

## **POSTSOVIET MIGRATION TRANSITION IN UKRAINE**

### *From the passport regime to the freedom of movement*

Migration doctrine of the soviet period as a system of official views and regulations, as a leading political principle was based on the passport system, labour legislation and housing policy. The soviet model of industrialization with its orientation on labour-intensive sectors of national economy, labour division between large economic regions and leveling of economical development in the republics of the USSR was accompanied by acceleration of labour resources mobility. The large-scale state programmes were spread out for regulating of the migration flows. The organized recruitment of workers and agricultural resettling of families were the most efficient ones. The system of professional and regional differentiation of wages and salaries was created for attraction of workers to regions with a lack of labour resources. But the main instrument of controlling and regulating of migration flows in the USSR remained during the soviet period without change: it was the passport system but not economic policy, human rights and civil freedoms. The freedom of residence choice was brought to naught.

The migration doctrine has radically changed in Ukraine after the dissolution of the USSR. In January 1994, the Ukrainian Parliament adopted the Law "On the Procedure of Exit from and Entry into Ukraine by Citizens of Ukraine" that guaranteed the right to leave the Ukraine and to return in without restriction. This law burst the old order. With its adoption the article 11 of Law of Ukraine "On Employment" admitting the labour or undertaking activity of Ukrainian citizens during their stay abroad acquired the additional force. Innovations in the sphere of migration policy were contained in the articles 24, 25, 26, 33 of the Constitution of Ukraine adopted on 26 June 1996.

And at last in December 2003 the Ukrainian Parliament adopted the Law "On the freedom of movement and free choice residence in Ukraine". Propiskas does not exist any longer. It is changed by registration procedura having the notification meaning. The freedom of movement is defined in the Law as a right of citizen of Ukraine as well as the foreigner and stateless person, staying in Ukraine on legal grounds, to move without restriction and by own wish throughout its territory in any direction, by any way, at any time, with the exception of restrictions established by Law. The Ukraine passed from passport regime to the freedom of movement and free choice of residence and working place.

In the last decade of the XX century the migration processes in Ukraine obtained a new content and dynamics; migration priorities are changed; structure of directions and intensity of migration flows are transformed, a new kinds and forms of migration mobility are appeared. At first the run of

migration events does not inspire the observers with apprehension of danger. The first signs of its approach come to light in the eighties: the All-Union Census of 1989 fixed the considerable migration flows of Russian-speaking population -- Russians, Ukrainians and Belarusians, from republics of Middle and Central Asia and Caucasus. The coming changes, for the time being vague, indistinguishable and as if unthreatening, are hardly guessed. The events that will change the world, will happen in the nearest future. The huge country will fall to pieces, the Commonwealth of Independent Countries will appear at the post-soviet space. And a new migration history will germinate here from the common migration past.

The author analyses in this article the reconfiguration of migration flows and their contribution to the forming of population potential of Ukraine on the eve and after collapse of the USSR; investigates the dominants of the migration situation at the different stages of its development in country, discusses a new forms of migration mobility of its population, arisen at the threshold of a new millennium, estimates the perspectives of their development in the near future.

### **The eighties: Reconfiguration of Migration Flows as Forerunner of the Soviet Union Collapse**

At the end of eightieth the reconfiguration of the migration flows in the USSR become obvious. The Caucasus and Asian republics appear for the first time as migration donors and Russian Federation, Ukrainian SSR and Baltic Republics strengthen their positions of the host countries.

The population of the Ukrainian SSR as of 12 January 1989 amounted to 51,7 million persons. For ten years expired since the preceding Census in 1979, a size of inhabitants increased here by 1949 thousands persons or by 4,0%. Just in the Ukrainian SSR the lowest rate of population growth was observed in the eighties being twice less than in the USSR on the average. While the share of population increase due to net migration constituted in 1979-1988 18% in Russian Federation, 34,2% in Lithuanian SSR, 51,4% in Estonian SSR, 58,1% in Latvian SSR, in Ukrainian SSR its portion run up to 7,8% only (table 1).

