

THE PHENOMENON AND FEATURES OF INTERNAL MIGRATION IN THE COUNTRIES OF THE VISEGRAD GROUP

The article is dedicated to analyzing the phenomenon and features of internal migration in the Visegrad group countries. This was done according to such parameters as: “regions – capital” migration, “region – region” and “village – city” migration, “poor regions – rich regions” migration. In addition, the author identified the factors and motives of internal migration in the countries of the region. In this regard, it was established that suburbanization as the growth and development of the suburban area of large cities, due to which urban agglomerations are formed, is a common characteristic of the countries of the Visegrad group. In addition, migration processes from poorer to richer regions and settlements can be traced in the countries of the region. It was also found that in terms of GDP per capita and migration balance in the regions of each of the Visegrad group countries, high GDP per capita is typical for regions with a positive migration balance, and low GDP per capita for regions with a negative migration balance.

Keywords: migration, internal migration, population, urbanization, Visegrad Group.

ZJAWISKO I CECHY MIGRACJI WEWNĘTRZNEJ W KRAJACH GRUPY WYSZEHRADZKIEJ

Artykuł analizuje zjawisko i cechy migracji wewnętrznych w krajach Grupy Wyszehradzkiej. Dokonano tego według takich parametrów jak: migracja „regiony – stolica”, migracja „region – region” i „wieś – miasto”, migracja „regiony biedne – regiony bogate”. Ponadto zidentyfikowano czynniki i motywy migracji wewnętrznej w poszczególnych regionach. W związku z tym ustalono, że suburbanizacja jako wzrost i rozwój obszaru podmiejskiego dużych miast, przez co powstają aglomeracje miejskie, jest wspólną cechą krajów Grupy Wyszehradzkiej. Ponadto w krajach regionu można prześledzić procesy migracji z biedniejszych do bogatszych regionów. Stwierdzono również, że pod względem PKB per capita i salda migracji w regionach każdego z krajów wyszehradzkich wysoki PKB per capita charakteryzuje regiony z dodatnim saldem migracji, a niski – dla regionów z ujemnym saldem migracji.

Słowa kluczowe: migracje, migracje wewnętrzne, ludność, urbanizacja, Grupa Wyszehradzka.

ФЕНОМЕН Й ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ВНУТРІШНЬОЇ МІГРАЦІЇ У КРАЇНАХ ВИШЕГРАДСЬКОЇ ГРУПИ

У статті проаналізовано феномен й особливості внутрішньої міграції у країнах Вишеградської групи. Це було здійснено за такими параметрами, як: міграція «регіони – столиця», міграція «регіон – регіон» і «село – місто», міграція «бідні регіони – багаті регіони». У доповнення визначено чинники мотиви внутрішньої міграції населення у країнах означеного регіону. З цього приводу встановлено, що субурбанізація як зростання і розвиток приміської зони великих міст, через що формуються міські агломерації, є спільною характеристикою країн Вишеградської групи. Крім того, в країнах регіону простежуються міграційні процеси від бідніших до багатших регіонів і населених пунктів. Також встановлено, що за показниками ВВП на душу населення та сальдо міграції у регіонах кожної із країн Вишеградської групи високі показники ВВП на душу населення характерні для регіонів із додатним сальдо міграції, а низькі – для регіонів з від'ємним сальдо міграції.

Ключові слова: міграція, внутрішня міграція, населення, урбанізація, Вишеградська група.

Migration and migration processes have become one of the most important research issues, problems and challenges of the late twentieth – early 21st. century. Voluntary and forced, domestic and international migrations have accompanied, accompany and will accompany the development of mankind throughout its existence, but it is in the modern period that they have reached the greatest scale. The fact is that emigrants and immigrants have become an integral, necessary and at the same time problematic part of life in different countries, a means of resolving the demographic, social and financial and economic crisis, as well as stimulating the aggravation of social, religious, political and ethnic problems. The situation is particularly active in most countries of the European Union, in particular in the Visegrad countries – Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic – although they pay considerable attention to migration flows and apply various (sometimes appropriate and sometimes not) migration measures. The component of migration and migration processes, which is relatively less studied against the background of other manifestations, is no exception in this context, as internal migration – as the movement of population within the same country. This has put on the agenda the need for its isolation, understanding and comparative analysis, in particular on the example of the Visegrad countries – Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic – a region that, on the one hand, meets European migration trends, but on the other hand, quite often positions itself in this context quite separately.

The phenomenon and features of internal migration in the countries of the Visegrad Group were analyzed by such researchers as F. Albert¹, P. Baimochi², V. Balazh³, D. Baliz⁴, L. Balint⁵, L. Vahak⁶, J. Vobetska⁷, S. Goszu⁸, I. Godri⁹, D. Drboglav¹⁰, R. Dudash¹¹, M. Zhyudelova¹², G. Zubik¹³, C. Kusa¹⁴, A. Mesyash-Lekh¹⁵, J. Mladek¹⁶, M. Okolski¹⁷, M. Rakotsova¹⁸, I. Topinska¹⁹, N. Urbanchikova²⁰, M. Urzhednichek²¹, A. Hars²², K. Chupelyova²³, A. Shchepanskaya²⁴ and many others.

Their research provided comprehensive data on the understanding of internal migration both in general and in the Visegrad countries in particular. However, these studies have

¹ Albert F., Hárs Á., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Hungary, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 61 s.

² Bajmocy P., Hosszu S., Dudas R., Baliz D., New Migration Trends and Their Motivation in Hungary, "Geographica Timisiensis" 2011, vol. 20, nr. 2, s. 29–40.

³ Baláz V., Kusá Z., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Slovakia, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 61.

⁴ Bajmocy P., Hosszu S., Dudas R., Baliz D., New Migration Trends and Their Motivation in Hungary, "Geographica Timisiensis" 2011, vol. 20, nr. 2, s. 29–40.

⁵ Bálint L., Gödri I., Internal migration, [w:] Monostori J., Öri P., Spéder Z. (eds.), Demographic Portrait of Hungary 2015, Wyd. HDR12015, s. 169–184.

⁶ Vagac L., Internal Labour Mobility in Slovakia, Wyd. European Employment Observatory 2013, źródło: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=12068&langId=en>

⁷ Vobecká J., Spatial dynamics of the population in the Czech Republic, 1989–2007: Ph.D. thesis, Wyd. Charles University and Université de Bourgogne 2010.

