Mobility and the assimilation of immigrants: Variations in migration patterns of Ukrainians and Vietnamese in the Czech Republic

Eva JANSKÁ [a*], Josef BERNARD [b]

Abstract

The distribution of international migrants is an essential part of socio-geographical differentiation. In addition to international migration, internal or domestic migration plays an important role in the geographical distribution of immigrants. Based on data from the population register, the Census, and a quantitative survey, we analysed the internal mobility of Ukrainian and Vietnamese immigrants, which are the first and third largest international migrant groups in the Czech Republic. Using the assimilation perspective, the results of the analysis indicate that each ethnic group behaves differently. Specifically, the concentration of these immigrants differed at both regional and neighbourhood levels.

Key words: internal migration, concentration/deconcentration, residential mobility, spatial assimilation, Czech Republic

1. Introduction

The temporary or permanent mobility of people leads to a spatial redistribution of the population and results in processes described as concentration and deconcentration. This phenomenon is even more complicated when ethnic and immigrant groups are involved. Despite the abundance of recent studies and papers on the geographical distribution of different ethnic groups (Ciobanu et al., 2015; Simpson and Finney, 2009; King and Newbold, 2007; Kritz and Gurak, 2001; Champion, 2005), there are still some gaps in the research on the internal or secondary[1] migration of international migrants at the regional or neighbourhood levels (Hall, 2012; Stilwell, 2010; Bolt and Kempen, 2010; Crul, 2016).

This issue warrants attention as it is apparent that, for many individuals, arrival in a foreign country is not the ultimate step on their migration path. Moreover, spatial mobility can be seen as one of the important integration indicators of the social mobility (with other examples such as education, gender and housing) of different ethnic groups and their residential segregation processes (e.g. Alba and Foner, 2015).

Existing research on the secondary migration of immigrant populations has reached mixed conclusions (Hall, 2012). While some authors (e.g. Park and Iceland, 2011) have found that secondary migration results in higher residential assimilation/integration levels, others (e.g. Lichte et al., 2010) have determined that the segregation of migrants from natives in secondary migration destinations is significantly higher than in gateway cities[2], where the initial flows of international migrants into the country often occur. These conflicting results indicate that more research on the spatial distribution of international migrants is needed. Furthermore, given the varying spatial

---

[1] Secondary migration is all migration that occurs after the initial immigration to the country of destination, usually within the same country.

[2] A gateway city is a large urban area that generally hosts new arrivals, including a large number of immigrants, often due to the opportunities it offers, such as a wider range of employment options and the chances of social interaction and convivial contact with others of the same ethnicity (Singer, 2004; King and Newbold, 2007).

[a] GEOMIGRACE (Geographical Migration Centre), Department of Social Geography and Regional Development, Faculty of Science, Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic (*corresponding author: E. Janská, e-mail: *eva.janska@natur.cuni.cz*)

[b] Institute of Sociology, Philosophical Faculty, University of Hradec Králové, Czech Republic

assimilation perspectives that have been presented (Zorlu and Mulder, 2008; Bolt and van Kempen, 2010; Tammaru and Kontuly, 2010), it is likely that internal migration (e.g. suburbanisation processes) is affected by economic and cultural assimilation (Alba et al., 1999; Massey, 1985) and, at the same time, affects spatial integration (i.e. residing outside one's ethnic concentration) and residence in neighbourhoods of good quality (Logan and Alba, 1993). According to this paradigm, immigrants will disperse from early settlements (e.g. gateways, neighbourhoods, cities of different sizes or regions) in the host country, in which members of the same group (usually defined by national or ethnic similarities, but other classifications may be considered) abound or predominate, to subsequent locations (Silvester and Reher, 2014).

For such investigations, variables such as length of residence, language proficiency, generation, citizenship (measures for cultural assimilation), income, housing and unemployment are often employed as measures of socioeconomic assimilation. Surprisingly, not many studies refer to residential mobility, especially ethnic secondary migration on different spatial levels at the same time. In this sense, few studies have focused on internal migration intensities at the macro level (Bell et al., 2015) or micro level (i.e. via residential segregation research) (Bolt and Kempen, 2010).

In our view, the impact of internal migration on the spatial distribution of immigrants at different residential levels, especially at the neighbourhood level, is an important field of investigation. Moreover, the spatial mobility and frequency of moving (which decreases with longer residence) can be seen as indicators of immigrant integration into the major society (Reher and Silvestre, 2009; Reher and Silvestre, 2011).

In order to assess the determinants of migration flows and the effects of secondary migration on ethnic concentration at the neighbourhood level, we used data from a population registry and a questionnaire survey distributed among Ukrainian and Vietnamese immigrants living in the Czech Republic.

This paper adds to the existing literature on the spatial distribution of immigrants by integrating concentration and diffusion processes of migrants at two different spatial levels with the frequency of internal moves and the presence of co-ethnics in relevant neighbourhoods. In addition, we did not use classical socioeconomic factors in the present research: instead, we employed the integrated factors of integration, length of stay, and frequency of movement.

The aim of this study was to identify the factors shaping the internal migration of selected ethnic groups (Vietnamese and Ukrainians) in the Czech Republic from an assimilation perspective, both at the regional and neighbourhood levels, with the assumption that the two groups' spatial behaviours are different from one another (Janska et al., 2015). To this end, we set up three questions: first, based on findings from the registry data, we asked if secondary migration of international migrants reduces their concentration at different hierarchical levels; second, based on the questionnaire survey, we wanted to know what the relationship was between ethnic concentration and immigrant secondary migration at the neighbourhood level; and third, we questioned whether the level of integration/ assimilation is interconnected with local concentrations of ethnic groups.

2. Theoretical background

The relationships between mobility and the spatial distribution of populations are most frequently studied from the perspectives of two assimilation theories formulated by American (US) scholars: specifically, these are assimilation theory (Alba and Nee, 2003) and segmented assimilation theory (Portes and Zhou, 1993; Portes and Rumbout, 2001). Although these theories were formulated for the US situation, European scholars have also adopted them to study integration processes at the country/region and neighbourhood levels (Bolt and Kempen, 2010; Crul, 2016; Silvestre and Reher, 2012; Tammaru and Kontuly, 2012). From an historical perspective, our understanding is that in the American literature we encounter the use of an assimilation concept (Alba and Nee, 2003), whereas integration is more frequently used in the European literature (e.g. Bosswick and Heckmann, 2006). Because it denotes much the same expression of the process, we are using the term assimilation/integration.

