

**Miloslav Šašek**

University of J.E. Purkyně in Ústí nad Labem

## **SOME ASPECTS OF MIGRATION IN THE PERIOD OF TRANSFORMATION IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC**

### **1. Introduction**

The paper is next to follow the earlier papers from the conference „Gospodarka lokalna i regionalna w teorii i praktyce”. The author monitors an internal migration among individual Czech regions and migration of the regional cities in the four three-year periods (1992-1994, 1995-1997, 1998-2000, 2001-2003) for the people 20+ in comparison with a total migration and populational migration with a university degree. The age of migrants is monitored according to seven age categories: 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-49, 50-59 and 60+.

The populational migration is a relevant part of migrational processes determining geographical organisation of the society. Unlike a national reproduction its effect is more variable in time and regionally (at lower units) too. Migration may seem to be a simple process, however, its complexity is given by a plurality and heterogeneity determined by various factors and similarly by the consequences of migrational shifts. The migrational variability represents a significant indicator of regional development and at the same time represents a process influencing the character of regional differentiation. It's obvious that migration represents one of the key features of the settlements development. Migrational study plays an important role in the evaluation of transition shifts in the Czech Republic after 1990.

The migrational development in the Czech republic and in the other post-communist countries in Central Europe is at the moment connected with general features of the development at the global level. The most relevant trends of

migrational processes in economically developed countries are determined by the development of new kinds of settlement systems. It is perhaps most obvious with the process of suburbanisation. For this process is typical a spatial dissemination of urbanized areas. In suburban environs of big cities there is a populational growth. The migrational waves directing here both from an outer agglomeration and mostly from central zones of these urban areas. Mainly the middle class and upper-middle class take part in this kind of migration. Suburbanisation cannot be reduced only to shifts in populational distribution. Apart from housing features in further stages there is a decentralisation of some commercial activities. In a broad sense the suburbanisation is a part of social shifts determined by for example new behavioral patterns.

Trends of an internal migration and its regional structures changed radically during the monitored period as a consequence of economic and social shifts in Czech society. The drop in migration mobility continued since 1970s and 1980s which resulted in a decrease of a long distance mobility figures and migrational 'enclosure' of territorial units of district level. Most of all, the process of populational concentration ceased. A migrational attraction of smaller municipalities (up to 5.000 inhabitants) increased. On the other hand big and subsequently smaller municipalities (with more than 5.000 inhabitants) had a migrational shortage. There are apparent deconcentration tendencies in large cities. The role of commuting mobility increases, both daily and weekly commuting. However, transition of the Czech Republic (which significantly increased a life standard diversity of regions) didn't stimulate any significant migrational mobility. Migration didn't contribute to a levelling of a life standard among regions, as expected. The drop in migrational turnover, mainly of a long distances, ceased around 1995. Eventually, the volume of a migration freezed.

During the transition period the process of a suburbanisation and metropolisation intensified. At a start Prague began to lose its population (since 1992), followed by large cities. Since 1994 mid-sized cities (20 – 50.000 inhabitants) began to lose. Since 1994 the cities with 10 – 20.000 inhabitants were losing. In 1999 for a first time the municipalities with 5 – 10.000 inhabitants began to lose.

## **2. Migration of the Czech most important cities with their environs**

In spite of many adverse factors from the shifts in both horizontal and vertical structure of migrational ties it's obvious that the development of migration in the 1990s was more and more determined by suburban processes. At the beginning of a new century we can see these as dominant within the whole Czech migration system. This trend is ultimately confirmed by a negative migrational balance in big cities and by a growth of small towns in their environs.

There were relevant migrational suburbanisation ties not only in the largest agglomerations of Prague, Brno, Plzeň or Ostrava but also in a hundred-thousand city category such as Hradec Králové, Olomouc and České Budějovice. For the purpose of this report we have defined the expected suburban environs of these cities by reducing the administrative borders of particular districts, however, the development of migrational ties in these units in 1992-2003 confirmed the development of suburban processes. In the first half of the 1990s the nucleus cities of these agglomerations began to lose in migration with its environs.