⁸ Bajmocy P., Hosszu S., Dudas R., Baliz D., New Migration Trends and Their Motivation in Hungary, "Geographica Timisiensis" 2011, vol. 20, nr. 2, s. 29–40.

⁹ Bálint L., Gödri I., Internal migration, [w:] Monostori J., Öri P., Spéder Z. (eds.), Demographic Portrait of Hungary 2015, Wyd. HDR12015, s. 169–184.

¹⁰ Drboglav D., Rákoczyová M., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Czech Republic, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 84 s.

¹¹ Bajmocy P., Hosszu S., Dudas R., Baliz D., New Migration Trends and Their Motivation in Hungary, "Geographica Timisiensis" 2011, vol. 20, nr. 2, s. 29–40.

¹² Žudelová M., Urbaničková N., Labour Migration and Mobility in the Districts of the Slovak Republic, Presented at 5th Central European Conference in Regional Science, CERS 2014, s. 1198–1208.

¹³ Zębik G., Typology of Suburban Communities in Poland, "Bulletin of Geography: Socio-economic Series" 2011, vol. 16, s. 173–188.

¹⁴ Baláz V., Kusá Z., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Slovakia, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 61 s.

¹⁵ Mesjasz-Lech A., Szczepańska A., Development of Suburbanization in the Context of Socio-economic Changes in Urban Areas on the Example of Poland, [w:] Management, Enterprise and Benchmarking in the 21st Century, Budapest 2015, s. 385–395.

¹⁶ Mládek J., Čupelová K., Population Processes and Structures in the Urban and Rural Spaces of Slovakia, "European Countryside" 2010, vol. 3, s. 72–93.

¹⁷ Okolski M., Topińska I., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Poland, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 60 s.

¹⁸ Drboglav D., Rákoczyová M., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Czech Republic, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 84 s.

¹⁹ Okolski M., Topińska I., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Poland, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 60 s.

²⁰ Žudelová M., Urbaničková N., Labour Migration and Mobility in the Districts of the Slovak Republic, Presented at 5th Central European Conference in Regional Science, CERS 2014, s. 1198–1208.

²¹ Ouředníček M., Differential Suburban Development in the Prague Urban Region, "Geografiska Annaler: Human Geography" 2007, vol. 89, nr. 2, s. 111–125.

²² Albert F., Hárs Á., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Hungary, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 61 s.

²³ Mládek J., Čupelová K., Population Processes and Structures in the Urban and Rural Spaces of Slovakia, "European Countryside" 2010, vol. 3, s. 72–93.

²⁴ Mesjasz-Lech A., Szczepańska A., Development of Suburbanization in the Context of Socio-economic Changes in Urban Areas on the Example of Poland, [w:] Management, Enterprise and Benchmarking in the 21st Century, Budapest 2015, s. 385–395.

sometimes not been completely systematized and comprehensive for all countries in the region, so we are trying to address this analytical gap in our research paper.

It is well known, and this is noted by many of the researchers listed above, that population migration is any territorial movement of the population associated with the crossing of both external and internal boundaries of certain administrative-territorial entities in order to change permanent residence or temporary stay on the territory for training or employment, etc., regardless of the factors under which such relocation occurs²⁵. In view of this, S. Caslzza distinguishes domestic and international migration as a territorial feature. At the same time, this researcher considers internal migration to be a movement from one area (province, county, municipality or general administrative-territorial unit) to another within one country²⁶. Thus, internal migrants are the category of people who for various reasons cross the internal administrative borders (cities, districts, regions, etc.) of their country and settle permanently or temporarily in new places. As a rule, this category of persons are legal migrants, although in some autocratic countries they were or are still considered illegal, as was the case, in particular, in the former USSR in the 1930s – first half of the 1950s, when residents rural areas did not have passports and were deprived of the right to change their place of residence. Today the situation is completely different, especially in democratic political regimes, but the status of internal migrants is certainly determined by the domestic law of a particular country, and therefore can be subject to comparison in regional or subregional terms, including the Visegrad Group.

It is important to note that we analyze internal migration in the Visegrad Group countries according to such parameters as: 1) migration “regions – capital”; 2) migration “region – region” and “village – city”; 3) migration “poor regions – rich regions”. In addition, the peculiarities of internal migration in the Visegrad countries – Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic – are analyzed using official statistics on population change at the regional and local levels due to their inherent emigration and immigration processes. In supplement, we determine the factors and motives of internal migration in the countries of the region. We pass these tasks and stages of research gradually and their consideration in general is extremely important.

First of all, let's analyze migration on the parameter “regions – capital” in the Visegrad countries. In Budapest (the capital of Hungary), the population was decreasing during 1990–2005, and was increasing during 2005–2010. In general, during 1990–2020, it was established that in Budapest: 1) within the framework of permanent migration: the maximum population growth was recorded in 2014, and the minimum one – in 2000; 2) in the framework of temporary migration and re-emigration: the maximum population growth was recorded in 2010, and the minimum one – in 1997; in the framework of permanent migration, temporary

²⁵ Vorob'eva O., Migracionnye processy naselenija: voprosy teorii i gosudarstvennoj migracionnoj politiki, [w:] Problemy pravovogo regulirovanija migracionnyh processovna territorii Rossijskoj Federacii: Analiticheskij sbornik Soveta Federacii, Wyd. FS RF2003, vol. 9, nr. 202, s. 35.

²⁶ Kaslza S., Global'nye tendencii i problemy. Mezhdunarodnaja migracija v nachale XXI veka: global'nye tendencii i problemy, “Mezhdunarodnyj zhurnal social'nyh nauk” 2001, vol. 32, s. 27–42.

migration and re-emigration (total): the maximum population growth was recorded in 2010, and the minimum one – in 2000. In Warsaw (the capital of Poland) as of 2020, the migration balance was positive (the number of immigrants was higher than the number of emigrants)²⁷.

In Bratislava (the capital of Slovakia), the migration balance in 1997–2004 was negative (the number of emigrants was higher than the number of immigrants); in 1993, 1995–1996 and since 2005 it has been positive. The population during 1993–2020 was the highest in 1996 and the lowest in 2011. Finally, in Prague (Czech capital) the migration balances in 2002–2012 and since 2014 have been positive, and in 2013 – negative ones.

