

PRACE NAUKOWE

Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu

RESEARCH PAPERS

of Wrocław University of Economics

241

Przestrzeń a rozwój



Redaktorzy naukowi

Stanisław Korenik

Anna Dybała



Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu
Wrocław 2011

Recenzenci: Florian Kuźnik, Janusz Słodczyk, Zygmunt Szymła,
Eugeniusz Wojciechowski

Redaktor Wydawnictwa: Jadwiga Marcinek

Redaktor techniczny: Barbara Łopusiewicz

Korektor: Justyna Mroczkowska

Łamanie: Beata Mazur

Projekt okładki: Beata Dębska

Publikacja jest dostępna w Internecie na stronach:

www.ibuk.pl, www.ebscohost.com,

The Central and Eastern European Online Library www.ceeol.com,

a także w adnotowanej bibliografii zagadnień ekonomicznych BazEkon

http://kangur.uek.krakow.pl/bazy_ae/bazekon/nowy/index.php

Informacje o naborze artykułów i zasadach recenzowania znajdują się
na stronie internetowej Wydawnictwa

www.wydawnictwo.ue.wroc.pl

Kopiowanie i powielanie w jakiegokolwiek formie
wymaga pisemnej zgody Wydawcy

Publikacja została sfinansowana przez Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach

© Copyright by Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny we Wrocławiu
Wrocław 2011

ISSN 1899-3192

ISBN 978-83-7695-272-7

Wersja pierwotna: publikacja drukowana

Druk: Drukarnia TOTEM

Spis treści

Wstęp.....	11
------------	----

Część 1. Współczesne uwarunkowania rozwoju społeczno-ekonomicznego krajów, regionów i obszarów metropolitalnych

Patrycja Brańka: Atrakcyjność inwestycyjna województwa małopolskiego w oczach przedsiębiorstw z udziałem kapitału zagranicznego (w świetle badań ankietowych).....	15
Adam Dąbrowski: Kierunki europejskiej polityki regionalnej – wybrane problemy	30
Piotr Hajduga: Dolnośląskie specjalne strefy ekonomiczne jako miejsce prowadzenia działalności gospodarczej w świetle ocen przedsiębiorców – wyniki badania empirycznego	41
Krzysztof Heffner, Brygida Klemens: Struktury klastrowe w gospodarce przestrzennej – wybrane korzyści i problemy rozwoju w skali lokalnej i regionalnej	56
Petr Hlaváček: The classification of analytical and management qualitative frameworks for municipal and regional development	65
Stanisław Korenik: Nowe zjawiska występujące w rozwoju aktywizujących się regionów.....	76
Anna Mempel-Śnieżyk: Uwarunkowania funkcjonowania powiązań sieciowych w województwie dolnośląskim	85
Katarzyna Miszczak: Partnerstwo publiczno-prywatne w regionach przygranicznych Polski, Czech i Niemiec – szanse i zagrożenia	105
Monika Musiał-Malago: Polaryzacja strukturalna Krakowskiego Obszaru Metropolitalnego.....	120
Małgorzata Rogowska: Znaczenie miast w polityce regionalnej Unii Europejskiej.....	133
Dorota Rynio: Rozwój społeczno-gospodarczy ośrodka wzrostu w okresie kryzysu gospodarki światowej.....	140
Miloslav Šašek: Development of population in the Czech Republic after 1989	150
Piotr Serafin: Stan i zmiany zagospodarowania przestrzeni wsi w strefie podmiejskiej województwa małopolskiego na przykładzie gmin Niepołomice i Wieliczka	162
Kazimiera Wilk: Sytuacja demograficzna w Federacji Rosyjskiej w latach 1990-2009	180

Arkadiusz Przybyłka: Narodowy Fundusz Zdrowia jako główny organizator usług zdrowotnych w Polsce	190
Justyna Anders: Rola władz publicznych w stymulowaniu partycypacji obywateli w procesach <i>governance</i> – doświadczenia międzynarodowe i wnioski dla Polski.....	200
Marek Dylewski, Beata Filipiak: Możliwości rozwoju obszarów metropolitalnych w nowych uwarunkowaniach finansowych jednostek samorządu terytorialnego.....	212
Andrzej Rączaszek: Procesy rozwojowe największych polskich miast w okresie transformacji.....	224

Część 2. Społeczne, gospodarcze i środowiskowe problemy rozwoju lokalnego

Jacek Chądzyński: Władza lokalna a rynek – pomiędzy współpracą a konkurencją.....	241
Eleonora Gonda-Soroczyńska: Uwarunkowania środowiska przyrodniczego w przestrzeni uzdrowiska na przykładzie Czerniawy-Zdroju.....	252
Magdalena Kalisiak-Mędelska: Partycypacja społeczna – przymus czy rzeczywista potrzeba?.....	262
Magdalena Kalisiak-Mędelska: Zadowolenie z miejsca zamieszkania – ocena mieszkańców i władz lokalnych na przykładzie Głowna	277
Andrzej Łuczyszyn: Lokalna przestrzeń publiczna w gospodarce kreatywnej	290
Magdalena Pięta-Kanurska: Związki kultury i ekonomii oraz ich wpływ na rozwój miasta.....	301
Joost Platje: Local governance's capacity to direct its own path of sustainable development.....	310
Andrzej Raszkowski: Nowe trendy w marketingu miejsc.....	319
Anna Batko: Administracja publiczna jako stymulator zmian w turystyce miasta – na przykładzie Krakowa w latach 1989-2006	328
Piotr Ruczkowski: Ewidencja ludności – nowe zasady meldunkowe	340

