

## THE IMPACT OF THE UKRAINIAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION 2004 ON ETHNIC RELATIONS IN UKRAINE (EMPIRICAL DATA STATISTICAL ANALYSIS)<sup>1</sup>

*The paper is devoted to the results of monitoring of ethnic prejudices of the population of Ukraine, the surveys which is conducting by the Kyiv International Institute of Sociology (KIIS) every year since 1994. The data of 13 surveys, representative for the population of Ukraine, are analyzed. Each survey includes from 1500 up to 2000 respondents (altogether about 22 000 respondents).*

*Our data shows that president elections campaign 2004 in Ukraine results in worsening of ethic relations at all, especially between Russians and Ukrainians.*

### **Data and methods**

#### ***Omnibuses conducted by Kyiv International Institute of Sociology***

In order to determine the attitude of the population of Ukraine toward these or those ethnic groups, we use the data from 12 sociological surveys "KIIS-Omnibus" that were conducted by KIIS in 1994-2004 (in 2001 two surveys took place). The data are representative for the population of Ukraine 18 years of age and older. The sample is stratified by oblasts and types of settlements. At the first stage, the random selection of settlements (using PPS - probability proportional to size) is implemented. At the second stage

postal districts are randomly selected, and at the third stage there is a random selection of addresses within the postal districts and respondents within each household (Our sample is described in details in M. Swafford, M. Kosolapov, L. Kish and S. Heeringa, 1995, Chapter 6). In different years the surveys were conducted in 120-165 cities, towns, and villages (on the territory of 250-375 postal districts) in all 24 oblasts of Ukraine and the Crimea.

Sampling error for the whole data varies from 3% to 4% in different years taking into account the design effect. (We estimate design effect of our sample as 1.5.)

The total number of respondents in the age of 18 and over 18<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The paper was reported on ASN (Association for the Study of Nations) 86th Annual World Convention, Columbia University, 14-16 April 2005.

<sup>2</sup> In some years respondents in the age of 16 and over were polled, but only respondents of 18 years and older were taken for the analysis.

| Year | Month    | Polled      | Year | Month    | Polled |
|------|----------|-------------|------|----------|--------|
| 1994 | December | 2180        | 2000 | March    | 1946   |
| 1995 | October  | 1530        | 2001 | January  | 1997   |
| 1996 | November | <b>1431</b> | 2001 | December | 2012   |
| 1997 | June     | 1890        | 2002 | November | 2023   |
| 1998 | November | 1573        | 2003 | October  | 2020   |
| 1999 | February | 1552        | 2004 | December | 2044   |

Total polling was 22 198 respondents.

Standard errors for our main variable - Xenophobia index - was:

| Year | Month    | Xenophobia index<br>standard error | Year | Month    | Xenophobia index<br>standard error |
|------|----------|------------------------------------|------|----------|------------------------------------|
| 1994 | December | 0.03                               | 2000 | March    | 0.03                               |
| 1995 | October  | 0.04                               | 2001 | January  | 0.03                               |
| 1996 | November | 0.04                               | 2001 | December | 0.03                               |
| 1997 | June     | 0.03                               | 2002 | November | 0.03                               |
| 1998 | November | 0.04                               | 2003 | November | 0.03                               |
| 1999 | February | 0.04                               | 2004 | November | 0.03                               |

### *The Bogardus Scale*

We used the Bogardus scale of social distance to determine attitudes toward the representatives of various ethnic groups in the version used by N. Panina (N. Panina & Y. Golovakha, 1999, p. 80):

**In the table given below in each row please circle the number of the variant of the statement you agree with.**

**I WOULD AGREE TO TOLERATE THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NATIONALITY GROUP NAMED IN ROW (see table) AS (see card)**

#### **CARD**

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| members of your family       | 1 |
| close friends                | 2 |
| neighbors                    | 3 |
| work colleagues              | 4 |
| inhabitants of Ukraine       | 5 |
| visitors of Ukraine          | 6 |
| would not allow into Ukraine | 7 |

|     |                         |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----|-------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.  | Americans               |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2.  | Byelorussians           |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3.  | Jews                    |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4.  | Canadians               |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5.  | Negroes                 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6.  | Germans                 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7.  | Poles                   |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8.  | Russians                |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9.  | Romanians               |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. | Russophone Ukrainians   |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. | Ukrainophone Ukrainians |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. | French                  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. | Gypsies                 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

The list of the ethnic groups appeared in the order that is presented in the table (in Ukrainian this order corresponds to alphabetical one). Although in the surveys face-to-face interview method was used, the part of the questionnaire with Bogardus scale was given as self-administered.

