

CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

Department of Civil Society Studies

Natallia Allen

Civic Engagement and the Migration Experience

Master's Thesis

Thesis Supervisor: Dr. Dana Moree

Prague 2016

Statement:

I declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. I wrote it using sources and literature properly cited and listed in the bibliography. I did not use this research to receive another or similar academic title.

I agree that this thesis may be published in the electronic library of FHS UK and can be used as a study text.

In Prague,

Natallia Allen

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the supervisor of this thesis, Dr. Dana Moree, for her support during the research and the writing of this study. I would also like to thank all the respondents for their time and willingness to participate in the research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	1
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	2
CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	5
2.1. Civic engagement.....	5
2.1.1. The role of civic engagement in democratic societies.	5
2.1.2. Definition of civic engagement.	6
2.1.3. Civic versus civil, social, and political engagement (Berger, 2009).....	7
2.1.4. Latent and manifest participation, towards a comprehensive typology of civil and political engagement (Ekman, Amnå, 2012).....	8
2.1.5. Engagement in civil society organizations.....	11
2.1.6. Civic engagement of migrants in the Czech Republic.	12
2.2. Migration experience, identity, and civic engagement.....	14
2.2.1. Factors that influence civic engagement.	14
2.2.2. Motivation.....	15
2.2.3. Identity, personal and social self.....	18
2.2.4. Ethnic and national identity.	21
2.2.5. Migration experience and civic engagement.....	23
2.2.6. Migration experience and identity. Trans-national and migrant identity.....	24
2.2.7. Engagement in migration-related and ethnic organizations.	26
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH.....	31
3.1. Aim of the study and research questions.....	31
3.2. Operationalization of research questions.	31
3.3. Research methods.	32
3.4. Sample.....	32
3.5. Ethics of research.	33
3.6. Research process and data analysis.....	33
CHAPTER 4. DATA ANALYSIS.....	37
4.1. Civic engagement of first-generation migrants.....	37
4.1.1. General perception of civic engagement.	37
4.1.2. Civic engagement before migration experience.....	40
4.1.3. Civic engagement after migration experience.....	43
4.2. Migration experience.	54

4.2.1. Reasons for migration (rupture).....	54
4.2.2. Transition and learning.....	55
4.3. Identity.....	61
4.3.1. Connection to the country of origin (primary ethnic/national/cultural identity).....	62
4.3.2. Connection to other places (bi-cultural/mixed/cosmopolitan identity).....	65
4.3.3. Migrant identity.....	69
4.4. Motivation for civic engagement.....	70
4.4.1. Self-focused motivation.....	71
4.4.2. Other-focused motivation.....	75
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	78
5.1. Motivation for civic engagement and migration experience.....	78
5.2. Identity and civic engagement.....	82
5.3. Conclusions.....	85
LITERATURE.....	88
SUPPLEMENT 1.....	95
SUPPLEMENT 2.....	97

Abstract

This study analyzes the relationship between motivation for civic engagement, migration experience, and identity, in first generation migrants. It draws upon the idea that civic engagement is beneficial for democratic societies in general, and that it can also be a source of great support for migrants in the process of integration into a new environment. So far, very little attention has been paid to the civic engagement of migrants in the Czech Republic, especially from the point of view of migrants themselves. This qualitative study aims towards a better understanding of the connections between migration and civic engagement. Personal histories of civic engagement of active migrants are analyzed, with an emphasis placed on the roles migration experience and ethnic/national identity shifts play in the process of civic engagement.

Abstrakt

Tato práce analyzuje vztahy mezi motivací k občanské angažovanosti, migrační zkušeností a identitou migrantů první generace. Práce vychází z myšlenky, že obecně občanská angažovanost je přínosem pro demokratické společnosti, a přitom současně může být zdrojem velké podpory pro migranty v procesu integrace v novém prostředí. Doposud jen velmi malá pozornost byla věnována občanské angažovanosti migrantů v České republice, a to zejména z pohledu migrantů samotných. Tato kvalitativní studie si klade za cíl lepší pochopení souvislostí mezi migrací a občanskou angažovaností. Osobní příběhy občanské angažovanosti aktivních migrantů jsou analyzovány s důrazem kladeným na význam migrační zkušenosti a změny v etnické/národní identitě v procesu občanské angažovanosti.

Keywords/Klíčová slova

- civic engagement/ občanská angažovanost
- first generation migrants/ migranti první generace
- motivation/ motivace
- ethnic identity/ etnická identita
- migration experience/ migrační zkušenost

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Migration is a very complex phenomenon. If experienced, it can contribute to a profound change in the perception of the world around. In order to make sense of a new environment, a migrant has to learn a great deal about how the new society works, what values it is based on, and how one deals with everyday practical issues. Migration also causes a disruption in personal and social identification, it changes points of reference, and makes people reflect more on "who they are" and "where they are from". The process of identity negotiation can, therefore, become quite important in migration. Migrants use a number of tools to alleviate the difficulties of migration, understand their new environment better, and become a part of their new society. Civic engagement can be looked upon as being one of these tools. By becoming civically engaged, migrants can communicate more with local people, receive valuable information, knowledge, and skills. Civic engagement also has the potential to strengthen the connection of migrants to their new home and boost the feeling of responsibility for the society in which they live.

Civic engagement of migrants has been a focus of a number of studies abroad, but it has not received much attention in scholarly research in the Czech Republic (Černík, 2005; Redlová, 2011). According to academic research, migrants tend to participate less in their new society, especially due to their lower socio-economic status, lack of political and societal opportunities, lower language proficiency, reduced social capital, and so on (Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005). Moreover, migrants tend to engage more often in so-called migrant or ethnic associations (Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005; Gonalons-Pons, 2009; Zani, Barrett, 2012). This type of engagement, however, has caused debate in academic literature, questioning whether engagement in solely 'ethnic organizations' leads to separation of migrants and the creation of 'parallel societies' (Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005). There is not much information on this type of engagement of migrants in the Czech Republic, and to our knowledge, there is no study that systematically deals with this topic.

Overall, the question of civic engagement of migrants in the Czech Republic remains largely unexplored. Little is known about what migrants think about civil society, how they perceive their own civic engagement, what forms and themes of civic engagement they choose, and why? Likewise, not much is known about what motivates and leads migrants to civic engagement, or how their experience with migration affects civic engagement?

This qualitative research paper will attempt to contribute to a better understanding of how migration experience, and the identity shifts connected to it, affect civic engagement of first generation migrants. The main part of the research will aim towards a better understanding of the motivation of migrants to become engaged, and its connection to migration experience and ethnic/national identity. It will attempt to answer the main question: **What roles do migration experience and ethnic/national identity play in civic engagement of first-generation migrants? If any at all?** The argument will be developed based on the following research questions:

RQ1. What is the relationship between the motivation of first-generation migrants for civic engagement and migration experience?

RQ2. In what ways does ethnic/national identity affect civic engagement of first-generation migrants?

The main research method of this study is in-depth, semi-structured interviews conducted with selected respondents who have a history of civic engagement in the Czech Republic. All respondents of the research represent information-rich cases. The data is analyzed using the open coding technique, as well as inductive and deductive categorization.

The findings of the research look closely at civic engagement of migrants and its connection to migration experience and identity negotiation. Drawing upon the idea, that civic and political engagement can be powerful integration tools, an analysis of migrant engagement can contribute to a better understanding of how it can be encouraged and developed, in what forms and why, what role civil society organizations play in the process, and whether they should improve certain aspects of their functioning to create opportunities for migrant involvement.

The thesis is divided into five main parts: introduction, theoretical background, methodology of the research, data analysis, discussion and conclusions. The Theory chapter introduces the main theoretical concepts related to the research. It also lays the groundwork for the data analysis and further conclusions. The theoretical background is roughly divided into two main thematic clusters, one related to civic engagement, and the other to migration experience and identity. In the sub-chapter on civic engagement, the

following concepts are introduced and developed in more detail: civic engagement, its definitions and classifications, and civil society organizations (CSOs). The following sub-chapter introduces factors that influence civic engagement including migration-related factors, the concept of motivation, ethnic, national, and trans-national identity, the notion of migration experience, and engagement in ethnic organizations. The chapter on Methodology explains the aim of the study, the methods selected for the research, the sample, the ethics of the research, and the process of data collection and analysis. The Data analysis chapter presents the findings of the study connected to the main research questions. The final chapter, Discussion and Conclusions, answers the research questions, and presents a summary of the research and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. Civic engagement.

2.1.1. The role of civic engagement in democratic societies.

Civic engagement has received significant attention in scholarly research. A number of studies draw upon the idea that civic engagement strengthens democracy and, therefore, is beneficial and desirable (Putnam, 2000; Odmalm, 2004; Aleksynska, 2007; Ekman, Amnå, 2012). Civic engagement is also believed to be useful for the creation of social capital and the development of civic skills (Putnam, 2000; Odmalm, 2004). Individuals who possess greater social capital can have more elaborate civic skills, they can become engaged in political and civil affairs more, and are believed to have the potential to become active citizens who take part in the democratic processes of their polity. Active citizenship, on the other hand, is necessary for healthier democracies. It provides the necessary input from citizens and can 'cure' certain ailments modern representative democracies face, e.g. lower engagement of citizens in political life, skepticism about political institutions, and low voter turnout (Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005; Ekman, Amnå, 2012).

Since the Czech Republic is still a quite 'young' democracy, the context of civic engagement and civil society in this country is somewhat different from Western democracies. Civil society has been present in the Czech Lands for a very long time, beginning in the 9th century through to the first half of the 20th century, where it became vibrant and fertile during the Czechoslovak Republic (Navrátil, Pospíšil, 2014). This ended, though, with the German occupation and subsequent communist rule. The country became a subject of a non-democratic regime, where citizen initiative and engagement were suppressed. Officially, civil society organizations ceased to exist. There was, however, a dissident movement, which eventually played an important role in overthrowing the regime in 1989. Moreover, some of the influential Czech dissident figures (e.g. Vaclav Havel, Vaclav Benda) played a role in reviving the concept of civil society in general. The ideas of East European dissidents sparked a wave of interest in civil society, which started to be perceived as a remedy for some ailments of liberal democracies. Built on the ideas of the dissidents and the Revolution, civil society started to develop rapidly in Czechoslovakia. The number of CSOs increased dramatically (from 537 in year 1989 to e.g. 21694 in 1993) and citizen engagement flourished (Navrátil, Pospíšil,

2014: 30). During the following years, Czech civil society went through a number of stages in its development, from enjoying massive funding by Western foundations for its development, to increased professionalization, diversification of topics, and support from EU funds. One can say that Czech civil society organizations evolved in general, but that they also became more distant from the public and more embedded in the structures of the state (Navrátil, Pospíšil, 2014; Frič, 2015). These tendencies can have certain effect on the way people get engaged. There are trends in Czech society towards individual engagement in certain topics, e.g. humanitarian issues, versus collective engagement in CSOs, especially in those dealing with advocacy. (Navrátil, Pospíšil, 2014; Centrum občanského vzdělávání, 2015). The individualization of participation is also reinforced by modern technologies, which allow new forms of engagement, e.g. online activism, and the overall professionalization and elitism of CSOs (Frič, 2015). There is also a certain distinction between 'civic' and 'political' in the Czech context, where the latter is still seen as something suspicious and is not very popular with the public. This can be demonstrated by a very low level of trust of people in the political institutions, such as the parliament or political parties on the one hand, and a low level of participation in advocacy CSOs in comparison with the relatively large membership in cultural, sport, and leisure oriented organizations on the other hand (Navrátil, Pospíšil, 2014).

2.1.2. Definition of civic engagement.

The term civic engagement can be quite confusing as it is used differently by researchers, and often encompasses quite a wide range of activities, with often unclear boundaries. There have been a number of attempts to classify and define civic engagement (Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005; Berger, 2009; Ekman, Amnå, 2012). According to Adler and Goggin, (2005) researchers tend to define it based on their interests and the focus of their research. Some authors, for example Putnam (2000), used the term civic engagement for a very wide range of activities from voting, to being a part of a bowling league. However, his contribution to the development of this notion has been quite significant, since his influential books *Making Democracy work* (1993) and *Bowling alone* (2000) have intensified the debate on the matter and sparked a great deal of research. Another author, who have defined civic engagement quite broadly, is Della Caprini, who claimed that it is "*...individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern. Civic engagement can take many forms, from individual voluntarism to*

organizational involvement to electoral participation..." (n.d. in Adler, Goggin, 2005:239). Others, however, define civic engagement much more strictly, based on a certain aspect or type of activity. For instance, civic engagement as community service or civic engagement as political involvement (Adler, Goggin, 2005).

The conceptual vagueness of civic engagement is partially connected with the development of the term *political participation*, which initially was concerned with the voting behavior of citizens and has consequently become broader in its meaning. With the rapidly changing and interconnected modern world, scholars started to look at other, less formal, ways of influencing those in power. The two terms started to overlap quite significantly as time went by. Civic engagement often involves political aspects or even absorbs political participation, especially in its broad definitions. Throughout the thesis the terms 'engagement' and 'participation' will be used interchangeably.

2.1.3. Civic versus civil, social, and political engagement (Berger, 2009).

During the last decade there have been a number of attempts to create a more conceptually clear definition or classification of civic engagement. According to Berger, who is a strong opponent of the all-encompassing definition, civic engagement "*is ready for the dustbin*" and "*like other buzz-words, civic engagement means so many things to so many people that it clarifies almost nothing*" (2009:335). Berger further specifies that the broad definition of civic engagement is lacking coherence, conceptual depth, and is very difficult to operationalize for the purpose of academic research. In reaction to the problems which have developed around the term, Berger proposes his own classification of engagement which divides into *social, moral, political engagement*, and *civil engagement*. *Social engagement* is related to all types of associational engagement, which do not have a political agenda and are in the domain of everyday, civil life. Berger believes, that this type of engagement in particular is beneficial for the creation of social capital, which he also calls 'pre-political'. *Moral engagement* is connected with following a certain moral code, or moral principles. In turn *political engagement* is connected to attention and activity directed at political institutions. In this way Berger draws from a definition by Verba, Scholzman, and Brady, who say that political engagement is an "*activity that is intended to or has the consequences of affecting, either directly or indirectly, government action*" (1995 in Berger, 2009:341). Actions such as voting, contributions to political parties and interest groups, protests, demonstrations, and involvement with groups that attempt to

influence political processes can be examples of political engagement. Berger claims that the term *civic engagement* also has some difficulties when addressing the activities of non-citizens, since the word *civic* is closely related to the notion of citizenship and to being a member of a city. The author, therefore, proposes the term social, or political engagement as being more conceptually clear. Berger also addresses the notion of *engagement* itself claiming that it should be specified whether an individual is both attentive and active while being engaged. The author differentiates among a few meanings of the verb *to engage*. Thus, *to engage in* defines activity without attention, *to engage by* means attention without activity and only *to engage with* means both attention and activity (Berger, 2009:340). Berger emphasizes that it is important to clarify which meaning of engagement a researcher implies while studying civic engagement. Finally, the notion of *civil engagement* according to Berger is a combination of social and moral engagement, realized by public-spirited, cooperative individuals. In conceptualizing civil engagement Berger draws from Tocqueville and his ideas on associational involvement in the USA. According to both authors precisely this type of engagement is important for democracy and its development. Moreover, Berger claims that countries where social and civil engagement, and social capital thrive more than political engagement, are more stable and efficient, with higher levels of people's overall satisfaction with their lives.

Apart from Berger, other authors, such as, Kastoryano also distinguish between *civic activities*, meaning political participation and *civil activities*, which are associated with community engagement in various forms (1998 in Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005:11).

2.1.4. Latent and manifest participation, towards a comprehensive typology of civil and political engagement (Ekman, Amnå, 2012).

According to Ekman and Amnå, one of the most comprehensive classifications of political participation is the one developed by Teorell et al. (2007 in Ekman, Amnå, 2012). Teorell et al. introduced five dimensions of political participation, all of which are concerned with active and manifest participation: electoral participation, consumer participation, party activity, protest activity, and contact activity (2007 in Ekman, Amnå, 2012:287). In relation to this classification, Ekman and Amnå claim that it is missing one very important element: the so-called latent or *pre-political* participation. The authors claim that not all participation has to be active, the mere fact that people are aware of a political situation and take interest in societal and political issues already represent

participation which is, in fact, much more widespread. Reacting to this omission, Ekman and Amnå developed a new typology, which differentiates between latent and manifest political participation on the individual and collective level (2012). The *manifest political participation* on an individual level is related to formal political participation, such as voting in elections or referendums, contacting politicians and civil servants, or running for political office. In the collective domain, political participation is realized through membership in political parties, trade unions, and other groups that have a political agenda, for instance, certain advocacy groups. Apart from formal ways of political participation, the authors also distinguish *extra-parliamentary participation*, which is related to protests, demonstrations, participation in social movements, and other network-based groups. In the individual domain, extra-parliamentary activism can manifest itself in signing petitions, boycotting, distributing political leaflets, etc. Not all forms of extra-parliamentary activism are legal. Sometimes, for instance, there is a very fine line between protests and violent riots. Apart from manifest political participation which is aimed at influencing political decisions, there is also a wide area of engagement in broader societal issues, which in the classification by Ekman and Amnå is referred to as *civil participation*. In its turn it is divided into *involvement* and *civic engagement* (for the full classification see Table 1). The peculiarity of this pre-political or latent category is its broad scope, encompassing anything from reading news to voluntary work in CSOs. Civil participation is, therefore, aimed at a broad array of societal issues, which do not necessarily need to be political in nature, but which address issues outside one's family and close circle of friends. Civil participation in this classification is latent in relation to political participation. This category includes both active participation (*civic engagement*), for instance, volunteering, activity in charities, community-based organization, and *involvement*, which relates to attention to certain societal issues, for instance, a certain life-style, identifying oneself with an ideology, taking interest in politics. The latency is, therefore, only related to the manifest political participation, not to passivity and non-engagement. This division into civil and political participation partially resembles Berger's classification which differentiates political engagement and social engagement. Apart from political and civil participation, the authors also talk about *disengagement*, when people do not take any interest in political and societal issues, and do not participate in any related activities. Passive disengagement is attributed to people who do not perceive politics as important or interesting and are in other words apolitical. Active disengagement, on the other hand, is connected with anti-

political attitudes, when politics is perceived as something negative that has to be fought against. Therefore, the full range of participation or non-participation according to the authors includes *disengagement, civil participation, and political participation*.

Table 1. Latent and manifest political participation (Ekman, Amnå, 2012:292)

Civil participation (latent political participation)		Manifest political participation		
Involvement (attention)	Civic engagement (action)	Formal political participation	Activism (extra-parliamentary participation)	
			Legal	Illegal
<i>Individual forms</i>				
Personal interest in politics and societal issues Attentiveness to political issues	Activities based on personal interest in and attention to politics and societal issues	Electoral participation and contact activities	Extra- parliamentary forms of participation: to make one's voice heard or to make a difference by individual means (e.g. signing petitions, political consumption)	Politically motivated unlawful acts on an individual basis

<i>Collective forms</i>				
A sense of belonging to a group or a collective with a distinct political profile or agenda Life-style related politics (e.g. identity, clothes, music, food, values)	Voluntary work to improve conditions in the local community, for charity, or to help others (outside the own family and circle of friends)	Organized political participation: membership in conventional political parties, trade unions and organizations	Loosely organized forms or network-based political participation: new social movements, demonstrations, strikes, and protests	Illegal and violent activities and protests: demonstrations, riots, squatting buildings, damaging property, confrontations with the police or political opponents

2.1.5. Engagement in civil society organizations.

For the purpose of this thesis, CSOs will represent the organized part of civil society and be an umbrella term for a variety of other terms used in the scholarly literature: 'community-based organizations', 'voluntary organizations', 'charitable organizations', 'non-governmental organizations', 'non-profit organizations'. To be included in the range of CSOs, an organization will have to fit in the structural and operational definition proposed by Salomon and Anheier and have the following features: be an organization, e.g. be institutionalized; be private, e.g. independent from the government; do not distribute generated profits; be self-governing and have a certain degree of voluntary involvement (1998:216).

Ekman and Amnå (2012) differentiate between civil and political participation quite substantially, relating the former to the pre-political domain. There are some cases, however, where the two can still overlap, especially when analyzing activities of CSOs. The overlaps can occur especially among collective forms of civic engagement and formal political participation, since within one CSO there can be activities which fall under both categories, e.g. CSOs that perform both advocacy activities and do charitable work, or

organizations which get involved in lobbying and also strive to promote community-based activities. Therefore, by being an active member of, for instance, a large environmental organization, an individual can be involved in actions aimed at direct influence of political authorities, let's say through lobbying or contacting (formal political participation) and contribute to a local community, for instance, by participating in the revitalization of a local park. The boundary between the various activities of an individual within one organization do not always have to be clear and need to be analyzed more closely in order to determine whether a person is civically or politically engaged, or whether it is rather a combination of both.

