almost every ninth lost his job due to economic/industrial reasons (Vlasyuk et al. 2005).

Unemployment rates increased in all regions. The most dramatic increases were recorded in Vinnytsya oblast (by 4.2 percent), Rivno (by 3.9 percent), Donetsk, Sumy and Poltava oblasts (by 3.7 percent)\(^{13}\). Three groups of oblasts as regards their unemployment rates can be identified and summarised as illustrated in table 10.

The main reason for unemployment is the changing structure of the Ukrainian labour market. The economic crisis of the mid-1990s led to substantial unemployment. In 1998, 41.8 percent of workers became unemployed due to structural macroeconomic reasons (Figure 10)\(^{14}\). Indeed, the majority of unemployment was not short-term but long-term unemployment; the majority (56.3 percent) of the unemployed registered in 1998 was still unemployed in 1999.

The financial crisis of 2009 gradually affected the labour market. The level of unemployment has increased by 37.5 percent (2 million) from 2008. Almost three thirds are urban populations (1.5 million) while the rural areas only account for 502,000 unemployed persons. Also a gender difference can also be observed: men were affected more likely than women (Figure 11)\(^{15}\).

From 2008 to 2009, the major developments at the Ukrainian labour market are (State Statistics Committee of Ukraine):

- A slump of economic activity in the labour force: from 72.3 percent to 71.6 percent; increased unemployment rates from 6.9 percent to 9.6 percent.


Declining rate of the creation of new vacancies (by 27.7 percent);
Declining rates of reintegrating unemployed person into the labour market: from 43.3 percent to 32.8 percent;
Increasing rate in average monthly unemployment benefits by 14.8 percent;
Increasing average monthly nominal salary by 5.5 percent; reduction of real salary index from 106.3 percent to 90.8 percent.

Nevertheless, during the past decade the overall level of unemployment rates and with it poverty (Figure 12) gradually decreased, whilst in 2008/2009 the unemployment rate has increased (Figure 11).

These indicators of poverty are contested by experts since the impact of inflation was not taken into account. Heyts et al (2009) argued that poverty level in 2008 was 16.1 percent instead of 12.6 percent. Düvell (2007: 2) indicates that about 25 percent of the Ukrainian population live on US$ 5 a day; this number is however decreasing. The Institute of Demographics and Social Studies (2008) conducted a study that found 28.2 percent of the Ukrainian population belong to the category of ‘poor’ and 15 percent live in destitution. In 2009, the highest index number of poverty could be found in Zakarpattya oblast, and the lowest in the city of Kyiv. The highest share of people affected by poverty though can be found in Donetsk oblast, the lowest in Kirovograd oblast.

Only in five of the oblasts the average wage was higher than the national average wage: city of Kyiv (UAH 3.022, $US 377), Donetsk oblast (UAH 2.224, $US 278), Dnipropetrovsk oblast (UAH 2.033, $US 254), Kyiv oblast (UAH 2.006, $US 250), Luhansk oblast (UAH 1.975, $US 247). The lowest level of wages can be found in Ternopol (1.455 UAH, $US 182), Volyn (1.479 UAH, $US 185), Chernihiv (1.510 UAH, $US 189) and Kherson (1.535 UAH, $US 192) oblasts.

In February 2010, the total amount of unpaid salaries for employees and workers increased by 2.7 percent or by UAH 45 million UAH, and on 1 March it rose by 17.9 percent (UAH 264 million), up to UAH 1738 million. The highest rates of unpaid salaries can be found in Kirovohrad, Zhytomyr, Sumy and Luhansk oblasts; the lowest in Ivano-Frankivsk oblast.

Education

Ukraine has a well-organized system of education, a relic from Soviet times (Figure 13). The education level of the Ukrainian population is comparatively high when looking at international indicators. The level of literacy is 99.4 percent (men 99.7 percent and women 99.2 percent). In 2005

---

16 Minimum wage in Ukraine was 744 UAH in 2010.
18 Ibid.
only 12 percent of the economically active population had not finished secondary education, but more than 45 percent had finished specialized secondary or polytechnic education.\textsuperscript{20}

The sector of higher education plays a significant role in Ukraine; high numbers of students and eductive institutions illustrate this role (Table 11). About 7 percent of the Ukrainian GDP is spend on education, which represents $US 143 per capita, placing Ukraine at 48\textsuperscript{th} place worldwide (Heyts et al. 2009).

The Ukrainian education system was not reformed after the independence and therefore failed to adjust to the transition of the economy. During the 1990s, many academics emigrated to the USA, Russia, Germany, Israel and Canada. During the last 15 years 600 fellows of National Academy of Science institutions have moved abroad; among them 105 doctors of sciences and 327 candidates of sciences\textsuperscript{21}. However, in more recent years the number of ‘academic emigration’ has shrunk to one tenth of the number of academics leaving Ukraine during the 1990s.

\textit{Health care}

Health care is a problematic issue in Ukraine. In particular high rates of HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis-infections are a severe problem in Ukraine (International Centre of Prospective Studies, 2008). The health care sector is underfinanced and understaffed, additionally it is burdened by the constantly increasing consumer prices (Figure 14). The general access to health care is becoming increasingly restricted; an asymmetric relationship between demand and supply of health care becomes evident.\textsuperscript{22}

\textit{Rights}

Although human rights are guaranteed and protected by law, the implementation level shows substantial deficiencies. Shortfalls of the Ukrainian legal system and necessary reforms in the judicial system exacerbate the enforcement of human and social rights. Discriminative actions, for instance, at the work place as well as unfair payment of employees are only two examples. International bodies (such as UNO, OSCE, Council of Europe, European Court of Human Rights) as well as non-governmental organizations confirm that human rights issues emerged in the relation to Ukrainian security agencies, a corrupted judicial system, anti-Semitism, minority groups, freedom of speech, human trafficking and others (Heyts et al. 2009).\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{23} The Kharkiv Human Rights Protection Group offers an overview of individual cases of human rights violations, not only for the oblast of Kharkivska but also for Ukraine as a whole (http://www.khporg.org/en/, accessed 20/7/2010). Most prominently the case of a journalist’s ‘disappearance’ (Vasyl Klymentyev) was more widely discussed and has reinforced the
Social Issues: Corruption, Crime, Drugs

With reference to surveys conducted by the ‘National Press-Club of Reforms’, 24 92 percent of Ukrainians consider corruption to be wide-spread in Ukraine; 72 percent of the respondents thought that corruption has grown in Ukraine during the past five years (Hladun, 2006). Similarly, the Kyiv International Sociology Institute conducted a survey enquiring the level of corruption in Ukraine. 61.3 percent of respondents reported an increase of corruption since 2004. A research project entitled ‘Worthy Ukraine’ addressed the level of acceptance of corruption in Ukraine. Among Kyiv residents, the level of acceptance was the highest (54.4 percent) while the lowest was found in Vinnytsya oblast (23.2 percent). Such differences among regions were likewise confirmed by another study. Corrupt activities differ in western and eastern regions: extortion is widespread in eastern parts of Ukraine (such as the Kharkivska oblast) while ‘voluntary bribes’ is more common practice in western Ukraine. The most corrupt institutions (via bribing) are state medical institutions (63 percent), secondary school institutions (60 percent), police (46 percent) and road inspection (40 percent), high schools (44 percent) and institutions deciding upon council housing (40 percent).

Some experts tend to be highly critical about the issue of corruption and how this issue imbues all level of politics and public services. For instance, regarding the founding years of Ukraine Anderson and Albini (1999) claimed that forms of a ‘new oligarchy’ dominated and controlled the Ukrainian political and economic landscape with the firm help of corruption among key institutions such as the Ukrainian intelligence service. We are not aware of a recent study establishing whether and to what extent this has changed though there are grounds to believe that these ‘new oligarchs’ still hold considerable power.

Drugs are a wide-spread and precarious issue in Ukraine. The UN estimated that the number of drug addicts in Ukraine will increase in future; a sidestepping effect of the economic crisis and increasing unemployment. Closely related issues such as HIV/AIDS infections are similarly problematic. Ukraine is one of the countries of highest rates of drug use and HIV/AIDS infections. Officially, 174.000 of Ukrainians are diagnosed as “drug addicts” (see also figure 29). International experts state that the real number of drug-dependents can be calculated by multiplying eight times

---

the official number. Experts argue that the number of drug addicts will reach 1 million in the near future.\textsuperscript{31} Alcoholism is growing issue. Estimates state that 7 percent of people of working age suffer from alcoholism. Among minors and young adults this issue is gradually growing.

**Culture**

**Religions and Minorities**

The base of the Ukrainian multi-ethnic nation is mainly formed by Slavic people, who have common ancestors and speak similar languages (Indo-European languages). Most of the Ukrainian population is eastern Slavic (ethnic Ukrainians, Russians and Byelorussians), also western (Polish, Czechs and Slovaks) and southern (Bulgarians, Serbs, Croatians). Only Slavic-Christians live in Ukraine: Orthodox, Catholic and Greek-Catholic; more than 96 percent of the Ukrainian population is Slavic (Heyts et al. 2009: 492, 493).

According to the State committee on nationalities and religions, on 1 January 2009 there were 55 religious faith registered in Ukraine; of all registered communities in 2008, 51.6 percent were Christian-Orthodox, 30 percent Protestant, 11.2 percent Greek-Catholic, 3.2 percent Roman-Catholic, 1.6 percent Muslim and 0.9 percent Jewish (Figure 15).

The Ukrainian Orthodox Church dominates eastern and southern oblasts (while Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyivan Patriarchate dominate Kyiv); the Roman-Catholic Church in central oblasts; the Greek-Catholic Church and Autocephalous Orthodox Church in western oblasts; Protestant Church in central and eastern oblasts.

Two cultural macro-regions can be pointed out: Ukrainian in central and western regions and Russian in eastern and southern regions. The Ukrainian population is only a minority in the exceptional oblasts, which are the Autonomous republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol (for the distribution of minority groups and their proportions residing in Ukraine oblasts see Table 12).

**Language**

Fifty percent of the population speak Russian as first language whilst another significant number of ethnic Ukrainians regularly use the Russian language in everyday life. There is correlation between language and ethnic identity though this cannot be taken as a per se indicator for ethnic affiliation to one or the other 'nation'.\textsuperscript{32}


\textsuperscript{32} The issue of language is strongly politicised; in the field of research and public debates alike. In eastern and southern Ukraine, many Ukrainians consider the Ukrainian language as their native language, but speak Russian in their everyday
Ukrainian language is mostly used in the central, northern and western parts of Ukraine, while Russian is predominantly spoken in southern and eastern regions where the Ukrainian language is only used in state institutions and in some rural areas (Figure 16).

Figure 16: Ukrainian as a native language, percentages in each oblast (according to 2001 National Census)

The ‘language structure’ of the Ukrainian population is characterized by the following features:

- Ukrainian is the native language for 67 percent of the population, which is 2.8 percent more than according to 1989 National Census;
- Russian is the native language for 29.6 percent of the population, comparing to the previous census this indicator fell by 3.2 percent;
- The proportion of other languages named as native during this period (1989-2001); it has grown by 0.4 percent and was in total 2.9 percent;
- Respondents indicated that their national language was considered as their native language (85.2 percent of Ukrainians and 95.9 percent of Russians), which underlined the strong correlation between nationality and language, i.e. language as a strong criteria of national self-identification.

---

life. Thus, numbers as well as terminology (as used in surveys) become confusing. ‘Native language’ may be understood as ‘mother-tongue’ while ‘first language’ is the language used in everyday life.
Migration

Migration Patterns and Flows

Migration History

The history of Ukraine is characterized by foreign rulers, i.e. by colonial powers. An almost non-intermittent\textsuperscript{33} rule by dominant powers at the time can be observed: First by Lithuania and Poland, parts of today’s Ukraine were ruled by the Ottoman Empire, Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, later Tsarist Russia and subsequently the Soviet Union before its independence in 1991. These conditions also shaped the migration history of the country. Throughout the years, population movements made Ukraine a multi-ethnic and multi-religious population, while domestic turbulences led to high rates of emigration.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, rural poverty dramatically increased and undeveloped industries could not absorb the surplus of rural labour. Approximately 10 percent of this population decided to leave the country. A first wave of emigration was heading overseas: to the United States (Kuropas, 1991; Subtelny, 1991), to Canada (Martynowich, 1991)\textsuperscript{34} and to a lesser extend to South America (Cipko and Lehr, 2006). Before World War I, around 470.000 people moved to the United States and about 170.000 to Canada (Satzewich, 2002). Further emigration flows were stimulated by the unsuccessful national liberation struggle between 1917-1920 (Malynovska, 2006b).

During the Soviet rule and even more drastically during the Stalin period, hundreds of thousands of people from rural areas were forced to move, ‘dekulakized’ resettled to less populated areas. After the reunification with Soviet Ukraine, 1939-1941, possibly another million people, mainly politically engaged people, religious people, intellectuals as well as workers from rural areas were deported from western Ukraine. Among these were ethnic Germans (approx. 450.000) and Crimean Tartars (approx. 200.000), but also Armenians, Bulgars, Greeks and Poles (Malynovska, 2006b).

During the communist rule, Ukrainian emigrants only moved within the Eastern block, particularly to Russia and the oil producing Soviet Republics in the east, such as Kazakhstan (Düvell, undated). Generally, inter-soviet migration led to population growth in the Ukrainian territory. In the 1960s, migration-induced growth constituted 12 percent of the total population growth in Ukraine. This migration trend continued during the 1970s and 1980s, however, migration flows slowed down

\textsuperscript{33} Only in early 1918, Ukraine declared its independence, but its new government collapsed. The Soviet Red Army invaded and installed a Bolshevik government in 1922. Ukraine became subsequently one of the four founding republics of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR).

\textsuperscript{34} For a concise overview on Ukrainian emigration to Canada in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century: Taras Shevchenko Museum Toronto, Ontario, http://www.virtualmuseum.ca/pm_v2.php?id=story_line&lg=English&fl=0&ex=464&sl=5504&pos=1, accessed 19/04/2010.
slightly. While net-migration in most Soviet republics was negative, migration flows still contributed to population growth by approximately 8 percent (Steshenko, 1987; Zakharova, 1991). Emigration was dominated by the Ukrainian population and by 1989 close to 7 million Ukrainians, i.e. 15.4 percent of the total population resided outside Ukraine (mostly in other Soviet republics). At the same time, 43.3 percent of the Russian citizens residing in Ukraine were born outside Ukrainian territory (Anderson, 1989; USSR Goskomstat, 1989).

The Perestroika has liberated international migration for Soviet people. Restrictions to leave the country were reduced, for instance for the purpose of family reunification. Notably, members of ethnic minorities (Germans, Greeks, Jews and Poles) who had relatives abroad started to leave the Ukrainian territory between 1987 and 1990. For instance in 1990, permissions to leave for Israel only amounted 68,000.

After the Ukrainian struggle for independence from 1991 to 1993, migration flows were dominated by reverse and return migration, Russians and Belarusians moved out of the Ukrainian territory, while Ukrainians, Tatars returned from Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. The same period witnessed the arrival of first refugees.

East Ukrainians tended to move east, i.e. to Russia, whilst west Ukrainians with the exception of Zakarpattyia tended to move westwards. This pattern has changed over time and east-west movements lost its relevance after 1994 (see Pirozhkov et al. 2003, Malynovska 2004).

Due to the movement of people and the territorial change of Ukraine, ethnic Ukrainians, respectively people born on what is now Ukraine territory can be found in several countries: Russia (4.3 million in 1989; 2.9 million in 2002), U.S. (Ukrainian ancestry about 1 million), Canada (400,000 single Ukrainian ancestry and 650,000 partial ancestry), Brazil (500,000), Belarus (248,000 in

---

35 State Committee of Ukraine for Statistics, http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/, accessed 21/04/2010. Zissels (1997) points to Jewish people from several countries (Israel, the U.S., Germany, Russia) returning to Ukraine. With reference to the Ministry of Statistics of Ukraine some 6.500 Jews returned to Ukraine between 1994 and 1997, while the actual numbers figures could be two or three times higher due to ‘unregistered returnees’. Such figures need to be treated with care as Zissels (1997) noted and Gobert (2001) elaborated upon: “It is not in Israel’s best interest to report official figures for return (i.e. out-migration); it may also be in the interest of a leader of the Ukrainian Jewish community to exaggerate them” (Golbert, 2001: 730)

36 Diaspora-Ukrainians around the world (especially from Canada and the U.S.) played a vital role during the struggle for independence. A strong lobby outside Ukraine has developed over hundreds of years of Ukrainian diaspora. Meanwhile also conflicts arose between Ukrainian ‘returnees’ and governmental circles – certain diaspora politics have emerged (King and Melvin, 1999).


2007, Poland (up to 300,000), Slovakia (35,000), Lithuania (22,500 in 2001), Hungary (10,000), Czech Republic (5,000) Croatia (4,000), Moldova and Romania (Düvell, 2007; OSCE, 2001).

**Net-Migration**

The geographical position of Ukraine inevitably generates a vibrant in and out migration of people – Ukraine is situated on the European-Asian crossways; amongst east-west and west-east routes of migration. In addition, Ukraine is surrounded several countries and their relationships are characterized by active exchanges of these countries’ people. Thus, Ukraine is a country of emigration and transit migration and also increasingly receiving migrants and refugees from many parts of the world. It is one of the top sending (ranked 3) and receiving (ranked 4) countries worldwide (Düvell, 2007) (Figure 17, Table 13, Table 14).

Available migration figures are distorted by the large extent of temporary migration and circular migration. Ukrainian-Russian labour migration, for instance, varies between 1 million and 3 million (during summer season). Cross-border commuters and petty traders between Ukraine and Belarus, Poland and Turkey are another factor of distortion. These movements cannot per se be referred to as ‘migration’. Most of these business and trading trips take 1-3 days and can be rather understood as cross-border economic activity and rather an alternative to migration strategy. The impetus of such business trips is the high-income margin. One trip generates for some families up to 40 times more income than the average per capita income (Pirozhkov, 1996).

**Emigration**

In the early 1990s, after the fall of the Soviet Union, 50-60 percent of the Ukrainian population have expressed aspirations of leaving Ukraine (Shevstova, 1992). Ukrainian emigrants are estimated to be up to 7 million individuals (World Bank, 2006).

Between 1994 and 1998 some 636,000 people left Ukraine for the Russian Federation; in the course of the 1990s approximately 10,000 Ukrainian emigrants went to Argentina; within three years the Ukrainian population in Portugal increased from solely 127 to 65,000 (1999-2002) (Cipko, 2006) (Figure 18).

In the early 1990s, petty trade and shuttle traders became a common form of survival strategy (as mentioned above). This was the only form of work many Ukrainians could find during the economic

---

41 The figures stemming from the World Bank report 2007 included return migration and therefore this ranking tends to be misleading. It does however demonstrate tentative indictors, which are rather used here as illustrative figures than analytical components.
42 One shall note that these figures include non-Ukrainians from the other Soviet Republics and also a share of ethnic Russians in eastern part of Ukraine.
crisis in the mid-1990s, i.e. buying small quantities of certain goods in countries such as China, Hungary, Poland, Turkey and selling them in Ukraine and vice versa (Pavlychko, 1996). Through such trade shuttling, business contacts and network were build which facilitated gradually but increasingly labour migration. By the end of the 1990s, labour migration became a mass phenomenon. Estimates such as indicated by Malynovska (2006a) refer to 2-3 million Ukrainian citizens working abroad, mostly in building and construction sector, housekeeping as well as in the agricultural industry. Most recent numbers of Ukrainians working abroad including persons migrated as guest workers amounts to nearly 4.5 million persons, of whom nearly 1.7 million reside in the EU (Markov et al. 2009) (see also table 15, more specifically table 16 shown in the annex demonstrated the proportion of Ukrainians working and living in the EU).

