

Miloslav Šašek

University of J. E. Purkyně in Ústí nad Labem

INFLUENCE OF MIGRATION ON POPULATIONAL AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

This contribution continues with the topic the author dealt with in contributions read in recent years in conferences in Ústí nad Labem and Jelenia Gora. In the theoretical part the author tries to describe the links between migration and population and regional development. In the analytical part the author continues in migration development observation and in observation of its influence on population development, especially within the transformation period of the most important cities and towns of the Czech Republic.

2. Literature discussion

Till 50s natural rise in population had a considerable share in population increase in individual towns and cities and regions (except for migration movements in border regions of the Czech Republic.) After the World Wars migration of population becomes the main bearer of changes in the overall space structure of population and simultaneously it becomes a mechanism of the urbanisation process. A study of space aspects of migration becomes therefore one of the most important task in social geography. According to Kühnl [1975] it is possible to qualify migration as a certain type of regional process and by its observation it is possible to contribute to understanding the complex social geographical system as a regional structure or a structure of settlement. The relationship between migration and geographical organisation of a

society leads to work on observation of links between migration streams and economic development of an area, directing of inventions, intensity of house building and geographical position (e.g. [Kühnl 1978, Drbohlav 1986; 1989]).

As Hampl, Gardavský, Kühnl [1987] say migration of population is in essence a basic mechanism of a concentration process. In our literature there are works where migration of population is observed in bonds with urbanisation, development of space structure of population, sociogeographical regionalisation. These works are for example Kühnl [1975; 1979; 1989], Hampl [1972], Hampl, Ježek, Kühnl [1978; 1981], Šašek [1997]. Migration is therefore a process of development but from the point of view of relatively short time periods it could be understood as a structural process declaring certain regional relations in the present (expression of regional integrity and so on). Migration is a “structural” regional process and its observation is closely connected to regional development and regional politics.

In 70s and 80s greater attention was paid to evaluation of migration in wider connection to overall dynamics of population. Migration was understood as a multilaterally conditioned process and its study got gradually interdisciplinary character.

Geographical study of migration is not to be understood as a mere description of a narrow conception of migration process space arrangement but as a study which evaluate also all the factors conditioning migration within which intensity of migration links decreases with the distance to emigration and immigration areas and movement between greater distances is predominantly movement between the centres of settlement. Each one of the more important migration streams is to be understood in connection with its migration counter stream. Mere distance is modified by extent and a character of obstacles and by the opportunities lying between observed centres of population; from which it is clear that in areas with lower density of population an average migration contact distance is higher. Differences in importance of distance for migration of population reflect therefore the character of regions.

Centres of settlement are in essence a core for settlement structure of geographical regionalisation. They are bound to a deciding part of commuting to work and services. The same as for migration applies there, that is to say a greater part of this phenomena is happening between centres of settlement (towns and cities).

Among above mentioned forms of movement of population there are some connections, especially a certain sequence, substitution or supplement of these forms. For example commuting is often regarded as a certain pre-step of migration (see [Čermák 1996]) or it substitute migration to certain distance (time distance). Generally it can be said that there is a considerable interconnection of all forms of population territorial mobility.

In today's literature more attention is paid to evaluation of migration in wider connection to overall dynamics of population. Nowadays variability of all forms of population movement is increasing, so it applies for migration as well. Very simply speaking there is deviation from one side concentrationally orientated movements from villages to towns and cities that were dominant in the past. Moreover nowa-

days the processes of concentration as well as deconcentration are happening even more visibly. On the whole importance the saldo part of migration is decreasing and importance of equal migration exchange between individual centres is increasing. "New forms of concentration are typical for their integration function. They create organic system of qualitatively higher type" [Čermák 1993]. This concept agrees with more general transformation "concentration of phenomena and concentration of phenomenon contacts" [Hampel 1989]. Migration as one of the forms of population space mobility is understood as a multilaterally and very complicatedly conditioned process whose external conditions especially economic conditions are combined with internal conditions – especially socio-psychological conditions. The study of migration has got gradually an interdisciplinary character. Attention is paid particularly to the general problems of spatial behaviour of population and to causes and motives of this behaviour.

