

Anna Lukešová¹

ORCID: 0000-0001-5556-4055

Department of European Studies, Institute of International Studies,
Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, Czech Republic

Is Czechia an immigration country? Evidence from civic integration policies

Abstract

In Western Europe, the first integration policies emerged in the 1980s as a reaction to the long-term settlement of foreign workers, originally perceived as temporary migration, transforming these countries into immigration ones. Based on this West-European experience, the article claims that Czechia has evolved into an immigration country in the last two decades, providing evidence from its integration policies. It shows how Czechia implements what is called “civic integration policies”, a novel form of integration approach promoted by West-European countries since the end of the 1990s, inquiring into what aspects Czech civic integration policies resemble and differ from the West-European examples. For this purpose, the research offers a qualitative comparison with Austria as a representative of such a West-European experience. As a result, it brings new knowledge of immigrant integration policies in a region neglected in migration studies, while supporting the argument that immigration to Czechia has turned into a constant trend, requiring a complex set of integration policies in order to tackle this new reality successfully.

Keywords: immigration, Czech Republic, Austria, integration policies, civic integration

¹ **Corresponding author:** Anna Lukešová, Department of European Studies, Institute of International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, U Kříže 661/8, 158 00 Prague, Czech Republic; email: anna.lukesova@fsv.cuni.cz

Introduction

Since the Second World War, Europe started to tackle a trend of vast mobility of people across borders, either forced due to the emergence of totalitarian regimes in Eastern Europe or voluntary for the purpose of better living conditions abroad.² Mainly in the 1950s and 1960s, West-European countries began to accept foreign guest-workers as a consequence of labour shortages in the emerging post-war economic boom. As these foreigners were initially supposed to stay only temporarily, the host countries did not actively promote their integration into society. However, after reducing immigration with the oil crises of the 1970s, the majority of guest-workers chose to stay long-term in their host countries while uniting there with their families. Such a situation resulted in the creation of the first integration policies in Europe during the 1980s. Due to divergence in approaching immigrant integration across European states, the literature speaks about “national models of integration”, most often referring to the assimilationist model of France, the multiculturalist approach of the United Kingdom or the Netherlands, and exclusivism historically employed by Germany (Carrera, 2006; Castles, 1995; Joppke, 2007).

Nonetheless, a series of events after the turn of the millennium, such as the murders of Pim Fortuyn (2002) and Theo van Gogh (2004), bombings in Madrid (2004) and London (2005) or riots in Paris (2005) triggered a debate on problematic immigrant integration, entitled as “crisis of integration” (de Haas et al., 2020, p. 327). As a result, the chase for an alternative to the “failed” classical models has started. It is exactly by this time when civic integration policies (further CIP) attracted the most attention. Inspired by the Netherlands, adopting the first CIP in the *Newcomers’ Civic Integration Act* in 1998, several West-European countries began to implement similar practices, such as the introduction of integration programmes or agreements, language and civic courses and tests, or citizenship ceremonies and oaths. Promoted subsequently by the European Union, civic integration seems to offer a practical solution adaptive to different national migration experiences and needs.

This paper contributes to the already extensive CIP scholarly debate with an investigation of civic integration in a neglected region of Central Europe by examining the Czech case. With the claim that the “Czech Republic has become primarily an immigration country” (MV ČR, 2011, p. 74), the Ministry of Interior confirms identical conclusions made by several scholars (Baršová & Barša, 2005; Drbohlav, 2004; Kušniráková, 2014; Zogata-Kusz, 2020). This article also supports this argument by providing unique evidence from the implementation of the West-European model of immigrant integration. For this purpose, the research inquires in what aspects CIP in Czechia, where integration policies have generally evolved only recently, resemble and differ from the West-European examples, which have been developing their integration policies for almost a half-century. To answer this question, the analysis brings a detailed comparison of Czech CIP with the experience of its Austrian neighbour, a country with one of the eldest practices of CIP in Europe.

² This publication was supported by the Charles University Grant Agency, project GA UK No. 730119, and the SVV project of the Institute of International Studies, FSV UK, No. 260594.

The order of the article is as follows: it first focuses on the basic theoretical concept with which the research works, civic integration, and reviews the already existing relevant literature. Subsequently, the paper provides an overview of the methodology and methods applied by the research. The third part sheds light on the basic facts on migration and integration policies in both countries and the EU, followed by two sections summarising CIP implemented in Austria and Czechia. In the end, the article offers a discussion before coming to a conclusion.

Theory and literature: civic integration

This research understands civic integration as an approach, “in which integration arises through immigrants’ acquisition of ‘citizen-like’, or civic, skills. These might include speaking the host country language, having knowledge about the country’s history, culture and rules, and understanding and following the liberal democratic values that underscore their new home” (Goodman & Wright, 2015, p. 1886). The acquisition of such “skills” can be promoted via integration programmes or agreements signed between the foreigner and the host state containing language and civic courses and tests, or citizenship ceremonies and oaths when passing the naturalisation process. In contrast to the afore-mentioned CIP definition, this paper does not see civic integration measures as “uniquely applied as conditions in the process of obtaining citizenship” (Goodman & Wright, 2015, p. 1886), as any of these measures can be offered to immigrants voluntarily, without elements of coercion.

As it follows from the term itself, civic integration intersects with two main migration concepts: immigrant integration and citizenship. Regarding the former, the research perceives immigrant integration as a two-way process, as it does not concern immigrants only, but affects the receiving society as well. This understanding of integration, where migrants are enabled to maintain their original identity, is distinguished from the assimilationist one-way approach, requiring a complete absorption of migrants into the host society (Penninx & Garcés-Mascareñas, 2016, pp. 11–12; Van Wolleggem, 2019, pp. 8–9). The research thus reflects that the process of immigrant integration requires adaptation of both parts of the society, and civic integration does not account for an exception in this regard. In addition, as integration is a long-term process, it takes place across different dimensions of the individual’s life, most often referred to as cultural, socio-economic and legal-political dimensions (Penninx & Garcés-Mascareñas, 2016). While CIP interferes with all three of them, its main focus lies in the cultural, social and legal-political integration with an impact on the economic one as a result, as language knowledge and socio-cultural orientation in the host society are important prerequisites for successful labour-market integration.

Citizenship as a concept plays an important role in CIP as well because acquiring citizenship by immigrants is often perceived as the final step of their successful integration into the host society. With naturalisation, immigrants gain full access to their political rights. However, European countries began to implement rising numbers of conditions for naturalisation through civic integration. Goodman identified three gates of state membership that immigrants have to pass in order to obtain their new

citizenship: entry to the country, settlement and acquisition of citizenship (Goodman, 2010). This research however revealed an important difference between the initial settlement of immigrants in their first years of stay and their subsequent long-term residence. Thus, four gates of membership are applied in the research: (1) entry, (2) initial settlement, (3) long-term residence, and (4) naturalisation.