According to spatial assimilation theory, international migrants or other minorities move from ethnic enclaves or gateway destinations to neighbourhoods that are predominantly populated by the native population (Massey, 1985). In the ecological model of ethnic succession derived from Park (1925) and Gordon (1964), this process is driven by improvements in the migrants' socioeconomic status and command of the host country's language. This may result in their separation from co-ethnics and in acculturation (i.e. behavioural assimilation) or a better matching of their lifestyle to that of the majority population (Alba et al., 1999; Silvestre and Reher, 2012).

In contrast, the segmented (or structural) assimilation theory (Portes and Zhou, 1993) assumes that migrants pursue a diversity of strategies in their contact with the majority population, and consequently integrate themselves into different segments of the host society. In this conceptualisation, their mobility does not necessarily depend on socioeconomic situation and may result in new forms of spatial segregation outside the migrant gateway cities, e.g. in so-called 'ethnoburbs' (Li, 1998); see also Ellis and Goodwin-White, 2006; Tammaru and Kontuly, 2012; Wright and Ellis, 2000; Bolt and Kempen, 2010.

Crul (2016) or, earlier, Vertovec (1998), have attempted to adopt an alternative perspective called superdiversity theory, which seems to be more suitable for application in some European cities, such as Amsterdam and Brussels, where the minority became the majority. The concept also attempts to explain different patterns of social mobility within a selected ethnic group and across generations. For example, Crul studied the use of different institutional arrangements, including the labour market, schools, gender aspects and child care, bringing together important features of the integration context.

The above-mentioned assimilationist approaches usually are related mainly to the second and subsequent generations of migrants (Portes and Zhou, 1993; Crul, 2016; Janska, 2007), arguing that intergenerational outcomes differ among different ethnic groups, and that these outcomes are substantive for explaining the long-term assimilation of immigrant populations. Their main premise, however, namely that the spatial behaviour of immigrants and their residential locations are related to their position within the host society, are inspiring even for the situations of first-generation immigrants. Bernard and

Mikešová (2014), for example, found that the populations of first-generation Ukrainian and Vietnamese immigrants in the Czech Republic are profoundly heterogeneous in terms of assimilation levels, and that their assimilation is crucially affected by the length of residence, particularly in the case of Ukrainians. Specifically, the longer they stay in the Czech Republic, then the higher their assimilation levels are. It seems probable that, together with increasing assimilation, a transformation of the spatial behaviour and changes in places of residence can be expected even in the first-generation immigrant groups.

According to assimilation theory, the deconcentration (diffusion) of particular ethnic groups since their first entry migration does occur. At the same time, the segmented assimilation theory provides the opportunity to assess their different behaviours – that is, either deconcentration or concentration. The processes of internal mobility thus change the relative proportions of immigrant (ethnic) populations in different regions (and especially in major cities and their neighbourhoods). For example, around the late 1990s, a number of studies indicated growing concentrations of ethnic groups in certain urban districts and a parallel flight of white native residents from US cities (Frey, 1996; Frey and Liaw, 1998; Ellis and Wright, 1998; Champion, 2005). Other research showed that international migrants were leaving their gateway cities, for example in Estonia (Tammaru and Kontuly, 2009) and the US again (Wright and Ellis, 2000), and suburbanising (Alba et al., 1999).

The ethnic enclave model (Freeman, 2000) explains how migrants choose destinations with higher concentrations of co-ethnics. Such ethnic enclaves facilitate their adaptation to the new environment through linguistic proximity, co-ethnic employment, availability of housing and some additional protection from discrimination by the majority (van Gent and Musterd, 2012; Gurak and Kritz, 2000; Frey, 1995; Bolt and Kempen, 2010). Their mobility from these regions is also lower in the presence of larger or predominant co-ethnic populations (Gurak and Kritz, 1998; Newbold, 1996). This model additionally assumes that members of minority groups with relatively high socioeconomic statuses would not want to leave their neighbourhoods (Bolt and Kempen, 2010), as was suggested by the assimilation model. Notably, this represents one of the reasons why we used variables other than socioeconomic status for our analyses.

Furthermore, the subject matter of secondary concentration/deconcentration processes due to the internal migration of international migrants in the host country can be studied at different spatial levels. Concentration processes at the regional level do not necessarily translate into the same processes in lower-level units such as neighbourhoods. The settlement processes at both levels may have their own logistics and be determined by different factors. While spatial assimilation theory typically examines immigrant concentration in lower-level units such as city districts (van Kempen and Ozuekren, 1998; Bolt and van Kempen, 2010), researchers studying immigrant concentrations in the context of demographic or labour market developments often prefer looking at

higher-level units (Kritz and Nogle, 1994; Frey, 1995; Hempstead, 2007). Processes at different spatial levels are often studied separately from one another, but in reality they complement each other, even if they may take different forms at different spatial levels at the same time.

In the present study, we aimed to explore the concentration and deconcentration processes at two different spatial levels simultaneously, at the regional level and within cities, at the level of neighbourhoods. Due to insufficient data available for monitoring secondary migration within cities, we employed an alternative approach consisting of a questionnaire survey to obtain the necessary information.

Existing empirical studies of secondary mobility in a number of countries (e.g. Estonia, the Netherlands, Japan, the US, the United Kingdom, Spain, the Czech Republic, Italy and Canada) take into account a broad range of explanatory variables. Examples of such variables include educational attainment, income level, occupational category, unemployment and housing (Kritz and Nogle, 1994; Newbold, 1996; Finney and Simpson, 2008; Hampstead, 2007; Zorlu and Mulder, 2008) as well as the length of residence in the host country. The latter was shown to be important by Zorlu and Mulder (2008), who demonstrated that migrants from non-Western countries such as Turkey, Algeria and Morocco who had been living in the Netherlands for no more than five years, were more likely to relocate to areas with higher rates of ethnic segregation. Although a number of studies suggest a tendency for international migrants to deconcentrate (especially in North America: see, for example, Wright and Ellis, 2000), secondary migration in countries like the Czech Republic, Italy and Spain continue to be dominated by concentration processes (Janska et al., 2015; Silvestre and Reher, 2012) at the regional level.

