
**СЕКЦИЯ 4
МИГРАЦИОННЫЙ ВЫЗОВЫ
В УСЛОВИЯХ ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИИ**

**IMPACT OF MIGRATION ON THE DEMOGRAPHIC SITUATION
OF THE SOUTH BOHEMIAN PERIPHERAL REGIONS**

Danielová K.

University of South Bohemia, České Budějovice, Czech Republic

E-mail: daniek01@pf.jcu.cz

The article presents an example of two regions of the northern periphery of South Bohemia in the Czech Republic – Mladovožicko region in the North-East and Belčicko-Mirovicko region in the North-Western part [4; 5]. The territory lies on the border of two Czech administrative and statistical regions NUTS3 (Jihočeský and Středočeský). The regions have been affected by long-term out-migration and depopulation, related to specific historical events, such as the industrialisation since the early 19th century and especially at the turn of the centuries and in the 1940s, several cases of migration of the German and Czech population between the world wars, quantitatively dramatic expulsion of the German population after the Second World War with further socio-economic implications for the regions, as well as the policy of a central system of settlement and integration of municipalities which has been put in practice between 1971 and 1990 [1; 3]. A reversal occurred following more than a hundred years with tendency to the stabilisation of its migration. The research on counterurbanisation and the character of migration and its effectiveness was based on the analysis of statistical data of the Czech Statistical Office over 25 years, from 1991 to 2015 [2]. To express the importance of migration, we used the migration importance index as a percentage share of the net migration over the total population increase ($Imi = NM/TI * 100$). The determining factor of the demographic change was the volume and character of migratory flows. The negative migration balance (-2.4‰ between 1991 and 2010 for both regions) has changed over the last five years of 2011-2015 to a positive one (3.1‰), especially for municipalities with up to 100 residents (11.0‰ between 2011 and 2015). The values of the migration importance index point to a change in the importance of migration from the "negative" level to the "preservative" level. Prevailing in-migration and counterurbanisation flows from metropolitan and regional centres are confirmed. Although the observed peripheral regions are naturally constantly losing in population (rate of natural increase of -4.4‰ in 2015) and overall the number of inhabitants does not grow, or it grows to a minimum degree (overall increase of 0.5‰ in 2015, -0.7‰ between 2011 and 2015), the important factor for the potentially more progressive demographic development of the peripheral region is the favourable age structure of the in-migrants (the share of children below the age of 15 years of 22.9%, the age index 140.3%). As such counterurbanisation based on the migration of seniors was not confirmed. Counterurbanisation and in-migration of young families thus becomes a determining process for demographic "healing" of the peripheral regions, as illustrated by the example of remote rural areas of South Bohemia. Given its low volume and low economic and social impact, in general counterurbanisation cannot be compared with urbanisation, however it is important not only for the population stability, but also for the overall social stability of the affected, long depopulated rural regions.

References

1. Boháč A. Studie o populaci v Československé republice // Praha: Státní statistický úřad –1928.

2. ČSÚ. Databáze migrace obyvatelstva // Praha: Český statistický úřad – 2016.
3. Kučera M. Obyvatelstvo českých zemí ve 20. století / L. Fialová et al. // Dějiny obyvatel českých zemí. Praha: Mladá Fronta. 1998. P. 311 – 381.
4. Musil J., Müller J. Vnitřní periferie v České republice jako mechanismus sociální exkluze // Sociologický časopis. 2008. Vol. 44, issue 2. P. 321 – 348.
5. Popjaková D., Danielová K., Valešková M. Importance of migration and counterurbanisation as factors of stabilization of the demographic situation of the peripheral regions – example of South Bohemia // Folia Geographica. 2018. Vol. 60, issue 2. P. 101 – 117.