Although at first it seemed that CIP expansion across European states finally brings a convergence of otherwise divergent immigrant integration practices in Europe (Joppke, 2007), subsequent research revealed a high variation in CIP use. According to several scholars, the cross-national differences differ significantly even after the application of this novel policy (Jacobs & Rea, 2007; Koopmans et al., 2012). Goodman's civic integration index (CIVIX) provides a comprehensive overview of such a variation within CIP use, as it measures language, civic-knowledge and value-commitment requirements across 15 EU Member States (Goodman, 2010, 2014). The Netherlands and Denmark rank among the countries with the widest and strictest use of civic integration requirements. Introducing CIP as the first country, the Netherlands implemented a 12-month integration course consisting of 600 hours of language and civic education with the *Newcomers' Civic Integration Act* in 1998. In 2006, the country extended CIP with pre-entry language and civic knowledge tests in the country of origin, getting a label of "the most drastic expression of this [CIP] development" (Joppke, 2007, p. 8). Other countries, such as Germany, France or Denmark, followed with similar programmes, also concluding integration agreements with newcomers in order to set up the responsibilities of the immigrant and of the state in the new relationship (Carrera, 2006). However, as Goodman's CIVIX index shows, the degree of restriction differs substantially among the countries.

The cases examined here support the argument of such divergent approaches to civic integration. Austria accounts for one of the strictest CIP regimes in Europe, while Czechia belongs to the moderate group, as it applies a mixture of obligatory and voluntary measures (Goodman, 2010, 2014; Mourão Permoser, 2012; Simbartlová, 2019). However, the CIP literature focuses mostly on the experience of West-European countries, omitting the region of Central and Eastern Europe. Thus, this article aims at filling this gap, showing in the example of Czechia that a Visegrad country, previously known to be an emigration or transit country, has already transformed into an immigration country implementing a complex integration model similar to its Western neighbours.

Data and methods

The paper offers a qualitative comparison of the Czech and Austrian cases in order to provide an answer to the research question, in what aspects Czech CIP resemble and differ from the West-European examples. It zooms into the period since the end of the 1990s when both Austrian as well as Czech integration policies started to evolve, and follows their development until the end of 2021. The research was conducted in two phases. First, a qualitative analysis of legislative acts and governmental reports on migration was processed to uncover the development of CIP

in the studied environments. In the second phase, 43 semi-structured interviews were conducted in the years 2018–2022 with diverse actors involved in integration policy making at various levels of governance (national, regional, municipal), representing different kinds of units (governmental, administrative, as well as of NGOs and other institutions).³ These interviews aimed at revealing the practice of CIP laid down in the legislation and other policy documents. For the protection of the identity of respondents, interviews are partially or fully anonymised, according to the consent given by the interviewees.

Examining CIP interferes with both immigration as well as integration policies. While immigration policies determine the rules for the entry of foreigners and regulate the conditions for their long-term stay in the country, integration policies aim at the integration of immigrants already living in the country. Together with asylum and other sets of policies (e.g. on irregular migration etc.), they are covered by an umbrella term of migration policies that tackle the regulation of migration flows over the country's borders generally (Baršová & Barša, 2005, pp. 9–11). Although migration policies deal with a wide range of migrant categories, this research focuses only on the integration of third-country nationals (further TCNs), as other important categories, such as EU nationals or refugees, do not pass the same gates of membership on their integration path and thus are subject to different integration strategies.

There exist several reasons for choosing Czechia and Austria as cases for comparison. First, many similarities drove the selection of these countries. Both have comparable geographic as well as demographic sizes and are geographically situated in Central Europe as neighbours. While having shared a long common history, the countries are also culturally close, being significantly impacted by the Christian religion, specifically by the Catholic tradition. Further, they represent states with the highest share of foreign citizens in their population in the region, Austria belonging to the top in Europe, and Czechia following the Netherlands and Portugal in the EU ranking (Eurostat, 2022). The development of migration flows is alike in both countries, also in the long-term, as they both accepted guest-workers before 1989 (Drbohlav, 2004; Kraler, 2011) and faced refugee flows after 1989, namely from dissolving Yugoslavia. Also, both countries have been dealing with integration policy making for a similar period of time, since the end of the 1990s. And last but not least, they both apply CIP.

On the other hand, several divergences bring important aspects to the comparison. First, while the countries were tied with common political and historical development

³ Twenty-three interviews were conducted with Austrian representatives of: Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs (BMEIA); Federal Ministry for Women, Family, Youth and Integration (BMFFJI); Expert Council for Integration; Austrian Integration Fund (ÖIF); government or administration of five Austrian provinces; administration of four Austrian municipalities; five Austrian NGOs involved in immigrant integration; and International Organisation for Migration (IOM) in Vienna.

Twenty interviews were conducted with Czech representatives of: Ministry of Interior (OAMP MV ČR); Refugee Facilities Administration (SUZ); administration of six regional integration centres; administration of two Czech regions; administration of one Czech municipality; three Czech NGOs involved in immigrant integration; and International Organisation for Migration (IOM) in Prague.

until 1918, they have evolved very differently since then, namely after the Second World War, divided by the Iron Curtain. This fact led to a diverse development of migration flows and periods of accession to the EU with consequences on migration policy management. Hence, although they represent countries with the highest share of foreigners in their population in the Central European region, Austria experiences an impact of migration in much larger numbers than its northern neighbour, becoming an immigration country sooner than Czechia. Thus, Austria has always been a step ahead of Czechia in dealing with an influx of immigrants.

For these reasons, Austria is associated rather with West-European countries as existing cross-national analyses show (Carrera, 2006; Joppke, 2008; Michalowski, 2011). The state also evinces more publications focused on its (civic) integration policies (e.g. Kraler, 2011; Mourão Permoser, 2012, 2018; Mourão Permoser & Rosenberger, 2012; Perchinig, 2010) than other Central European countries that are generally marginal in the academic debate on immigrant integration. While there is only scarce research in this field in Slovakia and Hungary (Temesi, 2018; Zaková, 2019; Zubiková, 2021), several studies reporting on the development of local integration policies in Poland emerged recently (Duszczak et al., 2018; Okólski & Wach, 2020; Ślęzak & Bielewska, 2021; Winiarska & Wojno, 2018). Nevertheless, most attention regarding immigrant integration management in the Visegrad countries has been drawn to the Czech case (e.g. Bernard & Mikešová, 2014; Kušniráková, 2014; Simbartlová, 2019; Zogata-Kusz, 2020). Yet, the examination of civic integration in this region is still considerably underdeveloped. Therefore, comparing Czechia with Austria as the closest example of a West-European immigration country is relevant for searching for possible similar patterns in the field of immigrant integration policies in the Central European region.

