"Where Are They Going?": Immigrant Inclusion in the Czech Republic (A Case Study on Ukrainians, Vietnamese, and Armenians in Prague)[1]

Dušan Drbohlav* and Dagmar Dzúrová*

ABSTRACT

This paper is based on research conducted by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) Office in Prague and the Faculty of Science, Charles University in Prague in the fall and winter of 2003-2004. Within the questionnaire survey, 126 first-generation immigrants in Prague (51 Ukrainians, 45 Vietnamese, and 30 Armenians) were successfully contacted via a non-probability sampling method. The main goals of the research were to ascertain what mode of inclusion into Czech society the immigrant groups practiced and to determine their satisfaction level with their new lives. Special attention was paid to finding out important factors that stand behind both the common features and particular patterns of behaviour. Our approach is an attempt to analyse the issue via quantitative statistics (Chi-square Test, the AnswerTree Method). Berry's (1992) acculturation strategies model and Portes and Zhou's (e.g. 2000) segmented assimilation model serve as reference points while discussing conceptual matters.

The results indicate that the immigrants' inclusion in Czech society in Prague has developed into specific modes: Ukrainians are typical of their specific transnationalization patterns, Vietnamese represent a "well-off" but separated and segregated community, and Armenians practice a clear assimilation strategy, while approaching the mainstream in terms of socio-economic status. Based on various indications, it seems that successful inclusion in Czech society is connected to the assimilation mode. In sum, the immigrants most satisfied with their quality of life are those for whom it is not important

* Faculty of Science, Department of Social Geography and Regional Development, Charles University, Prague.

to live close to their compatriots and those whose knowledge of the spoken Czech language is above average. The lowest satisfaction score is tied to those immigrants who prefer to live close to their compatriots, those with university education, and those with a low income. Good knowledge of the Czech language seems to be a gateway to immigrants' satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

In its October 2005 report The Global Commission on International Migration (established by the United Nations Secretary General and a number of governments on 9 December 2003 in Geneva) affirms that the international community has failed to realize the full potential of migration and has not risen to the many opportunities and challenges it presents. The Commission stresses the need for greater coherence, cooperation, and capacity to achieve a more effective governance of international migration. The situation, however, is even more challenging and dramatic. Recent reality in developed countries of Europe but also, for example, in North America, has proven that the international migration issue has become a global problem. One of the most problematic issues seems to be a co-existence of numerous and rather culturally distant minority populations coming from weak economies with majority populations and, indeed, immigrants' inclusion in the whole system and its various structures in individual destination developed countries. Tensions between the majority and minority populations are permanently on the agenda in developed democracies. As Vetrovec and Wessen (2005: 14), mention "…some societies such as the United Kingdom, France, Germany and the Netherlands have witnessed a kind of moral panic surrounding the place of the so-called 'second-generation', marked by inter-ethnic tensions or violence, suspicions and some indicators of criminal activity and public disturbances or indeed riots". The November 2005 massive riots led mostly by Maghreb young immigrants of the second and third generations in suburban ghetto housing developments of Paris and of other French big cities only confirm what has been said. Of course, one has to also point out that a mutual relationship between the destination countries and immigrants was further negatively influenced and exacerbated by terrorist attacks by Muslim fundamentalists on "Western liberal doctrine" like in New York and Washington, DC on 11 September 2001, in London on 7 July 2005, or via the murder (also clearly motivated by religious fundamentalism) of filmmaker Theo van Gogh in Amsterdam on 2 November 2004. All in all, it really seems that the co-existence of majority societies with immigrants does not work well irrespective of what specific mode of immigrant inclusion is applied "from the top". The countries mentioned above by Vetrovec and Wessendorf (2005) represent different policy models of destination developed countries: the differential exclusion model, the assimilation model, and the pluralist model (more in Castles, 1995). However,

none of them, including the pluralist/multicultural model that until recently has been proven most successful in incorporating immigrants into society (Castles, 1995: 293), is now able to successfully handle and manage immigrants and related issues. Cultural differences are often accompanied with socio-economic inequalities. "Recent national censuses and other instruments for measuring the socio-economic standing of communities have, in many countries, shown that immigrant groups and ethnic minorities that now at least two or three generations since original migration tend to show poor levels of education, quality of housing and degree of residential segregation, types of jobs or levels of unemployment and other indicators of low socio-economic attainment or mobility"(Vetrovec and Wessendorf, 2005: 13). Again, even typical multicultural societies failed to integrate their immigrants and very often isolate themselves in their own worlds without communicating with and contributing to the majority society – see e.g. in the United States (Huntington, 2005), Canada (Collacott, 2003), Sweden (Hjerm, 2005), and the Netherlands (van Selm, 2005). While remedies are now being found in more restrictive migration policies, shifting away from group emancipation toward an emphasis on individual integration (the case of pluralist societies), calling for pushing common values and cohesion, solving the most serious problems related to immigrants' lives in majority societies will be a long-term and, indeed, difficult process.

Thus, there is not too much at this moment the new immigration countries, like, for example, the Czech Republic (as of 31 December 2005, there were 278,312 legally staying immigrants), could rely on when designing their migration and integration policies and practices. What is clear is that, to a large extent, the Czech Republic fully harmonized "mandatory areas" of its migration policy with those in the EU. From the very beginning the country applied a sort of multicultural integration model, while pushing (one must say, more in theory than in practice) "principles of equal access and equal opportunity" (Drbohlav et al., 2005b). In harmony with other European countries, however, the latest documents and concepts point to reorientation from community/group integration toward civic integration of immigrants (Barsova, 2005). What is positive is that over time the government has moved toward a more multifaceted approach to immigration and integration. Immigrants (for the time being, rather than in theory) are starting to be seen as an asset that contributes to economic growth and complements the domestic labour market. Migration is now seen in terms of a management or assessment of migration needs. There is a strong traditional focus on long-term and permanent migration and refugees, and there is now some interest in more flexible arrangements for highly skilled and educated immigrants in particular (Drbohlav et al., 2005b). Some of the key issues and problems that the Czech Republic now faces in the field of migratory policies and practices are: to clearly define and detail migration principles and policies in relation to social, economic, political, demographic, and geographical structures

of Czech society; to more successfully combat illegal migration but, at the same time, to also find ways how to integrate "requested" economic migrants legally in the Czech labour market; to further decentralize migratory and foreigners' inclusion responsibilities (including involving municipalities); to better the cooperation among the state, non-governmental organizations, and international organizations that operate in the migration/inclusion field; and to improve international migration statistics and initiate more public debates on migration issues in general.

