

THE FEATURES, STATISTICS AND VARIETIE OF EMIGRATION PROCESSES IN THE COUNTRIES OF THE VISEGRAD GROUP

The article is devoted to analyzing the features, statistics and varieties of emigration processes in the countries of Visegrad Group, i.e. in Poland, Slovakia, Hungary and the Czech Republic. The author argued that emigration processes from the countries of the region before and during their integration into the EU were conditioned primarily by differences in social and economic development. It is observed that before and after the collapse of the USSR and changes in the labor markets and societies of the Visegrad countries, they were economically and socially dependent on Western European countries, and therefore key emigration processes were (and still are) directed to them. At the same time, it is motivated that emigration processes from the countries of the region lead to a shortage of labor, but due to the fact that the more educated is a population of a country the higher is an emigration flow from a country. Accordingly, it is recorded that the emigration activity of immigrants from the Visegrad countries changed after their accession to the EU. It is concluded that the countries of the region are summed up by the “liquid” migration in the form of transnationalism and mobility, since emigrants leave the countries not forever and not for a long time, but for a short time. At the same time, it is found that emigration from the countries of the region has both positive and negative consequences for them.

Keywords: migration, emigration, countries of the Visegrad group, the EU.

CECHY, STATYSTYKI I RODZAJE MIGRACYJNYCH PROCESÓW W KRAJACH GRUPY WYSZEHRADZKIEJ

W artykule przeanalizowane zostały cechy, statystyki i rodzaje procesów migracyjnych w krajach Grupy Wyszehradzkiej – w Polsce, na Słowacji, na Węgrzech i w Czechach. Udowodniono, że procesy migracyjne z krajów regionu przed i podczas ich integracji z UE były spowodowane przede wszystkim różnicami w rozwoju społeczno-gospodarczym. Zaobserwowano, że przed i po upadku ZSRR i zmian na rynkach pracy i społeczeństwach krajów Grupy Wyszehradzkiej, były one ekonomicznie i społecznie zależne od krajów Europy Zachodniej, dlatego kluczowe procesy migracyjne były (i nadal są) skierowane właśnie do nich. Jenocześnie motywuje się, że procesy migracyjne z krajów regionu prowadzą do niedoboru siły roboczej na rynkach pracy, a wynika to z faktu, że im lepiej wykształcone jest społeczeństwo, tym wyższy strumień migracyjny z kraju. W związku z tym, odnotowano, że migracyjna aktywność osób

pochodzących z krajów wyszehradzkich zmieniła się od czasu ich przystąpienia do UE. Podsumowując, we wszystkich krajach Grupy Wszehradzkij występuje «płynna» migracja pod postacią transnarodzizmu i mobilności, ponieważ emigranci opuszczają kraj nie zawsze i nie na długi okres czasu, a raczej krótkoterminowo. Jednocześnie stwierdzono, że migracja z krajów regionu ma dla nich zarówno pozytywne, jak i negatywne skutki.

Słowa kluczowe: migracja, emigracja, kraje Grupy Wszehradzkiej, UE.

The peculiarities of emigration processes in the contemporary Visegrad countries lie in the fact that they reached their the present-day format as late as the early 90's of the previous century, having historically proved to be utterly diversified and disparate. Therefore, following the experienced state-administrative and social-economic changes in the late 1980s and early 1990s, east-west migration became a major problem for the Visegrad countries. In the aftermath of initial stages of significant emigration from this former communist region, Western European countries subsequently adopted restrictive rules. This occurred largely due to rising unemployment figures and the burden of «eastern» immigrants on the welfare systems of the West. Simultaneously with the rise of emigration processes from the Visegrad countries, they themselves became the destinations for immigration influx from the east¹. However and most interestingly, the strict EU regulations on the Visegrad countries and other countries of Central and Eastern Europe (particularly, prior to their accession to the EU) consequently set an example of the desired legislature, regulating migration from newly democratic states, thus resulting in elaboration of certain migration management mechanisms². Hence, the anticipation of emigration from the countries of the Visegrad Group (especially in early 1990s) turned out to exceed its actual outcomes, as migration processes began to occur in different directions, in lieu of the east-west vector alone, being both short- and long-term, as well as legal and illegal. All this stipulated the necessity for scientific (theoretical, empirical and statistical) determination of the features and varieties of emigration processes in the Visegrad countries.

The alleged issue has been elucidated in influential scholarly treatises by such researchers as M. Bahna³, T. Bauer and K. Zimmermann⁴, J. Bijak and I. Korys⁵, K. Bodnar and L. Szabo⁶,

¹ Okólski M., Topińska I., *Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe: Final Country Report Poland*, 2012.; Wallace C., Chmouliar O., Sidorenko E., The eastern frontier of western Europe: mobility in the buffer zone, "New Community" 1996, vol 22, nr. 2, s. 259–286.

² Epstein G., Informational Cascades and Decision to Migrate, "IZA Discussion Paper" 2002, nr. 445.

³ Bahna M., *Migracja zo Slovenska po vstupe do Európskej unie*, Wyd. VEDA 2011.

⁴ Bauer T., Zimmermann K., An Assessment of Possible Migration Pressure Following EU Enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe, "IZA Research Report" 1999, nr. 3.

⁵ Bijak J., Korys I., Statistics or reality? International migration in Poland, "CEFM Working Paper" 2006, nr. 3/2006.

⁶ Bodnar K., Szabo L., The Effect of Emigration on the Hungarian Labour Market, "MNB Occasional Paper" 2014, nr. 114.

K. Budnik⁷, I. Czerniejewska and E. Goździak⁸, E. Duda-Mikulin⁹, J. Friberg¹⁰, M. Garapich¹¹, T. Hardy¹², A. Hárs¹³, K. Iglicka¹⁴, J. Marešová i D. Drbohlav¹⁵, B. Nowok¹⁶, M. Okólski and I. Topińska¹⁷, M. Pytlikova¹⁸, E. Sik¹⁹, D. Stola²⁰, P. Trevena²¹, C. Wallace²² and others. However, they did not manage to provide a systemic overview of the features and varieties of emigration processes in the Visegrad countries. Therefore, the proposed article is aimed primarily at eliminating the identified gaps through the prism of methods and toolbox of Political Science.

In this light the features of emigration in the Visegrad countries are worth discussing, especially through the prism of their orientation, activity, structure, geography, as well as varieties. The orientation of emigration processes from the countries of the region under consideration, i.e. Poland, Slovakia, Hungary and the Czech Republic, is conditioned primarily by their accession to the EU, both prior and posterior. It was found that the main destination of emigrants from the Visegrad countries has traditionally been Germany. Simultaneously, other neighboring and nearby countries are among the key destinations, e.g.: Austria is a typical target for the Czech Republic, with Slovakia

⁷ Budnik K., Migration Flows and Labour Market in Poland, "NBP Working Paper" 2007, nr. 44.

⁸ Czerniejewska I., Goździak E., "Aiding Defeated Migrants": Institutional Strategies to Assist Polish Returned Migrants, "International Migration" 2014, vol 52, nr. 1, s. 87-99; Goździak E., Biała emigracja: variegated mobility of Polish care workers, "Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture" 2016, vol 2, nr. 1, s. 26-43; Goździak E., Polish Migration after the Fall of the Iron Curtain, "International Migration" 2014, vol 52, nr. 1, s. 1-3; Goździak E., Pawlak M., Theorizing Polish Migration across Europe: Perspectives, Concepts and Methodologies, "Sprawy Narodowosciowe: Seria nowa" 2016, vol 48, s. 106-127.