Migration and integration policies in Austria, Czechia and the EU

The adherence of both studied countries to the group of immigration states is simply derivable from long-term data provided by the national statistical offices. According to Statistics Austria, net migration of non-nationals for the period of 1961–2021 accounts for +1.784 million in total which has significantly changed the structure of society with almost 9 million inhabitants. The share of non-nationals in the population has been growing steadily since 1961, culminating in January 2022 with 1.587 million, representing 17.7 % of the total Austrian population. Nevertheless, when taking into account all persons with a migration background (thus nationals included), the number rises even to 2.240 million, making the share 25.4 %. Among the largest immigrant minorities coming from the EU countries count Germans, Romanians and Croatians, while TCNs come most often from Turkey, the region of ex-Yugoslavia and Syria (Statistics Austria, 2022, pp. 22–27).

Although the figures of non-nationals living long-term in Czechoslovakia before its division in 1993 counted less than 40,000, they have significantly risen since 1994 when the number exceeded 100,000 for the first time (Czech Statistical Office, 2022b). While constantly growing, the volume of non-nationals living in Czechia

reached 6.2 % of the 10 million population by the end of 2021, counting 660,849 in total (Czech Statistical Office, 2022a). Among the most represented TCNs, there are citizens from Ukraine, Vietnam and Russia, while Slovaks, Romanians and Poles account for the largest EU immigrant minorities (Czech Statistical Office, 2022c). Even if the national offices offer different statistical perspectives, one can clearly see a similar trend in both studied cases: long-term immigration has been present there for decades and impacts the host societies considerably.

As a consequence, both countries significantly reformed their migration policies and started to develop their own immigrant integration policies during the 1990s. The integration issue became more visible in the Austrian political debate with the promotion of the “integration before new immigration” principle in 1997 (Kraler, 2011, p. 34). In Czechia, the government responded to the integration question with the adoption of the Principles for the Concept of Immigrant Integration in the Territory of the Czech Republic (Cze. *Zásady koncepcie integrace cizinců na území České republiky*, further the Principles) in 1999. The Principles were subsequently followed by a more detailed Conception of Immigrant Integration (Cze. *Koncepcie integrace cizinců*, further the Conception) implemented in 2000 and updated in 2006, 2011 and 2016 (further the Updated Conception). A similar approach has been implemented in Austria in 2010 too, by designing a National Action Plan for Integration (Ger. *Nationaler AktionsPlan Integration*). With these documents and related legislative reforms, the Austrian as well as Czech governments progressively introduced civic integration measures, accounting for the major changes in immigrant integration in both countries.

When developing their policies, both countries relied on the coordination of integration approaches managed at the European level. While the harmonisation of immigrant integration policies is prohibited by the Lisbon Treaty, the EU institutions possess the competence in providing incentives and support to the Member States in this area (*Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union*, 2012, para. 79.4). Among the most important tools which the EU used in this regard, there are the Family Reunification and the Long-Term Resident Status Directives, impacting the field of integration policies by setting up minimum standards for the TCNs’ rights concerning their arrival and stay in the host countries. Further, the EU provided its Member States with a definition of an integration process, including the emphasis on immigrants’ knowledge of the host country’s language, history and values, in the Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU, adopted in 2004. Another tool for enhancing immigrant integration in the EU is represented by the European Integration Network, previously known as the National Contact Points on Integration, which gathers representatives of national authorities for exchanging best practices in the immigrant integration area. And last but not least, the EU employs its spending power through the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund, preceded by the European Integration Fund, through which the Commission determines conditions for gaining subventions for immigrant integration projects. All these incentives considerably impacted the development of Czech as well as Austrian CIP which are described in more detail in the following sections.

Civic integration policies in Austria

As Austria implemented the first civic integration measures as early as 2003, it ranks among the first states which drew inspiration from the new Dutch integration approach. Since then, it developed its own model of CIP, which led to one of the most restrictive citizenship and integration regimes in Europe (Mourão Permoser, 2012), together with the Netherlands or Denmark (Goodman, 2010, 2014). The next pages provide an overview of Austrian CIP as they evolved in time until 2020.

In 2002, the reform of the Aliens Act (Ger. *Fremdengesetz*), coming into force in 2003, introduced an obligation on the part of immigrants to sign and fulfil an Integration Agreement (Ger. *Integrationsvereinbarung*, further IA). The responsibility for the effectuation of IAs was transferred to the Austrian Integration Fund (Ger. *Österreichischer Integrationsfonds*, further ÖIF), originally entitled to deal with refugees, but becoming a close partner of federal ministries responsible for immigrant integration over time (*Interview No. 6*, October 17, 2019). In the first IA version, foreigners had to prove their language competence at the A1 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (further CEFR), either with a passed certificate or by attending a partly subsidised government-sponsored integration course of 100 hours without a final exam, secured by ÖIF. With the subsequent reform of 2006, the language requirement increased to the A2 level. The language courses continued to be optional and partly subsidised by the government, but their charge increased to 300 hours, the costs scaled to hundreds of euro, and their completion was conditioned by a standardised final test (*Interview No. 4*, September 12, 2019; *Interview No. 5*, September 12, 2019; Mourão Permoser, 2012, pp. 186–187).

Also in 2006, a reform of the Citizenship Act (Ger. *Staatsbürgerschaftsgesetz*) took place, implementing new civic integration measures for naturalisation. Until then, applicants had to show their “adequate knowledge of the German language, taking into account the living conditions of the foreigner” only, as required by the Citizenship Act of 1998 (*BGBI. 124/1998*, 1998, para. 3). As the law did not set up clear guidelines for such an assessment, the recognition of the applicants’ skills has been largely dependent on the juries’ consideration (Stern & Valchars, 2013, p. 15). This changed with the 2006 amendment of the Citizenship Act, making the long-term residence permit a condition for naturalisation. Thus, since then, applicants for Austrian citizenship needed to fulfil the IA at the A2 level, which has risen to the B1 level in 2011 (Goodman, 2014, p. 100; Kraler, 2011, p. 45; Stern & Valchars, 2013, pp. 15, 24).

The 2006 reform of the Citizenship Act also introduced a very important novelty in the form of a citizenship test assessing the civic proficiency of the applicant. This exam is composed of three parts containing six multiple-choice questions each about: (1) the history of Austria, (2) the Austrian democratic political regime, and (3) information on the federal province of the applicant’s residence (Goodman, 2014, p. 99; Stern & Valchars, 2013, p. 24). The content of the test has been criticised repeatedly due to huge differences across various provinces as the responsibility for its design lies in the hands of provincial governments. The same concerns application fees, which differ considerably among federal states, ranging from 100 to 1360 euro (plus a federal fee of about 1000 euro, which must be counted as well) (Stern & Valchars, 2013, p. 31).