It is worth noting that the list offered to the respondents included not only representatives of ethnic groups, but ethno-linguistic (Russophone Ukrainians) and racial groups as well. The scale is developed in such a manner that if a respondent agrees to tolerate representatives of some nationality as members of his or her family, he or she would also agree to tolerate them as friends, neighbors, colleagues etc., and if, for example, he or she agrees to tolerate them as work colleagues, then he or she would naturally also agree to tolerate them as inhabitants or visitors of Ukraine. That is, if the respondent circles some number in a row, then he or she also circles all greater numbers as well. We can consider the first (lowest) number in the row as the answer to the question, that is, the minimum social distance at which the respondent agrees to tolerate representatives of the given ethnic group to him or her. Then the *index of social distance between population (respondents) and given ethnic group* is the arithmetic mean of the minimum social distances at which the respondents agree to tolerate representatives of the given national group. It varies from 1 to 7. The index would equal 1 if all respondents consent to representatives of the given national group being members of their families, and the index would equal 7 if all respondents would not permit representatives of the given national group into Ukraine.

### The Index of Xenophobia, Slavonic and non-Slavonic intolerance

The preliminary analysis of the data proved that notwithstanding some dynamics within 11 years, the structure of social distances remains quite stable, therefore, we base our analysis on joint data set of 1994-2004 ( $N = 22\ 198$ ). In order to build the index of xenophobia we conducted factor analysis of respondents' responses to Bogardus scale (see V. Paniotto, 2003, p. 72-94). Based on factor analysis two factors were identified. The first factor - attitude to the Ukrainians, Russians, and Byelorussians, the second one - attitude to other ethnic groups. We can state that xenophobia has two dimensions: intolerance towards Slavonic and non-Slavonic ethnic groups. With this in view the attitude to Slavonic and non-Slavonic nationalities as a single-dimension solution can be perceived as general xenophobia index.

It was found that factor meanings of the above mentioned factors are very close to the arithmetical mean of the social distance index for Slavonic and non-Slavonic ethnic groups accordingly (correlation coefficient for the grouped data is 0.99). For this reason to simplify the procedure we can refer not to the factor values, but to the arithmetical mean. Thus, we suggest that 3 indices be calculated: the general xenophobia index or simply xenophobia index, index of intolerance to non-Slavonic nationalities and index of intolerance to Slavonic nationalities.

The arithmetical mean of social distance indices for all 13 surveyed ethnic groups  $\bar{D}_j$ , is assumed by us as the *xenophobia index*  $X_j$  of the respondent<sup>^</sup>.

In this way the arithmetical mean of every respondents' replies was calculated for each of the 13 groups -  $X_j$ :

$$X_j = 1/13 \sum D_{ij},$$

where  $D_{ij}$  - is social distance from respondent  $j$  to ethnic group  $i$ ; index  $X_j$  varies from 1 to 7.

In the same way, two other indices were calculated for every respondent - **index of non-Slavonic intolerance (NSI)** and **index of Slavonic intolerance (SI)**.

$$SX_j = 1/4 \sum D_{ij}, \quad NSX_j = 1/9 \sum D_{ij},$$

where  $D_{ij}$  - is social distance from respondent  $j$  to ethnic group  $i$ ; Russophone and Ukrainophone Ukrainians, Russians and Byelorussians being considered for the index of Slavonic intolerance, the rest of the groups - for the index of non-Slavonic intolerance.

The arithmetical mean for all the respondents is viewed by us as xenophobia index, Slavonic and non-Slavonic intolerance for Ukraine as a whole (see table 1).

For instance index 1.7 at the intersection of the line "Ukrainophone Ukrainians" and column

"1994" characterizes the attitude of the Ukrainian population to the Ukrainians speaking Ukrainian language. This meaning of index denotes that the majority of Ukrainian population in 1994 would agree to accept Ukrainophone Ukrainians as their family members or friends. The index 5.02 for the Americans in 2004 signifies that the majority of population at that point was in favor of Americans residing in Ukraine, but would not tolerate them as colleagues, neighbors, friends or family members.

### Validity Problems

What do indices of social distance and xenophobia say?