Migration in connection with political and economic changes after 1989 is the topic of study for example for Z. Čermák [1996; 1997; 2001]. In evaluation of migration development in 90s he draws attention to influence of considerable house building decrease on deepening the tendency to overall migration mobility decreasing. Furthermore he analyses the changes of migration streams according to the municipality size categories. The author also observes different preference in connection with age and education of migrants. D. Bartoňová [1997] and A. Andrlé [1997] deal with internal and foreign migration of population in the Czech Republic in 90s from the point of view of a demographic structure of the migrants. Contributions by A. Andrlé [2002] and M. Šásek [2003] are aimed at migration in the Czech Republic (or in Ústí nad Labem region) in the second half of 90s from the point of view of education of the migrants. M. Aleš [2001] focuses on evaluation of internal migration in the Czech Republic in 80s and 90s especially from the point of view of its volume and its structure, main migration streams and the migration causes. He draws attention to the fact that so far the main streams of migration have been given by arrangement of house building, but at the same time migration reacts only to a small extent to regional changes in labour market. Z. Čermák [1999] exemplifies the similarity of migration processes development in middle European countries in the transformation period.

3. Migration in Prague

Prague became a dominant centre of migration movements within the settlement system of the Czech Republic in the transformation period. It lures university students from the whole Czech Republic when the percentage of university students in the overall migration rises noticeably. If we look at the migration of the capital city and its suburbs, i. e. Prague-east and Prague-west regions, we can say that migration of Prague and these regions is raised noticeably by the university students. Deciding factor is movement of former university students now professionally matured, i. e. between 35

and 39 years old. The percentage of university students in migration saldo of Prague-west is created by Prague 85% and over 80% on turnover. If we look at migration of Prague with individual regions of Central Bohemia regions, we can see the increasing share of the nearest Prague surrounding on university student migration. The share of Prague-east and Prague-west regions on migration turnover of university students increased from 38.4% in 1992-1994 to 54,6% in 2001-2003. Within the whole observed period 1992-2003 the share of these regions in migration saldo was 90.9%, on the other hand the share in migration turnover was 49% (see the table).

Similar changes in migration movements in places with their own background can be found in Brno, Ostrava, and Plzeň. However these changes occurred later than in central Bohemia. In Brno there were relatively small values of migration saldo with Brno-suburb region in 1992-1994, in Plzeň the saldo with its suburbs was nearly zero in the same period. Not early than in 1995-1997 migration saldo increased radically not only by the whole migration, but also by university students. In Ostrava similar migration movements were aimed at the Nový Jičín and Frýdek-Místek regions. In the monitored period the migration saldo with Nový Jičín was steady in time by the whole migration, but at the same time it rose in Frýdek-Místek. In saldo of university students there is a statistically important rise from insignificant values in the second half of the monitored period. Completely different migration movements can be observed between Ostrava and Karviná region whose economics was fully based on the heavy industry. Within the whole monitored period Ostrava has a positive saldo with this region by university students and in the second half of the given period also the overall saldo became positive.

Table 1. Natural, migration and total increase in selected regions in Czech Republic

	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006		
	PP	MP	CP	PP	MP	CP	PP	MP	CP	PP	MP	CP	PP	MP	CP
Praha východ	-2,1	19,6	17,5	-2,0	20,3	18,2	0,6	30,2	30,9	1,2	36,0	37,2	3,3	32,0	35,3
Praha západ	-0,5	26,2	25,7	-0,3	24,5	24,1	0,8	34,2	35,0	3,0	42,1	45,2	4,0	44,4	48,0
Plzeň jih	-2,6	6,1	3,5	-2,5	9,7	7,2	-2,4	8,2	5,9	-1,4	7,0	5,6	0,4	5,3	5,7
Plzeň sever	-1,9	7,0	5,0	-1,7	10,2	8,5	-0,8	9,6	8,6	-0,9	9,5	8,6	0,1	11,2	11,2
Brno venkov	-1,7	9,4	7,8	-1,9	14,1	12,2	0,1	14,7	14,8	-0,1	5,0	4,9	1,4	7,6	9,0
ČR	-1,5	1,2	-0,3	-1,7	2,5	0,8	-0,9	1,8	0,9	-0,6	3,5	3,0	0,1	3,4	3,5
Středočeský	-1,7	5,9	4,2	-2,1	8,4	6,3	-1,5	8,4	7,3	-0,6	12,8	12,2	0,2	5,3	5,5
ZČ	-1,9	1,5	-0,4	-2,3	3,7	1,3	-1,7	0,8	-0,9	-0,7	4,2	3,5	-0,2	5,7	5,4
JIM	-1,7	-0,7	-2,4	-1,8	2,5	0,7	-0,8	1,4	0,6	-0,8	0,9	0,1	-0,1	2,1	1,2

Source: self-made from database of Czech statistical office.

