




[2, . 84-86].  
 - 13,7 ‰, (13,3) (13,4) (11,4), (13,2), - 1990 2008 .  
 3,3 ‰. 2008 . 35,1 . , 235 , 0,7 %  
 ( . 1).  
 5,2 ‰, 1,4 ,  
 2007 .  
 266 .




. 1. ; 2 - ; 3 - . : 1 -  
 (18,5). (19,7 1 000 ), (18,8)  
 ( . 2)



2. 2008 .  
 %: 1 – 12,0; 2 – 12,1–15,0; 3 – 15,1–18,0; 4 – 18,0.

2008 .  
 23,1 % 2000 . 20,4 %  
 45–49 – 38,1 %, 50–54 – 35,8 % 30–  
 34 – 24,6 %.  
 2008 . 9,8 %  
 30–34 – 4,3

– 3,3 , , 35–39 – 3,9 , 40–44 – 3,6 , 45–49 – 3,7 , 50–54  
 3–4 , ,  
 , 2025 . 30 % 15- 65 -  
 [3, . 39].



. 3. ; 2, 5 - ; 3, 6 - . ∴ 1, 4 - ; 1-3 - ; 4-6 - .  
 2008 . 100 526,9 -  
 835,3 - ( - 482,6, - 600,8),  
 , 192,5 - . 1990 . 2008 .  
 1990 . 39,4 % ( 3). 1998 . - 415,5  
 100 . 2008 .  
 2008 . 1 677  
 1 642,5 100 (455,7 ) ( . 4).



4. ., 2008 .  
 100  
 : 1 – 500,0; 2 – 500,1–  
 900,0; 3 – 900,1–1 300,0; 4 – 1 300,1.  
 (64,7 %), (11,3),  
 (6,8), (1,9). ( 4,0),  
 (29,9%),



2008 (16,9).  
 1 000 (19 2007) ( .6).



1 000 .6. : 1 – 2,0; 2 – 2,1–8,0; 3 – 8,1–14,0; 4 – 14,1. ., 2008 .

2008 . 0,7 %.

(56,5 % , ),

(2,8), (7,1), (24,1 %),

(2 %).

[1, .66].

1990–2008 . 2003 .


1996 . – 69,8 ,

(69,3 ).

1999 ., 70,7 ( .7).

(65,0 ). 11

2,9






( . 8).  
 ( .  
 ), ( . 63,0  
 ). ( .  
 ) 2008 . - (66,4 )




. 8. ., 2008 .  
 : 1 – 63,0; 2 – 63,1–64,0; 3 – 64,1–65,0; 4 – 65,1.

2008 . 2 122,9 . [3, .4] .  
 2,7 3,4 % 2007 2000 . 20,3 % , 1995 .



(1) . 9. (2).  
 , 1 046,2 . ( . 9).  
 - (112,8 .). (114 .) (141,1 .), (119,6 .),  
 , 14 26,3 % (556,4 .) 100 .  
 , 15 17 - 4,6 % (98,1 .). (138 .) 55,2 %  
 72 .), - 1,3 (90 .). (42 .)

2008 . 7 843 . ( . 10).  
 2008 . 2007 ., 200 . 2006 . 11 .  
 100 . , , 30,0 17,8 % . 1990 2000 .



65,8 %

2008 . 1 828


2007 . 1 939

2007 . ( 111 )

1990 . 2,3

2000 - 10,8 % ( . 11).

69 %



. 11.

(2).

(1)

2007 . ( 2,6 %), ( 2,2 %).  
( 41 2007 ). 72,9 % (76,7 % – 2007 ).  
18 34 .  
2,8 %.  
45,2 %  
(82 100 66 ). 2000 .  
( - ).  
2007 .  
; “ ” ;  
9,8 %;  
1990 .; 2008 .  
11 , - 2,9 , ;  
2007 . - ;  
; , -  
; , -  
- , ;  
; -  
; -

— , , , :  
 • , ; , -  
 • , , ; ,  
 • , - ; , -  
 • , , ; ,  
 — , , , ;  
 : -  
 • ,  
 • , , ,  
 [4]. -  
 : -  
 1. , , , , , -  
 , , ( ) . -  
 2. , . -  
 3. , [2, . 268].

1. : : , 2008.
2. : : , 2006.
3. / : - - , 2007.
4. [www.ukrstat.org.ua](http://www.ukrstat.org.ua)

#### **GEOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS OF FORMING OF MODERN TYPE OF DEATH RATE IN LVIV AREA**

**N. Hodis**

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,  
Doroshenko St., 41, UA – 79000 Lviv, Ukraine*

The dynamics of indexes of general death rate of population, child's death rate, death rate of capable of working population, expected life-span, morbidity, and distributing of dyings are analysed after reasons of population in the Lviv area and on administrative districts. Measures are offered on the improvement of health, decline of death rate and increase of life-span population.

*Key words:* modern type of death rate, general coefficient of death rate, general coefficient of child's death rate, general coefficient of death rate of capable of working population, structure of death rate, mean expected time of life.

