Social remittances and interpersonal communication: Moldovans in Prague and Turin

DUŠAN DRBOHLAV, DAGMAR DZÚROVÁ

Charles University, Faculty of Science, Department of Social Geography and Regional Development, Prague, Czechia; e-mail: drbohlav@natur.cuni.cz, dagmar.dzurova@natur.cuni.cz

ABSTRACT   The authors contribute to filling a gap that exists in the knowledge of personal communications and their interaction with social remittances. Moldovans in Prague, Czechia, and Turin, Italy, and communications with their families and peers in Moldova are studied using our own survey data (from 2017/2018 – N = 203 in Prague and N = 206 in Turin, factor analysis used). We argue that there is a close relationship between interpersonal communication topics (while themes linked to everyday activities dominate over serious broader structural and institutional domestic or "global issues") and real social remittances. Particular communication topics have their typical bearers in relation to age, gender, and education. The geographical context matters. Prague attracted Moldovans who stay abroad for a shorter time and are less educated, less integrated, and more transnational than those in Turin. Hence, Prague Moldovans communicate more and also transfer more social remittances. However, the overall impact of these social remittances upon Moldova is small.

KEY WORDS   interpersonal communication – social remittances – Moldovan migrants – Prague – Turin – factor analysis

1. Introduction

Research activities in the field of broadly defined social remittances – "the ideas, behaviors, identities and social capital that flow from receiving to sending-country communities" (Levitt 1998, p. 927) – are spread over a wide spectrum of subtopics and studied regions/countries. In fact, social remittances – in addition to traditional research topics such as diasporas, brain drain, and financial remittances – have gradually become an integral part of the given migration-development nexus and its discourses. Researchers generally use qualitative methods; using a quantitative approach is rare (see exceptions to this trend – Grabowska 2018, Sandu 2010) mainly due to problems with the operationalization of social remittances data. Moreover, any focus on refining and enriching the given conceptual framework is often missing (see exceptions in Grabowska 2018; Isaakyan, Triandafyllidou 2017; Levitt, Lamba-Nieves 2013). The concept is still new and internally diversified, fragmented, and underdeveloped in terms of conceptual, methodological, and methodical aspects (see various critical remarks – e.g. Boccagni, Decimo 2013; Drbohlav et al. 2017b). Moreover, the impact of social remittances on immigrant incorporation into their home societies and on sending-community dynamics is not well understood (Levitt, Lamba-Nieves 2010). Despite these shortcomings, the concept of social remittances is promising and has developmental and modernization potential (e.g. Levitt 1998, 2005).

With the understanding that social remittances represent a wide spectrum of issues, in this article we concentrate only on one particular aspect closely related to social remittances – migrants' personal communication through which social remittances are potentially and really distributed. This issue – the interaction between social remittances, social networks and personal communication – is one of the research gaps that needs to be filled.

After this introduction, a description of the conceptual/theoretical background follows. It is structured in two parts: the perspective of social remittances, and that of social networks and interpersonal communication. Main goals precede the nature of the Moldovan migration and the presence of Moldovans in Czechia and Italy is also briefly sketched. The empirical research starts with a chapter on data, methodology, and methods of analysis, and then, selected results of the analyses are presented. Discussion and conclusions follow.

2. Conceptual/theoretical background

In terms of applied theoretical/conceptual matters, in addition to our own ideas (Drbohlav, Dzúrová 2021), our analysis is supported primarily by the concepts of

social remittances (Levitt 1998) and social network formations and functioning (Granovetter 1973, 1983).

Regarding more specific issues, such as topics debated or exchanged via various social network tools between social remittances transmitters and recipients, we found no propounded theses, regularities, or accumulated experiences we could present and lean on within our own empirical research. Our goal is to bridge, at least in part, this gap.

2.1. Social remittances perspective

As mentioned above, our aim in this article is to bring more awareness to one particular aspect of migrants' social remittances issues – transmission of social remittances and closely-related circumstances. Therefore, let us recall some basic facts chiefly specifying the broadly defined transmission of migrants' social remittances, while also stressing prerequisites that must be met to fulfil the definition of social remittances. As Levitt (1998, p. 936) mentions: "Social remittances exchanges occur when migrants return to live in or visit their communities of origin; when non-migrants visit their migrant family members; or through interchanges of letters, videos, cassettes and telephone calls." Levitt wrote this in 1998; since then, some new developments have occurred and, as a result, the role of modern social network communication tools has been dramatically strengthened (Skype, Facebook, etc.). Furthermore, "social remittances travel through identifiable pathways; their source and destination are clear" (Levitt 1998, p. 936). Therefore, it is obvious where and how the given social remittances were sent and received. This determines and predestines another important aspect; social remittances usually travel between persons who know each other. In this regard, Misztal (1999) also mentions the increasing importance of face-to-face social remitting (cf. Misztal 1999). In fact, Galstyan, Galstyan (2021) do the same in relation to the current COVID-19 era.

Levitt also differentiates three different kinds of recipient's observed and potential efficient transmitters of social remittances. The most important in this regard seems to be 'purposeful innovators' who 'aggressively search for, select and absorb' new ideas and practices (Levitt 1998, p. 931), while also having the greatest potential to transmit them back effectively to their country of origin in the form of new social remittances. Moreover, individuals with higher status positions are more important when effectively transmitting social remittances (Levitt 1998, p. 939). In any case, the receiver's side characteristics (such as gender, class, or life cycle stage) come into play and also influence the overall impact of social remittances (Levitt 2005).

Finally, the transmission of social remittances is not valued equally and can be perceived both positively and negatively (see e.g. Cingolani, Vietti 2019; Grabowska, Engbersen 2016; White et al. 2018).

This article is, to some extent, a logical follow-up of our previous one (Drbohlav, Dzúrová 2021) where we, inter alia, conceptualized social remittances into three types: (1) interpersonal communication–based, (2) project-oriented, and (3) return-tied remittances. We had stated that interpersonal communication–based social remittances target mostly family members and peers and concern new norms, ideas, values and practices that touch various spheres of life transferred; this type of social remittance is also typical of easy contacts (almost everybody is involved) using various tools of modern social networks transition, self-sufficiency (no financial remittances needed) and high frequency, albeit decreasing over time (along with other symptoms of transnationalism; see also Drbohlav, Dzúrová 2021).

2.2. Social networks and interpersonal communication perspective

New global population mobility patterns closely related to modern complex globalization realities are materialized in various transnational social formations – for example transnational fields, transnational spaces, transnational communities, or diasporas (see, e.g. Faist 2000; Kelly 1998; Levitt, Glick Schiller 2004; Vertovec 2004). Within all these formations functioning transnationally, over the state border (interconnected via ways of "being or belonging"), the social network ties play a dominant, irreplaceable role (see e.g. various understandings of the whole concept in Boccagni 2012; Nowicka, Šerbedžija 2016; Williams 2007; but see also e.g. Kim, Kim 2021).