The question remains as to whether concentration processes occur at both the regional and neighbourhood levels, and whether the answer to this question differs among the two immigrant groups we examined in the Czech Republic (i.e. Ukrainians and Vietnamese). Individuals from these groups tend to behave differently in the labour market and apply for different types of residence. Although both groups have higher rates of mobility than the majority population, based on the segmented assimilation theory we assume there exist different migration patterns in these two migrant groups. We also expect different residential assimilation/integration[3] strategies to be present at the neighbourhood level. The combination of length of stay, type of housing and mobility brings about new avenues for the research of the social distribution of immigrant groups (in this case, Ukrainians and Vietnamese) according to various levels of assessment.

3. International migration to the Czech Republic

With its long-term record of positive net migration, the Czech Republic has become the new country of immigration in East Central Europe (Drbohlav and Lesińska, 2014). With more than 510,000 residents with foreign country citizenship in 2017, it was recorded as having the largest international migrant population among all post-communist

---

[3] We do not aim to reproduce the discussion of the similarities and differences of the "integration" and "assimilation" concepts, which often are considered synonymous, one of which being more frequently used in the European context (integration) and the other in the US (assimilation) – see Ellis and Almgren, 2009; Alba and Nee, 2003; Bosswick and Heckmann, 2006. Thus, we decided to use the term assimilation/integration. For a thorough overview of the theoretical discussion on the links and differences of both concepts, see Uherek (2011)

Central European countries (Eurostat, 2018). In the time period 2001–2008, a continuous increase of the international migrant population in the Czech Republic was registered, as net migration grew from 25,000 to 100,000 annually. The decrease (or stagnation) of that population after 2008 usually has been attributed to the global economic downturn (Janska et al., 2013). Since 2010, however, the number of international migrants has been continuously growing again. Ukrainians form the largest migrant group (although their population shrank after 2008), followed by Slovaks[4] and the Vietnamese. These three groups accounted for three-fifths of the Czech Republic's total international migrant population in 2015.

Until the early 1990s, net population gains were recorded in cities, while losses were conversely noted in rural areas. After 1990, however, the capital city, Prague, became the region with the highest net loss. This trend is believed to be related to suburbanisation processes, in which most natives move to the surroundings of major cities (Čermák, 2004). The flow of people from Prague to its suburbs was counterbalanced by the net gains of international migrants, both newcomers and internal migrants. In 2013, as the home to 37% of all international migrants versus 12% of Czechs, Prague (and some areas bordering Germany) was the most attractive immigrant destination in the Czech Republic (the Czech Statistical Office (CZSO), 2013). In the 2000s, Prague and the Central Bohemian Region received three-fifths of Ukrainians, 45% of Slovaks and one-fifth of Vietnamese migrants who came to the Republic. Although the rates of internal migration of international migrants declined after 2008, existing ethnic ties and labour market opportunities made Prague, Central Bohemia and regional cities, much more attractive as places to live for both direct and secondary international migrants, compared to Czech nationals (Čermák and Janská, 2011; Janska et al., 2015).

4. Methods and data sources

Our first research question, whether the secondary migration of international migrants reduces their concentration at the regional level or not (with the exception of Prague as a gateway city), was tackled with an analysis of data from a publicly available database of the CZSO. This database showed the stock (individuals with valid residence permits) and flows of international migrants (individuals who reported a change of place of residence in the period 2001–2012) and allowed us to calculate net migration figures for different categories of regions. Regions in this analysis are represented by 77 districts in the Czech Republic, with a median population size of 111,000 inhabitants. We aggregated the districts into three categories, as follows: (i) Prague metropolitan area (three districts); (ii) districts with the highest concentrations of Ukrainians or Vietnamese (in the case of Ukrainians, seven districts that included major cities and economically strong industrial regions and, in case of Vietnamese, five districts at the Czech–German border); and (iii) remaining districts.

The boundary between districts with the highest concentrations of Ukrainians or Vietnamese and the remaining districts was set at a 1.5% concentration level of the district population. Forty-seven percent of Ukrainians live in the Prague metropolitan area and another 19% live in high-concentration districts, versus 23% of Vietnamese who live in the Prague metropolitan area and 16%

who live in high-concentration districts, respectively. Subsequently, we analysed migration rates of Ukrainians and Vietnamese between these district types in the time period of 2011 to 2013.

The second research question explored the relation between the secondary migration of international migrants and ethnic concentration at the neighbourhood level. As the available data did not contain sufficiently detailed geo-localisation information to be used for a neighbourhood-level analysis, we used data obtained through a survey of Ukrainians and Vietnamese conducted between March 2013 and May 2013. The sample included immigrants from Ukraine and Vietnam who were 15 years of age or older and who had been legally residing in the Czech Republic for more than one year. Quota sampling (based on age, gender and NUTS3 region) was used, and migrants reporting at least one relocation within the territory of the Czech Republic were overrepresented (to account for at least 40% of the sample). The official administrative database of international migrants was used to construct the basic quota structure. According to the logic of quota sampling, the data are representative of gender, age and regional distribution (NUTS3). Unfortunately, the representativeness of other variables is hard to control due to missing official evidence.

The questionnaire was translated into Vietnamese and Ukrainian and distributed by professional interviewers of the Public Opinion Research Centre. The self-administered surveys were verified on the spot for completeness by the interviewers. A total of 912 interviews were completed by 445 Vietnamese and 467 Ukrainian migrants, respectively. A subjective indicator of ethnic neighbourhood concentrations was used in the survey, based on a respondent's assessment of ethnic concentrations in their neighbourhoods. The respondents were asked to assess how many of their compatriots lived within a five-minute walk of their residence, according to a three-item scale (quite a lot, not that many, practically none). While such a subjective indicator has its weaknesses (e.g. respondents may not be able to make a good estimate), it does not suffer from systematic bias as in the case of the population registry, and allows for analysis to be completed at one of the lowest spatial levels (i.e. at the neighbourhood level). In the analyses, assessment of ethnic neighbourhood concentration was used as a dependent variable, influenced by the number of inter-communal relocations in the Czech Republic. Table 1 shows the distribution in the sample of basic variables that were used in the following analyses.