Concerning research activities, whereas rather descriptive, or if analytical, very simple, quantitative or qualitative studies in the given field have so far prevailed in the Czech Republic (see an overview in Uherek and Cernik, 2004; Drbohlav 2001). In this contribution we are using, to some extent, a more sophisticated, purely quantitative approach, while testing selected "migration and inclusion" theories/concepts. Besides a few prior studies in the Czech Republic, such practices in Czech migratory research have so far been rather rare (see e.g. Drbohlav et al., 2004, 2005a).

In an environment where there is a lack of experience regarding the migrants and immigrants' inclusion in society, any in-depth study into how immigrants behave, their living conditions, their living strategies, and their perception of their lives in a new host society are welcome. Immigrants respond to the existing policies and practices, but at the same time they respond via their various modes of inclusion into society (there is always some free room for behaving in a specific way), which creates new conditions and structures that call for permanent adjusting and the reshaping of existing policy models to new situations. Just shifting from a macro (a state) to a micro level (an individual or a group) and targeting a mode or modes of immigrant inclusions in Czech society is the main and real topic of this contribution.

IMMIGRANTS IN QUESTION AND THEIR STATUSES

International migration (mostly economic) very quickly gained a foothold in the newly established Czech democratic system and has found its place within Czech society. The current migratory reality is also conditioned by what happened in Czech history. Before characterizing immigrants' inclusion patterns in the Czech society in Prague by the given three immigrant communities – Ukrainians, Vietnamese, and Armenians, some basic historical facts and several selected statistical data have to be pointed out.

Ukrainians

People of Ukrainian origin stayed in the territory of the current Czech Republic (mainly in Prague) as early as the Austria-Hungarian Monarchy, since the

western part of Ukraine belonged to the Monarchy. Also, Transcarpathian Ukraine was a part of independent Czechoslovakia during the 1920s and 1930s. First, more freedoms and rights for Ukrainians in Austria-Hungary vis-à-vis Russia and, then, no willingness to tolerate establishing an independent Ukraine by the newly established Soviet Union pushed Ukrainians outside their mother country. Czechoslovakia became one of the important destinations. Army staff and politicians followed by representatives of intelligentsia, officers, students and poor people, mostly peasants, were leaving Ukraine. Many of them got asylum status in Czechoslovakia (like e.g. Russian immigrants in the country). Perhaps around 6,000 Ukrainian emigrants stayed in pre-war Czechoslovakia (see Cerna, 2003). The Czechoslovakian government financially supported their integration. Immigrants established Ukrainian institutions and associations in political, cultural, educational, and scientific fields. Since many Ukrainians in Czechoslovakia were against the continuation of the Soviet regime in Ukraine after World War II, they left the country just before the end of the war mostly for Germany. After the war, many of those who stayed were caught and sent to prison in the Soviet Union. In fact, until 1948 all Ukrainian institutions and associations in Czechoslovakia were closed and cancelled. During the socialist/communist era, from 1948 to the beginning of the 1990s, there were no social organizations for Ukrainians in Czechoslovakia.

Vietnamese

Vietnamese started arriving into the Czech Republic with the so-called international aid among socialist/communist countries (political and economic mutual support) as early as the 1950s. The migration was based on official intergovernmental agreements. Mostly young persons (without their families) came to increase their qualifications (training, apprenticeship, study). They found (except university students) their place in many industrial plants as temporary workers across the country for several years while, on one hand, getting experience and improving their qualifications and, on the other hand, filling some gaps in the Czechoslovakian labour market. For example, in 1981 between 30,000 and 35,000 Vietnamese stayed in Czechoslovakia. Two-thirds were workers (Drbohlav et al., 2004). Their stay, though for them attractive (after returning to Viet Nam they improved their and their families' prestige and income as well), was "highly politically watched". Every new group that arrived in Czechoslovakia had a "mediator" who had come years ago, spoke Czech, and was familiar with the administration and legislation and with the culture in the broadest sense of the word. This role of mediators has survived, though not based on a legal and organized platform. The given inflow of Vietnamese citizens started decreasing in 1986 when economic reforms, "Doi Moi", started in Viet Nam and stopped after the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia in 1989.

Armenians

Armenia is one of the nations with the highest migration outflows and potential. When taking into account recent development (since the 1980s), Armenia and Armenians have suffered from natural disasters, political and economic changes, and instabilities and ethnic cleansing. Though being one of the most typical "diaspora nations" having both strong "old settled" and "newly arrived" communities throughout the whole world, history of the Armenian's immigration into Czechoslovakia/the Czech Republic is very young and immigrant numbers are very low. What is worth mentioning is that between 1991 and July 2003, more than 3,000 (3,093) Armenians asked for asylum status in the Czech Republic while only 149 received it (Drbohlav et al., 2004).

As of 31 December 2005, Ukrainians, with almost 88,000 immigrants, clearly dominated (except Slovaks) all other legally staying immigrant groups in the Czech Republic (31.5% of all legal immigrants). Vietnamese rank as the third most numerous community in the country (37,000). On the other hand, Armenians (about 1,300 immigrants) are a very small immigrant group that stays legally in the Czech Republic[2] (0.5% of all legal immigrants) (Table 1).

Among Ukrainians, economic migrants (to a large extent represented by those with visas for a period exceeding 90 days or long-term residence permits, see Table 1) are much more common than immigrants coming on family re-unification/formation grounds (mostly represented by those who own permanent residence permits). Among Vietnamese and Armenians, it is the opposite: "family reasons" and permanent migration are more important than a typical temporary short-term economic one. Concerning the Vietnamese, one can be surprised by a clear dominance of entrepreneurs over employees. Also the Armenian immigrant community has more entrepreneurs (however, a share of employees is not negligible), whereas employees out-number the entrepreneurs within the Ukrainian community (Table 1).

The above mentioned migratory types tied to individual immigrant groups reflect various factors that shape particular behavioural models of the immigrants. For example, different motivations and strategies by representatives of individual immigrant groups; various historical patterns of mutual relations between the Czech Republic/Czechoslovakia and the given countries of origin (and related social capital); human capital variables that immigrants bring with them to the destination country; and variables like the geographical position of a country of origin (vis-à-vis the Czech Republic) and the cultural distance of the individual immigrant groups from Czech majority society may come into play (regarding lives of Ukrainians and Vietnamese in the Czech Republic, see more in Drbohlav, 2004).

TABLE 1

UKRAINIAN, VIETNAMESE, AND ARMENIAN IMMIGRANTS IN THE CZECH
REPUBLIC BY MAIN MIGRATORY TYPES, AS OF 31 DECEMBER 2005

Country of origin*/type of status	Legally staying immigrants	Permanent residence permit	Long-term stay/visa for a period exceeding 90 days**	Work permit	Trade license
Ukrainians	87,789	15,334	72,455	38,926	21,135
Vietnamese	36,832	23,235	13,597	187	22,620
Armenians	1,268	906	362	161	337

Notes: *It is based on a citizenship category. ** If a foreigner has to stay on the Czech territory for more than three months to fulfill his/her goals (employment, business, study, etc.), he/she has to be granted a visa for a period exceeding 90 days. Since 1 May 2005, if the purpose of stay lasts for more than one year, he/she may ask for a so-called long-term residence permit – no more extensions for a visa exceeding 90 days exist (Zprava, 2005).