Note should be taken that net migration increase was observed only in the towns and cities of these republics. At the same time their countryside suffered losses of the rural inhabitants that resulted in a swift development of depopulation in the most of rural regions. Migration increase of urban population was formed mainly by arrived peasants from there. Latvian SSR was the only exception where the quarter of urban population increase consisted of townspeople (table 1).

**Table 1. Components of population size changes in the republics of the USSR, 1979-1989, thousands<sup>x</sup>**

Republics of the USSR	Size of population as of 12.01.1989	Increase in population during 1979-1989			1989 in % to 1979
		total	natural	net migration	
USSR	286717	24281	24450	-169	109
Russian Federation	147386	9835	8068	1767	107
Ukranian SSR	51704	1949	1796	153	104
Belarusian SSR	10200	640	648	-8	107
Kazakh SSR	16538	1854	2638	-784	113
Moldovian SSR	4341	394	450	-56	110
Republics of the Middle Asia	32843	7363	8213	-850	129
Uzbek SSR	19906	4515	5022	-507	129
Kirghiz SSR	4291	762	919	-157	122
Tajik SSR	5112	1311	1413	-102	134
Turkmen SSR	3534	775	859	-84	128
Republics of the Caucasus	15761	1687	2326	-639	112
Georgian SSR	5449	434	486	-52	109
Azerbaijani SSR	7029	1001	1267	-266	117
Armenian SSR	3283	252	573	-321	108
Republics of the Baltic region	7944	559	311	248	108
Lithuanian SSR	369	292	192	100	109
Latvian SSR	2681	160	67	93	106
Estonian SSR	1573	107	52	55	107

<sup>x</sup> It's calculated by the author by: Statistical press-bulletin, № 9/1989. – p. 95.

More than a half of new-comers in the Latvian and Estonian cities (62,3% and 50,1% accordingly) came here from other Union Republics. Only in the Lithuanian SSR the share of external migration was essentially lower (29,7%) running up to the average index in the USSR. The migration increase of urban population in Ukrainian SSR was formed mainly by the internal migration and more exactly by its intro-regional component (73,2% and 55,1% accordingly). In the Russian Federation the structure of migration increase in urban population is characterized by the same proportions (70,5% and 53,2%).

Migration processes have undergone the essential changes in the Ukrainian SSR. If in the fifties and sixties migrations served as a channel of population redistribution between the union republics and economic regions, in seventies and especially eighties the "theatre of migration operations" was narrowed and the movement of rural inhabitants to the towns within of own region and from two-three neighbour provinces become the most widespread type. The main contingent both new comers in Ukrainian towns and inhabitants leaving from there was represented by the indigenous population.

The most high indicators of migration mobility in eighties was immanent for Russians, Ukrainians and Belarusians. Migratory links were formed mainly by the principle of the nearest neighbourhood. Thus, Belarusians gravitated towards Russian Federation and Ukrainian SSR but mostly towards Baltic republics; Moldavians – towards Ukrainian SSR. One can meet Ukrainians almost everywhere, but more often – in Latvian, Estonian, Belarusian republics and Russian Federation. A lot of Ukrainians lived in Kazakh republic. But the most high mobility was immanent to Russians whose share in the contingent of new-comers in Latvian and Estonian republics was

especially considerable. It is sizable enough in Ukrainian SSR as well. It should be noted that the indigenous population of Baltic republics didn't not practically participate in migration exchange with Russian Federation and Ukrainian republic as well as with other Union republics. The migration exchange by the indigenous inhabitants between Baltic republics was extremely low, its share was minimum.

**Table 2. Structure of net migration in the urban settlements of the Soviet Union republics, 1988, %<sup>xx</sup>**

Structure of net migration	Republics of the USSR				
	Russian Federation	Ukrainian SSR	Lithuanian SSR	Latvian SSR	Estonian SSR
Migratory increase of urban population - total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Including contribution of:					
New-comers from towns	3,6	6,4	1,1	24,9	7,6
New-comers from countryside	96,4	93,6	98,9	75,1	92,4
Migratory increase of urban population - total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Including contribution of:					
Internal migration -	70,5	73,2	70,3	37,7	49,9
intra-regional	53,2	55,1	-	-	-
inter-regional	17,3	18,1	-	-	-
External migration	29,5	26,8	29,7	62,3	50,1
Migratory increase of urban population - total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Including contribution of ethnic groups:					
Russians	63,3	25,4	13,3	53,8	70,0
Ukrainians	5,8	67,6	3,2	10,8	-2,2
Belarussians	1,5	1,4	4,1	11,0	4,2
Moldovans	0,5	1,0	0,1	0,4	0,1
Lithuanians	0,0	0,0	67,4	0,9	0,6
Latvians	0,0	0,0	0,3	18,6	0,3
Estonians	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	9,4
Tatars	6,3	1,8	0,4	0,7	1,7
Others	22,6	2,8	11,2	3,8	15,9