2.1.6. Civic engagement of migrants in the Czech Republic.

The number of migrants in the Czech Republic (including EU citizens) is constantly growing and currently constitutes about 4% of the population or 473.516 people (MVČR, 2016). Despite the relatively large number of people in question, there is very little attention paid to the civic and political participation of migrants, both in policy and research (Černík, 2005; Redlová, 2011; Organization for Aid to Refugees, 2015). Some political rights are granted only to migrants from other EU countries, who, overall, enjoy better residence rights based on common EU legal provisions. The concepts of political rights and overall encouragement of participation of migrants in society are present in state policies aimed at the integration of non-EU nationals. These can be found, for instance, in *the Principles of Policy for the Integration of Foreigners within the Territory of the Czech Republic* (Czech Government Resolution No. 689/1999). However, very little has been done in these areas, and it remains more of a proclamation than an actual policy that is being implemented. Political rights of migrants were mentioned again in the *Updated Policy for Integration of Immigrants – Living Together – and Proposal for Further Steps in the Year 2011*, which says that: "*the participation of immigrants in public life, mainly in the form of participation in events in the municipality, should be encouraged. Certain groups of immigrants feel the fact that they cannot be involved in elections to be a problem. The opportunity of involvement of immigrants in elections is to be addressed in connection with the preparation of the election code and ratification of the Council of Europe Convention (No.144) on the Participation of Immigrants in Public Life at a Local Level. The scope of voting rights and connected conditions will then be a subject of discussion in future.*" (2011:19). In the year 2015, the Czech Government ratified the

aforementioned Convention only in its very limited meaning by accepting Chapter A, which deals with freedom of expression, assembly, and association of migrants. The creation of advisory bodies stipulated in Chapter B, and the voting rights on the local level stipulated in Chapter C, were not ratified (Czech Government Resolution No. 20/2015:5,6). The overall discussion on political rights of non-EU nationals in the Czech Republic is still at its beginning. At present, first generation migrants from non-EU countries cannot vote on either the local or the national level, nor can they establish and join political parties. They are, therefore, denied any political rights and remain a largely non-represented group in a representative democracy. The only consultative body that currently deals with the rights of migrants is the Committee for the Rights of Foreigners which is one of the permanent committees of the Government Council for Human Rights. The Committee is, however, very underrepresented by migrants themselves with only 1 member in 2015 (Organization for Aid to Refugees, 2015). There were also attempts in the past to establish Integration Councils in former districts in the Czech Republic, but this initiative ended in 2002 with a new administrative division into regions. At the moment no regions except for the City of Prague has a consultative body dealing with integration of migrants. In cooperation with the Integration Center Prague, the City of Prague developed its own Conception for the Integration of Foreigners. Consultative bodies were created in other municipalities at their own initiative as well, e. g. in Brno and Plzen, but the level of participation of migrants is very low there as well (Ibid.).

Since migrants do not have many options to defend their rights, this role is often taken up by CSOs, which are often considered sort of 'gate-keepers' for migrant participation (Černík, 2005). In this context, it seems that civil society in general is one of the very few arenas available for first generation non-EU migrants to get involved in public life and be civically and even politically active. Migrants can establish civic associations and are not, at least legally, restricted from engagement with any CSO activities. This process, however, is not without its limitations, since there is generally a very low number of migrants involved in some highly professionalized CSOs, and the clients of service-oriented CSOs rarely have a say in the way their projects and activities are created (Szczepaniková, 2009).

The categories of collective civic engagement and manifest political participation mainly within CSOs will be the focus of this thesis due to their relevance to the

engagement of first-generation migrants in the Czech Republic and the poor political opportunity structure, which prevents first-generation migrants from full formal political participation, e.g. through voting and membership in political parties. The results of the research cannot be considered conclusive of the whole scope and range of activities that migrants can be engaged with, as it will not include spontaneous, network-based, or purely individual activities, which, nevertheless, constitute a significant part of one's participation in a society and the global world.

2. 2. Migration experience, identity, and civic engagement.

2.2.1. Factors that influence civic engagement.

Civic engagement, whether in its narrow or broad definition, is a complex phenomenon which is influenced by a variety of factors and is contingent on an individual's resources, interests, education and so on. In scholarly, predominately empirical and quantitative studies on political engagement, researchers often attempt to establish connections among various factors and try to predict which factors facilitate or decrease engagement. The studies of political engagement can be used for the analysis of civic engagement as well, since it is the 'engagement' with public and societal affairs which matters, and the two types of engagement often overlap. The factors which are important while studying political and civic engagement can be roughly divided into demographic factors (e.g. age, gender, marital status, number of children), socioeconomic factors (e.g. education, income, employment, social capital) and individual resources (e.g. time, motivation, interests, psychological factors, skills, recruitment).

All these factors can influence civic engagement in a variety of different ways and ideally they all should be taken into account while studying civic engagement. There are also factors that can be 'group' specific, which means that they can be important for the analysis of civic engagement of a certain group of people, for instance, women, youth, migrants.

When referring to migrants, researchers differentiate additional, group-specific factors, that may have an effect on engagement. These factors include:

- political and societal opportunity structure, e.g. in relation to the legal status of a migrant, his/her citizenship, and the general perception of participation in a country

(Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005; Gonalons-Pons, 2009; Sinha, Greenspan, Handy, 2011). Some general aspects of opportunity structure for civic engagement can also be analyzed in the context of migration. Legal frameworks can undoubtedly prevent migrants from using certain forms of participation, e.g. voting. On the other hand, the overall perception of the immigration topic and civic engagement of migrants in society can have a crucial effect on the way civic engagement of migrants is encouraged or discouraged, as well as on existing opportunities for civic engagement (Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005);

- ethnic capital, the density of ethnic associations, and interactions within communities (Fennema, Tillie, 2001; Gonalons-Pons, 2009);
- factors related to individual's assimilation, e.g. length of residence in the host country (Aleksynska, 2007; Gonalons-Pons, 2009; Sinha, Greenspan, Handy, 2011);
- language proficiency (Jacobs, Phalet, Swyngedouw, 2004; Gonalons-Pons, 2009);
- activities in the country of origin (Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005; Gonalons-Pons, 2009);
- participatory culture in the country of origin (Aleksynska, 2007) and others.

Education is considered to be a very important factor which determines engagement, since better educated people generally tend to engage in societal affairs more (Uslaner, Conley, 2003; Gonalons-Pons, 2009).

This study will look at certain personal factors that affect civic engagement and can be influenced by the migration experience, *such as motivation and psychological factors, in particular, related to identification.*

2.2.2. Motivation.

Motivation to become engaged is one of the personal factors that can be quite important for the analysis of civic engagement. Generally speaking, motivation is related to the underlying processes that lead a person to take up and proceed with an activity (Clary et al., 1998). In connection with civic engagement, motivation has been a subject of academic research connected mostly with volunteering (Clary et al., 1998; Omoto, Snyder, Hackett, 2010; Lu, Schuett, 2014) and political participation (Verba, Schlozman, Brady, [1995] 2002). Both strains of research can be applied to the study of civic engagement,

since they deal with related processes and concentrate on engagement of people in pro-social activities (Kosic, 2007).

A number of theoretical approaches to motivation have been developed over time, dealing with different aspects of this complex process. Verba, Schlozman and Brady ([1995] 2002) in their extensive research dedicated to volunteer political participation highlighted three main factors that influence participation: *resources, motivation and networks of recruitment*. In their study of motivation the authors drew upon the *rational actor theories*, which mostly deal with the question of why actors become involved in collective action (in this case political participation), when they can stay inactive, and benefit from involvement of others instead. In this line of thought, people are seen as motivated in particular by their (economic) self-interest (Kosic, 2007). Verba, Schlozman and Bradey claim that the rational actor theory, while being valid in some other disciplines (for instance, while explaining economic behavior), fails in the case of participation, since it cannot explain why so many people still get engaged, even if it is seemingly 'irrational' from their side. According to the authors, the explanation can be found in the idea of *selective benefits*, which are only available for those who get engaged, not the 'free-riders' (Verba, Schlozman, Bradey, [1995] 2002). The benefits can be divided into a few categories:

- *selective material gratifications*, which refer to better opportunities connected to jobs and careers, solving some personal or family problem;
- *selective social gratifications*, which are connected with social relations, enjoyment of doing something together with other people, developing a sense of appreciation by other people etc.;
- *selective civic gratifications*, which relate to the sense of performing one's civic duty, or contribute to the well-being of the society (Verba, Schlozman, Bradey, [1995] 2002: 102,109). The last two types of selective benefits are connected with the activity itself and are more immediate, while material benefits can develop over time.

The explanation of collective engagement based only on cost/benefit relationship and rational actor models, do not, however, provide a whole picture of motivation for civic engagement, some other factors should be taken into account as well. For instance, the

psychological approach concentrates more on "...*personality variables, motives and values as determinants of civic participation.*" (Kosic, 2007:5). In other words, civic engagement can be influenced not only by rational thinking, but also by the individual psychological characteristics of different people. In relation to motives, for instance, Maslow's theory of *hierarchy of needs* is relevant. According to this theory, people's needs can be divided into five levels, where the first four are called *deficiency needs* and the last level is called *growth needs*. Once the latter is satisfied people tend to pay more attention to the former. The deficiency needs relate to psychological needs and the need for safety. The growth needs are associated with *social acceptance, self-value, and self-realization* (Kosic, 2007).

In the field of social psychology, other approaches to motivation were introduced as well. For instance the *functional approach to motivation*, developed by Clary et al. (1998), can also be used to study motivation for civic engagement. This approach was developed especially for the research of motivation for voluntary engagement, which is explained through a range of functions that people try to achieve. The authors draw largely from functionalism theories in psychology, which "...*emphasize the adaptive and purposeful strivings of individuals toward personal and social goals.*" (Cantor, 1994, Snyder, 1993 in Clary et al, 1998:1517). Clary et al. applied functionalism theories to voluntary actions and differentiated among six main functions volunteerism can serve: *values, understanding, social, career, protective and enhancement* (1998:1517-1518). The *Values* function relates to opportunity for the volunteer to express his/her altruistic concerns for the well-being of others. The *Understanding* function refers to the possibility for those who get engaged and volunteer to use knowledge and skills that they would not be able to use otherwise. This function also relates to self-development and learning possibilities. The *Social* function relates to the possibility of being with other significant people, doing something together with them, or getting engaged in an activity which is viewed favorably by friends, family, etc. The *Career* function serves mainly for enhancing one's career progress through achieving career relevant skills. The *Protective* function is related to the study of ego, where volunteering and engagement serve to protect the ego from itself, for example, through helping to deal with some personal problems or reducing a feeling of guilt. The *Enhancement* function is related to a person's self-development, enhanced self-esteem and personal growth. The *functional approach to motivation*, thus, provides a base for an analysis of a wide range of motivations, which are often interrelated and can occur

simultaneously. The authors also claim that the approach can have interesting insights for opportunity structure for volunteering, since the matching of volunteering opportunities to the underlining psychological motivations of people can lead to a more satisfying volunteering experience. Thus, if motivations match the activities performed, the volunteer is more prone to continue his/her engagement over time (Clary et al, 1998). These conclusions can be quite relevant for the work of CSOs as well, since they involve a large number of volunteers. A more targeted offer, which takes into account psychological motivations and functions of volunteering for various people, can potentially lead to a more active and long-term engagement.

The six types of functions can also be roughly grouped into two categories, which, Omoto, Snyder, Hackett call *self-focused* and *other-focused* motivations (2010:1713). Where *values* in particular fall under the *other-focused category*, or what Verba, Schlozman, and Bradey ([1995] 2002) also call *community-interest* motivation. At the same time *understanding, social, career, protective and enhancement* fall largely under the self-focused category of motivations.

In general, motivation is a very complex notion to study. When asked, people can rarely analyze how their motivations come into play. Moreover, the information given is based on retrospective reconstruction and there is a possibility people would provide plausible answers, which might not be accurate. In their research of motivation for political participation, Verba, Schlozman, Bradey ([1995] 2002) noticed that people tended to emphasize community-interest motivations over self-focused ones, since it is more socially accepted. On the other hand, it is possible to claim that, under certain conditions, respondents' interpretations of motivation can provide a very useful scientific insight.

2.2.3. Identity, personal and social self.

Human identity has been the subject of academic research across a variety of disciplines, such as psychology, social psychology, sociology, anthropology and others. In a very general sense, it is possible to say that the notion of identity is useful when we try to determine who we are, who others are, who others think we are, and so on (Jenkins, 2008). It is possible to distinguish between personal and social identity, where the former refers to values, attitudes, cognitive styles, personal traits, etc. (Timotijevic, 2000; Salett, [1994] 2003). Social identity, on the other hand, is related to collective membership and social

relations (Either, 1994; Worchel et al., 1998). Already by the end of the 19th century the distinction between the 'I' and the 'me' was made by a scholar William James, which signified the "*duality of self-representation*" (Worchel et al., 1998:2). Later on, Mead, developed the idea further, suggesting that there is a social and a personal component to the self (1934 in Worchel et al., 1998). This distinction has been and still is crucial to the conceptual development of identity.

Personal identity is not very easy to define. It can generally be attributed to specific characteristics of an individual, which make him/her unique and differentiate him/her from other individuals. This differentiation from others is of particular importance, since this is how a person can tell he/she has a personal identity (Worchel et al., 1998). It is also questionable whether this personal identity is always stable and unchangeable. A number of scholars believe that personal identity is *fluid*, and people can "*actualize, mobilize or produce identities according to the context*" (Worchel et al., 1998:3). The personal component of identity can also be considered as being socially embedded. According to the concept of psychosocial identity, personal identities are not absolutely self-contained, but are rather created in relation to the society one lives in, its norms, values, traditions, roles, etc. (Salett, [1994] 2003). Moreover, the identity of oneself is not given, it is self-created. This notion is strongly related to predominantly Western societies and the value of individualism, which puts great emphasis on the *self*, an individual's self-reliance, self-interest, personal choices and overall self-centeredness (Ibid.). The value of individualism, does not necessarily apply to all societies, though. And not everywhere in the world is one's identity seen as being so closely related to one's personal choices and self-reliance. For instance, Roland differentiates between two types of self - an *individualized self* and a *familial self* - where the former is "*...an experiential 'I-self' ...a relatively stable and integrated inner unity regardless of inner conflicts, with a sharp separation of inner images of self and other*" and the latter refers to "*...an experiential 'we-self', with self-experience varying from one relationship to another, and much closer emotional connections between inner images of self and other.*" (in Salett, [1994] 2003:9). Therefore, there are variations in how personal identity can be created and perceived. Since it is society/culture that seem to be crucial for the development of one's identity, it is necessary to define these terms. It is not an easy endeavor, though, since both words (sometimes even used interchangeably) have a multitude of various definitions. Very generally, *culture* can

be compared to a kind of "*social fabric*" (Cosner and Larsen, 1980 in Salett, [1994] 2003:21). In other words, it encompasses a wide range of elements that people come in contact with and then interpret in a given locality, including social and political systems, values, moral principles, language, traditions, etc. *Society* can be very generally defined as "*organized human interactions, such as social structure, organizations and institutions*" (Samovar et. al., 2013:9). It can also define autonomous groups of people in a certain geographic location, and society can consist of multiple cultures (Samovar et. al., 2013).

Social identity, on the other hand, is related to our social interactions and group-identifications. In its turn, social identity is also only possible with regards to the groups and categories one does not belong to. There are two very important notions in the conceptual development of social identity and the theories related to it: *similarity* and *difference*. One identifies him/her self with a group or a category based on similarity to other members of this group, while, at the same time, the difference from other groups is emphasized in this context (Worchel et al., 1998; Jenkins, 2008). Moreover, it is widely noted in academic literature, that the more one identifies with a certain group, the more salient the difference of other groups will seem (Ethier, Deaux, 1994; Worchel et al., 1998). These developments are often claimed to be the basis for inter-group discrimination and the idea that one group is better than the other (also in relation to ethnic, national, religious groups, etc.). The interrelation of similarity and difference in relation to identity is somewhat problematic and has been a source of academic debate for a while. It seems that in order to develop a personal identity, an individual has to see his/her self as *different* from other people, while in order to develop a social identity one has to see his/her self as *similar* to the group. Some scholars believe, that these are two opposite spectrums of identity, which are hard to combine, in the sense that it is hard to be different and similar at the same time (Worchel et al., 1998). Others believe, that these two processes can interplay (Jenkins, 2008). The interrelation of personal and social identities is quite complex, they often influence each other, and gain or lose prominence depending on different situations.

Another important notion for the understanding of social identity is *categorization*. This notion is quite important for the explanation of how people perceive the world around them, since we tend to group things and notions together, based on their similarities to and differences from other things and notions. Therefore, we create categories. In other words categorization is "*...a psychological process that simplifies the perception of physical and*

social worlds and the way the individual organizes the subjective perception of his or her environment" (Worchel et al., 1998:4). This cognitive process of categorization also applies to human beings, the same way it applies to things. In this way, social categories are created, such as nationality, religion, profession etc., which become an integral part of one's idea of a self and provide a basis for understanding the world.

Apart from a cognitive element, social identities also have a motivational aspect. People tend to identify with a particular group in order to boost their self-esteem and form a better idea of one-self. A person *"tries to preserve or reach a positive self-image, and if she cannot evaluate herself according to the interpersonal behavior pole - which lies in evaluating oneself directly by comparing oneself to the others - she can satisfy her desire for positive self-evaluation through social competition between groups (which must be considered as a groups comparison) with this tendency to introduce a positive difference in favor of one's own group in relation with other groups"* (Worchel et al., 1998:6). In light of this dichotomy between interpersonal and intergroup relations one can say, that the importance of positive self-esteem has an influence over which identity, personal or social, is more prominent. It is possible to say, that once social identity becomes stronger, the personal identity becomes weaker, and vice versa. Moreover, once the importance of identifying with a group becomes stronger, a person identifies more and more with the in-group and its features, while the difference of other groups also becomes more prominent (Worchel et al., 1998). Social identities, similarly to personal ones, are also unstable and changeable, they are being created, negotiated and different layers of social identity become salient depending on a situation (Jenkins, 2008; Eriksen, 2010; Bradatan, Popan, Melton, 2010).

2.2.4. Ethnic and national identity.

Ethnic identity is often considered one of the basic social identities that people have. Ethnicity, however, is another highly debatable notion. There has been a long tradition of studying ethnicity in anthropology, social anthropology, sociology and other disciplines (Jenkins, 2008; Eriksen, 2010). There is no clear definition of what it is, as different schools of thought define it differently. In very general terms, ethnicity *"refers to aspects of relationships between groups which consider themselves, and are regarded by others, as being culturally distinctive"* (Eriksen, 2010:5). In other words, the ethnic distinction only comes in play in relationship between groups, it cannot exist in isolation. It is in these

social relations that ethnicity is created through differentiation from others. According to Barth, an ethnic group refers to a population that is: "1. largely biologically self-perpetuating, 2. shares fundamental cultural values, realized in overt unity in cultural forms, 3. makes up a field of communication and interaction, 4. has a membership which identifies itself, and is identified by others, as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order." ([1969] 1998:10,11). There are basically two quite distinctive views on ethnicity. From the so-called 'primordialist' perspective ethnicity is ascribed and it classifies "a person in terms of his basic, most general identity, presumptively determined by his origin and background" (Barth, 1969a in Eriksen, 2010:63). An 'instrumentalist' view on the other hand does not support the ascribed nature of ethnicity, but sees it as a more flexible construct. For instance, Cohen believes that "ethnic identities develop in response to functional organizational requirements. He defines ethnicity simply as a particular form of informal political organization where cultural boundaries are invoked so that the group's resources or 'symbolic capital' can be secured" (Eriksen, 2010:63). If one assumes, that ethnicity is dynamic and changeable, it can be said that ethnicity is also largely a belief system, in the way that there are no clear criteria for ethnic differentiation, not even language, geographical location or cultural differences, since people claiming to be of different ethnicities often share geographical area or even cultural traits (Brubaker, 2004 in Jenkins, 2008; Eriksen, 2010). Ethnicity is, therefore, also a *fluid* category, with unclear boundaries which need to be constantly redefined.