Source: Horakova and Macounova, 2006.

One of the important factors instrumental in immigrant inclusion into Czech society, particularly via cultural activities, is ethnic institutions. There are now four active Ukrainian organizations in the Czech Republic (the oldest and most distinguished is The Ukrainian Initiative). There is no ideal cooperation among the respective associations. On the contrary, apparent rivalry between some does exist (namely respecting differences tied to the old versus the new modes/types of Ukrainian immigration). Concerning Vietnamese, about ten registered Vietnamese associations work in the country; however, only four are well-known. So far their activities have neither opened the Vietnamese community nor developed much cooperation with the Czech majority (Drbohlav et al., 2004). Currently, two ethnic associations for Armenians exist in the Czech Republic. Nevertheless, neither has much support from the Armenians in the country and do not represent their interests enough (Drbohlav et al., 2004).

CONCEPTS AND THEORIES

Results of our analysis are tested vis-à-vis important aspects included in the following two conceptual frameworks:

(1) The acculturation strategy model was developed by Berry (see Berry, 1992). He defines four different acculturation options available to individuals and to groups in plural societies: assimilation, integration, separation,

and marginalization. These options (both a strategy and an outcome) are based on: (a) whether one's (migrant's) own cultural identity and customs are of value and should be retained and (b) whether relations (inter-ethnic contact) with the larger society are of value and should be sought. When the first option is answered "no", and the second "yes", the assimilation option is defined. It can take place by the absorption of a non-dominant group into an established dominant group, or it can take place through the merger of many groups to form a new society, as in the "melting pot" concept. The integration option implies some maintenance of the cultural integrity of the group as well as the movement to become an integral part of a larger societal framework. If there are no substantial relations with the larger society, accompanied by a maintenance of ethnic identity and traditions, segregation (the pattern is imposed by the dominant group) or separation (the pattern is desired by the acculturating group) comes. Within marginalization groups/individuals lose cultural and psychological contact with both their traditional culture and the larger society (either by exclusion or withdrawal) (see Berry, 1992).

(2) Portes and Zhou's segmented assimilation model touches more specifically on the socio-economic aspects of immigrants' lives while looking into which sector of a society a particular immigrant group manages or chooses to include. The authors offer three possibilities: (a) immigrants group's growing acculturation and parallel integration into the middle-class takes place, (b) there is a path leading straight in the opposite direction to permanent poverty and assimilation to the underclass, and (c) there is a path that combines rapid economic advancement with deliberate preservation of the immigrant community's values and solidarity (see Portes and Zhou, 2000).

Rather more implicitly than explicitly, one can see how other important aspects following from our research are reflected vis-à-vis several other well-known migration theories and concepts like the network theory, the transnationalization concept, the neoclassical economic theory, the dual labour market theory, and the institutional theory (see more e.g. in Massey et al., 1998).

EMPIRICAL SURVEY

This paper is based on research conducted by the IOM Office in Prague and the Faculty of Science, Charles University in Prague for the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic in 2003 and 2004. While the whole research activities were composed of several various activities (oriented toward both basic and applied research, see more in Drbohlav et al., 2004), our analysis is a follow-up study tied to a questionnaire survey in which three different

communities of immigrants: Ukrainians, Vietnamese, and Armenians staying in the Czech Republic (namely, in Prague and neighbouring Central Bohemia region) were researched. A purely quantitative approach is used.

Goals and hypotheses

The main goal defined within this research was to analyse the level of social integration of the selected immigrant groups. In other words, our main research question in this contribution is: What are the modes of immigrant inclusion in Czech society by the individual immigrant groups: Ukrainians, Vietnamese, and Armenians? How and through which factors can we explain characteristic features of the given modes? The second important goal is to try to quantitatively express a level of satisfaction that could clearly specify inclusion of immigrants into the host society. Hence, one can also logically derive our main hypotheses:

(1) Due to many factors involved (e.g. different motives for migration, different cultural distance from the majority, different historical ties between countries of origin and the destination, immigrants' different human and social capital, geographical distance between the country of origin and destination, etc.) modes of immigrants' inclusion in Czech society will differ by the individual immigrant groups – Ukrainians, Vietnamese, and Armenians.

(2) In view of how complicated the process of immigrant inclusion is into a host society – as shown worldwide – there will also be problems regarding this issue in the Czech Republic and the given three groups.

(3) Accordingly, the given immigrant groups will differ in terms of how they are satisfied with their acculturation and lives in the Czech Republic.

Study design: methods, respondents, structure

As already indicated, the questionnaire survey was a main tool through which data was gained. The "snowball" method was used while selecting respondents. No other suitable sampling methods, namely representative or quota sampling, could be applied because we would miss some important data to precisely identify/ locate the targeted immigrant respondent population, or the existing data that could help us in this regard could not be released by state authorities for security reasons. Despite non-probability samples making it impossible from a purely statistical point of view to generalize and to make "far-reaching conclusions", such methods for selecting respondents are often used and the results are highly important and provide relevant information (see e.g. Fawcett and Arnold, 1987; Massey, 1987). In our case, the immigrants were contacted via both personal individual contacts and ethnic community associations and also in areas with a

high concentration of particular immigrant groups (either where they lived or worked). Geography students and researchers contacted respondents and collected the information for the questionnaires. Half of the contacts were carried out in immigrants' native languages.

There were several key criteria that respondents had to meet in order to qualify for the survey: (a) older than 18 years; (b) a foreigner – i.e. not to possess Czech citizenship; (c) lived legally in the Czech Republic between 1990 and 2002; (d) lived in the Czech Republic (in Prague or in its vicinity) legally for more than one year. Altogether 126 immigrants were successfully contacted in the fall and winter of 2003/2004: 51 Ukrainians, 45 Vietnamese, and 30 Armenians.

The questionnaire was structured into several basic thematic blocks: economic activities, housing, interethnic relations, intracommunity relations, cooperation with the state administration, family issues, health status (its subjective assessment), and future migratory strategies. Both open and closed questions were formulated and asked; thus, both qualitative and quantitative approaches could be used, although we stress only the latter one here. Out of a number of different questions we chose 23 variables that we considered the most important for studying immigrant inclusion in the host society. Six of these variables will become a base for forming the dependent variable – the satisfaction score of the immigrants' quality of life (SS). In our view, it is composed of variables that best reflect the features of the immigrants' quality of life in the host society, including relations with the majority society at individual and institutional levels, and satisfaction with work, housing, and personal health. The remaining 17 variables will serve as explanatory ones.