The scale of remittances for Ukraine is the second highest among countries with average levels of migration flows (World Bank, 2006). No accurate figures of the scope of remittances are available, but for the year 2006, the World Bank (2009c) puts the figure of remittances at US $829 million and for the 2007 at US $4.503 million. This represents an increase of 443 percent. An estimate for 2008 was given at US $5.000 million. Malynovska (2006a) referred to a range between US $4 and 6 billion; in 2003 Boris Dovzhuk, director of the Ternopol job centre claims that annually US $100 million flow into the western Ukrainian town of Ternopol (population in 2004: approx. 205.000).

Wealth disparities triggering social disruption in Ukraine were identified (Åslund, 2004; Whitefield and Wittrock, 2009), while other scholars go a step further and call the economic transition in post-socialist Ukraine “a process of social Darwinian economic vandalism, a new form of imperialism, or, as the most radical reformers would argue, a necessary and painful step toward integration into the global economy” (Wanner, 2005).

Emigration raised not only demographic issues, but also social issues as for instance family issues. An increasing number of divorces were recorded (The Economist, 2003), while another survey resulted that 75 percent of Ukrainian women have left one or two and 8 percent three or more children behind (see also below section on discursive themes) (IOM, 2006). The issue of ‘emigration-orphans’ may have an effect on gender roles and responsibilities as well as women’s social status on the one hand, but more importantly, these children and adults are social orphans and their family life might be highly disrupted (Piperno, 2007; Yarova, 2006). The phenomenon of social orphans is increasing in numbers over past recent years in Ukraine (based on data from UNICEF, Kyiv office (Danzer and Dietz, 2009)).

---

44 Studies confirm that remittances play a decisive role for consumption and investment level, thus remittances will sustain economic growth rates (Ratha, 2003). At the same time remittances can also lead to wealth disparities in particular areas of a country which could trigger social disruptions as demonstrated by Buch and Kuckulenz (2004).
Emigrants’ aspirations widely differ, however evidences show that aspirations increasingly centred on economic motivations. A national survey confirmed that most emigrants are driven by the situation of their living conditions (Malynovska, 2006c). Only 1.1 percent of the respondents of the survey stated that they are ‘rich’, 45.6 percent described themselves as ‘poor’ and 53 percent referred to a ‘medium-level’. Malynovska (2006c) argued that in a cohort of people living close to the border areas the satisfaction of those people with their well-being is 19 times higher than among people of a nation-wide cohort (see also section on labour migration). A survey conducted in 2002 investigated how labour migrants’ households would ‘self-asses’ their increase of welfare in their family due to migration. 41.1 percent reported a ‘tangible increase’; 43.1 percent stated that their financial situation has ‘somewhat improved’; 8.8 percent stated ‘no change’ of the family well-being. At the same time, 63.4 percent referred to a higher ‘economic status’ due to labour migration and 13 percent reported a ‘poor financial situation’ (SIFY, 2004; Tolstokorova, 2009).

Similarly, INTAS45 conducted an ethno-survey (see Massey et al. 1987; Massey and Zentento, 2000)) in 2005/2006, which points to a change in motivations and major motives of (potential) Ukrainian migrants and non-migrants. Dietz (2007b) argued that a shift took place. The formerly migratory movement inspired by ethnic and political reasons after the independence of Ukraine (Frejka et al. 1999, Dietz 2007a) were replaced by motives and motivations mainly driven by economic reasons.

Economic concerns such as unemployment, social welfare and professional development were signified by more than 60 percent of population sample. About 95 percent agreed to the general question of ‘economic improvement’. Political and ethnic reasons as well as concerns over military conflicts or criminality in Ukraine were considered as causal factors by less than 20 percent (Dietz, 2007b; Wallace and Vincent, 2007).

Nonetheless, Sabuschko (2007: 4) refers to the “myth of Europe” that represents justice and social welfare, which is still alive in contemporary Ukraine. It ever since epitomised the ideal of human rights and the rule of the law. The Parisian idea of liberté, égalité, fraternité was a popular symbol that was impregnated in the imagination of Ukrainian people. Europe is still the “paradise lost”, a place where these original ideas of human rights are guaranteed and more importantly respected by the law (Sabuschko, 2007). This judicial aspect of human rights, the implementation of fundamental human rights following the rule of law is of particular significance with reference to Kuts (2006). Human rights are enshrined in the Ukrainian Constitution, however the actual implementation and enforcement of rights represent an ambiguous issue.

45 ‘International Association for the promotion of cooperation with scientists from the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union (NIS)’ was established in June 1993. This non-profit, charitable association, based in Brussels was founded with the aim of supporting scientific co-operation between scientists on the basis of mutual benefit.
Immigration

During the past two decades, Ukraine also gradually became a country of immigration and the Ministry of the Interior noticed an increase in applications for permanent residence (Braichevska et al. 2004). Indeed, in 2004, Serhiy Brytchenko, head of the Presidential Administration’s Migration Directorate drew attention to an increasing number of immigration flows into Ukraine (Brytchenko, 2004).

According to the UN Secretary General (2006) Ukraine ranks fourth in the world in terms of number of international migrants: in 2005, 6.6 million international migrants in Ukraine account for 3.6 percent of the scope of international migrants worldwide. 2 million people came to Ukraine between 1991 and 2004 mostly from former Soviet satellite states; the majority was Ukrainians returning from Russia (see also section below).

These patterns of immigration have changed during the period 1991-2010. In the first period, ethnic Ukrainians and their descendants returned to Ukraine. In a second period (2001-2010), newcomers from various destinations increasingly arrived. In 2009, 178,500 immigrants arrived in Ukraine. In the period from 2001-2009, official data provide quantities and nationalities of immigrants as illustrated in figure 19 and figure 20.

Kyiv is the hub of immigrants, but also Kharkov and Odessa are popular destinations. One of the most significant groups of immigrants is students (about 20 percent of the total immigration population). According to the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and Science (2008), most of the students are enrolled at universities in Kyiv (8526), Kharkov (8340), Odessa (3910), Donetsk (2277), Lugansk (2230), Sevastopol (2202). Further destinations are Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizia, Lviv and Poltava. In academic year (2007/2008), there were 39.700 foreign students from 129 different countries. The share of foreign students in comparison to the total number of students in Ukraine (2007: 2.72 million) is rather low, however, the trend is clearly positive since the share of total numbers of foreign students has increased from 2006-2008 by 11 percent. The most common countries of origin are China (17.24 percent), the Russian Federation (12.1 percent), Jordan (7.1 percent), Syria (6.9 percent), India (6.5 percent) and Iran (6.2 percent). More than a third enrolled in medicine.

In Ukraine, immigrants are often categorised by scholars as well as policy makers into two groups: traditional and non-traditional immigrants or old and new immigrants (e.g Braichevska, et al. 2004; Popson, 2004). Traditional or ‘old’ immigrants are considered to be immigrants from CIS countries, while non-traditional immigrants are people originating from East Asia, Africa and the Middle East.

In Kyiv alone, there were close to 500 active migrant associations, which at the time were tightly networked with the Kyivans communities and local institutions (Popson, 2004). However, most recent research assessed the third sector (NGO sector) as diminishing in number and activity (Palyvoda and Golota, 2010). Kuts (2006) concluded that civil society can not be regarded as an powerful agent in the Ukrainian political landscape.

The definition of ‘student’ may differ from other countries’ definition. This remains unclear, and therefore comparisons may be treated with care: the total number of foreign students in the Great Britain is 13 percent, in Germany 12 percent, in France 11 percent and the U.S. 4 percent.
A study conducted by the Kennan Institute in 2001–2002 included surveys interviewing immigrant households in Kyiv from twenty-three countries. The majority of respondents were from Afghanistan and Vietnam. Most of them arrived after the collapse of the Soviet Union; 38 percent of all migrants entered Ukraine irregularly. The most commonly stated impetus for leaving their countries and moving to Ukraine was ‘economic reasons’ or ‘improving living conditions’ (38 percent). A small proportion (3 percent) originally intended to only transit through Ukraine and move on to the EU (Braichevska, et al. 2004).

Refugees and Return Migration

Deported persons and their descendants returned to Ukraine and represent significant groups. 250,000 Crimean Tartars, Bulgarians, Armenians and Greeks returned to Crimea and more than 2,000 Germans resettled in southern Ukraine. After resettlement, notably Tatars found themselves on the margins of society. In 2005, only about 50 percent of returned Crimean Tartars had permanent housing, while more than 50 percent of the working age population were unemployed (Maly novska, 2006b).

Starting in 1991, after Ukraine gained independence, refugees arrived from several countries such as Afghanistan, Chechnya as well as further former Soviet republics such as Abkhazia, Uzbekistan, but at an increasing scale also from other parts of the world. In mid-1992, 60,000 victims of the conflict in Moldova/Transnistria have been granted asylum in Ukraine. Another 15,000 refugees arrived from the conflict zone of Abkhazia, however only 3,000 were granted asylum status (Stadilna, 2003). Some scattered numbers of Chechen refugees arrived in 1994 and 1995. About 1,500 to 2,000 arrived in period of 1995-1997 as a result of the war in Chechnya (Levin, 2006). Since 1997, about 1,500 citizens of the Russian Federation have applied for asylum in Ukraine, of those most are assumed to be Chechen refugees (Düvell, undated; Levin, 2006).

Ukraine adopted the first Refugee Law in 1993 but it was only implemented in 1996. Initially, recognition rates were high but have since dropped significantly. Since 1996, about 5,459 asylum seekers were granted refugee status, of which 2,277 continued to reside in Ukraine (measured at the beginning of 2008). Only a small number is legally resettlement to other safe countries as part of international schemes arranged by UNHCR (see figures 21 and figure 22).

Since 1996, the majority of recognized refugees originate from Afghanistan (51 percent, 1,171 persons); from CIS countries (including Russian Federation, Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Tajiki-

---

49 Pozniak (2008) found that 73 percent of refugees applying for asylum in Ukraine are of working age and are well-educated. 52.1 percent obtained higher education. 54.9 percent of the respondents of the survey stated that they speak in addition to their mother-tongue language Russian and Ukrainian. 30 percent claimed they speak Russian fluently.

Readmission agreements (with Ukraine installed in 2006 and ratified in 2007)\textsuperscript{52} as well as return directives\textsuperscript{53} are not designed to interfere with the right to seek asylum, but occasionally not only irregular migrants and failed asylum seekers are returned under such agreements (Byrne, 2003).\textsuperscript{54} Also asylum seekers whose application is pending and who would qualify under the protection of international law are returned. By this practice, the right to seek asylum, as enshrined in Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is violated.\textsuperscript{55}

Occasionally, refugees have no access to refugee status determination procedures (Polikarpova, 2007). As consequence of the rigid\textsuperscript{56} and partially problematic Ukrainian asylum system – although the asylum and migration mandates in Ukraine have been reorganized several times in recent years\textsuperscript{57} – is that many people turn to irregular strategies of migration as the following sections will elaborate.

\textit{Irregular Migration and Transit Migration}\textsuperscript{58}

A substantial share of Ukrainian migration is irregular (Düvell, 2007). From a EU perspective the concern of irregular transit migration (that goes through Ukraine and lead into the EU) is of particular importance (Düvell and Vollmer, 2009). Because of its geographic location as well as its established bonds and networks with Asian and African countries, which go back to Soviet times, Ukraine territory became a crossing of (predominantly) east-west migration (Dietz, 2007a; Mansor and Quillin, 2006). For the sake of protecting EU borders as well as EU interests, sophisticated border surveillance have been introduced in the case of the Ukrainian borderland. An echelon of

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{52} Council of the European Union (2007).
  \item \textsuperscript{54} Experts are undecided about the effects of readmission agreements for Ukraine. For instance Viktor Chumak argued that Ukraine will not become a migration buffer zone due to readmission treaties with the EU (ICPS, 2005b), while Uehling (2004), Vachudová (2000) and Zimmer (2008) have a much more critical view towards such readmission agreements between Ukraine and the EU.
  \item \textsuperscript{55} Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution; This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc A/810 at 71 (1948), Article 14).
  \item \textsuperscript{56} Until May 2005, Article 9 of the Ukrainian Law on Refugees only allowed to seek asylum within the first three working days (in case of irregular entry) and five working days (in case of regular entry) after arrival in Ukraine. If this deadline was ignored, asylum applications were rejected by the migration service. UNHCR office in Kyiv reported that in 2002 and 2003 up to 70 percent of asylum applications were rejected on these or similar procedural grounds (UNHCR, undated).
  \item \textsuperscript{57} For more details see below section on policy developments.
  \item \textsuperscript{58} There is no single definition for transit migration in international policy or international law. This complex concept is problematic and a definition is hampered by the vagueness and the transient nature of the phenomenon as such; for a discussion see Düvell and Vollmer (2009).
\end{itemize}
controls was introduced that reaches from inside the EU territory far into Ukraine (as far as Kyiv) (Molodikova and Düvell, 2009).

In the mid-1990s, transit routes were described that start in south-east and central Asia via Russia and Ukraine to western Europe, i.e. migrants mostly from Afghanistan, Bangladesh, China, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Vietnam; as well as the Middle East, i.e. from or through Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Syria and Turkey. Another route by migrants from Angola, Ethiopia, Morocco, Nigeria and Somalia led primarily through Turkey and Iran into the trans-Caucasus and finally to or through Kyiv and Moscow (ICPS, 2006; IOM, 1994).

In 2009, 23,384 individuals were apprehended by the State Border Guards Service for illegally crossing the Ukrainian border. The development of apprehension at the Ukrainian border from 2006–2009 and apprehensions within Ukraine as well as deportations of irregular migrants (2001-2009) can be drawn from the graphs in figure 23 and figure 24.

Duvell (undated) argued that the number of those who cross the border undetected is higher than it is commonly assumed. Suggested multipliers range from 1:2 to 1:8, however a ratio of 1:3 to 1:4 can be regarded as plausible. NGOs engaged in refugee support have confirmed such multiplier ratios.

Borders, border guards and detention centres are a precarious issue around the globe and also in Ukraine. Corrupt border guards as well as criminal gangs force migrants often to become victims of trafficking and subsequent sexual exploitation is a particular issue at the Ukraine-EU border (Düvell, 2007; Hughes, 2000; Zhyznomirska, 2006). ‘Transit migrants’ fear such criminal organisations and either decide to stay in Ukraine instead or try to travel on potentially even more hazardous migration routes.

**Gendered Migration Patterns**

The economic downturns in the 1990s particularly affected women. Women accounted in this period for an economic low performing social group and at times the unemployment rate reached 80 percent (Dyczok, 2000).

In developed regions, the share of women emigrating from Ukraine - 51 percent – marginally outweighs men (United Nations, 2006), while the share of women in the total estimated migrant stock is growing over time (Piperno, 2007; Wallace and Vincent, 2007; Zimmer, 2007a).

The gendered pattern of migration from Ukraine became obvious in the early 1990s: the majority of men migrate to eastern destinations (i.e. mostly to the Russian Federation), while women predominantly migrate to destinations west of Ukraine (i.e. Italy, Spain, Portugal, etc.) (Hormel and

59 For more details see: http://www.globaldetentionproject.org/about/about-the-project.html, accessed 08/05/2010.
Southworth, 2006; Malynovska, 1996). Determinants for such a pattern are mostly given by the economic sectors in the destination countries which have a 'gender preference'. The construction sector in the Russian Federation demands foreign male workers and the tourist and cleaning sector in western/southern EU demands foreign female workers. Up to 70 percent of migrants from western Ukraine are women (Zimmer 2007b).

In various destination countries Ukrainian migration is predominantly female: 65 percent in Spain; 75.5 percent in Greece and 90.2 percent in Italy. Petty trade to neighbouring countries of Ukraine is likewise done by 53.6 percent of women. The gender composition of migration flows changes dramatically over time depending on the seasonal as well as economic cycles (Tolstokorova, 2009).

The preference of women selecting Italy for instance has a religious background as argued by Tolstokorova (2008). Many women in domestic sector in Italy originating from western Ukraine and specially the women from traditional rural families migrated to Italy hoping to continue practicing their Catholic belief in this destination country (see also table 15).

**Two Outstanding Features of Contemporary Migration in Ukraine**

The first is the shift of migration motivations that took place according to Dietz (2007a, 2007b): from migratory movement inspired by ethnic and political reasons to motives and motivations mainly driven by economic reasons. The contextual economic and socio-political developments of Ukraine of the past 5-10 years play an important role in this development and will be analytical taken into account. The second outstanding feature is the share of women in migration process. This percentage share is high in comparison to other countries and may not only be determined by economic sectors in the destination countries but also by more complex, inner-societal conditions. A comparative perspective needs to be drawn to this particular feature.

**Politics and Discourses in Ukraine**

The following section offers a brief overview on the recent legal/policy developments concerning migration as well as an evaluation of the state-of-the-art in policy-making affairs in Ukraine.\(^60\) In a second section a brief elaboration of discursive themes will be provided that condense the core elements in policy, media and popular discourses in Ukraine.

**Policy and Legislative Developments - Internal Affairs**

The Declaration of State Sovereignty of the July 1990 guarantees the regulation of migration (Article 4, point 5). Shortly afterwards the Law on "The Citizenship of Ukraine" was adopted which fa-

\(^60\) Migration law and policy developments have been discussed in the past (e.g. Chekhovych, 2001; Kondeatiev et al. 2000; Piskun, 1998; Subotenko, 2001), but recent up-dates and critical assessments are rare.
Cilitated the repatriation of Ukrainians residing outside Ukraine. A series of laws went through parliament in the mid-1990s and in the first decade of the 21st century including:

- Draft of the Law of Ukraine “On State Migration Service of Ukraine” (No. 4797, 2009)
- Decree of the President of Ukraine on “Directions of the State migration Policy of Ukraine and Urgent Actions of Increasing of its Effectiveness” (No. № 657/2007, 2007)
- Law of Ukraine “On Refugees” (No. 2557 III, 2001)
- Law of Ukraine “On Immigration” (No. 2491 III, 2001)
- Decree of the President of Ukraine on Issues Pertaining to Arrangements for Enforcement of Law of Ukraine “On Immigration” (No. 596/2001, 2001)
- The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine Resolution "On measures to provide assistance to persons who had left places of their permanent residence in the Autonomous Republic of Abkhazia (Georgia) and arrived in Ukraine” (No. 674, 1996)
- Law of Ukraine "On Procedure for Exit and Entry of Ukrainian Citizens into Ukraine” (No. 3857 XII, 1994)

Various government departments are involved to co-ordinate such laws and regulations. The State Committee of Nationalities and Migration and several sub-bodies at regional and local levels were created in 1993 and expanded in 1994. Main bodies that are involved include the Ministry of the Interior, the State Committee for Border Control, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Security Service of Ukraine, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, the Ministry of Health as well as the Ministry of Statistics. In addition, the international policy arena got increasingly engaged with Ukrainian migration affairs. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) commenced collaborations with Ukrainian authorities. The initial liberal policy approach towards migration, mostly return migration, and towards ethnic minorities during the first decade after the independence has gradually changed to a more restrictive approach. For instance, the rights of immigrants and the amount of available resident permits in Kyiv were limited (Braichevska et al. 2004). From the beginning if the 21st century policy-makers aimed at discouraging further immigration (Popson, 2004). According to Article 5 of Ukrainian law.
"On migration", there is a set immigration quota for Ukraine (the categories of ‘immigrants’ and ‘distribution by regions’ for 2010 can be found in table 17).61

Experts such as Malynovska (2004) described the state of laws and policies as unclear and scattered; a coherent strategy is missing.62 Policy-making culture in the past can be best characterised by reactionism due to rapid geopolitical, economic and societal transformation. This time of changes therefore made policy-makers focus on controlling measures first, i.e. in order to control the state of affairs in the Ukrainian migration regime. Consequently, one of the most developed policy sub-areas in both ways legislative and institutional is the area of irregular migration. As early as January 1996, the Ukraine government planned for a prospective program to control irregular migration, which were followed by further policy programs such as ‘Programme for the Prevention of Illegal Migration 2001-2004’63. Düvell and Vollmer (2009) underlined the lack of a coherent policy framework on migration in Ukraine. They point to an incoherent institutional organisation and management has an additional sidestepping influence on the implementation level of migration policy. Which department or authority at local level is in charge for which policy measure and is responsible for which implementation action is often unclear and introduces managerial uncertainties. Policies towards labour migrants, the insufficient number of relevant bilateral agreements on labour migration, and of consular services outside Ukraine, were especially criticised in the view of African and Asian countries as likewise endorsed by Pylynskyi (2008a).