Finally, we examined whether there is a relation between the level of immigrant concentration in neighbourhoods within cities and their level of integration/assimilation. In this analysis, neighbourhoods were represented by intra-city districts with a median size of approximately 3,500 inhabitants in four major cities in the Czech Republic. Not all districts are of the same size. Unfortunately, some of these districts represent areas significantly larger than neighbourhoods. The four most populated districts have more than 50,000 inhabitants. The census data that were used in the analysis, however, could not be aggregated to more detailed spatial levels due to confidentiality reasons.

Three indicators of social integration/assimilation of international migrants were derived from the census data, as follows:

---

[4] We did not evaluate Slovaks, who have similar mobility and behavioural patterns compared to Czechs, in the present study.

Characteristics		Ukrainian	Vietnamese
Mean age (years)		36.8	33.9
Mean length of residence in the Czech Republic (years)		7.1	10.9
Gender	Male	60%	60%
	Female	40%	40%
Education (excluding students)	Higher	22%	11%
	Secondary with SE	33%	32%
	Lower	45%	57%
Housing	Hostel	25%	8%
	Rental room	19%	9%
	Rental flat	44%	58%
	Flat ownership	12%	25%
Moved to another municipality in 1998 – 2013 (only respondents with length of residence of 5+ years)	Yes	80%	79%
	No	20%	21%
Perceived number of co-ethnics in neighbourhood	Quite a lot	34%	43%
	Not that many	48%	48%
	Practically none	18%	9%

Tab. 1: Basic structure of the sample of Ukrainian and Vietnamese immigrants (Note: n = 912; the sample consists of 445 Ukrainians and 467 Vietnamese). Source: own survey (2013); authors' calculations

1. the share of international migrants who live in a standard and stable accommodation (i.e. a house or apartment, not a hostel or other nonstandard accommodation);

2. the level of home-ownership among international migrants residing in flats; and

3. the sharing of common households with international migrants and Czech citizens.

These indicators were measured separately for Ukrainians and Vietnamese. Subsequently, the assimilation/integration indicators were correlated with the separate concentrations of Ukrainians and Vietnamese in the districts. The first two indicators relate to housing conditions of both immigrant populations. Housing quality and homeownership have been repeatedly understood together as an important assimilation/integration dimension (Rosenbaum and Freidman, 1999; Gobillon and Solignac, 2015). The third indicator relates to households and partnerships formed across national groups. As Ellis et al. (2016) argue, cross-national household composition is an important indicator of the dismantling of social barriers and, moreover, has the potential to disrupt ethnic neighbourhood concentrations. Table 2 indicates the basic descriptions of the indicators.

5. Results and discussion

5.1 Internal migration of international migrants and their concentration at the regional level

Our results indicate that Prague has been much more important as an immigrant gateway for Ukrainians than for Vietnamese because of the ethnic-specific geographies of the labour market. Ukrainians often work in the temporary construction jobs that are concentrated in Prague, while the Vietnamese tend to seek opportunities in small-scale retail that are more evenly distributed across the country[5]. It has been repeatedly argued that Prague is also the

primary destination of international migrants because of its place in the urban hierarchy. Janská and Bernard (2015) identified trends towards larger cities, for both Ukrainian and Vietnamese migration and particularly in favour of Prague, for the 2010 to 2012 period. Until further analysis is performed, it remains uncertain as to whether the prevailing upward movements within the urban hierarchy result in increasing regional concentrations of international migrants. The tendency to move into the largest cities could result in an increase in concentrations of Ukrainians and Vietnamese in a few important urban settlements and an emptying of the remaining space. We investigated the changing regional concentrations of Ukrainians and Vietnamese by secondary migration, using individual migration data from the CZSO as described above. Tables 3 and 4 summarise the results.

For Ukrainians, the crucial importance of the Prague metropolitan region as a secondary migration destination was confirmed. Secondary migration contributes noticeably to the growth of the Ukrainian population in Prague, where almost half of all Ukrainians in the Czech Republic were concentrated in 2011. Secondary migration increased the dominance of Prague as the most important Ukrainian destination by more than 4% in the period 2011 to 2013. Both high- and low-concentration districts experienced secondary migration losses, but, given the more severe losses in high-concentration districts, secondary migration slightly equalised Ukrainian concentrations outside of Prague.

A similar, albeit weaker trend in favour of secondary migration to the Prague metropolitan region occurred in the case of Vietnamese inhabitants, in that they moved from both high- and low-concentration districts and increased the number of Vietnamese living in Prague by more than 3%. Low-concentration districts were the other types of districts gaining a net migration of Vietnamese immigrants, as there was a distinct migration flow noted from high-

[5] The association can be explained by the differing geographies of job opportunities that are typically tapped by each immigrant community. Most temporary construction jobs for Ukrainians are found in Prague, while opportunities in small-scale retail for Vietnamese are distributed more evenly.

	Ukrainians	Vietnamese
Share of Ukrainians/Vietnamese in standard and stable accommodation	71.2%	92.4%
Home ownership	31.9%	36.5%
Common households with natives	16.3%	15.7%

Tab. 2: Assimilation/integration indicators of Ukrainians and Vietnamese in four main cities in the Czech Republic in 2011. Sources: Census, 2011; authors' calculations

Origin	Destination		
	Prague metropolitan region	High concentration districts	Low concentration districts
Prague metropolitan region	0	− 1,652	− 982
High concentration districts	1,652	0	571
Low concentration districts	982	− 571	0
SUM	**2,634**	**− 2,223**	**− 411**
Relative change of the immigrant population by secondary migration	4.8%	− 9.9%	− 1.1%

Tab. 3: Migration flows between district types, Ukrainians (2011–2013)
Sources: Czech Statistical Office; authors' calculations

Origin	Destination		
	Prague metropolitan region	High concentration districts	Low concentration districts
Prague metropolitan region	0	− 331	− 75
High concentration districts	331	0	492
Low concentration districts	75	− 492	0
SUM	**406**	**− 823**	**417**
Relative change of the immigrant population by secondary migration	3.3 %	− 10.0 %	1.3 %

Tab. 4: Migration flows between district types, Vietnamese (2011–2013)
Sources: Czech Statistical Office; authors' calculations

to low-concentration districts. The relative dominance of Vietnamese in Prague increased slowly and the dispersion of Vietnamese into low-concentration districts with small Vietnamese minorities, was the second important secondary migration effect observed.