Część 3. Innowacyjność i przedsiębiorczość a rozwój

Niki Derlukiewicz: Unia innowacji jako sposób na zwiększenie innowacyjności gospodarki europejskiej.....	355
Dariusz Głuszcuk: Finansowanie działalności innowacyjnej – źródła i bariery w przekroju regionów Polski (NTS-2).....	366

Niki Derlukiewicz, Małgorzata Rogowska, Stanisław Korenik, Jarmila Horáková, Jiří Louda: Polsko-czeska współpraca transgraniczna małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw	377
Anna Korombel: Najczęściej popełniane błędy podczas wdrażania zintegrowanego zarządzania ryzykiem (ERM) w polskich przedsiębiorstwach	388
Kamil Wiśniewski: Systemowe zarządzanie wiedzą w ujęciu teoretycznym i praktycznym	396
Paweł Dziekański, Jan Puchala: Wspieranie przedsiębiorczości przez samorząd terytorialny na przykładzie powiatu limanowskiego	405
Jerzy Wąchol: Rola państwa i jego interesariuszy we władztwie korporacyjnym w okresie wychodzenia ze spowolnienia gospodarczego i kryzysu ...	417
Aleksandra Pisarska, Mieczysław Poborski: Wybrane problemy inwestowania w rzeczowe aktywa trwałe (na przykładzie uczelni publicznych w Polsce).....	427
Agnieszka Izabela Baruk: Specyfika działań motywujących stosowanych wobec polskich pracowników.....	437
Monika Stelmaszczyk: Właściciel małego przedsiębiorstwa menedżerem zorientowanym na kulturę – wyzwania i perspektywy	447
Barbara Batko: Wpływ jakości informacji publicznej na minimalizację ryzyka podejmowania decyzji na rynku pracy	455

Część 4. Wybrane problemy planowania przestrzennego

Oğuz Özbek: Central planning of development through etatism in Turkey: the state planning organisation	467
Kinga Wasilewska: Samorząd terytorialny jako nowy podmiot polityki przestrzennej	474
Aleksandra Koźlak: Modelowe ujęcie transportu w planowaniu przestrzennym	489
Anna Kamińska: Rola ewaluacji w zarządzaniu procesem rewitalizacji przestrzeni miejskiej	502

Część 5. Zagadnienia różne

Hubert Kaczmarczyk: Właściwe zadania państwa w ujęciu F.A. von Hayeka	513
Małgorzata Gajda-Kantorowska: Transfery fiskalne a przeciwdziałanie szokom asymetrycznym w ramach Unii Gospodarczo-Walutowej w Europie ..	522
Adam Peszko: Krytyka liberalnej doktryny lat 90. i nowe nurty w ekonomii pierwszej dekady XXI wieku.....	532
Andrzej Adamczyk: Incydentalna kontrola rozporządzeń przez sądy.....	543

Summaries

Patrycja Brańka: Investment attractiveness of Małopolska voivodeship in opinion of foreign capital enterprises (in the light of survey results).....	29
Adam Dąbrowski: Directions of European Regional Policy – selected problems.....	40
Piotr Hajduga: Special economic zones in Lower Silesia as a business place in the light of assessments of entrepreneurs – results of empirical research	55
Krystian Heffner, Brygida Klemens: Cluster structures in spatial economy – chosen benefits and problems of development on the local and regional scale	64
Petr Hlaváček: Klasyfikacja analitycznych i zarządczych ram kwalifikacyjnych w rozwoju gmin i regionów	75
Stanisław Korenik: New phenomena occurring in the development of activating regions	84
Anna Mempel-Śnieżyk: Conditions of functioning of the network relations in Lower Silesia Voivodeship	104
Katarzyna Miszczak: Public-Private Partnership in the border regions of Poland, the Czech Republic and Germany – opportunities and threats.....	119
Monika Musiał-Malago: Structural polarization of Cracow Metropolitan Area.....	132
Małgorzata Rogowska: The importance of cities in the European Union's regional policy	139
Dorota Rynio: Social-economic development of growth center in the time of worldwide economy crisis	149
Miloslav Šašek: Rozwój populacji w Czechach po roku 1989	161
Piotr Serafin: Spatial planning of rural areas in the suburbs of Małopolska: state and changes – the case of Wieliczka and Niepołomice.....	179
Kazimiera Wilk: The demographic situation in the Russian Federation in the years 1990-2009.....	189
Arkadiusz Przybyłka: The National Health Fund as the main organizer of health services in Poland	199
Justyna Anders: The role of public authorities in promoting civic participation in processes of <i>governance</i> – application of international practices in the Polish context.....	211
Marek Dylewski, Beata Filipiak: Development opportunities of metropolitan areas in the new financial circumstances of local government units	223
Andrzej Rączaszek: Development processes in the biggest Polish cities in the transformation period.....	237