The number of emigrants from the nucleus began gradually increasing. For instance, for Prague this suburban wave in 2000-2002 meant almost a half of all emigrants (46.1%). Districts making an agglomeration environs used to have highest migrational gains since the beginning of 1990s. For instance, in 2000-2002 (when 90% of districts had an average annual migrational balance from -3 per mille up to +3 per mille) the figure for the district Prague-East was +16.8 per mille, for Prague-West even +24.3 per mille, however, for Brno-country-side 6.9 per mille and for Plzeň-South 6.6 per mille.

Let's have a look at the development of mutual migrational ties between Prague nucleus agglomeration, its environs and other Czech areas. We have mentioned earlier the basic features of the development of the migrational nucleus balance – of Prague in its administrative borders. The most significant differences were in an age pattern migrational balance. Despite the overall losses Prague is gaining population in a younger productive age (18-30 years), which means the category with a highest migrational mobility. For other age groups the balance of immigrants and emigrants is negative. This traditional migrational pattern of cities in developed countries (typical for its unattractiveness for elderly people) is enhanced in the case of Prague by an increasing migrational gains of a narrow age interval.

Migration thus influences demographic situation and prevents the ageing process of the Prague population (see Drbohlav-Čermák, 1988).

Prague is also attractive for people with higher education. In the 1990s this trend was enhanced. The share of university graduates in immigration increased from about 20% at the beginning of 1990s to 30% in 2000-2002. There are employment motivating reasons for moving to the nucleus of Prague agglomeration. However, the low motivation is attributed to housing problems. Apart from the above mentioned changes in the character of migrational balance of Prague with its environs there is a relevant shift in favour of increasing the share of immigrants from further areas – i.e. mainly from Moravian districts.

One of the most relevant migrational features of suburban processes is a migrational wave from the agglomeration nucleus towards its environs. In Prague agglomeration this wave has doubled during the last 12 years and represents the most vigorous trend of migration.

Monitoring the migration of Prague with the regions and districts confirms the increasing importance of the migration from Moravian regions to Prague. Prague has a positive migrational balance with all the regional cities. The share of university graduates influences the overall migrational balance (see the chart no. X). This share varies from 28.4% (Karlovy Vary) up to 84.4% (České Budějovice). Half of the cities have this share within the interval of 43-49%. This figure confirms the dominant position of Prague in a settlement system.

The share of university graduates in regional cities in migrational turnover with Prague varies from 18.3% (Ústí n. L.) up to 32.7% (Liberec). This share is significantly higher than the share of university graduates in population of particular cities. The share of university graduates in a turnover and migrational balance with Prague has increased in the period of economic transition.

Comparing the migrational turnover with regional cities of a total and migrational turnover of university graduates we end up with the share of regional cities in a total migrational turnover of 12.6% for the 25-29 age group. For this age group the graduates share is 21.5%. For the 30-34 age group the shares are 12.1% and 17.7%. These figures refer to a significant attractiveness of Prague for university graduates on the brink of their professional career.

For the migration of Prague with regions is typical increase of university graduates in total the turnover in time, for the whole monitored period, varies between 13% (Ústí nad Labem) and 25.1% (Moravskoslezský region). It is notable that these two regions have the highest unemployment rate in the country. With a new altered geopolitical situation of Northern Moravia came a highest migrational efficiency with Prague. Prague has a highest positive balance both in total and in university graduates with the Moravskoslezský region. The university graduates balance of Prague with most Czech regions is higher than the total (highest difference with the Ústí region) balance. The total migrational balance of Prague and all the Moravian regions is higher than the university graduates balance.

The growth of suburban processes is also confirmed by the shares of the districts in a migration of regional cities. The figures for 9 regional cities (not being independent municipal districts) illustrate the relevance of migration to their environs which is defined by their district borders. These districts have the highest share in evicted regional cities when in all cities some age groups reach more than a third from a total number of evicted population and for the age groups 30-34, 35-39 and 40-49 of evicted graduated population reach the maximum. The highest share is in districts in České Budějovice, Olomouc and Zlín whereas Ústí nad Labem reach the highest share in migration within the Ústí district. It is given by the character of this particular district where the four fifths of the population in the district live in a district city and therefore the city environs is low (see the details in the chart no.1, 2, 3).