⁹ Duda-Mikulin E., *Citizenship, migration and gender: Polish migrant women in the UK and Poland*, Paper to be presented at the Joint Annual Conference of the East Asian Social Policy Research Network (EASP) and the United Kingdom Social Policy Association (SPA), University of York 2012.

¹⁰ Friberg J., The States of migration: From going abroad to settling down: Postaccession Polish migrant worker in Norway, "Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies" 2012, vol 38, nr. 10, s. 1589-1605.

¹¹ Garapich M., *Odysean refugees, migrants and power – construction of "other" within the Polish "community" in the UK*, [w:] / Reed-Danahay D., Brettell C. (eds.), *Immigration and citizenship in Europe and the U.S.: Anthropological perspectives*, Wyd. Rutgers University Press 2007.

¹² Hardy T., *Labor Outflow from the Visegrad Countries after the EU Accession*, Wyd. Central European University 2010.

¹³ Hárs Á., Hungarian emigration and immigration perspectives – some economic considerations, "South-East Europe Review" 2001, s. 111-129; Hárs A., Simonovits B., Sik E., The Labor Market and Migration: Threat or Opportunity? The Likely Migration of Hungarian Labour to the European Union, "TÁRKI Social Report Reprint Series" 2005, nr. 15.

¹⁴ Iglicka K., Mechanisms of migration from Poland before and during the transition period, "Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies" 2000, vol 26, nr. 1, s. 61-73.

¹⁵ Marešová J., Drbohlav D., Fenomén pendlerství – z Chebska do Bavorska a zpět (stav a podmínčnosti), "Demografie" 2007, vol 49, nr. 2, s. 96-107.

¹⁶ Nowok B., Evolution of international migration statistics in selected Central European countries, "CEFMR Working Paper" 2005, nr. 8/2005.

¹⁷ Okólski M., Topińska I., *Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe: Final Country Report Poland*, 2012.

¹⁸ Pytlikova M., *Where Did Central and Eastern European Emigrants Go and Why?*, Presented at SOLE/EALE world conference, San Francisco 2005.

¹⁹ Sik E., *The sociological aspects of migration to and from contemporary Hungary and accession to the European Union*, Prepared for the World Bank 1998.

²⁰ Stola D., *Międzynarodowa mobilność zarobkowa w PRL*, [w:] Jazwinska-Motyłska E., Okólski M. (eds.), *Ludzie na bustawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu*, Wyd. Scholar 2001, s. 62-100; Stola D., *Two kinds of quasi-migration in the Middle Zone: Central Europe as a space for transit migration and mobility for profit*, [w:] Wallace C., Stola D. (eds.), *Patterns of Migration in Central Europe*, Wyd. Palgrave Macmillan 2001, s. 84-104.

²¹ Trevena P., "New" Polish migration to the UK: A synthesis of existing evidence, "ESRC Centre for Population Change Working Paper" 2009, nr. 3.

²² Wallace C., Opening and closing borders: migration and mobility in East-Central Europe, "Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies" 2002, vol 28, nr. 4, s. 603-625; Wallace C., Chmouliar O., Sidorenko E., The eastern frontier of western Europe: mobility in the buffer zone, "New Community" 1996, vol 22, nr. 2, s. 259-286.

and Hungary; Czech Republic for Slovakia; Slovakia in its turn for the Czech Republic; Switzerland for Hungary and the Czech Republic, the United Kingdom and the United States for Poland, etc. Interestingly, emigration processes in Germany are noticeable due to almost complete (at least half) coverage by Poland, amongst the rest of the Visegrad countries. This was especially common in the early 1990s, when a number of Germans, being Polish citizens, returned to their ethnic motherland. During the second half of the decade, emigration flows from Poland to Germany stabilized at the level of about 70,000 people a year. However, given the extent of the Polish immigrants influx and the fact that in 2000 there were 300,000 Poles settled in Germany, it can be claimed that migration from Poland to Germany has primarily been a temporary phenomenon, that is, most Polish immigrants move to this country either for a short time stay, or en-route²³. The situation slightly differs in the USA and Canada, with fewer Visegrad countries citizens migrating, however on long-lasting stays, as a rule. On the whole, it is noteworthy that in 1990-2000 the largest percentage of emigrants in the region came from Poland, whereas the Czech Republic was the least prone to migration (see Table 1).

Table 1. Emigration flows from the Visegrad countries by destination-countries in 1989-2000 (average annual figures in absolute numbers and as a population percentage of the destination-countries)

Major destination-countries	HUNGARY		Major destination-countries	POLAND	
	Average annual number	Percentage of the destination-country population		Average annual number	Percentage of the destination-country population
Germany	18 290	0,180	Germany	110 279	0,287
Austria	2 219	0,022	USA	17 104	0,045
USA	1 102	0,011	Canada	6 720	0,018
Canada	644	0,006	Austria	4 416	0,012
Netherlands	405	0,004	Italy	3 673	0,010
Switzerland	383	0,004	France	1 530	0,004
Total	24 359	0,239	Total	152 179	0,396
Major destination-countries	SLOVAKIA		Major destination-countries	CZECH REPUBLIC	
	Average annual number	Percentage of the destination-country population		Average annual number	Percentage of the destination-country population
Germany	7 827	0,146	Germany	12 163	0,118
Czech Republic	3 835	0,072	Austria	1 388	0,014
Austria	1 756	0,033	Slovakia	942	0,009
USA	555	0,010	USA	570	0,006
Hungary	333	0,006	Canada	450	0,004
Canada	273	0,005	Switzerland	342	0,003
Total	15 626	0,291	Total	17 197	0,167

Žródło: Pytlíková M., *Where Did Central and Eastern European Emigrants Go and Why?*, Presented at SOLE/EALE world conference, San Francisco 2005.

²³ Pytlíková M., *Where Did Central and Eastern European Emigrants Go and Why?*, Presented at SOLE/EALE world conference, San Francisco 2005.

As for the emigration processes from the Visegrad countries prior to and immediately following their accession to the EU, particularly in 2002-2007, they occurred in accordance with the abovementioned scheme, however retaining some peculiarities of their own²⁴. The main peculiarity was that after being granted the rights and freedoms of movement within the Union of European Countries, significant restrictions were imposed on the Visegrad Group labour market. Thus, on one hand, the EU membership of Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic had a positive impact on migration activity in each of the countries, on the other hand, the intensity of emigration proved rather low²⁵. The point is that the countries of the region anticipated that Western Europe would open new markets for them and their citizens would be able to work freely and without restriction in the "old" EU Member States. This would harmonize with the standard economic migration model by A. Roy²⁶, in terms of which the outflow of emigrants (primarily as labour force) from the four Visegrad countries had to increase, as more people had decided to move and work in the western countries owing to obvious advantages of the "old" EU Member States. In contrast, the latter expressed concern that an influx of relatively "cheap" yet skilled workers from the east could reduce the opportunities and social-economic status of their own workers. For this reason, Western countries were reluctant to agree on identical freedoms and job-opportunities for both newly acceded countries and the "old" EU Member States²⁷.