Jacek Chądzyński: Local government and market – between cooperation and competition	251
Eleonora Gonda-Soroczyńska: The condition of the natural environment in the development of a spa town – the case of Czerniawa-Zdrój	261
Magdalena Kalisiak-Mędelska: Social participation – obligation or real need?	276
Magdalena Kalisiak-Mędelska: Satisfaction with the place of residence – evaluation of place and local authorities as on the example of Główno.....	289
Andrzej Łuczyszyn: Local public space in creative economy.....	300
Magdalena Pięta-Kanurska: The relationship between culture and economics and their impact on urban development	309
Joost Platje: Zdolność samorządu terytorialnego do kierowania własną ścieżką rozwoju zrównoważonego	318
Andrzej Raszkowski: New trends in place marketing	327
Anna Batko: Public administration as a stimulator of changes in city tourism – based on Cracow between the years 1989 and 2006	339
Piotr Ruczkowski: Population registration – the new residence regulations..	351
Niki Derlukiewicz: Innovation Union as a way to increase the innovation in European economy	365
Dariusz Głuszczyk: Financing innovation activities – sources and barriers with regard to regions in Poland (NTS-2)	376
Niki Derlukiewicz, Małgorzata Rogowska, Stanisław Korenik, Jarmila Horáková, Jiří Louda: Polish-Czech border cooperation of small and medium-sized enterprises	387
Anna Korombel: The most common errors during the implementation of Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) in Polish enterprises	395
Kamil Wiśniewski: System knowledge management from theoretical and practical perspective	404
Paweł Dziekański, Jan Puchała: Support of the enterprise by the territorial council on the example of Limanowski administrative district.....	416
Jerzy Wąchol: The role of the state and its stakeholders in corporate governance while getting out of the economic downturn and crisis.....	426
Aleksandra Pisarska, Mieczysław Poborski: Selected problems of investing in tangible fixed assets (as exemplified by public institutions of higher education)	435
Agnieszka Izabela Baruk: Essence of motivation activities used towards Polish employees	446
Monika Stelmaszczyk: Owner of small company as a culture-oriented manager – challenges and prospects	454
Barbara Batko: The impact of public information quality to minimize the decision making risk on the labour market.....	464

Oğuz Özbek: Centralne planowanie rozwoju przez etatyzm w Turcji: Państwowy Urząd Planowania	473
Kinga Wasilewska: Local self-government as a new subject of spatial policy.	488
Aleksandra Koźlak: Land-use/transport models in spatial planning.....	501
Anna Kamińska: The role of evaluation in the management of urban space revitalization process	510
Hubert Kaczmarczyk: Appropriate tasks of the state in terms of F.A. von Hayek.....	521
Malgorzata Gajda-Kantorowska: Fiscal transfers as asymmetric shocks absorption mechanisms in the European Monetary Union.....	531
Adam Peszko: Criticism of neoclassic doctrine of the 90s and new currents of economics in the first decade of the XXI century.....	542
Andrzej Adamczyk: The right of courts to refuse incidentally to apply regulations.....	557

Miloslav Šašek

University of J. E. Purkyně in Ústí nad Labem

DEVELOPMENT OF POPULATION IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC AFTER 1989

Summary: In the period of transformation the Czech Republic underwent a considerable change in demographic behaviour of the population. Regional difference in population development will furthermore deepen despite the fact that economics in Central Europe has been enlivened. It is caused by the continuing selective development.

Keywords: regional development, development of population, migration, demographical development, structures of population

1. Introduction

In the period of transformation the Czech Republic underwent a considerable change in demographic behaviour of the population. It was caused by dramatic changes in society, economy and politics. Demographic behaviour of the population of the Czech Republic was during the socialism period very much different from the population behavior in the states with developed market economy. The Czech Republic fell behind in improving mortality rate and high rate of people getting married continued, the couples were very young getting married, there was also a high number of abortions and a high divorce rate. After 1989 population behavior has changed to a great extent.

The migration of population is an important part of regional processes that co-form geographical society organization. In comparison with natural reproduction the effect of migration is more variable in time as well as in space. Migration is a very complex process influenced by many conditional factors. It represents an important indicator of regional differentiation and currently it is one of the key mechanisms of settlement development. The study of migration plays therefore a significant role in the evaluation of transformation changes in the Czech Republic after 1989.

Migration development in the Czech Republic is influenced by suburbanization process similarly to other transformation countries in Central Europe. Spatial enlargement of urbanized areas is very typical of this process. In suburban areas of big cities the population grows and migration streams are heading there from the areas out of agglomeration as well as from central zones of these urban units.