Table 1. The share of the district in a total turnover and a university graduates turnover

age	20-24		25-29		30-34		35-39		40-49		50-59		60 +	
Č. Budějovice	40.1	17.4	39.9	22.4	45.4	34.2	52.6	49.3	53	50.2	49.7	49.3	52.2	35.4
H. Králové	23.3	7.5	25.1	10.2	27.6	19.6	28.1	19.6	32.5	28.1	32.4	23.3	29.1	17.1
Jihlava	44.2	18.6	43.5	13.9	46.0	28.0	43.7	35.4	49.4	40.9	51.6	48.2	48.1	23.9
K. Vary	37.8	14.4	35.1	16.6	37.4	27.8	40.5	34.1	41.3	32.9	45.5	38.0	35.5	23.1
Liberec	28.1	9.7	26.1	10.9	31.4	17.7	35.4	25.7	34.6	22.8	38.2	27.5	32.3	18.7
Olomouc	41.2	18.1	39.2	20.1	41.2	27.5	44.7	35.1	46.7	33.6	48.1	35.9	40.4	26.8
Pardubice	29.7	12.4	29.6	14.7	35.4	23.6	39.1	35.4	38.9	35.2	35.6	28.6	31.5	13.5
Ustí n.L.	20.1	4.3	20.5	6.6	24.5	9.2	25.5	12.3	29.0	21.0	27.8	22.8	27.3	10.1
Zlín	50.4	23.7	49.2	28.9	55.6	42.6	53.3	44.8	53.3	46.0	51.7	49.0	51.1	33.3

Source: own calculations of the author. From the database of CSO.

Table 2. Share of the district in evicted: both in a total turnover and a university graduates turnover

age	20-24		25-29		30-34		35-39		40-49		50-59		60 +	
Č. Budějovice	47.2	22.3	46.4	28.3	54.9	44.3	63.7	61.7	62.7	62.7	59.3	61.9	65.8	48.9
H. Králové	25.0	9.1	28.1	10.9	33.2	24.0	33.4	26.9	37.3	35.7	37.4	30.4	28.9	20.2
Jihlava	44.4	12.8	44.7	12.5	48.2	23.4	52.4	49.4	56.2	50.9	57.6	58.0	52.4	27.3
K. Vary	38.2	11.4	34.7	14.8	37.7	26.7	41.2	38.8	45.5	39.0	47.3	41.4	37.3	26.6
Liberec	31.6	11.8	29.5	11.3	35.5	19.1	42.2	35.8	40.9	28.8	45.4	36.8	39.6	25.7
Olomouc	45.3	19.3	44.2	22.7	48.2	34.4	56.4	53.4	54.5	48.4	53.9	44.6	42.0	30.7
Pardubice	31.9	15.8	33.6	16.2	39.7	27.7	46.4	46.4	43.6	43.8	41.2	36.3	37.9	15.7
Ustí n.L.	24.8	5.7	25.2	7.6	30.2	11.1	31.8	16.2	36.2	25.0	34.2	27.8	32.5	13.0
Zlín	51.4	21.4	48.4	26.8	56.4	38.6	54.3	49.0	56.0	50.3	55.7	54.5	57.8	38.6

Source: own calculations of the author. From the database of CSO.

Table 3. Share of the district of immigrants: both in a total turnover and a university graduates turnover

age	20-24		25-29		30-34		35-39		40-49		50-59		60 +	
Č. Budějovice	33.7	14.2	33.8	18.0	33	21.7	33.7	23	37.1	22.9	31	23.6	32.4	18.9
H. Králové	21.2	5.8	21.6	9.4	20.3	14.0	21.0	10.2	24.5	15.2	22.6	10.6	29.3	12.3
Jihlava	43.8	24.8	42.0	16.5	43	33.9	32.9	18.2	39.6	22.4	40.4	33.3	42.6	17.4
K. Vary	37.4	19.7	35.6	19.8	37.1	29.5	39.5	25.4	34.7	22.8	42.0	31.7	32.3	17.5
Liberec	24.7	8.3	22.8	10.6	25.9	16.3	26.4	14.6	24.9	14.6	23.7	13.5	18.8	8.8
Olomouc	37.6	17.3	35.0	18.3	34.3	22.4	30.7	18.1	35.5	16.6	37.3	19.0	38.3	21.7
Pardubice	27.3	10.1	25.3	13.2	30.0	18.9	29.1	18.0	31.0	19.5	23.5	16.0	23.2	10.3
Ustí n.L.	15.5	3.1	14.7	5.4	14.7	4.7	14.5	1.6	16.4	11.9	18.3	10.9	19.8	4.7
Zlín	49.2	26.2	50.0	31.6	54.6	46.4	52.1	40.1	49.6	40.0	44.6	39.1	39.9	24.0

Source: own calculations of the author. From the database of CSO.