4. Influence of migration on populational development

In 2006 natural currency of the population of the Czech Republic changed after 12 years. More children were born than people died. If we look at the regional differences of this factor, we find out that the migration movements in the Czech Republic influenced these differences to a great extent in the transformation period. While the value of natural increase in the whole Czech Republic is 0.1 per mille, in the Central Bohemia region it has a double value, in Prague-east and Prague-west it reaches 3.3, or 4 per mille. A positive value of a natural change occurred in rural areas of Prague already in 2004, but it was at 1/5 height of the value in 2006. In rural areas of Brno and Plzeň the value of natural increase was positive not early than in 2006 and it reached noticeably lower values than the suburbs of Prague. If we look at the migration increase development in these regions in time, we find out that in Prague-east the value increased from 1.1 to 32 per-mille, in Prague-west it rose from 5.3 to 44.4 per mille, in Brno-suburb from 0 to 7.6 per mille, in Plzeň-south from -1 to 5.3 and in Plzeň-north from 0.2 to 11.2 per mille in the period between 1993-2006. The fact is that younger age groups of population have the distinct part in the migration movements and so it is clear that immigrants to the suburbs of big cities/towns decided to carry out their reproduction. And because the processes of suburbanization and metropolization started to work more intensively in the suburb of Prague and also in advance before other big cities/towns, we find there noticeably higher values of natural and overall increase. This is also caused by the fact that the attractiveness of Prague in comparison with other towns and cities is multiple.

Table 2. Total migration Prague with districts of Central Bohemian Region

District	1992-1994		1995-1997		1998-2000		2001-2003		1992-2003	
	Net m.	Gross m.	Net m.	Gross m.	Net m.	Gross m.	Net m.	Gross m.	Net m.	Gross m.
Benešov	-8	2 614	-398	2 328	-703	2 313	-520	2 582	-1 629	9 837
Beroun	-226	1 834	-467	1 713	-694	1 882	-928	2 386	-2 315	7 815
Kladno	-421	3 287	-1 061	3 401	-1 321	3 629	-751	4 059	-3 554	14 376
Kutná Hora	53	1 067	-42	992	-131	1 007	23	1 209	-97	4 275
Mělník	-117	2 347	-633	2 179	-738	2 052	-384	3 270	-1 902	9 748
Mladá Boleslav	-70	1 250	-307	1 159	-238	1 132	-58	1 574	-673	5 115
Nymburk	-193	1 543	-437	1 565	-873	1 985	-515	2 603	-2 018	7 696
Rakovník	93	885	-75	797	-222	812	-108	906	-312	3 400
Příbram	78	2 032	-180	1 836	-325	1 909	-135	2 115	-562	7 892
9 okresů Σ	-811	16 759	-3 630	15 970	-5 245	16 721	-3 376	20 704	-13 062	70 154
Praha -východ	-514	5 282	-1 404	5 210	-3 302	5 500	-3 732	9 060	-8 952	26 052
Praha -západ	-886	5 620	1 942	5 622	-4 941	8 019	-5 033	9 643	-12 782	29 004
Středočeský k. Σ	-2 211	27 661	-6 976	26 802	-13 488	30 240	-12 141	39 407	-34 796	125 210
Share PZ+PV na Σ%	63,3	39,4	48	40,4	61,6	44,7	72,1	47,5	62,5	44

Source: self-made from database of Czech statistical office.

Table 3. Migration of Prague university graduates with selected districts of Central Bohemia