After the change of political system the demographic behaviour of the population of the Czech Republic has undergone rapid changes. The situation was similar to the changes in demographic behaviour of some European democratic countries in the 70s and 80s. This process is often defined as the second demographic transition; demographic revolution is considered as the first transition. Higher competitiveness of labour market increases the importance of education. At the beginning of the 90s about 14% of given generation studied at universities, at the end of the 90s it was one fifth of young people and currently it is about 40% of the generation. While evaluating these rapid changes in society we can say that the majority of young people behaved reasonably from the demographic behaviour point of view. With the rapid decrease in natality (from 128 thousand babies born in 1989 to 90 thousand in 1996) it started to be questioned if population politics should be a part of the state policy. These discussions continue to a lesser extent up to now. Personally speaking I think that it is more a question of individual political parties.

In table 1 we can see the development of demographic indicators in the Czech Republic in recent past. These indicators show that a considerable part of natality in the second half of the 90s was postponed to higher age of the couples and in 2008 about 120 thousand babies were born. A positive element is a constant decrease in mortality despite the ageing of population and the decrease in baby mortality which got lower than 3‰. The Czech Republic joined the countries with the lowest mortality of babies. The number of abortions decreased to a large extent, the value of the abortion rate indicator is 1/5 of the value in 1988. Past migration movements increased regional differences in the number of babies born and in the population growth of spatial units.

2. Demographic development

In 1989 the process of ageing of the Czech Republic population began. It has many reasons. Simultaneously there is a rapid decrease in natality because of parenthood postponing till higher age and at the same time there is a distinctive improvement in a mortality rate and therefore the increasing of life expectancy age leading to a higher rate of people at post-productive age. It is very characteristic for the Czech population that its age structure is irregular. This irregularity is caused by historical events in the last hundred years. The First World War led to the huge decrease in natality and the increase of baby and overall mortality. The age structure of the Czech population began to deform. The deformation was deepened by the world business crisis in the 30s and by events connected with the Second World War. In the last twenty years whether the development was positive or negative it depended on the development of individual demographical indicators. Media present mostly the opinion that the development is negative. However, on the basis of objective demographical statistics evaluation it can be said that the most of demographic indicators has been developing positively (see tables 1-3). Although there is a constant ageing of the population, there is also the decreasing mortality rate. The value of the baby mortality rate

Table 1. Population development in the Czech Republic in the years 1990-2010 (per thousand inhabitants)

	1990	2000	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Marriages	8.8	5.4	5.1	5.1	5.5	5.0	4.6	4.4
Divorces	3.1	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.9
Live births	12.6	8.8	10.0	10.3	11.1	11.5	11.3	11.1
Induced abortions	10.3	3.3	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.3
Deaths	12.5	10.6	10.5	10.2	10.1	10.1	10.2	10.2
Infant Mortality	10.8	4.1	3.4	3.3	3.1	2.8	2.9	2.7
Immigration	0.4	0.8	5.9	6.6	10.1	7.5	3.8	2.9
Emigration	0.3	0.1	2.4	3.3	2.0	0.6	1.1	1.4
Natural Increase	0.1	-1.8	-0.6	0.1	1.0	1.4	1.0	1.0
Net Migration	0.1	0.7	3.5	3.4	8.1	6.9	2.7	1.5
Total Increase	0.2	-1.1	3.0	3.5	9.1	8.3	3.7	2.5

Source: Czech Statistical Office (own calculations).

indicator dropped from 10.8‰ in 1990 to 2.7‰ in 2010. The Czech Republic joined the states with the lowest baby mortality rate in the world.

The gross mortality rate decreased at the same time by 2.3‰. The difference, which was standardized to the age structure in 2010, is even 5‰. The improvement of mortality rate was caused by the decrease in the number of deaths because of the diseases of circulatory system from 72 thousand in 1990 to 53 thousand in 2010, i.e. roughly half of all deaths. Life expectancy at birth increased for women in the same period from 75 years to 80.6 years, for men from 67 years to 74.4 years.

Table 2. Population development in the Czech Republic in the years 1990-2006 (per thousand inhabitants)

Index	1990	2000	2005	2006
Marriages	90 953	55 321	51 829	52 860
Divorces	32 055	29 704	31 288	31 415
Live births	130 564	90 910	102 211	105 831
Induced abortions	111 268	34 623	26 453	25 352
Deaths	129 166	109 001	107 938	104 441
Infant Mortality	1 410	373	347	352
Immigration	6 970	7 802	60 294	68 183
Emigration	857	1 263	24 065	33 463
Natural Increase	1 398	-18 091	-5 727	1 390
Net Migration	6 113	6 539	36 229	34 720
Total Increase	7 511	-11 552	30 502	36 110
Population total	10 362 740	10 272 503	10 251 079	10 287 189

Source: Czech Statistical Office (own calculations).

