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THE MAIN IDEA

- **Though “distant metropolis is never perceived in perfect material terms” and actions are driven by its meaning (D. Ley) but still, objective differences in well being, mostly related to differences of incomes (employment and salaries) plays **important role** redistributing population in various locations, especially when these differences are high**

- **This redistribution should result in changing socio-demographic structure of Lithuania, as migrations are spatially selective**
METHODS AND DATA

- It’s an inductive research based on empirical spatial analysis of statistical data
- Socio-economic statistics at municipal level (LAU 1)
- Population censuses 2001 and 2011 (LAU 2 and census track level)
1. OBJECTIVE ECONOMIC REGIONAL WELLBEING – 3 MAIN ASPECTS

- 1. OBJECTIVE (HARDLY EXISTS) – SUBJECTIVE (HARDLY MEASURABLE)?

- 2. ECONOMIC WELLBEING (TOO NARROW) – SELF SATISFACTION OF LIFE (NO DATA AT LOW LEVEL)?

- 3. NATIONAL - REGIONAL – LOCAL? (WHAT AREA IS MOST SUITABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR HUMAN PROSPERITY?)
SUBJECTIVE VS OBJECTIVE WELLBEING

- **Subjective** one gains more and more attention (Diener, 2000, Jordan, 2008, Schvanen and Atkinson 2015, Ala-mantila et al, 2018, Morrison and Weckroth, 2018, etc....).

- In 2014 1/4 % of questioned youngsters in Lithuanian periphery declared that they like everything in their town but still they want to leave it... Basically at the same time carried out sociological request in LT didn’ t find any happy person in Taurage county...

- However specialised targeted (costly) surveys are needed for the revelation of situation at municipal level... So we must believe that objective wellbeing (or rather objective data) is an important factor (indicator) of subjective wellbeing, satisfaction with life or happiness...
"OBJECTIVE" WELLBEING

- **Set of indicators describing situation in various areas (regions, localites, places)**
- **Usually several groups of indices forming some synthetic one (i.e. 11 groups in case of OECD studies)**
- **Problem (apart from other) – only a few of them are available at level where everyday life take place (home-work-leisure, i.e. municipality)**
- **So: Wages and employment...**
CONTEXT: SHRINKAGE OF JOBS IN THE MAIN ECONOMIC SECTORS 1990 – 2017:
1/3 OF ALL EXISTED JOBS WERE LOST IN INDUSTRY AND AGRICULTURE IN 1990 - 2010
DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS HAVE DIFFERENT SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS AND THIS HAS VERY STRONG CONSEQUENCES FOR LABOUR MARKET AND CONSEQUENTLY EMIGRATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 1 – REGIONAL (LOCAL) CHANGES OF OBJECTIVE ECONOMIC WELLBEING IN POST COMMUNIST ERA – CHANGES OF EMPLOYMENT

2010 - 2017

1995 - 2010

Change of number of employees, 1992 - 2010 (%)
-89.7 - -40.0
-39.9 - -20.0
-19.9 - 0.0
0.1 - 20.0
20.1 - 40.0
40.1 - 88.9

Border of Lithuania
Municipal boundaries

Change of number of employees, 2010 - 2017 (%)
-23.5
-23.4 - -20.0
-19.9 - 0.0
0.1 - 20.0
20.1 - 40.0
40.1 - 61.5

Klaipėda
Kaunas
VILNIUS

Map showing changes in employment from 1995 to 2010 and from 2010 to 2017.
WAGE GROWTH DIFFERENCES -

1995 - 2008

Wage growth difference, deviation from an average, 1995 - 2008 (%)

2009 - 2017

Wage growth difference, deviation from an average, 2008 - 2017 (%)

Klaipėda

Kaunas

VILNIUS

Border of Lithuania

Municipal boundaries
2. EMIGRATION (VOTING WITH FEET?)

1994-2009

Net migration, % from total population, 1994 - 2009
-25.2 - -10.0
-9.9 - -5.0
-4.9 - 0.0
0.1 - 5.0
5.1 - 10.0
10.1 - 18.9

1994 - 2009

Net migration, % from total population, 2010 - 2017
-20.6 - -10.0
-9.9 - -5.0
-4.9 - 0.0
0.1 - 5.0
5.1 - 10.0
10.1 - 29.4

Border of Lithuania
Municipal boundaries
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHANGE OF EMPLOYMENT AND MIGRATIONS 1995 – 2015 (PAERSONS COEF. – 0,58)
CHANGE OF THE NUMBER OF POPULATION (MEASURE OF WELLBEING?)

Change of population, 1994 - 2017 (%)
-38.6 - -30.0
-29.9 - -20.0
-19.9 - -10.0
-9.9 - 0.0
0.1 - 10.0
10.1 - 24.8

Border of Lithuania
Municipal boundaries

Klaipėda
Kaunas
VILNIUS
WHERE TO?

