

Current population migration and mobility in the Czech Republic – reflections on some conceptual frameworks

DUŠAN DRBOHLAV, ZDENĚK ČERMÁK

Charles University of Prague, Faculty of Science, Department of Social Geography and Regional Development, Prague, Czech Republic

Abstract:

After November 1989, new political and economic establishments in the Czech Republic brought about new mobility/migratory patterns. The first part of the article is devoted to sketching the main mobility patterns in relation to settlement patterns. The basic conceptual and theoretical frameworks are described and special attention is devoted to discussing the relationship between internal and international migration movements. The next part focuses on characterizing important contemporary trends such as the concept of transnationalism and the “S curve” model. The final two sections deal with the situation in the Czech Republic within a broader CEE context. Besides characterizing general patterns, special focus is also paid to border zones.

Key words: mobility/migration, concepts, theories, border zone, the Czech Republic

Introduction and overview

Spatial population mobility is undoubtedly among vital regional processes and an integral part of mechanisms forming the geographical organization of society. As a complex process it actually expresses a whole set of inter-related factors. Mobility is thus an important aggregate index of regional disparity in the fields of demography, social development, economy and the environment. At the same time, it is a process which influences not only the total population level, but also its demographic, economic, social and cultural composition.

Development of migratory trends is closely connected with the establishing of customs or norms within settlement systems. In the present – almost completed – stage of extensive urbanization, characterized by both absolute and relative urban population growth, territorial mobility within the population has been mainly represented by one-way migration from rural to urban areas. The current period of transition from quantitative to qualitative forms of growth is marked by a completion of “static” territorial population density. Urbanized regions with complex structures are being developed, and a relatively strong and reciprocal mobility relationship is developing between big towns/cities, accompanied by the development of further forms of territorial mobility. Whilst in the previous era migration chiefly had a concentrating and selecting role, the integrating role is currently increasing in developed countries.

The change is made visible through alterations in the direction of migration streams, whilst the proportion of net migration out of the migration turnover is shrinking (see Hampl, Gardavský, Kúhnl 1987, Dostál, Hampl 1994).

The emergence of new forms of settlement points to a transition from the extensive to the intensive stage in the development of settlement systems. Especially over the last three decades, there have been various processes at work in Western Europe and North America which are shown through changes in the spatial distribution of the population. However, these changes do not have a uniform orientation. Suburbanization is primarily responsible for the territorial diffusion of urbanized space and the creation of vast agglomerations and conurbations. In core urban areas the population level stagnates and eventually diminishes. By contrast, there is population growth in external zones.

The increasing tendency towards decentralization, of a higher regional order, is caused by the process of de-urbanization. So far, this has been rather limited and has not yet spread worldwide. The decentralization trends of suburbanization and de-urbanization are at present opposed by re-urbanization, a process which includes certain elements of selective concentration and which is connected with the rehabilitation of urban areas, especially with the revitalization of town centres (see Cheshire 1995, Fielding 1989).

In developed countries, the whole postwar era distinguished itself by a strong relationship between the scopes of migration mobility and economic development. High migration levels in the 1950s and 1960s were to a large extent due to the economic prosperity of the time, as well as to the continuing fast rate of development. In contrast, the worldwide economic recession triggered by oil crises in the 1970s influenced the reduction of migration mobility, which could be observed in a number of countries between the 1970s and the first half of the 1980s. A particularly important phenomenon mediated the relationship between economic recession and the scope of migration mobility. This was the slump in housing construction, which had a large impact on commuter belts of metropolises. From the viewpoint of net migration there were long-term losses in peripheral regions with a dominance of rural settlement and, more recently, in the regions shaped by the old manufacturing industries such as textiles, mining, steel refinery and heavy engineering. Together with the attraction of traditional metropolises – their sprawling suburbs rather than inner cities – there was the attraction of regions which were developing branches of progressive manufacturing and regions boasting a high quality of environment.

Conceptual and theoretical issues and frameworks

Spatial mobility represents different types of population movement. The first criterion according to which one may conceptualize the issue is connected to whether (and for how long) a person stays in a given place and whether he/she returns back to his/her place of origin. Migration has always been a relatively permanent type¹ of a movement,

¹ Current trends show changes. The impact of globalization on mobility and migratory movements has resulted in many other kinds of shorter movement, which can also be classified as "migration".

which often results in "settlement migration" (see below). Several temporary movements can include both long-term visits (several weeks/months) as well as very short-term circulatory movements like commuting (including shopping), tourist/recreational visits, study trips and the like. The second factor is distance. Primarily, movement can be understood as redistribution within space. One can differentiate between several distinct levels of movement, two of which are crucial: municipality and state levels. Accordingly, one can recognize intra and inter-urban migration movements and internal and international migration movements. "Cultural distance" need not necessarily correspond with "physical distance"².

A complicated and intricate relationship exists between different types of population mobility – mainly interwoven relations, complementariness, and substitution. One such relationship can be found between migration and commuting (Čermák 1989), where circulatory commuting often precedes settlement migration. One should not forget the relationship between geographical (physical) mobility and social mobility, which is simply characterized by climbing up and possibly even down the career ladder (shifts within social and economic structures during one's life). See also respective reflection in theory (e.g. Hoffmann-Nowotny 1983).

When discussing mutual relationships between forms of mobility, special attention must be paid to the relationship between international and internal migration movements. Confusion arises when the same models, theoretical concepts, and experience from the field of internal migration are applied to that of international migration (also, to lesser extent, vice versa). This is done on the whole with practically no modifications, improvements or sometimes even references despite the number of fundamental empirical observations and ensuing theoretical frameworks focusing on analysis of internal migration movements (see Sjaastad 1962, Todaro 1968 and Mabogunje 1970). Too little attention has been paid to those facts which are in many ways significant for a better understanding of the mechanisms of both the migration movement as a whole, international migration and internal migration. Only a limited number of texts have been devoted to these issues (see Pryor 1983). In this context, it is worth mentioning some basic similarities and differences between internal and international migration³:

Common features:

1. Similar analytical frameworks (methods of analysis).
2. Common social and economic roots.
3. Similar determinants and consequences.
4. "Structural similarities" – namely, migrants tend to be young.
5. Places boasting a high standard of living (in a complex view⁴) serve as migratory magnets.
6. Movements which begin as short-term (or circulatory) movements may often change into long-term and permanent ones.
7. A close relationship between geographical and social mobility.