Secondary migration should, therefore, not be described as a straightforward increase of international migrant concentrations at the district level. Instead, its effects are dual: whereas it strengthened immigrant concentrations in the most important metropolitan areas, it also further contributed to reducing differences in immigrant concentrations in the remaining districts, and resulted in a slow dispersion of both studied minority groups in the Czech territory. The dispersion effect was especially pronounced in the case of Vietnamese individuals.

5.2 Internal migration and ethnic concentrations on the micro/neighbourhood level

Using the subjective indicator of international migrant neighbourhood concentrations, we first investigated whether there were any differences in subjectively perceived co-ethnic populations in different types of settlements. Table 5 shows the proportion of respondents who agreed there were 'quite a lot' of co-ethnics residing in the vicinity of their place of residence ("in their neighbourhood"). The presence of increased concentrations of Ukrainian and

Vietnamese migrants in Prague and other larger towns were reflected in their perceptions of co-ethnic populations in the neighbourhood. Respondents in larger towns perceived more often 'quite a lot' of co-ethnics in the neighbourhood as compared to small municipalities. Ukrainians were most likely to perceive quite a lot of co-ethnic individuals in Prague, while Vietnamese did the same in medium-sized and larger towns. For both groups, the differences were statistically significant at the 95% level.

In order to ascertain the effects of the internal migration of international migrants on the perceived concentration of local co-ethnic individuals, we first tested the relationship between the perceived number of co-ethnics and the number of times respondents moved from one Czech municipality to another. The analysis demonstrated a strong relationship in the case of Ukrainians – for these migrants, the share of immigrants perceiving 'quite a lot' of co-ethnics in the neighbourhood decreased with the number of relocations. Interestingly, in comparison, no such relationship was identified for the Vietnamese respondents (Tab. 6).

Subsequently, we used a general linear model approach (logistic regression) to control for the association identified among Ukrainians for additional independent variables (e.g. gender, education, housing and municipality type). A dichotomous dependent variable was defined in terms of whether the respondent perceived a large co-ethnic

	Quite a lot of co-ethnics live in the neighbourhood			
	Prague	Regional city	Medium-sized town	Other settlements
Ukrainians	45.1%	34.8%	29.9%	28.8%
Vietnamese	46.6%	40.3%	52.9%	20.9%

Tab. 5: *Share of Ukrainian and Vietnamese immigrants who report perceiving "quite a lot" of co-ethnics in their neighbourhood by commune size category (Note: n = 797)*
Source: *own survey (2013); authors' calculations*

	Quite a lot of co-ethnics live in the neighbourhood		
Number of inter-communal relocations in Czech Republic	0	1	2+
Ukrainians	40.4%	31.9%	20.6%
Vietnamese	43.9%	46.5%	41.0%

Tab. 6: *Share of Ukrainian and Vietnamese immigrants who report perceiving "quite a lot" of co-ethnics in their neighbourhood by the number of inter-communal relocations (Note: n = 797)*
Source: *own survey (2013); authors' calculations*

population in the vicinity of his/her current residence or not. Three models were developed, with a gradually increasing number of controls. The results are presented in Table 7.

In Model 1, the single independent variable 'number of inter-communal relocations in the Czech Republic' had a significant effect on the outcome. Each relocation led to approximately 30% lower odds of reporting 'quite a lot' of co-ethnics in the neighbourhood. The inclusion of three additional independent variables in Model 2 – namely gender, education, and municipality type – increased the model's explanatory power. In conjunction with these additional factors, the effect of relocations was weakened just slightly. In fact, only gender proved to be a significant predictor in this model, with women reporting significantly less often that there were 'quite a lot' of co-ethnics in the neighbourhood. The addition of 'education' had no effect. In Model 3, the inclusion of a fifth independent variable, type of housing (with the categories of hostel, rental room, rental

flat, and flat ownership as the baseline variable) considerably improved the model's explanatory power and simultaneously reduced the effect of the number of relocations.

The apparent interpretation of these findings is that subjective reports on the local co-ethnic population were strongly associated with the type of housing. Ukrainians living in more precarious housing arrangements, and especially in hostels, perceived that they had many more compatriots around them than did those residing in more stable segments of the housing market. A significant reduction of the effect of relocations after the inclusion of the housing type variable means that the effect of relocations on the outcome apparently is mediated by housing type. In fact, there is a significant relationship between the number of relocations and the type of housing (contingency coefficient between the variables: 0.17). Every relocation decreases the number of immigrants living in less stable housing arrangements (e.g. hostels and rental rooms) and increases the number living

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	S.E.	Exp(B)
Number of intercommunal relocations	− 0.37*	0.18	0.69	− 0.34	0.18	0.71	− 0.13	0.19	0.88
Municipality (reference: other)									
Prague				0.53	0.31	1.70	0.80*	0.34	2.24
Regional center (population > 50,000)				0.13	0.36	1.14	0.46	0.39	1.58
Medium sized town (population > 10,000)				− 0.03	0.39	0.97	0.10	0.43	1.10
Gender (reference: female)				0.54*	0.22	1.72	0.11	0.25	1.11
Education (reference: tertiary)									
lower secondary				0.46	0.30	1.58	− 0.00	0.34	1.00
higher secondary				0.37	0.32	1.45	0.03	0.34	1.03
Housing (reference: flat ownership & other)									
hostel							2.40*	0.47	11.00
rental room							1.00*	0.47	2.70
rental flat							0.37	0.44	1.45
Constant	− 0.39*	0.11	0.68	− 1.29*	0.39	0.28	− 2.03*	0.55	0.13
Nagelkerke R^2		0.016			0.066			0.244	

Tab. 7: *Effect of number of intercommunal relocations on perceiving „quite a lot" coethnics in neighbourhood, three logistic regression models, Ukrainian immigrants (Note: n = 354; *alpha < 0.05)*
Source: *own survey (2013); authors' calculations*

in more stable housing types (e.g. rental flats and ownership flats)[6]. In these more stable housing types, immigrants less often report that they perceive a lot of co-ethnics in their neighbourhood.

Analogue models with the same variables were developed also for the Vietnamese immigrants. The number of inter-communal relocations for this group, however, was not significant in either of them[7]. This points at the absence of any substantial relationship between the patterns of internal migration among Vietnamese immigrants in the Czech Republic and their concentration at the level of neighbourhood.