In other words, transnational social network ties are crucial transmitters of social remittances. Nevertheless, how these networks work and how they contribute to patterns of circulation is not well known, because they are understudied (Lacroix, Levitt, Vari-Lavoisier 2016). Studies on social remittances and social network ties are rarely brought together (Krzyzowski 2016). Berger (2014) touches on the important issue of how strong versus weak ties work in the given context (Granovetter 1973, 1983). People we know well, trust, and speak to often create strong ties, whereas weak ties are created with acquaintances with whom we have less powerful connections. As for the concept of social remittances, it is important to consider Granovetter's (see 1973, 1983) main argument which states that weak ties are actually strong (i.e. important), because, when bridging contacts among various groups, they can provide access to novel resources (Brashears, Quintane 2018). In contrast, individuals active within influential groups comprised of strong ties mostly exchange pieces of information among themselves. Accordingly, social

systems lacking in weak ties tend to be fragmented and incoherent (Granovetter 1983). One can consider Granovetter's hypothesis as an accepted and important paradigm (Jack 2005); however, there are studies questioning or challenging this concept and its real applicability (see e.g. the concept of a structural whole Burt 1992, or, the concept of bandwidth – Aral, Van Alstyne 2010).

In any case, these aspects go far beyond the scope of this contribution. When interpreting results of the analyses of social network ties, one cannot focus only on a micro-level perspective of interpersonal communications and relations. One must take into account other structural components of reality, the broader context, such as the "effects of cognitive, cultural, and political embeddedness" (Sunley 2008, p. 10; see also Boccagni, Decimo 2013; Grabowska, Garapich 2016; Levitt, Lamba-Nieves 2011; Sandu 2016). In fact, the same argument is valid for the context of social remittances.

3. Main goals

We try to ascertain what interpersonal communication between migrants and their family and peers looks like and how it might contribute to transferring new elements in the form of new social remittances (creating communication-based social remittances). We researched the communication between Moldovan migrants (staying in Prague/Czechia and Turin/Italy) and their family members and friends/acquaintances in Moldova while: (1) focusing on what topics are discussed, how often and between whom, (2) searching for typical features (characteristics) of migrants-'speakers' tied to individual debated topics and, at the same time, (3) comparing the above two groups of communication recipients (family versus peers) and given migrants' behavior in the two different geographical contexts (Prague versus Turin). We also touch on the issue of relationships between interpersonal communications and real social remittances. As we know, no such systematic study in this field has yet been done. In doing this, we applied a quantitative approach (factor analysis), which is relatively unusual in the study of social remittances.

4. Moldova and Moldovans in Czechia and Italy: "setting settings"

Currently, Moldova is one of the least developed countries of Europe, maintaining the 90th position on the Human Development Index ladder (UNDP 2020). On the other hand, Czechia and Italy occupy the 27th and 29th ranking among 189 assessed countries of the world. There is, of course, also a difference in economic performance of Moldova vis-à-vis Czechia and Italy. As a corollary, there

are strong migratory "pushes" leading to intensive and long-lasting emigration mainly to Russia and countries in the European Union (see also much more in Drbohlav et al. 2017a).

Italy and Czechia are prominent as important destinations for Moldovan migrants. While Czechia and Italy share some similar trends of Moldovan migration and immigrants' integration, especially on the labor markets, a more detailed picture shows some significant differences (Drbohlav et al. 2017a). What they have in common is that Moldovan labor migrants enter the so-called secondary labor market in both destination countries; this secondary labor market is comprised of low paid, dirty, dangerous, and difficult jobs. What is also common for both countries is that, quite often, Moldovans migrate as Romanians – due to historic and linguistic ties and cultural/ethnic affinities they can get Romanian citizenship/passport, thus facing no restrictions when entering the EU labor market (Drbohlav et al. 2017a).

The Moldovan community in Italy is larger and more established when compared to the community in Czechia. By contrast, Moldovan migration to Czechia is more recent and much less intensive (see more facts in Drbohlav et al. 2017a).

The two metropolitan areas in the two countries where Moldovan migrants reside represent two different settings. Prague is the capital of Czechia with some 1.3 million inhabitants in a post-communist country of Central/Eastern Europe. Turin has a population of about 0.9 million and is an industrial, commercial, and cultural center of Piedmont in the Northern part of Italy – a highly developed liberal democracy.

5. Data, methodology, and methods of analyses

Questionnaire surveys (questions prepared specifically for this research by the research team) were administered to two immigrant groups from Moldova: one group lives in Czechia – mainly Prague or the nearby Central Bohemia region – and the other group lives in Italy – Turin and its close neighborhoods. In Czechia the surveys were carried out between October 2017 and April 2018, and in Italy between November 2017 and March 2018. There were 203 respondents in Czechia and 206 respondents in Italy – 409 respondents combined. There were common mandatory criteria determined: (1) The respondent has or has had in the past Moldovan citizenship (including the Pridnestrovian Moldavian Republic), (2) is at least 18 years old, (3) has lived in Czechia (Prague)/Italy (Turin) for at least one year, and (4) is in touch with someone in Moldova.

In both countries a snow-ball method for selection of the respondents was applied. In Czechia, several main channels to identify respondents were used: priests of the Orthodox church, selected Moldovan entrepreneurs employing

Moldovan migrants, and selected managers of hostels where Moldovan migrants are accommodated were instrumental in contacting would-be respondents. In Italy, cultural associations and the parishes of the Orthodox church served as the main intermediaries for reaching the target population. Sample networks of Moldovan students from the University of Turin and the Polytechnic University of Turin were also used.

After putting all the pieces of information into the questionnaire, the PAPI (Pencil and Paper Interview) method was applied. Regarding the place where all the pieces of information were gathered, different settings came into play – in Czechia, university campuses, Orthodox churches, coffee bars, and dorms, and in Italy, headquarters of ethnic associations, Orthodox churches, university campuses, kindergartens, restaurants, grocery stores and private houses. The fulfilling of the questionnaire took an average of 60 minutes to complete, and respondents were rewarded for their work (€10)[1].

To map a complex situation around social remittances we designed a questionnaire survey and developed a respective data set.

5.1. Mapping potential social remittances via interpersonal communications

We analyze different pieces of information communicated/discussed between Moldovan respondents in Czechia and Italy, and family and friends/acquaintances back home via e-mail, Skype, face-to-face during short-term visits, etc. Respondents were offered 18 various topics – see Table 2 – and they were asked to mark the topics with numbers from 1 to 5 where 1 = never, 5 = very often. There is a problem when connecting the given interpersonal communication to social remittances. In fact, we only have various topics, frequencies, and recipients of the communications; we do not know their contents. Hence, instead of talking about social remittances, we should speak in this regard about potential/possible forerunners of social remittances.