² When a person migrates to a not-so-distant locality abroad (across the frontier) their adopted country can be culturally very different from their state of origin.

³ The above remarks can only serve as illustration, and act as a reminder that a relationship in some direction and to some extent may exist (see Drbohlav 1993).

⁴ It means also a better quality of environment in terms of environmental and social aspects.

Differences:

1. International movements are much more susceptible to political and administrative control.
2. Reasons for international migration are more complex. In the broadest sense of the word, this migration is much more strongly influenced by political factors and social networks.
3. The distance factor carries a different weighting in the different types of migration.

Indeed, it is both interesting and important to investigate the “practical functioning of this relationship in the field”. Firstly, international migrants can serve as a substitute for missing internal migrants – as is the case of many big European cities, which acquire new populations mainly from international migrants or from very specific segments of the domestic population (e.g. the young and educated). Prague, the capital city of the Czech Republic, is typical of the above mentioned trends. Secondly, when they move to (specific districts of) cities or regions, international migrants can under some circumstances start pushing the domestic population out of those particular city districts/regions, thereby triggering internal migration movements (or they can “prevent” other potential internal migrants from moving in). Thirdly, “a factual loss” (in terms of economic performances) of some domestic “pendular” migrants – those living in border zones and regularly commuting abroad – can be offset by an immigrant labour force. It is rather difficult, however, to draw “robust” conclusions and the issue of these “substitution” and “complementarity” concepts (points 2 and 3) requires further elaboration (see Whitley – Imai 1994, Barff – Ellist – Reibel 1995, Champion 1996).

Concerning the developmental aspect, there are changes in terms of the importance of individual mobility types over time. In this context one can especially pinpoint the growing role of circulatory movements over the course of time (see Zelinsky 1971).

It is crucial to define specific mobility processes for statistical accuracy. Two examples are pointed out. Firstly, there is the problem of discrepancies between formally registered versus actual places of residence. Secondly, despite the UN recommendation to apply a one-year threshold when defining a person as an international migrant (emigrant/immigrant), most countries still use their own time-horizons, which are often very different from those which have been recommended (see Poulaint – Herm 2003).

Two migratory trends

Before introducing some of the well-known theoretical and conceptual frameworks, let us pinpoint two trends which significantly shape the current situation in the field of international migration. The first, migratory transnationalism, can be characterized in the following way (see Portes – Guarnizot – Landolt 1999):

“The events in question pertain to the creation of a transnational community linking immigrant groups in the advanced countries with their respective sending nations and hometowns...This field is composed of a growing number of people who live dual lives: speaking two languages, having homes in two countries, and making a living through regular contact across national borders. Activities within the

transnational field are comprised of a whole gamut of economic, political and social initiatives ranging from informal import-export businesses, to the rise of a class of bi-national professionals, to the campaigns of native politicians among their expatriates”.

On the other hand, there is also the well-known model in which circular labour migration gradually transforms into permanent immigration and settlement. Settlement patterns develop an S-shape over time (see Martin – Taylor 1995 and their guest-worker settlement patterns in Europe, Singapore and Gulf countries).

In fact, the two concepts need not be in opposition. According to Portes – Guarnizo – Landolt (1999) a transnational system can also be created by migrants who settle abroad but sustain significant ties with their place of origin. As long as contacts between countries of origin and destination are intensive and “productive” (immigrants maintain contacts either via direct and permanent circulation – moving back and forth – or via other communication channels) the “S” curve formation may be only one of several ways by which transnationalism is reached (see Drbohlav – Janská, forthcoming). One should remember that “what is meant by “transnationalism” and what should and should not be included under its rubric is not always clear” (Levitt – DeWind – Vetovec 2003).

Application towards Central/Eastern Europe and border zone areas

We shall begin with some general comments, before discussing specific concepts. We will devote our attention to regional aspects, namely Central/Eastern Europe in general, and the Czech Republic in particular. As part of an isolated communist “second world”, CCE countries have been unable, until recently (the late 1990s), to make a significant contribution to the study of international migration. Those theories which have been developed in relation to migratory experience (situations) stem from migration realities either within the developed (or “first”) world, within the developing (“third”) world or between these two worlds. Now, logically, a basic question is raised as to whether one can make use of these theories when describing and explaining migratory reality in newly liberated and liberalized, democratic and capitalist CEEc. It seems that the answer is yes. Evidence indicates that many features of the current migratory processes in CEEc really do resemble those one can find (or could find) in countries with developed immigration (see e.g. Drbohlav 2002). Although we clearly need more sophisticated analyses, applying well-known migratory theories to CEEc seems to be well-founded.

Many well-known conceptual/theoretical frameworks used when explaining international migration issues in general can be applied towards border areas.

First of all, one can pinpoint the classic “push-pull” model which is a good conceptual tool for researching migrants’ decision-making processes (a micro approach) or, for example, for throwing more light on the variables which explain migratory movements between particular countries (a macro approach). Based on a micro perspective and through ascertaining the positive, negative and neutral factors in both place of origin and destination, we are able to penetrate more deeply into the

motives behind a given migration. One can trace the origins of the “push-pull” concept as far back as Ravenstein (1885 and 1889). Nevertheless, over the course of time it has been further developed and refined (see e.g. Lee, 1969) including adding “new parameters” - intervening opportunities or intervening barriers (Stouffer, 1940).