Social distance index is assumed to reflect attitude (prejudice level) of an individual or a group of individuals towards a particular ethnic group. For example, the social distance index in relation to Jews, calculated for the population of Ukraine, is supposed to measure the level of anti-Semitism of the population of Ukraine. The level of anti-Semitism, however, is a complex multidimensional phenomenon (see, for example, Gudkov, Levinson, p. 111) that cannot be described by a single indicator. From this point of view, the social distance index cannot be assumed as a valid indicator of anti-Semitism or ethnic prejudices, but is merely a component of the indicator (Gudkov, Levinson). On the other hand, it is obvious that social distance index *correlates* with the level of prejudice. Therefore, we think that it is not appropriate to use social distance index as a direct adequate indicator of prejudice. The index, however, can be used adequately *for comparison* of different groups and for the study of changes in cross-time data.

If we consider validity of xenophobia or intolerance index, which is weighed total of social distance indices toward different ethnic groups, the problem is further complicated by the issue of adequacy (representativeness) of the list of the ethnic groups. Is it possible, for example, that replacement of a particular ethnic group in the list can result in substantial changes in xenophobia index and interpretation of data obtained: e.g. a particular list of ethnic groups can show growth of xenophobia in Ukraine, while another one can demonstrate its decrease? In order to explore this possibility we conducted a series of calculation experiments. We compiled different lists, excluding three different ethnic groups from each of them and re-calculating the xenophobia indices (V. Paniotto, 2003, p. 74-92). Such repeated calculations demonstrated that correlation coefficient between xenophobia indexes of respondents for initial and modified lists varied from 0.97 to 0.99. So that index is rather stable and doesn't depend dramatically on the small changes in the lists of ethnic groups.

**Table 1. Dynamics of indices of social distance and xenophobia from 1994 to 2004 for the total of Ukrainian population**

| Ethnic group             | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1                        | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 11   | 12   | 13   |
| Ukrainophone Ukrainians  | 1.7  | 1.72 | 2.03 | 2.27 | 1.84 | 1.77 | 2.07 | 2.01 | 2.06 | 1.95 | 2.20 |
| Russophone Ukrainians    | 1.78 | 1.84 | 2.06 | 2.34 | 1.98 | 1.99 | 2.32 | 2.16 | 2.24 | 2.12 | 2.21 |
| Russians                 | 1.95 | 2.06 | 2.45 | 2.55 | 2.29 | 2.24 | 2.5  | 2.14 | 2.4  | 2.44 | 2.48 |
| Byelorussians            | 2.32 | 2.49 | 3.05 | 3.18 | 3.07 | 2.96 | 3.15 | 2.94 | 3.17 | 3.23 | 3.4  |
| Jews                     | 3.63 | 3.74 | 3.89 | 3.97 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.1  | 3.95 | 4.13 | 4.34 | 4.29 |
| Americans                | 3.68 | 3.76 | 4.04 | 4.03 | 4.24 | 4.17 | 4.35 | 4.09 | 4.64 | 4.79 | 5.02 |
| Canadians                | 3.69 | 3.73 | 4.13 | 4.06 | 4.31 | 4.25 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.37 | 4.58 | 4.92 |
| Poles                    | 3.85 | 3.84 | 4.16 | 4.23 | 4.45 | 4.45 | 4.45 | 4.05 | 4.66 | 4.37 | 4.50 |
| French                   | 3.9  | 4.01 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.56 | 4.37 | 4.62 | 4.42 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 5.03 |
| Germans                  | 4.03 | 3.92 | 4.39 | 4.3  | 4.67 | 4.46 | 4.68 | 4.39 | 4.56 | 4.61 | 4.93 |
| Romanians                | 4.27 | 4.4  | 4.38 | 4.51 | 4.72 | 4.51 | 5.02 | 4.77 | 4.94 | 4.91 | 4.98 |
| Negroes                  | 4.92 | 5.04 | 4.96 | 4.94 | 5.22 | 5.17 | 5.45 | 5.22 | 5.43 | 5.54 | 5.47 |
| Gypsies                  | 5.15 | 5.14 | 5.15 | 5.35 | 5.45 | 5.48 | 5.61 | 5.43 | 5.72 | 5.89 | 5.70 |
| Xenophobia index         | 3.45 | 3.51 | 3.77 | 3.85 | 3.91 | 3.82 | 4.06 | 3.83 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.24 |
| Slavonic intolerance     | 1.94 | 2.03 | 2.40 | 2.59 | 2.30 | 2.24 | 2.51 | 2.31 | 2.47 | 2.44 | 2.57 |
| non-Slavonic intolerance | 4.12 | 4.18 | 4.38 | 4.41 | 4.63 | 4.53 | 4.75 | 4.51 | 4.80 | 4.85 | 4.98 |