The next step is to analyze the migration by the parameter “region – region” and “village – city” in the Visegrad countries. In Hungary, during 1990–2005, the population in large and medium-sized cities was decreasing, and in the suburbs of Budapest and large cities, as well as in the tourist area, it was increasing. A part of the population of large and medium-sized cities moved to villages due to socio-economic difficulties. Suburban areas / suburbs have sprung up around these cities, containing several settlements. The most dynamic situation was around the capital, when the agglomeration of Székesfehérvár, Dunaujvaros, Tatabánya, Kecskemét and Szolnok²⁸ was formed. However, in many towns and villages in northern Hungary, the population has grown due to the positive balance of migration (immigration dominance over emigration). Most people moved to the region because of job changes, lower housing prices and cheaper livelihoods, or a desire to return to their former place of residence. During 2005–2010, the population in large cities, suburbs of Budapest and large cities, as well as in tourist areas increased, and in medium and small cities, as well as in rural areas – decreased (see Table 1). As noted by P. Baimochi, S. Goszu, R. Dudash and D. Baliz, the population of large cities again began to grow mainly due to re-urbanization.

Table 1. Population distribution (as a percentage) by types of settlements in Hungary (On the example of 1990–2010)

Year	Budapest	Large cities	Medium-sized cities	Towns	Suburbs of Budapest	Suburbs of large cities	Tourist area	Rural area	In total
1990	19,44	18,40	11,40	10,35	7,92	4,68	2,17	25,64	100,00
2001	17,27	18,30	11,27	10,53	9,31	5,26	2,25	25,82	100,00
2005	16,85	18,10	11,12	10,42	10,11	5,52	2,30	25,58	100,00
2010	17,19	18,36	10,91	10,06	11,07	5,65	2,34	24,42	100,00

Zródło: Bajmocy P., Hosszu S., Dudas R., Balizs D., New Migration Trends and Their Motivation in Hungary, “*Geographica Timisiensis*” 2011, vol. 20, nr. 2, s. 33.

In general, in Hungary during 1990–2020, it was established that in the framework of constant migration: 1) the maximum population growth of other cities was recorded in 2008,

²⁷ Regions of Poland 2017, Wyd. Central Statistical Office of Poland, źródło: <http://stat.gov.pl/en/topics/other-studies/cities-voivodship/regions-of-poland-2017,5,11.html>

²⁸ Bajmocy P., Hosszu S., Dudas R., Balizs D., New Migration Trends and Their Motivation in Hungary, “*Geographica Timisiensis*” 2011, vol. 20, nr. 2, s. 33.

and the minimum one – in 1995; 2) the maximum increase in the population of villages was recorded in 2000, and the minimum one – in 2013; within the framework of temporary migration and re-emigration: 1) the maximum population growth of other cities was recorded in 1994, and the minimum one – in 2012. 2) the maximum population growth of villages was recorded in 1997, and the minimum one – in 2008; in the framework of permanent migration, temporary migration and re-emigration (total): 1) the maximum population growth of other cities was recorded in 2008, and the minimum one – in 1997; 2) the maximum population growth of villages was in 2000, and minimum one – in 2010

On the back of the existing research (P. Baimochi, S. Goszu, R. Dudash, D. Baliz²⁹, F. Albert, A. Hars³⁰, L. Balint, I. Godry³¹) and the author's vision, we assert that the main processes that explain the decrease in the population of Budapest and other cities and the increase in the population of suburbs and villages in the above time periods (depending on the type of migration) were as follows:

1. Suburbanization is the process of growth and development of the suburban area of large cities, resulting in the formation of urban agglomerations. It is characterized by a higher rate of increase in the number of inhabitants of suburban settlements and satellite cities compared to the cities-centers of agglomerations. For example, according to a 2011 survey conducted by the University of Szeged, the most important motives for suburbanization were: environmental benefits, the need for own housing and better living conditions (larger apartment or house), and the least important - the deterioration of the financial situation (see table 2) for details.

Table 2. Motives for suburbanization in Hungary (as a percentage): survey results as of 2011

Motive	Important	Not important
The need for own housing	70,6	20,6
The need for a larger apartment / house	63,9	26,1
Cheaper housing	38,7	51,6
Improving the financial situation	35,3	34,5
Deterioration of the financial situation	8,9	77,0
Gardening	52,2	32,9
Environmental advantages / disadvantages	73,9	17,3
Job change / retirement	14,9	79,1
Health change	14,9	81,1

Zródło: Bajmocy P., Hosszu S., Dudas R., Baliz D., New Migration Trends and Their Motivation in Hungary, "Geographica Timisiensis" 2011, vol. 20, nr. 2, s. 37.

²⁹ Bajmocy P., Hosszu S., Dudas R., Baliz D., New Migration Trends and Their Motivation in Hungary, "Geographica Timisiensis" 2011, vol. 20, nr. 2, s. 29–40

³⁰ Albert F., Hárs Á., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Hungary, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 61 s.

³¹ Bálint L., Gödri I., Internal migration, [w:] Monostori J., Ori P., Spéder Z. (eds.), Demographic Portrait of Hungary 2015, Wyd. HDR12015, s. 169–184.

2. desurbanization / deurbanization – the process of reducing the population of large cities and their relative production potential. Desurbanization is a process in which the center of population growth shifts to rural areas, beyond urban agglomerations: the rural population increases while the urban population decreases³². Desurbanization is a complex process of deconcentration, which is caused by both structural and behavioral changes. There are such types of desurbanization as: periurbanization / exurbanization – when they move to the village for residential reasons, without losing contact with the city³³ (in fact, it is suburbanization); displaced urbanization refers to those migrations that are mainly due to economic reasons (for example, opportunities to earn higher incomes or reduce living costs); if conditions that allow migrants to return to the city arise, they will do so; counter urbanization is the process of deconcentration of the population, ie the transition from a state of greater concentration to a state of less concentration³⁴. Counter-urbanization means not only a change of residence, but involves the transfer of jobs and a comprehensive change in the lifestyle of migrants. At the same time, according to the results of the same survey from 2011, the most important motives of urbanization were environmental benefits, the need for housing, gardening, the need for better living conditions (larger apartment or house), and the least important deterioration of the financial situation (Table 3).