It was further argued that regulating the labour market and bringing the Visegrad Group countries closer to the EU level were crucial for them to achieve a European level of economic development in the future. However, even so, the first decade after the EU accession, the Visegrad countries tended to increase the number of emigrants to Western Europe. In the period from 2002 to 2006, for instance, the ratio of temporary emigrants to the overall population of Poland increased from 2 to 6%²⁸. Similarly, 11.3% of qualified Slovaks, Hungarians and Czechs were ready to emigrate to Western Europe, although merely 1.1% intended to do so on a permanent basis²⁹. In general, researchers anticipated that approximately 3% of the eastern population (not just from the Visegrad countries) would migrate west after their countries joined the EU, assuming that the migration flow was expected to rise to about 3 million people³⁰. Most of them had to focus on one destination-country, primarily Germany or the United Kingdom³¹.

²⁴ Hardy T., *Labor Outflow from the Visegrad Countries after the EU Accession*, Wyd. Central European University 2010.

²⁵ Wallace C., Opening and closing borders: migration and mobility in East-Central Europe, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 2002, vol 28, nr. 4, s. 603-625.

²⁶ Roy A., Some Thoughts on the Distribution of Earnings, *Oxford Economic Papers* 1951, vol 3, nr. 2, s. 135-146.

²⁷ Hardy T., *Labor Outflow from the Visegrad Countries after the EU Accession*, Wyd. Central European University 2010.

²⁸ Budnik K., Migration Flows and Labour Market in Poland, *NBP Working Paper* 2007, nr. 44.

²⁹ Hárs Á., Simonovits B., Sik E., The Labor Market and Migration: Threat or Opportunity? The Likely Migration of Hungarian Labour to the European Union, *TARKI Social Report Reprint Series* 2005, nr. 15.

³⁰ Bauer T., Zimmermann K., An Assessment of Possible Migration Pressure Following EU Enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe, *TZA Research Report* 1999, nr. 3.

³¹ Gilpin N., Henty M., Lemos S., Portes J., Bullen C., The impact of free movement of workers from Central and Eastern Europe on the UK labor market, *Department for Work and Pensions Working Paper* 2006, nr. 29.

On the whole, statistics prove that emigration activity from Visegrad countries has significantly changed since their accession to the EU. On one hand, the outward migration flow of workers from the four countries increased precisely in 2004, but began to vary after they joined the EU. It has been found that EU membership has had a significant impact on the Polish labour market, since emigration from the country to the EU doubled during the period of 2002-2005. Thus, in 2002 every 3rd out of 1000 people emigrated to the EU, in 2005 - every 6th out of 1000 people, and in 2007 - every 7th out of 1000 people in total. Identically, in 2007, emigration from Poland started to decrease, reaching the 2004 level. As far as Hungary is concerned, the outflow of labour in this country increased from 1 person to about 3 per 1000 citizens, and this increase has been partly continuing. This means that Hungary's EU accession has had a positive, albeit rather slight, impact on the outflow of labour force. Essentially, in Slovakia and the Czech Republic European integration proved positive immediately upon the EU accession, however weakening slightly in 2005. Therefore, in 2006 only 1 person per 1000 in the Czech Republic, as well as 5 people per 1000 in Slovakia emigrated to the EU (but first and foremost to Germany), thus reaching its 2002 level in total. On the whole, it resulted in the idea that in the long run the EU accession had little to no impact on the emigration activity of the Visegrad countries population³².

At the same time, it was found that Germany has remained the main target destination of immigrants from the Visegrad countries, both before and after their accession to the EU: on average, 2-3 people out of 1000 emigrated to this country in the given period. Emigration to the United Kingdom illustrated substantial growth once the Visegrad countries joined the EU. It may be accounted for by the fact that the UK was one of three European countries to have opened its labour market immediately after 2004. Austria has also become a popular destination country, as the number of emigrants has nearly doubled since joining the EU. Germany and Austria have become important destinations for immigrants from the east, at least because they are located in the centre of Europe, i.e. the closest to the emigrants' countries of origin³³. Hence, it is analytically proved (see Table 2) that the Visegrad countries EU accession has positively affected the outflow of labour from the region over a six-year period. This has demonstrated that since 2004, on average, more and more people are seeking to move and work in Western Europe. Among the positive-correlation factors, first of all, GDP per capita and the unemployment rate should be mentioned, whereas the minimum wage is a major negative-correlation factor. With a deeper insight, this is reflected in the fact that the average minimum wage does not affect the choice of emigration destination whatsoever, while the GDP per capita plays a decisive role in the case of emigration from Hungary and the Czech Republic, it being the unemployment rate in the case of Slovakia. Complementing the picture is the fact that the possibility of free movement of labour (against the background of the mobility of the region's population in the EU) does not affect the

³² Hardy T., *Labor Outflow from the Visegrad Countries after the EU Accession*, Wyd. Central European University 2010.

³³ Wallace C., Opening and closing borders: migration and mobility in East-Central Europe, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 2002, vol 28, nr. 4, s. 603-625.

outwards labour flow. However, such an analytical effect, peculiar for the Visegrad countries is purely qualitative, not quantitative, since the outflow of labour from the region is diversified and with a different intensity, typical of each of the countries: the most intensive emigration processes, judging by the accession to the EU were observed in Poland (several times higher than in other Visegrad countries), with much less intense consequences in the Czech Republic and Hungary, and the least intense in Slovakia³⁴.

Table 2. Statistics and Econometrics of the Reasons for Emigration from the Visegrad Countries to the EU (2002-2007) by the Number of People per 1 Million of the Population

An Indicator of statistics and econometrics of the emigration causes	Середнє значення	Стандартне відхилення	Максимальне значення	Мінімальне значення
The number of people, having moved to the EU countries from Hungary	94,24	347,96	2272,96	0
The number of people, having moved to the EU-25 countries from Poland	184,14	695,88	4288,67	0
The number of people, having moved to the EU-25 countries from Slovakia	234,95	666,04	45.33,23	0
The number of people, having moved to the EU-25 countries from the Czech Republic	58,58	180,71	1092,45	0
The number of people, having moved to the EU-25 countries from the Visegrad Group countries	154,08	526,28	3175,51	0
Indicator of whether the country of origin was already a EU member-state at the point of analysis: 0=no, 1=yes	–	–	1	0
GDP per capita, in Euro	20403,99	14645,92	78100	2100
Average annual unemployment rate,%	7,74	3,6	20	2,6
Minimum monthly wages, in Euro	388,71	469,09	1570,3	0

Źródło: Hardy T., *Labor Outflow from the Visegrad Countries after the EU Accession*, Wyd. Central European University 2010.

On one hand, such a statistical situation, has been a favourable prospect for the Western countries, anticipating constant immigration of workers from the Visegrad Group countries in search of better working and living conditions. On the other hand, however, there arose concerns in the realm of economy, regarding the fact that emigrants would be able to diversify the labour market in Western Europe. Nonetheless, in reality the situation took a different turn, as immediately after the EU accession, emigration from the Visegrad countries increased at initial stages, significantly decreasing later on. This was predetermined by the increasing convergence of the Visegrad countries with the EU, resulting in the threat of a drastic decrease in the number of emigrants from Central and Eastern Europe, particularly in the light of

³⁴ Hardy T., *Labor Outflow from the Visegrad Countries after the EU Accession*, Wyd. Central European University 2010.

meeting the demographic requirements of the Western Europe³⁵. Poland proved to be an exception, with traditionally higher number of emigrants than that of immigrants, since before the EU accession, the migration balance had been negative, and this trend continued after 2004. Alternatively, in Hungary, Slovakia and the Czech Republic as of 2004 the migration balance was positive, which meant that more people arrived than left³⁶. This corresponded to the emigration causes³⁷, including the search for better economic and social-economic benefits (wages and social security), as well as indicators of human development and capital. Additionally, the EU has traditionally felt anxious about a simultaneous increase in supply as well as cheapening of labour due to emigrants from the Visegrad countries (compared to higher rates of unemployment and payments of Western Europeans), whereas the Visegrad countries were disquieted by a large outflow of highly skilled workers.