### Ethno-linguistic groups

In our list of ethnic groups we consider Ukrainians that prefer to speak Ukrainian and Ukrainians that prefer to speak Russian as two separate groups. Research of Kyiv International Institute of Sociology implemented during recent ten years proves that these two groups differ substantially in a series of parameters, in particular, their electoral behavior and many other orientations (D. Arel and V. Khmelko, 1996).

It was found that the "convenient language" for the people of Ukraine (namely, the language people choose during home interviews, when they are asked which language they are more comfortable with: Ukrainian or Russian), is a very important factor for many orientations of Ukrainian people. Thereby in the majority of cases for data analysis it is reasonable to apply not merely ethnic groups, but "ethno-linguistic groups", in particular, Ukrainophone Ukrainians (about 44 % of respondents), Russophone Ukrainians (about 30 %), Russophone Russians (about 20 %), Ukrainophone Russians (about 0.5 %, who most likely grew up in the families where one of the parents is Ukrainophone Ukrainian), and about 0.5 % of others (Russo- and Ukrainophone Jews, Poles etc.).

The table 2 represents the ethno-linguistic composition of Yuschenko's and Yanukovich's electorate according to the data of pre-election polling performed by KIIS (see Khmelko V., rate dynamics., 2004).

**Table 2. Ethno-linguistic composition of Yuschenko's and Yanukovich's electorate (distribution in percent)**

| Social-demographic categories        | Electorate |            |
|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|
|                                      | Yuschenko  | Yanukovich |
|                                      | N=911      | N=701      |
| Этническая самоидентификация         |            |            |
| Ukrainians                           | 92.2       | 60.2       |
| Russians                             | 5.3        | 33.0       |
| Others                               | 2.5        | 6.8        |
| TOTAL                                | 100.0      | 100.0      |
| Preferred language of communication: |            |            |
| Ukrainian                            | 76.4       | 8.8        |
| Russian                              | 23.6       | 91.2       |
| TOTAL                                | 100.0      | 100.0      |
| Ukrainians speaking Ukrainian        | 73.4       | 7.9        |
| Ukrainians speaking Russian          | 19.1       | 51.8       |
| Russians speaking Russian            | 3.2        | 32.8       |
| Others                               | 4.4        | 7.4        |
| TOTAL                                | 100.0      | 100.0      |

## Results

### *Ukraine presidential elections in 2004*

The 31 of October and the 21 of November the 1st and the 2nd rounds of the election of the president of Ukraine took place. The results of the second round were protested by opposition because of the mass falsifications, the mass demonstrations of population in support to the claims of opposition, blockade and picketing of government institutions

<sup>1</sup> According to our data, more than 90 % of the people in the West speak Ukrainian as their language of convenience, while more than 80 % of Eastern Ukrainians use Russian.

(so called "orange revolution") with the demand to cancel the results of elections took place. The Supreme Court declared the second round of the elections invalid and appointed the third round (a revote of the second round) of the elections, which took place on November 26, 2004. The election campaign lasted the whole year 2004.

Both population and politics perceived these elections as extremely important, the election campaign was held in a very aggressive, tough way, with the large amount of violations. For Leonid Kuchma who occupied the post of the president of Ukraine 10 years long and for the oligarchs that supported him it was vitally important to pass the presidential power to a president who would be able to guarantee their personal security and safety of their businesses and funds. Also, the severity of the competition is proved by the fact that during election campaign there was an attempt to poison the opposition candidate V. Yushchenko, now President of Ukraine.

Because almost all rating television companies of Ukraine were monopolized by the authority representatives, during the election campaign they covered events in favor of unique authority representative - prime-minister V. Yanukovich. For example in November 2004 according to the data of monitoring of Institute of Sociology of NAS of Ukraine and Academy of Ukrainian Press 2/3 of all advertisement was dedicated to V. Yanukovich ([www.aup.com.ua](http://www.aup.com.ua)). What was the content of that advertisement?