Districts	1992-1994		1995-1997		1998-2000		2001-2003		1992-2003	
	Net m.	Gross m.	Net m.	Gross m.	Net m.	Gross m.	Net m.	Gross m.	Net m.	Gross m.
Benešov	26	270	3	217	-20	242	-16	304	-7	1 033
Beroun	21	181	-31	167	-74	238	-143	309	-227	895
Kladno	22	384	-66	386	-102	440	-105	473	-251	1 683
Kutná Hora	42	128	7	95	11	133	31	131	91	487
Mělník	26	236	-26	192	-5	207	-13	281	-18	916
Mladá Boleslav	-11	191	18	148	26	198	12	224	45	761
Nymburk	9	175	-16	184	-55	241	-54	276	-116	876
Rakovník	6	118	4	96	-8	90	8	116	10	410
Příbram	40	260	11	213	11	241	-12	256	50	970
9 okresů Σ	181	1 943	-96	1 698	-216	2 030	-292	2 370	-423	8 031
Praha -východ	-109	573	-217	643	-515	883	-798	1 254	-1 639	3 353
Praha -západ	-163	639	-328	728	-1 010	1 391	-1 092	1 600	-2 593	4 359
Středočeský k. Σ	-91	3 155	-641	3 069	-1 741	4 304	-2 182	5 224	-4 655	15 743
Share PZ+PV na Σ%	298	38,4	85	44,7	87,6	52,9	86,6	54,6	90,9	49

Source: self-made from database of Czech statistical office.

Table 4. Migration between Brno city and district Brno venkov in age group in total

	1992-1994			1995-1997			1998-2000			2001-2003			1992-2003		
20-24	518	610	92	557	512	-45	532	415	-117	520	326	-194	2 127	1 863	-264
25-29	458	517	59	515	360	-155	587	442	-145	896	526	-370	2 456	1 845	-611
30-34	285	250	-35	388	217	-171	446	212	-234	652	253	-399	1 771	932	-839
35-39	202	172	-30	232	135	-97	310	119	-191	502	142	-360	1 246	568	-678
40-49	330	309	-21	473	230	-243	514	203	-311	731	198	-533	2 048	940	-1 108
50-59	204	136	-68	260	123	-137	402	144	-258	650	133	-517	1 516	536	-980
60+	254	200	-54	301	193	-108	284	163	-121	458	141	-317	1 297	697	-600
Total	2251	2194	-57	726	1770	-956	3075	1698	-1377	409	1719	-2690	12 461	7381	-5080

Source: self-made from database of Czech statistical office.

Table 5. Migration between Brno city and district Brno venkov in age group of UE

	1992-1994			1995-1997			1998-2000			2001-2003			1992-2003		
20-24	32	27	-5	9	27	18	32	20	-12	27	17	-10	100	90	-9
25-29	79	96	17	98	76	-22	119	68	-51	153	93	-60	449	333	-116
30-34	58	44	-14	83	63	-20	135	47	-88	193	54	-139	469	208	-261
35-39	40	22	-18	45	29	-16	83	15	-68	152	36	-116	320	102	-218
40-49	46	41	-5	83	28	-55	115	36	-79	188	32	-156	432	137	-295
50-59	20	18	*2	41	29	-12	83	13	-70	124	17	-108	268	77	-191
60+	22	12	-10	25	10	-15	21	10	-11	62	12	-50	130	44	-86
Total	297	260	-37	384	262	-122	588	209	-379	899	261	-638	2 168	992	-1 176

Source: self-made from database of Czech statistical office.

Table 6. Migration between Plzeň and district Plzeň jih age group in total

	1992-1994			1995-1997			1998-2000			2001-2003			1992-2003		
20-24	225	277	52	206	199	-7	182	187	5	199	163	-36	812	826	14
25-29	178	165	-13	143	104	-39	186	159	-27	303	176	-127	810	604	-206
30-34	89	66	-23	106	65	-36	147	60	-87	178	85	-93	515	276	-239
35-39	82	54	-28	77	44	-33	105	42	-63	119	56	-63	383	196	-187
40-49	105	101	-4	138	58	-80	204	77	-127	232	57	-175	679	293	-386
50-59	86	49	-37	99	36	-63	167	43	-124	182	36	-146	534	164	-370
60+	83	83	0	92	110	18	96	95	-1	113	72	-41	384	360	-24
Total	848	795	-53	856	616	-240	1 087	663	-424	1 326	645	-681	4 117	2 719	-1 398

Source: self-made from database of Czech statistical office.

Table 7. Migration between Plzeň and district Plzeň jih in age group of UE

	1992-1994			1995-1997			1998-2000			2001-2003			1992-2003		
20-24	6	13	7	9	5	-4	10	20	10	14	22	8	39	60	21
25-29	21	32	11	16	15	-1	17	28	8	49	33	-16	103	105	2
30-34	9	16	7	19	15	-4	26	12	-14	28	17	-11	82	60	-22
35-39	13	8	-5	15	6	-9	18	4	-14	26	7	-19	72	25	-47
40-49	8	13	5	7	6	-1	30	6	-24	45	7	-38	90	32	-58
50-59	11	3	-8	8	1	-7	19	9	-10	28	5	-23	66	18	-48
60+	4	1	-3	4	2	-2	12	3	-9	13	2	-11	33	8	-25
Total	72	86	14	78	50	-28	132	79	-53	203	93	-110	485	308	-177

Source: self-made from database of Czech statistical office.