5.2. Mapping migrants' sociodemographic characteristics

Furthermore, we use two sets of variables. The first set is composed of 7 selected variables describing sociodemographic characteristics of migrants (sex, education, marital status, age, citizenship, language skills, and self-rated health). The second set of 5 selected variables describes migration, integration, and economic

---

[1]   Moreover, mediators who found and brought in a new respondent were rewarded with €10.

situation of migrants (number of years in Czechia/Italy, transnationalization index, satisfaction with life, position on the labor market, and income) – see Table 1.

The selection of these variables is not accidental. The other way round, as some studies on social remittances clearly show, basic sociodemographic characteristics may significantly differentiate specific groups of migrants by their behavioral patterns (see also above). The same is valid for the length of stay, the intensity of connections to the country of origin, economic integration and, indeed, overall satisfaction with one's life in a destination country (see more in e.g. Boccagni, Decimo 2013; Drbohlav, Dzúrová 2021; Isaakyan, Triandafyllidou 2017; Levitt 1998, 2005; Levitt, Lamba-Nieves 2011, 2013; Nowicka, Šerbedžija 2016; White et al. 2018). There are no reasons why not to apply the given list of variables also to researching the interaction between social remittances, social networks and personal communication.

The sociodemographic characteristics were determined and encoded as follows: Education was categorized as basic (or less), complete secondary education, and complete university education. In relation to marital status, people were classified into three categories: singles, married/cohabited, and other (divorced, or widowed). Age was categorized into four age groups: 18–25 years, 26–35 years, 36–45 years, and 46 years and older. Citizenship was categorized into two groups – only Moldovans and others.[2] Language skills, Czech language for migrants in Czechia and Italian language for migrants in Italy, were tested via the following statement: "Language skills – cross one option – limited, good or very good." Self-rated health was measured on a 5-point scale ranging from very good (1) to very bad (5) (the question was: "What do you think your health is like, in general, in the last 30 days?").

5.3. Mapping migration, integration and economic situation of migrants

The migration, integration and economic situation of migrants' characteristics were determined and encoded as follows: Number of years in Czechia/Italy – short-term (0–2 years in Czechia and 0–10 years in Italy), mid-term (3–5 years in Czechia and 11–15 years in Italy), and long-term (6 and more years in Czechia and 16 and more years in Italy). The transnationalization index represents a cumulative index comprising four individual characteristics measuring: (a) number of migrants' visits of Moldova during the last three years (4 categories – 0–2, 3, 4, and 5 and more); (b) frequency of remitting money back to Moldova during the last 12 months (4 categories – 0, 1, 2–3, 4–11, every month or more often); (c) frequency

---

[2]   Besides ethnic Moldovans with Moldovan citizenship, there was also a quite numerous group (both in Czechia and Italy) of ethnic Moldovans born in Moldova but now holding Romanian citizenship/passports.

of keeping in touch/communicating with family members in Moldova (4 categories – few times a week, up to 4 times a month, less than 4 times a month, never); (d) frequency of keeping in touch/communicating with friends and acquaintances in Moldova (4 categories – 5 times a week, up to 4 times a month, less than 4 times a month, never). Final index represented for Czechia: low level of transnationalization – 3–9, average – 10–11, and high – 13 and more. The same data for Italy: low level of transnationalization – 3–7, average – 8–9, and high – 10 and more. Satisfaction with life (our proxy for success of integration[3]) was measured on a 5-point scale ranging from extremely satisfied (5) to not at all (1) (the question was: "Are you satisfied with your life in Czechia/Italy?"). Position on the labor market was tested via the question: "What is your current employment status?" with 10 following possible statements to choose from: 1. Still at school, 2. Retired, 3. Housewife/Stay-at-home, 4. On maternity leave, 5. A state employee full or part-time, 6. An employee in the private sector full or part-time, 7. Self-employed, 8. Unemployed, 9. Not working and not looking for a job, and 10. Other. These items were clustered together and recategorized into six categories as follows: Students, Stay-at-home (2 and 4 combined), A state employee, An employee in the private sector, Tradesman, and Unemployed (8 and 9 combined). Income was tested via the question: "What were/are your total monthly gross earnings? Including all jobs, you have, even those undocumented." Respondents could choose from the following categories: 1. less than €500; 2. €501–1,000; 3. €1,001–1,500; 4. €1,501–2,000; 5. €2,001–2,500; 6. €2,501–3,000; 7. €3,001–4,000; 8. more than €4,001; and 9. without income. Consequently, income was categorized into three categories: below €500, €501–1,000, and more than €1,001.

5.4. Data processing

The data was organized into a database and further analyzed using SPSS 20 software.

The 18 discussed topics between migrants in Czechia and Italy and family members and friends/acquaintances in Moldova – our main core research target in this article – were detected using factor analysis. We used the orthogonal varimax rotation method. The eigenvalue was calculated for each factor extracted and used to determine the number of factors to extract. We used a cut-off value of 1 to determine factors based on eigenvalues. The method of principal components was used as an extraction method. The percentage of explained variance was also considered. We calculated the factor scores for all respective models. Moreover, the parametric Paired Sample T-test and variation coefficients were used too.

---

[3]   We are aware of the shortcomings of this simplification.

Table 1 – Basic descriptive statistics of variables entering the analysis

		Moldovans in Czechia		Moldovans in Italy		
		N	%	N	%	Total
Socio-demographic variables (7)						
Sex	Females	96	47.3	130	63.1	226
	Males	107	52.7	76	36.9	183
Education	Basic	34	16.7	14	6.8	48
	Secondary	80	39.4	97	47.1	177
	University	77	37.9	94	45.6	171
Marital status	Single	52	25.6	65	31.6	117
	Married	106	52.2	107	51.9	213
	Other	33	16.3	34	16.5	67
Age groups	18–25	43	21.2	41	19.9	84
	26–35	83	40.9	45	21.8	128
	36–45	39	19.2	51	24.8	90
	46+	36	17.7	69	33.5	105
Citizenship	Only Moldovan	87	42.9	104	50.5	191
	Other	114	56.2	102	49.5	216
Language skills	Limited	103	50.7	6	2.9	109
	Good	45	22.2	113	54.9	158
	Very good	23	11.3	81	39.3	104
Self-rates health	Excellent	39	19.2	47	22.8	86
	Very good	90	44.3	59	28.6	149
	Average	70	34.5	84	40.8	154
	Not good	2	1.0	15	7.3	17
	Very bad	1	0.5	1	0.5	2

6. Results

6.1. Who entered the study?

Table 1 provides a basic description of the samples via their selected characteristics. In comparison with the population in Italy, Moldovan migrants in Czechia are represented by more males, less educated, and younger individuals, with limited knowledge of the Czech language, and those receiving a rather low income. Moreover, in this comparative perspective, Moldovan respondents in Czechia spent less time in their destination country and were much more transnational than Moldovan respondents in Italy. All these facts correspond to the fact that Moldovan migration to Czechia is a more recent phenomenon and is therefore less matured, resulting in a higher population of less educated men employed in manufacturing, construction, and wholesale and retail trade (see more in Drbohlav et al.