Secondly, network theory should be mentioned. It has often been shown that it is crucially important to research the inter-personal ties which link established migrants/pendlers in a destination country with their compatriots back in their home country (e.g. Massey, 1988). Such social networks increase the probability of further migration, since they decrease the associated cost and risk whilst increasing expected gains. Hence, one must study the process of information diffusion concerning migration as well as the actual diffusion of migration itself.

Thirdly, the dual labour market theory is worth testing. This theory postulates that the labour market in a destination country is divided into two: primary and secondary. Whilst the majority of the population usually takes the more lucrative, attractive, more secure and better paid jobs, foreigners are predetermined to take jobs that are rather unattractive, unstable, poorly paid (“dirty, difficult and dangerous”) and lacking in promotion opportunities.

Fourthly, one cannot ignore the institutional theory, which deals with the impact that institutions have upon migratory processes. Various types of organization from GOs, NGOs to mafia-like structures come into play. The basic question is to what extent institutions strengthen or hinder a given movement and to what extent they themselves “exploit” migration and migrants (who they depend on for their existence). To what extent is migration spontaneous or driven by institutional structures? Legislation also plays a part – not merely its existence, but also the extent and efficiency with which it is enforced.

The above mentioned concepts/theories can be more or less “mechanically” applied to CEEc and their border zones. The application of other concepts/theories to the CEEc presents a fascinating challenge. For example, if the cumulative causation theory is to be applied to the given area, its original framework must be somewhat modified. The cumulative causation theory in migration is based on Myrdal’s (1957) basic proposition⁵ that a “change of one of factor has a knock-on effect, which strengthens the original change” (see also Blažek-Uhlíř, 2002). In relation to the migration issue and the cumulative causation theory Massey et al. (1998) mention – “In addition to the growth of networks and the development of migrant-supporting institutions, international migration sustains itself in other ways that make additional movement progressively more likely over time”. Causation is cumulative in that each act of migration alters the social context within which subsequent migration decisions are made, typically in ways which make further movement more likely. So far, social scientists have discussed six socioeconomic factors which are potentially affected by migration in this cumulative fashion: 1. the distribution of income, 2. the distribution of land, 3. the organization of agriculture, 4. the culture of migration, 5. the regional distribution of human capital and 6. the social meaning of work (see Massey et al. 1998 for more detail). The cumulative causation theory might be tested to see whether

⁵ Myrdal’s theory is devoted to a characterization of socioeconomic development in the broadest sense.

it can also be a good “explanatory tool” in CEEc. However, when using it some modifications must be made. One should respect the different environment in which the migration occurs. Originally the theory dealt with movement between the classic developed and developing countries (the latter being more agricultural in nature and usually geographically distant from the First World). One can still test it in CEEc in which the standard of living is better and which are geographically close to each other. Not only long-term or permanent migration movements but also short-term, circular, pendular movements occur between the origin and destination countries and can bear “cumulative causation patterns”. Taking into account the different character of the countries of origin of the CEEc’ World, it is necessary to reconsider some of the above mentioned six factors. Generally, emphasis should move away from agriculture towards those aspects closely linked with industrial or service-based societies, or specifically border communities. In fact, economic performances and lifestyles are much closer to the First World than the Third World. Border zones typify intensive short-term circular economic migration movements and would make a particularly good lab for applying the theory in this “new coat” (e.g. Poland-Germany, Czechia-Germany, Czechia-Austria, Hungary-Austria, Slovakia-Austria).

The Czech Republic and its migratory patterns

(in a broader CEE context focusing on border zones)

Deep changes within society and the economy during the 1990s brought about in many respects a totally new situation. Czechoslovakia (and the Czech Republic) opened its borders westward and eastward thereby intensifying international and crossborder movements – of persons, capital, goods and services. An endeavour to join western developed democracies was fulfilled on May 1, 2004, when the Czech Republic along with seven other post-communist countries became members of the European Union. Its geographical position predetermines this country to mediate contacts between East and West, and also between North and South, although this has less relevance to socioeconomic development. This country had a mediating position in the past, it has now and this role will probably strengthen in the future. “Understanding the various social, economic and political relations that spring from economic migration, its positive and negative impacts, dictates permanent analysis of migration movements which quickly change their intensity, quality and direction” (Horáková 1998). However, a new migration model of behaviour typical of short-term, repeated, circular movement between residence and workplace is more and more important in relation to permanent employment-based migration. Current migration movements are qualitatively different from those encountered in the past, due to new information channels, the existing type of workforce and “shrinking” geographical distance (e.g. Fassmann – Kohlbacher – Reeger 1995). The Czech Republic has quickly become attractive for citizens of countries to its east. On the other hand, some Czech citizens are making use of the possibility to work in neighbouring western countries. “Political liberalization and freedom of movement along with uneven distribution of economic power among countries of origin and destination lead to spontaneous economic (labour) migrations that, in fact, did not exist earlier” (Horáková – Drbohlav, 1998). As

a corollary, the Czech Republic has been becoming at the same time a country of emigration (albeit only for limited groups of people or for particular regions – e.g. border zones), a country of immigration (for people coming mainly from the “East” for economic and political reasons – including wars) and a country of transit migration. Migrants stay in the Czech Republic only for a limited time (usually as short as possible) whilst trying to reach “classic Western countries”. In terms of social and cultural factors, there is a wide spectrum of economic immigrants in the country whilst some particular ethnic groups have already found their specific niche in the Czech labour market (e.g. Americans and Britons as management within international/foreign companies or as foreign language teachers, Ukrainians as an auxiliary labour force in construction, Vietnamese as retail businessmen selling cheap clothes, electronics and food). There is also economic immigration from Slovakia to the Czech Republic. This differs significantly from other migration movements due to its history, scale and qualitative parameters.