Table 3. Motives for desurbanization in Hungary (as a percentage): survey results as of 2011

Motive	Important	Not important
The need for own housing	57,8	35,7
The need for a larger apartment / house	48,7	39,0
Cheaper housing	39,9	46,4
Improving the financial situation	22,9	56,2
Deterioration of the financial situation	3,4	85,8
Gardening	49,4	36,4
Environmental advantages / disadvantages	65,6	18,8
Job change / retirement	31,8	63,0
Health change	11,7	82,5

Zródło: Bajmocy P., Hosszu S., Dudas R., Balizs D., New Migration Trends and Their Motivation in Hungary, "Geographica Timisiensis" 2011, vol. 20, nr. 2, s. 3

As for Poland, according to M. Okolski and I. Topinska, internal migration here mainly reflects movements related to changes in marital status (permanent migration) or educational

³² Enyedi G., A városnovekedés szakaszai, Wyd. Akademia Kiado 1988, s. 83

³³ Fielding A., Counterurbanisation, [w:] Pacione M. (ed.), Population geography: progress & prospect, Wyd. Croom Helm 1986, s. 224–256.

³⁴ Berry B., The counterurbanization process: urban America since 1970, [w:] Berry B. (ed.), Urbanization and counterurbanization, Wyd. Urban Affairs Annual Reviews 1976, vol. 11, s. 17.

mobility (temporary migration), while the share of migration movements for work (labor migration³⁵) is quite low³⁶. This is due to the low level of labor mobility in Poland and the fact that a significant part of employment-related mobility traditionally takes the form of relocation within regions or smaller administrative units. Internal mobility of the Polish population is quite low and decreases over time. This is typical of most units in the country.

In Poland, the main direction of migration is relocation from east to west (to a lesser extent to the north) of the country: from the so-called old lands – southern and eastern to the western and northern voivodships. Among other areas, migration to the largest cities in Poland – Warsaw, Lodz and Krakow – stood out³⁷. Since 1988, there has been a steady decline in the inflow and outflow of the city's population, and in 2000 this tended to change the migration balance from a positive to negative one. Since then, the population of cities has been declining due to migration, and the number of villages has been increasing. Analyzing the regional differences in migration among the voivodships since 2000, it should be noted that only in four voivodships the influx of migrants was greater than the outflow, namely in Mazovec'komu, Malopol's'komu, Pomors'komu i Velykopol's'komu voivodships. After 2005, these voivodships were joined by four more voivodships – Opole, Lubus, Zahidnopomork ta Silez, which in the last decade of the 20th. century were leaders in migration, and after 2000–lost this level. The lowest levels of migration were observed in Sventokshysk, Ljublin, Pidljask, Varmins'ko-Mazursk, Podkarpatsk, Silez, i Lodz voivodeships. In some voivodships in eastern Poland, the decline in migration was due to the fact that industry there ceased to play an important role (partly see Table 4).

Table 4. Indicators of internal migration in the voivodships of Poland (on the example of the situation in 2016)

Capital, regions, voivodships	Immigrants	Emigrants	Migration balance
Warsaw (capital)	18080	11509	+6571
Central region	79719	70247	+9472
Lodz voivodship	20058	21753	-1695
Masovian voivodship	59661	48494	+11167
South region	68001	68053	-52
Malopolskie voivodship	29587	26211	+3376
Silesian voivodship	38414	41842	-3428
East region	57036	67071	-10035
Lublin voivodship	18589	23041	-4452
Podkarpatske voivodship	18010	20057	-2047
Podlaske voivodship	10906	12471	-1565

³⁵ Okólski M., Topińska I., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Poland, Wyd. European Commission 2012, s. 7.

³⁶ Okólski M., Topińska I., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Poland, Wyd. European Commission 2012, s. 7.

³⁷ Lamekina H., Heohrafichnyi analiz vnutrishnoi i zovnishnoi mihratsii naselennia Polshchi, "Naukovi zapysky" 2015, vol. 2, s. 59.

Svientokshynske voivodship	9531	11502	-1971
North-west region	69450	69831	-381
Lubus voivodship	10657	11397	-740
Velykopolskie voivodshp	39815	38832	+983
Westpomerania voivodship	18978	19602	-624
South-west region	40942	39009	+1933
Lower Silesian voivodship	31935	29276	+2659
Opole voivodship	9007	9733	-726
North region	63048	63985	-937
Kuyavsko-Pomorsk voivodship	20312	22031	-1719
Pomorsk voivodship	28338	24853	+3485
Verminko-Mazursk voivodship	14398	17101	-2703

Zródło: *Area and Population in the Territorial Profile in 2017 – tables*, Wyd. Central Statistical Office of Poland, źródło:<http://stat.gov.pl/en/topics/population/population/area-and-population-in-the-territorial-profile-in-2017,4,11.html>

Currently, in particular as of 2016, the migration balance in Velykopolskie, Malopolskie, Mazovian, Lower Silesian and Pomeranian voivodeships has been positive. In turn, in Łódź, Silesia, Lublin, Podkarpackie, Podlaske, Svientokrzyske, Lubuskie, West Pomerania, Opole, Kuyavsko-Pomeranian, and Verminko-Masurian voivodships, this level was negative, indicating the dominance of internal domination (see Table 4).

Mesyash-Lech and A. Szczepanska consider the current causes of suburbanization in Poland in the context of three aspects: 1) social is the improving living conditions (changing the apartment building) without the need to give up a career; 2) economic is the cheap plots for construction, available in suburban areas; 3) industrial is the movement of commercial and industrial enterprises in suburban areas³⁸. Researchers in the context of suburbanization analyzed the dynamics of population change in urban, rural and urban-rural gminas within each voivodship. It is established that during the period after 2004. there is: 1) a decrease in the population of urban gminas in the Lower Silesian, Kuyavsko-Pomeranian, Lublin, Lubuskie, Łódź, Opole, Silesian, Svientokshysk, Warmian-Masurian, Wielkopolska and West Pomeranian voivodships; increase in the population of urban gminas in Malopolskie, Masovian, Podkarpackie and Pomeranian voivodships (population of urban gminas in Podlaskie voivodship has not changed); 2) reduction of the population of rural communes in Lublin, Opole, Podkarpackie, Podlaskie and Svientokrzysk voivodships; increase in the population of rural communes in Kuyavian-Pomeranian, Lower Silesian, Lubus, Malopolsk, Masovian, Pomeranian, Silesian, Warmiano-Masurian, Velykopolsk and West Pomeranian voivodships (population of rural communes in Łódź voivodship) has not changed;

³⁸ Mesjasz-Lech A., Szczepańska A., *Development of Suburbanization in the Context of Socio-economic Changes in Urban Areas on the Example of Poland*, [w:] *Management, Enterprise and Benchmarking in the 21st Century*, Budapest 2015, s. 387.