Corruption is another complex issue. Corruption in Ukraine is not only a legal issue but also a societal and cultural issue. Pylynskyi (2008a) refers to the Ukrainian economy (or possibly to the Ukrainian state system as such) that follows certain rules which are not in line with the western European standards of rule of law. The stringent Ukrainian law has an asymmetric relation to its ‘permissive application’. The judicial system also is not free of corruption, instead corruption became internalised as a cultural artefact and part of ‘everyday business’. In addition (or as a consequence) policy-making or policy affairs as such are not held transparent. Particularly in this area of policy implementation, the complex issue of corruption within authorities and enforcement agencies seem vital (Pylynskyi, 2008a). Pylynskyi (2008a: 7) referred to policemen who treat migrants as a kind of “money source” and a “feeder” (through bribes).

A key issue in the Ukrainian policy domain on migration policy-making is the matter of demographic developments. The main indicators and estimates play a significant role in the process of decision-making. The discipline of demographic research appears to be at the centre of governmental interests and on this way a slightly weighted research field can be found bringing about a

61 The quota for Kyiv is the highest (2,247 people), Kharkiv oblast (1,132 people), and the smallest quota is for Volyn oblast (45 people). The Ternopil oblast has an immigration quota of 124 people. Notably, this quota does not include students from other countries.

62 The IOM (2006) criticised the absence of a coherent conceptual legal framework on national migration policy and management. “Clearly cut outlined mechanisms and feasible tools for implementation” were needed (IOM, 2006: 9).

plethora of especially quantitative studies (e.g. Adamets et al. 2009; Libanova and Kurilo, 2009; Pozniak, 2008; Shevchuk and Shvydka, 2009).

External Affairs/EU Politics

As an immediate external neighbour of the EU, Ukraine is of highest interest to the EU. Ukrainian authorities have not been preparing for administration and resources to deal with large-scale immigration and integration, since immigration was not regarded as a matter of national interest. Migrants from countries with no links with Ukraine were anticipated to move on towards the EU instead of staying in the Ukraine (Düvell and Vollmer, 2009). Therefore, stability and migration rank high on the EU-Ukrainian policy agenda, particularly in respect to the Ukrainian aspirations of joining the EU (Fischer et al. 2008; Turczyński, 2005).

In the meanwhile the EU sent signs of seeking a closer and yet distant relationship with Ukraine. Broader cooperation was formalised through the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (1998) and the EU-Ukraine Association Agenda (2009) rated by experts as ‘ambitious’ (Boroda et al. 2010). With respect to migration various initiatives were agreed: the EU Action Plan on Justice and Home Affairs (2001) on border crossing from Ukraine into the EU; the European Neighbourhood Policy (2004); Söderköping Process (2003) initiated by the Swedish migration authority, IOM, UNHCR and EU authorities on regional border controls; the European Union Border Assistance Mission (EUBAM) (2005) targeting autonomous zone of Transnistria/Moldova; Border Management at the Moldova-Ukraine Border (BOMMOLUK) to improve border controls at the Moldova-Ukraine border; and the General Directors’ Immigration Service Conference (GDISC) an ongoing cycle of meetings of senior officials of EU and non-EU directors of migration control authorities.

Simultaneously, Ukraine has signed a number of bilateral labour agreements with various EU countries and a number of countries, which aimed at the protection of Ukrainian citizens and workers abroad. Some EU member states arranged specific agreements with Ukraine notably Portugal which requires work visa and employment contracts and in exchange guarantee various social rights, also for temporary workers (Ukrainian Ministry of the Interior, 2005).

Also the EU’s Copenhagen criteria were addressed in the past and Ukraine has ratified a number of human rights treaties and conventions such as the:

- Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime 2000;
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966;

---

• International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination 1966;
• Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment 1984;
• Convention relating to the Status of Refugees 1951;
• Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women 1979;
• International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966;

International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families 1990 was not ratified by Ukraine as of yet.

**Discursive Themes**

The underlying discursive evidences that were found in the different discourses in Ukraine are only sketched in the following sections. Exemplifying evidences will be stated only as to suffice for the purposes of this report. The discursive themes that were derived from this broad-brush approach have cross-cutting relevance for each discourse domain (policy, popular, media), and these will be the following:

- Emigration – Ambiguous discursive elements: dangers, human losses or heroic act
- Immigration, identity, security
- EU – Ukraine relations

**Emigration – Ambiguous Discursive Elements: Dangers, Human Losses or Heroic Act**

Policy campaigns were launched in the past, which let the discursive element of ‘emigration as danger’ emerge, i.e. emigration cannot only be an improvement of persons’ life situation but it can also bear dangers (Shelley, 1998). This is expressed in information on trafficking emphasising emigration risks for women (IOM 1998) or the activities of women support NGOs (“La Strada Ukraine”). In 2005, the Ukrainian government announced the creation of bureau to combat human trafficking (Associated Press Newswires, 2005). Collaborative operations between the Ukrainian authorities and the IOM have started the same year (BBC Monitoring Ukraine and Baltics, 2005). Nevertheless, in the policy as well as in the popular discourse, a distinction between migration processes (e.g. irregular migration processes such as smuggling) and trafficking (a criminal process of trade) is missing and therefore figures may be highly overestimated and related discursive themes on these highly distinct matters have started to get interchanged and misleadingly intertwined.

65 “In 1998, the Ukrainian Ministry of Interior estimated that 400,000 or more Ukrainian women were trafficked during the previous decade” (Düvell, 2007: 3).
At policy level, the scope of emigration developed into a political dispute, in which emigrants become subjects of the games played by competing political forces (Bilan et al. 2010). The parliamentarian opposition usually refers to high numbers of emigration since higher numbers are used as a discursive tool to accuse the government of being incapable of creating appropriate social and labour policies. Therefore, it is argued, people leave the country and Ukraine might ‘lose’ valuable human capital or ‘members of their own kind’. On the other hand, government circles behave reluctant when it comes to measures that address the reduction of emigration figures. Instead, the government aims for advocating and supporting ‘ordinary’ Ukrainians who wish to stay in Ukraine and have no aspiration of leaving Ukraine.

Scholars and policy makers likewise refer to a capital or ‘human loss’ fearing that Ukraine is ‘losing’ their people66. Effects such as brain drain or emigration of highly-skilled Ukrainians can have ambivalent economic effects67, however, discursive artefacts among members of the public rather confirm the element of ‘human losses’. In the popular discourse this act of ‘leaving the mother country behind’, was occasionally associated with ‘dissidents’. For instance, in an open letter by a priest from the Lviv region to the Ukrainian President in 2003 pointed to Leonid Danylovych’s and his government’s fault of “sending away millions of our citizens, representatives of our intelligentsia, into strange lands”.68 In line with this narrative, Sabuschko (2007) argued that first the Ukrainian intelligentsia was keeping alive the Ukrainian culture as European culture for which they were send to prisons and gulags at the time, and nowadays the Ukrainian intelligentsia tends to leave its own country behind.

A more general policy approach is taken by the Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights (UPCHR) (2004) which, in collaboration with Ukrainian consular posts highlights the negative experiences of Ukrainians abroad. In this context the related theme of protection of rights of Ukrainians abroad is brought into play.69 In contrast, further discursive evidences found in popular discourses point to a different picture of emigration – introducing an ambiguous aspect into the discursive theme of emigration. Emigration does not only appear as a ‘human loss’ or ‘act of dissidents’ but was also described as investments in the future or as an inevitable sacrifice that one can do for others such as family members. In contemporary migration cultures and narratives of migration Emigration can stand for a ‘heroic act’ as found in the case of Filipino (Rafael, 1997; Tyner, 1997) or Indonesian migrants (Robinson, 2000). In the case of Ukraine, ethnographic fieldwork in

---

66 These ‘depopulation processes’ are also discussed in the context of abandoned residential property (apartments in the cities and houses in small towns and villages). This emerging development can be observed in some smaller towns such as cities in Donetsk and Dnipropetrovsk oblasts (Pylinskyi, 2008a)
67 Not only negative effects of having lost social capital to other countries, but also encouragement for non-migrants to fill such positions of highly-skilled emigrants, which reduces negative economic effects, were found by Lundborg and Rechea (2002).
68 Mykhaylo Nyskohuz, Open letter to the President of Ukraine, 15/03/2003 in Keryk (2004: 2).
69 For this reason, the Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs initiated first steps to guarantee mechanism in the area of foreign employment and social security including a treaty for creation and free trade zone between Ukraine and EU as well as new regulations for the movements of employees (Official letter of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine No. 71/BKB/36-194/503-60046 from 23/07/2008 to the International Centre’s for Policy Studies inquiry (see IPP et al. 2008)).
western Ukraine also found this heroic element in migration cultures. “I realised I had to go; I had to go for my family”\textsuperscript{70} as an interviewee confessed while another interviewee proudly stated: “Some people are just afraid, but I have put a lot of efforts of learning other languages so I could make my life in Germany […], so one day I will live in Spain or Italy and I will have a good life there”\textsuperscript{71}

The three main elements briefly illustrated in this section demonstrated the ambiguous nature of the theme of emigration in the Ukrainian discourses. Although emigration can contribute to the economic welfare of emigrants and their families who can be seen as the ‘saviours’ or ‘heroes’ in critical times, discursive elements with negative connotations were found. At policy level these negative aspect are endorsed by the ‘dangers’ that migration can potentially bear (i.e. trafficking) and in the popular discourse emigrants are swiftly portrayed as ‘dissidents’ or ‘traitors’, people who leave their country and their culture behind.

\textit{Immigration, Identity, Security}

Immigration and repatriation has an impact of the composition of population. Pylynskyi (2008a) points to the changing ethnic structure in Ukraine. This has a certain impact on politics or ‘ethno-politics’, which are heatedly debated issues and have discursive effects. Malynovska (2003) argued that these effects have prevented active support for the repatriation of ethnic Ukrainians (Malynovska, 2003). The Ukrainian state missed to reinforce policy-making on ethnic Ukrainians who resided outside Ukraine and wished to return to Ukraine. A large number of Ukrainians residing in Transcaucasia and Central Asia immigrated into the Russian Federation instead of returning to their ‘home country’.

A survey was conducted with Kyivan citizens and experts which demonstrated that people are not concerned by the arrival of immigrants from Asia, Africa, and the Middle East (Braichevska et al. 2004). The overwhelming majority of respondents did not refer to immigrants as ‘competitors on the labour market’. The few respondents who had a negative attitude indicated an optimistic future, i.e. relations between Ukrainian citizens and immigrants may improve over time. However, Malynovska (2004) pointed to public fears of uncontrolled influx of foreigners entangled with Ukrainian nation-building and identity formation. The role of the ‘ethnic core’ is a theme in popular discourse, which addresses the formation of Ukrainian statehood and its ambivalent debate on Ukraine as a multi-ethnic and multi-lingual country opposed by the question of a homogenous ‘one nation-state’. Stability and integrity are two features of statehood that seem to have highest stands in popular discourses and immigration may pose a danger to these two desires. A survey conducted by the Institute for Demography and Social Studies and the Kennan Institute addressed students in Kyiv on their attitude towards immigrants from developing countries. 35.4 percent of respondents said ‘No, Ukraine has to be the country for Ukrainians’ and 19.3 percent of respondents thought that

\textsuperscript{70} Informal conversation 1, Zbarazh in Ternopilska oblast.
\textsuperscript{71} Informal conversation 2, Lviv.
government policies should stimulate immigration only for ethnic groups that are ‘traditionally’ living in Ukraine (Pylynskyi, 2008b).

Malynovska (2004) described popular themes of ‘threats’ and of ‘invasions of foreigners’, which are recurrently used by the Ukrainian media. Many journalists draw on their own alarming prognoses and refer to “uncontrolled migration is a threat to the national security of Ukraine.” Nikolayenko (undated) found in her study that the Ukrainian media focuses on negative aspects of immigration such as the direct relation between immigrants and crime, ‘imported’ diseases as well as drug use. Unfounded claims in popular discourses on epidemic diseases among migrants and the fear of its spread to the ‘Ukrainian population’ can be found. Ukraine’s HIV/AIDS infection rate is one of the highest amongst non-African countries (CIA, 2005) and such facts give rise to discussion.

A further element of security can be also found in the popular discourses: a growing Muslim population is getting associated with policy strategies of counter terrorism (Popson, 2004). Xenophobic movements appear to be an increasing element in the public sphere. Skinheads and racist groups are marginal in Ukraine but racist violence is increasingly condoned by parts of society (Pylynskiy 2008a).

Some media sources focus on prophesising future threats that the Ukrainian society may have to face. Direct relations to situations and incidences in the EU are constructed as to exemplify these potential future threats induced by immigrants (e.g. Paris and its suburban riots). Ukrainian media coverage by and large ambiguously simplifies migration processes. For instance, a series of sensationalistic articles in Ukrainskyi tyzhden (Ukrainian week) on migrants’ journey through Ukraine to western Europe mainly drawing attention to border guards and national security services perspective. Realistic coverage is additionally hampered by foci that address the conflict-loaded relationship among government departments as regards issues of migration (Pylynskyi 2008a). Popson (2004) referred to the media coverage as ‘sensationalistic news stories’, which mainly report on irregular migration, crime, and drug/human trafficking. Irregular migration and associated

---

73 The issue of a potential ‘soft security threat’ as generally discussed by Ullman (1983) and for the case of Russia by Tsiulina (2008), also influence public discourses on xenophobic behaviour in Ukraine. Nevertheless, an element for national security threat as Tsiulina (2008) has argued, goes far beyond the scope in the case of Ukraine.
74 For the case of Ukraine, securitization processes were identified and critically reviewed by Zhyznomirska (2006). Similar to the discussions in the past, Zhyznomirska (2006) pointed to the dangers of demonising and stigmatising social groups. The discursive construction of such threats and stigmatisation of migrants as ‘criminals’, ‘bogus refugees’ and ‘intruders’ has been discussed in academia in the framework of the theory of securitization of migration (Buzan, 1992; Waever et al. 1993; Bigo, 2005) and applied to certain country contexts such as Germany (e.g. Vollmer, 2008) and France (e.g. Freedman, 2004).
76 The media discourse in Ukraine represents a comparatively similar bottom line as it can be found in EU Member States: demonising immigration, sending out messages of alarming ‘foreign threats’ and negatively exacerbating migration related issues (Vollmer, 2009).
77 Ukrainskyi tyzhden (Ukrainian week), 27/06/2008 - 03/07/2008.
process are generally overrepresented in the media (e.g. The Ukrainian Observer; News Agency Prima; Kyiv Post).

In Zakarpattia oblast as well as western Ukraine, frequently, local media reproduces border guard reports that demonstrate success in enforcement matters. Apprehension figures recurrently underline effective border operations in order to demonstrate the authorities’ control over migration affairs (Düvell and Vollmer, 2009). Journalists refer to grossly exaggerated figures of irregular migrants in the country which has led to article titles such ‘Is Kyiv a paradise for illegal migrants?’ including recommendations such as “cleaning the markets in Shuliavka [Kyiv] with fire” or accusing migrants from Eastern Asian countries to be criminals.

This convoluted discursive theme fleshed out by elements of immigration, identity and security has demonstrated the interrelations between migration and ethno-politics, migration and security on the one hand, and on the other it showed how ‘new’ or ‘young’ these elements are in the discourses: sometimes radical statements can be found in discursive evidences; discourses appear to be immature.

**EU – Ukraine Relations**

Tense relations are at stake between the EU and Ukraine. Some discursive elements as regards migration related topics can be summarised.

The first element involves the asymmetric relationship between visa requirements for travelling into the EU for Ukrainian citizens and the absence of visa requirements for EU citizens travelling to Ukraine. Oversimplified, the former stands for a closed club and some people with appropriate documentation are allowed into the club while the latter is an open door. From a policy perspective, restrictive visa regulation may result in reverse effects (i.e. an increase of irregular migration) as it was discussed by Shakhno and Pool (2005). However, in a public arena the matter of unfairness is the predominating element in this discursive theme.

Although some ‘friendly’ signals were launched by EU administration, Ukraine’s next steps will be rather directed towards its internal socio-economic problems and integration of a functional economic cooperation with its western as well as eastern periphery. Efforts can be anticipated towards positioning Ukraine and its supporting geopolitical stability and security in the region, also in the view of having a status of a major eastern transport and energy transit country for Europe (Vlasyuk et al. 2005).

Secondly, ongoing Ukrainian-Russian relations play a decisive role in EU-Ukraine politics. After the breakdown of the Soviet Union, a tense relationship has developed between Ukraine and Russia.

---

78 Dzerkalo Tyzhnia (Mirror of the week), 13/06/2008.
Some political issues arose in more recent years as regards foreign affairs. The aftermath of the August 2008 Russia-Georgia conflict, Kyiv had to deal with increasingly assertive signals from Russian foreign policy. Reading such signals a bit more carefully, the Kremlin occasionally expresses its unhappiness with Kyiv’s endeavours towards the EU (Pifer et al. 2009). The issues of Ukraine’s geopolitical orientation, the Black Sea Fleet, Sevastopol as well as Crimea were and will be in future a ‘hot iron’ in the domain of Ukrainian-Russian relations. In turn, due to the role of Russia and the ‘cultural divide’ in Ukraine, these international or foreign affairs can have implications on the inner political spheres or can become ‘internal’ matters as such. In fact, these issues have the political dynamite to trigger an internal political crisis, let alone a foreign political crisis with Russia as well as the EU.

The newly elected government of President Yanukovych, however, after reassuring the relevance of good EU-Ukraine relations is nevertheless considered rather pro-Russian which will change the geopolitical role of Ukraine.
Background on Research Areas

Kharkivska Oblast and the Research Area Novovodolaz’ka

**Geography: Climate, Agro-Ecological Conditions**

Kharkivska oblast is located in north-east Ukraine. There are two climate zones: the forest in the central, northern and western areas and the plains in the southern and eastern areas. The north and northeast of Kharkivska oblast shares borders with the Belgorodskaya oblast of the Russian Federation. The territory of the region is 31.4 thousands sq. km that accounts for 5.2 percent of the territory of Ukraine. High-yield black soil and favourable climate conditions allow the region to produce commodity grain, the most important industrial crop, as well as to run oleiculture and gardening.