Political and economic barriers, the appropriate migration policy, accompanied by introduction of the respective migration restrictions by both the EU and the Visegrad countries have therefore resolved mutual concerns³⁸. The socio-cultural and ethnolinguistic restrictions imposed have differently affected the emigration processes in the countries of the region. In particular, over time migration from Poland intensified, remaining at a relatively low level in the outwards direction from Hungary, Slovakia and the Czech Republic. Also, as a result of emigration from the Visegrad Group countries to the EU, immediately following its expansion, wages increased and against the background of the decrease in the number of inefficient jobs. Another consequence was a gradual inflow of additional capital into the Visegrad countries, stipulating similar processes to those of Western Europe. For this reason, the emigration expenses began to make up for benefits and wages in Western Europe over time, with people beginning to return to the «new» EU Member States. This transformation process, in turn, has been the wealth maximization in the entire European Union, compelling the EU and national economies to substantially liberalize migration processes in Europe. This proved that the overall economic impact of emigration from Visegrad countries was insubstantial, yet positive, on the whole, reflecting flexibility and speed of immigrants' adaptation to the labour market. In addition, it has illustrated that income allocation plays an important role in structuring the influx of emigrants, because in case it is more equal in the destination country than that of the country of origin, then the least skilled are likely to emigrate to that country and vice versa³⁹. Moreover, the higher the distribution of wages is more typical of wealthy countries, as a rule, thus emigrants from a poorer country will be «disadvantaged» in terms of their knowledge and

³⁵ Wallace C., Opening and closing borders: migration and mobility in East-Central Europe, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 2002, vol 28, nr. 4, s. 603–625.

³⁶ Stola D., *Two kinds of quasi-migration in the Middle Zone: Central Europe as a space for transit migration and mobility for profit*, [w:] Wallace C., Stola D. (eds.), *Patterns of Migration in Central Europe*, Wyd. Palgrave Macmillan 2001, s. 84–104.

³⁷ Hardy T., *Labor Outflow from the Visegrad Countries after the EU Accession*, Wyd. Central European University 2010.

³⁸ Bauer T., Zimmermann K., An Assessment of Possible Migration Pressure Following EU Enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe, *IZA Research Report* 1999, nr. 3.

³⁹ Borjas G., Self-Selection and the Earnings of Immigrants, *American Economic Review* 1987, vol 77, nr. 4, s. 531–553.

skills that match their preferences on the labour market⁴⁰. This, in turn, can directly account for the low intensity of emigration from the Visegrad countries right after their accession to the EU (at least until 2006-2007), since the analyzed countries are on average less wealthy than the «old» EU Member States, respectively, their citizens (with the exception of the Polish) fear that they will be unable to do work that meets their expectations and skills⁴¹.

Finally, emigration along with emigration processes from the Visegrad Group countries diversified, having largely inherited the patterns of previous development, i.e. from 2004-2005 to the present day. There were a number of determining factors, in particular: enhanced cooperation within the EU; the financial and economic crisis that began in 2008; migration crisis, drastically intensifying in 2014. In general, as seen in Table 3, emigration processes from the Visegrad countries on the whole are gaining momentum for the following reasons: the total annual number of long-term immigrants from the Visegrad is growing from year to year, especially in Hungary, Poland (though not so rapidly and with some fluctuation), Slovakia and overall in the region (at least over the period from 2007 to 2012); the average annual number of emigrants from the region was relatively stable in 2004-2007, then increased sharply, finally stabilizing since 2008; the number of emigrants from the Visegrad countries grew, particularly in 2008-2009 and continued to rise in Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic (although the latter soon experienced a sharp decline). The Czech Republic exemplifies a country where the number of emigrants is extremely variable and volatile, since at its peak during the analyzed period it was in 2008–2012, and during 2004–2007 and 2013–2015 it was almost at the same level. In terms of statistics, the largest total and annual number of emigrants in the region during 2004–2015 was observed in Poland, much less in the Czech Republic and Hungary (in descending order) and the least in Slovakia, respectively. Overall, over 2.5 million people (both nationals and transit migrants) emigrated from the region in 2004–2015 (excluding return statistics). Among them almost 2 million migrated from Poland, more than 0.45 million moved from the Czech Republic, more than 0.2 million came from Hungary, with only 0.025 million from Slovakia. On average, more than 160,000 people emigrate from Poland each year, almost 40,000 from the Czech Republic, more than 17,000 from Hungary, and just over 2,000 from Slovakia. An additional fact that serves as a proof of the continuation of previously established emigration patterns was the dynamics of change in the total and annual number of emigrants from the Visegrad countries, particularly the 2015 to 2004 ratio. It was found that on the whole over this period (year to year) the total number of emigrants in the region increased by 5.6 times; the average annual number of emigrants in the region has also increased by 5.6 times. Moreover, the annual number of emigrants from Poland increased by 13.7 times, by 11.3 times in Hungary, and by 2.4 times in Slovakia. Instead, in the Czech Republic, the number

⁴⁰ Brücker H., Defoort C., Inequality and the (Self-)Selection of International Migrants: Theory and Novel Evidence. *“LAB Discussion Paper”* 2007, nr. 26/2007.

⁴¹ Brücker H., Defoort C., Inequality and the (Self-)Selection of International Migrants: Theory and Novel Evidence. *“LAB Discussion Paper”* 2007, nr. 26/2007.

of emigrants in correlation of 2015 to 2004 decreased, estimating for only 74% of the period, immediately following the country's EU accession.

Table 3. The Annual Number of Long-Term Emigrants from the Visegrad Countries (2004–2015, Annual Snapshot)

Year	Hungary, №	Poland, №	Slovakia, №	Czech Republic, №	Totally in all Visegrad countries, №	On average in all Visegrad countries, №
2004	3 820	18 877	1 586	34 818	59 101	14 775
2005	3 658	22 242	1 873	24 065	51 838	12 960
2006	4 314	46 936	1 735	33 463	86 448	21 612
2007	4 500	35 480	1 831	20 500	62 311	15 578
2008	9 591	30 140	1 705	51 478	92 914	23 229
2009	10 483	229 320	1 979	61 782	303 564	75 891
2010	13 365	218 126	1 889	61 069	294 449	73 612
2011	15 100	265 798	1 863	55 910	338 671	84 668
2012	22 880	275 603	2 003	46 106	346 592	86 648
2013	34 691	276 446	2 770	25 894	339 801	84 950
2014	42 213	268 299	3 644	28 468	342 624	85 656
2015	43 225	258 837	3 870	25 684	331 616	82 904
Total for the whole period, №	207 840	1 946 104	26 748	469 237	2 649 929	662 482
On average annually for the whole period, №	17 320	162 175	2 229	39 103	220 827	55 207
The ratio of 2015 to 2004	11,3	13,7	2,4	0,7	5,6	5,6

Źródło: Population (Demography, Migration and Projections): Main tables, Eurostat, Źródło: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/population-demography-migration-projections/population-data/main-tables> (odczyt: 25.05.2019).