3. reduction of the population in urban and rural communes in Lublin, Łódz, Małopolsk, Opole, Podkarpack, Podlaskie, Świętokrzysk, West Pomeranian voivodships; population growth in urban-rural communes in the Lower Silesian, Kuyavian-Pomeranian, Lubus, Masovian, Pomeranian, Silesian, Warmiano-Masurian, and Wielkopolsk voivodships (for details, see Table 5).

Table 5. Dynamics of population change in the voivodships of Poland (on the example of the period 2004-2014)

Voivodships	Dynamics of population change in gminas (%)		
	Urban	Rural	Urban and rural
Lower Silesian,	-0,19	+0,58	+0,05
Kuyavo-Pomorsk	-0,17	+0,52	+0,08
Lublin	-0,17	-0,05	-0,40
Lubus	-0,05	+0,43	+0,03
Lodz	-0,43	0,00	-0,18
Małopolsk	+0,38	+0,42	-0,34
Masovian	+0,13	+0,26	+0,46
Opole	-0,40	-0,22	-0,35
Podkarpack	+0,10	-0,07	-0,23
Podlyask	0,00	-0,26	-0,42
Pomorsk	+0,31	+0,87	+0,11
Silesian	-0,31	+0,30	+0,11
Świętokrzysk	-0,32	-0,09	-0,10
Warmino-Masursk	-0,01	+0,28	+0,03
Wielkopolsk	-0,17	+0,61	+0,27
Westpomeranien	-0,03	+0,51	-0,14

Źródło: Mesjasz-Lech A., Szczepańska A., *Development of Suburbanization in the Context of Socio-economic Changes in Urban Areas on the Example of Poland*, [w:] *Management, Enterprise and Benchmarking in the 21st Century*, Budapest 2015, s. 390.

Therefore, the researchers determined that in most voivodships in Poland: 1) the population of urban gminas has decreased; 2) the population of rural communes has increased; 3) the population of urban-rural communes has increased / decreased in half of the country's voivodships. Accordingly, suburbanization in Poland is not widespread.³⁹ The main centers of suburbanization are the suburbs and suburbs of Warsaw, Krakow, Wrocław, Poznan and Częstochow⁴⁰. At the same time, as A. Mesyash-Lech and A. Szczepanska point out, the city continues to be the main place of residence and work of people in Poland⁴¹.

³⁹ Mesjasz-Lech A., Szczepańska A., *Development of Suburbanization in the Context of Socio-economic Changes in Urban Areas on the Example of Poland*, [w:] *Management, Enterprise and Benchmarking in the 21st Century*, Budapest 2015, s.393

⁴⁰ Zębkik G., *Typology of Suburban Communities in Poland*, "Bulletin of Geography: Socio-economic Series" 2011, vol. 16, s. 177.

⁴¹ Mesjasz-Lech A., Szczepańska A., *Development of Suburbanization in the Context of Socio-economic Changes in Urban Areas on the Example of Poland*, [w:] *Management, Enterprise and Benchmarking in the 21st Century*, Budapest 2015, s.394.

In turn, in Slovakia in the Bratislava region, the migration balance in 1998 was negative (the number of emigrants was higher than the number of immigrants), and in 1993, 1995-1997 and from 1999 – positive one (the number of immigrants was higher than the number of emigrants). Population since 1993 gradually increased, although it was the lowest in 2002. In the Banskobystrýtsk region, the migration balance in 2002–2016 was negative, and in 1993 and 1995–2001 it was positive one. Instead, the population since 1993 gradually decreased. In the Žilina region, the migration balance in 1993, 1996–2004 and since 2010 was negative, and in 1995 and 2005–2009 it was positive one. The population size during 1993–2020 was the highest in 2010 and the lowest in 1993. In the Košice region, the migration balances in 1993, 1998–1999 and 2001–2020 were negative, and in 1995–1997 and 2000 – positive ones. The population size gradually grew in 1993, and the lowest was in 1993. In the Košice region, the migration balance in 1993, 1998–1999 and 2001–2020 was negative, and in 1995–1997 and 2000 it was positive. The population size gradually grew in 1993, and was the lowest in 1993. In the Nitra region, the migration balance in 1995 and 2013–2020 was negative, and in 1993 and 1996–2012 it was positive one. Instead, the population size since 1993 gradually decreased. In the Prievidza region, the migration balance in 1993 and since 1996 was negative, and in 1995 – positive one. Therefore, the population size here since 1993 gradually increased. In the Trenčín region, the migration balance in 1993, 1995–2005 and 2009–2020 was negative, and in 2006–2008 it was positive. Accordingly, the population size in the region during the analyzed period was the highest in 1997, and the lowest – since 2016. Finally, in the Trnava region, the migration balances in 1993 and 1995 were negative, and since 1996 – positive ones. The population size here gradually, but with exceptions, increased since 1993.

Table 6. Balance of constant internal migration flows by type of settlement in Slovakia (on the example of the period 2001–2009)

Year	Population size increase or decrease	
	Urban settlements	Rural settlements
2001	-6 730	+7 742
2002	-8 570	+9 471
2003	-9 023	+10 432
2004	-9 510	+12 384
2005	-7 034	+10 437
2006	-7 910	+11 764
2007	-6 234	+13 027
2008	-8 047	+15 107
2009	-8 032	+12 399

Zródlo: Baláž V., Kusá Z., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Slovakia, Wyd. European Commission 2012, s. 42.

Thus, at the present stage of development only in the Bratislava and Trnava regions the indicators of the migration balance were or are positive, which indicates the predominance of internal immigration over emigration. In contrast, in the Banskobystrytsk, Zhylyn, Kosice, Nitra, Presov and Trenchin regions, the migration balance is negative, as internal emigration predominates over immigration. In general, within the framework of constant internal migration flows in Slovakia during 2001–2009, the maximum rate of increase in the population of rural settlements was recorded in 2008, and the minimum one – in 2001. Regarding urban settlements, the maximum population size decline was recorded in 2004 and the minimum one in 2007, at least if we take into account the time period for several years before and after Slovakia's accession to the European Union, in particular the period 2001-2009 (see Table 6).