Conceptually, when measuring the economic effects of migration movements and related work abroad there is a sort of a “production-reproduction game” being played out. The most effective behavioural model is to “produce” money in a rich destination World whilst “reproducing oneself” in a poor source country. The greater the difference between quality of life and, consequently, earnings, between these two Worlds, the better for the migrant – see for example the differences between Germany or Austria to the Ukraine. Of course, the least effective and really unreasonable solution is to “produce money” in a poor World and to “reproduce” oneself in the rich World. When this is done, it occurs within international/foreign companies who compensate such migrants for living in a generally poor environment through salaries of a level comparable with those in the developed World. Most migrants in CEEc make use of “reasonable” (“worth doing”) – though certainly not the most advantageous – differences between earnings in source and destination countries (e.g. Czechs in Germany or Austria, Ukrainians in the Czech Republic⁶ or Slovaks or Poles in Austria).

Researching the migration process is an important issue in the Czech Republic. Reasons are closely tied to the demographic situation but more importantly to potential and existing gaps in the labour market. The Czech Republic shares the somewhat negative trends of demographic development characteristic of many developed Western European countries. For example, the fertility rate is currently around 1.2 – one of the lowest in the whole world. This situation, along with low mortality rates and increasing life expectancy leads to an ageing population. Whilst immigration cannot provide a total remedy for a depleted and ageing population, immigrants can fill at least some of the vanishing segments within the labour market and thus help propel economic development in the future. This can be done via selective recruitment of foreign labour. Such a programme was launched by the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic in 2003. The numbers of accepted qualified/skilled immigrants through this pilot program, however, have so far been rather low and, for the time being, do not have any significant impact.

⁶ The average salary in the Czech Republic was about 7 times higher than in the Ukraine at the beginning of the 21st century.

Whereas the level of internal migration in the Czech Republic is at a constant low, (mainly because of the still underdeveloped housing market and insufficient investment in building new housing) international migration is gaining importance. Despite this, during the 1990s immigration was unable, as in many other European countries, to offset losses brought about by negative natural demographics. In any case, the country's net migration remains positive as more immigrants (mainly economic immigrants) enter than Czechs leave to work abroad. Both cases involve a selective process since only particular groups of people are involved in the migration movements. Although economic motives for migration clearly prevail, emigrants towards the West are more qualified, more highly educated and positioned higher up the social ladder than those who enter the Czech Republic from the East. To some extent, one can speak about a sort of migratory succession, a phenomenon well-known in many other countries of the world. Labour migration of Czechs eastward is, excluding perhaps migration to Slovakia, extremely rare. On the whole, it is those who could easily be assimilated into the Czech labour market who seek work abroad. When working abroad, migrants often "undervalue" their qualifications. Nevertheless, their adaptability, flexibility and productivity increase whilst their demands on the quality of working environment, housing and catering decrease. Clearly, the current 240,000 legally registered foreigners in the Czech Republic – two thirds of whom are economic migrants – and perhaps about 200,000 irregular migrants again mostly brought to this country through economic motivation (except maybe some 100,000 transitory ones) calls for deeper and more sophisticated analyses (see Drbohlav 2003 for more detail).

Economic labour migration movements have quickly become a new trend in CEE within its so-called compact "border zone". This was created by Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary (see Wallace – Chmuliar – Sidorenko 1995) and functioned until these countries have joined the EU in 2004. Among other migratory types, this zone attracted foreign labour force both from countries which are less successful at achieving transformation and those which are geographically distant (mainly Asian countries such as Vietnam and China). These movements are economic in their character and respect: a) a relatively good standard of living in the destination countries, b) relatively healthy labour markets (the border zone countries were relatively able to maintain living standards – there was no drastic fall in this respect), c) at least until recently, relatively liberal migration legislation, leniently enforced. These features were accompanied by a stable political (democratic) environment and by the important factor of geographical location. In fact, the border zone was an intermediate quasi-developed part between traditional "West" and "East". The zone functioned as a corridor, with massive transit migration movements westwards. However, because of more and more restricted borders to the West, the zone has become a refuge for many migrants who cannot penetrate any further and are thus compelled to stay. Labour migration is concentrated around poles/nodes of development – the largest urban areas, Prague or other big cities – where working opportunities, anonymity of environment and support from compatriots who have already settled strengthen further movement. The second important migration inflow is directed to border zones. "The border with developed countries represents a direct contact of the Czech labour market with potential visitors, but mostly investors" (Dokoupil – Toušek 2001). A higher than average share of

foreigners from neighbouring countries within the Czech labour market is typical of the Czech-Polish and Czech-Slovak border zones. Based on the Czech-Slovak agreement, the city district of Ostrava had more than 5,000 legally registered Slovaks, who represented 3% of the local labour force in 1998. In common with many other studies throughout the world, the impact of foreigners upon the Czech labour market is unambiguous. For example, whilst one can look positively at filling gaps in the market (including accepting jobs which are unattractive for Czechs), "degrading" working conditions by foreigners is a rather negative phenomenon.

Of course, accession into the EU changed the situation within the "buffer zone" and, partly, therefore, around its borders. New legislation came into force, diminishing differences in the treatment of migrants between new member states and old member states. The new era will also make it easier for representatives of old member states to enter and operate within the labour markets of new member states. It seems that the provisional ban on free movement, which most of the old member states started applying to delay the influx of workers from newly joined countries to their territories was in fact unnecessary. The Czech Republic is a good example of this since its population was, is, and shall probably remain very stable. Also, new EU systems will start functioning between new member states themselves (e.g. between the Czech Republic and Slovakia). To some extent, the "migratory burden" and responsibility (and "the buffer zone") will be shifted eastwards – from the Czech Republic to Slovakia.