Table 1 (cont.) – Basic descriptive statistics of variables entering the analysis

		Moldovans in Czechia		Moldovans in Italy		
		N	%	N	%	Total
Migration, integration and economic variables (5)						
Position on the labor market	Student	12	5.9	11	5.3	23
	At home	26	12.8	8	3.9	34
	State employee	29	14.3	15	7.3	44
	Employee in the private sector	89	43.8	103	50.0	192
	Tradesman	13	6.4	33	16.0	46
	Unemployed	13	6.4	21	10.2	34
Satisfaction with life	Not at all			5	2.4	5
	Not completely	11	5.4	22	10.7	33
	Normally	85	41.9	71	34.5	156
	Quite a lot	78	38.4	82	39.8	160
	Extremely satisfied	28	13.8	26	12.6	54
Transnationalization Index	Low	71	35.0	81	39.3	152
	Average	56	27.6	63	30.6	119
	High	74	36.5	57	27.7	131
Income	Below 500 EUR	44	21.7	24	11.7	68
	501–1,000 EUR	105	51.7	52	25.2	157
	1,001+ EUR	44	21.7	110	53.4	154
Number of years in Czechia or Italy	Short	70	34.5	61	29.6	131
	Average	68	33.5	73	35.4	141
	Long	65	32.0	72	35.0	137
	Total	203	100.0	206	100.0	409

Notes: Transnationalization index – This represents a cumulative index comprising four individual characteristics measuring: (a) number of migrants' visits to Moldova during the last three years (4 categories – 0-2, 3,4, and 5 and more); (b) frequency of remitting money back to Moldova during the last 12 months (4 categories – 0, 1, 2–3, 4–11, every month or more often); (c) frequency of keeping in touch/communicating with family members in Moldova (4 categories – a few times a week, up to 4 times a month, less than 4 times a month, never); (d) frequency of keeping in touch/communicating with friends and acquaintances in Moldova (4 categories – 5 times a week, up to 4 times a month, less than 4 times a month, never. Final index represented for Czechia: low level of transnationalization – 3–9, average – 10–11, and high – 13 and more. The same data for Italy: low level of transnationalization – 3–7, average – 8–9, and high – 10 and more.
Number of years in Czechia or Italy: Short – Czechia 1–2 years, Italy 1–10 years; Average – Czechia 2–3 years, Italy 11–15 years; Long – Czechia 6+ years, Italy 16+ years.

2017a). By contrast, Moldovan migration to Italy has a longer tradition and it is represented by a larger and stronger integrated community with a more homogeneous composition (more women-caregivers in domestic assistance and personal services, an overall higher level of education; Drbohlav et al. 2017a). Despite the fact that our sampling method (snowball) was not representative, the selection of the respondents in Czechia and Italy adequately reflects basic migratory features in both countries (see details in Drbohlav et al. 2017a).

6.2. What topics and between whom are exchanged?

Table 2 presents basic results that show what interpersonal communication between migrants and their families and friends/acquaintances looks like. More specifically, it displays the importance of certain individual topics based on the frequency with which these topics are discussed in a comparative perspective (vis-á-vis other topics but not necessarily in real life – see more below), regardless of what sort of communication channel is used (e-mail, phone, short visit, etc.). The proposed topics regard various dimensions of reality, from everyday activities (transport, work, finances, food and eating, life standard), through broader structural and institutional issues (political sphere and public institutions, social and civil norms, legal order, education systems), to topics tied to more "delicate areas" like values, world view, or lifestyle relationships, religion, health, leisure time, environmental issues, volunteer work. (When designing the topics, we were partly inspired by Krzyżowski 2016, although we ultimately changed our list, removing some topics and adding others.)

Several important findings are worth discussing in more detail: Work, food, and eating, health, lifestyle, and life standard are among to the most frequent topics discussed (compared to other themes) between migrants and their families in Moldova; the order of importance for these topics is slightly different in Prague and Turin (Table 2), nevertheless, the differences are small. The same holds true for the communication between migrants and their friends and acquaintances. In contrast, in Prague, the least frequently discussed issues between migrants and their families are those linked with volunteer work, the political sphere and public institutions, legal order, social and civil norms, and religion. Very similar picture is typical of the sample in Turin. In fact, regarding communications between migrants and their friends/acquaintances, the situation is more or less the same in Prague and Turin.

The documentation shows, nevertheless, that there are significant differences between frequencies (measured through means; see details in Table 2).

To summarize, there is a clear and strong relationship between topics discussed, on one hand, between migrants and family members and, on the other hand, between migrants and their friends and acquaintances (see means in Table 2). What is astonishing is that the same features – (a) almost the same 'attractivity and un-attractivity' of topics, and (b) their accordance between frequencies of topics exchanged between migrants and family members and migrants and friends/acquaintances – is valid not only for Prague, but also for the Turin sample (proved by correlation coefficients too).

Nevertheless, the Paired Sample T-test, more specifically, sign (2-tailed) (measuring differences between the means of frequencies), proved that there are some statistically significant differences as to how frequently given topics

Table 2 – Eighteen discussed topics between Moldovan migrants in Czechia (Prague; N = 203) and Italy (Turin; N = 206) and their family members and friends (Means, Paired Sample Test and Variation coefficients of the frequency score of the discussed topics)