Preparation for the test is the responsibility of the applicant. What is available online is only an information booklet about the test and a training test (BMI Österreich, 2022).

The next substantial update of Austrian CIP happened in 2011. First, Austria followed the examples of some European states such as Germany, the Netherlands, France or Denmark (Hollomey & Kraler, 2011, p. 15) and introduced language knowledge at the A1 level of CEFR as a condition for obtaining visas enabling TCNs to enter and settle in the country. Specifically, this condition has to be proved by a “generally acknowledged language diploma” acquired at one of the selected institutions⁴ when first applying for selected residence titles (migration.gv.at, 2022). Further, the 2011 reform of the Aliens Act introduced two modules of IA. Module 1 preserved the form of the previous IA with the A2 level for newcomers to Austria, while Module 2 started to serve to immigrants aiming for a long-term residence permit. Those needed to prove their language knowledge at the B1 level of CEFR (Mourão Permoser, 2012, p. 187).

Until 2017, the required language examination of both modules could be proved by either an internationally recognised language certificate (Ger. *Österreichisches Sprachdiplom*, further ÖSD) or a test specially designed for this purpose by ÖIF (Mourão Permoser, 2012, pp. 186–188). Nevertheless, this changed with the Integration Act of 2017 (Ger. *Integrationsgesetz*) which established a special examination designed by ÖIF, newly called the “integration exam”, as the only eligible form of fulfilling the IA requirements for both modules (*Integration Act*, 2017, para. 11–12). This step added civic knowledge to the obligation for newcomers while making ÖSD relevant only for certifications at the B2 and above levels, which are not legally required in Austria.

As the IA requirements are compulsory for newcomers under Module 1, a system of sanctions has been in operation already since 2002. The first stem involves a partial loss of the subsidies for the course after 1.5 years. The second is about with financial penalties. The third is a possible deportation order unless the migrant meets the conditions within the 4-year time frame. These conditions remained the same with the 2006 reform, with the only exception of the entire loss of subsidies after two years, which was even lowered to 1.5 years in 2011 for Module 1 (Mourão Permoser, 2012, pp. 186–188). However, only four persons were threatened with the deportation order until 2011, while merely two eventually left the country (Mourão Permoser, 2012, pp. 193–196). With regards to Module 2, this requirement does not imply any sanctions as the acquisition of the long-term residence permit is not a compulsory step in order to stay legally on the Austrian territory.

Civic integration policies in Czechia

Czechia experienced a different development in civic integration policy making than Austria, which hit a strict tone from the very beginning of CIP implementation. Contrarily, Czech policy makers aimed to avoid copying the restrictive examples, such as the Netherlands or Denmark (*Interview No. 7*, June 3, 2020). The next

⁴ Austrian Language Diploma German (ÖSD), Goethe-Institut, Telc GmbH and Austrian Integration Fund (ÖIF).

paragraphs will present the Czech model of CIP and its development in time, as in the Austrian case.

Since the adoption of the Principles and the Conception at the turn of the millennium, immigrants have been offered a range of language as well as socio-cultural courses through various integration projects carried out mainly by NGOs (MV ČR, 2004; Tollarová, 2011). These services were provided mostly for free, thanks to the subventions by the EU funds and relevant Czech ministries. Nevertheless, as NGOs did not reach all regions, the Ministry of Interior promoted the creation of a network of regional integration centres in 2009, in order to cover the integration needs of foreigners throughout the whole country (*Interview No. 2*, November 8, 2018).

The creation of such a network intersected with the first civic integration measure introduced in the 2007 amendment of the Aliens Act (*Cze. Zákon o pobytu cizinců na území ČR*), coming into force in 2009, requiring language knowledge proof at the A1 level for the applicants for a permanent residence permit (MŠMT ČR, 2008, para. 1; *Zákon č. 379/2007 Sb.*, 2007, para. 89). Thus, the integration centres provide the immigrants with appropriate preparation for this language examination, ensured separately by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports. Apart from language courses, the integration centres also secure what is called “courses of socio-cultural orientation”, consisting of 1.5- or 2-hour sessions focused on practical issues of everyday life in more detail. These topics include information on residence issues, CV preparation, children’s primary school enrolment, and the pension system for foreigners, among others (*Interview No. 1*, 2018; *Interview No. 3*, 2018; *Interview No. 8*, 2022). These courses, language as well as socio-cultural ones, are offered for free, and their undertaking is voluntary.

Apart from these services, provided to Czech immigrants already throughout the 2000s by NGOs (Tollarová, 2011, p. 16) and subsequently by the integration centres, the Czech government announced the creation of a new introductory civic course called “adaptation-integration course” for newcomers in 2011 (Vláda ČR, 2011, p. 19). Designed by a platform of NGOs in cooperation with IOM (MV ČR, 2013, p. 73), the course lasted 8 hours and provided “information on rights and obligations related to residence (...) and basic socio-cultural orientation” (Vláda ČR, 2011, p. 19), offered on a voluntary basis. This course has been created together with a pre-departure package of information aimed at potential migrants in their country of origin, distributed at Czech embassies abroad, and other post-arrival information materials aiming at long-term settled immigrants, under an integration project focusing on the development of a “three-level system of information for foreigners” (MV ČR, 2013, p. 82).

The next significant update of Czech CIP came with the 2014 reform of the Citizenship Act (*Cze. Zákon o státním občanství České republiky*). Until 2014, applicants for naturalisation were obliged by the Citizenship Act of 1993 to pass a language knowledge proof in the form of a simple interview without a specified level of such a skill. Applicants only had to demonstrate that they can “fluently and linguistically correctly respond to questions related to everyday situations” and “orally communicate the content of text from the daily press” in a 30-minute interview (*Zákon č. 40/1993 Sb.*, 1992; MŠMT ČR, 1993). However, the 2014 reform of the Citizenship Act required the applicants to undergo a standardised language examination, while also proving “basic

knowledge of the constitutional system of the Czech Republic and basic orientation in cultural, social, geographic and historical realities of the Czech Republic” (*Zákon č. 186/2013*, 2013, para. 14.5).