It is also interesting that the most important reasons for immigration to the Bratislava region in 2011 were identified: housing; the desire to be closer to the workplace; the factor “after one of the family members has already immigrated” and other reasons; to the Trnava region – the factor “after one of the family members has already immigrated”; housing and other reasons (see Table 7). The factor of “change of workplace” was mostly conducive to emigration from Presov, Banskobystrytsk and Kosice regions. Instead, the “housing” factor was the main reason for emigration from Banskobystrytsk, Zhylyn, Kosice, Nitra, Presov, and Trenchin regions. The “health” factor contributed the most to immigration to the Trnava region. In addition, the “health” factor was mostly conducive to emigration from the Bratislava region. After all, the “learning” factor was mostly conducive to immigration to the Bratislava region. This was complemented by the fact that labor migration was directed and is directed mainly to urban areas (almost two thirds of migrants work in cities with a population of over 20 thousand inhabitants).

Table 7. Reasons for migration and migration balance in the regions of Slovakia (as of 2011)

Reasons	Region							
	Bratislava	Trnava	Trenčin	Nitra	Zhylyn	Banskobystrytsk	Prešov	Košice
Change of workplace	+321	-4	-22	+9	-12	-79	-111	-77
Closer to the workplace	+870	-20	-96	-16	-76	-89	-180	-87
Study	+54	-11	+10	-7	+15	-4	-11	+2
Health	-36	+44	-3	-2	+6	+1	+6	-7
Marriage	+396	-1	-36	-91	+3	-67	-134	-65
Divorce	-7	+4	-8	-2	+17	+12	-2	+1
Housing	+1 419	+436	-339	-211	-177	-332	-577	-137
After one of the family members	+530	+505	-74	-33	-37	-87	-217	-213
Other reasons	+990	+480	+144	+513	+111	-31	-195	+90
Total number of migrants	+4 537	+1 433	-424	+160	-150	-676	-1 421	-493

Zródło: Vagac L., Internal Labour Mobility in Slovakia, Wyd. European Employment Observatory 2013, źródło: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=12068&langId=en>

It is also important that the data of the national labor force survey in Slovakia show that, for example, in 2012, 141.1 thousand people worked outside their region of residence, which was 6.1% of all employed (see Table 8). The largest share of the labor force (73.9 thousand people) immigrated to the Bratislava region, and the smallest one – to the Banskobystrýtsk region. The largest share of the labor force (37.5 thousand people) emigrated from the Trnava region, and the smallest one – from the Bratislava region (5.4 thousand people). The highest rates of mutual migration were recorded between Bratislava and Trnava, as well as between Prešov and Košice regions.

Table 8. Labor migration in the regions of Slovakia (as of 2012)

Region of residence	Region (region) of the workplace								
	Bratislava	Trnava	Trenčin	Nitra	Zhýlin	Banskobystrýtsk	Prešov	Košice	Departure (from)
Bratislava	x	2,7	1,4	0,3	0,6	0,3	0,1	0,0	5,4
Trnava	32,5	x	1,3	3,4	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	37,5
Trenčin	4,8	1,4	x	2,1	2,7	0,4	0,0	0,0	11,4
Nitra	13,8	10,4	0,5	x	0,4	1,4	0,0	0,0	26,5
Zhýlin	6,3	0,6	1,0	0,0	x	0,3	0,1	0,1	8,4
Banskobystrýtsk	6,9	2,0	0,1	2,6	1,1	x	0,3	2,1	15,1
Prešov	6,7	0,6	0,4	0,7	2,1	0,2	x	14,9	25,6
Košice	2,9	0,5	0,0	0,0	0,9	0,8	6,1	x	11,2
Moving (to)	73,9	18,2	4,7	9,1	8,1	3,4	6,6	17,1	141,1

Zdroňo: Vagac L., *Internal Labour Mobility in Slovakia*, Wvd. European Employment Observatory 2013 zdroj: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=120688&langId=en>

Finally, in the Czech Republic in the Central Bohemian and South Bohemian regions, the migration balance has been positive since 2002. In the Plzen region, the migration balance in 2002–2009 and since 2011 was positive, and in 2010 it was negative. In the Karlovy Vary region, the indicators of the migration balance in 2002–2004 and 2006–2008 were positive, and in 2005 and since 2009 – negative one. In the Ústetski region, the migration balance in 2002–2005 and 2007–2008 was positive, and in 2006 and since 2009 – negative one. In the Liberec region, migration balance indicators in 2002–2003, 2005–2011 and since 2014 were positive, and in 2004 and 2012–2013 – negative ones. In the Kralovohradetsky region, the indicators of the migration balance in 2003–2008 and 2015 were positive, and in 2002, 2009–2014 and 2016 – negative ones. In the Pardubice region, the migration balance in 2004–2012, 2014 and 2016 was positive, and in 2002–2003, 2013 and 2015 it was negative. In Vysočina Region, the indicators

of the migration balance in 2003 and 2005–2008 were positive, and in 2002, 2004 and since 2009 they have been negative. In the South Moravian region indicators of the migration balance since 2003 were positive, and in 2002 – negative ones. In the Olomouc region, the indicators of the migration balance in 2003 and 2005–2007 were positive, and in 2002, 2004 and since 2008 – negative ones. In the Zlín region, the migration balance in 2005–2008 was positive, and in 2002–2004 and since 2009 – negative one. Finally, in the Moravian-Silesian region, migration balances since 2002 have been negative ones (at least as of early 2016). Thus, migration balances have traditionally been positive in Prague, Liberec, Pardubice, South Moravia, South Bohemia, Plzen, and Central Bohemia, and negative in Vysočina and Zlín, Karlovy Vary, Kralovohrad, Moravian-Silesian, Olomouc and Ustec regions (see Table 8).

Table 9. Statistics of internal migration indicators in the regions of the Czech Republic (as of 2016)

Capital and regionws	Immigrants	Emigrants	Migration balance
Prague(capital)	36 901	26 630	+10 271
Centralczech region	26 274	16 202	+10 072
Southczech region	5 480	4 836	+644
Plzen region	6 189	3 982	+2 207
Karlovary region	3 052	3 755	-703
Ustec region	7 324	8 002	-678
Liberecs region	4 834	4 412	+422
Kralovohradetsky region	4 432	4 984	-552
Pardubys region	4 969	4 330	+639
Region Vysochyna	3 456	4 289	-833
Southmoravian region	11 416	9 082	+2 334
Olomouc region	4 464	5 225	-761
Zlin region	3 627	4 274	-647
Morav-Silesian region	5 578	7 929	-2 351

Having analyzed internal migration in the Czech Republic by migration types, it was found that in 2008 (compared to 1990) the level of migration from municipalities to municipalities in the districts has not changed, from district to district in the regions – decreased, and from region to region – increased. As one can see in Table 10, in the Czech Republic, the negative balance of migration during 1995–2006 was characteristic of regional centers and large cities, during 1998-2006 – for medium-sized cities, and during 1995-1997 – for small villages. The positive balance of migration during 1995–2006 was characteristic of small towns, large villages and inland districts, in 1995-1997 –for medium-sized cities, and in 1998-2006 – for small villages. In addition, it was found that during 1995-2006, the highest rate of negative migration balance was recorded in large cities, and the highest rate of positive migration balance – in large villages.