Table 3. Population development in the Czech Republic in the years 2007-2010

	2007	2008	2009	2010
Marriages	57 157	52 457	47 862	46 746
Divorces	31 129	31 300	29 133	30 783
Live births	114 632	119 570	118 348	117 153
Induced abortions	25 414	25 760	24 636	23 998
Deaths	104 636	104 948	107 421	106 844
Infant Mortality	360	338	341	313
Immigration	104 445	77 817	39 973	30 515
Emigration	20 500	6 027	11 629	14 867
Natural Increase	9 996	14 622	10 927	10 309
Net Migration	83 945	71 790	28 344	15 648
Total Increase	93 941	86 412	39 271	25 957
Population total	10 381 130	10 467 542	10 506 813	10 532 770

Source: Czech Statistical Office (own calculations).

A very positive development is seen in the abortion rate. The decrease of miscarriages is statistically very distinctive, it is connected with investments in health care (accessibility of medical devices and medicinal drugs). A rapid decrease of abortions is related to more responsible behaviour of young people who have more personal chances than before 1989 (studying, working abroad, travelling).

The decrease in the number of abortions between 1988 (the highest amount) and 2010 is about 1/5 of the maximum value. This decrease greatly influences improvement in health of especially young girls and women because the highest level of abortion decrease is in the lowest age groups.

Negative development can be seen in overall marriage rate. There is a distinctive decrease in the number of young people getting married and therefore the increasing number of children born to single mothers. The gross marriage rate dropped in the studied period by half, the number of children born to single parents multiplied four times and its value was 40.3% of all born babies. A positive element of the development in the last two years is the increasing age of people getting married and the age of mothers with their first child. The age of women getting married increased for the first time from 21.4 years in 1990 to 28 years in 2010, for men from 24 years to 31 years. The average age of a mother with her first child increased in the same period from 22.5 years to 27.6 years.

3. Migration

Inner migration in the Czech Republic distinctively decreased in the 90s. While the number of migrants in the previous years annually exceeded the level of 220 thousand (in 1980 it exceeded even the number of 250 thousand), in the following years the

number of migrants was lower. In 1991 the Czech Republic registered 217.6 thousand, in 1992 212.2 thousand and in 1993 only 200.5 thousand of people moving inside the country. The number of migrants dropped for the first time below the level of 200 thousand in 1994 when the number was only 176.2 thousand. The lowest number of migrants was observed by the Czech statistics in 1996 (164.5 thousand). The decrease in migration was caused especially by the decline in housing construction. This decline was connected with the stop of panel-concrete houses construction. The revival of housing construction (houses particularly in big city surroundings) in the second half of the 90s led to the gradual increase in inner migration. 173 thousand people moved within the Czech Republic in 2000. The increasing number of inner migration was even more dynamic after 2000. The data published about the number of migrants in the Czech Republic are, however, influenced by the change of methodology in the registration of inner migration. Since the beginning of 2001 also people with foreign citizenship have been counted as migrants if they worked in the Czech Republic (also for a short period of time) having visa for minimum 90 days. In 2000 the number of foreigners in inner migration was 0.3% (582 people) and one year later it was 3.4% (6 thousand people). In the following 6 years the analyzed share increased even up to 16.7%. In 2007 it was 42.8 thousand foreigners involved in inner migration. This year the number of migrants within the area of the Czech Republic has exceeded the level of 250 thousand again (255.690 people) which is similar to 1980.

The Czech Republic became migration-profitable country after 1989. Positive migration saldo was influenced at the beginning by a high number of return immigration of Czech citizens, and the increased migration movement with the connection of Czechoslovakia splitting in 1992 and 1993 as well as the increasing influx of foreigners participating in labour market in economically prospering areas during the 90s (especially after 1997). The migration growth was slowed down at the beginning of the 90s by relatively high number of emigrants in the connection of Czechoslovakia splitting. Then the emigration gradually increased although official data are not precise because of an incomplete register of emigrants (the incompleteness is still a problem today.)

Statistical data about the overall number of immigrants from abroad and about the number of foreigners in the Czech Republic were quite incorrect in the 90s. It was caused by several laws valid at the same time which specified kinds of stay and the way of foreign citizens registration. As stated above, new laws about foreigners stay were passed in 2000 and they changed the definition of a foreigner stay and its registration. At the end of 2000 there were 201 thousand foreigners with residence permit registered in the Czech Republic (in 1993 it was only 77.7 thousand), out of these 66.9 thousand had permanent residence permit and 134.1 thousand for long stay (visa for more than 90 days). The number of foreigners with residence permit in the Czech Republic doubled in the following eight years. At the end of 2008 there were 483.3 thousand foreigners registered as people with residence permit, out of

these 172.9 thousand had permanent residence permit and 265.4 for long stay. The percentage of foreigners among the population of the Czech Republic exceeded the level of 4% (4.19%). At the period of economic crisis the number of foreigners with residence permit in the Czech Republic decreased slightly and in the first half of 2010 the number was 426.5 thousand.