The Visegrad countries emigration structure traditionally does not bear traces of unilateral prevalence of either women or men (see Tables 4 and 5). However, generally, the majority of emigrants are predominantly male, both in the region as a whole, and in individual countries of the region, except for Slovakia. However, a gradual rise (unilaterally in Hungary and gradually, yet with fluctuations in the Czech Republic, and through the entire region) or stabilization (in Poland and Slovakia) of the percentage of female emigrants from the Visegrad countries was primarily observed in 2006–2015. As of 2015, the largest number of female emigrants came from Poland, with the smallest number coming from Slovakia (which corresponds to the overall emigration statistics). In turn, among all the countries in the region, Slovakia was the country of origin of the largest percentage of emigrants, significantly fewer emigrants came from the Czech Republic and Hungary, and the least number moved from Poland. This determines that emigration from the Visegrad Group countries is subject to modification by gender, being gradually feminized. Nevertheless, the emigration estimate by sex has proved male prevalence,

largely due to the structure of the destination-countries labour markets. It is also noteworthy that the proportion and number of female emigrants began to increase mainly after 2008, when Europe reached the «peak» of the financial and economic crisis, affecting the need for employment, not only for men, but also for women (simultaneously unemployment rate in Western Europe rose, leading to the search for additional migration resources).

Table 4. Generalized gender characteristics of emigration from Visegrad countries (2006–2015, annual snapshot)

Country	2006	2009	2012	2015
<i>Annual number of emigrants from the Visegrad countries (2006–2015, for one year), No.</i>				
Hungary	4 314	10 483	22 880	43 225
Poland	46 936	229 320	275 603	258 837
Slovakia	1 735	4 753	2 003	3 870
Czech Republic	33 463	61 782	46 106	25 684
Total	86 448	306 338	346 592	331 616
<i>Annual number of female emigrants in correlation to the annual number of emigrants from Visegrad countries (2006–2015, for one year), No.</i>				
Hungary	1 633	4 449	10 049	19 540
Poland	19 699	114 132	135 017	109 958
Slovakia	1 030	1 833	1 225	2 316
Czech Republic	13 108	22 896	20 474	12 318
Total	35 470	143 310	166 765	144 132
<i>Annual percentage of female emigrants in correlation to the annual number of emigrants from the Visegrad countries (2006–2015, for one year), %</i>				
Hungary	37,9	42,4	43,9	45,2
Poland	42,0	49,8	49,0	42,5
Slovakia	59,4	38,6	61,2	59,9
Czech Republic	39,2	37,1	44,4	48,0
Total	41,0	46,8	48,1	43,5

Annual percentage of female emigrants in correlation to the annual number of emigrants from the Visegrad countries (2006–2015, for one year), %

Źródło: *Trends in International migrant stock 2015: Migrants by Destination and Origin*, United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs 2015. Źródło: <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates15.shtml> (odczyt: 25.05.2019).; *Population (Demography, Migration and Projections): Main tables*, Eurostat, Źródło: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/population-demography-migration-projections/population-data/main-tables> (odczyt: 25.05.2019).

It is noteworthy that the proportion of female emigrants differs in terms of age, since most of them, at least as of 2015, were under 14 both in the entire region, and in Poland, in particular (see Table 4). In contrast, Hungary illustrates the highest proportion of female emigrants under the age of 29, in the Czech Republic between the ages of 15 and 29, whereas in Slovakia between the ages of 20 and 39. Alternatively, the smallest proportion of emigrant women in the region is aged from 15 to 19, and from 30 to 54, though with significant variations by country: in Hungary - from 35 to 49, in Poland - from 15 to 24, in Slovakia - up to 19 years, and in the Czech Republic - from 45 to 64 years. In general, by age estimate, emigrants from the Visegrad countries most often belong to the age group of 25-39 years old, rarely to the age group of 20-24 and 40-49 years, and most rarely to the age category of 19 and 50. Totally, this means that the «lion's share» of emigrants from the countries of the region are persons of both working and middle age, and the least represented age group is children, adolescents, pre-retirement and retirement age. Slightly different is the situation in the snapshot: Poland, where the number of able-bodied emigrants decreases when they are 40 years old; Slovakia, where the number of able-bodied emigrants decreases after they reach 45; The Czech Republic, where the number of emigrants decreases when they turn 55 years old. Also, in Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic, the number of emigrants aged more than 65 is larger than those aged 55-59 or 60-64.

Table 5. Quantitative characteristics and percentage of the age and gender structure of emigration from the Visegrad countries (as of 2015, in annual snapshot)

Country/age of emigrants	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65+	Total	
	Total number	215	469	325	744	6 691	9 804	6 918	5 489	4 205	3 135	1 905	1 310	680	1 335	43 225
Number of females	104	234	158	352	3 477	4 959	3 086	2 136	1 588	1 248	785	556	278	579	19 540	
percentage of females	48,4	49,9	48,6	47,3	52,0	50,6	44,6	38,9	37,8	39,8	41,2	42,4	40,9	43,4	45,2	
Poland	Total №	11 828	14 999	9 580	13 422	18 394	31 149	40 134	31 963	23 681	17 016	13 075	10 604	8 235	14 577	258 837
	Number of females	5 731	7 430	4 730	4 454	7 244	13 586	16 197	13 247	9 967	6 953	5 578	4 761	3 744	6 336	109 958
	percentage of females	48,5	49,5	49,4	33,2	39,4	43,6	40,4	41,4	42,1	40,9	42,7	44,9	45,5	42,9	42,5
Slovakia	Total number	194	358	179	132	138	425	726	705	410	197	136	101	86	83	3 870
	Number of females	85	172	81	63	86	268	500	461	247	108	79	60	52	54	2 316
	percentage of females	43,8	48,0	45,3	47,7	62,3	63,1	68,9	65,4	60,2	54,8	58,1	59,4	60,5	65,0	59,9
The Czech Republic	Total number	590	744	595	1 380	3 611	4 162	3 130	2 826	2 345	1 843	1 547	1 088	690	1 133	25 684
	Number of females	288	352	289	748	2 111	2 212	1 419	1 258	1 070	739	580	419	280	553	12 318
	percentage of females	48,8	47,3	48,6	54,2	58,5	53,1	45,3	44,5	45,6	40,0	37,5	38,5	40,6	48,8	48,0
Total	Total number	12 827	16 570	10 679	15 678	28 834	45 540	50 908	40 983	30 641	22 191	16 663	13 103	9 691	17 308	331 616
	Number of females	6 208	8 188	5 258	5 617	12 918	21 025	21 202	17 102	12 872	9 048	7 022	5 796	4 354	7 522	144 132
	percentage of females	48,4	49,4	49,2	35,8	44,8	46,2	41,6	41,7	42,0	40,8	42,1	44,2	44,9	43,5	43,5

Zdroj: *Trends in International Migrant Stock 2015, Migrants by Destination and Origin*, United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs 2015. Zdroj: <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates15.shtml> (odczyt: 25.05.2019).; *Population (Demography, Migration and Projections)*, Main tables, Eurostat, Zdroj: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/population-demography-migration-projections/population-data/main-tables> (odczyt: 25.05.2019).