5.3 Assimilation/integration indicators and ethnic concentrations

According to classical spatial assimilation theory, there is a relationship between ethnic concentrations and the level of assimilation/integration of individual immigrants in the host society. This relationship results from improvements in migrant socioeconomic status, their stabilisation in he host society, and their adoption of host culture, which is often accompanied by relocations from high-ethnic concentration areas into areas inhabited predominantly by natives (Bosswick and Heckmann, 2006). Largely ethnic neighbourhoods are virtually absent in Czech cities, but there are parts of cities with increased immigrant concentrations (Sýkora et al., 2016; Přidalová and Ouředníček, 2017; Přidalová and Hassman, 2017; Musterd and van Kempen, 2009). Our findings on the decline of subjectively perceived ethnic concentrations in neighbourhoods during the course of secondary migration paths of Ukrainians in the Czech Republic, raises the question of whether neighbourhood ethnic concentrations are associated negatively with the above-mentioned indicators of social assimilation/integration.

Using 2011 census data, we correlated ethnic concentrations of Ukrainians and Vietnamese in individual districts of the four major Czech cities with the three integration/assimilation indicators introduced above. Table 8 summarises the results of the correlation analysis.

For the Ukrainian population, two of the three assimilation/integration indicators show a reasonable correlation with their concentration in individual districts, thus supporting a tendency for spatial assimilation. The total share of Ukrainians in a district correlates negatively with the proportion of Ukrainians living in standard and stable accommodation, and also with the proportion of Ukrainians who form a common household with natives. In other words, Ukrainians living in districts with the highest Ukrainian concentrations are relatively less residentially stabilised, staying mostly in hostels and forming ethnically homogeneous households. Conversely, in neighbourhoods with lower proportions of Ukrainians, the level of standard accommodation and the proportion of ethnically mixed households is apparently higher.

In the Vietnamese population, only very modest correlations were found. Thus, assimilation/integration indicators appear to be unrelated to local Vietnamese concentrations. The strongest correlation was an association between the proportion of Vietnamese in the district population and the share of Vietnamese in home ownership. This relationship is opposite to what might be anticipated for spatial assimilation. The Vietnamese are more often homeowners in those neighbourhoods in which they compose a higher population percentage. This finding could suggest a gradual formation of residentially stable, ethnically segregated Vietnamese areas, but, in the absence of additional data, this interpretation cannot be reliably supported.

The results of the census-based analysis of assimilation/integration indicators are roughly consistent with the outcomes of the questionnaire-based analysis of neighbourhood-level concentrations. It seems probable that the internal migration of Ukrainians in the Czech Republic results in their spatial dispersion at the neighbourhood level and relates to higher assimilation levels. In the case of Vietnamese, however, such spatial dispersion does not occur, as their concentration at the neighbourhood level appears to be not affected by their secondary migration within the Czech Republic.

6. Conclusions

Our analysis of the population registry data and of information from a questionnaire survey of international migrants has enabled us to contribute to the existing scholarly debate about the effects of the internal/secondary migration of international migrants (as represented by contributions such as: Zorlu and Mulder, 2008; Bolt and van Kempen, 2010; Tammaru and Kontuly, 2010), with respect to their spatial redistribution while using assimilation perspectives.

Besides the commonly-used assimilation approach for the explanation of the concentration and deconcentration processes of immigrants (Silvester and Reher, 2012;

	Ukrainians in the district population (%)	Vietnamese in the district population (%)
Share of Ukrainians/Vietnamese in standard and stable accommodation	− 0.570	0.077
Home ownership rate among Ukrainians / Vietnamese	0.064	0.187
Common households with natives	− 0.415	− 0.163

Tab. 8: Pearson correlations of assimilation/integration indicators of Ukrainians and Vietnamese with Ukrainian and Vietnamese concentrations in individual districts in 2011 (Note: 4 cities: 174 districts for Ukrainians, 119 districts for Vietnamese. Districts where no Ukrainians or no Vietnamese live are omitted from the analysis (i.e. counted as missing data). As we use census data, standard errors and statistical significance are not indicated. Sources: Census, 2011; authors' calculations

---

[6] The results are not presented due to space limitations, but can be obtained from the authors. The association between the number of relocations and housing type is not so strong as to indicate a multi-collinearity problem in the analysis.

[7] These models are not presented due to space limitations.

Wright and Ellis, 2000; Janska et al., 2014), we have also added to our research the perspectives of an ethnic enclave model for a better understanding of the different movement behaviours of the selected ethnic groups. Unlike the situation in Western countries with more long-standing immigration traditions, immigrants to the Czech Republic are rarely concentrated in the most deprived neighbourhoods, and the majority of them in fact reside in core urban areas and in socially heterogeneous housing estates (Přidalová and Hassman, 2017). This situation adds significance to our research by bringing new insights to studies of the spatial distribution of populations, with respect to the concentration/deconcentration trends of the movement of international migrants/ethnic groups, by presenting examples from post-socialist countries.

Our results support the somewhat mixed conclusions of research on internal and residential mobilities and the spatial distribution of immigrant populations in new destinations (Hall, 2012). The results of this research project demonstrate that:

- first, it is clear that Prague, as a gateway city, is a primary and secondary destination for Ukrainian and Vietnamese nationals (at the regional level), but there are slight differences between their behaviours. Contrary to what was seen with Ukrainians, we observed a secondary migration effect via the occurrence of dispersion of Vietnamese into low-concentration districts. The results indicate that Prague has been much more important as an immigrant gateway for Ukrainians than for Vietnamese, because of the ethnic-specific geographies of the labour market, which correspond with models of ethnic enclaves. While Ukrainians, due to their work in temporary construction jobs, are largely concentrated in Prague, the Vietnamese migrants tend to seek opportunities in small-scale retail that are more evenly distributed across the country and owned mostly by themselves;

- second, the opposite effects can be observed at the neighbourhood level, where we assessed secondary migration in relation to ethnic concentration. Interestingly, we found that the number of relocations contributes to the ethnic deconcentration of Ukrainians, whereas we detected no such effects in the case of Vietnamese. Silvestre and Reher (2012) found that multiple immigrant movers deconcentrate spatially. Based on our findings, we argue that the role of subsequent moves for immigrant deconcentration does not apply in general and differs for different ethnic groups. Ukrainians move subsequently after arrival in the country into neighbourhoods with lower ethnic concentrations, which relates to a progressive rise in stable accommodation. In the case of Ukrainians, repeated relocations improved their housing situation and diffuse them within the city at the neighbourhood level, which is in accordance with assimilation theory. For the Vietnamese, such a relationship was not confirmed. Their secondary migration does not result in spatial diffusion within cities and is not associated with an improving and stabilising housing situation;

- third, we were able to show that the level of integration/ assimilation is not universally interconnected with local concentrations of the ethnic group. In neighbourhoods with a low proportion of Ukrainians, the level of standard accommodation and the proportion of ethnically-mixed households were significantly higher. Again, for the Vietnamese, the situation was different,

especially in Prague where Vietnamese were more often homeowners and also formed a higher population share in the neighbourhood. This finding could potentially suggest the possibility of a gradual formation of residentially stable, ethnically segregated Vietnamese areas (Sýkora et al., 2016).