Table 8. Migration between Plzeň and district Plzeň sever age group in total

	1992-1994			1995-1997			1998-2000			2001-2003			1992-2003		
20-24	273	342	69	264	237	-27	290	231	-59	273	177	-96	1 100	987	-113
25-29	176	224	48	178	135	-43	262	183	-79	349	258	-91	965	800	-165
30-34	100	91	-9	108	83	-25	188	96	-92	208	93	-115	604	363	-241
35-39	82	64	-18	84	53	-31	121	41	-81	150	79	71	437	237	-200
40-49	150	102	-48	206	90	-116	234	75	-159	277	97	-180	867	364	-503
50-59	82	47	-35	120	36	-84	160	45	-115	213	47	-166	575	175	-400
60+	100	92	-8	97	104	7	104	94	-10	159	72	-87	460	362	-98
Total	963	962	-1	1 057	738	-319	1 359	765	-594	1 629	823	-806	5 008	3 288	-1 720

Source: self-made from database of Czech statistical office.

Table 9. Migration between Plzeň city and district Plzeň sever in age group of UE

	1992-1994			1995-1997			1998-2000			2001-2003			1992-2003		
20-24	10	17	7	12	5	-7	16	23	7	12	10	-2	50	55	5
25-29	17	30	13	22	16	-6	28	22	-6	51	33	-18	118	101	-17
30-34	16	10	-6	20	10	-10	45	13	-32	35	12	-23	116	45	-71
35-39	18	11	-7	11	7	-4	25	6	-19	33	9	-24	87	33	-54
40-49	11	10	-1	21	6	-15	40	15	-25	57	12	-45	129	43	-86
50-59	7	4	-3	11	0	-11	26	5	-21	30	4	-26	74	13	-61
60+	4	3	-1	4	4	0	12	3	-9	18	1	-17	38	11	-27
Total	83	85	2	101	48	-53	192	87	-105	236	81	-155	612	301	-311

Source: self-made from database of Czech statistical office.

5. Conclusion

The analysis of migration streams in the suburbs of cities/towns in the Czech Republic proves that the processes of suburbanization and metropolization developed in the most intensive way in the suburb of Prague. The percentage of university students within migration movements rises noticeably as well. The preceding migration gains causes present increase of a birth rate in the suburbs of big cities/towns where the value of natural increase is distinctly higher than the average of the Czech Republic. We can say that transformation success will probably bring in some successful regions a statistically important populational increase as it is seen in the analyses of big Czech city/town rural areas.

