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Motivation

Russian mean share of young population is 19.2%
Motivation

Every regional **center** is younger than the regional inner periphery

**Hypothesis:**
this is the result of long-lasting patterns of migration (mainly internal)

Russian mean share of young population is 19.2 %
Quick glance at Russia maps based on Census 2010 data in order to form hypothesis
Census data VS current record data
Cohort research on intraregional youth migration
  5 regions: Altai, Bashkortostan, Kostroma, Kursk, Rostov
  2 Censuses: 2002 and 2010
Do the “students” return to periphery?
Why do we use Census data?

• Only Census data gives us the opportunity to “look inside” the regions to see “catch” intraregional movement patterns

• Census data seems much more convenient than the current migration record in dealing with “student ages” migration (see the next slide)

• Current migration record appeared to systematically fail to take into consideration the biggest part of student migration due to registration limitations

• The situation changed only in 2011 which leaves the intercensus period internal migration to be verified
## Statistics discrepancy

### Cohort of 1988-1992 years of birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Altai Krai</th>
<th>Kostromskaya oblast</th>
<th>Kurskaya oblast</th>
<th>Rostovskaya oblast</th>
<th>Bashkortostan Republic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population in 2002</td>
<td>183,5</td>
<td>51,4</td>
<td>84,4</td>
<td>297,5</td>
<td>346,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in 2010</td>
<td>172,5</td>
<td>44,4</td>
<td>74,4</td>
<td>335,3</td>
<td>324,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change by the Censuses</td>
<td>-11,0</td>
<td>-7,0</td>
<td>-10,0</td>
<td>37,8</td>
<td>-22,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead in 2003-2010</td>
<td>-1,6</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td>-0,6</td>
<td>-2,0</td>
<td>-3,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered migration in 2003-2010</td>
<td>-5,9</td>
<td>-1,4</td>
<td>-0,6</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>-1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td>-3,5</td>
<td>-5,1</td>
<td>-8,8</td>
<td>38,3</td>
<td>-18,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unexplained change, %

|                | 31,7 | 73,2 | 88,3 | 101,4 | 81,7 |

### Unaccounted cohort change, %

|                | -1,9 | -9,9 | -10,5 | 12,9  | -5,2 |
Current record fails only “student ages”

CENS = IntMG + RegMG - Mort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>IntMG</th>
<th>RegMG</th>
<th>CENS abs</th>
<th>Mort</th>
<th>Discr abs</th>
<th>Discr %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KURSK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohort88-92</td>
<td>-9998</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>-1406</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>-8828</td>
<td>88,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohort80-84</td>
<td>-4199</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>-4576</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>6,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KOSTROMA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohort88-92</td>
<td>-6966</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-1658</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>-5101</td>
<td>73,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohort80-84</td>
<td>-2782</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>-2140</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kostroma region – cohort 1988-92

Kostromskaya oblast’ change in population between Census 2002 and 2010 cohort of 1988-1992 years of birth

Change in cohort size, %
- Decrease: more than 60
- Decrease: from 60 to 40
- Decrease: from 40 to 20
- Decrease: from 20 to 0
- Increase: from 0 to 20
- Increase: more than 20
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Bashkortostan, Rostov region
Do the “students” come back?

- If the youths only move for education there should be a mass return migration.
- As we do not have long time series to trace the real cohorts we are forced to make some synthetic cohort assumptions.
- Let’s see the intercensus population change in cohorts who were 18-22 in 2002 (1980-84 years of birth).
- Then we assume that the intensity of migration (and also mortality) for the 88-92 cohort in the nearest future would be the same as it was for 80-84 cohort in 2002-2010 intercensus period.
Kursk - Change in 1980-84 cohort

Kurskaya oblast' change in population between Census 2002 and 2010 cohort of 1980-1984 years of birth

Change in cohort size, %
- Decrease: more than 60
- Decrease: from 60 to 40
- Decrease: from 40 to 20
- Decrease: from 20 to 0
- Increase: from 0 to 20
- Increase: more than 20
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Kursk - Change in 1988-92 cohort

Kurskaya oblast' change in population between Census 2002 and 2010 cohort of 1988-1992 years of birth

Change in cohort size, %
- Decrease: more than 60
- Decrease: from 60 to 40
- Decrease: from 40 to 20
- Decrease: from 20 to 0
- Increase: from 0 to 20
- Increase: more than 20
Projection for Kursk region

Kurskaya oblast'
cohort of 1988-1992 years of birth
projection to 2018

Change in cohort size, %
- Decrease: more than 60
- Decrease: from 60 to 40
- Decrease: from 40 to 20
- Decrease: from 20 to 0
- Increase: from 0 to 20
- Increase: more than 20
Kostroma - Change in 1980-84 cohort

Kostromskaya oblast'
change in population between Census 2002 and 2010
cohort of 1980-1984 years of birth

Change in cohort size, %
- Decrease: more than 60
- Decrease: from 60 to 40
- Decrease: from 40 to 20
- Decrease: from 20 to 0
- Increase: from 0 to 20
- Increase: more than 20
Kostroma - Change in 1988-92 cohort

Kostromskaya oblast' change in population between Census 2002 and 2010 cohort of 1988-1992 years of birth

![Map showing change in cohort size in Kostroma](image-url)
Projection for Kostroma region

Kostromskaya oblast' cohort of 1988-1992 years of birth projection to 2018

Change in cohort size, %
- Dark brown: Decrease: more than 60
- Brown: Decrease: from 60 to 40
- Orange: Decrease: from 40 to 20
- Light brown: Decrease: from 20 to 0
- Yellow: Increase: from 0 to 20
- Green: Increase: more than 20
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Conclusions

• Census data is more reliable source of data for researching youth migration in Russia in 2002-2010 period than current record
• Census data allow us to study intraregional migration
• There is a lasting pattern of “student” centripetal internal migration
• Up to 70% or school graduates leave the most depressive peripheral districts
• The return rate of “students” from inner periphery is not significant or not present at all. Though some small towns do manage to attract young workers
• Regional centers face surplus of high school graduates
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