In the last decades the number of foreigners involved in the labour market of the Czech Republic increased considerably again. At the end of 2000 there were 165 thousand of them, which means that foreigners formed 3.17% of labour force in the Czech Republic. During the following eight years their number increased up to 200 thousand and at the end of 2008 there were 361.7 thousand foreigners (i. e. 6.43% of labour force) registered by labour offices and by the Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic (in the register of trade authorization). In the period of economic crisis the number of working foreigners decreased more considerably than the number of residence permits. 307.9 thousand foreigners were active on the labour market at the first half of 2010, i. e. 5.39% of labour force in the Czech Republic.

What changes in inner migration were present in the Czech Republic after 1989? It is clear that in the 80s migration headed especially to big cities. Migration saldo in the capital city of Prague reached between 1980 and 1989 almost 70 thousand people. Brno 25 thousand and Pilsen 7.7 thousand. In the given period migration activity of Ostrava decreased considerably (Ostrava migration profit was only 4.4 thousand people.) On the other hand inner migration was distinctively influenced by investment activities into two districts of the Czech Republic. The district of České Budějovice benefiting from the construction of Temelín nuclear plant in the 80s showed migration profit 8.5 thousand people. In the district of Česká Lípa active migration saldo reached almost the same number (8.3 thousand). Migration was influenced there by the creation of many working places in the factory of the Czech Uranium Industry in Stráž pod Ralskem. In the first half of the 90s migration to cities slowly declined and suburbanization began to develop in the Czech Republic. Migration aimed mainly at the district in the nearest surroundings of big cities, especially Prague-East and Prague-West, but also the districts of the Central Bohemian region. High migration profit can be seen in Brno-Outskirts, Pilsen-South and Pilsen-North too.

After 1989 the number of inhabitants in individual areas was much more influenced by migration from abroad. In the whole period between 1980-1989 the Czech Republic had the migration profit from abroad which roughly amounted to 22.3 thousand people, i.e. significantly lower saldo than e. g. the registered saldo in mere one year (see saldo in 2007). Similarly to the map of "unemployment in the Czech Republic" we can define in the recent period three areas also on the map of "inner migration" from which two are with migration loss and one with migration profit. The areas with migration loss are Moravian regions including Vysočina region as well as Hradec Králové region. Another loss-making area is the locality formed by

NUTS 2 Northwest (Ústí region and Karlovy Vary region) and Liberec region. The areas with profit are all other places in Bohemia including the capital city of Prague (Central Bohemia region is perceived together with its core city of Prague). Just as in the period of Czechoslovakia establishing zonality, East – West could be observed again. Bohemia lies nearer to the biggest business partners and therefore grows more dynamically in economics as well as in population than Moravia. The attractiveness of central Bohemia area together with Prague, Pilsen and South Bohemia region also considerably influences currently growing differences in population development, i.e. in its demographic element.

4. Regional differences of population development in the Czech Republic

Past migration movements deepened regional differences in the number of born babies and in the population growth of individual spatial units. Charts 4-11 show the development of natural migration and overall growth for units NUTS 2, regions and districts in the Czech Republic in the years 2004-2010. A positive natural growth did not exist in any of the regions of NUTS 2 in the years 2004-2005. In the years 2007-2008 natural growth was positive in every NUTS 2 unit. Overall the growth was positive in all regions in 2008 because there was the highest rate of natality then (after the decrease of natality in the 90s). The decrease in migration balance from abroad led to the total decrease of the population in three from eight spatial units – NUTS 2 units in Moravia. While observing the development of individual regions, it can be noticed that in 2004 all regions had negative natural growth. Nine regions had positive migration growth and six regions had positive total growth. From Moravian regions only South Moravia region showed total growth. The highest total growth was due to high foreign migration balance in 2007. All 14 regions showed positive total growth as well as positive natural growth.

Positive migration balance was in 13 regions apart from Moravia-Silesia region (where there was negative balance). In 2008 all regions had positive natural as well as total growth again. Negative migration growth was besides Moravia-Silesia region also in Olomouc region. In 2010 most of the regions showed negative migration balance (8) and only 8 regions had positive total growth. Moravia-Silesia region is the only region with negative value of natural growth as well. In the Czech Republic population development can be observed in 76 districts (not taking Prague into consideration). In 2004 positive natural growth was only in 15 districts of the Czech Republic; and out of these only 2 districts were from Moravia.

The majority of districts showed negative total growth (in most of Bohemian regions districts with positive total growth prevailed; in all Moravian regions (apart from South Moravia) negative total growth dominated.). In 2007 and 2008 population

Table 4. Natural increase (NI), net migration (NM) and total increase (TI) in regions NUTS 2 in the Czech Republic

Years	(NI)		NM		TI	
	+	-	+	-	+	-
2004	0	8	6	2	4	4
2005	0	8	7	1	6	2
2006	6	2	7	1	7	1
2007	8	0	7	1	7	1
2008	8	0	7	1	8	0
2009	7	1	5	3	5	3
2010	7	1	5	3	5	3

Source: Czech Statistical Office (own calculations).