Literature

- Aleš M., *Vnitřní migrace v České republice v letech 1980-1999*, „Demografie” 2001, 43, č. 3, s. 187-201.
- Andrle A., *Vnitřní stěhování v České republice podle pohlaví a věku*, „Demografie” 1997, 39, č. 2, s. 131-132.
- Andrle A., *Stěhování v České republice podle vzdělání migrantů v letech 1993-1998*, „Demografie” 2002, 44, č. 1, s. 70-75.
- Bartoňová D., *Demografické aspekty vnitřní a zahraniční migrace v České republice v 90. letech*, „Demografie”, 1997, 39, č. 4, s. 248-256.
- Čermák Z., *Geografické aspekty prostorové mobility obyvatelstva. Kandidátská disertační práce*, Univerzita Karlova, Přírodovědecká fakulta, Praha 1993.
- Čermák Z., *Internal migration in the Czech Republic during period of transition*, Acta Facultatis Rerum Naturalium Universitatis Comenianae – Geographica, 1996, 37, s. 122-130.
- Čermák Z., *Transformační procesy a migrační vývoj v České republice*, [in:] M. Hampl a kol.: *Geografická organizace společnosti a transformační procesy v České republice*, Universita Karlova, Přírodovědecká fakulta, Praha 1996, s. 179-197.
- Čermák Z., *Geografické aspekty vnitřní migrace v České republice*, „Demografie” 1997, 39, č. 4, s. 242-248.
- Čermák Z., *Migrační aspekty dlouhodobého vývoje Prahy se zvláštním zřetelem k transformačnímu období devadesátých let*, *Geografie – sborník České geografické společnosti*, 1999, 104, č. 2, s. 122-132.
- Čermák Z., *Vývoj migrační mobility v devadesátých letech v České republice*, [in:] J. Musil, Z. Pavlík, (eds.): Hampl M. a kol.: *Regionální vývoj: Specifika české transformace, evropská integrace a obecná teorie*, Přírodovědecká fakulta Univerzity Karlovy, katedra sociální geografie a regionálního rozvoje, Praha 2001, s. 87-98.
- Drbohlav D., *Motivy migrace jako jeden z indikátorů formování geografické struktury organizace společnosti*, „Demografie” 1986, 28, č. 3, s. 202-209.
- Drbohlav D., *Migrační motivace, regionální a sídelní preference obyvatelstva. Kandidátská disertační práce*, Karlova univerzita, Přírodovědecká fakulta, Praha 1989.
- Hampl M., *K problematice vývoje sociálně-geografické diferenciaci*. Výzkumná zpráva, Přírodovědecká fakulta UK, Praha 1972.
- Hampl M., *Hierarchie reality a studium sociálněgeografických systémů*, Rozpravy ČSAV, řada matematických a přírodních věd, 99, sešit 1, Academia Praha, Praha 1989.
- Hampl M., Gardavský V., Kühnl K., *Regionální struktura a vývoj systému osídlení ČSR*, Univerzita Karlova, Praha 1987.
- Hampl M., Ježek J., Kühnl K., *Sociálně geografická regionalizace ČSR*, VÚSEI, Praha 1978.
- Hampl M., Ježek J., Kühnl K., *K problematice vymezení a hodnocení urbanizovaných prostorů v ČSR*, Referát přednesený na semináři k problémům ekonomické geografie v Alšovicích – listopad 1981. GgÚ ČSAV, Sborník prací 8, Brno 1981, s. 73-102.
- Kühnl K., *Geografická struktura migrace obyvatelstva v Čechách. Kandidátská disertační práce*, Karlova univerzita, Přírodovědecká fakulta, Praha 1975.
- Kühnl K., *Selected Aspect of Migration Motivation in the Czech Socialist Republic*, Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Geographica, 1978, 13, č. 1, s. 3-11.
- Šašek M., *Vývojové tendence sídelní struktury Severočeského kraje. Ústí nad Labem*, Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně, Acta Universitatis Purkynianae 1997, 22, s. 130.
- Šašek M., *Regionální Differences in Educational Development in the North Bohemia*, *E+M Economics and Management (Ekonomie a Management)*, Masarykova Univerzita v Brně, TU v Liberci, 2003, s. 76-81.
- Šašek M., *Migration in the Northern Bohemian Region in the 1983-1988 and 1991-1995*, Mezinárodní konference: Geographical space at the turn of the century, Warsaw University Faculty of Geography and Regional studies, Warsaw 2003, s. 51-54.

Šašek M., *Regional Differences in Educational Structures of Migrants and Their Impact on the Educational Structures in the Regions*, Mezinárodní konference, Prace Naukowe Akademii Ekonomicznej we Wrocławiu, „Gospodarka lokalna i regionalna w teorii i praktyce”, AE, Wrocław 2003, s. 566-572.

Šašek M., *Několik poznámek ke vzdělanostní struktuře migrantů v ČR v letech 1996-2001*, Ve sborníku: VI. Mezinárodní kolokvium o regionálních vědách, Masarykova univerzita v Brně Ekonomicko-správní fakulta, Sborník referátů z mezinárodního kolokvia v Pavlově 2003, s. 169-177.

WPLYW PROCESÓW MIGRACYJNYCH NA LUDNOŚĆ I ROZWÓJ REGIONALNY

Streszczenie

Niniejsza praca stanowi kontynuację problemu, nad którym autor pracuje od kilku lat i który prezentował już wielokrotnie podczas konferencji w Ústí nad Labem i w Jeleniej Górze. W części teoretycznej artykułu podjęto próbę opisu wzajemnych relacji pomiędzy procesami migracyjnymi a ludnością oraz rozwojem regionalnym. W części analitycznej autor kontynuuje temat obserwacji rozwoju migracji oraz jego wpływu na rozwój ludności, zwłaszcza w okresie transformacji najważniejszych miast Republiki Czech.