Within this study several research phases of quantitative analysis were done step by step: (1) descriptive statistics are used to uncover patterns and to comment upon some ascertained facts. Cross-tabulation and resulting tables (the basic technique for examining the relationship between the categorical variables) are presented; (2) the Chi-square Test was used. The Chi-square test measures the discrepancy between the observed call counts and what we would expect if the rows and columns were unrelated. Results are pinpointed and commented upon while reflecting on whether a significant relationship is confirmed ($p<0.05$) or not ($p>0.05$); (3) the SPSS AnswerTree method was used. AnswerTree is a computer learning system that creates classification systems displayed in decision trees. AnswerTree brings together four of the most popular and current analytic methods (algorithms) used in science. The outcome of the AnswerTree method is a synoptical multi-level dendrogram (top-level split, second-level split, etc.). The root node of the tree provides summary information about the target variable for the entire data set. The flow-lines in the AnswerTree dendrogram identify statistically significant subgroups located in nodes of the tree.

Results

Basic characteristics

Descriptive statistics of the study sample by individual immigrant groups and their country of origin (of those who stay in the country for more than one year) uncover some of the patterns that characterize their living style and, at the same time, the quality of their lives. Five areas are specifically pinpointed: basic socio-demographic characteristics, economic activity, housing, relations and family, and future migratory strategies.

Demographic characteristics

Generally, males slightly dominated over females while young immigrants (20-29 years) dominated over older age categories (the oldest in our sample are Armenians). All of the contacted Vietnamese stayed in Prague,[3] whereas lesser shares were linked with the other two groups (see Table 2). Vietnamese immigrants in our sample had a lower educational level (25% with the university education) as compared to the other two groups – Ukrainians (53%) and Armenians (53%). The lower share tied to Vietnamese is still, for example, significantly higher than the share of the whole Czech population (8.9% according to the 2001 Census).[4]

Economic activity

Information on the immigrants' economic activities shows that Vietnamese work more often as small entrepreneurs (vis-à-vis employees) and, at the same time, have a higher income than others. On the other hand, Ukrainians' length of work is by far the longest among the groups. In addition, Ukrainians do not make use of their original qualification as often as the other two groups (see shares in Table 2).

Housing

In contrast with Ukrainians, Vietnamese and Armenians proclaimed better housing conditions in terms of both some objective quality parameters and their subjective perception (see Table 2). There is an apparent preference of Vietnamese, compared to the other two groups, to live close to other compatriots.

Relations

In contrast to Ukrainians and Armenians, Vietnamese do not often maintain intimate friendships with Czechs. On the other hand, they revealed that compatriots more frequently helped them in the Czech Republic compared to the other two groups.

Family, future life, and migratory strategies

Ukrainians stay much less frequently with their children in the Czech Republic than those in the other immigrant groups, but all of the Ukrainian respondents informed us that they visit their relatives/friends in their mother country. While Ukrainians, in contrast to the other two groups, more often recommend emigration to the Czech Republic to relatives, their share of those who are going to stay in the Czech Republic until 2009 is the lowest among the two groups (Table 2).

All in all, these results, to large extent, fit and confirm facts that may be deduced from existing statistics reflecting characteristics of legal, registered immigrants. Hence, relative "reliability" of the data from our survey has been supported (nevertheless, see note in Table 2).

TABLE 2

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF UKRAINIAN, VIETNAMESE,
AND ARMENIAN IMMIGRANTS (%)

Characteristics[1]	Ukrainians (N[2]=51)	Vietnamese (N=45)	Armenians (N=30)
Basic parameters (in %)			
Male	61	58	53
Age 20-29	47	45	30
University education	53	25	53
Stay in Prague	67	100	80
Economic activity			
Small entrepreneurs	18	56	30
Type of activity	36 industry, 32 other services, 19 buying and selling goods	76 buying and selling goods	64 other (mainly construction, journalism, banking, art), 27 buying and selling goods
Working at least 80 hours/week	20	2	6
Making use of their own original qualification	24	37	39
Income 20,000-29,000 Czech crowns[3]	7	19	9

TABLE 2 (continued)

Characteristics[1]	Ukrainians (N[2]=51)	Vietnamese (N=45)	Armenians (N=30)
	Housing		
Living in apartment	35	53	80
Having at least 3 rooms	16	71	60
Satisfied with their housing	44	67	60
It is important for them to live close to other compatriots	57	71	28
	Relations		
More intimate friendship with Czechs	88	49	83
Compatriots have helped them in unselfish way while in the CR[4]	78	89	60
	Family and future migratory strategies		
In the CR together with their children	52	90	90
They visit their relatives/ friends in their mother country	100	51	55
They recommend emigration to the CR to relatives	33	9	17
They are going to stay in the CR until 2009	54	75	90

Notes: 1. Concerning some of the characteristics, due to the non-probability sampling method used we faced some "deviations" from what might be expected as compared to other data sources or surveys. For example, within the "type of activity", we have no Ukrainian respondents who are involved in construction (otherwise a typical sort of employment for this immigrant group). Also, other "parameters" like work burden/load or quality of housing may be influenced by the sampling method (and specificities of Prague). 2. Depending on what question is asked, N is often slightly lower than indicated (respondents usually do not answer all the questions). 3. Altogether, out of all immigrants, 80 per cent had an income of less than 19,000 Czech crowns. 4. We did not tackle the issue of mediators here. Their role seems to be very important as "organizers" of immigrants' lives vis-à-vis Czech society, especially concerning Ukrainians and, to lesser extent, Vietnamese. Mainly in the case of Ukrainians, mediators/clients help but, at the same time, in many ways exploit immigrants/compatriots (see e.g. Cernik, 2006).

Assessment of the immigrants' behavioural patterns: a two-dimensional analysis

We use the Chi-square test to measure differences among the selected immigrants' socio-demographic parameters vis-à-vis those that characterize the immigrants' living style, a mode of their inclusion processes and, indeed, their personal satisfaction with important aspects of their lives. In fact, within our further analytical steps we work with a set of 23 variables (see note with Table 3).