<sup>xx</sup> It's calculated by the author by: Statistical press-bulletin, № 4/1989. – p. 50, 51; 64-70.

The natives predominated among settled migrants in the towns of Ukrainian and Lithuanian SSR. But their part in Latvian and Estonian SSR was extremely low: 18,6% and 9,4% accordingly. Migration increase of urban population here was formed mainly by Russians. In addition, the contribution of Ukrainians and Belarussians into the net migration proved to be high enough. The share of new-comers, having Russian origin, has been sufficiently perceptible in the Ukrainian SSR: in 1988 its size made up a quarter of whole migration increase of urban population here (table 2).

Increase of urban population in Ukrainian SSR owing to migration proceeded with the active participation of young and able-bodied contingents. As a whole this process exerted positive influence on forming of age structure of urban population and the dynamics of its labour potential.

According to the data of Census of population in 1899, only 84,7% of all Ukrainians lived in the Soviet Union were residents of Ukrainian SSR. The rest 15,3% were residents of other Union republics. The largest in the number Ukrainian contingent (4364 thousands of people) were residents of Russian Federation. About 900 thousands lived in Kazakh SSR, 600 thousands – in Moldova SSR, 290 thousands – in Belarusian SSR, 154 thousands – in Uzbek SSR, a little larger 100 thousands – in Kirgiz SSR. All these people belonged to numerous contingent of potential migrants whom the collapse of the USSR will put before a choice of vital importance in a short time. And migration expansion of Russian and Ukrainian contingents into the Baltics countries will have highly painful consequences both for themselves and for indigenous population of these republics.

The Ukraine as well as other union republics entered into period of political instability. According to the operative data of the Department of migration and refugees of the Republic Centre of employment, the total population being forced to leave their residence and displaced from the zones of military operations in the Transcaucasian and Tajik republics, as well as Russian Federation to the Ukraine, numbered to 17,6 thousands of person, from March 1988 to March 1993. In 1989-1990, after armed interethnic conflicts in the Fergana valley, more than ten thousands of meschetians were arrived at the south regions of Ukraine and Donbas. There was uneasy situation in the Baltic countries. The central powers made unavailing attempts to keep it under control by force of arms. The most far-seeing persons discuss the emigration plans and get ready for evacuation. The others are short of time and resources and become the refugees.

Migration doctrine of the soviet pattern was exhausted. Its ideological and political postulates lost its validity.

### **The Nineties: Migration Practices and their Reflection in the State Policy and Administration**

The disintegration of the USSR became the turning-point in the development of migration history in Ukraine. It was the time to comprehend the meaning of radical changes and their irreversibility. The varieties of a new migration practices were in need of non-standard administrative decisions supported by legislative initiatives, financial investments and at last by political will-power of a new Ukrainian leaders. There existed an urgent demand for a new migration doctrine based on the principal values of democratic societies – human rights, civil freedoms, prerogative of the Law.

A bloody conflicts and civil wars in the Central Asia and Caucasus were accompanied by mass escape of Slav and indigenous population from these regions. Many of them appeared in the Ukraine in search of shelter. An interim government commissions were created here to render them

assistance on arrival. A branch departments of Government machine were charged with an important mission of their reception, accommodation and employment.

On arrival of forced migrants from Azerbaijan in April 1988 a new Department of migration and refugees was established in the structure of Republic Centre of Employment of the Ministry of Labour of Ukraine. This executive body carried out the functions of working group attached to interim Government commissions. Such approach to the decision of organizational questions proved to be the most successful: the Ministry of Labour with its branching structure of territorial bodies was able to decide efficiently the problems of reception and accommodation of shelter seekers.