Previously established migration patterns related to the structure of emigration directions from the Visegrad countries have preserved. As of 2015 (see Table 6), emigrants from Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic have traditionally moved in the direction of the EU countries, preferably Western Europe (excluding re-emigrants). In total, more emigrants from the Visegrad countries (excluding re-emigrants) were moving towards the non-EU countries (although they could be in Western Europe). This is true for the region as a whole, and particularly for Poland and the Czech Republic. Instead, emigrants (yet not re-emigrants) from Hungary and Slovakia mostly headed for the EU. On the other hand, totally (including re-emigrants and cyclical migrants), most of the permanent or temporary migrants from (or through transit countries) from the Visegrad Group travelled to the EU and Western Europe, similarly to previous years.

Table 6. Structure of emigration destinations (by number of emigrants) from the Visegrad countries (as of 2015, in annual snapshot)

Country	Emigration country (re-emigration)	EU countries (except for the analysed country)	Non-EU countries	Non-governmental association	Other	Total
Hungary	32 852	7 104	3 269	0	0	43 225
Poland	169 375	34 320	54 961	18	163	258 837
Slovakia	3 835	30	5	0	0	3 870
Czech Republic	6 803	3 830	15 051	0	0	25 684
Total	212 865	45 284	73 286	18	163	331 616

Źródło: *Population (Demography, Migration and Projections): Main tables*, Eurostat, Źródło: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/population-demography-migration-projections/population-data/main-tables> (odczyt: 25.05.2019).

The situation is further reiterated by the fact that most of the emigrants from the Visegrad countries moved to countries, such as Germany, Austria, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the like. Nevertheless, the causality of the emigration processes in the analysed countries, in spite of bearing a number of similarities, was frequently conditioned by the national criteria of migration and economic policies of certain countries. Therefore, their contemplation may further testify to the peculiarities of emigration from Visegrad.

The emigration situation in Hungary is determined by particular intensity since 2008, which, on one hand, coincided with the financial and economic crisis, yet the Hungarian economy became more flexible⁴². Such a tendency clearly differentiates between the prior and posterior to the EU accession⁴³ situation in Hungary, since during this period the country was characterized by a moderate (against the background of the Visegrad countries) population outflow, even despite

⁴² Bodnar K., Szabo L., The Effect of Emigration on the Hungarian Labour Market, "MNB Occasional Paper" 2014, nr. 114.

⁴³ Sik E., *The sociological aspects of migration to and from contemporary Hungary and accession to the European Union*, Prepared for the World Bank 1998.

the gradual removal of restrictions on labor emigration in the EU. Therefore, as of 2011, a large part of Hungarian citizens, to be precise more than 460 thousand or 4.6% of the population, lived abroad, with 400 thousand, living in the countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, primarily Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, United Kingdom, and more. This occurred due to the fact that Hungary's GDP and other social-economic indicators are much lower than in the highly developed countries of the world, hence emigration from Hungary has traditionally been economically⁴⁴ and labour-determined. On the other hand, contemporary Hungary has been characterized by re-emigration (return of emigrants) and less intensive long-term and more intensive short-term emigration, which is caused by the intended improvement of the social-economic environment in the country.

Emigration from Poland (where national statistics are extremely complicated, and not always meeting international requirements⁴⁵) is traditionally defined as perhaps the most vivid against the background of the rest of the Visegrad countries⁴⁶, as emigration, both political and economical, has remained an inherent phenomenon, rooted deeply in the history and public consciousness of the Poles⁴⁷. For instance, during 1871–1913 almost 3.5 million Polish people emigrated (approximately 14% of Poland's population of those times), whereas another 2.1 million people left Poland in the interwar period (1918–1939). As a consequence, a number of Polish emigration networks were established abroad, contributing to immense volumes of international migration, the final institutionalization of emigration as well as the development of targeted national migration programmes. Nevertheless, after the Second World War emigration processes in Poland were strongly politicized⁴⁸. Therefore, since the 1990's emigration (including re-emigration) processes have become the main form of international mobility in Poland, which is primarily reflected in the long-term population outflow. The emigration trend in the country has proved that emigration processes are regular, circular and purposeful, as a rule, targeted at Germany, the USA, Canada, Austria, France, Italy, the Netherlands, the United States, and the like⁴⁹. Notably, the inhabitants of the southern provinces of Poland are most prone to emigration. However, the EU accession and consequently further opening up of all EU labour markets have led to one of the largest emigration flows in the postwar history of Poland⁵⁰, which has become one of the

⁴⁴ Sik E., *The sociological aspects of migration to and from contemporary Hungary and accession to the European Union*, Prepared for the World Bank 1998.

⁴⁵ Nowok B., Evolution of international migration statistics in selected Central European countries, "CEFMR Working Paper" 2005, nr. 8/2005.

⁴⁶ Bijak J., Korys I., Statistics or reality? International migration in Poland, "CEFMR Working Paper" 2006, nr. 3/2006.

⁴⁷ Morawska E., Labour Migrations of Poles in the Atlantic World Economy, 1880–1914, "Comparative Studies in Society and History" 1989, vol 31, nr. 2, s. 237-272.

⁴⁸ Stola D., *Międzynarodowa mobilność zarobkowa w PRL*, [w:] Jazwińska-Motyłska E., Okolski M. (eds.), *Ludzie na bustawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu*, Wyd. Scholar 2001, s. 62-100.

⁴⁹ Jazwińska E., Filhel A., Praszatowicz D., Weinar A., Kaczmarczyk P., *Studies of mechanisms of emigration from Poland after 1989*, [w:] Kicingier A., Weinar A. (eds.), *State of the art of the migration research in Poland*, "CEFMR Working Paper" 2007, nr. 1/2007, s. 18-36.

⁵⁰ Gozdzik E., Pawlak M., Theorizing Polish Migration across Europe: Perspectives, Concepts and Methodologies, "Sprawy Narodowosciowe: Seria nowa" 2016, vol 48, s. 106-127.; Gozdzik E., Biała emigracja: variegated mobility of Polish care workers, "Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture" 2016, vol 2, nr. 1, s. 26-43.

largest labour-providers in the expanded EU⁵¹. Another inherent feature of the country is that it is characterized by negative net migration (a negative migration balance), receiving significantly fewer immigrants than emigrants⁵². In addition, if in the 1990's Polish emigrants mainly consisted of middle-aged people without higher education, today mostly young and highly skilled workers are apt to emigration⁵³. Therefore, to conclude one should say that Poland manifests the so-called "liquid" migration⁵⁴ in the form of transnationalism and mobility, with emigrants leaving the country for short-term stays. This is what differentiates the present situation from the historical one, when Poles traditionally would leave either forever or for a long time. The emigration directions have also changed, since earlier the US used to be the key destination for the Poles, whereas modern-day Poles prefer Western Europe, primarily Germany and the United Kingdom⁵⁵. This substantially modernized the inherent public discourse of comprehending emigration in Poland, because in terms of politics it is mostly perceived as a "sacred act of the fight for freedom" while, in the economic context, as "a necessary evil, a manifestation of weakness, or simply cowardice, selfishness, and an ambiguous act of aversion from the Destination of the Nation"⁵⁶. It manifested itself in the fact that people, having previously emigrated to various foreign countries, were increasingly returning to Poland. Even if they contemplated the option of emigration, it would mostly be circular, i.e. still returning home⁵⁷. As a result, emigration began to be socialized and highly mobile, starting to be conditioned by a certain "liquid culture" and "transnational consciousness".