Although the language knowledge has been set up at the B1 level of CEFR, the government does not organise any preparatory courses nationwide. Immigrants may only use free courses offered by the integration centres or NGOs, which, however, are not available in all regions at such a level, or pay for a commercial language course (*Interview No. 1*, 2018). Nevertheless, applicants may try the exam in a “dry run” mode or go through a model test online (NPI ČR, 2022a). They can also prepare with a specific course book focused on the exam. The civic part of the test is designed as 30 multiple-choice questions on three subjects: (1) citizenship basics, (2) basic geographic information about Czechia, and (3) basic historical and cultural information. Again, interested persons may prepare in courses provided by the integration centres or NGOs; however, not all these institutions offer such services, as in the case of language preparation. On the other hand, applicants have access to the database containing all 300 questions and their correct solutions, which is openly available online. Immigrants interested in passing this test need to pay 5,500 CZK (ca. 220 euro) for the exam as a whole, aside from additional administrative fees of 2,000 CZK (ca. 80 euro) required for the naturalisation process as such (NPI ČR, 2022a).

The last substantial change in the Czech CIP came with the 2019 reform of the Aliens Act which, for the first time, introduced an individual section focused on immigrant integration solely. Aside from legal anchorage of the existence of regional integration centres, the amendment turned the adaptation-integration course compulsory (*Zákon č. 176/2019 Sb.*, 2019, para. 149). Thus, since January 2021, all newcomers coming into the country are obliged to take part in this course while covering the relevant costs. Also, as this stands for a mandatory requirement, a sanction has been introduced, counting on financial penalties in case of non-compliance (*Zákon č. 176/2019 Sb.*, 2019, para. 154). On the other hand, the duration of the course has been shortened to 4 hours only (MV ČR, 2020, para. 13).

Models of civic integration: Austria and Czechia compared

As the preceding section shows, both countries apply a broad range of civic integration measures in both languages as well as civic knowledge, implemented in various phases of the integration process. This part will now compare the selected cases and analyse their similarities and differences in order to answer the question of whether Czechia employs integration policies close to those implemented by West-European countries. The analysis will follow the order of the membership gates, as set out in the theoretical section. For easier orientation, Tables 1 and 2 offer overviews of Austrian and Czech CIP throughout the main milestones of the countries’ integration policy making.

Already from the very beginning of the migrants’ way to these two countries, one can recognise significantly higher expectations regarding the integration of immigrants in Austria than in Czechia. Even before their very entry into Austria, TCNs need to

prove their language knowledge with a certificate at the A1 level of CEFR since 2011. No material or financial support is provided by the government; the applicants thus have to make relevant arrangements themselves which may prevent some categories of migrants from entering the country (Mourão Permoser, 2012, p. 187; 2018).

In Czechia, no such a requirement has been introduced yet and is not even planned (*Interview No. 7*, 2020). The Czech government rather aims at information dissemination through a three-level system, starting at the pre-entry stage. Thus, since 2013, Czech embassies and consulates have distributed a free “pre-departure packet” containing an information sheet and a DVD, providing potential migrants with basic information about the conditions of entry relevant to different types of permits as well as stay in the territory (MV ČR, 2014, p. 86). Czech measures, therefore, do not include any obligatory requirements such as preparatory courses or tests in this integration phase. Both countries thus apply civic integration measures at the first gate of membership, although in a different way.

As for the second gate of initial settlement, a more restrictive approach is noticeable in the Austrian case with the language knowledge at the A1 level introduced in 2003 and raised to the A2 level in 2006. Apart from the language requirement, civic knowledge has also become relevant in the second gate of state membership in Austria since 2017. As migrants could prove the required language knowledge also by ÖSD until then, civic knowledge did not represent an obligatory measure for the initial settlement of immigrants in Austria. Nevertheless, since 2017, only integration exams designed by ÖIF, containing a civic part too, have been eligible for the fulfilment of IA (*Integration Act*, 2017, para. 11). This CIP reform, therefore, incorporated civic knowledge into the compulsory requirement.

Newcomers in Czechia are not required to pass a language test but, contrarily to Austria, are offered language courses for free, organised either by regional integration centres or by NGOs since as early as the 2000s. In addition to language courses, in 2011 Czech policy makers introduced an adaptation-integration course as part of the three-level information system, aimed at newly arriving immigrants. This initially voluntary and free 8-hour long course, providing immigrants with fundamental information not only about the conditions of the stay but also about their basic socio-cultural orientation in the country, became mandatory with the 2019 reform for all immigrants coming to Czechia after January 2021, in a paid but shortened version. Both countries, therefore, employ obligatory civic integration elements for incoming migrants, even though Austria emphasises language knowledge more while Czechia the immigrants’ orientation in the society.

The third gate of state membership deals with immigrants who aim to gain a long-term residence permit. In Austria, it is carried out through the EU long-term residence permission which immigrants can apply for after five years of stay. Since 2011, such applicants have to pass Module 2 of IA, which proves their language knowledge at the B1 level of CEFR. While the government secures the courses for Module 1 nationwide, offering some categories of immigrants a subsidy for an otherwise paid programme, such support does not apply to Module 2 (*Email Correspondence No. 1*, 2022; Mourão Permoser, 2018, p. 190). The applicant thus needs to prepare for the test individually either with material provided online (MeinSprachportal,

2022) or with commercial language courses. While the language requirement could be fulfilled by passing ÖSD or the special ÖIF exam before 2017, this changed to only the ÖIF integration exam being valid for fulfilling IA in 2017 (*Integration Act*, 2017, para. 12), as in the case of Module 1, making civic knowledge compulsory for this gate of membership, too.

Immigrants staying in the Czech territory for five years have the right to apply for permanent residence. This permit corresponds to the EU Directive on the long-term residence status for TCNs but enables them to live in Czechia permanently. Aside from various conditions such as proof of accommodation and sufficient financial means for the stay, no civic integration measures concerned the applicants until 2009, when a new requirement of language knowledge proof at the A1 level came into force. While the applicants get a voucher from the Ministry of Interior to pass their first exam for free, they need to pay for every other retake (MV ČR, 2012, p. 90; NPI ČR, 2022b). Two years after this requirement has been in force, the government also announced plans for the increase of the level demanded from A1 to A2 (Vláda ČR, 2011, p. 20), coming into effect in September 2021 after several years of negotiations (Vláda ČR, 2021). While civic knowledge became part of the integration exam in Austria in 2017, Czech long-term immigrants do not have to fulfil any civic exams to get a permanent residence permit. Contrarily, they enjoy the possibility of a wide range of socio-cultural courses offered for free by the integration centres or NGOs.

The last gate of state membership, naturalisation, shows a similar approach in both studied countries. Austria as well as Czechia required language knowledge proof already before the first official CIP, Czechia even preceded Austria with the Citizenship Act of 1993, while the latter implemented the likewise condition only in 1998. Nevertheless, both countries later reformed their naturalisation procedures, requiring language examination at the B1 level and employing similar civic tests containing parts focused on the knowledge of geography, history and culture as well as the political and institutional setting of the country. While Czech immigrants may prepare easily for the test with a database of all questions with correct solutions available online, Austrian applicants may consult an information booklet and a model test online only. As for linguistic preparation, immigrants cannot enjoy grant-aided language courses at such a level in either country and thus need to prepare on their own.