Ethnic and national identities are not the same, but they can overlap considerably in certain cases. *National identity* is related to identification with a particular nation-state, its territory, values, symbols, etc., and it is a relatively recent and modern concept. There can be multiple ethnicities living in one nation-state. In fact, this is, perhaps, the most spread state of affairs in the world nowadays. It is very rare that a nation-state accommodates only one particular ethnicity (Eriksen, 2010). According to Salazar, national sentiment is based on: *territory, shared culture, historical memory of genealogical communality and the existence of a nation-state* (in Worchel et.al, 1998:116). There are two types of nationalism that are commonly differentiated - ethnic and civic nationalism (Eriksen, 2010). The distinction is connected with the way the nation is constructed. In the case of ethnic nationalism, it is the common descent and birth right that play a crucial role. In the case of

civic nationalism, people are united behind the idea of a shared culture, myths, history, values (Worchel et al., 1998). In the recent decades the theory of nationalism has come through a variety of developments, especially influenced by globalization, modern technology, changes in political and economic organization of the world. The world and the nation-states that it is commonly divided into, have become increasingly interconnected and the boundaries between different cultures and societies are often quite blurred. The dominance of nation-states and nationalism has been questioned by the existence of supra-national and trans-national organizations, including political entities (e.g. European Union). Moreover, intensified migration around the world has led to a greater number of people moving around, sometimes changing their residence in a number of nation-states in their life-span and, thus, questioning the idea of loyalty and belonging to one exclusive nation-state.

2.2.5. Migration experience and civic engagement.

Migration itself is a very complex process that affects lives of people in a number of ways. In its essence migration means both physical and mental relocation of a person. In the process of migration a person may encounter a whole range of challenges attributed to his/her psychological state, identifications (both personal and social), well-being (both psychological and material), belief system, etc. Due to migration people experience a substantial *change* in their reference system, related to e.g. culture, society, language, political arrangement, personal networks, identity. It is not that migration is only connected with physical movement and relocation, but with psychological shifts as well. It is bound to happen at least to a certain degree regardless of whether a person will choose to adapt and assimilate in a new environment or not. According to Sonn and Lewis, *"the experience of dislocation that follow immigration can be profound; identities and many taken-for-granted sources of meaning and support are disrupted. The process of identity construction is challenging and continuous"* (2009:120 in Horner, 2012:19).

The complexity of the migration process can be described and somewhat structured using the notions developed by Arnold van Gennep ([1981]1998) in relation to human rituals of passage. In this sense migration can be seen *"as a passage from 'one life to another'"* (Seweryn, 2007:23). According to Gennep, during a passage people experience three stages: *pre-liminal (separation), liminal (transition) and post-liminal (re-incorporation)* (Seweryn, 2007). In the first stage the separation from social and personal

relations and networks, familiar social and cultural structures is happening. A person physically moves to a new environment and enters the second, liminal, stage. These stages are very similar to what another researcher, Greco Morasso (2012), calls *rupture* and *transition*, where individuals are taken out of their familiar context and need to adopt to a new environment in the process of *learning*. The stage of transition is very important and can develop in a number of different ways. Sometimes migrants can come through the transition quickly and successfully, sometimes it is a painful and long-lasting process, which can, in extreme cases, lead to personal disintegration and total disorientation. The transition stage of migration experience is closely connected to learning and adapting. Often, the whole belief system of a person is broken, and he/she needs to find a new way to refer to the environment around. In the process of learning, migrants need to acquire a number of new skills, develop cultural and social knowledge, social capital, etc. In the final, post-liminal stage, migrants finally start to find their place in the new society, they become an integral part of it. Their identity changes, they start to orient themselves well in society and aggregate enough knowledge and skills to function well.

Civic engagement, which in its essence often leads to developments of social capital and a range of various skills such as civic skills, communication and interpersonal skills, rhetorical and language skills, can be quite beneficial for migrants, especially in the transition stage. Civic engagement in an array of different issues, can develop necessary knowledge about various aspects of social and cultural life. The collective forms of civic engagement can also lead to the development of social capital and indispensable social relations with other people, which can decrease the alienation and marginalization of migrants (Putnam, 1993, 2000; Omoto, 2010). Since migration is a complex process, that affects various layers of human life, it is safe to assume that it has some effect on civic engagement of migrants as well.

2.2.6. Migration experience and identity. Trans-national and migrant identity.

The transition stage of migration experience is also crucial for one's identification. Since *transition* and *learning* are a part of the migration process, identity change can be particularly viable and acute at this time. As was mentioned before, during this stage migrants make sense of the new environment and its socio-cultural patterns. Their psychological state, relationships, social interactions, group memberships, social roles, are all affected by the change that migration brings with it. Due to the unknown and unstable

reference system, the identity itself becomes even more fluid and transitional. In order to adapt to the new environment, migrants need to be very open in their social and even personal identifications. As a result of the transition period and the absorption of new concepts, social, and cultural patterns, a person can develop ambiguous and complex identifications. This process can be connected with the notions of *assimilation* and *accommodation*. Where the former basically means absorption of new patterns into identity and the latter adjustment of identity in order to accommodate the new elements (Timotijevic, 2000). As a result of these processes identity can shift into being binary or mixed. This change in identity can result in "... a broadening understanding 'of human conditions and cultural differences and a view of things that are larger than any one cultural perspective'" (Seweryn, 2007:28). Moreover, according to a post-structuralist view, identities are also discourse-contingent (Horner, 2012). Therefore, identity is not only situational, it is also constructed by prevailing social and political discourse. In the process of rupture and transition that accompanies migration, individuals also encounter different 'discursive terrain', which affect how their identification is constructed and negotiated (Ibid.).

International migration has also brought a development of an arguably new *transnational identity* with it, which refers to the loyalty and engagement of migrants in two or more nation-states. This development is based on the idea that some migrants live in 'transnational communities', which, according to Portes, are made of "...dense networks across political borders created by immigrants in their quest for economic advancement and social recognition. Through these networks, an increasing number of people are able to live dual lives. Participants are often bilingual, move easily between different cultures, frequently maintain homes in two countries, and pursue economic, political and cultural interests that require their presence in both." (1997:812 in Vertovec, 2001:574). By being present in both nation-states (sometimes even more than two) people become influenced by the cultural and social contexts of both places, therefore, their identities are also negotiated between two different reference points. A person can be located somewhere at the boundary of both cultures, shifting freely from one to another. People who develop transnational identities can belong to both places simultaneously, they are able to switch between two cultures and feel equally linked to both. It has been observed, however, that, as any other social identity, transnational identity is not stable and might change over time,

for instance, the longer a person lives in a new country, the more they can become disconnected from the country of origin (Bradatan, Popan, Melton, 2010).

Another interesting identity change that happens due to migration experience is the development of a new *migrant identity*, which is not so widely discussed in academic literature. Migrant identity encompasses other identifications and relates to a new status of a person, when he/she is considered to be different from the rest of the society, precisely due to migration as a factor. It is, therefore, a very complex and changeable identification. According to Horner (2012), there are two wide-spread narratives positioning migrants. One of the narratives refers to migrants as being the Other, or "*...a mere absent co-presence, an 'Othered' body without a future*" (Horner, 2012:17). From the second point of view, the idea of migration is in a way romanticized. Migration brings hope and opportunities with it, it "*...unleashes the supposedly raw potential of immigrant bodies and identities*" (Ibid.).

It is also important to add that a person's identity is multi-layered and that ethnic identity is only one part of a person's multiple identity composition. It is not *always* at play in social situations, it does not always matter, and cannot be considered an ultimate definition of who somebody is. In other words, in certain situations and in certain contexts, other social identities are at play and the ethnic one might not even be of much relevance. People, especially those who live in societies with multiple ethnicities side by side, can also act according to different ethnic identities in different social contexts (Eriksen, 2010). There is also a wide range of other identifications that can affect people's behavior, e.g. gender, professional identification, social class, family-related identifications, etc. It is all the complexity of human identity and interests that also affect civic engagement. The identification with a certain ethnicity, or, in fact, with any group, can have a certain affect on human behavior, but it is hardly *determining* it (Jenkins, 2008). If ethnic, national or migrant identity do have an effect on civic engagement, so can other factors and identities.

2.2.7. Engagement in migration-related and ethnic organizations.

Ethnic identity can become important and intensified in the new environment (Ethier, Deaux, 1994; Seweryn, 2007). Especially, in the situation where people at once become an *ethnic minority*. It is a very peculiar situation for migrants, who, in the process of transition

due to migration, begin to identify themselves not with a *majority population*¹, but with a minority categorized along ethnic and cultural lines. The identification with an ethnic minority can lead to new experiences, e.g. discrimination, racism, inability to use one's native language etc. Racial or ethnicity-based discrimination also differentiates migrants from the rest of the society (Odmalm, 2004). All these changes and shifts in identification can, among other things, affect the process of civic engagement of migrants. While some of these collective identities are intensified, it can result in sharing a common interest and be an impetus for engagement along ethnic lines, or along migration-related issues. The 'need' to organize can be caused by the perception of being different from the population of the host society or even from other migrants and/or by the desire to preserve a certain culture, way of life, language, traditions, etc. On the other hand, the motivation to form CSOs and other less organized, mutually beneficial structures can stem from 'functionalism', or the need to substitute non-existent and poorly functioning structures that deal with leisure activities, health and social system, education of migrants, etc. (Moya, 2005).

If one considers the 'instrumentalist' perspective on ethnic identity as well as its functional aspect, the migration process can, among other things, trigger the creation of ethnic associations in the receiving societies. The engagement of migrants in so-called *migrant* or *ethnic organizations* has been a source of academic debate, since it poses many questions that do not have straight-forward answers. At some point, the development of ethnic associations was highly supported, for instance, in Sweden, the Netherlands, and Norway (Odmalm, 2004; Atsuko, 2006; Strömlad, Adman, 2010). They were seen as a necessary pre-condition for better integration of migrants. With time, however, the functioning of purely 'ethnic' organizations posed a number of debatable issues. Can participation in ethnic organizations be considered participation in the host society? Does development of ethnic organizations lead to creation of 'parallel societies' and separation? Does the participation in ethnic organizations lead to greater participation in mainstream organizations? Overall scholars tend to include migrant engagement in ethnic organizations while studying participation in the host society, since it represents a very substantial part of

¹ Most migrants, but not all, do not belong to ethnic minorities in their home countries, they represent the dominant majority.

² Cultural identity is often defined in very similar terms to ethnic identity, but it can also be viewed as "*the emotional significance that we attach to our sense of belonging or affiliation with the large culture*" (Ting-Toomey and Chung, 2005 in Samovar et al., 2013:206) It can, therefore, mean attachment to a culture in its

migrant activism (Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005). For instance, Schiffauer suggests that ethnic organizations cannot be considered mere 'transplants' of organizations in the country of origin, but they develop in reaction to the environment of the host country, therefore, they are an integral part of the host society (1999, 2004 in Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005). So it is more of a debate as to whether ethnic organizations are positive developments or not from the point of view of the receiving society. Many authors believe that ethnic organizations facilitate segregation and prevent integration of migrants, by creating the so-called 'parallel societies' (Esser, 1986,1988 in Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005; Cyrus, 2005 in Atsuko, 2006). On the other hand, there is a vast amount of literature connecting participation in ethnic organization to political mobilization and political participation (Wong, 2006). Another important question relates to the definition of an ethnic organization. There is a lot of conceptual ambiguity in this term, especially in relation to civil society as a whole (Moya, 2005; Strömblad, Adman, 2010). What can be considered as a migrant or ethnic organization? Who can be members and creators of such an organization, only migrants or other actors as well, e.g. citizens with migrant background, citizens of the host country? Should all those involved be of one ethnicity? Just the mere limitation of the notion in terms of singular ethnicity seems to suggest segregation and exclusivity, rather than democratic openness which is attributed to most CSOs. From the point of view of social anthropology, there can be different degrees of ethnic incorporation. For instance, Handelman distinguishes between ethnic category, ethnic network, ethnic association and ethnic community (1977 in Eriskin, 2010:49). According to the author, ethnic association is the third degree of ethnic linkage and it is constructed when "*members of an ethnic category feel that they have shared interests, and develop an organizational apparatus to express them*" (Handelman, 1977 in Eriskin, 2010:50). These associations should then serve *only* the members of a certain ethnic category. The term migrant organization is often used in relation to any CSO that deals with cultural, ethnic, migration, and integration issues which is established and/or is run largely by migrants. In reality, such clear-cut 'ethnic' or 'migrant' organizations might exist, but the majority of CSOs in the field of migration deal with a variety of issues. It does not seem fair to limit the functioning of migrant-oriented or specific culture/ethnicity-oriented CSOs to working with an exclusive group of people with a clear-cut ethnic or migrant identity. It is often that ethnic organizations attend to the various needs and interests of their members and clients.

It will be assumed that the activities of CSOs do not exclusively deal with culture only, but address various layers of human identity, be it gender, occupation, family status, and so on.

For the purpose of this thesis, the term *migration-related CSOs* will be used, where the organizations will be categorized based on the thematic profiles of their activities, rather than on a category of ethnicity. The migration-related CSOs will, therefore, include all organizations that:

- seek to promote culture, traditions, arts of a certain ethnicity/area/country, but do not exclusively work inside a certain group of people of common ethnicity;
- support migrants in their migration experience through e.g. information and counseling services, organization of community events, educational activities;
- deal with the issues of discrimination based on race, ethnicity, nationality or migrant status;
- advocate for better conditions of migrants and deal with broader issues connected with race, migration or integration of foreigners.

In the context of the Czech Republic, the question of ethnic organizations is largely understudied. There are organizations that have been established by migrants, but there are no clear statistics or concrete data on their functioning. According to the Organization for Aid to Refugees report (2015), most migrant organizations work largely on a voluntary basis. They try to work not only with migrants but with local people as well, who sometimes become members or volunteers. As to activities, migrant organizations usually receive funding for projects related to migration issues, such as employment, health, etc., or cultural topics. (Organization for Aid to Refugees, 2015). The report also mentions the two largest communities of migrants in the Czech Republic: the Ukrainian and the Vietnamese. There are about 15 organizations within the Ukrainian community, which mostly deal with cultural events, educational and humanitarian activities, and consulting. The activities of the Vietnamese CSOs are mainly concerned with the commercial sphere, culture, and cooperation between Vietnam and the Czech Republic. In contrast with the Ukrainian CSOs, a lot of Czech citizens are also involved in the Vietnamese organizations.

Despite the fact that the data about migrant organizations is very scarce, their development is supported in policy documents, e.g. the latest *Updated Policy for the Integration of Foreign Nationals for the Year 2015* mentions funding of activities initiated

by migrants or supporting 'organizations of foreigners' as one of the measures aimed at developing a connection between migrants and the local population (Czech Government Resolution No. 20/2015:17). The definition of migrant or ethnic organization, however, remains quite unclear in the Czech context.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

3.1. Aim of the study and research questions.

The main part of the research will aim towards a better understanding of the motivation of migrants to become civically engaged, its connection to migration experience, and a possible shift in the perception of one's ethnic/national identity. The research will attempt to answer the main question: What roles do migration experience and ethnic/national identity play in the civic engagement of first-generation migrants? If any at all? The argument will be developed based on the following research questions:

RQ1. What is the relationship between the motivation of first-generation migrants for civic engagement and migration experience?

RQ2. In what way does ethnic/national identity affect civic engagement of first-generation migrants?

3.2. Operationalization of research questions.

For the operationalization of the research question: **RQ1. What is the relationship between the motivation of first-generation migrants for civic engagement and migration experience?** the theoretical background connected to civic engagement, motivation and migration experience is used. In terms of civic engagement, we will partially draw upon Berger (2009), especially in regards to *engagement which is done with attention and activity*, and the classification developed by Ekman and Amnå (2012), in particular *civic engagement* (for instance, volunteering, activity in charities, community-based organization), some instances of *manifest political participation* within CSOs, and informal initiatives will be studied. For the analysis of motivation, the functional approach developed by Clary et al. (1998) will be used, which groups motivation into several categories: *values, understanding, social, career, protective, and enhancement*. Migration experience will be studied as a process of relocation, which is connected to *rupture, transition and learning* (Greco Morasso, 2012). For the operationalization of the research question: **RQ2. In what ways does ethnic/national identity affect civic engagement of first-generation migrants?** the theoretical background related to identity, in particular, social, ethnic, and national identity within the context of migration will be used. The research will focus on the following dimensions of identity: *ethnic identity* (as a

membership in a culturally-distinctive collective category); *national identity* (as a membership in culturally-distinctive collective category related to a nation-state); possible *transnational identity* (as a membership in two or more culturally-distinctive collective categories), *migrant identity* and *mixed identity* (as a combination of several ethnic/national/cultural identities).

3.3. Research methods.

Qualitative design aimed at understanding the relations between phenomena was chosen for this research. The aim of this thesis is to establish possible relationships and connections between migration experience, civic engagement, and ethnic/national identity. The qualitative methods, e.g. interviews, are particularly helpful when the relations between different notions are not well-known (Jensen, 2008). The qualitative method will make it possible to acquire first-hand, detailed information from the respondents, including their perception and interpretations of the researched phenomena.

A semi-structured in-depth interview will be used as the main qualitative method. This method is very flexible and particularly useful for the study of personal interpretations. Interviews allow a researcher to ask a broad range of questions in order to gain a lot of data. Interviews are also quite useful when we cannot observe the behavior of the respondents, or when it is necessary to research events that happened in the past (Merriam, 2009). The semi-structured form of interviews will be used based on a range of questions. The questions are not strictly given, but rather suggest topics for the interview, or present an *interview guide* (Bernard, 2011). During the interview based on semi-structured questions, the interviewer is able to flexibly react to the flow of the interview and ask additional, clarifying questions. This way the phenomena being researched can be explored more in-depth (Švaříček, Šedřová, 2007; Merriam, 2009).

The interview guide can be found in *Supplement 1*.

3.4. Sample.

The target group of this research paper are first generation adult migrants (non-EU citizens), who are actively engaged with the activities of CSOs and informal initiatives. First-generation migrants can be defined as those who came to the Czech Republic in their late teens or at a later age (Jensen, 2008). The sample was narrowed down, based on the

purposeful sampling approach, which advocates the choice of "*information-rich cases*" (Patton, 1990:169). The criteria were established in order to reach migrants that had been living in the country for at least some time and had a *history of active engagement*, thus, following the logic of *intensity sampling* (Patton, 1990). Since the focus of this study are personal factors that might have an effect on civic engagement, such as motivation and identification, the respondents were not be selected based on their nationality and country of origin. The aim of the research was to target as broad a sample as possible, in terms of nationality, age, gender, etc.

To be selected for the interview, the respondents must fit in the following criteria:

- be over 18 years old;
- currently hold citizenship of a non-EU country;
- live in the Czech Republic for at least 3 years;
- be actively engaged in CSOs activities and informal initiatives (as members of CSOs, volunteers, community leaders, employees, civic activists).

3.5. Ethics of research.

All the data collected during the interviews is handled anonymously. The respondents were given relevant information about the research and its purpose beforehand. The interviews were recorded and later anonymously transcribed with the previous consent of the respondents. The consent was recorded at the beginning of each interview. Respondents were also given the option of reviewing the transcription, which a few of them did. However, no changes were done to the original transcriptions.

3.6. Research process and data analysis.

The research took place between October-November 2015 in Prague. The potential respondents were selected using personal contacts, the snowball effect (Patton, 1990) and a small online questionnaire in English and Czech (for the English version of the questionnaire see *Supplement 2*), which did not prove effective in finding respondents. A *total of 10 respondents were interviewed*, of which 9 were addressed through personal contacts, and 1 through the snowball effect. The interviews were held in English, Czech and Russian, based on the preference of the person interviewed, and the language capacity

of the interviewer. The choice of language was given to respondents in order to secure a maximum comfort-zone, where respondents could discuss the questions freely, without experiencing a language-barrier. The possibility to conduct interviews in languages chosen by respondents may contribute to an overall increase in the validity of the research and reliability of the data. As a result of the research, 4 interviews were conducted in the English language, 4 in the Russian language and 2 in the Czech language. The interviews lasted from 30 (1 interview) to 90 (1 interview) minutes. The average time of the interviews was approximately 60 minutes. The following data partially describes the composition of the research sample:

- country of origin: Belarus, Mexico, Moldova, Russia, Canada, Egypt, Ukraine;
- age: 25-40;
- gender: 9 - female; 1 - male;
- level of education: 9 respondents had higher education at either undergraduate or graduate level; 1 respondent was currently enrolled in a BA program; 3 respondents were currently enrolled in PhD programs;
- length of residence in the CR: 5-10 years;
- age when moving to the CR: 18-30.

All respondents proved to be active people engaged in multiple organizations and informal initiatives. For some, the engagement started in the country of origin, for others it was connected with moving to the Czech Republic. All respondents represented information-rich cases of personal civic engagement, they were either employees, volunteers, founders of CSOs or civic activists.