Table 10. Balance of migration by types of municipalities in the Czech Republic (on the example of the period 1995–2006)

Type of municipality	1995–1997	1998–2000	2001–2003	2004–2006	1995–2006
Всего					
Regional centers	-5 519	-9 230	-8 262	-9 355	-8 091
Large cities	-5 985	-8 579	-11 363	-13 321	-9 812
Medium cities	390	-665	-350	-1 557	-545
Towns	2 381	2 457	2 294	1 432	2 141
Large villages	5 894	8 845	8 838	10 598	8 544
Small villages	-378	494	567	1 375	515
Large cities	-2,1	-3,1	-4,2	-5,0	-3,6
Medium cities	0,5	-0,8	-0,4	-1,8	-0,6
Towns	2,5	2,6	2,4	1,5	2,3
Large villages	2,9	4,2	4,2	5,0	4,1
Small villages					
Internal regions	3 217	6 678	8 277	10 828	7 250
Per 1000 inhabitants (in %)					
Regional centers	-1,9	-3,3	-3,0	-3,4	-2,9
Large cities	-2,1	-3,1	-4,2	-5,0	-3,6
Medium cities	0,5	-0,8	-0,4	-1,8	-0,6
Towns	2,5	2,6	2,4	1,5	2,3
Large villages	2,9	4,2	4,2	5,0	4,1
Small villages	-2,0	2,7	3,0	7,3	2,8
Internal regions	5,3	10,8	12,9	16,0	11,8

Zdrolo: Drbohlav D., Rákočyzová M., *Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Czech Republic*, Wyd. European Commission 2012, s. 60.; Novák J., Čermák Z., Ouředníček M., *Migrace mladých lidí*, [w:] Ouředníček M., Temelová J., Pospíšilová L. (eds.), *Atlas sociálně prostorové diference České republiky*, Wyd. Univerzita Karlova v Praze 2011, s. 95.

After 2000, suburbanization became an important factor influencing migration relations within the Czech Republic⁴². In this regard, J. Vobetska argues that since 1995, suburbanization has been clearly expressed around large cities, and since 2001 around medium and small cities⁴³. In this case, it is worth talking about housing suburbanization, when people work in cities but live in suburban areas / suburbs. Mainly the improvement of the situation in the Czech housing market contributed to the acceleration of housing suburbanization. During this period became more important deconcentration processes (suburbanization and partial desurbanization). According to the same researcher, during 1995–2006 the highest level of growth and development of the suburban zone / suburbs of such large cities as Prague, Brno and Plzen was recorded. During this period, the highest rates of migration growth were recorded in the following districts / counties: 22 % - Prague-West, 15 % - Prague-East, 6 % - Berouna Brno,

⁴² Novák J., Čermák Z., Ouředníček M., *Migrace mladých lidí*, [w:] Ouředníček M., Temelová J., Pospíšilová L. (eds.), *Atlas sociálně prostorové diference České republiky*, Wyd. Univerzita Karlova v Praze 2011, s. 95.

⁴³ Voběcká J., *Spatial dynamics of the population in the Czech Republic, 1989–2007*: Ph.D. thesis, Wyd. Charles University and Université de Bourgogne 2010.

5 ‰ – Plzen-North and Pilsen-South, i.e., in the districts / districts located near the largest cities⁴⁴. This is due to factors such as proximity to large cities, quality infrastructure and better environmental conditions. The most typical suburban area originated in Central Czech Republic, the western part of which is closely connected with the Plzen region. Due to the internal migration, the population of the Central Czech Region increased during 2000–2008 by 74,000 individuals. In addition, in 1997–2006, nine of the ten municipalities with the highest intensity of housing construction in the country were located in suburban areas and suburbs of Prague.

Most migrants migrated from Prague itself (61%) to the Prague suburbs from Prague, 9% from other cities in Central Czech Republic, and 15% from other parts of the Czech Republic⁴⁵. Among the inhabitants of suburban districts / suburbs have previously dominated, and still dominate young people. These are young families (mainly aged 25 to 34 years old) with children (up to 9 years). Therefore, this significantly leads to the rejuvenation of municipalities in suburban zones⁴⁶. Regarding the level of education, during 20195-2003 among migrants to Prague-East and Prague-West 14.6% had basic and 19.2% university education⁴⁷.

In addition, it is appropriate to analyze migration according to the parameter “Poor regions – rich regions” in the countries of the Visegrad Group. In Hungary since 1990, due to the lack of jobs and housing, many people moved to the poorest regions (megye) (Sabolch Satmar-Bereg, Borsod-Abauj-Zemplen, etc.)⁴⁸. In Western and Southern Hungary, the population decreased. This was due to the closure of a significant share of enterprises in the country. In their studies, S. Gatak, A. Mulcher and J. Watson also demonstrated very low (according to international standards) level of interregional migration in Poland. The main factor along with economic indicators (GDP per capita) was determined by a shortage of housing⁴⁹. As a result of migration from southern and eastern voivodships to Western and Northern sharply, the level of material welfare of settlers increased sharply⁵⁰. In general, in the countries of the Visegrad group, migration processes from the poorer to richer regions are traced: in Hungary – from South Transdanubia to Central Hungary; in Poland - from the Lublin and Podkarpatske to Mazovian, Lower Silesian and WielkopolskVoivodship; in Slovakia – from Prishovsky to Košice and Bratislavská regions; In the Czech Republic – from the Carlovary region and region

⁴⁴ Novák J., Čermák Z., Ouředníček M., Migrace mladých lidí, [w:] Ouředníček M., Temelová J., Pospíšilová L. (eds.), Atlas sociálně prostorové diferenciacie České republiky, Wyd. Univerzita Karlova v Praze 2011, s. 95.