Discussed topics	Means		Paired Sample Test; Sig. (2-tailed)	Variation coefficients	
	Family	Friends		Family	Friends
Czechia					
Political sphere and public institutions	1.99	1.92	.526	67.1	70.5
Social and civil norms	2.38	2.23	.064	61.0	63.3
Legal order	2.35	2.18	.052	63.4	65.9
Religion	2.26	1.97	< .001	69.1	70.1
Family relationships	3.68	2.83	< .001	42.9	56.9
Relationships among people	3.42	3.10	.004	45.0	50.5
Relationships between men and women	2.64	2.67	.772	62.1	60.6
Lifestyle	3.88	3.64	.006	35.1	41.0
Health	4.00	3.58	< .001	35.3	41.9
Education systems	3.30	2.93	< .001	49.0	55.7
Transport	3.18	3.08	.233	50.7	54.0
Environmental issues	2.84	2.68	.077	54.2	58.4
Work	4.17	3.80	< .001	30.9	38.5
Life standard	3.74	3.51	.010	37.7	42.9
Leisure time	3.46	3.26	.067	45.1	47.7
Food and eating	4.01	3.31	< .001	33.1	47.4
Finances	3.64	3.04	< .001	41.7	53.7
Volunteer work	1.71	1.73	.778	71.3	70.7
Total	3.15	2.86		46.7	52.8
Italy					
Political sphere and public institutions	2.29	2.34	.608	63.0	66.1
Social and civil norms	2.54	2.41	.157	56.1	61.5
Legal order	2.07	2.06	.911	65.4	67.3
Religion	2.27	1.96	< .001	65.8	71.8
Family relationships	3.49	2.51	< .001	39.0	59.1
Relationships among people	3.20	2.84	.001	43.3	51.0
Relationships between men and women	2.59	2.61	.808	56.6	58.2
Lifestyle	3.48	3.20	.004	40.2	46.3
Health	3.91	3.20	< .001	35.6	50.3
Education systems	2.82	2.68	.193	55.1	59.1
Transport	2.36	2.17	.021	62.5	67.2
Environmental issues	2.83	2.68	.074	54.7	56.2
Work	3.76	3.32	< .001	38.5	48.4
Life standard	3.25	3.05	.039	44.9	50.9
Leisure time	3.19	3.14	.553	45.7	47.4
Food and eating	3.61	3.15	< .001	38.1	47.4
Finances	2.74	2.34	< .001	57.4	63.2
Volunteer work	2.08	2.05	.692	69.9	71.8
Total	2.92	2.65		49.6	56.6

Notes. Question E7. Do you discuss the following topics related to Czech/Italian reality with: (a) your family members who stay in Moldova and (b) your friends and acquaintances who stay in Moldova (be it shared via e-mail, Skype, or during short-term visits)? Please mark the topics with numbers from 1 to 5 where 1 = never, 5 = very often. Insert two numbers in each row (one for family members, one for friends/acquaintances). Grey color – significant difference detected by T-test with Sig. (2-tailed) below 0.001.

Table 3 – Factor loadings for Czechia (Family and Friends)

Czechia	MODEL 1 Component for FAMILY				Extraction FAMILY	MODEL 2 Component for FRIENDS				Extraction FRIENDS
	1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4	
Political sphere			.536		.545			.775		.610
Social and civil norms		.736			.598			.731		.603
Legal order		.713			.526			.654		.508
Religion				.727	.654				.643	.533
Family relationships	.598				.574		.607			.484
Relationships among people			.633		.637		.786			.666
Relationships men-women			.721		.638		.777			.692
Lifestyle	.698				.544				−.507	.644
Health	.773				.639	.601				.576
Education system	.504				.450					.506
Transport		.612			.468	.674				.472
Environmental issues		.512			.369	.583				.465
Work	.693				.597	.626				.469
Life standard	.545				.456	.606				.492
Leisure time					.464					.398
Food and eating	.715				.599	.617				.482
Finances	.587				.502	.687				.614
Volunteer work				.734	.709					.442
% of Variance	33.28	9.53	6.87	5.71	55.39	31.91	8.70	6.74	6.28	53.64

Notes: (a) 4 components in both models had Eigenvalues above 1.0, (b) the table contains only factor loadings that are greater than ± 0.500.

are debated between family, on one side, and friends/acquaintances, on the other, see Table 2. Results tell us that topics related to everyday activities and worries (work, finances, food and eating, health, lifestyle, life standard) are more frequently debated between migrants and family members than between migrants and friends/acquaintances – strong ties are more important than weak ones (Granovetter 1973). The same is valid for topics reflecting relationships (among people and within families) and religion. What is worth pointing out is that all this holds true for both respondent-migrants in Prague and Turin. In contrast, quite 'unpopular' topics elaborating on broader structural and institutional issues, such as the political sphere and public institutions, social and civic norms, and legal order, were debated with the same frequencies (low in comparative perspective) both with family and friends/acquaintances, regardless of the country (see other details in Table 2).

There was another important regularity detected. The most frequently discussed topics are those where variability is lower or the lowest (see variation coefficients in Table 2). Again, it is valid for both the Prague and (with small deviations) Turin

Table 4 – Factor loadings for Italy (Family and Friends)

Italy	MODEL 3 Component for FAMILY					Extraction FAMILY	MODEL 4 Component for FRIENDS				Extraction FRIENDS
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	
Political sphere			.730			.624			.796		.701
Social and civil norms			.773			.711			.778		.724
Legal order			.652			.633			.672		.664
Religion					.554	.591				.724	.605
Family relationships				.748		.605		.549			.573
Relationships among people			.689			.668		.722			.654
Relationships men-women			.550			.566		.777			.681
Lifestyle						.627		.533			.694
Health	.701					.555	.710				.613
Education system		.619				.591		.635			.588
Transport		.720				.628					.375
Environmental issues		.514			.563	.656					.529
Work	.798					.674	.753				.666
Life standard		.546				.598		.628			.605
Leisure time		.607				.570	.521				.477
Food and eating	.749					.623	.785				.678
Finances	.512					.419	.605				.519
Volunteer work					.743	.592				.709	.651
% of Variance	30.58	9.69	7.59	6.94	5.92	60.72	38.15	9.08	7.42	6.40	61.09

Notes: (a) 4 components in both models had Eigenvalues above 1.0, (b) the table contains only factor loadings that are greater than ± 0.500.

research samples. In the same vein, the least debated topics were also those where respondents differ the most.

In the following analysis we discuss how individual topics are grouped together.

6.3. What topics are grouped together and how?

Tables 3 and 4 show us results of the factor analysis, while the factor loadings for the 18 discussed topics and percentage of explained variance for each extracted factor are presented.

On the left side are the discussed topics with family members, and on right side are the topics debated with friends/acquaintances. A cut-off eigenvalue greater than 1 was used in the first four components in both models. The first component in Model 1 (left side of Table 3 – related to communication with family members in Moldova) explained more than 33% of the variance. The highest loadings have the following discussed topics: *Health* (r = 0.773), *Food and eating* (r = 0.715), *Lifestyle,*

and *Work* (r = 0.698 and r = 0.693). The first component in Model 2 (right side of Table 3 – related to discussions with friends and acquaintances in Moldova) explained 31.9% of the variance. The highest loadings have the discussed topics: *Finances* (r = 0.687), *Transport* (r = 0.674), and *Work* (r = 0.626).