Despite the relatively broad socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents, the sample of the research cannot be considered representative, mainly because of the limited number of respondents and impossibility to cover all variety and socio-demographic richness of the migrant population. According to Flick (2013), this does not mean, however, that the findings of the research cannot be generalized. Moreover, the author claims that it is not always necessary to generalize and claim external validity of the research. Alternatively, based on the concept of *transferability*, developed by Guba one can claim, that it is enough if the findings can be transferred from one context to another, given they are similar enough: "...the concept analogous to generalizability (or external

validity) is transferability, which is itself dependent upon the degree of similarity (fittingness) between two contexts. The naturalist does not attempt to form generalizations that will hold in all times and in all places, but to form working hypotheses that may be transferred from one context to another depending upon the degree of 'fit' between the contexts" (1981: 81 in Flick, 2013:52).

After the interviews were conducted and recorded, a transcription was made for each interview. Since the data in the interviews is used anonymously, each respondent was labelled by a number from 1 to 10. The 10 texts were analyzed, using the open coding technique, which consists of "*naming segments of data with a label that simultaneously categorizes, summarizes and accounts for each piece of data*" (Charmaz, 2006:43 in Flick, 2013:156). This technique helps to approach the data in a critical and analytical way. During the data analysis, *both induction and deduction* were used to construct categories. In most cases the categories were devised based on the logic of induction, especially in the beginning of the analysis, when we look openly at the data and go from the particular to the general (Merriam, 2009). At the later stages, the elements of deductive thinking were employed as well, when we look for data which would correspond to developed categories, therefore, testing the general on the particular (Ibid). In the case of the analysis of the motivation of the respondents, the open coding analysis was followed mostly by deductive category construction based on the theoretical approach to motivation developed by Clary et al. (1998). The motivation of the respondents to become engaged was explained from the point of view of the functional approach to motivation. There can be certain risks in 'borrowing' categories and using concepts that have already been developed (Merriam, 2009). The risks are mostly connected with an inability to introduce new categories found in the data. However, in the process of the data analysis of the motivation of the respondents the functions developed by Clary et al. (1998) proved to be consistent with the data found during open coding. The initial cross-correlation of the codes produced very similar results to the functions developed by the authors. The following categorization of the data was then primarily done deductively. Most codes were incorporated in the categories/functions utilized in the analysis and no significant data remained unaccounted for.

Since the respondents were promised complete anonymity, some data in the interviews has been redacted, e.g. country of residence, nationality, native language, names

of CSOs the respondents were engaged with. All the translations of the interviews were made by the author of the study. In the cases of the interviews conducted in English (Interview 2, 4, 5, 8) the quotations are used in their original transcription, retaining all the grammatical and stylistic forms.

CHAPTER 4. DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter will introduce the results of the data analysis on the topic of motivation for civic engagement of first generation migrants, it's possible connections to migration experience, and identity transformation. The analysis is based on the data from the 10 interviews, which took place in autumn of 2015. Using the open coding technique, a list of codes was created, the codes were later grouped into sub-categories. The sub-categories became the building blocks of the categories which constitute the main topics of the research: civic engagement, migration experience, motivation, and identity. The connections and relationships among four major categories will be discussed in the following chapter.

4.1. Civic engagement of first-generation migrants.

4.1.1. *General perception of civic engagement.*

Before we start analyzing the relationships between the motivation for civic engagement of first generation migrants, their migration experience, and identity, it is important to understand how the respondents perceive civic engagement, what main attributes it has, where it happens, and why it is important for the people in question. The variety of perceptions and definitions is quite diverse, as is the concept itself, and the people interviewed. Nevertheless, there are a lot of connections and similarities in the way the interviewees think about civic engagement.

Place of civic engagement

When talking about civic engagement, the respondents stipulate that it can happen in a variety of different 'places', such as a city, a neighbourhood, work, university, local community, and CSOs. It can also happen at the local, national, supranational and global level. Among all the places mentioned, a more generalized term named *society* seems to play a crucial role: "*A citizen is a person who one way or another belongs to some city, country ... Activity is a well-known concept, which means we are not indifferent, or we have at least some interest ... and we are taking some steps. Adding the two of them together, I suppose it means taking part in the life of some society ...*" (Interview 7). The society is not necessarily bound to a nation-state, it can be also very local or on the contrary, global.

Attributes of civic engagement

When talking about civic engagement, the respondents mention certain core characteristics or attributes connected to it. These attributes show what civic engagement means for the respondents and what its most important manifestations are. The following list represents the most frequent characteristics mentioned by the respondents: *activity, expressing opinion, communication (with others, the government, media, etc.), awareness-raising, taking part in something, being informed, being a part of something, a reaction to social developments*. Among all of these, two attributes stand out most by being somewhat overarching notions that include other characteristics: *activity and communication*.

Activity is mentioned by all respondents in relation to civic engagement, often it is the first thing that comes up in the interviews: *"Well, for me it is a very general term. And I have not thought about it much. But maybe it's basically any kind of activity that goes beyond one's home and family. Basically, it is where there is some communication, some activities with citizens."* (Interview 1). Even if civic engagement in general is viewed quite broadly by the respondents, the fact that it should involve some kind of action is present in most interviews. The respondents state that activity can also be quite varied and can happen in different 'places', similarly to civic engagement. Sometimes the respondents refer to activity in general, sometimes more specifically, as in 'actively searching for information' (Interview 4). Often activity is also related to the notion of taking part in something: *"I think, first thing which come to my mind is civic engagement it is like active citizenship. It is like being active and taking part in the community you are living in."* (Interview 2).

Communication seems to accompany activity, it also happens on different levels and involves different actors. It is often through communication and discussion that civic engagement takes place and more importantly achieves its goals. Communication is also connected to awareness-raising, when civically engaged people discuss and promote certain issues: *"I think, first of all, it is reflected in any communication, some dialogue with people around you, who are in the same society with you, or with some kind of governing structures, or the media."* (Interview 9).

Importance of civic engagement

Many of the respondents see civic engagement as a valuable concept. There are a number of reasons for it, such as the idea that through civic engagement people can 'help' society to develop and improve. It can also be a very powerful tool to affect change and influence the society one lives in. One of the respondents also believes that the ability to affect change can also be of particular importance to migrants: "*...when you are engaged you have the power to change and improve the city you are living in. So it is not, especially when you're a migrant, it is not that you are. You come somewhere and you have some rules and you have to follow them, but you can also take part of what is decided to be or how things look like. So, you can change it or you can improve it or you can transform it in the way you want it to be in the future.*" (Interview 2).

Civic engagement seems to be a personal choice that people make, a subjective, conscious decision to take action and affect change. One respondent even refers to civic engagement as a 'lifestyle' where activity, participation, and initiative are very important: "*For example, it is also my approach to life: if you want to make something happen, you just do it yourself because you want this to happen, and do not expect that someone else will do it instead of you, and in this, because of this, in my opinion, it is very important that if you want to achieve some change, or change something, it's just up to you, and civic engagement is the way to achieve this.*" (Interview 3).

Civic engagement is also seen as being crucial for a democratic polity. Without it, society's development will be slowed down, e.g. one of the respondents refers to it as being 'stagnant' (Interview 5). The respondents also reflect on the danger of the oppression of civil society by governments, which can lead to authoritarian regimes suppressing personal rights and freedoms. One of the respondents goes as far as putting civic engagement as a top priority of any democratic government and society: "*(...) it is something that should be in any state that is able to do something... I do not know... which has some level ... which is on the right path, right? Because if there is no civic activity at all, then I do not know what's next. That is it, it is like the death of democracy, of the state and the people in this state. And that is why for me right now, it is something very, very important. The fact, that it should be a part of every person's life.*" (Interview 6). The same respondent also views civil society as a substitute for the state in solving a number of social issues. The

respondent calls civil society a 'rescue wheel' that is built on citizens self-reliance and mutual help.

Despite the seemingly important role civil society and civic engagement play in the existence and development of any polity, some respondents do not think that civic engagement is somehow a pre-requisite to membership in a society. Also, not all people can be civically engaged: *"I think it's important, but it is impossible. That 100%, the entire population is active. After working for so many years in non-profit sector, it seems to me, that it's just not for everyone. Because, civic participation, or pro-active position in life in general, hmm, it's just that people, a lot of people do not need it, and it is necessary to have the courage to accept that."* (Interview 10). The respondent also believes that CSOs tend to impose their values on other people and that they idealistically believe that civic engagement should be a part of everybody's life, while it is ultimately up to people to decide whether they want to become engaged or not. Other respondents also mention that civic engagement is not for everyone, and that it largely depends on people's interests and priorities (Interview 7, Interview 4). Also, civic engagement cannot be a solution to everything, some respondents are very aware of its limitations: *"if you care about the world, you have to, you have to do something about it, as much as you can, without beating yourself too much about not help... not fixing it (laughter)."* (Interview 8).

4.1.2. Civic engagement before migration experience.

When analyzing civic engagement of first generation migrants, it is very important to look back at their past, their experiences before the migration happened. Since all of them came to the Czech Republic at an older age (18 and over), it can be assumed that all respondents have been influenced, at least to a certain degree, by the 'participation culture' in the country of origin (Aleksynska, 2007). Other factors that can affect civic engagement can play a role as well, e.g. education, gender, interests, age, and so on. The effect of 'participation culture' in citizen civic engagement is not the focus of this study and would require a separate investigation. Nevertheless, the awareness about civic engagement, and experience with it, vary considerably among respondents. Their past experiences often seem to have a direct effect on their present perception of civic engagement and should not be excluded from this study entirely.

Awareness about civic engagement before migration

Taken individually, the respondents demonstrate quite a wide range of civic participation in their home countries. There seem to be two main factors that respondents mention as having an effect on their previous engagement: *age* and what can be called *participation culture* in the country. Often both factors are perceived as being connected and crucial in regards to the non-existent civic engagement.

It can be noted that the respondents who come from countries that are not democratic or countries that have just recently embarked on the journey of democratic transformation tend to show a much lower degree of participation, including overall awareness about civic engagement, and CSOs in particular. It seems that CSOs were just *not present* in their lives and their environment. The respondents who took part in this research mostly come from countries that have very short democratic histories, if any at all, along with an underdeveloped civil society (often due to oppression from the political regime). In fact, 6 out of 10 respondents claim that they had not been familiar with the concept of CSOs before they moved to the Czech Republic or had had a very unclear notion about what they were: *"No, I did not know about that ... the town was small, tiny, I would say. And I think that there were no organizations like this there. And as to the politics, the politics of the state, I did not really understand it back then, it was more ... it's ... just ... it was not even on my mind."* (Interview 7); *"(...) I have never in my life participated in elections, back then I did not show the slightest interest in public affairs, even less on the local level, to me, I did not see any special meaning in this. (...) No. I did not know, there was no such thing for me as 'non-governmental organizations', I had never heard of anything like this."* (Interview 9). Moreover, in some cases, they believed that CSOs were also *associated with suspicious activities*, which should not be trusted. People working in CSOs were believed to practice money-laundering or similar non-transparent activities: *"I would say I did not know, more so than that I knew. I mean, I knew that, let's say, there were shelters for dogs, for example, but it has never been my topic, so ... As to everything else ... also, in general, the social aspect, let's say, is not very promoted in X. [country], so nobody knows about it, and all these, it is believed that those are crooks who get the money out of you, that is why you are being very cautious."* (Interview 10).

The relatively *young age* is another important factor. A few respondents moved to the Czech Republic when they were quite young (18-19 years old). Some of them had no experience with civic engagement or CSOs, and stress the low level of knowledge and awareness about the society they had come from: "...it was a big unknown for me in X. [country]...(...) I have not seen any activities. I am thinking where I could have seen them, because I have left at a quite young age..." (Interview 1); "...it started when I arrived, moved to the Czech Republic, because in X. [country] it somehow was not possible, or I was still really young at that time and I did not understand a lot of things ..." (Interview 3).

Other respondents were not very clear about this issue, and only 1 respondent had had a very clear knowledge of CSOs and civic engagement before moving to the Czech Republic.

On the other hand, there are also respondents from non-democratic countries who were civically engaged. Therefore, the 'participation culture' of the country cannot be considered the only factor influencing civic engagement. However, it might be quite important when considering the different forms that civic engagement takes. The respondents' previous activity also stemmed from *different access points to civic engagement*, such as family, schools or universities, or just an internal need to become engaged: " I think it was back in X.[country] And ... And I remembered being, I don't know how old I was, probably. I have to check it, but I think I was around maybe, before 10 (...) So I was, I was everywhere. I was like very young, but I was very active ..." (Interview 2).

Forms and topics of civic engagement before migration experience

The previous civic engagement of the respondents was mainly quite *informal and not organized*, due to the lack of knowledge about CSOs, or just through a personal interest in grassroots activities and informal activism. In fact, none of the respondents mention involvement in any CSO in their countries of origin. The most widespread activities were connected to journalism, documentary film-making, charity work connected to school or university, organizing leisure activities for disadvantaged groups, and grassroots activism. Most activities were voluntary, since the respondents were not employed in any CSOs and were civically engaged in their free time.

The *topics* of civic engagement vary quite considerably, which reflects respondents' personal interests and also opportunities that they came across in their home countries. A lot of respondents were engaged in activities related to children and orphans, they e.g. collected toys, clothes for the children or prepared some leisure activities for them: *"I acted in a theatre play for children. And we went to orphanages, to prisons for juveniles, that have committed a crime. To hospitals."* (Interview 1).

Other respondents were more attuned to activism, including informal political participation. Their civic engagement was connected to a wide range of topics from ecology, culture, urban and community development, human right issues to anti-war activism.

The majority of respondents *were not engaged in any activities connected directly to migration or integration issues*, it was clearly an issue that was not relevant to their previous lives and interests. Only one respondent was involved in areas that can be connected to migration, such as the situation of minority groups, discrimination, racism, social inequality: *"in X.[country] the society is very divided. We have very strong classes, and that implies that there are different opportunities according to where you were born, to which class you are part of, and not only opportunities about education, in everything, but also in the way the others treat you and there is a lot of discrimination within the same X-s,[nationality] you know it's not like there is discrimination to other groups, but within the same... so that was an issue that to me was very interesting from the beginning (...)"* (Interview 4).

4.1.3. Civic engagement after migration experience.

Most of the respondents came across CSOs and civic engagement *only after they came to the Czech Republic*. Everybody's story is very unique, there are a number of motives and other factors involved in their decision to become civically engaged. Given the extent of their current personal engagement, it was a considerable change in the lives of most respondents. In order to better understand what led the respondents to become civically engaged, it is also important to look at how they found out about the existence of civil society, what interests and opportunities they followed up on, and what obstacles they faced on the way.

Access points to civic engagement

Information about civic engagement and CSOs can come from different sources, be it education, public space, family, social circles, and so on. In order for people to even consider the possibility of civic engagement, it is obviously necessary to be familiar with the concept, at least to a certain degree. Sometimes, though, civic engagement can happen without necessarily naming it as such. It is quite clear from the respondents' testimonies that some of them had never even heard about civic engagement before moving to the Czech Republic. Nevertheless, retrospectively, they attribute some of their activities to what they now perceive civic engagement to be. There is wide variation in the way the respondents found access to civic engagement after moving to the Czech Republic. For some of them it happened quite quickly and naturally, as a continuation of activities and interests they had had before. For others, though, the process was much longer and it took years until they came across CSOs and started to be active in society. It seems that the following access points were utilized by the respondents: *active search for CSOs and contacting them directly, being approached by a CSO or a friend, and education.*

In most cases, the respondents *actively searched for different CSOs or other opportunities to become engaged* for a variety of different reasons, be it further education, curiosity, the acquisition of professional skills, or just doing something meaningful with their free time. Often the urge to become engaged was connected with loneliness and the loss of social capital associated with migration. The respondents found out about CSOs and their activities by actively seeking out this information on the Internet, by studying university notice boards or different ads: *"I do not remember exactly, but I have a feeling that it was through some university notice boards.(...) And I did not know what to do with the time, so I was looking all the time for opportunities to get engaged, something, and via notice boards I was looking for some information, such as invitations, or information, or opportunities, offers to get engaged and actually I was not looking for particular organizations, or, but I was looking for more opportunities to spend my free time."* (Interview 3).

Education played an important role in the access to CSOs as well. Since some of the respondents were studying in the Czech Republic at some point in their lives, they found out about civic engagement or about different opportunities to volunteer with a CSO

through their studies. Sometimes, it was the content of the education itself that provided the respondents with at least a basic knowledge of civic engagement: *"For the first time, perhaps, it was in school when, not about the Czech Republic, I learned, I learned about the existence of NGOs to begin with... At the university, the X [the name of the university]., there was a subject in English, and it was connected to non-governmental organizations, there I first heard the abbreviation, and this abbreviation NGO has become much more clear to me."* (Interview 7). It is also often through educational events that the respondents actually got ahold of CSOs or became interested in the topic: *"I remember, I was... once in the Internet I found, there was this seminar about integration of migrants in the Czech Republic, or a conference. And at that time I was already starting to understand a little bit of Czech so I said ok I will go. And I went, and then there for the first time I saw all these organisations working with migrants in the Czech Republic, to me it was a surprise because I was like really shocked (...)"* (Interview 4). In the case of this respondent the actual access to CSOs was triggered by interest in the migration topic, which became quite important for the respondent in the attempt to make sense of their new experience.

In other cases the respondents were *approached either by people from their social circles, or by a CSO directly*. In these cases, one can say that they were 'activated'. Invitations from other people, or ads from CSOs triggered their interests and motivation to become civically engaged: *"(...) And I had some crazy newsletter (...) And in one of the letters there was something like ... something that there will be a group of immigrant women, come to talk about your experiences (...). So I decided that I would try for the last time, and then I'll leave at peace. And this is how I got in touch with X. [the name of CSO] in general, so that's how it was."* (Interview 6). In this case the respondent was approached by a migration-related CSO because she was their target group. In this particular instance, the attempt of the CSO to reach out for migrants corresponded with the need of the respondent to become a part of something, to meet new people, and utilize her potential, which was suppressed due to migration. The migration experience, therefore, had a direct connection to the respondent's motivation to become civically engaged.

Regardless of how the respondents learned about civic engagement and CSOs, and later got ahold of them, the actual *entry point* into civic engagement for all of them was *volunteering*. All respondents volunteered informally or in CSOs at the beginning of their engagement, and they continued to do so at the time of the interview. In some cases the

volunteering experience later led to employment in CSOs, either temporary or permanent. Some of the respondents also mention that once they got in contact with CSOs, they experienced a *snowball effect*, when, by attending different events and networking, they learned more and more about civil society and became more and more engaged. Moreover, a lot of respondents initially found out about the existence of migration-related CSOs and became engaged with them, which led to the development of social capital and networking in this field. One can argue, that the newly developed interest of the respondents in migration issues triggered by migration itself, led to increased civic engagement as well. For some respondents, the initial volunteering and participation in various events meant a life-changing experience, that influenced their attitudes, values, professional affiliations, and even life-style: *"I do not remember how, and it was organized through these, through Erasmus+ and I went there representing X. [the name of CSO] and at that moment, in its essence it was, youth work, what we are doing right now, civic engagement, non-formal education, after that there was no return point. It was a point of no return. After that I could not come back to my normal activities."* (Interview 10).

Forms and topics of civic engagement after migration experience

Since all respondents represent information-rich cases of civic engagement, we can find an abundance of various topics they engage with, doing so in different positions within CSOs or informal initiatives. Generally speaking, a considerable amount of the civic engagement of the respondents has been performed on a voluntary basis. However, for a lot of respondents engagement in CSOs later became connected with their *employment*. It is quite questionable to consider all employment in CSOs to be civic engagement, especially in the context of motivation. Sometimes, however, it is hard to separate activity which is done purely for matters of employment, and activity that is done voluntarily and fits better into the category of civic engagement. In most of the cases connected to the respondents, the two overlap considerably. For the purpose of this study, certain respondents employment will be considered as part of their civic engagement. Especially if it fits into the following criteria: the work takes place in CSOs, the respondents partially perform their work duties on a voluntary basis, they are directly involved in the conceptual creation of various projects and activities of the organization/s. Some of the respondents established CSOs during their history of civic engagement, thus, becoming directors and also employees, which will also be considered as a manifestation of civic engagement. The

analysis of forms and topics of civic engagement also stems primarily from the way the respondents perceive their own civic engagement. If they consider their job to be such, then, in our opinion, it can be included in the spectrum of civic engagement.

Voluntary activities of the respondents take various forms, among them we can find:

- *organizing various events, educational/awareness-raising/leisure activities (all respondents)*
- interpreting and translating
- coordinating other volunteers
- taking part in demonstrations
- presenting activities of CSOs
- accompanying study visit groups
- searching for information
- organizing campaigns
- organizing fund-raisers
- documentary film-making
- administrative work
- working with mass-media, and other.