To conclude, the assimilation/integration process of Ukrainians at the neighbourhood level seems to correspond well with the expectations of spatial assimilation theory: specifically, gradual assimilation/ integration is accompanied by residential de-segregation at the neighbourhood level. Conversely, there was no such trend in the Vietnamese population: whereas a gradual inter-regional dispersion can be observed in the case of the Vietnamese, their residential segregation at the neighbourhood level remains a relatively stable, long-term reality of their lives in the Czech Republic.

Despite the shortcomings of our research, such as missing panel data hindering our ability to uncover in a more detailed way the geographic and accompanying socioeconomic paths of immigrants, as well as the (non-)existence of reliable information on the exact geo-localisation of immigrant residences, and the approximate nature of integration/ assimilation indicators, we were able to uncover the complexity of the assimilation perspective in the case of the Czech Republic. In doing so, we aimed to provoke and enrich the debate on appropriate conceptual approaches to contemporary international migration and assimilation/ integration concepts, particularly in East Central Europe.

Acknowledgements

References:

ALBA, R., NEE, V. (1999): Rethinking Assimilation Theory for New Era of Immigration, In: Hirschmann, C., Kasinitz P., DeWind J. [eds.]: The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience. Russel Sage Foundation, New York.

ALBA, R., FONER, N. (2015): Strangers no More. Princeton University Press.

ANDRESSON, R. (2012): Understanding Ethnic Minorities' Settlement and Geographical Mobility Patterns in Sweden Using Longitudinal Data. In: Finney, N., Catney, G. [eds.]: Minority Internal Migration in Europe. Ashgate, Burlington (pp. 263–292).

BELL, M., CHARLES-EDWARDS, E., UEFFING, P., STILLWELL, J., KUPISZEWSKI, M., KUPISZEWSKA, D. (2015): Internal migration and development: comparing migration intensities around the world. Population and Development Review, 41(1): 33–58.

BERNARD, J., MIKEŠOVÁ, R. (2014): Sociální integrace imigrantů na rozhraní mezi dočasnou migrací a trvalým usazením. Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review, 50(4): 521–545.

BOLT, G., VAN KEMPEN, R. (2010): Ethnic segregation and residential mobility: relocation of minority ethnic groups

in the Netherlands. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 36(2): 333–354.

BOSSWICK, W., HECKMANN, F. (2006): Integration of migrants: Contribution of local and regional authorities. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Dublin.

Cizinci 2010: Cizinci v České republice 2010. Praha, Český statistický úřad.

Cizinci 2011: Cizinci v České republice 2011. Praha, Český statistický úřad.

CSU (2004): [online]. [cit. 21.07.2014]. Available at: http://notes3.czso.cz/csu/2003edicniplan.nsf/o/4120-03-casova_rada_1961_2001-2___rozmisteni_obyvatelstva

CZSO (2013): Cizinci v České republice 2013. Praha, Český statistický úřad.

CZSO 2018: [online]. Available at: http://www.czso.cz/csu/cizinci/4-ciz_pocet_cizincu

ČERMÁK, Z. (2004): Migration Aspect of the Suburbanization in the Czech Republic. In: Drbohlav, D., Kalvoda, J., Voženílek, V. [eds.]: Czech Geographic Society, Palacky University in Olomouc, Olomouc, pp. 319–328.

ČERMÁK, Z., JANSKÁ, E. (2011): Rozmístění a migrace cizinců jako součást sociálněgeografické diferenciace Česka. Geografie, 116(4): 422–439.

Demografická ročenka ČR 2010 Praha, Český statistický úřad.

ELLIS, M., ALMGREM, G. (2009): Local Contexts of Immigrant and Second-Generation Integration in the United States. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 35(7): 1059–1076.

ELLIS, M., GOODWIN-WHITE, J. (2006): 1.5 Generation internal migration in the U.S.: dispersion from state of immigration. International Migration Review, 40(4): 899–926.

ELLIS, M., WRIGHT, R. (1998): The balcanization metaphor in the analysis of US immigration. Annals of the Association of American Geographers. 88(4): 686–698.

EUROSTAT 2018: Population on 1 January by age, sex and broad group of citizenship [online]. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database

FINNEY, N., CATNEY, G. [eds.] (2012): Minority Internal Migration in Europe. Ashgate, Burlington.

FREY, W. H. (1995): Immigration and internal migration "flight" from US metropolitan areas: toward a new demographic balcanization. Urban Studies, 32(4–5): 733–757.

FREY, W. H. (1996): Immigration, domestic migration, and demographic Balkanization in America: new evidence for the 1990s. Population and Development Review, 22(4): 741–763.

GOBILLON, L., SOLIGNAC, M. (2015): Homeownership of immigrants in France: selection effects related to international migration flows. London, Centre for Economic Policy Research. DP10975.

GURAK, D. T., KRITZ, M. M. (2000): The interstate migration of U.S. immigrants: individual and contextual determinants. Social Forces, 78: 1017–1039.

HALL, M. (2013): "Residential integration on the new frontier: Immigrant segregation in established and new destinations". Demography, 50(5): 1873–1896. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-012-0177-x

HEMPSTEAD, K. (2007): Mobility of the foreign-born population in the United States 1995–2000: the role of gateway states. International Migration review, 41(2): 466–479.

CHAMPION, A. G. (2005): The counterurbanisation cascade in England and Wales since 1991: the evidence of a new migration dataset. Revue Belge de Geographie, 1–2: 85–101.

JANSKÁ, E., ČERMÁK, Z., WRIGHT, R. (2014): New Immigrant Destinations in a New Country of Immigration: Settlement Patterns of Non-natives in the Czech Republic. Population, Space and Place. 20(8): 677–767.