Table 4 demonstrates the factor loading for Moldovan migrants in Turin, Italy. A cut-off eigenvalue greater than 1 was used in Model 3 (left part of Table 4 – related to communication with family members in Moldova) for 5 components, and in Model 4 (right side of the Table 4 – related to discussions with friends and acquaintances in Moldova) for 4 components. The first component in Model 3 (left side of Table 4) explains 30.6% of the variance. The factor loadings of the three discussed topics exceeded value 0.700, namely: *Work* (r = 0.798), *Food and eating* (r = 0.749), and *Health* (r = 0.701). The first component in Model 4 (right side of Table 4) explains 38.2% of the variance. Also, three discussed topics exceeded the value of 0.700, namely: *Food and eating* (r = 0.785), *Work* (r = 0.753), and *Health* (r = 0.710).

First, the resulting factor analyses structures resemble each other very much, having one dominating first factor (between 30% and 40%) and the other 3 and 4 each explaining less than 10% of the variance. Second, there are the core communication topics – work, finances, food and eating, and health – significantly saturating the first and most important factor across all four analytical levels. Third, relationship variables (family relationships, relationships among people, and relationships between men and women) create a sort of independent factor cluster whether they are within the second, third, or fourth factor. Fourth, the same concerns of broader structural and institutional issues (political sphere and public institutions, social and civil norms, legal order), which mainly saturate the third factor. Once more, the degree of agreement of all these patterns (2 different recipients and 2 countries) is apparent and surprising.

6.4. What particular variables saturate individual factors? What topics are most frequently communicated and between what parties?

A simplified image with "reduction of content" was preferred here over a precise and detailed, yet fragmented, picture. When trying to search for more generally robust results[4] (across our 4 levels of analysis – 2 different recipients and 2 countries), some features appeared and are worth mentioning[5]: (a) Topics (quite frequently debated) reflecting basic everyday activities and worries are closely tied to transmitters who are university-educated, between 26–35 old with a typical transnational model of life; (b) Topics mirroring broader structural and

---

[4]   … while taking into account all the deficiencies which our surveys suffer from.
[5]   We comment on results where factor scores reached at least 6 or more.

Table 5 – Social remittances from the perspective of Moldovan migrants in Prague and Turin (freely stated and then categorized)

Social remittances (freely stated and then categorized)	Frequency Czechia versus Italy	Czechia rank	Italy rank
Interpersonal relations Good relations among people – both in public and in families, friendship, respect, civilized society	59 versus 39	1	2
1) Czech national cuisine Traditional meals, new recipes, dumplings, pork, cabbage, salads, strudel, duck, desserts – sweets, draught beer *2) Italian national cuisine* Traditional meals, new recipes, pizza, pasta, coffee, Mediterranean diet	56 versus 86	2	1
Education and taking care of children Good educational system, putting emphasis on education, high quality universities, not taking medications – if not necessary	33 versus 24	3	4
Czech/Italian lifestyle Self-fulfilment, making use of one's free time, travelling, do-it-yourself activities, outdoor activities, cultural activities	31 versus 38	4	3
Tidiness Clean environment – in the public and in households, waste separation	19 versus 18	5	5
Total N	428 versus 223		

Notes. Source – own survey. The question was: "Is there something you have learned in Czechia/Italy that you have already adopted in your family in Moldova? Please, shortly specify (it may touch areas like childcare, gender relations, family equipment, cuisine, etc.)." The data in the table enables us to evaluate the picture in an aggregate form. There is no possibility, however, to work with it at an individual level (the open-ended question with answers being variously fragmented).

institutional issues are more often communicated by university-educated males; (c) Topics on relationships were typical of university-educated females between 18–25 years of age who stayed in the country for a short time; (d) The rarely discussed topics of debate revolving around religion and volunteer work were more often raised by respondent-migrants older than 46 years.

So far, the rather overshadowed impact of geographical contexts has been manifested here – especially within the Turin sample of respondents (noticeably deviating from the results of those gained through the Prague sample of Moldovans). Without further research, accurately interpreting these results is impossible (Table 5).

6.5. Is interpersonal communication with "home" important in real life of migrants? Can we prove a relationship between interpersonal communication and social remittances?

We can repeat that "day-to-day interpersonal communication over a distance whatever the mediating technology ... is arguably the most pervasive channel through which migrants' life experience" (Boccagni, Decimo 2013, p. 8), including

intended social remittances, is transferred. In any case, we should now prove that interpersonal communication is really the important channel of transmission. So far, our results have not addressed the concern of the real frequency of communication between Moldovan migrants in Prague and Turin and their family members and peers. Thus, now we will see what the frequency of the realized interpersonal communication is. From such information we may reduce the impact or possible effectiveness of the transmitted information that may lead to establishing genuine social remittances.

In our research sample, 79% of Moldovan respondent-migrants from Prague communicated directly with their family members a few times a week, and 36% of respondent-migrants communicated with the same high frequency with their friends/acquaintances. In Turin, the same figures for Moldovans were 48% and 8%, respectively.[6]

Obviously, we can confirm the paramount importance of this communication channel only in relation to communication with family. Nevertheless, a much higher frequency of the communication was found for Moldovans in Prague compared to those in Turin. An important conclusion here is that interpersonal communication between Moldovan migrants in Turin and their friends/acquaintances is quite infrequent. Therefore, it is difficult to imagine that just this channel could play an important role in the forming of newly created social remittances. Accordingly, the importance of "strong" rather than "weak" ties is chiefly described in this situation.

If interpersonal communication is an important channel for the exchange of social remittances, then one may deduce that getting to know more about the interpersonal communication of migrants and their messages/discussion recipients may shed some light also on social remittances themselves.

All in all, basic everyday economic interests and needs materialized through work, food and eating, health, and features of lifestyle are among the most discussed topics both between respondent-migrants in Prague and Turin and their family members, as well as between respondent-migrants and friends/acquaintances in Moldova. Accordingly, it seems that these interpersonal communication topics have a chance to be more easily transferred into social remittances (in the form of new ideas and values, behavioral patterns, practices, etc.), ultimately impacting Moldova. Indeed, results of our research support, at least to some extent, this conclusion. In one open-ended question of the survey, respondents were to identify whether "there is something they have learned in Czechia/Italy that they have already adopted in their family in Moldova". The results in Table 5 clearly show us that resulting social remittances (5 of the most important ones in Prague

---

[6]   The figures representing frequency – up to four times a month – were as follows: for Prague: 10%, 27%, respectively, and for Turin: 32%, 24%, respectively.

and Turin are presented) are tied to interpersonal relations, Czech/Italian national cuisine, and Czech/Italian lifestyle. These interpersonal relations topics are also rather popular when communicating between migrants (in Prague and Turin) and their recipients (more with family than friends) in Moldova (see Table 2).