To sum up, the comparison of Austrian and Czech CIP clearly shows that Czechia, although developing its integration policies more recently, employs an integration model similar to those applied by West-European immigration countries, tackling immigrant integration for almost a half-century. Civic integration measures were identified in all four gates of membership, as in the Austrian case. While one cannot miss the differences between these two models, namely, at the level of restriction, Czech civic integration measures still account for typical CIP, likewise applied, e.g. in France between 2003–2007 (Goodman, 2014, pp. 192–194). The design of the Czech CIP thus corresponds to the claim of the representative of the Ministry of Interior that Czech policy makers do not want to go as far as Denmark, the Netherlands, or even Austria (*Interview No. 2*, 2018; *Interview No. 7*, 2020).

Table 1. Overview of the development of Austrian CIP

	Entry		Initial Settlement		Long-Term Residence		Naturalisation		
	Language knowledge	Civic knowledge	Language knowledge	Civic knowledge	Language knowledge	Civic knowledge	Language knowledge	Civic knowledge	Citizenship ceremony/oath
1998	No	No	No	No	No	No	Interview	No	No
2003	No	No	A1 level Language certificate (paid/subsidised)	In ÖIF course only	No	No	Interview	No	No
2006	No	No	A2 level Language certificate (paid/subsidised)	In ÖIF course only	No	No	IA fulfilled	Citizenship test (paid)	No
2011	A1 level Language certificate (paid)	No	A2 level Language certificate (paid/subsidised)	In ÖIF course only	B1 level Language certificate (paid/subsidised)	In ÖIF exam only	IA fulfilled	Citizenship test (paid)	No
2017	A1 level Language certificate (paid)	No	A2 level Integration exam (paid/subsidised)	Integration exam (paid/subsidised)	B1 level Integration exam (paid/subsidised)	Integration exam (paid/subsidised)	IA fulfilled	Citizenship test (paid)	No

Table 2. Overview of the development of Czech CIP

	Entry		Initial Settlement		Long-Term Residence		Naturalisation		
	Language knowledge	Civic knowledge	Language knowledge	Civic knowledge	Language knowledge	Civic knowledge	Language knowledge	Civic knowledge	
1993	No	No	No	No	No	No	Interview	No	No
2009	No	No	No	No	Language courses (free) A1 exam (first free/paid)	Socio-cultural courses (free)	Interview	No	No
2011	No	Pre-departure packet (in design)	No	Adaptation-integration course (in design)	Language courses (free) A1 exam (first free/paid)	Socio-cultural courses (free)	Interview	No	No
2014	No	Pre-departure packet (free)	No	Adaptation-integration course (free)	Language courses (free) A1 exam (first free/paid)	Socio-cultural courses (free)	B1 exam (paid)	Civic exam (paid)	No
2021	No	Pre-departure packet (free)	No	Adaptation-integration course (compulsory/paid)	Language courses (free) A2 exam (first free/paid)	Socio-cultural courses (free)	B1 exam (paid)	Civic exam (paid)	No

Conclusion

This paper intended to support the argument that Czechia has become an immigration country, as highlighted not only by some scholars (Baršová & Barša, 2005; Drbohlav, 2004; Kušniráková, 2014; Zogata-Kusz, 2020) but also by the Czech Ministry of Interior itself (MV ČR, 2011). The article provides new evidence for such a claim with its analysis of specific policies of civic integration widely applied by West-European states tackling immigrant integration for half a century. When comparing the Czech civic integration practice with Austria, the research revealed that Czech policymakers aim at designing long-term immigrant integration policies similar to those implemented by other European immigration states. Although not so restrictive as in the Austrian and other West-European cases, Czech civic integration measures were introduced in all gates of membership from the pre-entry stage through the initial and long-term settlement until the last one of naturalisation.

The concept of civic integration thus offers an interesting framework for identifying the development of a previously emigration or transit country into an immigration one, as the presence of such policies reflects the genuine need to incorporate non-nationals settling in the country in the long term. However, research on civic integration is rather scarce in the case of Central and Eastern Europe. A thorough comparison of integration policies applied by the Visegrad and other CEE countries could enrich the integration debate significantly with new original cases. And if these countries miss the civic integration dimension in their immigrant integration strategies, Czechia could serve as an inspiring successful model for them.

References

- Baršová, A. & Barša, P. (2005). *Přistěhovalectví a liberální stát. Imigrační a integrační politiky v USA, západní Evropě a Česku*. Masarykova univerzita v Brně, Mezinárodní politologický ústav.
- Bernard, J. & Mikešová, R. (2014). Sociální integrace imigrantů na rozhraní mezi dočasnou migrací a trvalým usazením. *Sociologický Časopis*, 50(4), 521–545. <https://doi.org/10.13060/00380288.2014.50.4.107>
- BMI Österreich. (2022). *Mein Österreich. Vorbereitung zur Staatsbürgerschaft*. <https://www.staatsbuergerschaft.gv.at/index.php?id=3#&panel1-1>
- Carrera, S. (2006). A Comparison of Integration Programmes in the EU. Trends and Weaknesses. *CEPS Challenge Papers*, 1. http://aei.pitt.edu/6773/1/1310_01.pdf
- Castles, S. (1995). How nation-states respond to immigration and ethnic diversity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 21(3), 293–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.1995.9976493>
- Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union*. (2012). Official Journal C 326/47. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:12012E/TXT&from=EN>
- Czech Statistical Office. (2022a). *R01 Foreigners in the Czech Republic in the years 2004–2021 (as at 31 December)*. https://www.czso.cz/documents/11292/27320905/c01R01_2021.pdf/3684c8ef-fc19-493e-8498-416697170c0a?version=1.0