TABLE 3

CHI-SQUARE TEST MEASURING SELECTED IMMIGRANTS´
SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC PARAMETRES VIS-À-VIS CHARACTERISTICS
OF THEIR LIVING STYLE (N=126)

	Citizenship (CS)	Family status (FS)	Number of children (NCH)	Sex (S)	Age (A)	Education (E)
Length of a stay in the CR (L)	0.000				0.002	
Type of economic activity (TEA) (1. employee, 2. entrepreneur, 3. others)	0.000	0.000	0.012	0.049	0.000	
Satisfaction with work (SATW) (from 1 the lowest to 5 the highest)						
Making use of qualification gained in a country of origin (QUA)						
Overall income (I)		0.036	0.014	0.008	0.002	
Satisfaction with housing (SATH) (from 1 the lowest to 5 the highest)						
Importance of having compatriots in their neighbourhood (COM)	0.001					
Keeping closer relations with Czechs (REL)	0.001					

TABLE 3 (continued)

	Citizenship (CS)	Family status (FS)	Number of children (NCH)	Sex (S)	Age (A)	Education (E)
Personal negative experience of living with Czechs (NEX)						
Acceptance of Czechs into own family (AC) (as a family member) (1. strong no, 2. rather no, 3. rather yes, 4. strong yes)		0.048				
Understanding of spoken Czech (UC) (from 1 the worst to 5 the best)	0.001	0.018			0.017	
Keeping closer relations with compatriots (REC)						
Visits to relatives or friends in a country of origin (VCO)	0.001	0.009	0.002			0.036
Experience of Czech administration/authorities (ECA) (from 1 lowest satisfaction to 5 highest)						
Reading Czech newspapers (RCN)	0.002					
Knowing somebody before arrival to the CR (KS)	0.051				0.050	
Satisfaction with health (SATHE) (from 1 the lowest to 5 the highest)						

Note: The two-sided asymptotic significance of the chi-square statistic is smaller than 0.05. Since this value is less than 0.05, we can conclude that the relationship observed in the cross tabulation is real and not due to chance.

As Table 3 shows, regardless of individual immigrant groups by country of origin (we work here with the whole respondent sample, N=126), several important facts have to be pointed out. First of all, it seems that regarding selected immigrants who stay in the country for more than one year, characteristics like sex, education, and number of children do not differentiate immigrant behaviour in the host Czech society; they do not alter the situation. On the other hand, age, family status, and mainly citizenship are important factors that make the whole process "more heterogeneous and dynamic". These variables particularly determine what the migration and inclusion processes look like. In a similar line of reasoning, "immigrant structures" differ especially in terms of their income, whether they visit relatives or friends in their country of origin, but mainly whether they are employees or entrepreneurs (type of performed economic activity). When elaborating on significant differences by citizenship, then, one can arrive at the following conclusions: Ukrainians in our sample in a comparative perspective have stayed in the country for a shorter time (1-3 years), they are more employees than employers, understand spoken Czech fairly well, follow Czech newspapers, frequently visit their relatives and friends, have closer friendships with Czechs, consider it important to have their compatriots close to their place of housing; Vietnamese, on the other hand, are typical of entrepreneurs, have a low understanding of spoken Czech, do not follow Czech newspapers, knew somebody before they arrived in the Czech Republic, do not have closer relations with the Czech majority, and feel it is important to live close to their compatriots. Armenians in our sample stay in the Czech Republic longer than other two groups, it is comparatively not important for them to live close to their compatriots, have closer friendships with Czechs, understand spoken Czech, are less connected to their country of origin, follow the Czech newspapers, and did not know somebody before they came to the Czech Republic.

After mapping the immigrants' type of behavioural model and the mode of their inclusion in Czech society, an important question arises: which of the given immigrant groups are the most satisfied while in the Czech Republic? Which of the given inclusion paths are the most promising as to how it is subjectively perceived by the immigrants themselves? For that purpose, while putting together the following six variables and counting average values (NEX, AC, ECA, SATW, SATH, SATHE – see note Table 3) we constructed a sort of a "satisfaction score" (SS) that, to a large extent, also reflect some selected features of immigrants' quality of life. As seen, the SS touches different, nevertheless, very important segments within which immigrants operate in the host society: relations with the majority society at individual and institutional levels, satisfaction with work, housing and personal health (see Table 4).

TABLE 4

FREQUENCIES BY SIX COMPONENTS OF THE SATISFACTION SCORE

		Ukrainians		Vietnamese		Armenians		Total	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
SATW	1- lowest	4	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	4.2
	2	4	11.1	5	12.2	1	5.3	10	10.4
	3	12	33.3	14	34.1	4	21.1	30	31.3
	4	10	27.8	17	41.5	8	42.1	35	36.5
	5 - highest	6	16.7	5	12.2	6	31.6	17	17.7
SATH	1- lowest	7	13.7	0	0.0	2	6.7	9	7.3
	2	3	5.9	0	0.0	2	6.7	5	4.0
	3	19	37.3	14	32.6	8	26.7	41	33.1
	4	13	25.5	16	37.2	8	26.7	37	29.8
	5 - highest	9	17.6	13	30.2	10	33.3	32	25.8
SATHE	1 - lowest	1	2.1	2	4.7	0	0.0	3	2.5
	2	6	12.8	1	2.3	2	6.7	9	7.5
	3	7	14.9	11	25.6	5	16.7	23	19.2
	4	15	31.9	21	48.8	11	36.7	47	39.2
	5 - highest	18	38.3	8	18.6	12	40.0	38	31.7
ECA	1- lowest	1	2.9	1	2.9	0	0.0	2	2.2
	2	1	2.9	1	2.9	3	13.6	5	5.5
	3	10	29.4	8	22.9	5	22.7	23	25.3
	4	13	38.2	14	40.0	5	22.7	32	35.2
	5 - highest	9	26.5	11	31.4	9	40.9	29	31.9
NEX	Negative experience	19	39.6	16	36.4	14	46.7	49	40.2
	Without negative exp.	29	60.4	28	63.6	16	53.3	73	59.8
AC	Strong no	2	4.3	4	12.5	1	3.6	7	6.5
	Rather no	5	10.6	7	21.9	5	17.9	17	15.9
	Rather yes	17	36.2	14	43.8	15	53.6	46	43.0
	Strong yes	23	48.9	7	21.9	7	25.0	37	34.6
Total		51	100.0	45	100.0	30	100.0	126	100.0
Satisfaction Score (SS) (average value)		Ukrainians 3.478		Vietnamese 3.595		Armenians 3.627		Total 3.555	

Notes: See Table 3 for the description of each acronym.

The SS decreased from Armenians (the most satisfied group) through Vietnamese to Ukrainians (the least satisfied group), as shown in the values in Table 4 (3.63, 3.60, and 3.48 respectively). While one can study individual parameters in the table, let us only pinpoint that in the given comparative perspective, Armenians showed that they have negative experiences living with Czechs, but they are very satisfied with their work and health. Vietnamese would not accept Czechs into their families, but are pretty satisfied with their housing. Ukrainians are not satisfied especially with their work and housing, but they are satisfied with their own health.[5]

It is possible and, indeed, important, to also compare the SS with other socio-demographic characteristics of the immigrants. Thus, females are more satisfied compared to males (SS is 3.60 versus 3.50), younger migrants (younger than 30 years) as compared to older ones (30 years and older) (SS is 3.65 versus 3.46), "others" (various family statuses except married) as compared to married (SS is 3.65 versus 3.49), and those having lower education as compared to university education (SS is 3.62 versus 3.48). Regarding the latter two characteristics, these surprising results must be explained. Married immigrants are those who are economic migrants and very often left their families behind in their country of origin. Hence, this fact contributes to their "dissatisfaction" above all else. On the other hand, highly qualified immigrants are often dissatisfied since their qualification is undervalued and undermined since they often cannot make use of it while working in manual jobs or running business where, to some extent, qualification differences may be obliterated.