**Demography**

The population of Kharkivska oblast, estimated on the 1st January 2010, was 2,769,100 (2,214,100 urban population and 555,000 rural population). In 2009 the population decreased by 13,333 people which is due to demographic changes and migration processes as demonstrated below. In 1995-2010 this linear decrease was observed across almost all districts of Kharkivska oblast and amounted to 340,900 people (Figure 25).

The region is characterized by high population density: 93 persons per sq. km. The most densely populated suburban rayons of the oblast are: Kharkivskyy (133 persons per sq. km), Dergachivskyy (110 person per sq. km). The lowest population density is in Bliznyukivskyy (19 person per sq. km) and Dvurechansky (20 person per sq. km) rayons. In 2010 the urban population made up 79.71 percent and the rural population 20.29 percent of (see Table 18).

The negative population growth is a typical feature of the Kharkivska oblast as well as of Ukraine as a whole. Despite the fact that there was a positive trend in increasing fertility rates in the region, the mortality rate exceeded this rate.

The age structure of the oblasts has also changed; the population is becoming increasingly older. The share of the population older than working age in Kharkivska oblast was 24.5 percent in 2008 (see also table 20 in annex).

---

**Education**

There are 70 institutions of higher education operating in Kharkivska oblast. At the beginning of the academic year 2009/10, 267.500 students were enrolled in the universities which was 5.6 percent less than in the previous academic year. In comparison with the data of 2008, the share of the full-time students decreased by 3.6 percent.

The total share of the female student population was 52.2 percent, in the universities of the I-II levels of accreditation (44 percent) and in universities of III-IV levels of accreditation (52.9 percent). Notably, Kharkivska oblast has the second highest number of students (after Kyiv) in Ukraine.

On February 2010, 12.004 foreign students representing 41.8 percent of the total foreign population in the oblast obtained higher education degrees in Kharkiv. Of these, the highest numbers of the students were from Turkmenistan, China, Vietnam, Russia, Jordan, Morocco, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and India.

The demand for high-skilled labour decreased in the past few years in Ukraine, but particularly in Kharkivska oblast. Almost 50 percent of graduates are unable to find jobs in the profession they were trained for. Instead, the labour market demands more machine operators, construction workers etc. Paradoxically, the number of vocational schools that train such specialties (machine operators, construction workers) is decreasing annually (Figure 27). In contrast, vacancies for accountants, economists and traders are rare.

**Economic/Industrial Structure**

Kharkivska oblast is one of the economic leading oblasts in Ukraine. In 2008, the Gross Regional Product (GRP, in current prices) of Kharkivska oblast was 59.389 million UAH, which has increased by 2.1 percent in the period 2007-2008 (just below the Ukrainian average of 2.3 percent) (Table 21). In 2008 its share of the GDP of Ukraine was 6.3 percent. After, Kyivska (17.9 percent), Donetsk (12.4 percent) and Dnipropetrovska oblasts (11.0 percent), it has the 4th highest GRP.

The index of the industrial production in January-March 2010 in comparison with the corresponding period of the previous year was 113.1 percent (national index: 110.8 percent). The production of the mining industry decreased by 1.1 percent; natural gas production increased by 0.7 percent; the output in the processing industry increased by 1.7 percent; the iron and steel industry grew by 9.2 percent.

---

83 Network and activity of the higher education institutions at the beginning of 2009/10 academic year / Department of Statistics in the Kharkivska oblast, published on the 25.11.2009 № 423
84 Records of Gross Regional Product (GRP) only started in 2004 in Ukraine. Before 2004 value added price was used as main economic indicator.
In January-February 2010 average monthly nominal wages in Kharkivska oblast was 1.799 UAH, 2.4 times higher than the standardized minimum wage (744 UAH). However, the nominal income in the region was 6.9 percent or 134 UAH less than the average nominal income in Ukraine. A positive trend of growing income levels for the period 2002-2008 can be observed in Kharkivska (Table 22). Nominal average wages have increased in Kharkivska oblast, but in 2009 it decreased by 26.9 percent and real wages by 13.7 percent in comparison with 2008 (Table 23).

In 2008/2009 the labour market of Kharkivska fell into a depression (Figure 28); the demand for workers slumped by 7 percent. In 2009, the unemployment rates for the working age population (ILO methodology) increased by 43.3 percent (105.5 thousand persons); the unemployment rate grow to 8.4 percent. Unemployment remains a major problem among young people. One third of the unemployed population is under the age of 35 and 30.4 percent are rural residents.

Social Issues: Corruption, Crime, Drugs

A large-scale survey addressing the issue of corruption in Ukraine resulted that the two oblasts of Donetska and Kharkivska lead the Ukrainian corruption index.86

Drug addiction remains one of the harmful social diseases in Ukraine, also in the Kharkivska oblast (Figure 29).87 Kharkivska oblast became not only a transit point for drugs, but also a market place for drugs (Sobolev and Serdyuk, 2000).

An increase in juvenile crime is a serious problem for major Ukrainian cities including Kharkiv. In 2009, the number of crime has increased in the city of Kharkiv: 2 murders, 17 robberies, 57 burglaries, 30 crimes related to illegal seizure of vehicles.

Ethnicity

Russians are the largest ethnic minority in the Kharkivska oblast. Their number declined in 2001 by 7.6 percent compared to 1989. The proportion of all other ethnic groups in Kharkivska oblast can be drawn for the table below (Table 24).

The Ukrainian language was considered as the native language for the 53.8 percent of the population and Russian by 44.3 percent, which is respectively 3.3 percent more and 3.8 percent less than in 1989.88

Migration

Kharkivska oblast’s proximity to the Russian Federation and its historical, social and economic peculiarities determine the scope, reasons and the structure of emigration patterns. Also the geographic and transport conditions of the oblast facilitate regional migration. Kharkivska oblast is selected as a region with a high level of emigration; indeed, in 2009 the oblast ranked next to Donetsk oblast as the oblast with the second highest level of emigration in Ukraine. According to official data the total number of emigrants from the Kharkivska oblast was 1967 (2009).

The Russian Federation is the main destination for emigrants from Kharkivska oblast. These emigrants can easily and legally travel to Russia thanks to a visa-free policy. However, most of these migrants work illegally, i.e. without the required permit. Most of migrants are men who work predominantly in construction, especially in and around Moscow and other industrial centres. In other words most of the migratory movements in and out of Kharkivska oblast is not recorded and therefore not reflected in the official statistics.

High level of unemployment and comparatively low living standards (including economic, ecological and social factors) led to emigration and subsequent family issues. Family members following the emigration path in order to be reunited with their family members abroad is a highly significant reason for emigration in Kharkivska oblast (accounting for 77 percent) (Figure 30).

For the period 2000-2005, 11 percent of emigrants left the country for better education abroad; labour emigration is likewise about 11 percent; 1 percent of the recorded departures are children of emigrants who were left behind in the country and decided to go and leave the country on their own. Other undefined reasons accounts for less than 1 percent.

Discursive Elements - Emigration to the East as a ‘Survival Strategy’ and Growing Xenophobic Landscapes

Firstly, labour migration plays a dominant role in Kharkiv oblast. A steady growth in the number of households opting for this strategy of survival, i.e. by temporarily leaving the country for seeking work abroad can be increasingly observed and is likewise represented in popular discourses. According to a survey conducted in 2006, 32 percent of respondents in Kharkiv oblast with varying degrees of certainty expressed their desire to work abroad (Kazilov, 2006). Most households of Kharkiv oblast are oriented toward Russia. Inhabitants of Kharkiv oblast tend to express an affinity to Russian culture, they speak Russian and feel comfortable with the Russian way of life and mentality and thus seem to prefer the Russian Federation over Europe in their choice of migration destination countries.

Secondly, the Ukrainian media and several NGOs reported about protests against irregular migrants and foreign students in Kharkiv, Ternopil, Chernivtsi, and Chernihiv.\textsuperscript{90} In 2009, a Kharkiv based but national association "Svodoba" organized a demonstration in Kharkiv against irregular migration.\textsuperscript{91} The demonstrators demanded to abolish the readmission agreement regarding deportation of third-country irregular migrants from EU member state to Ukraine.

**Research Area - Novovodolaz'ka Rayon**

Novovodolaz'ka is a rayon (administrative unit of an oblast) situated in the west of the Kharkivska Oblast. Nova Vodolaga is the administrative center of the Novovodolaz'ka rayon, 45 km away from Kharkiv. The current population of Nova Vodolaga is 13,000. The distribution of urban and rural population as well as the size of the research area of Novovodolaz'ka can be drawn from table 26.

According to the data of the Oblast State Archive, Novovodolaz'k rayon was created in 1923 by order of the Presidium of the Ukrainian Central Executive Committee and the present boundaries established on 4\textsuperscript{th} of January 1965 by the decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of Ukraine.\textsuperscript{92} The administrative center of the rayon is Nova Vodolaga, an urban-type settlement was founded in 1675. The structure Novovodolaz'sk rayon includes 2 townships, 13 rural councils and 56 settlements.

Novovodolaz'sk has 21 programs of development of industries, agriculture, medicine, education, culture, sports and social work over the years. Today, Novovodolaz'k rayon provides higher education at the Lipkovatovsk Agricultural College and the Rokitnensk Vocational Technical School; the rayon has 32 schools, 15 preschools, 31 libraries and 30 cultural institutions, including ‘Regional Center of Social Services for Youth’, ‘Children’s Art School’, ‘Vatutinsk Music School’, ‘House of Children and Youth Art’, ‘Children and Youth Sport School’. Likewise, a Central Rayon Hospital was built, 4 district hospitals, 4 ambulant clinics, 27 obstetric units.

The rayon’s industry is dominated by 2 large enterprises which are the Novovodolaz’sk dairy and Novoselivs’k Mining and Processing Plant. The agricultural industry consists of 28 agricultural enterprises, 48 farms, a number of small subsistence farms, as well as larger companies such as Agrobiznes-NV, Agroservis, Agrokhimiya. Main products of the rayon are grain, meat and milk.

Kyiv City and the Research Area Solomyansky Rayon

Geography: Climate, Agro-Ecological Conditions

Kyiv is the capital and the largest city of Ukraine, located in the north central part of the country and on both sides of the Dnieper River which flows north to south through the city towards the Black Sea. It is surrounded by forests and plains Kyiv's climate is continental humid, although it has changed significantly during recent decades due to global climate changes.

Demography

Kyiv attracts people from many other regions in Ukraine. According to official data, the capital of Ukraine is one of the few regions where population size is constantly growing (Figure 31).

Since the beginning of the new millennium, its population size has been growing by 15-18.000 persons per year. This rise is not only determined by high employment levels and high salary rates in Kyiv, but also by the high fertility rates among migrant groups. With reference to official statistics, on 1 January 2010 the number of Kyiv population was 2.785.100. During the period of January-December 2009 it increased by 19.600 persons. The natural growth was 4.196 persons (or 1,5 per 1.000 persons) and the increase due to immigration growth was 15.404 persons (or 5,6 per 1.000 persons) (see for more details table 27). A population increase was recorded in all districts of the city except Shevchenkyvsky. The highest populated districts are Desnyansky (339.000) and Dniprovskyy (330.400) and thee least populated district is Pechersky (129.900.). The highest density can be found in Shevchenkivskyy district (8.780 per 1 square km) and the lowest in Holosi-yivskyy district (1.310 per 1 square km).

The actual size of the population of Kyiv is problematic, and the official number provided by the State Statistic Committee of Ukraine does not reflect the actual number of people living in Kyiv. Pozniak (2009) argued that the actual number of population in Kyiv is about 3.144.300, which is 420.000 more than the number provided by government statistics. Different methods of estimating the number of actual population were applied. In the study conducted by the Institute of Demography and Social Research variables such as the consumption of salt, rate of general consumption, census of immigrants, as well as further data sets of the State Statistic Committee were integrated into the estimate. It is mostly internal migration (for study and work) in Ukraine that contributes to Kyiv's constant population growth. According to the Ministry of Education, 983 foreigners studied in Kyiv. In 2008, research found that only 54 percent of migrants possess the required permission

94 Notably, students are not considered as 'migrants'. They are not included in the statistics under the category of migrants while they are considered in the population census.
for permanent residence and 46 percent have a temporary work permit. Thus, the immigration situation in the capital continues to be complex and hardly controlled by the authorities. Significant gaps of knowledge, especially between official data on migration and the actual situation on the ground remains unsolved.

The death rate in Kyiv is 15-30 percent higher than the birth rate depending on the season of the year and district. As a rule of thumb, in the districts which are inhabited by young people (Troyeshchyna, Obolon’, Kharkivsky districts), the birth rate is higher than in the districts located in central Kyiv and districts inhabited by older people (e.g. Pechersk or Podil districts).

One of the most striking effects of the economic crises is the decreasing birth rate. In the 1990s and at the beginning of the 21st century, negative demographic trends developed in Kyiv: the total birth coefficient had decreased from 12.0 (newborn per 1.000 persons) in 1990 to 10.9 in 2010. The economic crisis demonstrated its effects and demographers forecast an ongoing drastic decrease in the upcoming five years. Some demographers estimate a decrease of 50 percent. The crises in the 1990s as well as the most recent one not only affected the birth rate but also the death rate. The death coefficient has been increasing from 8.7 in 1990 to 10.6 per 1.000 persons in 2010. Especially in the past few years the death rate has been increasing.

Furthermore, the population in Kyiv is ageing. The population of young people is declining and the population group of older than working age is increasing. Between 1995 and 2009 the share of children aged 0-14 decreased by 33 percent, while the share of people of retirement age (65 and over) increased by 34 percent (Table 28). This ageing process is expected to continue.

Economic/Industrial Structure

The Gross Regional Product (GRP) in Kyiv is the highest in Ukraine and has dynamically grown in the past few years (Table 29). The export volume as well as the import volume in 2008/2009 has however declined (by 21.2 per and 26.5 percent respectively).

From January 2009 to January 2010 manufacturing declined significantly (non-metal production: 46.4 percent; car-building: 21.1 percent; metallurgy and metal products manufacturing: 15.1 percent; food manufacturing, drinks and tobacco products: 12 percent. Industrial growth could be found in wood industry, chemical products and energy supply.

As of January 2010 the wage level of Kyiv inhabitants was still the highest among all regions of Ukraine. It is 1.6 times higher than the average figure. In January 2010, nominal wage of staff in

---

small-sized enterprises (10 or less employees) was 2.969 UAH per month in comparison with the average nominal wage of 1.916 UAH in the country (in Donetsk oblast 2183 UAH, Dnipropetrovsk oblast 2.023 UAH, Luhansk 1.963 UAH, Zaporizhzhya 1.846 UAH, Kharkiv 1.757 UAH)\textsuperscript{98}. The average wage paid by large-scale enterprises (more than 10 employees) was 3.684 UAH. Kyivan districts with the highest level of wage were: Pechersky (4.400 UAH), Shevchenkovsky (4.387 UAH) and Holosiivsky (3.931 UAH), respectively 19.4 percent, 19.1 percent and 6.7 percent higher than the average Ukrainian wage. A permanent growth of wages in Kyiv can be observed for the period 1995-2009 (Table 30, Figure 32).

The rate of unemployment is the lowest in the country. It is 0.4 percent, which is 4.8 times less than an average rate (1.9 percent), and 1.4 times less than the unemployment level given by International Labour Organization (Kyiv: 6.2 percent; Ukraine: 8.6 percent – see above for further details).\textsuperscript{99} Among the unemployed 15.6 percent are workers, 82.5 percent are civil servants, and 1.9 percent had no previous professional qualifications.

Numbers of unemployed in 2000-2009 calculated by International Labour Organization are shown in figure 33 (further indicators of the labour market (annual data from 2000 to 2009) are shown in the Table 31).

Despite the economic crisis, wages continued to increase and the level of employment is likewise improving. Not only in Kyiv but in all regions in Ukraine the unemployment rates have steadily decreased between 2000-2008.

Education

The 2001 National Census indicated the trend of an overall improving educational level of the population, i.e. number of persons with higher education is growing (for Kyiv see Table 32 and Table 33). At the same time there is a decline in the number of educational institutions teaching practice and techniques orientated studies (such as metal-works and construction) in Kyiv: a drop from 48 in 1995 to 31 in 2009. Consequently, a constantly declining number of such students graduating in these studies can be observed between 1990-2009 (see Table 34). However, surplus of highly skilled workers (higher education level) and a shortage of special-trained workers can be found on the labour market in Kyiv and nationwide.


\textsuperscript{99} Ibid.
Social Issues: Corruption, Crime, Drugs

According to the data of Ukrainian social service for family, children and the youth, every tenth Ukrainian drug addict lives in Kyiv. In 2009, the number of officially registered criminal incidences was 34,944 crimes in Kyiv only. This number has increased by 9,300; (36.6 percent) for the same period of the previous year. Thefts have drastically increased, from 2008-2009 by 77.7 percent; offences against property increased by 73.1 percent.

Ethnicity

Kyiv is a diverse and multi-ethnic city by which it differentiates itself from most Ukrainian cities (Table 35). According to the National Census, representatives of over 130 ethnic groups live in the territory of the city.

Migration

The population in Kyiv is mainly growing due to internal migration processes (91.7 percent), i.e. migration from various regions within Ukraine to Kyiv city (Table 36) and to a much lesser extent due to international immigration processes (8.3 percent).

Discursive Elements – Unsafe Environment

The European Commission as well as NGOs have noted increasing racial hatred and xenophobia in Ukraine and especially in Kyiv. A study of Amnesty International in Ukraine reflects the growing number of attacks against people on racial, ethnic or religious grounds, which caused concern. The nature of the attacks ranges from verbal abuse to serious physical harm and even murder. In addition, any person who does not look like the average Ukrainian is subject to police harassment (e.g. constant inspections of documents). Increasing number of attacks creates an atmosphere of fear and uncertainty, especially among asylum seekers and refugees. Amnesty International expressed its concern towards inadequate reaction of the Ukrainian authorities.

Another study found that during 2007-2008 there were 15 attacks on foreign students, one was even killed and concluded that the educational environment is unsafe for foreign students. In addition, foreign students often complain about inadequate information about tuition costs in Ukraine. According to the data of a non-governmental organization called African Centre and East European Development Institute, it was pointed out that students gradually find out about the true price for studying at universities in Ukraine and usually this price is higher than expected. Irregular migrants often face higher fees due to threats of denunciation.

**Research Area – Solomyansky Rayon of Kyiv**

Solomyansky rayon of Kyiv was founded in 2001 (formerly Zaliznycnyj and Zovtnevyj rayons). It is located in the south-western part of city. There are 331 streets and alleys in the district of a length of 215 kilometers. With its two railway stations (Kyiv-pasazhyrskij and Kyiv-tovarnyj, i.e. Central and South) and the smaller of the two international airports (Zhuliany) the rayon is considered to be an important gate of the capital of Ukraine.

General characteristics of the population, labour resources and migration flows in Solomyanska research area are summarised in table 37.