Research into labour migration in the Czech Republic does not have a long tradition. Despite this, there were a number of inspiring studies during the 1990s. The following studies cover the general issues: Drbohlav 1994, 1996, 1998, 1999, 2000, Horáková 1999, Marešová 1999. A more specific picture of labour migration and the position of migrants within the labour market from various perspectives is dealt with in: Drbohlav 1997, 2003, Drbohlav – Lupták – Janská – Šelepová 1999, Drbohlav – Lupták – Janská – Bohuslavová 1999, Chan 1998, Wang 1998, Marešová 1991, 1993, Horáková 1998b, 2000a, b, Horálek et al. 1996, Kroupa et al. 1997, Šelepová 1998, Horáková – Drbohlav 1998, Lupták – Drbohlav 1999. Horáková (1994, 1996) focuses upon circular labour migrants (pendlers).

In contrast with the interior, migration in border zones is characteristic of its higher heterogeneity, various forms of movements and more intensive circulation measured by the shorter periods in which the migration occurs. An interesting and, indeed, important feature of the border zone model is a mutual interconnection between individual forms of mobility (see above). For example, while part of the Czech population periodically circulates back and forth to Germany, Austria and in some cases Poland, this workforce is offset by similarly behaving Slovaks or Poles who live near the border. The migration of representatives of western business circles which invest and do business in the border zones plays a specific role. They make use of a cheap but, at the same time, quite qualified Czech labour force. The Czech border zone is also attractive for economic migrants who come from more remote countries and stay in the Czech Republic not for one day or one week but rather for periods of several months or years (mainly Ukrainians and representatives of other post-soviet republics, Vietnamese and Chinese). Forms of work are very varied, ranging from

working in agriculture to construction to selected fields of industry and services⁷ (including very attractive kinds of “buy-sell” activities and services including, for example, those in the sex industry). The cross-border activities of local inhabitants are very colourful as well. The creation of a “cross-border labour market” and its functioning is typical of many activities e.g. trading with foreign firms (e.g. German ones), working for a foreign firm or representing a foreign firm and last but not least, working abroad. People living close to the German and Austrian borders are intensively involved in daily commuting (the so called “pendlers”). Statistical data on pendlers is very imprecise in the Czech Republic. The only available data is intelligent estimates offered by representatives of various institutions. What is clear is that the first wave of interest to work abroad peaked in the Czech Republic in the mid 1990s. A higher living standard was clearly identified as the main reason for the pendling. This is supported by data on both a national level (e.g. between 20,000 and 25,000 Czechs worked in Germany in 1995) and on a regional level (e.g. in 1995, 1,822 people in the border district of Prachatice obtained documentary proof that they did not receive social support as unemployed persons, which was a prerequisite for having the chance to officially work abroad). The decreasing interest among Czechs to work abroad is also supported by data from empirical surveys (data obtained from individual respondents). “Whereas in the whole Czech-German border zone 5% of people of working age commuted to Germany in 1994, it was only 3% two years later” (Jeřábek 1998). In the same vein, data from the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs on short-term and long-term migrants shows how the numbers of officially registered employed Czech citizens in Germany⁸ has decreased over time – from 12,256 in 1993 to 1,983 in 2002 (Horáková – Macounová 2003). Officially 10,913 citizens of the former Czechoslovakia were working in Austria as of December 2003. The share of Slovaks is probably higher than that of Czechs. According to available data, one may estimate the total figure of Czech citizens currently legally working abroad (for various lengths of time) to be somewhere between 30,000 and 40,000.

Similar surveys have also been conducted around other border zones throughout CEE. Across the Slovak-Austrian border, “commuting from Slovakia to Austria represents the most frequent type of Slovak-Austrian circulation mobility” (Kollár 2000). A representative survey which concentrated on the regional dimension and spatial structures confirmed that unlike many other European regions, Slovak-Austrian mobility is mainly tied to mobility between the two capitals – Bratislava and Vienna. The sociodemographic parameters of those pendlers are rather specific since in contrast with Czech pendlers, they are relatively highly qualified, active in the tertiary sector and able to find the job for which they were trained at home in Slovakia. Commuting has become a permanent factor contributing to local development in respective cities. Following EU expansion, its importance is set to grow.

⁷ Economic migration is highly individual. However, its character is to some extent influenced by networks of contacts among people in their countries of origin and destination. Consequently, these links trigger a sort of chain migration (Horáková – Drbohlav 1998).

⁸ It concerns three programmes: working agreements for 18 months (total lifetime limit) to improve one's qualification, working agreements for 3 months maximum (during a single year) and also since 2001 “green cards” for specialists in information technology.

An individual perspective on this issue is represented by empirical surveys researching the subjective perception of immigration/immigrants by the population at large. Opinion polls provide an important insight into subjective perception and contribute to an accurate description of the role international migrants/migration play within the general population (e.g. K zaměstnávání 1997, Veřejné 1999, K národnostní 2000, Postoje 2000, O názorech 2000). Interest focuses on both the migratory process itself and its main participants. Temporary short-term circular migration (pendling) is perceived more or less positively by the population of border zones in the Czech Republic. Gains brought about by the movements for migrants themselves are appreciated above all (Jeřábek 1998). The Czech labour force seems to be extremely industrious compared with its cross-border neighbours. Such results are confirmed in both Czech-Austrian and Czech-Slovak border zones (Vaishar 2000). Cross-border economic migration can have a positive impact – transferring new experience and skills, building relations between representatives of neighbouring countries and, last but not least, developing/improving language abilities. On the other hand, there is also a sort of a negative evaluation that is based on fears of competition, hostility or even xenophobia towards foreigners or towards particular types of business (e.g. the “grey” economy). There is increasing mobility of the labour force and a greater penetration of foreign currency and investment via foreign firms. The results of research (Matoušková 1998) indicate that Czechs are ready and willing to work for foreign/international companies operating in Czechia. Respondents’ motives behind this attitude were the same as in the case of cross-border commuting.