- Czech Statistical Office. (2022b). *R03 Permanently and long-term resided foreigners in the Czech Republic in the years 1985–2021 (as at 31 December)*. https://www.czso.cz/documents/11292/27320905/c01R03_2021.pdf/7dedd28b-05d6-4847-955e-fdf4d2cc3dae?version=1.0
- Czech Statistical Office. (2022c). *R04 Foreigners in the Czech Republic by citizenship in the years 1994–2021 (as at 31 December)*. https://www.czso.cz/csu/cizinci/4-ciz_pocet_cizincu#cr
- de Haas, H., Castles, S. & Miller, M.J. (2020). *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World* (6th ed.). Red Globe Press.
- Drbohlav, D. (2004). *Migration Trends in Selected EU Applicant Countries. Volume II – The Czech Republic: The Times They Are A-Changin*. International Organization for Migration. https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/migrationtrends_eu_2.pdf
- Duszczyk, M., Wach, D. & Pszczołkowska, D. (2018). Warsaw: A new immigration city in search of its integration policy towards new comers. In T. Caponio, P. Scholten & R. Zapata-Barrero (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of the Governance of Migration and Diversity in Cities*. (130–142). Routledge.
- Email Correspondence No. 1. Representative of BMFFJI*. (2022, June 21). [Personal communication].
- Eurostat. (2022). *Share of non-nationals in the resident population, 1 January 2021*. [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=File:Fig06_Share_of_non-nationals_in_the_resident_population,_1_January_2021_\(%25\)_rev.png](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=File:Fig06_Share_of_non-nationals_in_the_resident_population,_1_January_2021_(%25)_rev.png)
- Federal Act on the Integration of Persons Without Austrian Nationality Legally Resident in Austria (Integration Act—IntG)*. (2017). Federal Law Gazette I No. 68/2017. https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/Dokumente/ErV/ERV_2017_1_68_a/ERV_2017_1_68_a.pdf
- Goodman, S.W. (2010). Integration Requirements for Integration's Sake? Identifying, Categorising and Comparing Civic Integration Policies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(5), 753–772. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691831003764300>
- Goodman, S.W. (2014). *Immigration and Membership Politics in Western Europe*. Cambridge University Press.
- Goodman, S.W. & Wright, M. (2015). Does Mandatory Integration Matter? Effects of Civic Requirements on Immigrant Socio-economic and Political Outcomes. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(12), 1885–1908. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1042434>
- Hollomey, C. & Kraler, A. (2011). *Perception and impact of pre-entry programmes for newcomers in Austria*. PROSINT country report (WP4). Retrieved from http://research.icmpd.org/fileadmin/Research-Website/Project_material/PROSINT/Reports/AT_WP4_Final.pdf (April 30, 2020)
- Interview No. 1. Representative of a Czech regional integration centre*. (November 6, 2018). [Personal communication].
- Interview No. 2. Representative of OAMP MV ČR*. (November 8, 2018). [Personal communication].
- Interview No. 3. Representative of a Czech regional integration centre*. (November 15, 2018). [Personal communication].
- Interview No. 4. Representative of an Austrian provincial administration*. (September 12, 2019). [Personal communication].

- Interview No. 5. Representative of BMEIA.* (September 12, 2019). [Personal communication].
- Interview No. 6. Anonymous respondent involved in immigrant integration in Austria.* (October 17, 2019). [Personal communication].
- Interview No. 7. Representative of OAMP MV ČR.* (June 3, 2020). [Personal communication].
- Interview No. 8. Representative of a Czech regional integration centre.* (August 12, 2022). [Personal communication].
- Jacobs, D. & Rea, A. (2007). The End of National Models? Integration Courses and Citizenship Trajectories in Europe. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 9(2), 264–283.
- Joppke, C. (2007). Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe. *Western European Politics*, 30(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402380601019613>
- Joppke, C. (2008). Comparative citizenship: A restrictive turn in Europe. *Journal of Law and Ethics of Human Rights*, 2(1), 1–41. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1938-2545.1018>
- Koopmans, R., Michalowski, I. & Waibel, S. (2012). Citizenship Rights for Immigrants: National Political Processes and Cross-National Convergence in Western Europe, 1980–2008. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(4), 1202–1245. <https://doi.org/10.1086/662707>
- Kraler, A. (2011). The Case of Austria. In G. Zincone, R. Penninx & M. Borkert (Eds.), *Migration Policymaking in Europe. The Dynamics of Actors and Contexts in Past and Present.* (21–59). Amsterdam University Press.
- Kušniráková, T. (2014). Is there an integration policy being formed in Czechia? *Identities*, 21(6), 738–754. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2013.828617>
- MeinSprachportal. (2022). *Tests.* <https://sprachportal.integrationsfonds.at/english/tests>
- Michalowski, I. (2011). Required to assimilate? The content of citizenship tests in five countries. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(6–7), 749–768. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2011.600116>
- migration.gv.at. (2022). *Sonstige Niederlassungsformen.* <https://www.migration.gv.at/de/formen-der-zuwanderung/dauerhafte-zuwanderung/sonstige-niederlassungsformen/>
- Mourão Permoser, J. (2012). Civic Integration as Symbolic Politics: Insights from Austria. *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 14(2), 173–198. <https://doi.org/10.1163/157181612X642367>
- Mourão Permoser, J. (2018). Testing the limits of the liberal constraint: The evolution of civic integration policy in Austria. In A. Rea, E. Bribosia, I. Rorive & D. Sređanovic (Eds.), *Governing Diversity: Migrant Integration and Multiculturalism in North America and Europe.* (179–202). Éditions de L'Université de Bruxelles.
- Mourão Permoser, J. & Rosenberger, S. (2012). Integration policy in Austria. In J. Frideres & J. Biles (Eds.), *International Perspectives: Integration and Inclusion.* (39–59). McGill-Queen's University Press.
- MŠMT ČR. (1993). *Výhláška MŠMT č. 137/1993 Sb. ze dne 23. dubna 1993, kterou se stanoví kritéria pro prokazování znalosti českého jazyka žadatelů o udělení státního občanství České republiky.* <https://www.zakonyprolidi.cz/cs/1993-137>.