**Kirovograd’ska Oblast and the Research Area Znamyanska Rayon**

**Geography: Climate, Agro-Ecological Conditions**

Kirovograd’ska oblast is located in northeastern Ukraine on the boundary of the forest-steppe and the climate is mild continental. The land area is 24.6 thousand sq. km, representing 4.1 percent of the territory of Ukraine.

The oblast is rich in natural resources: there are over 340 mineral deposits of which 85 deposits are used: brown coal, non-ore and ore raw materials (iron, nickel), raw material for nuclear energy (uranium). New gold, platinum, diamonds and chrome deposits were discovered in the last decades.

**Demography**

On the 1st of March 2010, the population of Kirovograd’ska oblast was 1,016,500 people (2.2 percent of Ukraine’s population), of which 61.7 percent are urban and 38.3 percent rural residents. During January-February 2010 the population decreased by 1,281 persons (7.8 persons per 1,000
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inhabitants), 422 persons (4.1 persons per 1,000 inhabitants) from urban areas and 859 persons (13.6 persons per 1,000 inhabitants) from rural areas. Reasons for this decrease are mainly demographic developments while migration process played a minimal role\textsuperscript{108} (Table 38).

During the period of market reforms (1990-2008) the decrease of population was 10-fold in comparison to the previous 50 years in Kirovogradska oblast (Figure 34). A deteriorating health system, the long-term economic crisis of the 1990s, a rapid increase in mortality but decrease in fertility rates contributed to this development (Semykina, 2009).

The population in rural areas has decreased particularly rapidly. The reasons for this are social and economic living conditions, ill-developed social infrastructure and limited access to medical treatment. Kirovogradska oblast is characterized by average population density; negative population growth (Table 39); the rate of outmigration from the oblast is very low; internal migration patterns in Kirovograd can be derived from the changes of population numbers.

The tables show that there was a rapid fertility decline in Kirovogradska oblast between 1991 and 2001 (Figure 35). Economic growth seemed to have a direct positive impact on fertility rates as the period from 2002 to 2009 demonstrates.

Deteriorating health conditions of the population in the Kirovogradska oblast resulted in increased mortality rates. Between 1991-2006 the population mortality increased by 18 percent, from 2006 to 2007 it was the top rate in Ukraine. Notably, the group of working age population has the fastest growing mortality rate in Kirovogradska oblast. During 1991-2007 mortality rate of persons aged 20-29 increased by 41 percent, aged 30-39 by 50 percent, aged 40-49 by 30 percent and aged 50-59 by 20 percent (Table 40) (Semykina, 2009).

\textit{Economic/Industrial Structure}

Kirovogradska oblast contributes to the overall Ukrainian economy by: industrial production (1.0 percent); agriculture (3.6 percent), crop production (4.3 percent), livestock (2.5 percent). The Gross Regional Product (GRP) as an indicator of macroeconomic trends amounted to 13.961 million UAH (at current prices) in 2008, which stand for an increase of 13.7 percent in comparison to the previous year (Table 41). The total share towards the Ukrainian GNP was 1.5 percent in 2008.\textsuperscript{109} The gross regional product per capita in Kirovogradska oblast is 13.515 UAH while the Ukrainian average is 20.495 UAH.

The industry sectors and their distributional share in the beginning of 2010 are shown in Table 42. In March 2010 compared with the corresponding month of 2009, industrial output has increased by


23.9 percent; production growth in the processing industry in January-March 2010 was 26.9 percent.

The average nominal wage in Kirovograd oblast in January-February 2010 amounted to 1.572 UAH, which is twice the minimum wage (744 UAH). The highest salary level can be found in the transport and in the financial sector, where wages are 1.6-1.7 times higher than average wages. The average nominal wage in Kirovograd oblast increased in 2002-2008. However, in 2009, it decreased by 27.9 percent (Table 43).

Real wages varied strongly over the period 2002-2009 according to official statistics (Table 44). The economic crisis led to lowest index figures of this period. The labour force in the Kirovograd oblast has been rapidly decreasing (Table 45). In 2000 there were 511.100 persons employed but by 2009, the number shrunk to 480.300 persons. The number of the unemployed though has decreased from the level of 14.9 percent in 2000. On the 1 April 2010, the number of registered unemployed was 16.600 people, which is 7.9 percent lower than on 1 March 2009. Semykina (2009) points to the need of restructuring the industry and innovative developments that were neglected in the region. As a consequence, the greatest number of employees can be found in the sector of agriculture (in 2007: 31.53 percent).

**Education**

At the beginning of the academic year 2009/2010 there were 15 universities of I-II level of accreditation according to the data of the Main Department of Statistics in Kirovograd oblast: eight colleges, four junior technical colleges and three specialized schools. In addition, there were seven universities of III-IV level of accreditation, including one academy, two universities and four institutes. A network of public vocational schools likewise exists, which provides education for construction, transport, communication and agricultural industries.

Altogether, 8.000 students graduated from universities in Kirovograd oblast: 3.100 (38.8 percent) junior specialists, 1.100 (14.2 percent) with a Bachelor degree, 2.800 (35.4 percent) of specialists and 925 with master degrees (11.6 percent of the total number of graduates). 10.363 students were enrolled in vocational schools at the beginning of 2009. The development of for the past 15 years can be drawn from the table below (Table 46).

---


111 "Junior specialist" is a degree offered at technical and vocational schools, which are different from other higher educational institutions of the first level of accreditation.

112 Institutions encourage students to complete a full (traditional) program of 5.5 years of length which leads to either the Diploma of Specialist or Master (Magister) degree. Often, the Master degree requires an additional semester of study. The main difference between these two programs is that the first one, leading to the Diploma of Specialist (engineer), is professionally oriented and its purpose is to work in the Ukrainian industry. The Master degree is oriented towards a scientific/research career.
In 2009, 2,165 graduates (27 percent of the total) found a job after graduation. 939 graduates had gone through a new training which qualified them as ‘workers’. White-colour professions such as accountants, financiers and managers got increasingly competitive (Semykina, 2009).

_Social Issues: Corruption, Crime, Drugs_

University degrees are in high demand in Kirovohrad region and students as well as their parents try ‘almost everything’ to enter one of the three Universities in Kirovohrad city where 90 percent of the around 10,000 students study. This competitive environment produces opportunities for corruption (mostly bribery) among teachers and students, as well as their parents.113

Linskyy et al. (2007) addressed drugs and alcohol issues in their study and compared several regions in Ukraine (Figures 36 and 37). A slight reduction of alcoholism and an increase of the consumption of alternative drugs can be found in the case of Kirovogradskaya oblast.

From January-March 2010, 2,635 crimes were committed in Kirovogradskaya oblast, a rise of 708 crimes (36.7 percent) from the corresponding period in 2009.114 Most criminal offences were against property (66.9 percent); others were related to drugs (5.2 percent); physical assaults (4.7 percent); criminal acts against labour and other personal rights and freedoms of man and citizens (1.9 percent). Based on the statistics of the Ministry of the Interior and the magazine “Focus”,115 Kirovogradskaya oblast was ranked the most criminal oblast in Ukraine. The oblast was ranked 11th place (out of 25) with a crime rate (24.1 per 10,000 people), and ranked number one in the list of murder rates (0.29 per 10,000 people).

_Ethnicity_

The vast majority in Kirovogradskaya oblast is Ukrainian (90.1 percent). Between 1989 and 2001 the share of Ukrainians in total grew by 4.8 percent (Table 48).

The Ukrainian language was considered as native by 88.9 percent of the population and Russian by 3.5 percent of the population. Bob and Vishnyak (2006) have discovered that the proportion of those who believe their native language is Ukrainian, is considerably less among young people. In the age category 55 and older, the Ukrainian language was considered native by 69 percent of the respondents while in the category aged 18-29 only 65.5 percent felt this way. At the same time, among the group aged 18-30 the proportion of those who consider Russian their native language

---

was 33.1 percent and 29.5 percent among those who were older than 55. A downward trend of the number of people who believe their native language is Ukrainian can be anticipated.\textsuperscript{116}

\textit{Migration}

Emigration processes had virtually no influence on the development of depopulation in this region (a proportional share of 0.8 percent). Instead, demographic developments were the reason of the shrinking number of population in Kirovogradska oblast (a proportional share of 99.2 percent) (Table 49). A distorting factor in statistics such as internal (circular) migration to Kiev can be ruled out since the distance to Kyiv is too far.

In 2008, 226 persons left Kirovogradska oblast. Positive economic development and favourable career perspectives may be two convincing factors. Kondratets (2009) points the migration processes that affect most parts of Ukraine, which is the exchange of people with CIS countries. This process can be likewise observed Kirovograd oblast, but at much lower scale.

\textit{Discursive Elements – The Concern over Orphans}

This region is particularly affected by social problems. Social orphanage is perhaps the most acute problem for this region. According to the data of the Ukrainian Ministry of Interior, every tenth juvenile offender in Ukraine has parents who left Ukraine and sought work abroad. The child orphanage issue in Ukraine is exacerbated by the fact that the people caring for children of migrant workers, which traditionally are relatives and friends of parents and even neighbors, usually cannot protect the rights of children.

The NGO “Flora” tries to attract the attention of social services, civil servants and teachers in order to communicate the issues and hardship of these children that were left behind by their parents. The NGO has initiated a “Child Protection Services” in four rayons of Kirovograd oblast: Kirovograd, Kompaniivsk, Znamyansk, Novomirgorod.\textsuperscript{117} A number of mobile advice centers where psychologists, social worker and lawyers are providing their help are situated in these rayons. In addition, a telephone helpline was started as well as seminars for the regional coordinators or the children themselves were offered.
Research Area – Znamyanska Rayon

Znamyanska rayon is situated in the north of Kirovograd oblast known for low scale emigration. There are one town, one urban-type settlements and 45 villages in Znamyanska research area. The distance from Znamyanska rayon’s administrative center to Kirovograd is 40 km. Some more details on the population and size of the area can be drawn from table 50 (see annex).

During the period of January-April 2010, the population of Znamyanska decreased by 74 persons that was 9 people per 1,000 inhabitants (in January-April 2009: 17.4 persons). This reduction can be explained by the increasing death rate. A positive balance of migration can be observed for the same period, i.e. the number of arrivals in the research area exceeds the number of departures (by 2 persons).

In April 2010, registered unemployment in the rayon amounted to 2.75 percent, which is 0.03 percentage points less than the corresponding figure for the oblast. Average monthly nominal salary in Znamensk rayon in January-March 2010 was 1,341 UAH, which is 1.5 times more than the general minimum wage. The level of salaries in Znamyanska is 16.2 percent lower than the average wage of the oblast (1,599 UAH).

There are six general education schools with 3,123 pupils and two vocational technical schools with 777 students in Znamyanka. Today, Znamyanka has four medical institutions, 61 political parties and 23 registered religious communities.

Ternopilska Oblast and the Research Area Zbarazh Rayon

Geography: Climate, Agro-Ecological Conditions

Ternopil oblast is located in the western part of Ukraine near to the border with Poland, Slovak republic, Hungary and Romania. Its territory spreads 195 km from north to south, and 129 km from west to east. Ternopil oblast covers 13,800 square km or 2.3 percent of Ukrainian territory. The fertile black earth and grey soils is the main natural resource.

Demography

On 1 March 2010, the population of Ternopil oblast was 1,087,800 people (2.3 percent of the total population). The administrative centre of the oblast is the city of Ternopil with about 230,000 inhabitants (Table 51). A comparatively high density of population can be found in Ternopil oblast (83 people/km²). The majority the population in Ternopil oblast lives in villages (57.3 percent). Also in Ternopil oblast, a depopulation process can be found, partially due to emigration as well as demographic developments.

However, in recent years (between 2000 and 2009) an increasing trend of population growth can be observed (Table 52). Demographic developments vary substantially in various areas of Ternopil oblast, especially between rural urban areas. The highest population growth rate can be found in the Ternopil city (2.5 people per 1.000 inhabitants). In rural areas the population growth rates are very low. In 2008 the birth rate was 9.1 percent and the death rate 17.6 percent, i.e. a decline of 8.5 percent (urban areas: 9.3 percent, rural areas: 10 percent). A trend of an aging population becomes evident consulting the statistics as indicted below (see Table 53). In rural areas, the working age population has constantly decreased (49.7 percent), while the share of children (20.5 percent) decreased and the number of pensioners (29.8 percent) grew. A less dramatic development can be found in Ternopil city.

**Economic/Industrial Structure**

The proportion of industrial sectors of Ternopil oblast in the Ukrainian economy is: industrial production (0.5 percent) (for 2009); agriculture (3.0 percent) life stock (2.8 percent). In 2008 the GRP in Ternopil oblast was 10.618 million UAH, which accounted for 1.1 percent of the total Ukrainian GNP (Table 54). The GRP per capita was at 9.688 UAH in 2008 (the average figure for Ukraine is 204.95 UAH).

The industrial production in the last decade varies at a generally upward trend, however, a dramatic decrease was recorded for the year 2009. In the same year the investment volume into agriculture decreased by 67 percent (a general picture of the industrial sectors of the Ternopil economy in January 2010 can be drawn from Table 55).

Since 2000 high rates of increasing wages have been recorded in Ternopil oblast. The main reason for this economic growth is industrial growth especially in the construction sector as well as in the transport sector. In 2007, the average monthly growth rate in wages was 29.6 percent and 39.2 percent in 2008 (up to 1.313 UAH). In the year of 2009, these growth rates settled down to 9.4 percent; the average monthly nominal wage in January-March 2010 was 1.406 UAH. Although a growing trend of nominal average income can be observed (see Table 56), the real average income constantly shrunk (Table 57). The level of average income in Ternopil oblast is the lowest in Ukraine.

---

120 Passport of Ternopil oblast (as of 1.01.2010), http://www.oda.te.gov.ua/, accessed 8/05/2010.
Between 2001 and 2006, the poverty level has increased in all districts of the Ternopil oblast. On the Ukrainian “map of poverty” as Libanova (2009) put it, an indicator of 25.1 percent can be found in Ternopil oblast in 2006 (city of Ternopil: 19.4 percent).

The ILO indicates a growing trend of unemployment for the region: 8.7 percent (2007), 8.8 percent (2008) and 11.3 percent (2009) (age 15-70; see Table 58). In the beginning of 2010 the number of registered unemployed has grown by 8.9 percent to almost 16,000 persons; highest numbers were found in Zalishchytyskyy, Chortkivskyy, and Lanovetskyy districts.

On 1 May 2010, 13,416 unemployed were registered in the Ternopil oblast, among them a growing number of university graduates. This suggests a growing discrepancy of the educational system and labour market demands.

**Education**

The department of statistics in Ternopil oblast refers to 19 institutions of higher education (10 of І-ІІ accreditation level and nine institutions of ІІІ-ІV accreditation level), and 23 polytechnics at the beginning of academic year 2009/2010. At institutions of І-ІІ level of accreditation the number of students gradually decreased, while the number of students at the level ІІІ-ІV increased constantly between 1995/1996-2003/2004 and decreased, however less sharply, until 2009/2010 (Table 59).

The greatest share of the working population graduate from polytechnics (10,500 students) where students can study 75 different courses such as constructing, gastronomy, transport, agriculture. 84.1 percent of students complete secondary education in Ternopil oblast.

**Social Issues Problems: Corruption, Crime, Drugs**

Corruption and drug addiction is another growing issue also in Ternopil oblast, however the level is below the Ukrainian average. In Ternopil oblast official data refers to 217 cases of corruption by state officials and other state representatives in the year 2009. A move of drug consumption from southern and eastern regions of the country to the western regions such as Ternopil oblast can be observed in the past few years.

A particular cause for concern is crime, and it is often argued that this is as much a consequence of the political and socio-economic crisis as of a lack of control over the business, financial and bank sector. Usually, the lowest levels of criminality are to be found in western oblasts of Ukraine includ-

---

ing Ternopil. Data by the Ministry of the Interior demonstrate that Ternopil oblast was on the 23rd place with regards to numbers of crimes committed (16 crimes per 10,000 persons Ternopil oblast compared with 41.2 crimes per 10,000 persons in Luhansk oblast)\(^\text{129}\).

*Ethnicity*

According to Census data, 14 nationalities live in Ternopil oblast. Ukrainians represent 97.8 percent of the total population of Ternopil oblast (see also table 60).

*Migration*

Emigration and labour migration is characteristic for the western regions of Ukraine. Migration flows are traditionally directed towards the neighbouring western countries. The main economic indicators as demonstrated above provide the reasoning for such developments. Brych (2009: 37) stated that “only a half of the people (covered in his survey) were able to cover the expenses on food and everyday products”. Every third person felt threatened by unemployment. It is thus hardly surprising that since 1995 the balance of migration in Ternopil oblast is negative: high emigration rates and a shrinking overall population (Table 61).

Many seasonal workers leave in order to work in Poland, Czech Republic, Russian Federation, UK, Greece, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Germany, USA, Israel, etc. According to the data of Ternopil Regional Employment Centre, 26,200 migrants from rural areas of Ternopil oblast worked abroad in 2006. A survey on labour migration in 2008 pointed to 50,400 labour migrants who were working abroad, but still 'officially' live in Ternopil villages.

*Discursive Element – A Monument for Labour Migrants*

Symbolically, the population and local authorities of Ternopil contemplate to erect a monument to honour the labour migrants who contributed significantly to the economic welfare of their families and the development of the region. A media article metaphorically captured the importance of this monument, and yet shed light on the social disruption that can be caused by the phenomenon of migration:

“All the figures of the monument will be forged out of metal; in the foreground: a father, a mother and a child near the family tree; in the background: a chapel in the form of a hemisphere with the meridians, symbolizing the earth [...]. The creators of the composition want to capture the meeting of the child and his parents who have returned from abroad. The meeting is held in the courtyard near the family tree. The composition of the monument will be ‘asking’ why in such a big country like Ukraine,

there was no place for millions of people, why they were forced to leave their children, the infirm parents, loved ones, all this just to earn for a living?

Research Area - Zbarazh Rayon

The research area Zbarazh rayon has a population of 59,062. The rayon is composed of one town (Zbarazh), one urban-type settlements and 73 villages. Its administrative centre is Zbarazh town located in the northern-east part of the oblast, not far from Ternopil city (24 km) and a population of 13,000 (13,700 in 2006) (see also table 62).

On the 1st of January 2010, the number of registered unemployed was 1,050 persons. Among the rayons of the Ternopil oblast and their industrial production, Zbarazh rayon is at the 9th place. There are 54 general education schools, where 6,340 students study and two vocational technical school with 756 students.

The number of total medical institutions is 68, including three hospitals with 285 beds and two clinics. The number of employees in the health sector is 775 including 149 people with higher education. The number of registered political parties in rayon is 69. The number of active religious communities their churches is 911.

The scale of labor migration from Zbarazh rayon is high, especially in villages, which are characterized by inhabitants that feel cut off from the industrial and business world. Substantial differences exist between rayons and single villages in Ternopil oblasts as regard the selection of destination countries in the Europe. Established social networks between the community in the rayons and villages are often dominated by the pioneers who left the rayon or village first and who are associated with success and prosperity.

Dovzuk (2005) points the preferred destination countries among residents of the Zbarazh rayon, which are: Italy (41.0 percent), Portugal (16.9 percent), Poland (10.6 percent), Russia (9.8 percent), Spain (5.5 percent). Reasons for emigration among citizens of Zbarazh town are strongly driven by socio-economic factors (Figure 38).