JANSKÁ, E., BERNARD, J. (2015): Koncentrační či dekoncentrační procesy? Faktory ovlivňující vnitřní migraci imigrantů. Geografie–Sborník České geografické společnosti, 120(4): 585–602.

KING, K. M., NEWBOLD, K. B. (2007): "Internal migration dynamics of a Canadian immigrant gateway: Toronto as an origin, way-station and destination between 1991 and 2001." Canadian Journal of Regional Science 30(2): 243–262.

KRITZ, M. M., NOGLE, J. M. (1994): Nativity concentration and internal migration among the foreign-born. Demography, 31(3): 509–524.

LI, W. (1998): Anatomy of new ethnic settlement: the Chinese ethnoburbs in Los Angeles. Urban Studies, 35: 470–501.

LEY, D. (2007): Countervailing immigration and domestic migration in gateway cities: Australian and Canadian variations on an American theme. Economic Geography, 83: 231–254.

MALHEIROS, J. (2012): Immigrants' Residential Mobility, Socio-ethnic Desegregation Trends and the Metropolises Fragmentation Thesis: The Lisbon Example. In: Finney, N., Catney, G. [eds.]: Minority Internal Migration in Europe (pp. 65–88). Ashgate, Burlington.

MASSEY, D. S. (1985): Ethnic residential segregation: a theoretical and empirical synthesis. Sociology and Social Research, 69: 615–350.

MUSTERD, S., VAN KEMPEN, R. (2009): Segregation and housing of minority ethnic groups in Western European cities. Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie, 100(4): 559–566.

NEWBOLD, K. B. (1996): Internal migration of the foreign-born in Canada. International Migration Review, 30(3): 728–747.

PORTES, A., ZHOU, M. (1993): The new second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 530: 74–96.

PORTES, A., RUMBAUT, R. G. (2001): Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation. Oakland, University of California Press.

PŘIDALOVÁ, I., HASSMAN, J. (2018): Immigrant groups and the local environment: socio-spatial differentiation in Czech metropolitan areas. Geografisk Tidsskrift-Danish Journal of Geography, 118(1): 72–87.

PŘIDALOVÁ, I., OUŘEDNÍČEK, M. (2017): Role zahraniční migrace v měnící se sociálně prostorové diferenciaci Prahy. Rural and urban sociology, Migration Studies, Praha, Sociologický ústav AV ČR.

RECANO-VALVERDE, J., LUKEN, V. (2012): The Internal Migration of Foreign-born Population in Southern

Europe: Demographic Patterns and Individual Determinants. In: Finney, N., Catney, G. [eds.]: Minority Internal Migration in Europe (pp. 239–262). Burlington, Ashgate.

REHER, D., SILVESTRE, J. (2009): Internal migration patterns of foreign-born immigrants in a country of recent mass immigration: evidence from new micro data for Spain. International Migration Review, 43(4): 815–849.

REHER, D., SILVESTRE, J. (2011): Internal migration patterns of foreign-born immigrants in Spain. A study based on the National Immigrant Survey (ENI-2007). Revista internacional de sociología, 69(1): 167–188.

ROSENBAUM, E., FRIEDMAN, S. (2004). Generational patterns in home ownership and housing quality among racial/ethnic groups in New York City, 1999. International Migration Review, 38(4): 1492–1533.

SILVESTRE, J., REHER, D. (2012): The internal migration of immigrants: differences between one-time and multiple movers in Spain. Population, Space and Place, 20(1): 50–65.

SIMPSON, L., FINNEY, N. (2009): Spatial Patterns of Internal Migration: Evidence for Ethnic Groups in Britain. Population, Space and Place, 15(1): 37–56.

STILLWELL, J., HUSSAIN, S. (2008): Internal migration of ethnic groups in England and Wales by age and district type. Working Paper 08/2. Leeds, School of Geography, University of Leeds.

STILLWELL, J. (2010): Ethnic population concentration and net migration in London. Environment and Planning A, 42(6): 1439–1456.

SÝKORA, L. et al. (2015): Metodika identifikace lokalit rezidenční segregace. Praha, Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Přírodovědecká fakulta, Multikulturní centrum Praha.

SÝKORA, L. et al. (2016): Soužití v městské čtvrti: majorita a Vietnamci v Praze-Libuši. Sociologický časopis, 52(4): 475–503.

TAMMARU, T, KONTULY, T. (2011): Selectivity and destinations of ethnic minorities leaving the main gateway cities of Estonia. Population, Space and Place 17: 674–688.

UHEREK, Z. (2003): Cizinecké komunity a městský prostor v České republice. Sociologický časopis / Czech Sociological Review, 39(2): 193–216.

UHEREK, Z. (2011). „Migrace a postmigrační kontaktní situace z antropologické perspektivy". In: Scheu, H.: Migrace a kulturní konflikty (pp. 256–263). Praha, Auditorium.

VAN KEMPEN, R., OZUEKREN, A. S. (1998): Ethnic segregation in cities: new forms and explanations in a dynamic world. Urban Studies, 35(10): 1631–1656.

VAN GENT, W., MUSTERD, S. (2012): Residential location and housing moves of immigrants and natives in the Amsterdam metropolitan context. Minority internal migration in Europe.

VERTOVEC, S. (2007): "Super-diversity and its implications." Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30(6): 1024–1054. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465

Vnitřní stěhování cizinců v krajích ČR – v letech 2003–2008. [online] Praha: Český statistický úřad [cit. 13.3.2010] Available at: http://www.czso.cz/csu/cizinci.nsf/t/420044445C/$File/c02r04.pdf

WRIGHT, R. A., ELLIS, M., REIBEL, M. (1997): The linkage between immigration and internal labour migration in large metropolitan areas in the United States. Economic Geography, 73(2): 234–254.

WRIGHT, R. A., ELLIS, M. (2000): Race, religion and the territorial politics of immigration in the US. International Journal of population geography, 6(3): 197–211.

ZORLU, A., MULDER, C. (2008): "Initial and subsequent location choices of immigrants to the Netherlands. "Regional Studies, 42: 245–264. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400601145210

Život cizinců v ČR (2010): [online]. [cit. 11.1.2011] Available at: http://notes2.czso.cz/csu/2010edicniplan.nsf/p/1118-10