The migration of Prague, Brno and Plzeň with their country-side districts (or the process of suburbanisation) develops quickly here. For instance the share of Prague in total migration of the district Prague-East increased for the immigrants from 45% in 1992-1994 to 58.1% in 2001-2003. In the district Prague-West from 54.2% to 64.7%. The turnover of these two districts in the monitored periods increased about 6.5%. The Prague highest shares in immigration to its both country-districts are in the age groups of 35-39 for both the total and graduates migration. However, university graduates have a higher share here. The share of Prague in migrational turnover of university graduates is significantly higher than the turnover of a total migration (approx. by 10%). There are changes of a migration in time and of a migration into the environs of Brno and Plzeň, however, the dynamics of the changes is slow.

### 3. Conclusion

It's obvious the migration ties in the transformation period is affected by various, mostly contradictory, factors. Shifts in geopolitical situations, economic restructure, and democratic society are of different power and their impact on the character of migration mobility is ambiguous. Anticipating that transformation processes enhance the freedom of choice at labour and housing market (reflecting migration mobility in development of settlement system) is showing only steadily. The drop in migrational mobility and a gradual turn in migrational balance of the settlement size is determined to a certain extent by a deformation at housing market. There are some

more relevant factors such as: suburban processes and gradual replacement of migration by other kinds of spatial mobility (such as job commuting temporal migration and cross-border migration). Suburban processes are a new phenomenon of migrational ties of settlement in the 1990s in the Czech republic these proceses are connected with general development tendencies of settlement system and are the most relevant part of deconcentration trends in the Czech republic. Theire gradual development since the beginning of the 1990s now reaches its final and complete stage. Suburban migrational waves are the most significant part of regional and settlement migration ties at the break of millenium and are the most apparant feature of migration ties throughout the whole country. Their position is quite significant, however, due to its low migration mobility and migration efficiency the impacts on the settlemnet systems (except for Prague environs) are more or less limited.

## Literature

- [1] Čermák Z., *Migrace a suburbanizační procesy v České republice*, Demografie 2005, 47, č. 3.
- [2] Drbohlav D., Čermák Z., *International Migrants in Central European Citie*, [In:] *The Social Change and Urban Restructuring in Central Europe*, Ed. György Enyedi, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1998.
- [3] Hampl M. a kol., *Regionální vývoj: Specifikace české transformace, evropská integrace a obecná teorie*, UK Praha 2001.
- [4] Hampl M., *Geografická organizace společnosti v České republice: transformační procesy a jejich obecný kontextu*, Přírodovědecká fakulta Univerzity Karlovy, Katedra Sociální Geografie a Regionálního Rozvoje, Praha 2005.
- [5] Hlaváček P., *The Development of the Unemployment in the Ústí Region, Social and Economic Development and Regional Politics in Ústí Region in Years 2000-2004 (First Election Period of Regional Executive Bodies)*, Proceedings of the 3nd International Conference FSE UJEP Ústí nad Labem 2003.
- [6] Kačírek P., *Změny v přirozené reprodukci obyvatelstva Ústeckého kraje po roce 1989*. VI. Mezinárodní kolokvium o regionálních vědách, Masarykova univerzita v Brně Ekonomicko-správní fakulta, Sborník referátů z mezinárodního kolokvia v Pavlově 2003.
- [7] Koutský J., *Infrastructure for a Transfer Innovations within a Region, Social and Economic Development and Regional Politics in Ústí Region in Years 2000-2004 (First Election Period of Regional Executive Bodies)*, Proceedings of the 5nd International Conference FSE UJEP Ústí nad Labem 2005.
- [8] Pavlik Z. (ed.), *Populační vývoj České republiky 1990-2002*, Katedra demografie a geodemografie, PřF UK Praha 2002.
- [9] Šašek M., *Vliv migrace na vývoj úrovně vzdělanosti významných středisek osídlení Severočeského kraje v 80. letech*. AUC-GEOGRAPHICA 1997 No.1.
- [10] Šašek M., *Vývojové tendenze sídelní struktury Severočeského kraje*, Acta Universitatis Purkyrianae 22, UJEP Ústí nad Labem 1997.
- [11] Šašek M., *Migrace obyvatelstva středisek osídlení severních Čech v letech 1991-1995*, UJEP Ústí nad Labem 1998.
- [12] Šašek M. (ed.), *Social and Economic Development and Regional Politics in Ústí Region in Years 2000-2004*, FSE UJEP Ústí nad Labem 2003.