130 In Ternopil region will be established a workers memorial, http://h.ua/story/274867/, accessed 22/07/2010
Conclusion

Ukraine experienced several political and economic crises leading to societal disruptions; emigration rates reached record-high levels; immigration started to set in first abruptly (return migration) and then international increased gradually and at lower levels. Combined effects of a reduction in the birth rate, an increase in the death rate, and the state and access to the health care system in the country as well as a negative rate of net-migration, has led to a substantial decrease in Ukrainian population. Ukraine migration flows are split into two to directions: in western Ukraine emigrants mainly head towards the EU, the U.S. etc., while in eastern Ukraine towards the Russian Federation. Low income levels; a rapidly ageing society; an education system that mismatches the demands of the labour market as well as dominating social issues of a partially dysfunctional state, corruption, drugs and crime are social phenomena and current drivers of contemporary migration patterns in Ukraine.
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Annexes

Figure 3: GDP indexes per capita and national income per capita in Ukraine and neighbouring countries in 2008

Figure 5: Consumer price indices and producer price indices 2000-2009 (% change to previous year)

Figure 7: Birth rate coefficient in Ukraine 2009

Birth rate coefficient in Ukraine, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth rate coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.ukrstat.gov.ua, http://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%A4%D0%B0%D0%B9%D0%BB:RaionsEdited.GIF, accessed 1/5/2010.
Figure 8: Main minority groups in the Ukraine

Source: State Committee on Nationalities and Migration in Ukraine, 2009.
Figure 10: Unemployed population and reasons of unemployment in 1998 and 2007, in % of total number

Source: State Statistics Committee of Ukraine

Figure 11: Unemployment rates (ILO method) in 2008 and 2009, working age\textsuperscript{131} and aged 15-70


\textsuperscript{131} Working age population: 16-59 (men) and 16-54 (women).
Figure 12: National poverty indices 1999-2008, in %

Source: Calculations of National Academy of Sciences; Data taken from a survey on households’ living conditions conducted by the State Committee of Statistics.
Figure 13: Levels of education, Census: 1959-2001

Figure 14: Indexes of consumer prices in health care, % to previous period

Source: State Statistics Committee of Ukraine.

Figure 15: Religious communities in Ukraine, 2004 (number of communities, in %)

Source: State Committee on Nationalities and Religions.
Figure 17: Net Migration of Ukraine 1990 - 2009

Source: State Statistics Committee of Ukraine.

Figure 18: Number of emigrants and their destination countries 2008

Figure 20: Nationalities of immigrants in Ukraine, in thsd.


Figure 21: Numbers of refugees and asylum seekers in Ukraine 1996-2009

Figure 22: Number of person who gained refugee status 1996-2009


Figure 23: Irregular migrants apprehended at the Ukrainian border 2006-2009

Figure 24: Apprehensions within Ukraine and deportations of irregular migrants 2001-2009


Figure 25: The population of Kharkivska oblast 1995-2010

Figure 26: Number of the students admitted in higher educational institutions 1995-2009, thousand

![Graph showing the number of students admitted in higher educational institutions from 1995 to 2009.]


Figure 27: Number of vocational schools in Kharkivska oblast 1995-2009

![Graph showing the number of vocational schools in Kharkivska oblast from 1995 to 2009.]

Figure 28: The demand for workers in Kharkivska oblast 2002-2010


Figure 29: Prevalence of drug addiction in terms of Ukraine regions in 2008 in absolute numbers

Figure 30: Main reasons of emigration from Kharkivska oblast in the period 2000-2005


Figure 31: Population in Kyiv 1995-2010

Figure 32: Development of monthly average nominal wage in Kyiv in 1995-2009, in UAH


Figure 33: Number of unemployed in Kyiv

Figure 34: Development of the population in Kirovograd'ska oblast 1939-2010, in thousand


Figure 35: Dynamics of fertility rates in Kirovograd'ska oblast 1991-2009

Figure 36: Registered and reconstructed (prognostic) prevalence of alcoholism in the Kirovograd oblast 1994-2006

Source: Linskyy et al. (2007).
Figure 37: Registered and reconstructed the prevalence of drug-taking in the Kirovogradskaya oblast 1994-2006

Source: Linskyy et al. (2007).
Figure 38: Attractiveness of Zbarazh from locals’ point of view (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDI value</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>85 (from 182 countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy at birth (years)</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>110 (176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult literacy rate (% ages 15 and older)</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>6 (151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined gross enrolment ratio, %</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>32 (177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita, (PPP US$)</td>
<td>6,914</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>94 (181)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Population (per 1000 population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Births rate</th>
<th>Deaths rate</th>
<th>Natural growth (decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* January-February 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR of Crimea oblasts</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinnytsya</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volyn</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dnipropetrovsk</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donetsk</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhytomyr</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakarpattya</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaporizhzhya</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivano-Frankivsk</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirovohrad</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhansk</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lviv</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykolayiv</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odesa</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poltava</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivne</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumy</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ternopil</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kherson</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmelnytskyi</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherkasy</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chernivtsi</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chernihiv</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kyiv</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevastopol</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*January-February 2010
Table 4: Population of Kyiv 1995 - 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total present population</th>
<th>of which, thsd.</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total, thsd.</td>
<td>males</td>
<td>females</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2597.3</td>
<td>1222.1</td>
<td>1375.2</td>
<td>416.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2588.8</td>
<td>1215.9</td>
<td>1372.9</td>
<td>424.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2577.0</td>
<td>1208.9</td>
<td>1368.1</td>
<td>430.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2572.3</td>
<td>1205.0</td>
<td>1367.3</td>
<td>438.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2565.7</td>
<td>1200.0</td>
<td>1365.7</td>
<td>452.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2567.0</td>
<td>1198.5</td>
<td>1368.5</td>
<td>465.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2567.6</td>
<td>1196.3</td>
<td>1371.3</td>
<td>472.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2567.0</td>
<td>1193.4</td>
<td>1373.6</td>
<td>478.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2577.3</td>
<td>1197.0</td>
<td>1380.3</td>
<td>478.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2597.7</td>
<td>1206.0</td>
<td>1391.7</td>
<td>482.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2625.1</td>
<td>1217.9</td>
<td>1407.2</td>
<td>487.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2651.9</td>
<td>1229.0</td>
<td>1422.9</td>
<td>484.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2676.8</td>
<td>1239.3</td>
<td>1437.5</td>
<td>477.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2698.9</td>
<td>1248.1</td>
<td>1450.8</td>
<td>465.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2724.2</td>
<td>1258.7</td>
<td>1465.5</td>
<td>443.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Population and age distribution 1990-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population by age at the end of the year, thsd.</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65 and more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>51556.5</td>
<td>11084.2</td>
<td>6935.2</td>
<td>14513.2</td>
<td>12849.3</td>
<td>6174.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>51623.5</td>
<td>11029.5</td>
<td>7002.9</td>
<td>14764.5</td>
<td>12497.5</td>
<td>6329.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>51708.2</td>
<td>10951.4</td>
<td>7055.0</td>
<td>14879.3</td>
<td>12314.3</td>
<td>6508.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>51870.4</td>
<td>10915.4</td>
<td>7118.7</td>
<td>15006.7</td>
<td>12139.3</td>
<td>6690.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>51715.4</td>
<td>10767.7</td>
<td>7146.1</td>
<td>14973.0</td>
<td>11965.3</td>
<td>6863.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>51300.4</td>
<td>10528.7</td>
<td>7159.6</td>
<td>14727.0</td>
<td>11924.0</td>
<td>6961.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>50874.1</td>
<td>10246.0</td>
<td>7164.4</td>
<td>14578.3</td>
<td>11826.4</td>
<td>7059.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>50400.0</td>
<td>9952.4</td>
<td>7131.7</td>
<td>14435.2</td>
<td>11827.9</td>
<td>7052.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>49973.5</td>
<td>9624.5</td>
<td>7117.9</td>
<td>14325.9</td>
<td>11878.6</td>
<td>7026.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>49544.8</td>
<td>9206.0</td>
<td>7202.0</td>
<td>14226.8</td>
<td>12008.4</td>
<td>6901.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>49115.0</td>
<td>8781.0</td>
<td>7275.9</td>
<td>14092.2</td>
<td>12147.0</td>
<td>6818.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>48663.6</td>
<td>8373.3</td>
<td>7325.5</td>
<td>13992.0</td>
<td>12128.8</td>
<td>6844.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>48240.9</td>
<td>7949.9</td>
<td>7381.2</td>
<td>13851.5</td>
<td>12079.7</td>
<td>6978.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>47823.1</td>
<td>7569.5</td>
<td>7457.8</td>
<td>13726.8</td>
<td>11875.5</td>
<td>7193.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>47442.1</td>
<td>7246.3</td>
<td>7478.6</td>
<td>13590.9</td>
<td>11757.0</td>
<td>7369.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>47100.5</td>
<td>6989.8</td>
<td>7455.7</td>
<td>13460.6</td>
<td>11687.2</td>
<td>7507.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>46749.2</td>
<td>6764.7</td>
<td>7366.7</td>
<td>13342.8</td>
<td>11707.8</td>
<td>7567.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>46465.7</td>
<td>6604.4</td>
<td>7266.8</td>
<td>13249.5</td>
<td>11739.9</td>
<td>7603.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>46192.3</td>
<td>6501.1</td>
<td>7103.1</td>
<td>13206.6</td>
<td>11874.8</td>
<td>7506.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>45963.4</td>
<td>6476.2</td>
<td>6829.9</td>
<td>13255.5</td>
<td>12084.4</td>
<td>7317.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6: Main minority groups in the Ukraine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% share of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>8,334,100</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussians</td>
<td>2,758,800</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldavians</td>
<td>2,586,000</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimean Tatars</td>
<td>2,482,200</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarians</td>
<td>2,046,600</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarians</td>
<td>1,566,000</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanians</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>1,441,100</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>1,036,000</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>999,000</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>91,500</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatars</td>
<td>73,300</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>47,600</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijaniens</td>
<td>45,200</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgians</td>
<td>34,200</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>33,300</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State Committee on Nationalities and Migration in Ukraine, [link](http://www.scnm.gov.ua/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=49793&cat_id=47904&search_param=%D0%BD%D0%B0%D1%86%D1%96%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%B0%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%BD%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%82%D1%96+%D0%BC.+%D0%9A%D0%B8%D1%97%D0%B2&searchForum=1&searchDocarch=1&searchPublishing=1), accessed 13/5/2010.

### Table 7: Regions and level of ethnic homogeneity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Level of homogeneity</th>
<th>Oblast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oblasts that can be denoted as practically homogenous</td>
<td>Ukrainians 90-98 percent</td>
<td>Vinnytsya, Volyn, Zhytomyr, Ivano-Frankivsk, Kyiv, Kirovohrad, Lviv, Poltava, Rivne, Ternopil, Khmelnytsky, Cherkasy, Chernihiv and Sumy (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions of central and southern Ukraine</td>
<td>relative homogeneity</td>
<td>City of Kyiv (82% Ukrainians, 13% Russians), Mykolayiv (82%, 14%), Kherson (82%, 14%), Dnipropetrovsk oblast (79.3%, 17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions of southern and eastern Ukraine</td>
<td>share of Russians is about 25%</td>
<td>Zaporizhzhya (71% Ukrainians, 25% Russians), Kharkiv oblast (70.7%, 25.6 %), and Odessa oblast (63%, 21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions (oblasts) of eastern Ukraine</td>
<td>share of Russians is more than 1/3 of population</td>
<td>Donetsk (58% Ukrainians, 38% Russians), Luhansk oblast (58%, 39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Crimea republic and the city of Sevastopol</td>
<td>Russians dominate in population size</td>
<td>Crimea (58.3% Russians, 24.3% Ukrainians, 12% Crimea Tatars); city of Sevastopol – 71.6% Russians, 22.4% Ukrainians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ukrainian Centre for Cultural Studies: [link](http://www.culturalstudies.in.ua/sekcia_s_s4_4.php), accessed 20/5/2010.
Table 8: Political parties of Ukraine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of a parliamentary parties</th>
<th>Number of members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Party of Regions&quot; fraction</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Yuliya Tymoshenko Block&quot; (&quot;All-Ukrainian association Batkivshchyna&quot;, Ukrainian Social-democratic party, &quot;Reforms and order&quot;)</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Block &quot;Our Ukraine – People's self-defense&quot; (People's Union &quot;Our Ukraine&quot;, political party &quot;Go ahead, Ukraine!&quot;, People’s Movement of Ukraine, Ukrainian People’s Party, Ukrainian Republican party &quot;Sobor&quot;, Party &quot;Christian-Democratic Union&quot;, European Party of Ukraine, Civil party &quot;PORA&quot;, Party of Motherhood defenders)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist party of Ukraine</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Block Lytvyna&quot; fraction (People's party, Workers’ Party of Ukraine)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputies who are not members of any Parliamentary fraction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 9: ILO unemployment rates in Ukraine 2000-2009 (percent of the total population in respective age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unemployed (following ILO methodology)</th>
<th>Average Monthly Wages, UAH (USD)</th>
<th>GDP per Capita, USD</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total, aged 15-70</td>
<td>of which working age(^{132})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>230 (44.2)</td>
<td>3324.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>311 (57.3)</td>
<td>3743.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>376 (70.8)</td>
<td>4037.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>462 (86.7)</td>
<td>4554.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>590 (110.7)</td>
<td>5282.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>806 (152.1)</td>
<td>5625.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1 041 (206.1)</td>
<td>6271.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1 351 (267.5)</td>
<td>7001.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1 806 (357.6)</td>
<td>7342.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1 906 (247.5)</td>
<td>6460.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{132}\) Working age population: 16-59 (men) and 16-54 (women).
Table 10: Groups of oblasts as regards their unemployment rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Level of unemployment</th>
<th>Oblast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First group</td>
<td>high level of unemployment (9.0% -</td>
<td>Ivano-Frankivsk (9.0%), Mykolayiv (9.3%), Donetsk (9.4%),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.7%)</td>
<td>Volyn (9.4%), Chernivtsi (9.4%), Kherson (9.5%), Khmelnytsk (9.5%),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kirovohrad (9.9 %), Zakarpattya (9.9%), Poltava (10.2%), Vinnytsya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10.6%), Zhytomyr (10.7%), Cherkasy (10.8%), Chernihiv (11,1%), Sumy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11.1%), Ternopil (11.3%), Rivne (12.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>city of Kyiv (6.5%), AR of Crimea (6.8%), Odessa (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second group</td>
<td>average level of unemployment (7.7% -</td>
<td>Kharkiv (7.7%), Luhansk (7.7%), Dnipropetrovsk (7.8%), Zaporizhzhya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.1%)</td>
<td>(8.1%), Kyiv (8.1%), Lviv (8.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third group</td>
<td>lowest level of unemployment (6.5% -</td>
<td>city of Kyiv (6.5%), AR of Crimea (6.8%), Odessa (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 11: Higher educational institutions of I-II and II-IV levels of accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total educational institutions</th>
<th>Total students, of which</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st and 2nd levels of accreditation</td>
<td>1st and 2nd levels of accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thsd.</td>
<td>% of total population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


133 More on such levels of accreditation in Ukraine can be found: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Higher_education_in_Ukraine; http://www.education.gov.ua/pls/edu/docs/common/higher_educ_eng.html.
Table 12: Percentage proportions of the total number of a minority group residing in various oblasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority group</th>
<th>of which (in %) live in the following oblasts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>35.4% Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts, Crimea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussians</td>
<td>44.9% Donetsk, Dnipropetrovsk, Crimea, Luhansk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldavians</td>
<td>73.8% Odessa, Chernivtsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarians</td>
<td>73.6% Odessa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>63.1% Zhytomyr, Khmelnytsky, Lviv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarians</td>
<td>96.8% Zakarpattya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanians</td>
<td>97.2% Chernivtsi, Zakarpattya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>63.3% city of Kyiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Odessa, Kharkiv, Donetsk oblasts (live mostly in the cities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>84.7% Donetsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatars (except Crimea Tatars)</td>
<td>61.6% Donetsk, Luhansk, Crimea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>29.4% Zakarpattya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagaus</td>
<td>86.5% Odessa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Heyts et al. (2009).
### Table 13: Net Migration Ukraine 1990 - 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net- Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>151.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>287.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>-142.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>-131.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>-169.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>-152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>-138.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-133.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>-152.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Net Migration Ukraine, by oblasts 2000 – 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International net-migration</th>
<th>Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous Republic of Crimea</td>
<td>-1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblasts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinnytsya</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volyn</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dnipropetrovsk</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donetsk</td>
<td>-1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhytomyr</td>
<td>-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakarpattya</td>
<td>-1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaporizhzhya</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivano-Frankivsk</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td>-2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirovohrad</td>
<td>-2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykolayiv</td>
<td>-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odesa</td>
<td>-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poltava</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivne</td>
<td>-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ternopil</td>
<td>-900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td>3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kherson</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmelnytskyi</td>
<td>-1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherkasy</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chernivtsi</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chernihiv</td>
<td>-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kyiv</td>
<td>16900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevastopol agglomeration</td>
<td>13000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Information for 9 months
**Information for January-March 2010 p.