Within the most widespread forms, we can find some activities that are closely related to political participation rather than civic engagement. Political engagement is present in the lives of some respondents, but *only in its informal manifestation*. Since some respondents mention these forms in the context of civic engagement, they can be viewed as instances of civic engagement overlapping with political activism.

The most widespread *topics of voluntary activities* are the following:

- *migration and integration of foreigners*
- development on the local level/ community development
- bringing people from different cultures together
- culture
- working with children
- youth work
- human rights

- art/arts and crafts
- development of volunteering
- development and transformation in other countries
- working with seniors
- refugees and asylum seekers
- social inclusion
- non-formal education
- discrimination
- parenting
- music
- literature
- equal opportunities of men and women
- urban development
- psychology
- photography
- health care
- geo-politics
- Roma minority
- global education, and other.

9 out of 10 respondents *were employed* at a CSO or were acting as an establishing director at the moment of the interview. The positions varied considerably and most respondents were employed either part-time or in temporary positions, one respondent was on a parental leave. It can be argued that all respondents were performing employment that can be considered to be a part of their civic engagement, at least to a certain extent. The respondents worked in the following position/s: project manager/coordinator, intercultural worker, director of CSO.

The respondents were *working* with the following *topics*:

- migration and integration of foreigners
- non-formal education
- advocacy
- human rights

- development of volunteering
- youth work, and other.

If we look at *ethnic organizations*, in the sense of working with a specific group of people of the same ethnicity or nationality, then *none of the respondents* were engaged with an organization of this type. Regardless of their migration experience, the respondents did not actively seek out organizations that would involve their countrymen. Some respondents simply had no knowledge about existence of such organizations in the Czech Republic and had no particular urge to seek them out: *"You know, I don't know them, I don't go to any kind of X.[nationality] events, or anything like this."* (Interview 8); *"That's awkward, I do not really know (laughs). I know it exists, and somehow is connected to X.[country], but I would not say anything about specific projects or some project results. (...) I have never actively sought this out, nor did it come to me, so I simply see it as, I have not had any inner need, I also have not come across a situation where someone would need me to be engaged in it (laughs)."* (Interview 1). One respondent showed some interest in finding out more about ethnic organizations after they were mentioned in the interview, but had no previous knowledge of their existence. Other respondents knew about ethnic organizations, but did not become engaged with them.

Some respondents, on the other hand, show quite negative attitudes towards ethnic organizations, seeing them as 'limiting', 'segregating', or they just simply disagree with the activities of these organizations: *"But just the fact that it only deals with X.[country], I do not like this in the first place, because it is very limiting for you. So I never wanted that... (...) I was at one event, it was an international concert and I realized that this is again segregation of a X.[language]- speaking community. I do not see a need to travel to another country and be with the same people, just in a different country."* (Interview 10). The respondents are not particularly inclined to become engaged with issues related to their countries and ethnicities. This tendency can be connected with the mixed identities of the respondents on the one hand, and a somewhat critical approach to CSOs activities on the other hand.

Nevertheless, some respondents *were engaged with or even established so-called 'migrant' organizations*. They perceive these organizations to be more open when compared to ethnic organizations. They often use English or another widely-spoken

language to make their activities accessible to as many people as possible. In this way these organizations are much closer to being migration-related, rather than ethnic organizations. This means that the respondents associate more closely with the topic of migration in general than with their ethnicity per se. 9 out of 10 respondents *were engaged with migration-related organizations* at some point in their civic engagement history, and 3 respondents established such an organization: "(...) *so I decided to create, me and my friends, we created this organisation, a civil organisation, to organise activities that would put together people from X.[region] and the Czech Republic, and give them the possibility to create new stuff. It was more related to the culture and art because at that time I was still more working with that (...)*" (Interview 4); "*We position ourselves as a migrant youth organization, while we have never officially written that anywhere. So, if you think about it, then we are open to everybody. We are not only open to migrants.*" (Interview 10).

Transnational civic engagement does not generally seem to be of a particular importance for most respondents. Some of them do not mention any kind of transnational engagement. They simply have no time to be engaged in their country of origin due to their very limited presence there. Additionally, these respondents have no interest in what is going on in their home countries anymore, sometimes due to the rupture that occurred because of their relocation to another country. The loss of connection in some cases is also related to a negative image of the country of origin in the new environment, which intensified the rupture even more. However, that is not the case with all the respondents. Some of them feel very strongly about their home countries, they follow political and social events and try to respond by using tools available, e.g. online media: "(...) *I still care quite passionately about what happens in the country.(...) I am quite active online and trying to, even holding talks here, about what is going on there and the thing (...)*" (Interview 8). Other respondents mostly become engaged in activities related to their country of origin in the Czech Republic, not in their home countries. In these cases the respondents act as a sort of '*liaison*' to their home countries in various development and transformation aid projects of Czech CSOs. Sometimes they even manage and conceptually create these projects: "*I started looking for NGOs that do work on the projects, to implement in X.[region] countries, because I felt that I am not there in Y.[country], I want to do something, I want to get active somehow.(...) They [NGOs] had like little projects, that they were starting, but they needed people who would translate for*

them, who would help with coordinating staff with people in Y.[country], with looking for information, looking for information online and so on." (Interview 5).

The forms and topics of civic engagement mentioned in this chapter *cannot be considered a complete list* of everything that the respondents have done during their civic engagement history. It only refers to what they chose to say in the interviews. There can be forms, topics, and activities that the respondents simply forgot to mention, or did not think of them as being the major part of their civic engagement. Since the interviewer knows most of the respondents personally, it is safe to assume that the whole spectrum of their civic engagement is, in fact, much more diverse and rich.

Obstacles to civic engagement

Apart from different opportunities and access points to civic engagement, the respondents also face some obstacles that prevent them from becoming engaged or make them look elsewhere to spend their free time. The obstacles can be roughly divided into two groups: *personal capacity* and *critique of CSOs*.

In terms of *personal capacity*, most of the respondents mention *time* as being a stumbling point for their activity. To be more precise, it is the lack of time that prevents most respondents from following up on their interest in civic activities. It is quite understandable that this obstacle comes into play so often, since all respondents either study, or work, or do both at the same time, and have a lot of other personal commitments. They also often mention parenting as being an important event that considerably limits their capacity for civic engagement. Another obstacle mentioned very often is connected to *Czech language skills*, or rather the lack thereof. Most respondents have had a difficult time learning Czech and have experienced a lot of setbacks in their civic engagement, careers, education, and so on due to the inability to speak the language well: *"It was not immediately, like I did not start working or volunteering for the NGO sector. In the beginning. Because I was kind of isolated, sort of. So the first year I was still learning the language, I was also, also, it was a huge hindrance in the beginning, so I could not really speak or look for something."* (Interview 5); *"(...) I don't feel like I am really helping too much, like I can't put together a report and go and lobby government, not that it makes, on the level that I can do that, Czech mainly, because of my Czech, like, I can't work professionally, like on the professional level..."* (Interview 8). This obstacle is obviously

directly related to migration experience, and a low level of language skills can be a great de-motivation point which can prevent people from following up on their interest in civic activities. Another obstacle is a *lack of knowledge about CSOs*, which is often connected to previous engagement history. Some respondents mention that it was impossible for them to become engaged, since they had no idea that civil society or CSOs existed: "*No, I was not looking for them [CSOs], because if a person does not know what it is, then he cannot find them.*" (Interview 6). In this case the relocation to the Czech Republic enabled the respondent's engagement, at least as time went by, and he/she became aware of CSOs. Some other obstacles that the respondents mention are also connected to *limited possibilities to affect change for a migrant or lack of experience and skills* to become engaged.

The respondents are often critical as to how CSOs function. They mention that some CSO activities and approaches are not in agreement with their view on how things should be done. This *critique of CSOs* can also be viewed as an obstacle for civic engagement, but it is connected with the respondents' critical approach to civil society and its various manifestations, rather than technical obstacles that they face, such as language, time, etc. If in the latter case, the obstacle can be removed by the respondent, in the former case it is more about systematic changes that are necessary in order to make civil society and CSOs more accessible to those who would like to be a part of them. One of the main critique points that respondents mention is *distance of CSOs*, both from the point of view of accessibility and also from the point of view of being remote from the needs of the target group: "*So, I went there and I started listening, and to me it seemed that everything is so theoretical, so far from the reality of the migrants, that means my reality as a migrant.*" (Interview 4); "*(...) the conferences are being organized, that is great, well-done, but there is little sense in that. They discuss without foreigners, I was the only foreigner there ...*" (Interview 6). In both cases the respondents talk about migration-related CSOs and their functioning. Despite the fact, that the respondents are interested in the topic of migration and the work of civil society in this area, they could potentially be very de-motivated by the lack of connection to actual real-life experiences of migrants, including themselves. This distance, therefore, can be a very important issue for CSOs to take into account while planning their work with the target group.

The remoteness of CSOs is also discussed in the context of their *dependence on funding and overall financial instability*, that make CSOs adjust their activities and lead them to stagnation and less creativity: *"And it's a lot closer to me, because in my experience that organizations that, let's say, only work with migration, they are very narrow minded. That means they begin to think only in terms of migration funds, one, two, three, four. We apply for these funds, otherwise we cannot support ourselves, so to say."* (Interview 10).

The respondents' access to CSOs is also related to their *visibility*, which some find to be *very low*. In the case of migration-related CSOs, it took some of the respondents years before they even realized that these organizations existed.

Other critical comments are related to the topic of *volunteer management in CSOs*, which is often *non-existent*. Very often, volunteers are not paid much attention and the cooperation is not very functional. Some respondents believe that this is a very crucial point given the overall significance of volunteering for civic engagement and they wish that CSOs would be more active and more professional in this regard: *"They [CSOs] give us a lot of freedom to do what we want to do, so we are, we are kind of, in fact, we had to actively pursue them to let us help them. We had to kind of push them, we were like: really, if you tell us what you are doing, we will help you (laughter). It has taken a couple of years to get a good working relationship with the actual office, they just gave us the space and said do what you want to do."* (Interview 8).

The respondents also mention cases of *unethical behaviour, lack of impact, and low activity of CSOs in certain issues* as being a deterrent for their civic engagement. The critique of the CSOs, though, is well-balanced with very positive attitudes of respondents towards various organizations. A lot of them see CSOs as agents of change that do very important work. Some of the respondents, however, prefer informal, grassroots activities to the organized part of civil society. Nevertheless, the long-term engagement of all respondents in various organizations and initiatives also points to the fact that they all support the idea of civil society in general. For some of them, engagement in CSOs was a life-changing experience, to the point that they even decided to dedicate their professional career to CSOs and their development.

4.2. Migration experience.

Migration is a very complex process and it would be necessary to conduct multiple additional researches to really attempt to understand its various aspects. For the purpose of this study we briefly look at some very basic findings about the respondents' experience with migration. Again, every story is very unique and multi-layered. It is impossible to really delve into this issue in the framework of this short study. However, we attempt to provide some information about the reasons that led people to migrate and their consequent coping with the migration experience. We, in particular, look at the transition stage of migration experience, in order to see if there is any connection to the civic engagement of the respondents.

4.2.1. Reasons for migration (rupture).

In the case of voluntary migration it always starts with a reason, or rather a combination of multiple reasons that people have when they leave their home countries. Sometimes the main reason for migration can be connected to a bit of an impulsive decision to simply run away somewhere, stemming from the feeling of being unhappy, or dissatisfied with some aspects of one's life. People decide to move and change, hoping that the life ahead will offer more opportunities and ultimately more happiness. It is an offer of a fresh start that appeals to people and pulls them out of their home countries. In a lot of cases the decision to migrate is not even final, it is more about embarking on an exciting adventure with an unclear, but preferably happy ending. Sometimes, migration is a carefully planned, long-term goal that people pursue over a course of years, which is loaded with expectations of a 'better life'. There might be a palette of different motivations in play and often the decision is quite final, with not much place to manoeuvre in case something goes wrong. People leave their home countries, knowing they may not return or in some cases having nothing to return to anymore. Sometimes migration also happens due to very personal, intimate reasons, related to families, partners, children and other close people. Here a decision to be with a loved one comes into play and ultimately makes people leave their homes, start anew and hope all will be well. People also tend to move and migrate to get new knowledge, experience, friends, and to try to understand the world a little bit better. Whatever the motivation is, it is always connected to a very profound change in people's lives. Some people embrace this change, some people struggle with it. And all people experience a 'rupture' of some sort, by detaching themselves from their

familiar surroundings. In the case of the respondents there is also a wide palette of reasons and motivations to move which would need an additional study to truly reveal themselves. Roughly, the respondents can be divided into those who migrated to change their lives and try new experiences (including leaving to study abroad) and those who left to be with a family member (a husband or a wife in all cases). The official *reasons to migrate* can be grouped as: family/personal - 4 respondents; study - 5 respondents; work - 1 respondent. For the majority of the respondents the Czech Republic was not really a planned destination for migration, it was either a convenience choice, a mere chance or coincidence, or a country where their loved ones lived. This factor seems to have some connection to the way the respondents perceive their migration experience, especially in the initial stage. It can be argued that the transition was much harder and the 'rupture' had stronger effect on some of them in comparison to the respondents who 'planned' their migration: *"So, I left everything (laughter), and then that was the end of my X. [country] story, let's say, because it was almost ten years ago, nine and a half, and it was very strong because I actually left everything and I had to start from the very beginning..."* (Interview 4); *"(...) I came here when I was 18. I did not have ... No, let's say: I came just because I was curious.(...) And then a time came when for a few years I had no friends or acquaintances, and the university did not give me any opportunities to meet people.(...) So from a very active life that I had (...) And then at once there was a vacuum."* (Interview 6). The perception of the initial 'rupture' also affected the consequent transition stage, which has been developing quite differently for the respondents.

4.2.2. Transition and learning.

The transition period is a long-term process. The respondents most likely mentioned just the fraction of their experiences which can be analyzed according to the following categories.

Coping techniques (learning)

Since the personal stories of the respondents vary quite considerably, it is not an easy task to find correlations and similarities, which can explain how people cope with the transition period. The respondents utilized a multitude of different techniques in their attempt to make sense of their new environment. There are, however, some tendencies or

overarching steps that some of them took. Most of these steps are closely connected with the idea of 'learning', which accompanies the transition period and helps people adjust.

Learning the language is one of the most spread topics that is mentioned by the respondents. A lot of their experiences related to migration, whether negative or positive, are somehow connected to their Czech language skills. It is most often affiliated with the ability to establish social contacts (find friends), find work, or be active and become civically engaged. Some respondents had an urge to learn the language as soon as it was possible, some postponed it and became fluent years later. Most respondents spoke quite good Czech at the moment of the interview. A lot of them mention that their overall situation in the Czech Republic has become much better with the language fluency: "*And then as I just built some, some ...sphere of contacts, yeah, a circle of contacts, some kind of society, my Czech improved, and yeah, and ... actually my first job was in X.[name of CSO] as in a non-profit.*" (Interview 3). The language issue, though, is mostly seen as an obstacle in the transition period, and it will be discussed more further.

Another topic mentioned quite frequently is, in fact, *civic engagement or activity* in general. For some respondents it was a source of great emotional support in the beginning of their migration experience, it provided opportunities for new experiences and self-realization, and was a source of valuable information: "*And I really, when I learned about the non-profits, it was like: 'Wow! I can do something here, somehow, I can express myself. Somehow use my energy in the positive way.'*" (Interview 6). Civic engagement also facilitated a sense of belonging, boosted self-esteem and gave access to a much richer social life: "*(...) and actually through those events, or engagement in these organizations all of a sudden, someone calls you and you're going somewhere, you are doing something and just go to dinner with someone ... so it was simply filling your life and actually you feel important, you feel needed (...).*" (Interview 3). In some cases, when the transition period was a little bit easier, the ability to become civically engaged was closely connected with becoming a part of the Czech society, or being 'integrated'. This is also associated with the final stages of the transition period: "*Given that I did not have to deal with the issues of, for example, employment, and also ... of the language, these did not matter to me so much, to me integration means actually becoming a part of the civil society.*" (Interview 9). Overall, it seems that civic engagement is a widespread coping technique to deal with most negative effects of migration experience that will be discussed in more detail further. Often the

respondents turn to civic engagement and volunteering to fill the void that migration brought with it. For some of them it is a way to bring their life back to 'normal', a way to fight isolation, low self-esteem and even boost their language skills.

Another coping technique that the respondents use quite often is connected with maintaining some kind of comfort zone, where they can develop new connections to people and feel like they are a part of a community. A lot of respondents find this 'community' not within local Czech people, but rather by *being around migrants*. Somehow this happens quite naturally, due to e.g. work environment. Being around international people is also a conscious choice connected with learning, since this communication offers the richness of an intercultural environment. Overall, many respondents find it easier to connect and communicate with international people (using English as lingua franca), or simply have no need to reach out to the local people: *"So being able to be part of the community that is international. I kind of had, especially here maybe, maybe even more so than it would be for the migrants at home, I don't know, but it feels like here it is...I kind of embraced the fact, that I am part of a migrant community."* (Interview 8); *"So I immediately began to communicate, perhaps, the fact that all my first jobs, they were all connected with the English language, so it was probably the expat community, not the Czechs."* (Interview 10). Some respondents also mention that it is, in fact, quite hard to approach Czech people, to make meaningful connections and new friends, partly, due to the language barrier but also due to the 'closed nature' of the local people: *"But I think it happened in a very natural way, because the social circle will most often be made of foreigners, if you are a foreigner, because, as we know, the Czech Republic, or may be any other country, by the way I do not know, I have never researched it, but, maybe, still the Czech Republic - it is not so, that ... that it is very easy to find this first contact with the Czechs. Well, because they are more ... reserved."* (Interview 7).

Among the other coping techniques that the respondents mention we can find: accepting one's minority status, utilizing partner's social circles, working, studying, looking for connections between two countries, reinforcing national identity, 'shuttling' between two countries, utilizing bi-cultural identity. All of these techniques, however, are more contingent on a particular story of a respondent, and there are not so many correlations within the sample.

Negative effects of migration experience

Migration experience, especially in the beginning, is often associated with extreme psychological and often financial pressure. The respondents of this study can be roughly divided into those who experienced quite a lot of negative sides of migration, and those who admitted that some aspects of migration can be hard, but in their cases it was more of a smooth process, or at least they did not mention many negative sides. The correlations, were again not easy to find and we would only mention a few. It also seems that a lot of hardships of migration follow a pattern of a 'snowball effect', once it starts with something, then one difficulty connects to, influences and intensifies another, and so on.

Czech language skills again appear as the biggest problem the respondents face. In this case, though, it is more of an *obstacle* that consequently makes a lot of other aspects of life difficult (e.g. finding work, friends, realizing one's potential, etc.). Therefore, it can be considered a sort of 'trigger' and there is a strong correlation between this obstacle and negative aspects of migration mentioned in the interviews. For some respondents the critical approach to their language skills is quite important in terms of overall perception of the society they live in: *"And so I notice that for the Czechs is very important when you speak without the accent, without making different mistakes. For example, you use a word which is an exact translation, but they need some other word. So, I think for them, this is something I don't particularly like here. Because you immediately see the distancing and such, if a person begins to speak let's say with a migrant accent."* (Interview 10).

Otherwise, *loneliness and lack of friends* is one of the most spread issues that comes up in connection with migration experience. It was quite a challenge for some respondents, especially those who were used to quite active and sociable life, to find themselves completely alone. Some of them attempted to solve this issue by communicating a lot with other migrants, others, though, found it very hard to find new friends: *"You lose all of your friends and so on. You feel that you simply cannot turn to anybody. That there is no such person here."* (Interview 6); *"(...)Yeah, we somehow did not become friends or quickly become friends with the other students, because we lived in a different student dormitory, where most of our classmates did not live, plus communication barrier, plus another style of communication and education, that the people actually changed all the time, there was no opportunity to become friends with them, so there was a feeling of some sort of*

loneliness (...)" (Interview 3). In both cases of the respondents, civic engagement in particular was a sort of cure for this problem. The respondents got hold of various CSOs, started volunteering, meeting new people and as time went by, their social capital grew considerably.