The Ministry of Labour of Ukraine carried out these functions in the beginning of nineties keeping the position and emergency powers of the principal body of executive authority responsible for reception and accommodation of the asylum seekers right up to the establishment of a new Ministry for Nationalities and Migration of Ukraine in April 1993. Thus, for example, the Centre of Employment of the Crimea province (afterwards the Autonomous Republic of Crimea) carried out the organization work for assistance to return, housing and employment of formerly deported peoples. After the disintegration of the USSR and cessation of the Union bodies activity the reception and accommodation of repatriates were fulfilled by the Republican Committee of Nationalities and Deported Citizens in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (ARC). On October 9 of 1992 ten member countries of the CIS signed in Bishkek "The Agreement on the issues of restoration of deported persons, ethnic minorities and peoples' rights" which defined ways to solve the problems of formerly deported peoples at the international level.

The collapse of the USSR and the formation of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) led to a change in their directions, structure and intensity. New types of flows emerged, such as a short-term migration for commercial purposes to Central Europe, Turkey and China. Many Ukrainians started seeking temporary work abroad, particularly in Central Europe. Due to its long borders, Ukraine became a transit country for illegal migrants from developing countries heading towards Western Europe. Emigration of scientists, widely known as "brain drain", reached considerable proportions, seriously endangering the intellectual potential of the country. All in all, Ukraine became an emigration country: in 1994 for the first time emigration exceeded immigration, with migration losses amounting to 143,2 thousands of persons; they were of 89,9 thousands of persons in 1995 and of 117,2 thousands of persons in 1996.

As the result of these migratory processes, in 1992 Ukraine started losing its population: while at the beginning of 1993 it numbered 52244,1 thousands of persons, at the beginning of 1997 it had decreased to 50893,5 thousands of persons, with a total loss of 1350,6 thousands of persons in

1992-1996 years<sup>1</sup>. A notable trend of recent years is the decreasing intensity of migration exchanges with the CIS and Baltic states.

Still, the CIS countries – and most importantly the Russian Federation – remained Ukraine's main migration partners. Ukraine continued to lose population in its exchanges with the Russian Federation and Belarus, and the inflow of migrants from other CIS countries and the Baltic states were not sufficient to compensate these losses. Negative net migration with Belarus started in 1992 and has steadily increased since then. In 1996, it was of 3,1 thousands of persons. Negative net migration with the Russian Federation was registered for the first time in 1994 and was continuing later, albeit at a lower intensity. In 1996, it was of 86,5 thousands of persons. Ukraine's other main migration partners were Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Moldova: their contribution into migration increase of Ukraine's population constituted correspondingly 6,8, 2,9 and 1,6 thousands of persons.

As concerns the Baltic states, in the first half on nineties Ukraine's migration balance has always been positive, although it has notably decreased from some 15,4 thousands of persons in 1992 to 1,03 thousands persons in 1996. The main protagonists of these flows were Russians and Ukrainians. As regards emigration to non-CIS countries, the traditional countries of destination at the early nineties were Israel, the USA and Germany. While emigration to Israel and the USA has been decreasing in 1992 - 1996, emigration to Germany was getting more and more. Emigration in Canada has also increased, reaching 1,8 thousands of persons in 1996. At the same time (1996) 20,4 thousands of persons emigrated to Israel (38,3% of the total outflows, 13,4 thousands emigrants to the USA (25,2%) and 9,7 thousands persons to Germany (18,3%). The other countries of destination were Greece, Poland, Hungary, the Czech and the Slovak Republics, Austria and Australia.

Among emigrants to Israel 50,1% were Jews, 23,8% were Ukrainians and 20,4% were Russians. The share of Jews decreased as compared to 1994, when it was of 63,9%, whereas that of Russians and Ukrainians sharply increased (it was of 16,4% and 16,1% respectively). Among emigrants to the USA, 41,8% were Ukrainians, 36,4% were Jews and 14,9% were Russians. Jewish emigration to the USA was also decreasing as compared to 1994 (it was of 53,5%), whereas that of Ukrainians increased substantially (it was of 27,6%) and that of Russians remained unchanged (it was 14,6%). Jews still hold the first place among emigrants to Germany. The share of Russians and Germans slightly decreased, from 18,2% in 1994 to 17,7% in 1996 for Germans, and from 16,3% in 1994 to 13,2% in 1996 for Russians.