⁴⁵ Ouředníček M., Differential Suburban Development in the Prague Urban Region, “Geografiska Annaler: Human Geography” 2007, vol. 89, nr. 2, s. 111–125; Drbohlav D., Rákočzyová M., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Czech Republic, Wyd. European Commission 2012, s. 10.

⁴⁶ Ouředníček M., Differential Suburban Development in the Prague Urban Region, “Geografiska Annaler: Human Geography” 2007, vol. 89, nr. 2, s. 111–125.

⁴⁷ Drbohlav D., Rákočzyová M., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Czech Republic, Wyd. European Commission 2012, s. 10

⁴⁸ Bajmocy P., Hosszu S., Dudas R., Balizs D., New Migration Trends and Their Motivation in Hungary, “Geographica Timisiensis” 2011, vol. 20, nr. 2, s. 30.

⁴⁹ Ghatak S., Mulhern A., Watson J., Inter-regional migration in transition economies, “Review of Development Economics” 2008, vol. 1, nr. 12, s. 209–222.

⁵⁰ Lamekina H., Heohrafichnyi analiz vnutrishnoi i zovnishnoi mihratsii naselennia Polshchi, “Naukovi zapysky” 2015, vol. 2, s. 59

Vysochyna prior to the Central Czech and South Moravian regions. In addition, as certifying GDP indicators per capita and balance of migration in the regions of each of the countries of the Visegrad Group, high performance of GDP per capita (according to some exceptions, for example: in the Czech Republic – Moravo-Silesian Region, in Slovakia – Trenčín Region, etc.) are characteristic of the regions with a positive balance of migration, and low ones – for regions with a negative migration balance.

In general, having analyzed the peculiarities of internal migration in the countries of the Visegrad group, however, in rather different time periods, it is stated that the suburbanization is common to these countries and the development of a suburban zone of large cities, which forms urban agglomerations. In addition, in the countries of the Visegrad group, migration processes from the poorer to richer regions and settlements are traced. It is also established that according to GDP per capita and migration balance in the regions of each of the countries of the Visegrad Group, high GDP per capita are characteristic of the regions with a positive migration balance, and low – for regions with a negative balance of migration. On this basis it has been established that high levels of GDP indifferent population are the factor in internal migration at the regional level in each of the countries of the analyzed sample, as well as provisions that suburbanization is a consequence of internal migration flows in the region.

References

1. Albert F., Hárs Á., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Hungary, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 61 s.
2. Area and Population in the Territorial Profile in 2017 – tables, Wyd. Central Statistical Office of Poland, źródło: <http://stat.gov.pl/en/topics/population/population/area-and-population-in-the-territorial-profile-in-2017,4,11.html>
3. Bajmocy P., Hosszu S., Dudas R., Balizs D., New Migration Trends and Their Motivation in Hungary, “Geographica Timisiensis” 2011, vol. 20, nr. 2, s. 29–40.
4. Baláz V., Kusá Z., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Slovakia, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 61 s.
5. Bálint L., Gödri I., Internal migration, [w:] Monostori J., Óri P., Spéder Z. (eds.), Demographic Portrait of Hungary 2015, Wyd. HDRI2015, s. 169–184.
6. Berry B., The counterurbanization process: urban America since 1970, [w:] Berry B. (ed.), Urbanization and counterurbanization, Wyd. Urban Affairs Annual Reviews 1976, vol. 11.
7. Drbohlav D., Rákoczyová M., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Czech Republic, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 84 s.
8. Enyedi G., A városnovekedés szakaszai, Wyd. Akademia Kiado 1988.
9. Fielding A., Counterurbanisation, [w:] Pacione M. (ed.), Population geography: progress & prospect, Wyd. Croom Helm 1986, s. 224–256.

10. Ghatak S., Mulhern A., Watson J., Inter-regional migration in transition economies, "Review of Development Economics" 2008, vol. 1, nr. 12, s. 209–222.
11. Kasz S., Global'nye tendencii i problemy. Mezhhdunarodnaja migracija v nachale XXI veka: global'nye tendencii i problemy, "Mezhhdunarodnyj zhurnal social'nyh nauk" 2001, vol. 32, s. 27–42.
12. Lamekina H., Heohrafichnyi analiz vnutrishnoi i zovnishnoi mihratsii naseleennia Polshchi, "Naukovi zapysky" 2015, vol. 2.
13. Mesjasz-Lech A., Szczepańska A., Development of Suburbanization in the Context of Socio-economic Changes in Urban Areas on the Example of Poland, [w:] Management, Enterprise and Benchmarking in the 21st Century, Budapest 2015, s. 385–395.
14. Mládek J., Čupelová K., Population Processes and Structures in the Urban and Rural Spaces of Slovakia, "European Countryside" 2010, vol. 3, s. 72–93.
15. Novák J., Čermák Z., Ouředníček M., Migrace mladých lidí, [w:] Ouředníček M., Temelová J., Pospíšilová L. (eds.), Atlas sociálně prostorové diferenciacie České republiky, Wyd. Univerzita Karlova v Praze 2011.
16. Okólski M., Topińska I., Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Final Country Report. Poland, Wyd. European Commission 2012, 60 s.
17. Ouředníček M., Differential Suburban Development in the Prague Urban Region, "Geografiska Annaler: Human Geography" 2007, vol. 89, nr. 2, s. 111–125.
18. Regions of Poland 2017, Wyd. Central Statistical Office of Poland, źródło: <http://stat.gov.pl/en/topics/other-studies/cities-voivodship/regions-of-poland-2017,5,11.html>
19. Vagac L., Internal Labour Mobility in Slovakia, Wyd. European Employment Observatory 2013, źródło: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=12068&langId=en>
20. Vobecká J., Spatial dynamics of the population in the Czech Republic, 1989–2007: Ph.D. thesis, Wyd. Charles University and Université de Bourgogne 2010.
21. Vorob'eva O., Migracionnye processy naselenija: voprosy teorii i gosudarstvennoj migracionnoj politiki, [w:] Problemy pravovogo regulirovanija migracionnyh processovna territorii Rossijskoj Federacii: Analiticheskij sbornik Soveta Federacii, Wyd. FS RF 2003, vol. 9, nr. 202.
22. Zębik G., Typology of Suburban Communities in Poland, "Bulletin of Geography: Socio-economic Series" 2011, vol. 16, s. 173–188.
23. Žudelová M., Urbančíková N., Labour Migration and Mobility in the Districts of the Slovak Republic, Presented at 5th Central European Conference in Regional Science, CERS 2014, s. 1198–1208.