Table 5. Natural increase (NI), net migration (NM) and total increase (TI) in administrative regions in the Czech Republic

Years	NI		NM		TI	
	+	-	+	-	+	-
2004	0	14	9	5	6	8
2005	2	12	12	2	10	4
2006	9	5	12	2	12	2
2007	14	0	13	1	14	0
2008	14	0	12	2	14	0
2009	12	2	7	7	8	6
2010	13	1	6	8	8	6

Source: Czech Statistical Office (own calculations).

Table 6. Natural increase (NI), net migration (NM) and total increase (TI) in districts in the Czech Republic

Years	NI		NM		TI	
	+	-	+	-	+	-
2004	15	61	46	30	36	40
2005	16	70	56	20	53	23
2006	36	40	58	18	58	18
2007	64	12	66	10	68	8
2008	68	8	64	12	68	8
2009	55	21	39	37	51	25
2010	54	22	34	42	39	37

Source: Czech Statistical Office (own calculations).

Table 7. Natural increase (NI), net migration (NM) and total increase (TI) in districts in administrative regions in the Czech Republic in the year 2004

Administrative region	NI		NM		TI	
	+	-	+	-	+	-
Středočeský	2	10	11	1	9	3
Jihočeský	3	4	5	2	4	3
Plzeňský	1	6	5	2	4	3
Karlovarský	1	2	2	1	2	1
Ústecký	1	6	7	0	6	1
Liberecký	2	2	1	3	2	2
Královéhradecký	0	5	3	2	1	4
Pardubický	1	3	2	2	1	3
Vysočina	2	3	2	3	1	4
Jihomoravský	1	6	5	2	4	3
Olomoucký	0	5	2	3	0	5
Zlínský	0	4	1	3	1	3
Moravskoslezský	1	5	0	6	1	5

Source: Czech Statistical Office (own calculations).

Table 8. Natural increase (NI), net migration (NM) and total increase (TI) in districts in administrative regions in the Czech Republic in the year 2007

Administrative region	NI		NM		TI	
	+	-	+	-	+	-
Středočeský	10	2	12	0	12	0
Jihočeský	5	2	6	1	7	0
Plzeňský	6	1	7	0	7	0
Karlovarský	3	0	2	1	2	1
Ústecký	7	0	6	1	6	1
Liberecký	3	1	4	0	4	0
Královéhradecký	5	0	5	0	5	0
Pardubický	3	1	4	0	4	0
Vysočina	4	1	5	0	5	0
Jihomoravský	5	2	6	1	6	1
Olomoucký	4	1	3	2	3	2
Zlínský	4	0	3	1	4	0
Moravskoslezský	5	1	3	3	3	3

Source: Czech Statistical Office (own calculations).

decrease was in 8 districts from which in 2007 only two were from Bohemia, the rest from Moravia. In 2008 only one district was Bohemian. Financial crisis led to the decrease in foreign migration balance and in 2010 total growth was positive only in 39 districts and in 37 districts it was negative (in Moravia there were 9 positive and 17 negative.)

The highest absolute and relative total growth can be observed in the main metropolitan regions, i.e. in Prague and its wider surrounding, in the surroundings of Pilsen and Brno. The majority of districts in central Bohemia has the distinctive

Table 9. Natural increase (NI), net migration (NM) and total increase (TI) in districts in administrative regions in the Czech Republic in the year 2010

Administrative region	NI		NM		TI	
	+	-	+	-	+	-
Středočeský	9	3	11	1	11	1
Jihočeský	4	3	3	4	4	3
Plzeňský	5	2	4	3	4	3
Karlovarský	2	1	0	3	1	2
Ústecký	6	1	2	5	2	5
Liberecký	4	0	2	2	3	1
Královéhradecký	5	0	2	3	2	3
Pardubický	3	1	2	2	2	2
Vysočina	4	1	1	4	1	4
Jihomoravský	5	2	5	2	5	2
Olomoucký	2	3	2	3	1	4
Zlínský	3	1	0	4	1	3
Moravskoslezský	2	4	2	4	2	4

Source: Czech Statistical Office (own calculations).

Table 10. Total increase of population in some districts in the Czech Republic in the years 2004-2010

Years	Praha-east	Praha-west	Beroun	Nymburk	Ostrava	Karviná
2004	3 132	3 153	761	811	-1 686	-489
2005	3 919	4 255	924	782	-1 324	-892
2006	3 846	4 445	1 138	1 170	-980	-972
2007	5 956	5 726	1 721	2 011	-386	-357
2008	8 443	6 163	1 634	1 339	-76	-534
2009	5 732	4 519	880	1 112	-1 310	-1 726
2010	5 187	4 260	1 260	1 372	-1 846	-2 725
Celkem	36 215	32 521	8 308	8 597	-7 608	-7 695

Source: Czech Statistical Office (own calculations).

positive total growth. For the total growth the most decisive factor is migration growth. The highest values migration growth was reached in districts of Prague West and Prague East. In the years 2004-2010 population size of the district of Prague West grew by 32.521 people, i.e. it increased by 36.1%. Prague West grew by 36.215 people, i.e. increased by 35.7% (districts of Beroun and Nymburk showed population growth higher than 10%). As far as regions are concerned the highest population growth in the given period was in Central Bohemia 11.35% (129.183 people) and Prague 7.85% (91.577 people). Total population decrease was only in Moravia-Silesia and Zlin regions.