The repatriation of ethnic Ukrainians started in the late eighties and reached a peak in 1990, when 150,8 thousands of persons or 76,9% of all migrants to urban centers were Ukrainians. Starting

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Naselennya Ukrainy, 1994. Demograficzny shchorichnyk, Kyiv, 1994, p. 6* and *Chyselnist naseleennya Ukrainy na 1 sichnya 1997, Kyiv, 1997, p.3.*

from 1991, this trend was further spurred by inter-ethnic conflicts in the Caucasus and Tajikistan. In 1996, 50,0 thousands of ethnic Ukrainians, representing 40,3% of the total number of immigrants, moved to Ukraine. Altogether, between 1991 and 1996 the number of repatriants was of around 1,4 million persons.

The return of formerly deported peoples to Ukraine is a new phenomenon which concerns mostly Crimean Tatars and Germans, but also Bulgarians, Greeks and Armenians. The inflow of Crimean Tatars to Crimea from other parts of the former USSR started in 1987, but picked up in the wake of the USSR Supreme Soviet declaration "On the Restoration of the Rights of Deported Peoples" of November 1989. Between 1989 and 1996, 183,4 thousands of Crimean Tatars returned to their historic homeland. As of 1 January 1997, 247,9 thousands of persons (64870 families) belonging to formerly deported peoples resided in Crimea. The overwhelming majority of the Crimean Tatars originated from Uzbekistan (72%), the Russian Federation (16%) and Tajikistan (3%), and the reminder from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and other regions of Ukraine. As concerns Armenians, Bulgarians, Greeks and Germans, their return to Crimea began already in the 1960-s and 1970-s, albeit on a small scale. As of 1 January 1997, the share of formerly deported people in the population of Crimea was 9,6%. More than 5,5 thousands of Crimean Tatars, as well as some 4,0 thousands of Meskhetians lived in the Kherson region.

Following the catastrophe at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant in April 1986, the population living in contaminated areas was evacuated and resettled. In total, between 1990 and 1996 32,05 thousands of persons were evacuated in the framework of the compulsory evacuation programme and 26,7 thousands persons were evacuated in the framework of the voluntary evacuation programme.

Ukraine's unique geographic location has made it a convenient transit country for illegal migrants, who used it as a springboard to the West. Illegal migrants originated mostly from South-East Asia and Africa, and particularly from Vietnam, India, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Syria, Israel, Jordan and Iran. A significant number of illegal migrants originated from CIS countries, particularly from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Russian Federation. The most frequently used entry channels were tourism, transit travel, visa-free entrance (for CIS citizens), business or private invitations and outright violations of entrance regulations. Illegal migration has become a profitable business for criminal groups. The majority of the migrants apprehended used falsified passports and passports belonging to others or had no passports at all. Between 1991 and 1996, 30,04 thousands of illegal migrants were apprehended.

In the first half of nineties, Ukraine witnessed several inflows of refugees and persons in refugee-like situations. Following the outbreak of armed conflict in Transdnistria (Moldova), in June 1992 60,0 thousands of refugees – including more than 30,0 thousands children – sought



asylum in Ukraine. A special commission on refugees from Transdnistria was established at the Cabinet of Ministers, with wide-ranging authority for refugee status determination and the coordination of measures for the reception and temporary settlement of refugees. Further inflows of CIS refugees came from Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Tajikistan and Chechnya (Russian Federation). In addition, growing numbers of non-CIS refugees have sought asylum in Ukraine. Asylum-seekers originate mainly from Afghanistan, Pakistan, Sri-Lanka, a number of African countries (Angola, Cameroun, Chad, Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Liberia, Mauritania, Rwanda, Sierra-Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, Zaire) and the Middle East (Iran, Iraq, Syria).