Assessment of the immigrants' behavioural patterns: a multidimensional analysis

To assess structural linkages between the satisfaction score of subjectively perceived immigrants' quality of life and the explanatory categorical variables considered (see 17 variables in Table 3), the SPSS AnswerTree method was used. We applied C&RT (Classification and Regression Trees), methods that are based on a minimization of impurity measures (Breiman et al., 1984). This method uses chi-square statistics to identify optimal splits. We are interested in identifying variables that significantly differentiate satisfaction with quality of life. In particular, we are interested in discovering which subgroups of variables can best explain variation of the satisfaction score. We can find this information in the tree.

A subsequent priority aim was to discover what structures influence the satisfaction score. The dendrogram obtained through the AnswerTree method helped to visualize the structure of significant interlinkages, using the satisfaction score as a dependent variable, the root node, mean=3.56.[6]

Perceived importance of territorial proximity of immigrant's compatriots (REL, see note Table 3) as the variable with the highest influence on the quality of life is the most important determining factor (of the factors we measured) where also the first "tree split" was made (REL, Yes versus No). This split gives an improvement of 0.0156, reducing the within-node variance by almost half.

The answer NO (Is it important for you that compatriots live close to your place of living? Yes/No) (Node 1, N=45.24%, SS mean=3,69) resulted in a further partition of the sample into two subgroups: respondents NOT following Czech newspapers (Node 3, N=13.5%, SS mean=3.93) and those following (Node 4, N=31.8%, SS mean=3.60). Node 3 is split further, based on a very good knowledge of spoken Czech language on the left branch, the highest important value of quality of life of immigrants in the Answer Tree output (Node 7, N=7.94%, SS mean=4.20) and on rather bad knowledge of spoken Czech on the right branch (Node 8, N=5.56%, SS mean=3.55).

For tracts where the answer was YES (Is it important for you that compatriots live close to your place of living? Yes/No) (Node 2, N=54.76%, SS mean=3.44), the next split is based on the educational level and was divided into two nodes, with lower educational level (different levels except university one) (Node 5, N=48.41%, SS mean=3.39) and university level (Node 6, N=23,02%, SS mean=3.29). The node with the university level was divided into two nodes, with higher income above 20,000 Czech crowns[7] (Node 14, N=3.97%, SS mean=3.83) and with lower income below 15,000 Czech crowns (Node 13, N=19.05%, SS mean=3.18). (In the edge categories, the lowest and the highest income included a very limited numbers of respondents). Node 13 created a subgroup of respondents with the lowest satisfaction score.

When summing up this analytical exercise, one can argue that in our sample the immigrants most satisfied with their quality of life (according to our own measures) are those for whom it is not important to live close to their compatriots, those who do not follow Czech newspapers, and those whose knowledge of spoken Czech language is above average. On the other hand, the lowest satisfaction score, the respective lowest quality of life is tied to those immigrants who prefer to live close to their compatriots, those who have university education, and those with a low income.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

All of the above formulated hypotheses were confirmed. Despite some limitations because of our sampling method, it has been shown in this paper that the

immigrants' inclusion into Czech society has crystallized into specific modes. Despite having and pushing one integration policy in the Czech Republic, the resulting modes of migration itself and immigrants' inclusion into Czech society are different for individual immigrant groups, as we have shown with the example of Ukrainians, Vietnamese, and Armenians. Historical heritage of countries and former mutual relations between countries of origin and destination, cultural specificities and distance and geographical distance between them, the socio-economic situation in the country of origin and destination, the already present diaspora of a particular ethnic immigrant group in the destination country and, indeed, human capital that is brought with immigrants may be some of the explaining variables (see Drbohlav, 2004).

Based also on our research, it seems that Ukrainians are typical of their specific "transnationalization patterns", that is, "making a living through continuous regular contact across national borders…" (Portes et al., 1999) not settled "forever", rather circulating and keeping strong ties with Ukraine. Because their stay is rather temporary, this mode is very difficult to tie to both Berry's (1992) and Portes and Zhou's (2000) conceptual frameworks.

Vietnamese, while, literally, spatially scattered throughout the whole country (Cermakova, 2002), at the same time, are a closed community, separated and segregated in particular locations. Their isolation is supported by their very intensive "internal", not "external" social communication and perhaps also by their perceived cultural distance from the Czech majority population. On the other hand, they are doing pretty well economically and in Portes and Zhou's words they did choose a "path that combines rapid economic advancement with deliberate preservation of the immigrant community's values and solidarity" (Portes and Zhou, 2000).

Armenians characterize a clear assimilation strategy (Berry, 1992) within Czech society in various areas of life, while, in terms of socio-economic status, approaching the average mainstream (Portes and Zhou, 2000). The question is to what extent is this pattern influenced by the fact that among all surveyed groups Armenians have stayed in the Czech Republic for the longest time. We think it might play some role (other modes can also change over time), however, we are convinced that the main features of their assimilation strategy were here from the very beginning.

What is important is that it seems like successful inclusion in Czech society – here measured via immigrants' subjective perception of their lives in the new country – is connected to the assimilation mode, as we can see with the Armenians based on their high satisfaction score and their results from the AnswerTree

analysis, where the most important factors are "no importance of living close to one's compatriots" and "above the average knowledge of spoken Czech language".[8] By the way, the same feature has been proven in another study done in Prague with immigrant children and youth, which found that "Post-Soviet youths…(mainly Russians…) who are heavily involved in Czech society adopt classical assimilationist behaviour patterns: they reject close ties to their country of origin, choosing instead to adopt a Czech lifestyle" (Drbohlav et al., 2005a). On the other hand, it has been indicated that the lowest satisfaction with one's life in host Czech society is linked with the desire to live close to compatriots (separation, isolation tendencies vis-à-vis the majority population), with the highest being linked to a university educational level and with low income. It seems that not fulfilling human capital on the immigrants' side may be the most important factor leading to dissatisfaction. It clearly reflects the limited possibilities offered to immigrants in the beginning of their career in the host society (see the dual labour market theory, Massey et al., 1998).