Concluding remarks

The deep transition and transformation processes which have been taking place in the Czech Republic and other CEEc have drastically changed migration patterns, especially international migration. Importantly, it has been shown that the whole situation is “normalizing” towards the “classic models” which are well-known from developed democratic societies based on a free market economy. Also, it has been shown that migratory patterns in this transforming zone can, to large extent, be explained by well-known migration concepts and theories. This does not mean, however, that in the context of CEEc these concepts should not be further refined and developed.

References

- BARFF, R. – ELLIS, M. – REIBEL, M. (1995): The Links between Immigration and Internal Migration in the United States: A Comparison of the 1970s and 1980s. Working Paper Series No. 1, Hanover, The Nelson A. Rockefeller Center for the Social Sciences – Dartmouth College 1995.
- BIRNER, A.: HUBER, P., WINKLER, P. (1999): Schätzung des Potentials an Einpendlern und Arbeitsmigranten aus den MOEL und regionale Arbeitsmarktauswirkungen. In: Regionale Auswirkungen der EU-Integration der Mittel- und Osteuropäische Länder. Wien 1999: ÖROK-Publikation Nr. 146, Band II. s. 15–62.
- BLAŽEK, J. – UHLÍŘ, D. (2002): Teorie regionálního rozvoje. Praha, Karolinum 2002, 212 s.
- ČERMÁK, Z. (1989): Stěhování do Prahy ve světle výsledků výběrového šetření. Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Geographica, 24, č. 2, str. 101–110.

- CHAMPION, T. (1996): International Migration and Internal Population Movements within Developed Countries. Paper to be presented at the 28th International Geographical Congress held at the Hague, 4–10 August, 1996. (Manuscript).
- CHAN, R. P. (1998): The Developmental Trajectories of the Vietnamese Immigrant Population in Prague: An Immigrant Population Emerging Without a Traditional Ethnic Enclave. A research report worked out within Dartmouth College Foreign Program at Charles University in Prague. Prague.
- CHESHIRE, P. (1995): A New Phase of Urban Development in Western Europe? The Evidence for the 1980s. *Urban Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 7, 1045–1063.
- DANĚK, P. (1999): Cizinci s pracovním povolením v ČR. In: Jeřábek, M. (ed.): *Geografická analýza pohraničí České republiky*. Pracovní texty, WP 99: 11, 1999. Praha, Sociologický ústav AV ČR. S. 95–96.
- DOKOUPIL, J., TOUŠEK, J. (2001): Zahraniční pracovníci na trhu práce v pohraničí ČR. In: Jeřábek, M. (ed.): *Reflexe regionálního rozvoje pohraničí České republiky*. Sociologický ústav AV ČR, Praha 2001, s. 40–46.
- DOSTÁL, P., HAMPL, M. (1994): Development of an Urban System: General Conception and Specific Features in the Czech Republic. In: M. Barlow, P. Dostál and M. Hampl (eds.): *Territory, Society and Administration. The Czech Republic and the Industrial Region of Liberec*. University of Amsterdam: Instituut voor Sociale Geografie, p. 191–224.
- DRBOHLAV, D. (1993): International Migration (Theory and Selected Aspects of the East-West European Migration). Research Report prepared for the Belgian Ministry of Science, Catholic University Leuven 1993.
- DRBOHLAV, D. (1996): Česká republika a mezinárodní imigrace. In: Hampl, M. (Ed.) *Geografická organizace společnosti a transformační procesy v České republice*. Praha, Přírodovědecká fakulta UK, s. 199–218.
- DRBOHLAV, D. (1997): Migration Policy Objectives for European East-West International Migration. *International Migration*, 35, No. 1, pp. 85–108.
- DRBOHLAV, D. (1999): International Migration and the Czech Republic. In: Hampl, M. (Ed.) *Geography of Societal Transformation in the Czech Republic*. Prague, DemoArt, pp. 223–242.
- DRBOHLAV, D. (2000): Die Tschechische Republik und die internationale Migration. In Fassmann, H., Münz, R. (Eds.) *Ost-West- Wanderung in Europa*. Wien – Köln – Weimar, Böhlau Verlag, pp. 163–181.
- DRBOHLAV, D. (2002): Migratory Trends in the Czech Republic: “Divergence or Convergence” vis-a-vis the Developed World? *Migracijske i etničke teme*, 18, 2002, č. 2–3, str. 167–176.
- DRBOHLAV, D. (2003): Immigration and the Czech Republic (with a Special Focus on the Foreign Labor Force). *International Migration Review*, Vol. 37, 2003, No. 1, pp. 194–224.
- DRBOHLAV, D. – JANSKÁ, E. (forthcoming): Current Ukrainian and Russian Migration to the Czech Republic: Mutual Similarities and Differences. In: *Migration in the New Europe, East-West Revisited*. Górný, A., Ruspini, P. (Eds.). New York, Palgrave MacMillan.
- DRBOHLAV, D. – LUPTÁK, M. – JANSKÁ, E. – BOHUSLAVOVÁ, J. (1999): Ruská komunita v České republice. Výzkumná zpráva grantu MV; U-2115/99. Praha, Přírodovědecká fakulta UK. 47 str.
- DRBOHLAV, D. – LUPTÁK, M. – JANSKÁ, E. – ŠELEPOVÁ, P. (1999): Ukrajinská komunita v České republice. Výzkumná zpráva grantu MV; U-2116/99. Praha, Přírodovědecká fakulta UK. 144 str.
- FASSMANN – HINTERMANN, CH. (1997): Migrationspotential Ostmitteleuropa. Struktur und Motivation potentieller Migranten aus Polen, der Slowakei, Tschechien und Ungarn. Wien, ISR-Forschungsbericht 15, 1997.
- FASSMANN, H., KOHLBACHER, J., REEGER, U. (1995): Die “Neue Zuwanderung” aus Ostmittel-europa -eine empirische Analyse am Beispiel der Polen in Österreich. ISR, Heft 13, Wien 1995, 78 s.
- FEITHEN, R. (1985): Arbeitskräftewanderungen in der Europäischen Gemeinschaft. Bestimmungsgründe und regionalpolitische Implikationen. University Press, New York, Frankfurt, 178 s.
- FIELDING, A. J. (1989): Migration and Urbanization in Western Europe since 1950. In: *Counterurbanization in Europe*. The Geographical Journal 155:3:60–69, London 1989.
- HAMPL, M., GARDAVSKÝ, V., KÜHN, K. (1987): Regionální struktura a vývoj systému osídlení ČSR. Univerzita Karlova, Praha, 255 str.
- HINTERMANN, CH. (1998): Migration Potential in East-Central Europe. Paper prepared for the Conference on “International Migration. Challenges for European populations”, Bari, June 25–27, 1998, Italy.
- HINTERMANN, CH. (2000): The Austrians and their Foreign Population. Příspěvek prezentovaný na semináři “Workshop on Demographic and Cultural Specificity and Integration of Migrants”, Bingen, 10.–11. listopad 2000, Německo.