As of 1 January 1997, 1,2 thousands of persons, including 482 children under 16, had been granted refugee status. The overwhelming majority (999 persons, 86% of the total) were Afghans who had close ties with the Najibullah regime and who had entered Ukraine before 1995. Since 1994, UNHCR has registered more than 6,0 thousands of refugees, half of whom however have left the country and moved to Western Europe. In addition, as of January 1997 2,6 thousands of persons had been granted the status of persons in refugee-like situations. Of these, 1,8 thousands of persons were from Chechnya (Russian Federation) and 775 persons from Abkhazia (Georgia).

The decline in migration evident in recent years continued in 1997. Ukraine's main migration partners, as in previous years, were the CIS and Baltic states. Net emigration, combined with a low birth rate, resulted in a population decline. Most of the migration losses were borne by the urban population (81,1 thousands of persons, compared to 1,1 thousands from rural areas). The Russian Federation was the main migration partner. Among other CIS countries, Moldova, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Belarus also had considerable migration exchange with Ukraine.

Migration changes with non-CIS and Baltic States has declined slightly. Emigration among Russians and Germans remained stable. For the first time in 1997, Ukrainians constituted the largest ethnic group emigrating to non-CIS and Baltic states (34,2%). Emigration was motivated by the desire to join other family members abroad and the continuing economic crisis in Ukraine characterized by a rise in unemployment and the non-payment of pensions and wages.

In 1997, 42,5 thousands of ethnic Ukrainians returned to Ukraine, a decrease of 15% from 1996. Ethnic Ukrainians thus constituted 40% (41,04 thousands of persons) of the total number of immigrants from other CIS and Baltic States. 75,6% of ethnic Ukrainians returned from the Russian Federation. Others arrived from Moldova, Kazakhstan, Belarus and Uzbekistan.

In 1998-2000 migration flows with CIS and Baltic States continued decreasing and stabilized. Emigration decreased more quickly than immigration, leading to a smaller negative migration balance. The Russian Federation remained Ukraine's principal migration partner, and Ukraine had a negative migration balance only with Russia and Belarus. Russians and Ukrainians constituted more than 80% of migrants, in roughly equal shares. The repatriation of Ukrainians slowed down: in 2000

it involved half as many Ukrainians as in 1997. Emigration of Ukrainians to CIS and Baltic States slowed down as well: in 2000 it almost equaled that of non-CIS and Baltic countries, whereas in 1997 it was almost three times higher. Migrants were primarily of working age and were highly educated.

Migration flows with countries outside the CIS and Baltic States decreased as well. Emigration continued being directed mainly at Israel, Germany and the USA. Emigrants were mostly Ukrainians, Jewish and Russians. In addition, according to the State Committee for Labour and Social Policy, in 1998, 24,4 thousands of Ukrainian citizens worked abroad with labour contracts, 28,2 thousands in 1999 and 33,8 thousands in 2000. Official statistics grossly underestimated the number of emigrants, however.

The Ukraine was routinely used as a transit country by irregular migrants on their way to Western Europe. In recent years, Ukraine has become increasingly concerned with irregular migration. The Government repeatedly expressed its willingness to improve migration management and took a number of steps in that direction; it was hampered however by a continual reshuffling of senior staff due to political instability, inadequate capacity for policy making, insufficient exposure to international practice and lack of funding. A Governmental Programme for Combating Illegal Migration in Ukraine in 1999-2000 was adopted in 1998, as was a Programme for the Prevention of Trafficking in Women and Children, in September 1999. In December 2000 Ukraine signed the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. Much progress has been made on the legislation front, although much remains to be done.

### **Millennium: a New Stage in the Development of Migration History in Ukraine**

During 2000s Ukraine experienced the diversification of interstate migrations flows. If the total number of registered movements of the population between Ukraine and other states including all migrants regardless the direction for their travels and countries of destination decreased by two times, migration exchange with the far abroad countries during the same period reduced by 2,2 and with CIS countries – by 1,9 times. Contribution of CIS countries into gross migration increased in 2002-2008 from 71,9% to 74,3%, and of the far abroad countries – decreased from 28,1% to 25,7%. Thus, the geography of interstate flows in Ukraine is gradually turning into the spatial structure for migration movements of the country existing at the beginning of the 1990s.