One of the main election strategies was blackening of the opposition candidate reputation. The main ideas - nationalism of Yushchenko, anti-Russian ideas of his command, persecutions of Russian speaking population, and that Yushchenko is a USA marionette. Yushchenko's coming to power would mean the division of Ukraine into three grades - West of the Ukraine - first grade, Center - the second grade, and the East - the third grade (see the picture 1 in appendix 2, which was shown many times a day). The aim was to create mistrust of the population of the East Ukraine and partially of the Central Ukraine to the candidate of opposition, but in the same time it influenced on the relation of eastern Russian speaking regions to western Ukrainian speaking regions. Television demonstrated fascist ideas of Yushchenko and his surroundings: the fascists meetings were shown as if in support of opposition candidate (see picture 2).

Another idea of antipropaganda - to show that Yushchenko is USA protegee and his come to power would pose Ukraine into dependence from USA on one hand, and would lead to the deterioration of rela-

tions with Russia - on other hand. One of the PR-technologies of Victor Yanukovich's campaign is the usage as antipropaganda the advertisement time of so called "technical candidates". From 26 registered candidates more than a half was not at least known politicians, and were registered only to use the promotion time provided by law as anti advertisement of Yushchenko. Among the brightest examples - pre-election TV-clip of candidate Roman Kosak, which pro-governmental channels broadcasted in general before or after Yushchenko's advertisement. The clip contained the appeals to radicalize relations with Russia and expressed support to Yushchenko in case if his wife-American would become a citizen of Ukraine. In such way, there was created the impression that Kosak is a supporter of Yushchenko, and that Yushchenko is against friendly relations with Russia and that Yushchenko is USA protegee.

Part of the propaganda campaign was directed against Julia Tymoshenko who supported Yushchenko, particularly often was quoted the phrase supposedly belonging to Tymoshenko that "Donetsk region should be fenced in barbed wire". Moreover, after the second tour of elections the part of Yanukovich's supporters hold several congresses on which the questions of separation or autonomization were discussed.

Besides the direct antipropaganda in mass media, the question of inter-ethnic relations was influenced also by the discussions of opposite parties about the most important problems, separating eastern, predominantly Russian speaking, and western, predominantly Ukrainian speaking regions of Ukraine. There belong the initiatives of Yanukovich - double citizenship, confer Russian language the status of the second state language, rejection of joining NATO.

One more factor which led to the polarization of population during the election campaign - insufficient attention of national-patriotic forces, making the core of Yushchenko's supporters, to the interaction with Russian speaking population. This is the traditional orientation of the main parties supporting Yushchenko, which appeared already during Rukh formation - national-patriotic movement, development of which led to the formation of main parties supporting Yushchenko. The constituting congress of Rukh was hold in 1989. The poll of Rukh activists arrived on that charting congress, conducted by a Sociological group of Rukh (I was the head of this group), showed that the activists of Rukh - delegates of the congress - considered their most important tasks the solution of political and lingvo-cultural problems, and only then economic and ecologic. Conducted in a same period poll of population

<sup>1</sup> The congress took place September 8-10, 1998, 720 from 1109 delegates of Charting Congress of Rukh were polled.

<sup>2</sup> Central Ukrainian department of VCIOM polled 2600 respondents, the data is representative for the population of USSR (which in that time was a part of the Soviet Union).

showed that in the answer what should be the Rukh's first task - the population put at the first place economic problems (44%), ecologic (26%), political (13%) and lingvo-cultural (12%).

**Table 3. Reaction of population of different regions of Ukraine on the initiatives of Yanukovych (the percent of respondents answered "agree" and "fully agree" on the questions in table)**

| What is Yours attitude to the initiative of V. Yanukovych to...     | Regions  |         |           |          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------|-----------|----------|
|                                                                     | West-ern | Central | South-ern | East-ern |
| ...reject of joining NATO?                                          | 28.5     | 29.8    | 51.3      | 59.1     |
| ...confer Russian language the status of the second state language? | 29       | 44.8    | 75.9      | 84.4     |
| ... allow citizens of Ukraine to have double citizenship?           | 35.8     | 45.4    | 69.3      | 71.5     |

Anyway, finally the population of Ukraine at the president election in 2004 was polarized regionally - western and central regions voted for Yushenko, southern and eastern - for Yanukovych (see picture 1).