- HOFFMANN-NOWOTNY, H. J. (1983): A Sociological Approach toward a General Theory of Migration. In: *Global Trends in Migration: Theory and Research on International Population Movements*. Kritiz, M. M., Keely, CH. B., Tomasi, S. M. (Eds.). New York, Center for Migration Studies 1983, pp. 64–83.
- HORÁKOVÁ, M. (1994): Krátkodobá pracovní migrace z České republiky do Spolkové republiky Německo na příkladu zaměstnávání tzv. sezónních pracovníků. Výzkumný ústav práce a sociálních věcí. Praha.
- HORÁKOVÁ, M. (1996): Pracovní pobyty českých občanů v Německu. Výzkumná zpráva č. 4. Výzkumný ústav práce a sociálních věcí. Praha.
- HORÁKOVÁ, M. (1998a): Pracovní migrace v ČR a její sociální souvislosti se zřetelem na regionální distribuci ekonomických aktivit cizinců v ČR a začlenění ČR do evropského prostoru. In: *Revitalizace problémových regionů*, UJEP Ústí n. L., s. 117–123.
- HORÁKOVÁ, M. (1998b): Vývoj mezinárodních pracovních migrací v České republice. Výzkumný ústav práce a sociálních věcí. Praha.
- HORÁKOVÁ, M. (1999): Migration in the Czech Republic. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Geographica*, 34, No. 1, pp. 129–145.
- HORÁKOVÁ, M. (2000a): Současný vývoj pracovních migrací v České republice. Výzkumný ústav práce a sociálních věcí. Praha.
- HORÁKOVÁ, M. (2000b): Vývoj pracovních migrací v České republice. Praha. Výzkumný ústav práce a sociálních věcí.
- HORÁKOVÁ, M. – DRBOHLAV, D. (1998): Mezinárodní migrace pracovních sil a Česká republika se zvláštním zaměřením na pracovní migrace Ukrajinců. *Demografie* 40, 1998, č. 1, str. 27–38.
- HORÁKOVÁ, M. – MACOUNOVÁ, I. (2003): Mezinárodní pracovní migrace v ČR. *Bulletin* č. 13. Praha, Výzkumný ústav práce a sociálních věcí 2003.
- HORÁLEK, M. A KOL. (1996): Zaměstnávání cizinců. Závěrečná zpráva. Díl 1. Analýza – komparace – návrhy. Díl 2. Legislativní úpravy ve vybraných zemích. Výzkumný ústav práce a sociálních věcí. Praha.
- JEŘÁBEK, M. (1998): Vytváření přeshraničního trhu práce – pendlerství v česko-německém pohraničí. In: *Demografie* 1/98, s. 39–42, Praha.
- K národní a rasové nesnášenlivosti. Institut pro výzkum veřejného mínění, 31. ledna 2000. Praha.
- K zaměstnávání cizinců v českých podnicích. Institut pro výzkum veřejného mínění, 12. března 1997. Praha.
- KOLLÁR, D. (2000): Slovenská migrácia za pracou do Rakúska – realita verzus predstavy. In: *Geografie* 105, č. 1, s. 41–49, Praha.
- KROUPA, A. A KOL. (1997): Nelegální zaměstnávání a podnikání cizinců na českém trhu práce. Praha. Výzkumný ústav práce a sociálních věcí.
- LEE, E. S. (1966): A Theory of Migration. *Demography*, 3, str. 47–57.
- LEVITT, P. – DEWIND, J. – VETROVEC, S. (2003): International Perspectives on Transnational Migration: An Introduction. *International Migration Review*, Vol. 37, 2003, No. 143, pp. 565–575.
- LUPTÁK, M. – DRBOHLAV, D. (1999): Labour Migration and Democratic Institutions in the Czech Republic (on the Example of Ukrainian Workers). Research report for NATO – within Democratic Institutions, individual fellowship program 1995/1997. Prague, 109 pp.
- LUTZ, W. (1999): Will Europe Be Short of Children? *Family Observer*, Luxembourg, European Commission, pp. 8–16.
- MABOGUNJE, A. L. (1970): Systems Approach to a Theory of Rural-Urban Migration. *Geographical Analysis*, Vol. 2, 1970, No. 1, pp. 1–18.
- MAREŠOVÁ, J. (1991): Vybrané aspekty mezinárodní migrace v souvislosti s jejími dopady na čs. pracovní trh. Praha, Výzkumný ústav práce a sociálních věcí.
- MAREŠOVÁ, J. (1993): Současné tendence zahraniční migrace na území České republiky z hlediska pracovního trhu. Praha. Výzkumný ústav práce a sociálních věcí.
- MAREŠOVÁ, J. (1999): The Czech Republic. In: *Trends in International Migration*. Paris, OECD, pp. 124–127.
- MARTIN, P. – TAYLOR, J. E. (1995): Guest Worker Program and Policies. Washington, the Urban Institute 1995.
- MASSEY, D. S. (1988): Economic Development and International Migration in Comparative Perspective. *Population and Development Review*, 14, č. 3, str. 383–413.
- MASSEY, D. S. – ARANGO, J. – HUGO, G. – KOUAOUCCI, A. – PELLEGRINO, A. – TAYLOR, J. E. (1998): *Worlds in Motion; Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