Resarch is a part of the GAČR grant „Social and Economic Development and the Regional Politics in Ústí Region in Years 2000-2004”, no. 403/03/1246 and the project of MPSV no.1J 016/04-DP2 „Socio-ekonomický vývoj českého venkova a zemědělství”.

## **NIEKTÓRE ASPEKTY MIGRACJI W OKRESIE TRANSFORMACJI W CZECHACH**

### **Streszczenie**

Niniejszy referat jest kontynuacją poprzednich, zaprezentowanych na konferencji „Gospodarka lokalna i regionalna w teorii i praktyce”. Migracja to proces regionalny. Monitorując ją, obserwujemy kompleksowe, społeczno-geograficzne systemy, a szczególnie struktury osadnictwa regionalnego. Monitorowanie migracji związane jest z rozwojem i polityką regionalną. Autor przeprowadza monitoring migracji wewnętrznej w poszczególnych regionach Czech oraz migracji w obrębie miast regionów na przestrzeni czterech 3-letnich okresów (1992-1994, 1995-1997, 1998-2000, 2001-2003) w odniesieniu do osób powyżej 20 lat w porównaniu z migracją całkowitą oraz migracją ludności posiadającej wykształcenie wyższe. Wiek osób podlegających procesowi migracji jest monitorowany na podstawie siedmiu kategorii wiekowych: 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-49, 50-59 oraz powyżej 60 roku życia.

## **NĚKTERÉ ASPEKTY MIGRACE V OBDOBÍ TRANSFORMACE V ČESKÉ REPUBLICE**

### **Anotace**

Příspěvek sleduje vývoj vnitrostátní migrace v české republice v letech 1992 až 2003. Období 12 let je rozdeleno na 4 stejně dlouhé časové intervaly: 1992 až 1994, 1995 až 1997, 1998 až 2000 a 2001 až 2003. Autor analyzuje a hodnotí vývoj migrace v čase, sleduje vzdělanostní a věkové struktury migrantů na úrovni mezikrajské migrace, migrace krajských měst a migrace velkých měst a jejich zázemí. Analýza migrantů podle vzdělání je provedena podle 4 stupňů dosaženého vzdělání. Jde o migranti se základním vzděláním, středoškolským bez maturity, středoškolským s maturitou a vysokoškoláky. 3 analýzy dokazují, že roste význam migrace osob s vysokoškolským vzděláním a že výrazně roste podíl migrace do zázemí velkých měst na celkové migraci.

## **EINIGE ASPEKTE DER MIGRATION ZUR ZEIT DER TRANSFORMATION IN TSCHECHIEN**

### **Zusammenfassung**

Das obige Referat ist eine Fortsetzung der vorigen Referate, die während der Konferenz „Lokale und regionale Wirtschaft in Theorie und Praxis“ präsentiert wurden. Die Migration ist ein regionaler Prozess. Wenn wir sie monieren können wir komplexe, gesellschaftlich-geografische Systeme beo-

bachten, und insbesondere die Strukturen der regionalen Ansiedlungen. Die Migrationsmonierung ist verbunden mit der Entwicklung und der regionalen Politik. Der Autor führt eine Monierung der inneren Migration in den jeweiligen Regionen Tschechiens durch sowie der Migration innerhalb der Städte in den Regionen im Zeitraum von vier 3-jährigen Perioden (1992-1994, 1995-1997, 1998-2000, 2001-2003) in Bezug auf die mehr als 20-jährigen Personen im Vergleich mit der gesamten Migration sowie der Migration der Bevölkerung mit Hochschulausbildung. Das Alter der Personen, die einem Migrationsprozess unterliegen wird moniert in Anlehnung an die sieben Altersgruppen: 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-49, 50-59 sowie über dem 60 Lebensjahr hinaus.