Table 11. Total increase of population in administrative regions in the Czech Republic in the years 2004-2010

Years	Praha	Středočeský	Moravskoslezský	Jihočeský	Plzeňský	Zlínský
2004	4 990	8 276	-2 723	171	-495	-1 160
2005	11 039	14 037	-2 488	2 054	1 910	-564
2006	6 516	17 146	-1 479	2 240	3 009	-303
2007	23 971	26 573	607	3 258	6 537	941
2008	21 114	28 846	358	3 064	8 553	632
2009	15 815	16 842	-2 882	1 315	2 236	-370
2010	8 132	17 445	-4 153	1 063	182	-681
Overall	91 577	129 183	-12 760	13 165	21 932	-1 505

Source: Czech Statistical Office (own calculations).

5. Conclusions

During the transformation period the Czech Republic underwent distinctive changes in population development. At the beginning natality decreased rapidly, i.e. between 1990 and 1996 it dropped from 130 thousand to 90 thousand of the born babies. The low level of natality continued until 2001. Since 2002 natality has been slightly increasing. In 2008 and 2010 there were 120 thousand babies born annually. Clear fertility rate decreased up to 1.12 of a child per a woman in 1997 and 1998. At the end of the first decade of the 21st century it increased up to 1.5 of a child per a woman. Increasing natality reflects the decision of strong population years 1972 and 1976 to enter partnerships and therefore to begin reproduction. In the following years it is very probable that natality will decrease because weak population years born after 1980 will become around 30 years old. This development can be expected only when there is no considerable change in the reproduction behaviour of the Czech population.

Regional difference in population development will furthermore deepen despite the fact that economics in Central Europe has been enlivened. It is caused by the

continuing selective development. The importance of central Bohemia and Prague will grow and north-west, or precisely speaking the whole Moravia (apart from Brno metropolitan area) will lose its population, or it will remain the same.

Literature

- Aleš M., *Vnitřní migrace v České republice v letech 1980-1999*, "Demografie" 2001, 43, č. 3, , p. 187-201.
- Andrle A., *Stěhování v České republice podle vzdělání migrantů v letech 1993-1998*, "Demografie" 2002, 44, č. 1, p. 70-75.
- Bartoňová D., *Demografické aspekty vnitřní a zahraniční migrace v České republice v 90. letech*, "Demografie" 1997, 39, č. 4, p. 248-256.
- Čermák Z., *Migrační aspekty dlouhodobého vývoje Prahy se zvláštním zřetelem k transformačnímu období devadesátých let*, "Geografie – sborník České geografické společnosti" 1999, 104, č. 2, p. 122-132.
- Čermák Z., Hampl M., Müller J., *Současné tendence vývoje obyvatelstva metropolitních areálů v Česku: Dochází k významnému obratu?*, "Geografie – sborník České geografické společnosti" 2009, 114, č. 1, p. 37-54.
- Katedra demografie a geodemografie PFF UK, *Populační vývoj České republiky 2001 – 2006*, UK Praha 2007, p. 114.
- Katedra demografie a geodemografie PFF UK, *Populační vývoj České republiky 2007*, UK Praha 2008, p. 140.
- Pavlík Z. et al., *Population Development in the Czech Republic 1990 – 2002*. UK Praha 2003, p.100.
- Šašek M., *Regionální Differences in Educational Development in the North Bohemia*, E+M Economics and Management (Ekonomie a Management), TU v Liberci 2003, p. 76-81.
- Šašek M., *Regional Differences in Educational Structures of Migrants and Their Impact on the Educational Structures in the Regions*, Mezinárodní konference, Prace Naukowe „Gospodarka lokalna i regionalna w teorii i praktyce“, Akademia Ekonomicznej im. Oskara Langego we Wrocławiu, Jelenia Góra 2003, p. 566-572.
- Šašek M., *The Changes of Internal Migration in the Czech Republic (with the Focus on Analysis of the Changes in Ústí nad Labem Region)*, UJEP Ústí nad Labem, AUP Studia Oeconomica 2011, č. 164, p. 121.
- Vítková L., *Dochází k homogenizaci demografické reprodukce v demograficky vyspělých zemích*, "Demografie" 2011, 53, č. 1, p. 19-32.

ROZWÓJ POPULACJI W CZECHACH PO ROKU 1989

Streszczenie: Po okresie transformacji można zaobserwować w Czechach zmianę kierunków migracji. Regionalne zróżnicowania w rozwoju populacji i kierunku migracji będą w przyszłości pogłębiać się, pomimo ożywienia gospodarczego w krajach Europy Środkowej. Region środkowej Bohemii i Pragi będzie cechował się wzrostem populacji, a całe Morawy, z wyjątkiem obszaru metropolitalnego Brna, stabilizacją lub spadkiem.

Słowa kluczowe: rozwój regionalny, przyrost naturalny, migracje, rozwój demograficzny, struktura populacji.