Thus, in our example of the given immigrant groups in Prague, there are no trends toward marginalization, the worst of the possibilities that migrants can adopt within their acculturation in the new society. On the other hand, there is no clear trend of "classical integration", as Berry (1992) argues.

On a general level, without taking into account individual immigrant groups by their country of origin, it has been shown that the following characteristics are not importantly tied to the given immigration and inclusion processes: sex, education and a number of children. On the other hand, age and family status, but mainly citizenship, are important factors that differentiate immigrants' behaviour. It is a clear message for migration policymakers, officials, practitioners, field workers, and so forth that in order for them to positively influence immigrant inclusion they have to target these variables and adjust their measures to their "structures". Also, what might be of help here is to realize that within our overall sample of immigrants (who stay in the country for more than one year), immigrant females (vis-à-vis males), younger age categories (versus older ones), various family statuses (versus married individuals), and those without university education (versus those with university education) seem to be more satisfied with their lives in the Czech Republic. Obviously, not making use of immigrants' human capital (in our case the educational level) hampers both the immigrants themselves and the host country. It is a great challenge to change this situation. The last comment reflects the importance of having a good knowledge of spoken Czech language (see figure 1). It is important for immigrants in order to have a successful life in a new host society and it is one of the clear challenges for the state to effectively help them in this regard.

Finally, one has to pinpoint that despite clear specificities like (1) the short time that has elapsed since the Revolution in 1989 and, thus, "normalization" of the environment in which migration can naturally develop, (2) still rather small numbers of immigrants (as compared to Western European countries) in the territory of the country, and (3) still not having a fully functioning free market economy (namely a market with houses and apartments), the current migration and immigrant acculturation processes in the Czech Republic have been adopting features well known from many other immigration countries, including Western-developed democracies (e.g. Bauböck, 1994; Bauböck at el., 1996; Brochman, 1996; Schuck and Münz, 1998; Adler and Gielen 2003).

NOTES

1. This paper was carried out with the financial support of Research Programme No. MSM 0021620831 sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport of the Czech Republic.
2. Hence, Ukrainians and Vietnamese are large communities in the Czech Republic and Armenians represent a typical diaspora group throughout the whole world; in 2003, 41 per cent of legal immigrants in the country were registered in Prague and the Central Bohemia region, which justifies who and where was studied.
3. It is worth mentioning that Vietnamese and Ukrainians are also spread throughout the Czech Republic. Most Vietnamese are in West and North Bohemia, while Ukrainians are concentrated in Prague, central Bohemia, and the city of Brno and its vicinity. Hence, a reader has to keep in mind some possible specificities that spring from the fact that most of the respondents stayed and operated in the capital city of Prague.
4. Of course, one has to take into account the unique character of individual educational systems in the given countries that make direct comparisons highly problematic, not to mention the different educational system qualities that are really incomparable to each other. For example, all of the people that finish basic school in Ukraine and Armenia have a formal high school qualification.
5. In this regard, the question was: "How have you recently (during the last month) been satisfied with your health? Evaluate it while choosing a number from 1, the most satisfied to 5, the least satisfied".
6. Those who are interested in seeing the dendrogram obtained through the AnswerTree can contact the authors.
7. It is about US$800 (as of November 2005).
8. However, it is also true that another variable that is linked with this part of the model "those who do not follow Czech newspapers" (see AnswerTree) goes against the "assimilation logic". Obviously, on the other hand, not reading Czech newspapers can be offset by many other various intensive cultural contacts with the majority society.

REFERENCES

Adler, L.L., and U.P. Gielen (Eds)
  2003   *Migration: Immigration and Emigration in International Perspective*, Praeger Publishers, Westport.

Barsova, A.
  2005   Multikulturalismus a politiky integrace pristehovalcu v Cesku, http://www.migraceonline.cz.

Bauböck, R.
  1994   *The Integration of Immigrants*, CDMG (94) 25 E, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Bauböck, R. et al.
  1996   *The Challenge of Diversity: Integration and Pluralism in Societies of Immigration*, Avebury, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Aldershot.

Breiman, L. et al.
  1984   *Classification and Regression Trees*, Wadsworth International Group, Pacific Grove.

Brochman, G.
  1996   *European Integration and Immigration from Third Countries*, Scandinavian University Press, Oslo.

Castles, S.
  1995   "How nation-states respond to immigration and ethnic diversity", *New Community*, 21(3): 293-308.

Cermakova, D.
  2002   *Prostorove rozmisteni cizincu v Ceske republice a jeho podminenosti*, magisterska prace, Prirodovedecka fakulta UK v Praze, katedra socialni geografie a regionalniho rozvoje, Praha.

Cerna, J.
  2003   *Rusti a ukrajinsti imigranti v Ceske republice*, magisterska prace, Prirodovedecka fakulta UK v Praze, katedra socialni geografie a regionalniho rozvoje, Praha.

Cernik, J.
  2006   "Of clients and chereps: the organizational structures of Ukrainian labour migration", in M. Canek and J. Grill (Eds), *Migration Processes and Eastern Europe: Unpacking the Diversity*, Multicultural Centre Prague, Prague: 25-29.

Drbohlav, D.
  2001   "Selected research activities in the field of international migration and integration of immigrants in the Czech Republic", *Demographic and Cultural Specificity and Integration of Migrants*, First Workshop organized by the Federal Institute for Population Research in cooperation with the Network for Integrated European Population Studies (NIEPS), 10-11 November 2000, Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung beim Statistischen Bundesamt, Wiesbaden: 155-166.
  2004   *Migration Trends in Selected EU Applicant Countries: Volume II – The Czech Republic: "The Times They Are A-Changin'"*, European Commission

Project: "Sharing Experience: Migration Trends in Selected Applicant Countries and Lessons Learned from the New Countries of Immigration in the EU and Austria", International Organization for Migration (IOM), Vienna.

Drbohlav, D. et al.

2004   *Vyzkumna zprava: Integrace cizincu v CR. Studie armenske, vietnamske a ukrajinske komunity v Praze a Stredoceskem kraji*, International Organization for Migration, Prague.

2005a   "Country report on the Czech Republic", *Dimension of Integration: Migrant Youth in Central European Countries*, International Organization for Migration, Vienna: 51-100.

2005b   "Czech Republic", in J.Niessen and Y.Schibel (Eds), *Current Immigration Debates in Europe: A Publication of the European Migration Dialogue*, Migration Policy Group, Brussels: 65-93.

Fawcett, J.T., and F. Arnold

1987   "The role of surveys in the study of international migration: an appraisal", *International Migration Review*, 21(4):1524-1540.

Hallacott, M.

2003   *Canada´s Immigration Policy: The Need for Major Reform*, Public Policy Sources, no. 64, A Fraser Institute Occasional Paper, The Fraser Institute, Vancouver.

Hjerm, M.