### Dynamics of the xenophobia level

At the graph 1 the dynamics of the social distances and of xenophobia level from year 1994 to 2004. The upper line is non-Slavonic intolerance (NSI index), middle line - xenophobic index (XI), lower line - Slavonic intolerance (SI). As we have mentioned before, with the probability 0.95 the confident interval of indexes is from 0.06 to 0.08 for different years. That is why in case of scale division at 0.5 index according to the axe Y the changes from 1/6 to 1/8 would be considerable.

Both indexes,  $SX$  and  $NSX$ , increased till the year 1998 (as well as the  $X$  index, because it is in fact the derivative from  $SX$  and  $NSX$ , closer to  $NSX$ ). However we can observe a stabilization and even small decrease of the intolerance and xenophobia level in 1999.

Besides, according to the results of our research, the year 1999 is a crucial moment from the point of view of subjective indexes of satisfaction by one's financial state. Before that we observed the increase of the level of dissatisfaction, but in the year 1999 it started to diminish (see V. Paniotto, 2003, p. 78). Thus, economic situation in Ukraine can be one of the factors, which influence on the xenophobia level. In addition to economic

hardships, the second factor influencing on the attitude of the population to another ethnic groups could be wars and conflicts in the different parts of the world, which are largely covered in mass media and became media-events (war in Chechnya, Afghanistan, Balkans and Iraq). Our researches show the increase of the quantity of Ukraine independence supporters after the beginning of the war in Chechnya or after taking hostages in Moscow (Paniotto V., Khmelko V., 2002). These conflicts increase level of fear and distrust toward representatives of other ethnic groups. Therefore the conflicts increase the level of non-Slavonic intolerance and general level of xenophobia and in less degree affect the level of Slavonic intolerance.


The graphic shows that Slavonic intolerance reached its maximum in 1997 and stayed at that level. In the same time, non-Slavonic intolerance continued to grow. Then, in the end of the year 2002, the level of xenophobia stabilized and in 2004 it was possible to expect the level of xenophobia same or less than in 2003. But the level of xenophobia in 2004 increased, also increased non-Slavonic and Slavonic intolerance. Since the economic situation in country improved this factor did not affect the increase of level of xenophobia. International events (for example, war in Iraq) could affect only non-Slavonic intolerance, therefore I suppose that increase of level of xenophobia is connected with the presidential elections in Ukraine, especially with propagandistic campaign of V. Yanukovych. The table 4 shows that most substantial increase of level of xenophobia (all differences in table, that are more than 0.06, significant on level of 5%) is typical for Russians and Russian speaking Ukrainians, living in southern and eastern regions of Ukraine. These are the categories of population, to which the message of propagandistic campaign was addressed, in particular these categories of population were set against Yushenko that was supported by Ukrainian speaking population of west and center of Ukraine.

**Table 4. Index of xenophobia for some ethnic, lingvo-ethnic and territorial groups of population in 2003 and 2004.**

| Groups of population          | 2003 | 2004 | Difference |
|-------------------------------|------|------|------------|
| All population                | 4.11 | 4.24 | -0.13      |
| Ukrainians                    | 4.20 | 4.29 | -0.09      |
| Russians                      | 3.91 | 4.16 | -0.25      |
| Russian speaking Ukrainians   | 4.11 | 4.33 | -0.22      |
| Ukrainian speaking Ukrainians | 4.31 | 4.25 | 0.06       |
| West                          | 4.34 | 4.31 | 0.03       |
| Center                        | 4.11 | 4.18 | -0.07      |
| South                         | 3.95 | 4.16 | -0.21      |
| East                          | 4.13 | 4.32 | -0.19      |



**Picture 1.** Map of Ukraine. Vote for Yuschenko and Yanukovych in the third round of the elections



Graph 1. Xenophobia and Slavonic and non-Slavonic intolerance dynamics

## Appendix.

*Anti-advertising, directed against Yuschenko and promoting growth of xenophobia*



**Figure 1.**



**Figure 2.** Example black PR, directed against Victor Yushchenko. The poster on which Yushchenko is represented as fascist. Such posters have been hanged in Donetsk