Table 15: Statistics Ukrainian labour migrants in the EU countries and the Russian Federation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Chechia</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Great Britain</th>
<th>Russia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Official/Expert Data</td>
<td>16 469/Over 450 000</td>
<td>64 000/200 000</td>
<td>3 500/ Over 10 000</td>
<td>10 000/70 000</td>
<td>169 000/ Over 2 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>2 groups: Guest workers – aged 40 Students – aged 25</td>
<td>Aged 25–45</td>
<td>Aged 30</td>
<td>Aged 30</td>
<td>Aged 40–45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex % male/female</td>
<td>33/67</td>
<td>Male prevail</td>
<td>55/45</td>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>80/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education %</td>
<td>75 – secondary, secondary special; 20 – high; 5 – highly qualified specialists.</td>
<td>Persons with high and secondary special education prevail; Large number of persons with high incomplete education (students).</td>
<td>secondary or secondary special – nearly 10%; secondary special – nearly 25%; high or high incomplete – over 65%.</td>
<td>80 – secondary; 20 – high, highly qualified specialists.</td>
<td>secondary or secondary incomplete – nearly 20%; secondary special – nearly 65%; high or high incomplete – over 15%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Concentration</td>
<td>60% Warsaw and the suburbs; 30% state bordering territories.</td>
<td>The majority stay in Prague, Brno and other industrial centres.</td>
<td>70% – Large cities – Dublin, Cork; 30% farms in the North.</td>
<td>London, Manchester, small towns, farms.</td>
<td>Moskva, near Moskve Region and St. Petersburg – 80%; Southern Volga region (Samara); Northern-European part; Central-Western Siberia; The Far East – 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Greece</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Official/Expert Data</td>
<td>195 412/ Nearly 600 000</td>
<td>69 903/Over 200 000</td>
<td>37 851/75 000</td>
<td>Nearly 20 000; in 2001 – 60–80 thousand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>Aged 41–60</td>
<td>Aged 20–45</td>
<td>Aged 40–45</td>
<td>Nearly 50 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex % male/female</td>
<td>16,8/83,2</td>
<td>54/46</td>
<td>62/38</td>
<td>Under 30/Over 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Concentration</td>
<td>North 25%; Centre 25%; South and islands 50%.</td>
<td>Ukrainian immigrants stay in all Spanish provinces and on the islands; Territories of largest concentration: Comunidad Madrid, Catalonia, Comunidad Valenciana, Andalucia.</td>
<td>12,8% – North; 65% – Centre; 18,5% – South; 3,8% – islands.</td>
<td>In general, megapolis Athens, Thessaloniki, PATRI’DA, Volos and the islands of Crete and Rhodes, where immigrants go for works of seasonal nature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Other Countries of the EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of People Official</td>
<td>40 000</td>
<td>128 110</td>
<td>30 000</td>
<td>32 465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally in the World</td>
<td>Nearly 4 500 000 Ukrainian Labor Immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Markov et al. (2009).
Table 16: Number and proportion of Ukrainians in the EU, several years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country name</th>
<th>Number of immigrants</th>
<th>% of immigrants against country of residence population</th>
<th>Number of Ukrainians</th>
<th>% of total number of Ukrainians in the EU</th>
<th>100% of all immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany (in 2004)</td>
<td>7,287,980</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>128,110</td>
<td>25,2</td>
<td>1,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4,002,509</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>50,450</td>
<td>11,7</td>
<td>1,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (in 1999)</td>
<td>3,263,186</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>2,689</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain (in 2004)</td>
<td>3,066,055</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2,286,024</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>93,441</td>
<td>18,4</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>900,500</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece (in 2003)</td>
<td>891,197</td>
<td>8,1</td>
<td>13,616</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>1,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>814,065</td>
<td>9,8</td>
<td>3,449</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland (in 2001)</td>
<td>700,329</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>27,062</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>34,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>691,357</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>479,899</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>456,758</td>
<td>19,9</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>432,000</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>65,800</td>
<td>12,9</td>
<td>14,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>314,100</td>
<td>7,4</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia (in 1999)</td>
<td>274,309</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>1,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>270,051</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>258,360</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>78,263</td>
<td>15,4</td>
<td>30,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>181,800</td>
<td>39,6</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>156,160</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>13,945</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>9,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>113,852</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>98,100</td>
<td>13,1</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>48,968</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>32,862</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>6,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>25,993</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria (in 2000)</td>
<td>25,634</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>25,563</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>4,003</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>18,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta (in 2004)</td>
<td>11,999</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Markov et al. (2009).
Table 17: Categories of immigrants in accordance with the second part of Article 4 of the Law of Ukraine "On immigration"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Categories of immigrants in accordance with the second part of Article 4 of the Law of Ukraine &quot;On immigration&quot;</th>
<th>scientists</th>
<th>investors in Ukraine's economy (investment should be no less then 100 thousand $)</th>
<th>persons who are brother or sister, grandfather or grandmother, or granddaughter or grandson of citizens of Ukraine</th>
<th>persons, who had citizenship of Ukraine before</th>
<th>parents, husband (wife) of immigrant and his minor children</th>
<th>persons who have continuously lived in Ukraine for three years from the granting of refugee status or asylum in Ukraine, as well as their parents, husbands (wives) and minor children who live with them</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR of Crimea</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Without limitations</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oblasts</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinnytsya</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dnipropetrovsk</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donetsk</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhytomyr</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakarpattya</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaporizhzhya</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivano-Frankivsk</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirovohrad</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhansk</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lviv</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykolayiv</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odesa</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poltava</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivne</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumy</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temopil</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kherson</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmelnytskyi</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherkasy</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chernivtsi</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chernihiv</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kyiv</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>2247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevastopol</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td></td>
<td>345</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>3495</td>
<td>2368</td>
<td>9191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: The population of Kharkivska oblast 1995-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POPULATION (as of January 1)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing population</td>
<td>Resident population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total, thousand persons</td>
<td>Including urban</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>Total, thousand persons</td>
<td>Including males</td>
<td>females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3123.3</td>
<td>2465.8</td>
<td>657.5</td>
<td>3104.4</td>
<td>1426.0</td>
<td>1678.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3087.8</td>
<td>2433.4</td>
<td>654.4</td>
<td>3069.7</td>
<td>1410.6</td>
<td>1659.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3053.9</td>
<td>2402.4</td>
<td>651.5</td>
<td>3036.5</td>
<td>1395.3</td>
<td>1641.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3022.7</td>
<td>2374.7</td>
<td>648.0</td>
<td>3005.9</td>
<td>1381.6</td>
<td>1624.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2994.5</td>
<td>2351.3</td>
<td>643.2</td>
<td>2979.5</td>
<td>1369.8</td>
<td>1609.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2965.9</td>
<td>2328.1</td>
<td>637.8</td>
<td>2951.3</td>
<td>1356.1</td>
<td>1595.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2937.3</td>
<td>2308.7</td>
<td>628.6</td>
<td>2921.8</td>
<td>1341.8</td>
<td>1580.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2914.2</td>
<td>2288.7</td>
<td>625.5</td>
<td>2895.8</td>
<td>1328.9</td>
<td>1566.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2887.9</td>
<td>2272.0</td>
<td>615.9</td>
<td>2872.3</td>
<td>1317.9</td>
<td>1554.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2866.7</td>
<td>2259.9</td>
<td>606.8</td>
<td>2851.1</td>
<td>1308.1</td>
<td>1543.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2848.4</td>
<td>2251.5</td>
<td>596.9</td>
<td>2832.7</td>
<td>1299.1</td>
<td>1533.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2829.0</td>
<td>2243.0</td>
<td>586.0</td>
<td>2813.4</td>
<td>1289.8</td>
<td>1523.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2812.1</td>
<td>2235.2</td>
<td>576.9</td>
<td>2796.5</td>
<td>1282.5</td>
<td>1514.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2795.9</td>
<td>2227.4</td>
<td>568.5</td>
<td>2780.3</td>
<td>1275.4</td>
<td>1504.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2782.4</td>
<td>2221.5</td>
<td>560.9</td>
<td>2766.8</td>
<td>1269.5</td>
<td>1497.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2769.1</td>
<td>2214.1</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>2751.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Mortality and birth rates in Kharkivska oblast 1995-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of births, persons</th>
<th>The share of children born from women who have not been in registered marriage, percent</th>
<th>Number of deaths, persons</th>
<th>Natural growth of population, persons</th>
<th>Migration beyond the region, growth (-reduction) of population, thousand people</th>
<th>Number of registered marriages, units</th>
<th>Number of registered divorces, units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>24840</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>51231</td>
<td>-26391</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
<td>26833</td>
<td>13651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>23396</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>48700</td>
<td>-25304</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>18237</td>
<td>13671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>22192</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>47817</td>
<td>-25625</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>21023</td>
<td>12783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>21384</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>44823</td>
<td>-23439</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>19557</td>
<td>12845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>19845</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>46579</td>
<td>-26734</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>21767</td>
<td>12151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19939</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>48468</td>
<td>-28529</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>16636</td>
<td>13780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>19514</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>45829</td>
<td>-26315</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19074</td>
<td>12685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>20679</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>46454</td>
<td>-25775</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>19462</td>
<td>12335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>21510</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>46765</td>
<td>-25255</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>22779</td>
<td>11606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>22782</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>46778</td>
<td>-23996</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>16161</td>
<td>11049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>22451</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>46941</td>
<td>-24490</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>19667</td>
<td>11620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>24025</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>45496</td>
<td>-21471</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>20507</td>
<td>11454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>25269</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>45512</td>
<td>-20243</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>24732</td>
<td>11390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>27207</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>45109</td>
<td>-17902</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>19110</td>
<td>10744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>27226</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>42544</td>
<td>-15318</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18707</td>
<td>8936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: The age structure of Kharkivska oblast population 1995-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Distribution of resident population by age at the beginning of the year, thousand persons</th>
<th>Including age:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>15-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3104.4</td>
<td>586.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3069.7</td>
<td>565.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3036.5</td>
<td>543.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3005.9</td>
<td>520.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2979.5</td>
<td>492.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2951.3</td>
<td>465.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2921.8</td>
<td>439.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2895.8</td>
<td>412.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2872.3</td>
<td>390.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2851.1</td>
<td>371.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2832.7</td>
<td>357.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2813.4</td>
<td>345.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2796.5</td>
<td>336.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2780.3</td>
<td>331.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2766.8</td>
<td>332.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Regional Product</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, at current prices, million UAH</td>
<td>20524</td>
<td>25618</td>
<td>32023</td>
<td>43868</td>
<td>59389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita, at current prices, UAH</td>
<td>7182</td>
<td>9025</td>
<td>11353</td>
<td>15645</td>
<td>21294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In comparable prices, the percentage on previous year</td>
<td>112.2</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>102.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Income</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Incomes, mio UAH</td>
<td>11253</td>
<td>13395</td>
<td>16524</td>
<td>22926</td>
<td>28188</td>
<td>37835</td>
<td>51971</td>
<td>53803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available income per capita, UAH</td>
<td>2929.1</td>
<td>3468.9</td>
<td>4489.6</td>
<td>6355.7</td>
<td>7819.6</td>
<td>10328.5</td>
<td>14065.7</td>
<td>14902.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real disposable income, in percent to previous year</td>
<td>122.6</td>
<td>110.8</td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>124.2</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Dynamics of the average nominal and real wages in percent to the previous year, 2002-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nominal wages in percent to the previous year</th>
<th>Real wages in percent to the previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>119,7</td>
<td>121,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>122,7</td>
<td>116,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>125,1</td>
<td>118,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>133,4</td>
<td>118,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>128,4</td>
<td>119,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>128,4</td>
<td>111,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>134,3</td>
<td>104,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>107,4</td>
<td>90,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 24: National composition of the population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>in thsd.</th>
<th>in %</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
<td>2048,7</td>
<td>62,8</td>
<td>70,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>742,0</td>
<td>33,2</td>
<td>25,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarusians</td>
<td>14,7</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>11,5</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azeris</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgians</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: Language composition of the population in Kharkivska oblast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of their nationality</th>
<th>Considered native language, percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarusians</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azeris</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgians</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatars</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldovan</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsies</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nationalities</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: Population and total area Novovodolaz'ki rayon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novovodolaz'ka rayon</th>
<th>The number of population, thousand people</th>
<th>The area, thsd. sq km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total amount</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 197</td>
<td>14201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 27: Natural population growth in Kyiv

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32488</td>
<td>31965</td>
<td>101,6</td>
<td>11,7</td>
<td>11,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths, persons</td>
<td>28292</td>
<td>30067</td>
<td>94,1</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>10,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural increase/decrease of the population, persons</td>
<td>4196</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>221,1</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriages</td>
<td>22774</td>
<td>21694</td>
<td>105,0</td>
<td>8,2</td>
<td>7,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorces</td>
<td>9285</td>
<td>10091</td>
<td>92,0</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>3,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: Distribution of residents in Kyiv by age 1995-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population by age at the end of the year, thsd.</th>
<th>of which age</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65 and more</th>
<th>Before the employment age</th>
<th>Employment age</th>
<th>Over the employment age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2597.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>515.7</td>
<td>416.1</td>
<td>840.7</td>
<td>580.4</td>
<td>244.4</td>
<td>553.6</td>
<td>1619.0</td>
<td>424.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2588.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>496.6</td>
<td>424.3</td>
<td>829.3</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>246.6</td>
<td>537.4</td>
<td>1619.8</td>
<td>431.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2577</td>
<td></td>
<td>475.9</td>
<td>430.2</td>
<td>818.4</td>
<td>605.8</td>
<td>246.7</td>
<td>515.6</td>
<td>1620.7</td>
<td>440.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2572.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>453.6</td>
<td>438.5</td>
<td>810.2</td>
<td>623.5</td>
<td>246.5</td>
<td>495.1</td>
<td>1626.8</td>
<td>450.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2565.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>425.1</td>
<td>452.2</td>
<td>804.8</td>
<td>640.9</td>
<td>242.7</td>
<td>470.8</td>
<td>1638.5</td>
<td>456.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2567</td>
<td></td>
<td>399.7</td>
<td>465.3</td>
<td>799.1</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>242.9</td>
<td>442.7</td>
<td>1659.4</td>
<td>464.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2567.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>378.2</td>
<td>472.5</td>
<td>798.8</td>
<td>669.6</td>
<td>248.5</td>
<td>417.2</td>
<td>1681.3</td>
<td>469.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2567</td>
<td></td>
<td>355.4</td>
<td>478.3</td>
<td>799.7</td>
<td>675.8</td>
<td>257.8</td>
<td>394.5</td>
<td>1693.8</td>
<td>478.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2577.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>344.3</td>
<td>478.3</td>
<td>801.9</td>
<td>674.5</td>
<td>278.3</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1712.4</td>
<td>488.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2597.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>336</td>
<td>482.7</td>
<td>806.2</td>
<td>677.9</td>
<td>294.9</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>1727.1</td>
<td>498.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2625.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>331</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>814.9</td>
<td>682.6</td>
<td>309.6</td>
<td>364.5</td>
<td>1748.9</td>
<td>511.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2651.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>329.2</td>
<td>484.1</td>
<td>827.6</td>
<td>691.6</td>
<td>319.4</td>
<td>359.5</td>
<td>1769.1</td>
<td>523.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2676.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>330.9</td>
<td>477.8</td>
<td>839.7</td>
<td>699.5</td>
<td>328.9</td>
<td>359.1</td>
<td>1777.7</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2698.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>335.3</td>
<td>465.9</td>
<td>854.4</td>
<td>713.2</td>
<td>330.1</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>1781.6</td>
<td>556.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2724.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>346</td>
<td>443.5</td>
<td>877.2</td>
<td>728.7</td>
<td>328.7</td>
<td>369.3</td>
<td>1782.8</td>
<td>572.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Gross regional product in Kyiv (million UAH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, in actual prices, million UAH</td>
<td>61357</td>
<td>77124</td>
<td>95267</td>
<td>135900</td>
<td>169564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counted per capita, in actual prices, UAH</td>
<td>23130</td>
<td>28780</td>
<td>35210</td>
<td>49795</td>
<td>61592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 30: Income in Kyiv

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incomes, total million UAH</td>
<td>17653</td>
<td>22769</td>
<td>30594</td>
<td>43348</td>
<td>57307</td>
<td>77435</td>
<td>109781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomes per capita, UAH</td>
<td>4257,3</td>
<td>5541,8</td>
<td>7584,8</td>
<td>10683,3</td>
<td>13566,9</td>
<td>18233,2</td>
<td>24960,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Main indicators of labour market in Kyiv 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>thsd.</th>
<th>% share of proper age group</th>
<th>average, thsd.</th>
<th>% share of proper age group</th>
<th>average, thsd.</th>
<th>% share of proper age group</th>
<th>average, thsd.</th>
<th>% share of economically active population of proper age group</th>
<th>average, thsd.</th>
<th>% share of economically active population of proper age group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1333.3</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1218.3</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1342.3</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1259.4</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1365.9</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1279.7</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1403.0</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1334.9</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1416.4</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1348.9</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1412.6</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>1310.6</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>1352.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>1250.0</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1425.7</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>1333.2</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>1375.6</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>1283.1</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1450.3</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>1351.9</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>1405.3</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>1307.2</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1465.7</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>1359.1</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>1420.2</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>1313.7</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1477.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>1348.7</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>1381.0</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>1252.9</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Number of students/institutions of higher education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of institutions of higher education of the I-IV levels of accreditation</th>
<th>Number of students at institutions of higher education of the I-IV levels of accreditation thsd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-II levels of accreditation</td>
<td>III-IV levels of accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 33: Secondary schools in Kyiv

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>Number of pupils in schools, total amount, thsd.</th>
<th>Number of teachers, thsd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>349,6</td>
<td>23,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>351,3</td>
<td>24,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>348,0</td>
<td>23,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>342,7</td>
<td>23,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>334,9</td>
<td>23,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>327,0</td>
<td>23,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>318,5</td>
<td>24,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>306,1</td>
<td>23,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>290,4</td>
<td>23,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>277,0</td>
<td>23,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>261,1</td>
<td>23,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>248,5</td>
<td>22,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>238,8</td>
<td>22,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>231,3</td>
<td>21,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>230,1</td>
<td>22,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34: Number of schools and students at institutions teaching practice and techniques orientated studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of the institutions at the end of a year</th>
<th>Number of students, thsd. people</th>
<th>Entered institution, thsd people</th>
<th>Finished institution, thsd. people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24,8</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td>13,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24,6</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>12,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24,2</td>
<td>15,9</td>
<td>12,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23,6</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>12,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24,0</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td>12,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23,7</td>
<td>14,2</td>
<td>12,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22,7</td>
<td>14,1</td>
<td>12,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22,0</td>
<td>12,9</td>
<td>12,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19,3</td>
<td>13,0</td>
<td>11,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22,9</td>
<td>13,6</td>
<td>11,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23,1</td>
<td>12,6</td>
<td>10,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21,1</td>
<td>11,4</td>
<td>11,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20,3</td>
<td>11,5</td>
<td>11,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19,4</td>
<td>10,7</td>
<td>10,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18,3</td>
<td>9,0</td>
<td>9,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35: Ethnic groups in Kyiv 1989 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number (thousand persons)</th>
<th>% share of total 1989</th>
<th>% share of total 2001</th>
<th>2001 in % of 1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
<td>2110.8</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>337.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussians</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijanians</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatars</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgians</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldavians</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 36: Migration of population in Kyiv, by district, 2007-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kyiv incl. Districts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golosiyvsky</td>
<td>8622</td>
<td>4986</td>
<td>3636</td>
<td>8724</td>
<td>5452</td>
<td>3272</td>
<td>8081</td>
<td>5532</td>
<td>2549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darnytsky</td>
<td>5295</td>
<td>3877</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>5287</td>
<td>3910</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>3762</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desnyansky (Trojeshchyna)</td>
<td>3811</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>3775</td>
<td>2493</td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>3558</td>
<td>2396</td>
<td>1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dniprovsky</td>
<td>4798</td>
<td>2108</td>
<td>2690</td>
<td>4773</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>2735</td>
<td>3682</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obolonsky</td>
<td>3669</td>
<td>2455</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3568</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>3117</td>
<td>2474</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pechersky</td>
<td>4201</td>
<td>3177</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>3981</td>
<td>2814</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>3586</td>
<td>3078</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podilsky</td>
<td>2153</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>2179</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svyatoshynsky</td>
<td>3822</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>4153</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>3411</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>1149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomyansky</td>
<td>12902</td>
<td>5557</td>
<td>7345</td>
<td>12656</td>
<td>6148</td>
<td>6508</td>
<td>11261</td>
<td>6253</td>
<td>5008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shevcheviksky</td>
<td>5612</td>
<td>2534</td>
<td>3078</td>
<td>5852</td>
<td>2706</td>
<td>3146</td>
<td>4778</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37: Population, demography and migration flows in Solomyansky rayon on 01/01/2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The area</td>
<td>thsd. sq km</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount of population</td>
<td>thsd. persons</td>
<td>319.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>thsd. persons</td>
<td>319.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density</td>
<td>people on 1 sq. km</td>
<td>7990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working age population</td>
<td>thsd. persons</td>
<td>185.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic data, trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births</td>
<td>persons</td>
<td>3005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>persons</td>
<td>3317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration processes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total arrivals</td>
<td>persons</td>
<td>12526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total departures</td>
<td>persons</td>
<td>5475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>migration growth (increase)</td>
<td>persons</td>
<td>7051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 38: Population of Kirovogradska oblast 1995-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Existing population (as of January 1)</th>
<th>Resident population (as of January 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total, thousand persons</td>
<td>Including urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1236.2</td>
<td>756.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1224.8</td>
<td>749.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1210.8</td>
<td>738.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1196.4</td>
<td>728.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1180.8</td>
<td>716.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1164.5</td>
<td>705.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1146.9</td>
<td>692.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002*</td>
<td>1133.0</td>
<td>682.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1115.7</td>
<td>673.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1100.0</td>
<td>666.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1083.9</td>
<td>659.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1067.2</td>
<td>651.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1053.1</td>
<td>644.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1039.7</td>
<td>637.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1027.0</td>
<td>631.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1017.8</td>
<td>627.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://www.kirstat.kr.ua/stat_inf_rik_demogr.htm](http://www.kirstat.kr.ua/stat_inf_rik_demogr.htm)