As for Granovetter's concept of strong and weak ties (Granovetter 1973; 1983), we proved via our research that interpersonal communication between migrants' family members (strong ties) in comparative terms were slightly more frequent and also slightly less variable (measured via variation coefficient) than communication with friends and acquaintances (weak ties). The differences, however, were not great. On the other hand, when measuring a real effect of the interpersonal communication – how often it does occur in reality – then, the dominance of family (strong ties) over peers (weak ties) increases significantly. We did not penetrate other aspects which would specify the role that strong versus weak ties play concerning discussed topics and realized social remittances.

7. Discussion and conclusions

We found out that interpersonal communication between migrants and their families/peers does exist (indeed, being in the touch with someone in Moldova was one of the requirements for entering our survey) and, in addition, sometimes it may also be influential. We discovered that everyday activities and concerns (such as work, food and eating, health, and lifestyle by extension) are among to the most popular topics of discussion. Using our Moldovan examples, we confirmed that just these communicated topics more or less correspond to realized social remittances which our respondents have already transferred (from both Prague and Turin) and applied back home in Moldova (namely, interpersonal relations, food and eating and various patterns of lifestyle). In absolute terms, however, social remittances as such did not represent an important phenomenon within our research samples (see Table 5) – interpersonal communication-based social remittances make the life of some people more pleasant but do not bring about robust societal changes. In contrast, topics about religion and volunteer work, along with a group of topics related to broader structural and institutional issues – such as the political sphere and public institutions, social and civic norms, and legal order – were much less attractive for transnational communication. This is a negative message signalling that, in terms of the development of poorer migratory countries of origin, these very topics should resonate in order to bring inspirations, novelties and new order while building new democratic, functioning and fair states. Accordingly, these elements rarely appeared in already realized social remittances in our case studies.

The data shows that family members play a slightly more significant role as conversation partners than friends/acquaintances (in comparative perspective

when measuring frequencies of individual topics among themselves). Importantly, those day-to-day activities and concerns create an evident backbone of the conversations, clearly dominating over other debated themes (see results of the factor analysis). This is valid for both the Czech and Italian samples.

Although this statement is simplified, we detected that topic tied to everyday activities and concerns were communicated chiefly by university-educated individuals between the ages of 26–35 with a highly transnational model of behavior. Topics of much less importance reflected: a) broader structural and institutional issues were typical of university-educated males; b) discussions related to relationships were typically linked to university-educated females between 18–25 years old who had a relatively short stay in the country; and c) religion and volunteer work were debated mostly by those older than 46 years old. These are general observations, but there are more specific points tied to the individual countries, mostly concerning Moldovans in Italy. Hence, gender, education, age, length of stay, and relation to the country-of-origin matter here above all. When analyzing how often interpersonal communication occurs in migrants' real life, family as a communication receiver clearly dominates over friends/acquaintances, and strong ties appear much more important that weak ones.

What must be emphasized is that there are significant similarities as to what topics are important versus unimportant (measured via frequencies) among Moldovans in Prague and Turin.

On the other hand, some important differences between the samples from Prague and Turin were discovered. Hence, we proved that the geographical context matters. The context did shape, to some extent, what and how information is communicated and transmitted (see e.g. Table 5). This fact mirrors differences between the two countries and cities in terms of their histories, socioeconomic development, social welfare regimes and values, and materialist versus post-materialist values (Drbohlav et al. 2017b; Inglehart, Welzel 2005). "The interconnections among individuals and places are vastly complex and vibrantly dynamic" – Kwan 2012, p. 966, thereby going far beyond the scope of this manuscript.

It is apparent that interpersonal communication with family members, and with friends and acquaintances, is generally much more frequent in real life for Moldovans in Prague than for their counterparts in Turin. (Additionally, for both migrant groups in Prague and Turin interpersonal communication with family members is much more important than interpersonal communication with friends/acquaintances). Accordingly, one can also deduce that greater potential for transmitting and establishing new communication–based social remittances in Moldova can probably come with (and as a consequence of) debated topics by Moldovans in Prague than those in Turin. Indeed, we have been shown this – see Table 5 (the overall number of the realized social remittances in Czechia versus Italy was, in absolute terms, 428 versus 223, respectively). It also has to do with the

characters of the two different immigrant Moldovan groups that make up the two research samples (their formation was also importantly influenced by their different geographical contexts). Besides other dissimilarities, Moldovan respondents in Czechia spent a much shorter time in their destination country and were much more transnational than Moldovan respondents in Italy. In contrast, Moldovans in Italy represent a group that is more mature, more educated, more integrated into the majority society, and much less transnationalized (see also Table 1). Just this latter group, however, could transfer to Moldova other more influential and prominent social remittances (see Bailey, Drbohlav, Dzúrová 2021).

To summarize, our research indicates that social remittances may follow the topics of interpersonal communication, while they may also gradually fade away over time (as does the overall communication) as migrants mature and integrate into a destination society (see the financial remittances decay hypothesis – e.g., Drbohlav 2015). Nevertheless, selected migrants' characteristics may resist this development.

References

ARAL, S., VAN ALSTYNE, M. (2010): The Diversity-Bandwidth Trade-Off". American Journal of Sociology, forthcoming. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.958158

BAILEY, A., DRBOHLAV, D., DZÚROVÁ, D. (2021): Migrant Remitting as Transnational Practice: Moldovans in Italy and Czechia. SAGE Open. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211016457

BERGER, J. (2014): Word-of-Mouth and Interpersonal Communication: An Organizing Framework and Directions for Future Research. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 24, 4, 586–607. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.05.002

BOCCAGNI, P. (2012): Even a Transnational Social Field Must Have Its Boundaries: Methodological Options, Potentials and Dilemmas for Researching Transnationalism. In: Vargas-Silva, C. (ed.): Handbook of Research Methods in Migration. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, Cheltenham, 295–318. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781005231

BOCCAGNI, P., DECIMO, F. (2013): Mapping Social Remittances. Migration Letters, 10, 1, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.33182/ml.v10i1.106

BRASHEARS, M.E., QUINTANE, E. (2018): The Weakness of Tie Strength. Social Networks 55, 104–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2018.05.010

BURT, R.S. (1992): Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition. Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Mass.). https://doi.org/10.1086/230374

CINGOLANI, P., VIETTI, F. (2019): Social Remittances and Local Development in the Republic of Moldova. A Critical Analysis of Migrants as Agents of Change. Southeast European and Black Sea Studies, 19, 4, 625–641. https://doi.org/10.1080/14683857.2019.1657685

DRBOHLAV, D., ed. (2015): Ukrajinská pracovní migrace v Česku. Migrace – remitence – (rozvoj). Karolinum, Praha.