### Conclusion

The level of xenophobia in Ukraine increased from 1994 to 2001 and was stabilized in 2002-2003. But in year 2004 it increased again, also increased non-Slavonic and Slavonic intolerance. Analysis of data of previous years showed that the dynamics of the level of xenophobia in Ukraine is still influenced by two main factors - economic situation and external wars and conflicts in other regions of the world widely covered by mass media. Since the economic situation in Ukraine improved, and foreign policy factor affects only non-Slavonic intolerance, therefore I explain that increase of level of xenophobia in 2004 is connected with the presidential elections in Ukraine. First, the population of Ukraine was territorially polarized, western and central regions supported the candidate from opposition, southern and eastern - candidate from authority. Second, during the pre-election struggle discussions on the critical

problems dividing east, mainly Russian speaking, and western, mainly Ukrainian speaking areas of Ukraine - relations with Russia, the status of Russian and Ukrainian languages, an autonomy of southern and eastern areas of Ukraine were conducted. Third, pre-election campaign of Yanukovich included as one of the basic components direct charges of supporters of Yushchenko in the anti Russian moods, in the nationalism understood as intolerance to all except for the own nation, in neglect to Russians and to others not Ukrainian ethnic groups. All that incited one group of the population against another and, possibly, has brought the greatest contribution to growth of xenophobia in Ukraine.

P.S. Last moment, when the paper was at printing house, we received data of new wave - October 2005 survey. The situation returned to the year 2003, it supports our conclusions.

1. Swafford M., Kosolapov M., Kish L., Heeringa S. Sample design for republics of the former Soviet Union - National council for soviet and east european research, 1995, Chapter 6.
2. Are! D., Khmelko V. The russian factor and territorial polarization in Ukraine II The Harriman review.- 1996.- Vol. 9.- № 1-2 (Spring).
3. Gudkov L., Levinson A. Attitude to Jews in USSR- M., 1991.
4. Paniotto V. Ukrainian movement for perestroika ("Rukh"): results of sociological survey II Soviet Studies.- Glasgow-1991.-Vol. 43.-№. 1.
5. Paniotto V. Dynamics of social distance between the basic ethnic and linguistic-ethnic groups in Ukraine, 1994-2001. Report for ASN 6th Annual Convention (5-7 April 2001) (it's available on KHS site [www.kjis.com.ua](http://www.kjis.com.ua)).
6. Панин Н. В., Головаха Е. И. Тенденции развития украинского общества (1994-1998). Социологические показатели - К.: Институт социологии НАН Украины, 1999. - 152 с.
7. Панин Н. В. Национальная толерантность, национальный изоляционизм и ксенофобия в Украине. Украина - 2002. Мониторинг социальных изменений. - К.: Институт социологии НАН Украины, 2002 - 568 с.
8. Паниotto В. З'їзд Руху про себе.- Три дні вересня вісімдесят дев'ятого.- К.: Редакція щорічника «Україна. Наука і культура», 2000.-С 491-494.
9. Паниotto В. Динаміка ксенофобії в Україні, 1994-2002 // Соціологія: теорія, методи, маркетинг.- 2003.- № 3.- С. 74-92.
10. Паниotto В. И., Хмелько В. Е. Динамика отношения населения к независимости Украины и факторы, которые ее определяют- Десять лет социально-экономических превращений в Украине: попытка непредубежденной оценки / Ред. И. Бураковский. - К.: КИС, 2002.-С. 23-28.
11. Украинское общество: десять лет независимости.- К.: Институт социологии НАН Украины, 2002.- 661 с.
12. Хмелько В. Є. Динаміка рейтингів і соціальний склад електоратів В. А. Юшенка та В. Ф. Януковича у виборчій кампанії 2004 року. Сайт КМІСа, 2004: <http://www.kjis.com.ua/index.php?id=4&sp=l&num=19>.

*В. Паниotto, В.Максименко*

### ВПЛИВ ВИБОРІВ ПРЕЗИДЕНТА УКРАЇНИ 2004 НА МІЖЕТНІЧНІ СТОСУНКИ В УКРАЇНІ (СТАТИСТИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ЕМПІРИЧНИХ ДАНИХ)

*Статтю присвячено результатам моніторингу етнічних упереджень населення України, аналізу досліджень, які проводяться Київським міжнародним інститутом соціології (КМІС) щороку починаючи з 1994. Аналізуються дані 13 досліджень, що є репрезентативними для населення України. Кожне дослідження включає від 1500 до 2000 респондентів (загалом близько 22 000 респондентів).*

*У результаті аналізу з'ясовано, що президентська кампанія 2004 в Україні погіршила міжетнічні стосунки взагалі, а між росіянами та українцями зокрема.*