Interestingly, both Slovakia and the Czech Republic are characterised by the fact that emigration there was mainly the result of the 1989-1993 political changes, when Czechoslovakia ceased to be socialist and subsequently split into two countries. Hence, the emigration processes in the analyzed countries were marked by their accession to the EU, which resulted in Slovakia becoming mainly an sending-country, whereas the Czech Republic became a transit-emigration / transit country. This presupposes that emigration from Slovakia has been conditioned by Slovaks themselves, while in the Czech Republic it occurred on account of emigrants who have used the country as an interim destination in the east-west movement. It therefore clarifies that Slovakia tends to emigrate more (as it did during the period of population movement

⁵¹ Gozdziaek E., Polish Migration after the Fall of the Iron Curtain, *"International Migration"* 2014, vol 52, nr. 1, s. 1-3.

⁵² Iglicka K., Mechanisms of migration from Poland before and during the transition period, *"Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies"* 2000, vol 26, nr. 1, s. 61-73.

⁵³ Czerniejewska I., Gozdziaek E., "Aiding Defeated Migrants": Institutional Strategies to Assist Polish Returned Migrants, *"International Migration"* 2014, vol 52, nr. 1, s. 87-99.

⁵⁴ Engbersen G., *Migration transitions in an era of liquid migration: Reflections on Fassmann and Reeger*, [w:] Okolski M. (ed.), *Europe: The continent of immigrants: Trends, structures and policy implications*, Wyd. Amsterdam University Press 2012, s. 91-105.

⁵⁵ Gozdziaek E., Polish Migration after the Fall of the Iron Curtain, *"International Migration"* 2014, vol 52, nr. 1, s. 1-3.; Trevena P., "New" Polish migration to the UK: A synthesis of existing evidence, *"ESRC Centre for Population Change Working Paper"* 2009, nr. 3.; Duda-Mikulini E., *Citizenship, migration and gender: Polish migrant women in the UK and Poland*, Paper to be presented at the Joint Annual Conference of the East Asian Social Policy Research Network (EASP) and the United Kingdom Social Policy Association (SPA), University of York 2012.

⁵⁶ Garapich M., *Odyssean refugees, migrants and power – construction of "other" within the Polish "community" in the UK*, [w:] / Reed-Danahay D., Brettell C. (eds.), *Immigration and citizenship in Europe and the U.S.: Anthropological perspectives*, Wyd. Rutgers University Press 2007, s. 7.

⁵⁷ Friberg J., The States of migration: From going abroad to settling down: Postaccession Polish migrant worker in Norway, *"Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies"* 2012, vol 38, nr. 10, s. 1590.

within Czechoslovakia), and the Czech Republic shows propensity to immigration and transit emigration. Moreover, most emigrants from Slovakia (see Table 7) are moving to the Czech Republic alongside Germany, proving that migration processes are primarily affected by the country's past as a part of Czechoslovakia. Alternatively, Czech emigrants (especially since 2002) are moving in very diversified directions, proving that the country is primarily transit. Such variability of the Slovak and Czech situations is due to the fact that the two countries started to diversify since 1993: Slovakia due to problems of democracy, and in contrast the Czech Republic with the benefits of democracy. The main reason for the Czech emigration and transit status was political stability, the evolution of democracy, attended by preserved or even rising standards of living, as well as the Czech mentality, which stimulated mostly casual and temporary emigration to highly developed countries of the world, as well as immigration of other foreign countries to the Czech Republic⁵⁸. As opposed to that, Slovakia over the 1990s was regarded as unstable, with deficiencies of democracy, therefore failing to attract immigrants, instead causing the outflow of its own population (of different ages, yet mostly university graduates) abroad⁵⁹.

Table 7. Logics and statistics of migration processes in the Czech Republic (partly Slovakia) (1990–2006, in annual snapshot)

Year	Emigrants to the Czech R. KRreREpub, №		Emigrants from the Czech R. Republic, №		Net migration, №	
	Total	From Slovakia	Total	To Slovakia	Total	Incl. Slovakia
1990	12 411	10 073	11 787	7 674	+624	+2 399
1991	14 096	8 334	11 220	7 324	+2 876	+1 010
1992	19 072	11 740	7 291	6 823	+11 781	+4 917
1993	12 900	7 276	7 424	7 232	+5 476	+44
1994	10 207	4 076	265	56	+9 942	+4 020
1995	10 540	3 845	541	140	+9 999	+3 705
1996	10 857	3 450	728	213	+10 129	+3 237
1997	12 880	3 088	805	260	+12 075	+2 828
1998	10 729	2 887	1 241	356	+9 488	+2 531
1999	9 910	3 235	1 136	336	+8 774	+2 899
2000	7 802	2 826	1 263	413	+6 539	+2 413
2001	12 918	3 050	21 469	8 671	-8 551	-5 621
2002	44 679	13 326	32 389	14 455	+12 290	-1 129
2003	60 015	24 410	34 226	18 316	+25 789	+6 094
2004	53 453	15 788	34 818	21 152	+18 635	-5 364
2005	60 294	10 133	24 065	1 935	+36 229	+8 198
2006	68 183	6 795	33 463	629	+34 720	+6 166

Źródło: The table is based on the internal statistics of the Czech Republic as of 2008.

⁵⁸ Marešová J., Drbohlav D., Fenomén pendlerství – z Chebska do Bavorska a zpět (stav a podmínčnosti), „*Demografie*“ 2007, vol 49, nr. 2, s. 96-107.

⁵⁹ Zelinsky T., *Chudoba a deprivácia na Slovensku: Metodologické aspekty a empiria*, Wyd. Equilibria 2014.; Bahna M., *Migrácia zo Slovenska po vstupe do Európskej únie*, Wyd. VEDA 2011.

In conclusion, it is worth stating that emigration from the Visegrad countries since 1990, that is, after the collapse of «real socialism», has proven unique in numerous ways. Firstly, it was unprecedented in the realm of velocity, scale and perseverance, compared to emigration from other countries, largely owing to the nature of the former communist countries' reintegration into the world economy. Secondly, it has been determined by the fact that the emigrants from the Visegrad countries are comprised of young and highly skilled people (with lower average age, and higher education level than that of the remaining population in the sending-country⁶⁰). In this respect, the so-called «brain drain» coincided with the population aging in the Visegrad countries, which had a far-reaching impact on their efficiency and productivity. Thirdly, emigration from the analysed countries seems more permanent than emigration from other foreign countries⁶¹. On one hand, Visegrad is characterized mainly by economic emigration, on the other hand, the movement of emigrants from the countries of the region is traditionally directed to Western Europe and North America. And the reasons, accounting for this fact are the following: the difference in per capita income levels, quality of institutions and employment prospects. Simultaneously, it is noteworthy that the situation among the countries under analysis is more favorable in Hungary and the Czech Republic, which demonstrate a significant level of migration within Central and Eastern Europe, herein these countries are usually determined by positive cumulative migration. The situation is accompanied by the fact that improvement of social-economic indicators contributes to re-emigration, which is more typical for Hungary and the Czech Republic. Ultimately, emigration from the Visegrad countries is socio-economically advantageous for the countries of Western Europe, not Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic themselves, therefore requiring a comprehensive response at both national and regional political levels.