- MYRDAL, G. (1957): *Economic Theory and Under-developed Regions*. London, Gerald Duckwords, 168 pp.
- MATUŠKOVÁ, A. (1998): Stabilita pracovních sil, problémy nezaměstnanosti a ochota pracovat u zahraničních zaměstnavatelů v okrese Plzeň-město. In: *Miscellanea Geographica Universitatis Bohemiae Occidentalis* 6/1998, ZČU Plzeň, s. 190–193.
- O názorech na možnost azylu v ČR. Institut pro výzkum veřejného mínění, 9. června 2000. Praha.
- OLSSON, G. (1965): *Distance and Human Interaction. A Migration Study*. *Geografiska Annaler*, 47, str. 3–43.
- PORTES, A. – GUARNIZO, L. I. – LANDOLT, P. (1993): The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 22, 1999, No. 2, pp. 217–237.
- Postoje občanů k problematice uprchlíků. Institut pro výzkum veřejného mínění, 12. června 2000. Praha.
- POULAIN, M. – HERM, A. (2003): An Overview and Comparison of the state of migration in EU countries? What the data reveal. In: *The Second Workshop on Demographic and Cultural Specificity and Integration of Migrants (NIEPS, 21–23 March, 2002, Helsinki, Finland)*. The Population research Institute Working Papers E 16/2003. Helsinki, The Population Research Institute of the Family Federation of Finland in cooperation with the NIEPS, 2003.
- POULAIN, M. (1990): Towards a Harmonization of Migration Statistics within the Scope of the European Community. Paper for Presentation at the Symposium on the Demographic Consequences of International Migration, Wassenaar, September 1990.
- PRYOR, R. J. (1983): Integrating International and Internal Migration Theories. In: *Global Trends in Migration: Theory and Research on International Population Movements*. Kritz, M. M., Keely, Ch. B., Tomasi, S. M. (Eds.). New York, Center for Migration Studies 1983, pp. 110–132.
- RAVENSTEIN, E. G. (1885): The Laws of Migration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 48, str. 167–235.
- RAVENSTEIN, E. G. (1889): The Laws of Migration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 52, str. 241–301.
- SCHREMMER, CH. (1999): Szenarien der EU-Osterweiterung: Zusammenfassung der Auswirkungen. In: *Regionale Auswirkungen der EU-Integration der Mittel- und Osteuropäischen Länder*. Wien 1999: (ÖROK-Publikation Nr. 146, Band II.) s. 87–95.
- ŠELEPOVÁ, P. (1998): *Zahraniční pracovní migrace v ČR*. Magisterská práce. Praha, Přírodovědecká fakulta UK 1998.
- SJAASTAD, L. A. (1962): The Costs and Returns of Human Migration. *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 70, Supplement: October 1962, No. 5 (Part 2), pp. 80–93.
- STOUFFER, S. (1940): Intervening Opportunities: a Theory Relating Mobility and Distance. *American Sociological Review*, 5, str. 845–867.
- VAISHAR, A. (2000): Vnímání česko-rakouského a česko-slovenského pohraničí lokální populací. In: *Geografie* 105, č. 1, s. 94–97, Praha.
- Veřejné mínění k zaměstnávání cizinců v ČR. Institut pro výzkum veřejného mínění, 8. února 1999. Praha.
- WALLACE, C. – CHMULIAR, O. – SIDORENKO, E. (1996): The Eastern Frontier of Western Europe: Mobility in the Buffer Zone. *New Community*, Vol. 22, 1996, No. 2, pp. 259–286.
- WANG, X (1998): *Chinese Enterprises in Prague: The Formation of an Ethnic Economic Niche*. A research report worked out within Dartmouth College Foreign Program at Charles University in Prague. Prague.
- WHITE, M. J. – IMAI, Y. (1994): The Impact of U.S. Immigration Upon Internal Migration. *Population and Environment: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, Vol. 15, 1994, No. 3, pp. 189–209.
- WOODS, R. (1982): *Theoretical Population Geography*. New York, Longman Inc.
- ZELINSKI, W. (1971): The Hypothesis of Mobility Transition. *The Geographical Review*, 61, č. 2, str. 219–249.
- ZIPF, G. K. (1949): *Human Behavior and the Principle of Least Effort*. New York, Hafner.

MIGRACE A MOBILITA OBYVATELSTVA V ČESKÉ REPUBLICE – REFLEXE VYBRANÝCH KONCEPTŮ A TEORIÍ

Résumé

Nová politická, sociální a ekonomická situace v České republice po roce 1989 ovlivnila i prostorovou mobilitu obyvatelstva. V první části příspěvku jsou charakterizovány hlavní vývojové rysy mobility obyvatelstva a její vztah k vývoji společnosti. V širším kontextu je prostorová mobilita především chápána jako důležitá součást fungování sídelních systémů. Nedílnou součástí úvodní části je i diskuse metodických problémů spojených především s definicemi jednotlivých procesů a s věrohodností statistických dat. Vedle ostatních forem prostorové mobility obyvatelstva je největší pozornost věnována mezinárodní migraci. Především v souvislosti s tímto procesem jsou diskutovány různé koncepty a teorie. Jedná se např. o tradiční migrační koncept „push-pull“, teorie sítí, dvojího trhu či institucionální teorii. Zvláštní pozornost je věnována teorii „cumulative causation“ a modelu tzv. S-křivky. Uvedené teorie a od nich se odvíjející hypotézy jsou verifikovány v podmínkách současné migrační situace v České republice.