Changes in the size and structure of migration flows are followed by the improvement of migration situation in Ukraine. Already in 2005 Ukraine turned into the country admitting immigrants and its migration losses over 2004-2005 were compensated by former citizens from CIS countries. However, for the first time since 1990s the increase of the population due to migration

exchange with the far abroad countries was recorded in 2006. Over the next years this tendency intensified. Even though the size of migration flows from abroad is small, the very fact shows the turning-point in the development of migration situation in Ukraine and its transformation from the country of emigrants into the country of destination for immigrants both from CIS and far abroad countries.

### **Migration Potential of Ukraine**

According to the monitoring results of social changes in Ukrainian Society annually conducted by the Sociology Institute of Academy of Sciences of Ukraine since 1992, in 2000s almost every fifth Ukrainian was a potential migrant and was eager to leave its place of residence (19,3% in 2000, 21,1% in 2004, 20,1% in 2006 and 19,6% in 2000). At the same time in 2010 11,2% of those wanting to leave chose another locality in Ukraine and only 7,9% of Ukrainians intended to leave the territory of former USSR. In 2000 the number of those wishing to leave their place of residence was larger: 14,4% expressed their wish to resettle within Ukraine and 9,6% - outside the territory of former USSR. The number of potential migrants indecisive about their place of destination was the largest: in 2000 it equaled to 17,0%, and in 2010 – to 18,3%. The main reasons that could provoke the intention of Ukrainians to leave their places of residence included harmful ecology conditions and the desire to find a new job (in 2000 15,4% and 18,0% respectively and in 2010 16,7% and 19,9%). Other reasons are mentioned less often. As a rule since the beginning of 2000 Ukrainians preferred to look for new employment. Almost half of the residents see the environmental conditions in their place of residence as harmful or extremely harmful (59,2% in 2002, 46,4% in 2006, 41,1% in 2010).

Migration potential of Ukrainian youth deserves special attention. According to the survey conducted by Democratic Initiatives Foundation and Ukrainian Sociology Service company among young people in Ukraine in December 2009 and January 2010 only 13,8% of young people aged 18-34 intended to leave their country forever. Much more often Ukrainian youth was determined to stay temporary abroad: 29,9% of young Ukrainians intended to leave for other countries for a certain period of time. However, more than half of Ukrainian young people did not express the inclination to emigration (51,5%). It should be mentioned that similar survey concerning potential migration intention of the youth held in 2003 showed that the share choosing the home land was basically the same – 50,9%.

*How long do potential migrants intend to stay abroad?* Young Ukrainians planned an average trip to foreign countries for 3-4 years. As a rule, young people do not plan to stay for more than 5 years outside their native country. The shares of those intending to stay in foreign countries for

different period are about the same: for one year – 22,1%, 2 years – 23,8%, 3 years – 22,1% and finally 5 years – 21,3%. In 2003 the period for eventual stay abroad was much shorter for potential migrants. Ukrainians defined the longest period for staying abroad as lasting 2 years (9,3%).

Only 6,0% of young Ukrainians intended to stay abroad for 5 years. Thus, over the last 7 years the duration of staying abroad for Ukrainian youth has significantly increased in their migration intentions.

*Why do young people intend to go abroad?* Young Ukrainians mention labour migration as the main reason for travelling abroad (65,1%). 2,2 times less often Ukrainian youth intends to realize its touristic interests (30,1%) and only 5,5% of them plan to study outside their country. In comparison with 2003 the number of young Ukrainians wishing to work abroad has increased by 2,9 times (from 22,4% to 65,1%).

Potential migrants make the choice of the country for realizing different interests depending on their preferences, availability of information and development of migration networks. Thus, for young Ukrainians Russia (19,0%), Great Britain (12,2%), Germany (11,7%), the USA (11,2%), Italy (10,2%) are priority countries. In 2003 Germany (14,1%) and the USA (12,3%) were the most desirable countries for young Ukrainians. Only 5,8% of potential migrants mentioned Russia at that time. Therefore the geography of destination countries has considerably changed.

*What encourages young Ukrainian people to constantly search for better life outside their own country?* More often young people name three reasons influencing their migration choice: economic, financial and socio-cultural. Very seldom they point out to political or ethnical grounds.