References

1. Ariu A., Squicciarini P., The Balance of Brains: Corruption and High Skilled Migration, "IRES Discussion Paper" 2013, nr. 2013/010.
2. Atoyan R., Christiansen L., Dizioli A., Ebeke C., Ilahi N., Ilyina A., Mehrez G., Qu H., Raci F., Rhee A., Zakharova D., Emigration and Its Economic Impact on Eastern Europe, „IMF Staff Discussion Note“ 2016, nr. 16/07.
3. Bahna M., *Migracia zo Slovenska po vstupe do Europskej unie*, Wyd. VEDA 2011.
4. Bauer T., Zimmermann K., An Assessment of Possible Migration Pressure Following EU Enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe, "IZA Research Report" 1999, nr. 3.
5. Bijak J., Korys I., Statistics or reality? International migration in Poland, "CEFM Working Paper" 2006, nr. 3/2006.

⁶⁰ Ariu A., Squicciarini P., The Balance of Brains: Corruption and High Skilled Migration, "IRES Discussion Paper" 2013, nr. 2013/010.

⁶¹ Atoyan R., Christiansen L., Dizioli A., Ebeke C., Ilahi N., Ilyina A., Mehrez G., Qu H., Raci F., Rhee A., Zakharova D., Emigration and Its Economic Impact on Eastern Europe, „IMF Staff Discussion Note“ 2016, nr. 16/07.

6. Bodnar K., Szabo L., The Effect of Emigration on the Hungarian Labour Market, "*MNB Occasional Paper*" 2014, nr. 114.
7. Borjas G., Self-Selection and the Earnings of Immigrants, "*American Economic Review*" 1987, vol 77, nr. 4, s. 531-553.
8. Brücker H., Defoort C., Inequality and the (Self-)Selection of International Migrants: Theory and Novel Evidence. "*LAB Discussion Paper*" 2007, nr. 26/2007.
9. Budnik K., Migration Flows and Labour Market in Poland, "*NBP Working Paper*" 2007, nr. 44.
10. Czerniejewska I., Goździak E., "Aiding Defeated Migrants": Institutional Strategies to Assist Polish Returned Migrants, "*International Migration*" 2014, vol 52, nr. 1, s. 87-99.
11. Duda-Mikulini E., *Citizenship, migration and gender: Polish migrant women in the UK and Poland*, Paper to be presented at the Joint Annual Conference of the East Asian Social Policy Research Network (EASP) and the United Kingdom Social Policy Association (SPA), University of York 2012.
12. Engbersen G., *Migration transitions in an era of liquid migration: Reflections on Fassmann and Reeger*, [w:] Okolski M. (ed.), *Europe: The continent of immigrants: Trends, structures and policy implications*, Wyd. Amsterdam University Press 2012, s. 91-105.
13. Epstein G., Informational Cascades and Decision to Migrate, "*IZA Discussion Paper*" 2002, nr. 445.
14. Friberg J., The States of migration: From going abroad to settling down: Postaccession Polish migrant worker in Norway, "*Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*" 2012, vol 38, nr. 10, s. 1589-1605.
15. Garapich M., *Odyssean refugees, migrants and power – construction of "other" within the Polish "community" in the UK*, [w:] / Reed-Danahay D., Brettell C. (eds.), *Immigration and citizenship in Europe and the U.S.: Anthropological perspectives*, Wyd. Rutgers University Press 2007.
16. Gilpin N., Henty M., Lemos S., Portes J., Bullen C., The impact of free movement of workers from Central and Eastern Europe on the UK labor market, "*Department for Work and Pensions Working Paper*" 2006, nr. 29.
17. Goździak E., Biała emigracja: variegated mobility of Polish care workers, „*Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*” 2016, vol 2, nr. 1, s. 26-43.
18. Goździak E., Polish Migration after the Fall of the Iron Curtain, "*International Migration*" 2014, vol 52, nr. 1, s. 1–3.
19. Goździak E., Pawlak M., Theorizing Polish Migration across Europe: Perspectives, Concepts and Methodologies, „*Sprawy Narodowościowe: Seria nowa*” 2016, vol 48, s. 106-127.
20. Hardy T., *Labor Outflow from the Visegrad Countries after the EU Accession*, Wyd. Central European University 2010.
21. Hárs Á., Hungarian emigration and immigration perspectives – some economic considerations, "*South-East Europe Review*" 2001, s. 111-129.
22. Hárs Á., Simonovits B., Sik E., The Labor Market and Migration: Threat or Opportunity? The Likely Migration of Hungarian Labour to the European Union, "*TÁRKI Social Report Reprint Series*" 2005, nr. 15.

23. Iglicka K., Mechanisms of migration from Poland before and during the transition period, *“Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies”* 2000, vol 26, nr. 1, s. 61-73.
24. Jaźwińska E., Filhel A., Praszatowicz D., Weinar A., Kaczmarczyk P., *Studies of mechanisms of emigration from Poland after 1989*, [w:] Kicinger A., Weinar A. (eds.), *State of the art of the migration research in Poland*, “CEFMR Working Paper” 2007, nr. 1/2007, s. 18-36.
25. Marešová J., Drbohlav D., Fenomén pendlerství – z Chebska do Bavorska a zpět (stav a podmínčnosti), *“Demografie”* 2007, vol 49, nr. 2, s. 96-107.
26. Morawska E., Labour Migrations of Poles in the Atlantic World Economy, 1880–1914, *“Comparative Studies in Society and History”* 1989, vol 31, nr. 2, s. 237-272.
27. Nowok B., Evolution of international migration statistics in selected Central European countries, “CEFMR Working Paper” 2005, nr. 8/2005.
28. Okólski M., Topińska I., *Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe: Final Country Report Poland*, 2012.
29. *Population (Demography, Migration and Projections): Main tables*, Eurostat, Źródło: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/population-demography-migration-projections/population-data/main-tables> (odczyt: 25.05.2019).
30. Pytlikova M., *Where Did Central and Eastern European Emigrants Go and Why?*, Presented at SOLE/EALE world conference, San Francisco 2005.
31. Roy A., Some Thoughts on the Distribution of Earnings, *“Oxford Economic Papers”* 1951, vol 3, nr. 2, s. 135-146.
32. Sik E., *The sociological aspects of migration to and from contemporary Hungary and accession to the European Union*, Prepared for the World Bank 1998.
33. Stola D., *Międzynarodowa mobilność zarobkowa w PRL*, [w:] Jazwinska-Motyłska E., Okolski M. (eds.), *Ludzie na bustawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu*, Wyd. Scholar 2001, s. 62-100.
34. Stola D., *Two kinds of quasi-migration in the Middle Zone: Central Europe as a space for transit migration and mobility for profit*, [w:] Wallace C., Stola D. (eds.), *Patterns of Migration in Central Europe*, Wyd. Palgrave Macmillan 2001, s. 84-104.
35. *Trends in International migrant stock 2015: Migrants by Destination and Origin*, United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs 2015. Źródło: <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates15.shtml> (odczyt: 25.05.2019).
36. Trevena P., “New” Polish migration to the UK: A synthesis of existing evidence, *“ESRC Centre for Population Change Working Paper”* 2009, nr. 3.
37. Wallace C., Opening and closing borders: migration and mobility in East-Central Europe, *“Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies”* 2002, vol 28, nr. 4, s. 603–625.
38. Wallace C., Chmouliar O., Sidorenko E., The eastern frontier of western Europe: mobility in the buffer zone, *“New Community”* 1996, vol 22, nr. 2, s. 259–286.
39. Zelinsky T., *Chudoba a deprivacia na Slovensku: Metodologicke aspekty a empiria*, Wyd. Equilibria 2014.