To find a job (or a new job) in a place one used to live was not an option for the majority of residents of peripheral places until recent at least. It should have been a new place - so the only question – WHERE???

1. Far enough - to emigrate outside LT?
2. Far but not enough – to commute on monthly - weekly - daily basis?
3. Nowhere – so remaining in place but out of place...
MIGRATIONAL REGIONS OF VILNIUS, KAUNAS AND KLAIPĖDA METROPOLITAN CENTRES (DOMINANT DESTINATIONS OF INNER MIGRANTS) 2001 AND 2016
STRUCTURE OF INTERNAL MIGRATIONS

- Regression analysis of population census data revealed that migrations are highly selective
- Young, employed with good jobs go to 3 metro regions
- Older and jobless go to periphery

To sum up:

Not the number of population but the reducing quality of population is the main problem of peripheral areas.

Not the attractive metropolitan cities but the "unattractive" peripheries should be regarded as the main factor of shrinkage of population in periphery.
4. Consequences

The main factors of change in 1990-2011 related to inner migration flows

1. Profound changes (polarization) of social structure of metropolitan areas – result of concentration of economy and population in the country:
   - increase of high status groups up to 25-50 % in last 10 years;
   - increase of unskilled by approx. 5 %.

2. The sprawl of metropolitan areas involving rural areas with distinctive social and often ethnic and age structure;

3. Increasing social segregation at country level as MA peripheries concentrate lower class residents
4. Spatial Consequences of migrations

SOCIAL SEGREGATION (SOCIAL DOWNGRADE OF PERIURBAN AREAS)

Change of share of residents with higher occupation status, 2001 – 2011, p.p

Distribution of low status occupational groups in 2011, %
- 5 - 10
- 11 - 20
- 21 - 40
- 41 - 60
- 61 - 81

Boundaries of municipalities
RESIDENTIAL DIFFERENTIATION OF PROFESSIONAL GROUPS: “ID” BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS (MAN AND PROF. VS UNSKILLED)
RESULT OF INNER MIGRATION: DIFFERENTIATING URBAN LANDSCAPES
(CONCENTRATION OF RESIDENTS WITH THE HIGHER OCCUPATIONAL STATUS IN LAU 2 REGIONS IN 2001-2011; P.P.)

Due to migrations urban space is being differentiated – the social „upgrading“ of Lithuanian metropolitan areas doesn’t result in upgrading of certain urban spaces
The result metropolisation of the country
Growing socio-ethnic segregation inside metropolitan regions
Capital city (2011)

Unskilled workers in Vilnius city

Ethnic minorities in Vilnius city
Another result – growing political differentiation both in the country and inside the metropolitan areas

The support for centre-right wing political parties in Vilnius MA in 2000 and 2012

Data: Central Electoral Commission of the Republic of Lithuania
CONCLUSIONS

• **The spatial character of unevenness of economic wellbeing have been formed in early 90-ies of last century and persist till this day.**

• **The most significant and visible negative trend of development of peripheral places is related to the extremely fast rates of depopulation, as these areas have lost more than 1/3 of their populaiton just in two decades. This los is mostly related to decreasing jobs in industry and agriculture.**
TO SUM UP

• THERE ARE NO RELIABLE EVIDENCE THAT FAST „SHOCK THERAPY“ OF 90-IES IS MAKING VISIBLE IMPACT ON EMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT AND ESPECIALLY INCOMES IN PERIPHERAL AREAS IN POST CRISIS PERIOD. EMIGRATION COULD BE A REASON FOR THIS ABSENCE (SO NEO-LIBERAL ATTITUDES ARE RIGHT?).

• THOUGH THE MAIN „WINNERS“ OF LATEST DEVELOPMENTS SEEM TO BE SUBURBAN AND PERIURBAN AREAS OF METROPOLITAN CITIES, NAMELY THESE AREAS ARE THE MOST SOCIALLY SEGREGATED ESPECIALLY IN A MOST „PROSPEROUS“ CAPITAL CITY REGION.

• DISTANT PERIPHERAL AREAS MAY NOT SEEM TO BE THE MOST ATTRACTIVE PLACES FOR MIGRANTS, THEY DO NOT SUFFER FROM THE MORE INTENSE JOB LOS OR MORE SLOW INCREASE OF WAGES, BUT CHANGES OF THEIR SOCIAL STRUCTURE HAVE CLEARLY NEGATIVE TREND. EMIGRATION PROBABLY IS HELPING TO SOLVE SOME LABOUR MARKET PROBLEMS IN PERIPHERY BUT DEMAGES ITS FUTURE.
Empty “central kolchoz settlements”
Thank you for your attention!