- MŠMT ČR. (2008). *Vyhláška MŠMT č. 348/2008 Sb. ze dne 9. září 2008 o výuce a zkouškách znalosti českého jazyka pro účely získání povolení k trvalému pobytu na území České republiky*. <https://www.zakonyprolidi.cz/cs/2008-348>.
- MV ČR. (2004). *Zpráva o situaci v oblasti migrace na území České republiky za rok 2003*. <https://www.mvcr.cz/migrace/clanek/rocnizpravy-o-situaci-v-oblasti-migrace-a-integrace-cizincu-v-ceske-republice-za-roky-2001-2019.aspx>
- MV ČR. (2011). *Zpráva o situaci v oblasti migrace a integrace cizinců na území České republiky za rok 2010*. <https://www.mvcr.cz/migrace/clanek/vyrocni-zpravy-o-situaci-v-oblasti-migrace-a-integrace.aspx>
- MV ČR. (2012). *Zpráva o situaci v oblasti migrace a integrace cizinců na území České republiky za rok 2011*. <https://www.mvcr.cz/migrace/clanek/vyrocni-zpravy-o-situaci-v-oblasti-migrace-a-integrace.aspx>
- MV ČR. (2013). *Zpráva o situaci v oblasti migrace a integrace cizinců na území České republiky za rok 2012*. <https://www.mvcr.cz/migrace/clanek/vyrocni-zpravy-o-situaci-v-oblasti-migrace-a-integrace.aspx>
- MV ČR. (2014). *Zpráva o situaci v oblasti migrace a integrace cizinců na území České republiky za rok 2013*. <https://www.mvcr.cz/migrace/clanek/vyrocni-zpravy-o-situaci-v-oblasti-migrace-a-integrace.aspx>
- MV ČR. (2020). *Vyhláška MV č. 520/2020 Sb. ze dne 8. prosince 2020 o provádění adaptačně-integračních kurzů*. <https://www.zakonyprolidi.cz/cs/2020-520>.
- NPI ČR. (2022a). *Zkouška pro občanství*. http://obcanstvi.cestina-pro-cizince.cz/index.php?p=aktuality-3&hl=cs_CZ
- NPI ČR. (2022b). *Zkouška z češtiny pro trvalý pobyt*. <https://cestina-pro-cizince.cz/trvaly-pobyt/>
- Okólski, M. & Wach, D. (2020). Immigration and integration policies in the absence of immigrants: A case study of Poland. In M. Duszczuk, M. Pachocka & D. Pszczółkowska (Eds.), *Relations between Immigration and Integration Policies in Europe: Challenges, Opportunities and Perspectives in Selected EU Member States*. (146–172). Routledge.
- Penninx, R. & Garcés-Mascreñas, B. (2016). The Concept of Integration as an Analytical Tool and as a Policy Concept. In B. Garcés-Mascreñas and R. Penninx (Eds.), *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe. Contexts, Levels and Actors*. (11–29). Springer.
- Perchinig, B. (2010). All You Need to Know to Become an Austrian: Naturalisation Policy and Citizenship Testing in Austria. In R. van Oers, E. Ersbøll and D. Kostakopoulou (Eds.), *A Redefinition of Belonging? Language and Integration Tests for Newcomers and Future Citizens*. (24–49). Martinus Nijhoff.
- Simbartlová, A. (2019). Civic Integration Policies in Central Europe: The Case of the Czech Republic. *Der Donauraum*, 59(1–2), 73–104. <https://doi.org/10.7767/dedo.2019.59.1-2.73>.
- Ślęzak, E. & Bielewska, A. (2021). Cities' migration policies in a country with a deficit of migration policy. The case of Poland. *International Migration*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12907>
- Staatsbürgerschaftsgesetznovelle 1998*. (1998). BGBl. Nr. 124/1998. https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/Dokumente/BgblPdf/1998_124_1/1998_124_1.pdf

- Statistics Austria. (2022). *Statistisches Jahrbuch: Migration & Integration. Zahlen, Daten, Indikatoren 2022*. https://www.statistik.at/fileadmin/publications/Migration_Integration_2022.pdf
- Stern, J. & Valchars, G. (2013). *Naturalisation Procedures for Immigrants: Austria*. EUDO Citizenship Observatory, Florence. https://homepage.univie.ac.at/gerd.valchars/eudo_naturalisation_procedures_austria.pdf
- Temesi, I. (2018). Administrative Background and the Process of Migrant Integration in Hungary. *Croatian and Comparative Public Administration*, 18(3), 421–446. <https://doi.org/10.31297/hkju.18.3.2>
- Tollarová, B. (2011). *Study on the local implementation of integration/introduction courses for newcomers. Case study Pardubice/ Czech Republic*. PROSINT country report (WP3). Retrieved from http://research.icmpd.org/fileadmin/Research-Website/Project_material/PROSINT/Reports/CZ_WP3_Final.pdf (April 30, 2020)
- Van Wolleghem, P.G. (2019). *The EU's Policy on the Integration of Migrants: A Case of Soft-Europeization?* Springer.
- Vláda ČR. (2011). *Usnesení vlády ČR ze dne 9. února 2011 č. 99 k aktualizované Koncepti integrace cizinců na území České republiky a k návrhu dalšího postupu v roce 2011*. <https://www.mvcr.cz/migrace/clanek/zakladni-dokumenty-k-integracni-politice-ke-stazeni.aspx>
- Vláda ČR. (2021). *Nařízení vlády č. 199/2021 Sb. ze dne 19. dubna 2021, kterým se mění nařízení vlády č. 31/2016 Sb., o prokazování znalosti českého jazyka pro účely získání povolení k trvalému pobytu*. <https://www.psp.cz/sqw/sbirka.sqw?cz=199&r=2021>.
- Winiarska, A. & Wojno, M. (2018). Local Perspective on the Practices and Challenges of Migrant Integration: The Case of Warsaw. *Croatian and Comparative Public Administration*, 18(3), 341–372. <https://doi.org/10.31297/hkju.18.3.4>
- Zákon č. 176/2019 Sb. ze dne 18. června 2019, kterým se mění zákon č. 326/1999 Sb., o pobytu cizinců na území České republiky a o změně některých zákonů, ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a další související zákony. (2019). <https://www.psp.cz/sqw/sbirka.sqw?o=8&T=203>.
- Zákon č. 186/2013 Sb. ze dne 11. června 2013 o státním občanství České republiky a o změně některých zákonů. (2013). <https://www.psp.cz/sqw/sbirka.sqw?o=6&T=827>.
- Zákon č. 379/2007 Sb., kterým se mění zákon č. 326/1999 Sb., o pobytu cizinců na území České republiky a o změně některých zákonů, ve znění pozdějších předpisů, zákon č. 325/1999 Sb., o azylu a o změně zákona č. 283/1991 Sb., o Policii České republiky, ve znění pozdějších předpisů, (zákon o azylu), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a některé další zákony. (2007). <https://www.psp.cz/sqw/sbirka.sqw?o=5&T=191>.
- Zákon České národní rady č. 40/1993 Sb. ze dne 29. prosince 1992 o nabývání a pozbytování státního občanství České republiky. (1992). <https://www.psp.cz/sqw/sbirka.sqw?cz=40&r=1993>
- Zaková, M. (2019). The Perception of the Integration Process and the Provision of Social Services by Immigrants. *Postmodern Openings*, 10(1), 165–181. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/60>
- Zogata-Kusz, A. (2020). Immigration and integration policies in Czechia: A new immigration destination country in the EU. In M. Duszczuk, M. Pachocka & D. Pszczółkowska (Eds.), *Relations between Immigration and Integration Policies in*

Europe: Challenges, Opportunities and Perspectives in Selected EU Member States (pp. 173–196). Routledge.

Zubiková, A. (2021). Assessment of the Immigrants Integration Level in the New Member States of the EU in 2009–2018. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 22, 635–652. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-020-00759-0>