DRBOHLAV, D., DZÚROVÁ, D. (2021): Social Remittances upon Closer Examination: Moldovan Migrants in Prague, Czechia and Turin, Italy. Problems of Post-Communism, 68, 3, 247–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/10758216.2020.1760723

DRBOHLAV, D., BAILEY, A., ČERMÁK, Z., ČERMÁKOVÁ, D., LOZOVANU, D., MASNÁ, E., PAVELKOVÁ, L., SEIDLOVÁ, M., STOJANOV, R., VALENTA, O., VIETTI, F. (2017a): Diversification Trends in Moldovan International Migration: Evidence from Czechia and Italy. AUC–Geographica, 52, 2, 237–248. https://doi.org/10.14712/23361980.2017.19

DRBOHLAV, D., BAILEY, A., LUPTÁK, M., ČERMÁKOVÁ, D. (2017b): Migrant Values and Social Remittances across the Contemporary Migration-Development Nexus: the Case of Moldovans in Czechia. Geografie, 122, 4, 526–553. https://doi.org/10.37040/geografie2017122040526

FAIST, T. (2000): The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces. Oxford University Press, Oxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198293910.001.0001

GALSTYAN, N., GALSTYAN, M. (2021): Social Remittances during COVID-19: on the "New Normality" Negotiated by Transnational Families. Comparative Migration Studies, 9, 51, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-021-00263-z

GRABOWSKA, I. (2018): Social Remittances, Channels of Diffusion. In: White, A., Grabowska, I. Kaczmarczyk, P., Slany, K. (eds.): The Impact of Migration on Poland. UCL Press, London, 68–89. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv550d7m

GRABOWSKA, I., ENGBERSEN, G. (2016): Social Remittances and the Impact of Temporary Migration on an EU Sending Country: The Case of Poland. Central Eastern European Migration Review, 5, 2, 99–117.

GRABOWSKA, I., GARAPICH, M.P. (2016): Social Remittances and Intra-EU Mobility: Non-Financial Transfers between U.K. and Poland. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 42, 13, 2146–2162. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2016.1170592

GRANOVETTER, M. (1973): The Strength of Weak Ties. American Journal of Sociology, 78, 6, 1360–1380. https://doi.org/10.1086/225469

GRANOVETTER, M. (1983): The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited. Sociological Theory, 1, 201–233. https://doi.org/10.2307/202051

INGLEHART, R., WELZEL, CH. (2005): Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy, The Human Development Sequence. Cambridge University Press, New York. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511790881

ISAAKYAN. I., TRIANDAFYLLIDOU, A. (2017): Sending So Much More than Money: Exploring Social Remittances and Transnational Mobility. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 40, 15, 2787–2805. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2016.1259491

JACK, S.L. (2005): The Role, Use and Activation of Strong and Weak Network Ties: A Qualitative Analysis. Journal of Management Studies, 42, 6, 1233–1259. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00540.x

KELLY, J. (1998): Time and the Global: Against the Homogeneous, Empty Communities in Contemporary Social Theory. Development and Change, 29, 4, 839–871. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7660.00101

KIM, E., KIM, Y.-CH. (2021): Communication Infrastructure, Migration Community Engagement, and Integrative Adaptation of Korean Chinese Migrants in Seoul. Communication Research, 48, 5, 717–739. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218782819

KRZYŽOVSKI, L. (2016): Structuring Social Remittances: Transnational Networks of Polish Migrants. In: Nowicka, M., Šerbedžija, V. (eds.): Migration and Social Remittances in a Global Europe. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 71–93. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-60126-1_4

KWAN, M-P. (2012): The Uncertain Geographic Context Problem. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 102, 5, 958–968. https://doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2012.687349

LACROIX, T., LEVITT, P., VARI-LAVOISIER, I. (2016): Social Remittances and The Changing Transnational Political Landscape. Comparative Migration Studies, 4, 16, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-016-0032-0

LEVITT, P. (1998): Social Remittances: Migration Driven Local-Level Forms of Cultural Diffusion. International Migration Review, 32, 4, 926–948. https://doi.org/10.2307/2547666

LEVITT, P. (2005): Social Remittances – Culture as a Development Tool. Inter American Development Bank.

LEVITT, P., GLICK SCHILLER, N. (2004): Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society. International Migration Review, 38, 3, 1002–1039. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00227.x

LEVITT, P., LAMBA-NIEVES, D. (2010): "It's Not Just About the Economy, Stupid" – Social Remittances Revisited. Migration Information Source. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2011.521361

LEVITT, P., LAMBA-NIEVES, D. (2011): Social Remittances Revisited. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 37, 1, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2011.521361

LEVITT, P., LAMBA-NIEVES, D. (2013): Rethinking Social Remittances and The Migration-Development Nexus from The Perspective of Time. Migration Letters, 10, 1, 11–22. https://doi.org/10.33182/ml.v10i1.107

MISZTAL, B.A. (1999): Informality. Social Theory and Contemporary Practice. Routledge, London. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203003626

NOWICKA, M., ŠERBEDŽIJA, V., eds. (2016): Migration and Social Remittances in a Global Europe. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-60126-1_1

SANDU, D. (2016): Remittances as Home Orientation Rooted in the Lifeworlds of Immigrants. Central and Eastern European Migration Review, 5, 2, 81–98.

SANDU, D. (2010): Modernising Romanian Society through Temporary Work Abroad. In: Black, R., Engbersen, G., Okolski, M., Pantiru, C. (eds.): Continent Moving West? EU Enlargement and Labour Migration from Central and Eastern Europe. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, 271–287. https://doi.org/10.1515/9789048510979-013

SUNLEY, P. (2008): Relational Economic Geography: a Partial Understanding or a New Paradigm? Economic Geography, 84, 1, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-8287.2008.tb00389.x

UNDP (2020): United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 2020 – The Next Frontier: Human Development and the Anthropocene. UNDP, New York. https://doi.org/10.18356/9789210055161

VERTOVEC, S. (2004): Migrant Transnationalism and Modes of Transformation, International Migration Review, 38, 3, 970–1001. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00226.x

WHITE, A., GRABOWSKA, I., KACZMARCZYK, P., SLANY, K. (2018): The Impact of Migration on Poland. UCL Press, London. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv550d7m

WILLIAMS, A.M. (2007): Listen to Me, Learn with Me: International Migration and Knowledge Transfer. British Journal of Industrial Relations, 45, 2, 361–382. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8543.2007.00618.x

ORCID

DUŠAN DRBOHLAV
https://orcid.org/0000–0001-6648–7833

DAGMAR DZÚROVÁ
https://orcid.org/0000–0003-0530–4997