2005   "Integration into the social democratic welfare state", Social Indicators Research, 70: 117-138.

Horakova, M., and I. Macounova

2006   *Mezinarodni pracovni migrace v CR; Bulletin c. 16*, VUPSV, Praha.

Huntington, S.P.

2005   *Who Are We? The Challenges to America´s National Identity*, Simon and Schuster, New York.

Massey, D.S.

1987   "The ethnosurvey in theory and practice", *International Migration Review*, 21(4): 1498-1522.

Massey, D.S., et al.

1998   *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millenium*, Claredon Press, Oxford.

2005   *Migration in an Interconnected World: New Directions for Action: Report of the Global Commission on International Migration*, www.gcim.org.

Portes, A., and M. Zhou

2000   "Should immigrants assimilate?", in P. Kivisto and G. Rundbland (Eds), *Multiculturalism in the United States; Current Issues, Contemporary Voices*, Pine Forge Press, Thousand Oaks: 317-327.

Schuck, P.H., and R. Münz (Eds)

1998   *Paths to Inclusion: The Integration of Migrants in the United States and Germany*, Bergham Books, New York.

Uherek, Z., and J. Cernik
    2004   *Vyzkumne zpravy a studie o integraci cizincu na uzemi Ceske republiky*, Ministerstvo prace a socialnich veci CR, Praha.
van Selm, J.
    2005   *The Netherlands: Death of a Filmmaker Shakes a Nation*, Migration Information Source, Washington, DC.
Vetrovec, S., and S. Wessendorf
    2005   *Migration and Cultural, Religious and Linguistic Diversity in Europe: An Overview of Issues and Trends*, SoAR Cluster B6, IMISCOE, Amsterdam, http://www.imiscoe.org/workingpapers/index.html.

« OU VONT-ILS ? » : L'INCORPORATION DES IMMIGRES DANS
LA POPULATION TCHEQUE UNE ETUDE DE CAS SUR LES
UKRAINIENS, LES VIETNAMIENS ET LES ARMENIENS A PRAGUE)

Cette étude s'appuie sur un travail de recherche mené par le bureau de Prague
de l'Organisation internationale pour les migrations (OIM) et la faculté des
sciences de l'Université Charles à Prague, au cours de l'automne et de l'hiver
2003-2004. Dans le cadre de l'enquête-questionnaire, 126 immigrants de la
première génération se trouvant à Prague (51 Ukrainiens, 45 Vietnamiens et 30
Arméniens) ont répondu grâce à une méthode procédant par sondage non
aléatoire. Les buts principaux de cette recherche consistaient à vérifier à quels
moyens avaient eu recours les groupes d'immigrants pour s'insérer dans la
société tchèque et à déterminer dans quelle mesure ils s'estimaient satisfaits de
leur nouvelle vie. Une attention particulière a été accordée à la recherche des
facteurs importants ayant contribué à fixer à la fois les caractéristiques communes
et les particularités en matière de comportement. L'auteur s'est efforcé d'analy-
ser la question à l'aide des statistiques quantitatives (test Chi carré, méthode
AnswerTree). Le modèle des stratégies d'acculturation de Berry (1992) et le
modèle d'assimilation segmentée de Portes et Zhou (par exemple 2000) servent
de points de référence dans l'examen de questions conceptuelles.

Les résultats montrent que l'incorporation des immigrants dans la société tchèque,
à Prague, s'est traduite de différentes façons. Les Ukrainiens correspondent aux
schémas spécifiques de transnationalisation qui leur sont propres ; les Vietnamiens
constituent une communauté « prospère » mais se tenant à l'écart des autres ; et
les Arméniens pratiquent une stratégie évidente d'assimilation, tout en se
rapprochant du courant central sur le plan du statut socio-économique.

Sur la base de différentes indications, il semble que l'incorporation réussie dans
la société tchèque soit liée au mode d'assimilation. Pour résumer, les immigrés
les plus satisfaits de leur qualité de vie sont ceux pour qui il n'est pas important
de vivre auprès de leurs compatriotes et ceux dont les connaissances de la
langue tchèque parlée sont au-dessus de la moyenne. Le niveau de satisfaction le
plus bas est celui des immigrés qui préfèrent rester en contact étroit avec leur
compatriotes, ceux qui jouissent d'une éducation de niveau universitaire et ceux
dont le revenu se situe dans une tranche basse. Une bonne connaissance de la
langue tchèque semble être la clé de la satisfaction des immigrés.

"¿A DÓNDE VAN?": INSERCIÓN DE INMIGRANTES EN LA REPÚBLICA CHECA (UN ESTUDIO DE CASOS SOBRE LOS UCRANIOS, VIETNAMITAS Y ARMENIOS EN PRAGA)

Este artículo se basa en un estudio realizado por la Oficina de la Organización Internacional para las Migraciones (OIM) en Praga y la Facultad de Ciencias de la Universidad Charles de Praga, durante el último trimestre de 2003 y el primer trimestre de 2004. Recurriendo al cuestionario y al método de muestreo improbable se encuestó a 126 inmigrantes de primera generación en Praga (51 ucranios, 45 vietnamitas y 30 armenios). Los objetivos principales del estudio fueron determinar los modos de inserción de los grupos de inmigrantes en la sociedad checa y su nivel de satisfacción con relación a sus nuevas vidas. Se concedió particular atención a otros importantes factores subyacentes, a saber, las características comunes y los patrones particulares de comportamiento. En este artículo se analiza la cuestión mediante: estadísticas cuantitativas (la prueba de Chi-square, el método del Árbol de Respuestas); el modelo de estrategias de aculturación de Berry (1992); y el modelo de asimilación segmentada de Portes y Zhou (2000) que sirvieron de referencia a la hora de debatir cuestiones conceptuales.

Los resultados apuntan a que la inserción de los inmigrantes en la sociedad checa, concretamente en Praga, se ha desarrollado según patrones específicos: los ucranios recurren a patrones típicos de transnacionalización, los vietnamitas son una comunidad "acomodada" pero que se halla separada y segregada, mientras que los armenios utilizan un patrón claro de inserción, al tiempo que intentan incorporarse a la corriente principal en lo que atañe a su estatus socioeconómico.

Sobre la base de diversas indicaciones, parece que una asimilación acertada en la sociedad checa depende del modo de inserción. En otras palabras, los inmigrantes más satisfechos con su calidad de vida son aquellos que no consideran importante vivir cerca de sus compatriotas y cuyos conocimientos del checo hablado superan la media. El índice más bajo de satisfacción se observa en los inmigrantes que prefieren vivir cerca de sus compatriotas, realizaron estudios universitarios y perciben bajos ingresos. Por lo visto, el buen conocimiento del idioma checo es la clave en la satisfacción de los inmigrantes.