This negative aspect of migration is also closely connected to an overall feeling of *rejection*. A number of respondents state that this is a hard issue for them to deal with. Rejection in the perception of respondents comes from different sources, either from other people, employers, or even the whole society: "*Because at that time I was in the Czech Republic for 3 years and all I saw everywhere were closed doors, rejections and so on. It was impossible to find a job, friends or acquaintances. A total loss of social circle.*" (Interview 6); "*I can't manage to feel comfortable in the society mainly because I feel all the time that I am, people are taking me as a foreigner, that I have never been here like... one of the team, you know what I mean? And it's not related to what is my identity or not, but it's more related to the fact how I am part of the society but only from my side. Because that is not only from one side it's always teamwork, and that is what is difficult in the migration, in general, I think (...)*." (Interview 4). The reasons for rejection can be quite complex, and sometimes it is based more on a *feeling* that respondents have, which can be caused by overall psychological pressure connected to migration and change. Perhaps, sometimes, the rejection is also more of a projection of internal frustration and it is not easy to pinpoint it and give examples, it might well be intensified by internal factors rather than actual external events. Often the respondents experience the feeling of rejection in the context of job search, and some of them find CSOs to be much more open and offering more possibilities. The fact that most respondents were employed at CSOs at various capacities at the time of the interviews also supports this supposition.

The feelings of loneliness and rejection, as well as other negative sides of migration can lead to *low self-esteem and doubting of one's abilities*, which is yet another issue a lot of respondents mention. It is a very strong side effect of migration, since it can be a big setback for a person in their overall adaptation in the new environment: "*(...) that in fact, may be because of migration I have always felt inferior, or somehow disabled, yeah, and I was ashamed (...)*" (Interview 3); "*(...) before I was on the verge, I felt cornered, because you're an immigrant, and for other reasons.*" (Interview 6). If this low self-evaluation persists it can lead to an inferiority-complex, negative perception of the society around and

perhaps, even a total failure to cope with the hardships of migration. Therefore, it is important to reflect on the issue and try to understand what exactly is causing low self-esteem and how it is connected to migration, if at all. One respondent refers to this reflection process as a state of 'schizophrenia': "*And I think lots of incomers are dealing with that, that I am always questioning my skills and my competences, I'm like doing some mistake and I'm asking myself, did I do this mistake because I am not a Czech speaker, like a native Czech speaker, or because I am just too tired or just because there are some circumstances (...) So, I'm always like pending between these two, dancing between these two like things that my outcome, my work outcome is always questioned, you know it is like... it's good enough for a migrant, it's bad enough for whatever (...) but it's always like this kind of schizophrenia you know.*" (Interview 2).

The respondents dealt with a number of other issues during their migration history, including discrimination (especially work-related), bureaucratic burden, culture shock, and disorientation, nostalgia, having to quit one's interest/profession due migration and others. However, all respondents have spent a long time in the Czech Republic and their migration history has, in most cases, been a mixture of hardships and opportunities that migration brings with it.

Migration as an opportunity

Since all the respondents made a conscious choice to move to another country, it can be said that they viewed it as *an opportunity* to change their lives, gain more knowledge and professional skills, be with their family members, etc. None of the respondents regret the decision they made and, in fact, some of them perceive migration as a very valuable experience. There are certain positive sides connected to it which are mentioned throughout the interviews. First of all, in some part thanks to the migration, the respondents managed to find some satisfaction in very important aspects of life, e.g. by finding employment that they like, or studies that brought them valuable knowledge. Some respondents started families, achieved a higher social status, gained financial stability, and so on. Apart from these developments, migration experience is particularly seen as valuable by some respondents also in terms of *personal development*. A number of respondents mention, e.g. *intercultural sensitivity* as one of the bonuses of migration, which makes one much more open to other people and other cultures. The personal

experience of several cultures led, in some cases, to a deeper interest in the topic. Up to the point that 4 respondents became involved in the topic professionally by becoming intercultural workers, a profession that is based largely on the ability to navigate multiple cultural settings: *"I have gone through that, and I think I can try to help those who are...at the beginning of the process, to also somehow go through it smooth.(...) And I feel like my role here is very important, because like a lot of culture confrontations, if I can call them like that happen, they kind of make me a little bit angry, but I think that is why I am there and that is why my role is important, yeah."* (Interview 5). When talking about their migration experience the respondents also mention some sort of *change, re-evaluation* of certain things that happened to them during the transition period, which can also be considered a sort of coping technique, but at the same time it can be viewed as an opportunity. An opportunity to change and evolve. This re-evaluation touches upon a broad array of issues, but the underlining idea is connected with the fact that through learning, a migrant's perception changes, sometimes leading to a more open and flexible view on things. It also means progress and development: *"And in general, people who migrate, they tend to mature a little earlier, because ... again ... the conditions are such that they need ... well, they need to move, move, often ... also accept, there should be flexibility."* (Interview 7); *"I do not see anything wrong with being a migrant. Yes, you have some difficulties, but you also have this experience, which then allows you to adapt, be very flexible, understand the situation of others and so on."* (Interview 10). The respondents also mention feeling stronger due to the migration experience, being more free and have access to many more opportunities as the advantages that migration brings.

4.3. Identity.

Identity is one of the main means people have to make sense of who they are, what they value in life, and what they want other people to think of them. Identity can take various forms and help negotiate various aspects of life. In this study we only look at *one aspect* of social identification related to *ethnic/national identity, or variations of such*. Thus, when we talk about the identification of the respondents it is always related *only* to this aspect. The analysis of the perception of the ethnic/national identification can shed some light on why people become engaged in some issues, and not others. Since identity is a fluid, changeable, and often situation-based notion, we draw entirely from the respondents' perception of their identity at the given moment of the interview. It is widely

believed that ethnic identity is rather static for human beings and that it remains relatively unchanged throughout a lifetime. However, there can be events and experiences in life that can shatter even the most stable foundations. Migration, for instance, can be one of those events. It has the potential to shake things up and lead to change. On the other hand, these events can also motivate people to reflect on issues that they have never really thought about before, or which they have taken for granted. With many respondents, that seems to be the case in terms of their own ethnic/national identity. Moreover, this reflection also led to a process of *identity negotiation*, which often resulted in the development of a mixed identity with quite unclear and fluid boundaries.

4.3.1. Connection to the country of origin (primary ethnic/national/cultural identity).

In order to understand the way the respondents perceive their ethnic/national identity we will first look at how they perceive their connection to their country of origin. In particular, we will see what exactly the respondents identify with in their homelands and whether they even maintain any connection at all.

Birthplace

When asked about their identification, most respondents stated that they come from a certain country and that they usually tend to present themselves to others as such. On the surface it may seem that almost all respondents have a singular ethnic/national identification, they refer to themselves as being Russian, Canadian, Ukrainian, etc. If one goes a little bit deeper into the topic, though, it becomes clear that the ethnic/national identification of the respondents is much more complex, changeable, and rarely unilateral. In fact, only 1 respondent states that he/she identifies with a certain nation-state and does not mention any other related identification. On the other hand, another respondent clearly states that he/she does not have a *primary* identification at all. All the rest kind of fall in between the two spheres. Moreover, it is not so much the nation, or certain ethnic groups the respondents identify with, but rather some other notions or even places within a certain country. In fact, some respondents openly deny nationalism, especially in its exclusive, ethnic form: "(...) *And actually to me in Europe, that's actually weird because you also have a lot of mixture of blood, so I really don't understand why it's important in the origin, really, I don't get it.*" (Interview 4); "*I fully enjoy living among all the people of the world. When I did, when I lived (?), so I do not subscribe to this ethnic, kind of purity ideas.*"

(Interview 8). In most cases, the identification to the home country stems from the fact that it is the *birthplace* of a respondent, where he/she spent his/her childhood and some formative years. The identification with the birthplace mostly invokes certain ties that rather constitute a *cultural identity*² than an ethnic or national one, e.g. the respondents show strong connection to traditions, context, local place where they grew up, language, culture, (in the sense of art, literature, etc.): *"That I was just was born there. Just was born there, I do not feel, I feel probably the connection at the cultural level, in terms of literature ... but that is all."* (Interview 10); *"I was born there and my context is built of that context, and that things, history and tradition and questions and confusions."* (Interview 4). For some respondents, a big part of this identification is connected to *values and socio-cultural norms* that are spread in their countries, which also became their values, which they hold dear: *"I think this period had the most influence on me, on my development as a person. I absorbed the moral principles from then, which I would like to comply with, it does not always work, I would like to be like the people who lived there."* (Interview 9); *"So, basically, you know that being from X. [country] means that you are generous, that you can be more, let's say, I do not know, that you value spiritual aspects more, that you enjoy having guests at your house, there are these little things, which then become a category - I'm from X. [country]."* (Interview 10). Finally, it is also largely the *personal ties* that create and maintain the connection to the country of origin. It is the ties to family, friends and other people that consequently manifest themselves in national or ethnic identification: *"I care where I am from, maybe just because I have so many friends there and because it is still feels like home in many ways (...)"* (Interview 8); *"I love it not just because it's my country where I have a lot of rememberings, and a lot of my life is there, and my traditions... I feel like it's my place mainly because of my family too, because they are living there, they are actually, it is their world (...)"* (Interview 4). The respondents also mention *citizenship, ancestry, or being different from other nations* as important aspects of their national or ethnic identification.

² Cultural identity is often defined in very similar terms to ethnic identity, but it can also be viewed as *"the emotional significance that we attach to our sense of belonging or affiliation with the large culture"* (Ting-Toomey and Chung, 2005 in Samovar et al., 2013:206). It can, therefore, mean attachment to a culture in its broader sense, a culture that consists of multiple ethnicities.

Negotiating and reclaiming identity due to migration

During the data analysis it also became clear, that for some respondents migration experience had a profound influence on the way their identification developed and changed over time. In some cases the identification with the country of origin *loosened* considerably due to long-term migration. At some point the respondents simply realized that the country of origin became much more distant: "(...) *If I go to X. [country] to some ... visit the parents, I do not feel at home, I do not feel that this is ...my home and that ... I can live here. I do not feel this.*" (Interview 7). Sometimes the loss of connection goes so far as to become almost non-existent, in the sense that the respondents lose any interest in the country, they stop visiting it, and even distance themselves from their origin. In fact, a few respondents also show an active urge to 'hide' their ethnic/national identity, because it is not perceived very positively by others or because they simply do not want to voice that connection any more. They refer to this stage in their identification as complete rejection, or even feeling shame because of their origin: "*Because at first, in the early years, I never said that I was from X. [country], because I was ashamed of it. Due to the fact that, basically, there is this attitude towards X. [country] here, so, the first few years it was a complete denial that I was from X. [country] (...).*" (Interview 10). Therefore, the migration experience itself spurs identity negotiation within some respondents. It makes people reflect on their identity much more, since it becomes so pertinent in the new environment. If one always faces the question of his/her origin and background, it becomes close to impossible not to reflect on it. By being constantly asked the question: "Where are you from?", a person needs to constantly look for an answer to that question. Some respondents consequently develop much more complex and mixed identifications, and the answer becomes much more situational or less straight-forward. It is also interesting to note that all the respondents who earlier denied their ethnic/national identity are coming back to it as time goes by and are *reclaiming* it in a way. They manage, at least partially, to overcome some issues they deal with, such as rejection, discrimination or a strong dissatisfaction with the country of origin. As the migration experience becomes longer, the ethnic/national identification becomes less salient and the respondents manage to embrace what is left of it: "*But in any case I'm happy about where I am from. And ... I am definitely not ashamed anymore... I just have that attitude right now that you can take the best from every culture, nobody can stop you from doing that ...*" (Interview 7). On another level, one of the

respondents 'has found' his/her national identity through the migration experience. In the sense that it was not very clear-cut before, or at least not very important for the respondent, but certain experiences during migration facilitated much stronger identification with the country of origin: "(...) and I went through some sort of catharsis, simply from some shame (...) to the point of some clarification of my position on those issues, yeah, some kind of self-understanding, yeah, about the X. [country] language, about the X. [country] culture, regarding that I am X. [nationality], that basically in the Czech Republic I became to see myself more as X. [nationality]" (Interview 3). The newly-acquired strong identification also proves to be quite helpful for this respondent while dealing with the negative sides of migration. The respondent claims that the national identity supported him/her during migration and prevented some negative stereotyping that is usually attributed to other nations of the region. Therefore, it is the difference from the other countries in the context of migration that was quite important in developing a national identity.

4.3.2. Connection to other places (bi-cultural/mixed/cosmopolitan identity).

The respondents represent a very diverse group with regards to their identification. All of them have experienced identity negotiation in their lives and represent people with rather mixed identities. They can be roughly divided into people who have lost their connection to the home country, gradually started getting it back due to a number of various factors, and those who initially come from a bi-cultural or mixed background.

Bi-cultural identity

In addition to stating their primary national, ethnic, or cultural identity 4 out of 10 respondents claim to have another identity alongside the primary one. The respondents clearly state that they have been negotiating their national or cultural identity for a while and admit to having very strong relation to at least two different cultures (not including Czech). In this intense identity negotiation process one identity always prevails, *the second one* is often seen as being *unattainable*, in the sense that a person cannot fully be both at the same time. In order to discover the real reasons for this unattainability, a much more thorough research on identification processes is needed. It is clear, however, that this partial bi-cultural identification creates some contentions in the respondents lives, which are mostly connected with the idea of *belonging* somewhere: "*I always say I am from X. [country] Like I am X-ian [nationality], that is the point. But even in X. [country] I had*

trouble with that, because I am not mainstream. The X. [country] society is very mainstream, but I am not mainstream, I am not a typical X-ian [nationality], so there are almost like the odd one out, but at the same time I am not Y. [nationality] and I will never be." (Interview 5). Since the respondents in question navigate between two cultures and contextually change their identities and perceptions, it may indeed lead to situations when they lack clear identification, especially in regards to being recognized and accepted by other people: *"Because I got into this situation, when I am half-X. [nationality] and half-Y. [nationality] And it's very interesting to me how both these nations behave, because I really love both these nations. (...) I mean, I have always said, 'I do not know who I am - an X. [nationality] or a Y. [nationality].' Now I know that I am a Y. [nationality] (...) And you know, it is a pleasure to watch the faces of people who cannot put these two things together in their mind (laughter)." (Interview 6). In fact, the respondent also mentions that it is only due to migration that he/she is capable of maintaining identification with both cultures and countries and it would be much harder to do so in the country of origin due to attitudes of other people. Another respondent also states that the bi-cultural identity is very helpful in dealing with migration difficulties, since it is much easier to embrace and comprehend the experience.*

Bi-cultural identification, on the other hand, has a direct connection to the civic engagement of some respondents. They explicitly state that this ability to navigate two cultures is what got them interested in the topic of culture, migration, integration of migrants, etc. The best example can be engagement with intercultural work, which is very connected to these topics: *"(...) I don't want to say like the cliché, of the bridge between 2 cultures. But I still feel, like I feel I am not completely like X. [nationality], but I am not also like Y. [nationality] and I will never be. So it is like this work kind of identifies me. Or I identify with that nature, of this work. And it is kind of, if you want to speak about the questions of identity, it is kind of like corresponding to my identity."* (Interview 5).

Mixed identity

In addition to admitting to bi-cultural identity, most respondents have traces of identification with even more places and cultures. The degree of connection varies, as do the identifications. It is possible to say that the majority of respondents have indeed quite *mixed cultural identities*, especially if one considers their *connection to the Czech Republic*

as well. None of the respondents mention being Czech as a part of their bi-cultural identification, so this belongs to yet another identity layer. Since the Czech Republic is a place where the respondents have lived for quite a long time, all of them developed some kind of connection to the country and culture. The degree differs considerably, but for most respondents this is their *home*, a place where they have families, friends, where they work, study, become engaged in civil society, etc: *"Would I call it my home? At this point, yeah, sure. I have been here for 5 years. It is hard of not think of it as home (...)." (Interview 8); "Yes, this is my home. And this change happened two years ago. Just at some point I realized that I have no other place to go anymore."* (Interview 6). This is a very strong connection that affects people in their everyday lives, and the idea of home and belonging is quite important for identification in general. Some respondents also believe that they are a part of Czech society, and it is partially civic engagement that helps them to feel as such: *"For me, without doubt, the main factor was the possibility of work in the field of civil society that made me feel like a member of this society, like a full-fledged member."* (Interview 9). For others, the young age of migration comes into play as well, since some respondents moved to the Czech Republic in their late teens and absorbed a lot of local culture, values, etc, through e.g. education, personal experience, work, and so on. All these factors have had a profound influence on their connection to the country: *"Yeah, so actually, I grew up here, as I often say that I was here when they ask me, like where you are from, so I say, from X.[country], but I grew up here. Because actually from 19 my personality was developing, I was educated here, and professionally, yeah, so my personality was built in this environment, and a lot of things are very close and natural here for me."* (Interview 3).

The overall connection to the Czech Republic is not without its contentions, though, since the respondents still negotiate the place of Czech culture in the palette of their identifications. For most of them this is still a very raw and ongoing process, with a very unclear ending. In fact, when asked about their identification directly, *none* of the respondents *consider themselves to be Czech*. Some of them meditate on the possibility of this ever happening, especially if they live in the country for a very long time. Others believe Czech identification is completely unattainable and there are number of reasons that can be traced in the interviews. The overall perception of the respondents' reasoning is summarized below:

- I have a bi-cultural identity that is already hard to negotiate, so a Czech one is unnecessary and unattainable
- Becoming Czech is simply impossible, because I am different, I am not from here
- I will never be Czech, because I do not know the culture so well, it is impossible to learn everything, I am uprooted
- I do not identify with Czech ethnicity and nation
- I am not Czech, because I am not integrated enough and/or I don't have Czech family or 'regional' connection to the country
- I will never be Czech, because others will never see me as such
- I am not Czech, because I do not identify with local values and mentality.

In the majority of cases the reasons are not so clear-cut, the respondents develop a mixture of different reasons for *not being Czech*. Sometimes it is also connected with the overall feeling of not being welcome and even rejected: *"Right now the Czech Republic for me is associated with xenophobia, with these attitudes to migrants, which means to me as well, that you take it as a general attitude all the same."* (Interview 10).

In the process of their identity negotiation, some respondents also claim to have some kind of international or cosmopolitan identity. They refer to themselves as being *world citizens*, rather than having a clear-cut ethnic/national identity. This is another indication of the complexity of ethnic/national identification that people can develop. In fact, some of the respondents state that this connection is quite important, being a sort of overarching notion which describes their identification the best: *"My identity is just through...but I guess I consider myself (...) I guess I consider myself slightly more of a citizen of the world, then of Czech Republic (...)"* (Interview 8). The cosmopolitan identification sometimes comes from multicultural environment that the respondents grew up in, which led to cultural openness and acceptance of diversity: *"On the other hand, since I was a child ... I was more aimed at 'friendship of nations' or something like that (...) I had a cosmopolitan approach."* (Interview 9). In the realm of this international, cosmopolitan identification, the ethnic/national part of it also becomes much less important, as it is the individual characteristics of people that matter, not so much their group membership.

4.3.3. *Migrant identity.*

Even if *migrant identity* is not directly related to the question of ethnic/national identification, it is important to analyze the attitude of the respondents to this very peculiar identification, especially in the context of migration and civic engagement. This is a part of identity which *develops partially due to migration*. It is something all migrants get by default once they cross the border and settle down. In a way, they don't have much say in the matter, since this identity is ascribed by other people, who see them as *different*. This difference is especially significant in the context of migrants' ethnic and national identity, because very often this is where the local people place the difference. This identity is not always internalized, though, and people do not always see themselves as having this identification at all. In certain contexts and situations migrant identity can become quite important, especially for others (e.g. while looking for employment, accommodation, dealing with public institutions, etc.). It is then up to migrants to work things through and develop their own approach to 'their' migrant identity. Not all the respondents of the study talk directly about this identity. Only half of them openly subscribe to migrant identity and share their perception of it. Quite often the migrant identity is closely *related to the mixed and cosmopolitan identity*, when people simply seek out other people like them and identify with other migrants: "*And sometime I think, it is because I have like a mix of identities in me. I'm not hundred percent X. [nationality], or Czech or Y. [nationality] or whatever, so I am a mix of everything. (...) But I'm not rooted, I'm uprooted. So I feel nice when I meet uprooted people also.*" (Interview 2). Some respondents also believe that migrant identity is created, on the one hand, by the common, *shared experience of migration*. On the other hand, migrants are considered a distinct group simply by *being different from Czechs*. People who have experienced different aspects of migration in the Czech Republic have a lot in common and this unique experience constitutes their identity and helps them to relate to each other: "*(...) guess there is a, the reason I, I guess, there is something common, which puts them together, right. That they can share, a cultural identity of sorts, yeah. (...) we all can kind of appreciate the...exceptionalism of not being Czech and having to deal with being from a foreign country, having to deal with bureaucracy, having to deal with the language, having to deal with the Czech society and the Czech culture as a whole.*" (Interview 8); "*I think there's an element of this, when you know that you could have gone through very similar things. I think it can usually bring*

people together (...)." (Interview 7). Migrant identity can also have quite negative effects on people's lives, especially when it becomes the most important identity in the perception of others. One respondent points out the dangers of such perception, which can lead to discrimination, stereotyping, judging, and so on: "*(...) having this label of migrant or incomer or whatever it's like... sometimes causing more trouble than being careful because you don't see the person behind the label, you see just the label and you kind of put this person in a box already, you don't give him a chance to be a human first of all (...).*" (Interview 2). Finally, this identification also comes into play in civic engagement, since migrants, by default, become a target group of certain CSOs, which in their turn, are more open to engaging migrants in their activities. There is a certain array of services, projects, activities aimed at migration and integration aspects, where migrants are at the receiving end. There are a lot of questionable aspects of this relatively passive image of migrants as users of services provided (Szczepaniková, 2009). This problem, however, is not the focus of this study. Migrants can also be active 'creators' of CSO activities, which most of the respondents are, by being engaged with migration-related CSOs. Migrant identity, therefore, can intensify interest in the topics connected to migration and steer people towards becoming engaged in order to help other migrants, learn more about migration, intercultural communication, etc.