Primarily financial reasons influence migration directions of Ukrainian Youth: they believe that they will be able to earn more abroad. 51,5% of young people adhere to such position. 48,5% of Ukrainian youth note the impact of economic reasons (lack of financing in the industry they are working in, lack of perspective for Ukrainian economy in general). Less often they mention social and cultural reasons (better living conditions, higher cultural level, etc.). 39,7% of young citizens mention such factors influencing their migration directions and plans. Another 23,5% of this age group mention the opportunities for professional/career growth and another 17,6% of young Ukrainians point to the family reasons (their relatives live abroad) in their migration choice. It should be mentioned that in 2003 young people in Ukraine were almost indifferent answering the questions about the factors influencing the formation of their migration plans: financial reasons were noted by only 8,3% of the surveyed; 6,4% mentioned economic reasons; 4,4% - social and cultural reasons; 2,3% - motivated their desire to leave the country by the lack of perspectives for carrier or professional growth.

According to the data of the migration analysis annually conducted by the State Statistics Committee of Ukraine, in 2007-2009 total number of registered movements in Ukraine including all

migrants regardless the direction of their travels, regions and types of settlement, correspondingly amounted to 14,997, 14,066 and 12,722 thousands of people. Division of migrants according to the flows shows that intra-regional movement of people dominates in Ukraine, making up 58,1%, 57,9% and 57,7% of general number. The resettling of the population between countryside and urban settlements within regions or territorial autonomy is still the main type of migration flows. (Intra-regional migration constitutes a considerable part of migration movement in Ukraine: the scale of population movements from one region to another within the country during 2007-2009 amounted to more than one third of gross migration (36,8%, 37,4% and 38,2% respectively). The smallest share of migration flows connects Ukraine with CIS countries and far abroad: interstate migratory exchange between these countries provided for only 5,1%, 4,3% and 4,1% of total migration in the country in 2007-2009. For comparison we should note that the share of external migration in 1999-2000 was 11,2% and 9,4%.

### **Conclusion**

Migration situation in Ukraine is stable now. The country is in the position of the new migration balance that it has been trying to achieve for 20 years. A certain stage of transformational changes in this sphere has been completed. The development of labour migration inside of Ukraine creates a counter balance for the external migration as it moves the population from the rural areas and small towns and thus it strengthens their demographic potential. At the same time the external labour migration of Ukrainian population is the strongest movement of migrants abroad. Therefore the issue of state policy development in the sphere of migration management and ensuring the protection of the rights of Ukrainian citizens going to work abroad as labour workers remains as before.

### **References**

1. CIS Migration Report: 1996 (1998). Geneva, IOM (in English).
2. Documents' Security and Migration Policy: Assessments and Recommendations of the International Working Groups for Ukraine (2011). Kyiv, Public Initiative "Europa Without Barriers" (in English).
3. Migration in the CIS: 1997-1998 (1999). Geneva, IOM (in English).
4. Migration Trends in Eastern Europe and Central Asia: 2001-2002 Survey (2002). Geneva, IOM (in English).

5. Migration Trends 2004-2006 Söderköping Process Countries (2007). European Commission (in English).
6. Migration Trends 2006-2008 Söderköping Process Countries (2009). European Commission (in English).
7. Postsoviet Transformations: Reflection in the Migrants (2009) / Edited by Zh. Zayonchkovskaya and G. Vitkovskaya. Moscow: Adamant (in Russian).
8. Pribytkova I. (1994). Migrations in Ukraine: Modern Situation and Perspectives of Development // Migration Processes After the Disintegration of USSR. Issue V. Moscow (in Russian).
9. Pribytkova I. (1996). Propiskas, Dwelling, Work as Regulators of the Freedom of Movement // Human Rights in Ukraine. – Issue 17. Kyiv (in Ukrainian).
10. Pribytkova I. (1998). Examination of the Citizenship Issue of the Return and Reintegration of the Formerly Deported Peoples in Crimea. – Kyiv, UNHCR (in English).
11. Pribytkova I. Migration Potential of Population in Ukraine (2004). // Public opinion, № 1, 2004. (in Ukrainian).
12. Statistical press-bulletin, №4 (1989). – Moscow, State Committee for Statistics of the USSR (in Russian).
13. Statistical press-bulletin, №9 (1989). – Moscow, State Committee for Statistics of the USSR (in Russian).