---

134 Data on the population size cover the ‘existing’ and ‘resident population’ of Ukraine. Population estimates are based on the most recent population census results, population registration records and registration cards of the place of residence. ‘Existing population’ is the number of population at the given time (in the case of the Census 2001 and the estimate of the given year), which also includes the temporary residents (not exceeding 12 month period of stay). ‘Resident population’ includes the population that is ‘temporarily absent’ (not exceeding 12 months of absence).
Table 39: Indicators of mortality, fertility and natural growth of Kirovograd oblast 1995-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of births, persons</th>
<th>Number of deaths, persons</th>
<th>Natural growth, persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>12289</td>
<td>21840</td>
<td>-9551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>11663</td>
<td>21414</td>
<td>-9751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>10558</td>
<td>20782</td>
<td>-10224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>9746</td>
<td>19663</td>
<td>-9917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>9181</td>
<td>20481</td>
<td>-11300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9105</td>
<td>20821</td>
<td>-11716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8685</td>
<td>19808</td>
<td>-11123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8936</td>
<td>20183</td>
<td>-11247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>9178</td>
<td>20125</td>
<td>-10947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9392</td>
<td>19933</td>
<td>-10541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>8967</td>
<td>20187</td>
<td>-11220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>9755</td>
<td>19093</td>
<td>-9338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10076</td>
<td>19219</td>
<td>-9143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>10538</td>
<td>19272</td>
<td>-8734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10916</td>
<td>17793</td>
<td>-6877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 40: Age composition of Kirovograd oblast 1995-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Distribution of resident population by age at the beginning of the year, thousand persons</th>
<th>Including age:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>15-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1224,9</td>
<td>245,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1213,4</td>
<td>240,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1199,6</td>
<td>234,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1185,9</td>
<td>228,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1171,6</td>
<td>219,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1156,0</td>
<td>210,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1140,0</td>
<td>200,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002*</td>
<td>1125,7</td>
<td>189,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1109,3</td>
<td>179,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1093,6</td>
<td>171,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1077,5</td>
<td>164,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1060,8</td>
<td>156,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1046,7</td>
<td>151,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1033,3</td>
<td>146,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1020,6</td>
<td>144,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1011,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*According to Ukraine nationwide census on December 5, 2001

Table 41: Gross Regional Product of Kirovograd oblast 2004-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Regional Product</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, at current prices, million UAH</td>
<td>5594</td>
<td>6877</td>
<td>8187</td>
<td>9989</td>
<td>13961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita, at current prices, UAH</td>
<td>5122</td>
<td>6394</td>
<td>7723</td>
<td>9546</td>
<td>13515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In comparable prices, the percentage of previous year</td>
<td>118,9</td>
<td>102,4</td>
<td>105,1</td>
<td>97,9</td>
<td>113,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 42: Industry in Kirovograd oblast January 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of industry sectors by economic activity</th>
<th>Share, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>4,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing Industry</td>
<td>86,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, beverages and tobacco</td>
<td>46,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industry</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction of timber and wood products manufacturing</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulp and paper, printing and publishing industry</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical and petrochemical industry</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products (building materials and glass)</td>
<td>4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallurgy and metal processing</td>
<td>11,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical engineering, repair and installation of machinery and equipment</td>
<td>19,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and distribution of electricity, water and gas</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43: Average wages in Kirovograd oblast 2002-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income, million UAH</td>
<td>3722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available income per capita, UAH</td>
<td>2576,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real disposable income, in % to previous year</td>
<td>117,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 44: Development of the average monthly nominal and real wages in % to the previous year, 2002-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominal wages in % to</th>
<th>Real wages in % to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previous year</td>
<td>December to December of the previous year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>121,9</td>
<td>118,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>125,2</td>
<td>126,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>129,1</td>
<td>129,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>137,1</td>
<td>146,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>131,3</td>
<td>126,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>128,7</td>
<td>127,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>135,5</td>
<td>120,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>107,6</td>
<td>117,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45: Labour force of Kirovograd oblast 2000-2009 (in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically active population</td>
<td>511.1</td>
<td>507.2</td>
<td>517.8</td>
<td>504.4</td>
<td>499.3</td>
<td>501.5</td>
<td>500.2</td>
<td>503.2</td>
<td>499.2</td>
<td>480.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working age</td>
<td>493.3</td>
<td>489.4</td>
<td>480.1</td>
<td>471.6</td>
<td>467.7</td>
<td>460.0</td>
<td>460.1</td>
<td>461.3</td>
<td>458.7</td>
<td>435.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older working age</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied population</td>
<td>435.2</td>
<td>429.3</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>454.9</td>
<td>457.5</td>
<td>457.5</td>
<td>458.9</td>
<td>462.4</td>
<td>459.1</td>
<td>432.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working age</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>433.3</td>
<td>422.1</td>
<td>413.7</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>418.8</td>
<td>420.5</td>
<td>418.6</td>
<td>388.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older working age</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed population (ILO methodology)</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working age</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older working age</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 46: Number of students in higher educational institutions in Kirovograd oblast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic year</th>
<th>Number of students in the institutions, thousand persons</th>
<th>I-I levels of accreditation</th>
<th>III-IV levels of accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 47: Unemployment rate and further indicators for Kirovogradska oblast 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Economically active population, thsd.</th>
<th>% of the total population</th>
<th>The need for labour at the end of the year, thousand persons</th>
<th>Number of unemployed per vacancy, vacant position at the end of the year, persons</th>
<th>Unemployed (following ILO methodology), %</th>
<th>Duration of unemployed (following ILO methodology), month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>511.1</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>504.9</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>517.8</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>504.4</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>499.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>501.5</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>500.2</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>503.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>499.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>480.3</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 48: The main nationalities in Kirovogradska oblast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Number (thousand, person)</th>
<th>as % of the total 2001</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>2001 as % of 1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
<td>1014.6</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldovans</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarusian</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.4 times higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nationalities</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

135 Official data provided by the public job centre of Kirovogradska oblast.
136 Ibid.
### Table 49: Social-economical indicators of Kirovogradskaya oblast 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total population, thsd.</th>
<th>Natural increase in population</th>
<th>Population migration Increase/decrease, thsd.</th>
<th>Economically active population, thsd.</th>
<th>Unemployed (following ILO methodology), %</th>
<th>Total number of students, 3-4rd levels of accred., thsd.</th>
<th>Medical staff, per 10000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1164,5</td>
<td>–11716</td>
<td>–5,9</td>
<td>511,1</td>
<td>14,9</td>
<td>17,7</td>
<td>112,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1146,9</td>
<td>–11123</td>
<td>–4,6</td>
<td>504,9</td>
<td>15,2</td>
<td>18,3</td>
<td>107,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1133,0</td>
<td>–11247</td>
<td>–4,3</td>
<td>517,8</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>19,0</td>
<td>109,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1115,7</td>
<td>–10947</td>
<td>–4,8</td>
<td>504,4</td>
<td>9,8</td>
<td>20,4</td>
<td>111,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1100,0</td>
<td>–10541</td>
<td>–5,6</td>
<td>499,3</td>
<td>11,0</td>
<td>20,4</td>
<td>112,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1083,9</td>
<td>–11220</td>
<td>–5,5</td>
<td>501,5</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>20,8</td>
<td>107,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1067,2</td>
<td>–9338</td>
<td>–4,8</td>
<td>500,2</td>
<td>8,3</td>
<td>21,8</td>
<td>107,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1053,1</td>
<td>–9143</td>
<td>–4,2</td>
<td>503,2</td>
<td>8,1</td>
<td>22,2</td>
<td>106,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1039,7</td>
<td>–8734</td>
<td>–4,0</td>
<td>499,2</td>
<td>8,0</td>
<td>22,0</td>
<td>104,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1027,0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>480,3</td>
<td>9,9</td>
<td>20,8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 50: The number of population, area and population density of Znamyanka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The number of population</th>
<th>The area, sq km</th>
<th>Population density, people on 1 sq. km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total amount</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Znamyansk</td>
<td>30,469</td>
<td>24,969 (82 percent)</td>
<td>5,500 (18 percent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 51: Population of Ternopil oblast 1991-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population, thsd.</td>
<td>1175,1</td>
<td>1175,4</td>
<td>1142,4</td>
<td>1126,6</td>
<td>1119,6</td>
<td>1112,1</td>
<td>1105,4</td>
<td>1098,6</td>
<td>1093,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>494,1</td>
<td>512,0</td>
<td>485,6</td>
<td>481,6</td>
<td>478,5</td>
<td>476,9</td>
<td>475,5</td>
<td>474,3</td>
<td>474,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>681,0</td>
<td>663,4</td>
<td>656,8</td>
<td>645,0</td>
<td>641,1</td>
<td>635,2</td>
<td>629,9</td>
<td>624,3</td>
<td>619,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of new-born</th>
<th>Number of deaths</th>
<th>Natural growth of population, people</th>
<th>Emigration (- decrease), thsd people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>14112</td>
<td>16122</td>
<td>-2010</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>13516</td>
<td>16321</td>
<td>-2805</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>12782</td>
<td>16648</td>
<td>-3866</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>12202</td>
<td>15782</td>
<td>-3580</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>11197</td>
<td>16569</td>
<td>-5372</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10570</td>
<td>15721</td>
<td>-5151</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>10102</td>
<td>16296</td>
<td>-6194</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10444</td>
<td>16345</td>
<td>-5901</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>10476</td>
<td>16823</td>
<td>-6347</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11094</td>
<td>16180</td>
<td>-5086</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>11035</td>
<td>16802</td>
<td>-5767</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>11623</td>
<td>16556</td>
<td>-4933</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>11431</td>
<td>16473</td>
<td>-5042</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>12388</td>
<td>16200</td>
<td>-3812</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12404</td>
<td>15652</td>
<td>-3248</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53: Age structure of Ternopil oblast population 1995-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0-14 years</th>
<th>15-24 years</th>
<th>25-44 years</th>
<th>45-64 years</th>
<th>65 and over</th>
<th>Younger than working age</th>
<th>Working age</th>
<th>Older than working age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1172,0</td>
<td>256,2</td>
<td>162,3</td>
<td>316,1</td>
<td>267,4</td>
<td>170,0</td>
<td>272,9</td>
<td>614,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1169,7</td>
<td>252,6</td>
<td>164,0</td>
<td>316,6</td>
<td>261,7</td>
<td>174,6</td>
<td>269,9</td>
<td>613,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1166,5</td>
<td>248,9</td>
<td>164,6</td>
<td>317,3</td>
<td>258,4</td>
<td>177,3</td>
<td>265,8</td>
<td>614,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1162,5</td>
<td>244,5</td>
<td>164,8</td>
<td>318,9</td>
<td>253,9</td>
<td>180,4</td>
<td>261,4</td>
<td>616,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1157,9</td>
<td>237,6</td>
<td>166,7</td>
<td>321,0</td>
<td>250,3</td>
<td>182,3</td>
<td>256,3</td>
<td>619,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1151,4</td>
<td>229,1</td>
<td>169,5</td>
<td>321,6</td>
<td>248,0</td>
<td>183,2</td>
<td>248,3</td>
<td>623,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1144,8</td>
<td>220,8</td>
<td>171,7</td>
<td>320,5</td>
<td>247,1</td>
<td>184,7</td>
<td>239,2</td>
<td>628,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002*</td>
<td>1138,5</td>
<td>212,4</td>
<td>173,8</td>
<td>319,3</td>
<td>247,3</td>
<td>185,7</td>
<td>231,0</td>
<td>632,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1131,0</td>
<td>204,5</td>
<td>175,4</td>
<td>317,3</td>
<td>247,9</td>
<td>185,9</td>
<td>222,0</td>
<td>637,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1123,4</td>
<td>197,2</td>
<td>176,2</td>
<td>314,8</td>
<td>249,7</td>
<td>185,5</td>
<td>214,6</td>
<td>640,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1116,3</td>
<td>191,3</td>
<td>175,4</td>
<td>312,0</td>
<td>253,1</td>
<td>184,5</td>
<td>207,8</td>
<td>641,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1108,9</td>
<td>185,5</td>
<td>173,8</td>
<td>310,1</td>
<td>255,0</td>
<td>184,5</td>
<td>201,9</td>
<td>643,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1102,1</td>
<td>180,6</td>
<td>172,4</td>
<td>308,0</td>
<td>257,5</td>
<td>183,6</td>
<td>196,7</td>
<td>644,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1095,4</td>
<td>176,1</td>
<td>170,7</td>
<td>306,4</td>
<td>261,6</td>
<td>180,6</td>
<td>191,6</td>
<td>644,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1090,1</td>
<td>173,5</td>
<td>166,3</td>
<td>307,5</td>
<td>266,3</td>
<td>176,5</td>
<td>188,1</td>
<td>644,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 54: Gross regional product of Ternopil oblast 2004-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>1st half of 2009*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, actual prices, million UAH</td>
<td>3948</td>
<td>5137</td>
<td>6452</td>
<td>8276</td>
<td>10618</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita, actual prices, UAH</td>
<td>3516</td>
<td>4603</td>
<td>5819</td>
<td>7510</td>
<td>9688</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparing prices, % to previous year</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*prognoses;
Table 55: Industry in Ternopil oblast (January 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume of realized production</th>
<th>Share, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extractive industry</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling industry</td>
<td>74,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of food, drinks and tobacco products</td>
<td>43,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light industry</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of wood and products, except furniture</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellulose-paper production, publishing</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical and oil-chemical industry</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of other non-metal mineral products</td>
<td>4,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallurgy production and manufacturing of new metal products</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine-constructing</td>
<td>13,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and division of electric energy, gas and water</td>
<td>23,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 56: Income of population of Ternopil oblast in 2002-2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total incomes, million UAH</td>
<td>3119</td>
<td>3983</td>
<td>4942</td>
<td>6969</td>
<td>8708</td>
<td>11367</td>
<td>14999</td>
<td>15665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existent income per capita, UAH</td>
<td>2158,1</td>
<td>2794,6</td>
<td>3524,2</td>
<td>5032,7</td>
<td>6283,4</td>
<td>8063,5</td>
<td>10583,0</td>
<td>10733,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real existent income, % to previous year</td>
<td>117,0</td>
<td>111,9</td>
<td>117,5</td>
<td>128,1</td>
<td>115,3</td>
<td>112,9</td>
<td>104,5</td>
<td>87,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* prognoses;
Table 57: Dynamics of average nominal and real income in Ternopil oblast, % to the previous year, 2002-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominal salary</th>
<th>Real salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% to Previous year</td>
<td>% to Previous year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>125,0</td>
<td>120,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>128,3</td>
<td>126,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>127,7</td>
<td>128,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>142,5</td>
<td>158,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>131,4</td>
<td>121,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>129,6</td>
<td>131,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>139,3</td>
<td>133,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>107,5</td>
<td>106,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 58: Main indicators for the labour market in Ternopil oblast 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economically active population</th>
<th>Employed population</th>
<th>Unemployed population (according to ILO methodology)</th>
<th>Average duration of unemployment (ILO methodology) of population aged 15-70, months</th>
<th>Demand for labour force at the end of the year, thsd people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>475,1</td>
<td>408,4</td>
<td>65,7</td>
<td>11,0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>459,0</td>
<td>380,3</td>
<td>57,2</td>
<td>11,1,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>436,0</td>
<td>370,5</td>
<td>56,1</td>
<td>11,1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>430,2</td>
<td>374,1</td>
<td>52,6</td>
<td>11,1,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>440,3</td>
<td>387,7</td>
<td>42,3</td>
<td>8,1,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>457,4</td>
<td>425,1</td>
<td>41,8</td>
<td>6,1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>453,5</td>
<td>417,1</td>
<td>36,8</td>
<td>5,1,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>483,3</td>
<td>423,5</td>
<td>41,1</td>
<td>5,1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>486,0</td>
<td>424,9</td>
<td>53,1</td>
<td>4,1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>475,9</td>
<td>422,1</td>
<td>52,9</td>
<td>11,1,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 59: Number of institutions/students of higher education in Ternopil oblast (beginning of academic year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of establishments, units</th>
<th>Number of students, thsd people</th>
<th>I-II level of accreditation</th>
<th>III-IV level of accreditation</th>
<th>I-II level of accreditation</th>
<th>III-IV level of accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>22,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,9</td>
<td>25,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,3</td>
<td>33,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>35,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,9</td>
<td>39,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11,0</td>
<td>43,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11,5</td>
<td>47,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td>51,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>58,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10,8</td>
<td>56,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>57,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td>54,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>55,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>56,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>51,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 60: Number of nationalities living in Ternopil oblast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Number (thsd people)</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>2001, % to 1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
<td>1113,5</td>
<td>97,8</td>
<td>96,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>14,2</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussians</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nationalities</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 61: Social-economic indicators of Ternopil oblast 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total population, thsd.</th>
<th>Natural increase in population</th>
<th>Population migration increase/decrease, thsd.</th>
<th>Economically active population, thsd.</th>
<th>Unemployed (following ILO methodology), in %</th>
<th>Total number of students, 3rd and 4th levels of accred., thsd.</th>
<th>Medical staff, per 10000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1156,9</td>
<td>-5151</td>
<td>-1,8</td>
<td>475,1</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>43,8</td>
<td>109,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1149,8</td>
<td>-6194</td>
<td>-2,4</td>
<td>459,0</td>
<td>17,1</td>
<td>47,4</td>
<td>106,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1142,4</td>
<td>-5901</td>
<td>-1,1</td>
<td>436,9</td>
<td>13,1</td>
<td>51,9</td>
<td>110,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1134,2</td>
<td>-6347</td>
<td>-1,3</td>
<td>430,2</td>
<td>13,0</td>
<td>58,6</td>
<td>110,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1129,6</td>
<td>-5086</td>
<td>-1,9</td>
<td>440,3</td>
<td>11,9</td>
<td>56,8</td>
<td>111,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1119,6</td>
<td>-5767</td>
<td>-1,7</td>
<td>467,4</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>57,4</td>
<td>108,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1112,1</td>
<td>-4933</td>
<td>-1,8</td>
<td>453,5</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>54,6</td>
<td>111,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1105,4</td>
<td>-5042</td>
<td>-1,7</td>
<td>463,3</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>55,2</td>
<td>106,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1098,6</td>
<td>-3812</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>466,0</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>56,0</td>
<td>110,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1093,3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>466,0</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>51,5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 62: Demographic data of Zbarazh rayon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>thsd. sq km</th>
<th>thsd.</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>People on 1 sq. Km</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The area</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>59 062</td>
<td>17 126, 29%</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount of population</td>
<td></td>
<td>thsd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthrate (per 1000 persons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural population growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>