4.4. Motivation for civic engagement.

Motivation is one of the personal factors that has an effect on civic engagement. It is connected with experiences, knowledge, interests, values, and many other aspects of one's personality. Since civic engagement is predominantly a voluntary activity, motivation is its main trigger. A person above all needs to come to the conclusion that he/she wants to become engaged and then act upon it. Motivation is also a very complex psychological phenomenon, which is extremely difficult to study and discern. It is always a combination of various motivations that leads a person to engagement. Often people act mostly because of *self-interest*, in order to get something they desire. However, in the case of civic engagement there are also other factors at play. People can become engaged to do something *for others*, e.g. in order to improve the situation of a certain group of people, 'change' the world for the better, make society function better, etc. The respondents of the study represent a mixture of all possible motivations and they most likely mentioned only *some motivations* that influenced their decision to become engaged. This analysis,

therefore, cannot be considered a full-fledged account of all the possible reasons for people to become engaged. There are, however, interesting correlations in the respondents' accounts.

4.4.1. Self-focused motivation.

Civic engagement in all its various forms can potentially offer a lot of benefits to those who decide to be active. People can benefit in their careers, personal development, broaden their social circles, and receive invaluable information and skills. Very often, it is precisely this beneficial reward that attracts people to civic engagement. According to the functional approach to motivation developed by Clary et al. (1998), the respondents' motivation is analyzed based on the following 6 categories: *values, understanding, social, career, protective, and enhancement*. All the categories, except *values*, can be considered as self-focused motivations, when a person becomes engaged in order *to receive a personal benefit* of sort.

Understanding

The motivations that fall under this category are mostly connected with the possibility to acquire and practice new skills, get a different perspective on some issue, understand one's strengths and weaknesses, and so on. This function of civic engagement is mainly connected to *learning*, both about the outside world and oneself. A number of respondents are civically engaged because they wanted to get new experiences, learn and understand something better: *"When I was little I didn't understand it [discrimination, racism] and it was bothering me always, but after, when I grew up it became something I wanted to understand and to see and, yeah, to understand why was that and what we could do about it."* (Interview 4). On a very practical level, some respondents also mention that civic engagement helps them to *learn Czech better*. Since the language has been quite an issue for most of the people interviewed, it can be considered as a fine example of a self-focused motivation which is also closely related to migration experience. Overall, this motivation category is also connected to a wider notion of *interest*. Very often the respondents mention that they are simply interested in something and that motivates them to learn and experience more. The notion of interest is much more complex and it is entangled in other motivations as well. It is often what drives people to explore, learn and understand an issue. It can also be connected with the excitement about finding new,

unexpected things, and enriching one's personality and knowledge: *"And at the same time the opportunity to work with this [civic engagement] - it's interesting. You never know what you will find. (laughter)"* (Interview 7); *"So that is why I am interested... what is happening between them, what is happening to the people ... How the Czech society relates to them. How the Czech state is treating them."* (Interview 6). A number of respondents also relate civic engagement to a *change in their perspective* on a certain issue. It is due to learning and experiencing, that they look upon an issue from a very different angle, e.g. after becoming engaged directly with diverse people, or by researching the issue more. All this knowledge leads to a different approach, sometimes even concerning one's own identity: *"I was thinking ok I'll go there to help them, but in the end I realized that they helped me more than I helped them. It was such a 'aha' moment and it was such an enlightenment for me..."* (Interview 2); *"And this has profoundly changed my approach to them [the Roma], and to this issue in general, because you realize how it is all mass-media."* (Interview 10) .

Career

This motivation for civic engagement is mostly related to the acquisition of certain skills and social contacts that can directly benefit one's career. It also relates to career choices at which point civic engagement helps somebody to get a more clear idea of what they would like to do professionally. Often the initial interest in a particular issue has led to the respondents' professional involvement with CSOs. Since 9 out of 10 respondents have been employed at a CSO at some point in their career, this category is also quite important for them. Some respondents mention that they are engaged with CSOs in part, in order to *get professional skills or job experience* which are directly connected to their professional interests: *"No it was more like, ok, I study psychology, so I want to do something outside of the school, also to practice my skills, like my psychology skills and whatever. To have some experience, like job experiences."* (Interview 2). The skills that the respondents mention are connected to e.g. working with groups, conflict resolution, and analytical work. Some respondents also mention being in an internship in a CSO, connected with their future professions. Other respondents say that they want to work in a CSO because this career path is in concurrence with their interests and experience. On the other hand, some respondents seem to have chosen CSOs not primarily because they want to work in this type of organization, but because their *professions are mostly performed by CSOs*. In some

cases the career choice actually leads people to CSOs and further civic engagement: *"In a social field a person will most likely find work in non-profit organizations, regardless of whether you want this or not. So through some occasional temporary work and some small jobs I got to non-profit organizations."* (Interview 1). The motivation for civic engagement that falls under the *career* category is very closely connected to the job-related motivation. The boundary is often not very clear. Perhaps, that is one of the reasons why the respondents do not mention this type of motivation too often.

Enhancement

Another widespread set of motivations found in the data relates to the enhancement of one's ego, in the way that civic engagement contributes to personal growth and development, to the boosting of one's self-esteem and to a positive image of one's life and personality. The respondents mention that civic engagement is a way for them to realize their potential and express themselves. Consequently it leads to a feeling of *personal fulfilment* and indicates positive self development: *"It's important for me. Maybe I just find myself in this, because I have always been interested in working with people."* (Interview 10). This aspect is also very closely connected with enhancing one's personality through *communication with other people*. It is through encounters with other people, that the respondents feel that they learn a lot, broaden their perceptions of things, and feel like they develop on a personal level: *"I see this as an opportunity to grow as an individual, and most often it happens due to contact with other people.(...) And what you 'take' is experience, and awareness, and contacts, you get to know people, and it's wonderful."* (Interview 7); *"(...)but on the other hand, I was very interested, I really liked the people I met. I had deep respect for their knowledge, their enthusiasm, that they can work with this for two decades and do not lose their enthusiasm. This is a very valuable experience, incredible, the most valuable in my life, I guess."* (Interview 9). The possibility to communicate and meet new people, in turn, leads to the development of the respondents' *social capital*. Their social circles become much more diverse and numerous. This is especially important for some respondents in the context of migration experience.

On the other hand, the motivation of the respondents to become civically engaged is also connected with looking for a *meaningful experience*. Being involved in some other activities, whether work or leisure-related, the respondents sometimes feel that what they

do lacks significance. They consequently attempt to find meaning through civic engagement, e.g. by promoting a cause they feel strongly about, trying to improve society or the situation of certain people: *"And I was feeling disappointed. And then I felt also, a kind of void of like not feeling that I have a meaning, just studying, just studying, it was so... not fulfilling from me. So I needed to be active and to do something for other people (...)"* (Interview 2). For some, civic engagement is also connected with the feeling of *belonging*, or searching for it. It is through activities in civil society that some feel like they are able to find a place for themselves which they can connect to. Moreover, by being active they can also shape whatever issue they are engaged with and have some influence on the outcome of the process: *"When you work in the civil society sector, it turns out that there, given the right circumstances, you can see the process, you can participate in the process. So, you can feel as if you are a part of something. So, I think, this is also about that, those who people choose to be in the civil society sector they want to feel a part of something. It's important for me..."* (Interview 10). Finally, this category relates to a wide range of other *feelings* that people experience during civic engagement driving them to engage more. The respondents mention feeling *important, needed, trusted, useful* due to civic engagement. Some of them are also civically engaged simply because it brings them great enjoyment to do what they like and care about: *"Well, as I was saying that I had the time, and really enjoyed it, because I am sort of a communicative type (...)"* (Interview 3).

Protective

This is yet another category of self-focused motivation which is connected to the ego. In this case, though, it is the negative side of the self that comes into play. This motivation to become civically engaged is connected with overcoming personal problems and contentions, and protecting the ego from itself. This category is particularly interesting for this study, since it mostly comes up in the *context of the migration experience* of the respondents, or to be more specific, in the context of them dealing with its negative sides. Some respondents clearly connect their motivation to become civically engaged to overcoming migration setbacks. The most widespread negative effect of migration they mention is *isolation*. Activity in civil society helps some respondents to break away from their isolation, meet new people and have much richer social lives: *"Precisely because it was a sort of integration element for me, I was meeting new people, I could do something, because at that time I was quite linguistically and otherwise restricted, and, in fact, some*

civic activities, or assistance in some activities, simply helped me to lead a fuller life (...)." (Interview 3). Civic engagement also facilitates belonging and helps to combat the *feeling of loneliness*: *"I realized that it would be cool to be a volunteer, at least for a few hours a week, to do something useful. I lacked that here, I think, probably because I had no family at that time here, and I probably wanted to feel a part of something bigger."* (Interview 10). The respondents also mention that civic engagement helps them in tackling *rejection, low self-esteem, or even helps reclaiming human integrity* that is affected by migration experience. One of the respondents mentions that civic engagement is a way to deal with some negative effects connected to communication with governmental authorities: *"(...) I found out that I still had a terrible trauma associated with the work of the Foreigners Police. I decided that, as a therapy, it would help me if I joined in distributing tea and coffee at 6 a.m."* (Interview 9).

Social

This category of motivation is related to the possibility to do something together with other significant people in our lives, e.g. partners, friends, family members. It can also be an activity that other people from our close social circle view as beneficial or important. This category occurs the least in the respondents' accounts. The respondents mention that they would like to be civically engaged to *be with one's friends*. Some respondents mention that they are also engaged because it gives them an opportunity to be with friends and other people who *speak their native language*: *" ... and of course in X. [name of CSO] too, we speak, when we meet people who speak X. [language], ... and this is also, it turns out, it is a part of my life ... I appreciate it."* (Interview 7).

4.4.2. Other-focused motivation

Apart from exhibiting motivation for civic engagement, which is mostly connected with personal benefits, all respondents also exhibit a wide range of motivations that can be analyzed within the category *values*. This category includes motivations connected with expressing humanistic concerns for others, for society, the world, and so on. These motivations are mostly connected to improving the situation of other people. Most respondents mention that they are civically engaged simply because they want to *help other people*. Some of them like to do it because they have empathy towards people in general or because they feel like their civic engagement can be useful for other people:

*"(...) so I could, like emphasize with people, who have this symptom. So I was fascinated by all these, and I started to, to go deeper into that alone and. So, yeah, I found an NGO, providing services for these kids (...)." (Interview 2); "And then on the other hand, these people are obviously suffering and I wish I could do more, I wish I was in that country where I could do more (laughter)." (Interview 8). This desire to help, manifests itself in a variety of different activities from being engaged in the social field by working with socially disadvantaged people, to activities in the human rights field, or intercultural work. In fact, all the respondents who mention this motivation also have an urge to *help migrants and refugees* in particular. In some cases it is connected with the migrant identity of the respondents and their desire to help people who they relate to: *"That I do not just live here and that is it, that I am doing something positive. And perhaps in my case for other people of my origin. The work that I do in X. [name of CSO], I believe, it is beneficial to those people who are like me, of the same origin like me."* (Interview 5); *"So I came back and I said ok, I would like really to go now into the migration field and really do something with that because I'm myself a migrant and I wanted to get more involved in that, not just doing some projects or taking pictures or writing articles, but really being more connected to that."* (Interview 2). In other cases, the motivation to work with migrants and refugees is more related to the promotion of intercultural co-existence, peaceful and constructive communication between people, and to 'linking' people together: *"I started finding a lot of common things which were very interesting to me and so I decided to create, me and my friends, we created this organisation, a civil organisation, to organise activities that would put together people from X. [region] and the Czech Republic, and give them the possibility to create new stuff."* (Interview 4). Some respondents are also involved with activities connected to awareness-raising, informing and promoting CSO work which is directly aimed at migrants, and is meant to 'help' them integrate in the new environment: *"(...) and we started discussing, that it was great that we found out about all these possibilities of free legal advice, different social courses, etc. We were so fascinated by this, that we decided, let's say, to devote our lives, well may be not life, but we would have liked very much to share this information. To tell people that there is so much done for them here."* (Interview 9). The desire to raise awareness and provide information to migrants is also one of the foundations of intercultural work which a number of respondents are engaged with. Another motivation partially connected to migration is the respondents' urge to *fight injustice, inequality, discrimination*, or a general interest in human rights as an overarching*

term. The activities connected to these motivations can deal with a number of different issues, from human rights violations to racial discrimination: *"Yes, most likely it is connected with a predisposition to help ... or being much more sensitive to injustice, these things ..."* (Interview 7).

A few respondents also mention their desire to *fight against oppression* in different societies, be it the Czech Republic or other countries: *"And I believe, that the society should be, the society that I am a part of, should try to nurture that and should try to absolutely stop oppression, where it does happen."* (Interview 8). A whole range of motivations are, therefore, addressed to a more general set of issues, all derived from the respondents' value systems. On numerous instances, they state that they would like to *change things, have an impact, express their beliefs, and influence public opinion*. A few respondents also show a deep interest in local affairs and local politics, in particular. They subscribe to a passion towards *civic engagement and see it as a value in itself*, that needs to be developed, e.g. in order to prevent indifference: *"Yes, because if I do care ... about the world which I live in, so, or simply some societal questions do not leave me indifferent and I just follow, I am interested in politics, and in public affairs and so on (...)"* (Interview 3). Sometimes the activity is also aimed at building a better world and developing alternative solutions for various social issues.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the research data presented multiple correlations among the main topics of the research - motivation for civic engagement, migration experience, and identity. This chapter will answer the research questions and present the main connections found in the data.

5.1. Motivation for civic engagement and migration experience.

The respondents of the study, being a very diverse group, showed various motivations for civic engagement. Most likely they only mentioned a fraction of motives drawing them towards civil society. The data revealed that in the majority of cases, the respondents were guided by *a mixture of self-focused and other-focused motivations* (Omoto, Snyder, Hackett, 2010). Where the other-focused motivation was mainly connected with an urge to help other people, or become a part of civil society in order to affect change in whatever issues the respondents felt strongly about, the self-focused motivation, was often connected *to personal enhancement*, which, in a lot of instances, *was needed due to migration experience*. In the cases of both the self-focused and other-focused motivations, the migration experience played a considerable role in the personal histories of civic engagement of the respondents. In an attempt to answer the RQ1: **What is the relationship between the motivation of first-generation migrants for civic engagement, and migration experience?** we propose that the following connections were found in the data.

Migration experience, as such, can be a gateway into civic engagement.

Since the study looked at the civic engagement of the respondents both before their moving to the Czech Republic and after, we can compare how it developed over time. It turned out that for some respondents the *migration experience became a crucial factor for their civic engagement*. In the sense that their civic engagement was very limited or non-existent before they moved to the Czech Republic. It is the migration itself that became a trigger for civic engagement; it is because of their migration that the respondents *found out about civil society* and decided to become a part of it. It is questionable, however, whether or not some respondents would have become interested in civil society without moving abroad. Some of them left their homes at a quite young age, when they just started on the path of personal self-realization, defining their priorities and interests. Nevertheless, it

seems that the migration experience and the process of learning in the new environment were important factors that affected the civic engagement of the respondents who had not been active before. Moreover, in some cases it has had a profound influence on the course of the respondents' lives, in the sense that they found personal fulfillment in civic engagement, or even became professionally involved with CSOs. On the other hand, some of the respondents were already quite active in their countries of origin, and for them migration was more connected with the adaptation to a new environment in their civic engagement activities (e.g. by changing their interests, not being able to use some forms of civic engagement due to language and other limitations, etc.).

Civic engagement can be a tool to cope with the negative sides of the migration experience, especially low social capital, low self-esteem, and the feeling of rejection.

It also turns out that civic engagement can be a very helpful coping technique in the process of transition connected to migration. The motivation of the respondents to become engaged was very often connected to overcoming certain personal and social limitations that occurred due to migration. The respondents of the study perceived civic engagement as a tool to:

- improve their Czech language skills;
- overcome the feeling of loneliness. Civic engagement turned out to be very beneficial in terms of establishing contacts with other people (both migrants and local people), developing friendships, enriching social circles, and learning invaluable information through communication with other people, therefore, enriching social capital (Putnam, 1993, 2000; Omoto, 2010);
- re-define the feeling of belonging somewhere, in the sense that civic activities stimulated this feeling and made the respondents believe that they had become a part of something bigger;
- boost or even regain their self-esteem which was lost due to migration setbacks. Civic engagement stimulated the feeling of personal value, personal dignity and self-reliance;
- overcome the feeling of rejection which often accompanies migration. By being engaged and doing something with other people for the benefit of the society, the respondents felt needed and appreciated, they felt a part of the Czech society;

- be around people who share a similar cultural background and speak their native language. This can only become important in the migration process. Civic engagement with its very strong social capital aspect made it possible for some respondents who needed it to stay in contact with people from their home countries.

The initial challenge of migration, which is connected with starting a new life, can be very stressful and hard, in terms of e.g. finding employment, housing, leisure activities, friends, taking care of family, etc. These challenges, however, are also accompanied by a range of opportunities that the new environment brings. The motivation for civic engagement and migration were not only related in the context of overcoming limitations of migration experience. The respondents also became engaged because they embraced their new experience and wanted to learn as much as they could about the society they live in. This knowledge was mostly gained through contacts with other people, but also through the activities of different CSOs and engagement in various societal issues not necessarily related to migration.

Personal experience with migration can lead to a profound interest in the topic, which in its turn leads to civic engagement in migration-related issues (up to the point of affecting one's career choices). The engagement in this case can be contingent on existing opportunity structure for migrants.

According to the research data, all respondents were engaged with the topic of migration or integration in one way or another. Moreover, for almost all of them, this *topic only became important once they became migrants themselves*, therefore, the personal experience and its role is undeniable. It is interesting to see, though, why exactly the respondents became engaged with migration topics and with what intensity they did so. For some it took years until they became engaged with this issue, for others it was somehow on the agenda from the very beginning. In any case, there is considerable variation in the way migrants can 'get in touch' with the topic of migration in their civic activities. If we go a bit deeper into the motivations of the respondents to become engaged in migration issues, the following motives stand out: *helping other migrants, linking diverse people together, being interested in migration and wanting to learn more about it, and using one's skills*. The first motivation is very spread among the respondents and it is closely related to projecting personal experience with migration into helping other people in similar situation. In this

case people feel like they can offer something to others, something which is also based on personal experience leading to a deeper and better understanding of the issue. The 'help' also manifests itself in a broader sense, when migrants want to become civically engaged to bring people together, fight segregation, combat intercultural conflicts, stop the spread of prejudice and ignorance. This motivation can also stem from the migration experience which shows people how dangerous and hurtful discrimination, rejection, and prejudice can be. Both motivations are also connected with empathy towards other people and the desire to affect societal change, and they both fall into the category of other-focused motivations (Omoto, Snyder, Hackett, 2010). On the other hand, the remaining two motives are self-focused and deal with personal interests and personal enhancement. *Using one's skills* and *other enhancement motives* are also interesting in terms of opportunity structure for civic engagement (Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005). Most respondents mentioned that they had *an urge to become engaged in something* at some point of their lives in the Czech Republic. They did so for a variety of different reasons discussed earlier. That 'something' did not necessarily have to be connected with migration, though. Often it was a combination of general interest, personal experience, and a unique set of skills that brought people to migration-related activities and CSOs, who in their turn accepted them. It can be argued, that these organizations are generally more open to migrants, since they directly work with the topic of migration. In some cases, the respondents were also approached by these organizations and became engaged because the opportunity presented itself. Some respondents also went as far as staying in these organizations as employees, dedicating their professional career to the topic of migration. So, some of them were, in a way, 'drawn' towards migration-related CSOs simply because the opportunity structure was more open (e.g. migrants can use some of their unique skills such as language skills and intercultural sensitivity in the context of migration-related activities). Given the relative openness of the respondents initial interests, it can be argued, that if they came across a wider set of opportunities to use their skills in other organizations, they would most likely have done so. In fact, at least half of the respondents found a way to realize their civic engagement potential in activities that were not directly related to migration.

Migration experience can have a direct influence on the topics/issues people become engaged with, as well as forms of civic engagement.

Since migration is a very broad and complex topic, that can potentially deal with a multitude of sub-topics, it can be argued that personal experience with migration also affects the range of issues people become engaged with. In a lot of cases the respondents became engaged with *issues related to migration*, such as the fight against discrimination, social injustice, human rights, intercultural and global education, development and transformation cooperation, urban and community development, and so on. In this way different aspects of the topic became present in the lives of all the respondents, while they were almost absent before migration. The migration experience also affects the forms of civic engagement. This again is connected with opportunity structure, and especially political opportunity structure available for migrants (Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005). Since all the respondents are citizens of non-EU countries, they all face great limitations in regards to their political participation (Organization for Aid to Refugees, 2015). For some of them it meant that they had to adjust their participation considerably and turn to more informal ways to affect political developments. On the other hand, migrants also see the limits of their participation, and feel like they do not have the means or 'legitimacy' to get engaged in political activities. Some of the respondents also mentioned, that they could not continue being engaged in a certain way due to some migration issues. This inability was mostly connected with not being able to engage in activities that require very proficient Czech language skills, e.g. journalism or documentary film-making related activities.

5.2. Identity and civic engagement.

While analyzing the ethnic and national identities of the respondents, the study stumbled upon the fact that most respondents do not have clear-cut identities. All of them have gone through the process of identity negotiation, partially due to migration, but also due to other factors. Which brings us back to the idea of the fluidity and instability of social identities (Jenkins, 2008; Eriksen, 2010). Most of the respondents represent cases of *mixed ethnic/national/cultural identities* where they feel connection to multiple ethnicities/nations/cultures. They can, therefore, be quite flexible and act upon various identities situationally (Eriksen, 2010). In an attempt to answer the RQ2: **In what ways does ethnic/national identity affect civic engagement of first-generation migrants?** the following conclusions were made.

Ethnic/national identity of migrants does not necessarily cause engagement in ethnic organizations. In fact, in some cases, it can stimulate disengagement rather than engagement. Lack of engagement can be related to the low number and unclear definition of ethnic organizations in the Czech Republic. Migrant identity, and overall identity negotiation, rather lead to engagement in migration-related activities.

It is argued in academic literature that migrants tend to engage in issues related to their country of origin, culture, and so on. They often participate in so called ethnic organizations that aim at preserving a certain culture, language, traditions, etc. (Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005; Gonalons-Pons, 2009; Zani, Barrett, 2012). According to the data in this study, none of the participants proved to be active in organizations of this type, with only 1 showing an interest in finding out more about their activities. Therefore, we can conclude that the intensification of ethnic/national identity that can happen during migration does not always lead to engagement along ethnic lines. The reasons for this can be quite diverse. Perhaps, in the case of the respondents, it is their predominantly mixed identification that played a big role, but also their values, personal priorities, interests, education, and so on. The sample of the research is quite limited and targeted, therefore, it is not possible to make an overarching generalization. A lot of migrants experience a quite intense identity negotiation process after migration, when their ethnic/national identity changes considerably. The connection to the country of origin can become loose, even to the point of denial and rejection. In the context of the Czech Republic the rejection of one's ethnic/national identity can also be discourse-contingent (Horner, 2012). In the way, that certain countries are not perceived very well in the society and migrants can develop a tendency to 'hide' their identity. In this situation, some of the respondents also reacted strongly towards ethnic organizations, showing no interest in their activities. The overall identity negotiation could also be a reason for some respondents to be very critical towards ethnic organizations and their activities, to the point of finding them useless and segregating. These ideas also correlate with the view on ethnic organizations as potentially creating 'parallel societies' (Esser, 1986;1988 in Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005; Cyrus, 2005 in Atsuko, 2006). On the other hand, the finding about the lack of engagement is also context-specific, since there are not many ethnic organizations in the Czech Republic. There is also no clear definition of what these organizations are. More broadly oriented migration-related organizations prevail and all respondents were engaged in their activities.

They did so also because of the identity contention, e.g. in order to belong somewhere, to be a part of Czech society, or to be with people who speak the same language. It seems that mixed ethnic/national/cultural identities in combination with the newly developed *migrant identity* lead migrants to civic engagement in issues primarily related to the broader topic of migration. Sometimes, this engagement stems from the functionalism idea, when migrants become engaged to substitute for non-existing or poorly working structures (Moya, 2005). They then get involved in migration-related CSOs or establish organizations of their own in order to help other migrants, or unite diverse people in the society. All respondents who established their own CSOs reacted to the lacking structures that would respond to their and other migrants' needs (e.g. responding to the needs of young educated migrants, who are not usually the target group of service-oriented CSOs). Migrant identity also stimulates interest in issues related to migration, such as the integration of migrants, discrimination, social justice, equality, interculturality, and so on. Migrants then become engaged with these issues in order to understand them better or affect change.

Transnational identity is a part of the identity negotiation process. Its presence does not necessarily lead to transnational engagement in the country of origin, but can manifest itself in engagement in the country of residence.

Transnational identity as such was not very relevant for the respondents of the study. In most cases it was a part of the overall identity negotiation process, and manifested itself *in mixed rather than transnational form*. None of the respondents were very engaged in their country of origin, since their presence there was very limited and, therefore, it can't be said that they developed a transnational identity per se (Vertovec, 2001). The engagement that took place mainly happened either online, or in the country of residence. In the latter case, the respondents became very involved in the development projects of Czech CSOs, where they could utilize their unique skills and knowledge of their native societies. Nevertheless, the instances of transnational engagement are quite important, since they show a direct connection between ethnic/national identity and civic engagement. Transnational engagement is also driven by strong identification with the country of origin, whether in an ethnic/national or cultural sense.

Civic engagement can have a powerful effect on the feeling of belonging in the new environment.

It is not only identity that can have influence on the civic engagement of first generation migrants, it is also vice versa. According to the data analysis, civic engagement was a powerful tool for the respondents in developing a connection to the Czech Republic. It made some respondents feel like they belonged in the new society, that they became a part of it. Therefore, civic engagement can be perceived as an integration tool, that facilitates stronger connections to the new country of residence, to society, and the people who live there. Civic engagement by itself is not enough to develop a Czech identity per se. There are a number of obstacles that migrants face in their process of identity and 'belonging negotiation' in relation to the Czech Republic. They deal with rejection, clash of values, or inability to 'know everything' about the new culture. If the question of values is very personal, and depends largely on one's perception of the world, the factors connected to e.g. rejection are social and they are contingent on the overall perception of migrants in the receiving society. In order for the feeling of belonging and identification with the Czech Republic to develop fully, it has to be also stimulated on the societal level, and civic engagement is just one of the ways to achieve that.

5.3. Conclusions.

This study focused largely on the relationships and connections between the motivation of first generation migrants to become civically engaged, their experience with migration and identity negotiation. All of the topics discussed are quite broad and complex, and it is not possible to cover all the aspects of the relationships in one short study. However, the analysis of the data from the 10 interviews presented many interesting correlations that, perhaps, deserve further investigation. They also showed the specific context of the Czech Republic in regards to participation in ethnic organizations.

It is quite clear from the findings of the research that migration is a very important factor for the civic engagement of first-generation migrants. Migration, as such, can sometimes be a trigger for civic engagement. If people move from a society where civic engagement is not very developed they can discover this possibility and use it as a tool to cope with migration setbacks, such as low social capital, low self-esteem, isolation, and so on. There is a whole range of motivations involved in this process, from more self-oriented

motives connected to personal and professional development, to an urge to help other people, especially other migrants who are going through their transition period. Civic engagement, therefore, can have a lot of functions in migrants' lives. On a practical level, it is important to work more with the motivation aspect of civic engagement and volunteering, especially in the context of CSOs. If the opportunities of civic engagement are more in tune with people's motivation, they tend to sustain their activity and become more and more involved (Clary et al., 1998). There is an overall tendency that migrants become engaged less in society when compared to local people, since they face a variety of limitations connected with migration (Vogel, Triandafyllidou, 2005). A more open approach to migrant engagement, a more concerted attempt to appeal to migrants' motivations, and a more diversified offer of volunteer opportunities, can contribute to making this situation better. The low level of engagement, on the other hand, can be also connected to specific trends in civic engagement contingent on a certain society. In case of the Czech Republic, for instance, there is a tendency towards more individualized forms of civic engagement that do not necessarily involve CSOs (Navrátil, Pospíšil, 2014; Frič, 2015). This can affect civic engagement of migrants as well, since they are also subject to these new trends and developments. Perhaps, also the individual civic engagement of migrants, outside of the CSOs, should be researched further.

On another level, civic engagement can contribute to a feeling of belonging in a new environment. This process is closely connected to identity negotiation, which is very acute during migration process. Civic and political engagement of migrants should be encouraged, since they can contribute to a more profound attachment to the place one lives in. It can also trigger the feeling of personal responsibility for the development of the society as a whole. The identities of migrants are not strictly given and related only to their countries of origin. Identification is much more complex and multi-layered, including ethnic and national identities which are constantly negotiated throughout the process of migration. It cannot be automatically assumed that migrants will participate only in ethnic organizations, since this assumption omits all the other identifications people have. It can also happen that people distance themselves from their primary ethnic identities precisely due to migration, especially if their country of origin is viewed negatively in the new society. In this light, the participation in ethnic organizations in the Czech Republic is not so straight-forward. There is a relatively low number of ethnic organizations, they are not

always visible, and the more broadly oriented migration-related CSOs are much more spread. This state of affairs can be connected to an overall relatively small number of migrants living in the Czech Republic, to a generally unwelcoming mood in society towards migrants and refugees, and very limited funding possibilities for CSOs to develop. It is necessary, however, to investigate further why this aspect of civil society developed in this way in the Czech Republic, and look closer at the context of ethnic and migrant organizations and their activities.

LITERATURE

1. Abe, Atsuko. 2006. Civic Activities of Non-Citizens. *Annual conference of the International Studies Association* [online]. March 2006. San Diego, CA [Accessed: 19.01.2015]. Available at: <http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/9/8/2/1/pages_98216/p98216-1.php>.
2. Adler, Richard P., Judy Goggin. 2005. What do we mean by "civic engagement"? *Journal of Transformative Education* 3 (3): 236-253.
3. Aleksynska, Mariya. 2007. *Civic participation of immigrants: culture transmission and assimilation* [online]. Bocconi University [Accessed: 01.12.2014]. Available at: <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/4594/1/MPRA_paper_4594.pdf>.
4. Barth, Frederik. [1969] 1998. *Ethnic groups and boundaries: the social organization of culture difference*. Long Grove: Waveland Press.
5. Berger, Ben. 2009. Political theory, political science and the end of civic engagement. *Perspectives on Politics* 7 (2): 335-350.
6. Bernard, Russell H. 2011. *Research methods in anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. 5th edition. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
7. Bradatan, Cristina, Adrian Popan, Rachel Melton. 2010. Transnationality as a fluid social identity. *Social Identities* 16 (2): 169-178.
8. Centrum občanského vzdělávání (COV). 2015. *Občanská angažovanost 2015. Mapa české společnosti z hlediska občanské angažovanosti* [online]. [Accessed: 14.06.2016]. Available at: <<http://www.obcanskevzdelavani.cz/obcanska-angazovanost-2015-novy-vyzkum>>.
9. Clary, Gil E., Mark Snyder, Robert D. Ridge, John Copeland, Arthur A. Stukas, Julie Haugen, Peter Miene. 1998. Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: a functional approach. *A Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74 (6): 1516-1530.
10. Černík, Jan. 2005. *Active participation of immigrants in the Czech Republic* [online]. Country report for the European research project POLITIS. Oldenburg

- [Accessed: 26.05.2014]. Available at: <<http://www.politis-europe.uni-oldenburg.de/download/czechRepublic.pdf>>.
11. Ekman, Joakim, Erik Amnå. 2012. Political participation and civic engagement: towards a new typology. *Human Affairs* 22: 283-300.
 12. Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2010. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. 3rd edition. London: Pluto Press.
 13. Ethier, Kathleen A., Kay Deaux. 1994. Negotiating social identity when contexts change: maintaining identification and responding to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 67 (2): 243-251.
 14. Fennema, Meindert, Jean Tillie. 2001. Civic community, political participation and political trust of ethnic groups. *Connections* 24 (1): 26-41.
 15. Flick, Uwe. 2013. *SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
 16. Frič, Pavol. 2015. *Občanská společnost a definice NNO, vývoj, stav a trendy* [online]. Dílčí studie pro Konceptci politiky vlády vůči nestátním neziskovým organizacím do roku 2020. [Accessed: 12.06.2016]. Available at: <http://www.vlada.cz/assets/ppov/rnno/dokumenty/studie_fric_pro_web.pdf>.
 17. Gennep, Arnold van. [1981] 1996. *Přechodové rituály*. Prague: NLN.
 18. Gonalons-Pons, Pilar. 2009. Immigrants' civic and political engagement in Spain. Combining and contrasting theories. *American Sociological Association Annual Meeting*.
 19. Greco Morasso, Sara. 2012. Learning as a precondition of migrants' interest and engagement. *Human Affairs* 22: 313-324.
 20. Horner, Jed. 2012. Developing a 'Critical Migrant Ontology': towards a productive praxis that works across difference. *Graduate Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies* 8 (1): 16-28.
 21. Jacobs, Dirk, Karen Phalet, Marc Swyndedouw. 2004. Associational membership and political involvement among ethnic minority groups in Brussels. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30 (3): 543-559.

22. Jenkins, Richard. 2008. *Social identity* [online]. 3rd edition. Oxon: Routledge. [Accessed: 20.01.2015]. Available at: <http://www.pueg.unam.mx/images/seminarios2014/genero_y_politica/mes_tres/Jenkins-Social_identity.pdf>.
23. Jensen, Lene Arnett. 2008. Immigrants' Cultural Identities as Sources of Civic Engagement. *Applied Development Science* 12 (2): 74-83.
24. Kotic, Ankica. 2007. *Motivation for civic participation of immigrants: the role of personal resources, social identities, and personal traits* [online]. University of Oldenburg. POLITIS-Working paper No. 1/2007. [Accessed: 27.09.2015]. Available at: <http://www.politis-europe.uni-oldenburg.de/download/WP11_POLITIS_Kotic_2007fin.pdf>.
25. Lu, Jiaying, Michael A. Schuett. 2014. Examining the relationship between motivation, enduring involvement and volunteer experience: the case of outdoor recreation voluntary associations. *Leisure Sciences* 36: 68-87.
26. Merriam, Sharan B. 2009. *Qualitative research : a guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
27. Moya, Jose C. 2005. Immigrants and Associations: A Global and Historical Perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Minority Studies* 31 (5): 833-864.
28. Navrátil, Jiří, Miroslav Pospíšil. 2014. *Dreams of Civil Society Two Decades Later. Civic Advocacy in the Czech Republic* [online]. Brno: Masaryk University. [Accessed: 12.06.2016]. Available at: <<https://munispace.muni.cz/index.php/munispace/catalog/book/20>>.
29. Odmalm, Pontus. 2004. Civil society, migrant organizations and political parties: Theoretical linkages and applications to the Swedish context. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30 (3): 471-489.
30. Omoto, Allen M., Mark Snyder, Justin D. Hackett. 2010. Personality and motivational antecedents of activism and civic engagement. *Journal of Personality* 78 (6): 1703:1734.
31. Organization for Aid to Refugees. 2015. *Participation and policy involvement of third country nationals in public life of 9 Central and Eastern EU member states*

- [online]. Prague: OPU. [Accessed: 12.06.2016]. Available at: <<http://www.migrant-participation.eu/soubory/55.pdf>>.
32. Patton, Michael. 1990. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* [online]. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, pp. 169-186. [Accessed: 04.06.2014]. Available at: <<http://legacy.oise.utoronto.ca/research/field-centres/ross/ctl1014/Patton1990.pdf>>.
 33. Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 34. Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling alone. The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster paperbacks.
 35. Redlová, Pavla (ed.). 2011. *Studie „východiska migračních politik“*. *Politická a občanská participace imigrantů v České republice* [online]. Prague: Consortium of Migrant Assisting NGOs. [Accessed: 04.06.2014] Available at: <<https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B7pZNVbozyqLamFhTkRnVIFJM3c/edit?pli=1>>.
 36. Salamon, Lester M., Anheier, Helmut K. 1998. Social Origins of Civil Society: Explaining the Nonprofit Sector Cross-Nationally. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 9 (3): 213-248.
 37. Salett, Elizabeth Pathy, Diane R. Koslow (eds.). [1994] 2003. *Race ethnicity and self: identity in multicultural perspective*. Washington, D.C.: National Multicultural Institute.
 38. Samovar, Larry A., Richard E. Porter, Edwin R. McDaniel, Carolyn S. Roy. 2013. 8th edition. *Communication between cultures*. International: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
 39. Seweryn, Olga. 2007. Identity change as a consequence of the migration experience. In Steven G. Ellis, Luďa Klusáková (eds). *Imaging frontiers, contesting identities* [online]. Pisa: Edizioni Plus - Pisa University Press, pp. 21-42 [Accessed: 22.07.2015]. Available at: <http://www.cliohres.net/books2/5/02_Seweryn.pdf>.
 40. Sinha, Jill Witmer, Itay Greenspan, Femida Handy. 2011. Volunteering and civic participation among immigrant members of ethnic congregations: complementary not competitive. *Journal of Civil Studies* 7 (1): 23-40.

41. Strömblad, Per, Per Adman. 2010. Political Integration through Ethnic and Nonethnic Voluntary Associations? *Political Research Quarterly* 63 (4): 721-730.
42. Szczepaniková, Alice. 2009. *Mezi státem a klienty - Nevládní neziskové organizace pracující s uprchlíky a migranty v ČR* [online]. Prague: MigraceOnline.cz [Accessed: 14.06.2016]. Available at: <http://aa.ecn.cz/img_upload/224c0704b7b7746e8a07df9a8b20c098/ASzczepanikova_Mezistatemaklienty.pdf>.
43. Švaříček, Roman, Klára Šed'ová, et al. 2007. *Kvalitativní výzkum v pedagogických vědách*. Prague: Portál.
44. Timotijevic, Lada, Glynis M. Breakwell. 2000. Migration and threat to identity. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 10: 355-372.
45. Uslaner, Eric M., Richard S. Conley. 2003. Civic engagement and particularized trust: the ties that bind people to their ethnic communities. *American Politics Research* 31 (4): 331-360.
46. Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, Henry E. Brady. [1995] 2002. *Voice and equality: civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
47. Vertovec, Steven. 2001. Transnationalism and identity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27 (4): 573-582.
48. Vogel, Dita, Anna Triandafyllidou. 2005. *Civic activation of immigrants - An introduction to conceptual and theoretical issues* [online]. University of Oldenburg. POLITIS-Working paper No. 1/2005. [Accessed: 26.05.2014]. Available at: <http://www.politis-europe.uni-oldenburg.de/download/WP1_POLITIS_VogelTriandafyllidou_2005.pdf>.
49. Wong, Janelle. 2006. *Democracy's Promise: Immigrants and American Civic Institutions*. University of Michigan Press.
50. Worchel, Stephen, J. Francisco Morales, Darío Páez, Jean-Claude Deschamps (eds.). 1998. *Social identity. International perspectives*. London: SAGE Publications.

51. Zani, Bruna, Martyn Barrett. 2012. Engaged citizens? Political participation and social engagement among youth, women, minorities, and migrants. *Human Affairs* 22: 273-282.

Websites:

52. MVČR - <http://www.mvcr.cz> - Accessed on 15.05.2016.

Laws:

53. Czech Government Resolution No. 689/1999. *Principles of Policy for the Integration of Foreigners within the Territory of the Czech Republic* [online]. [Accessed: 05.10.2015]. Available at: <http://kormoran.vlada.cz/usneseni/usneseni_webtest.nsf/0/C0665259AEE14CA4C12571B6006D8A70>.
54. Czech Government Resolution No. 99/2011. *Updated Policy for Integration of Immigrants – Living Together – and Proposal for Further Steps in the Year 2011* [online]. [Accessed: 12.06.2016]. Available at: <<http://www.mvcr.cz/mvcren/article/integration-of-foreign-nationals-in-the-territory-of-the-czech-republic.aspx>>.
55. Czech Government Resolution No. 20/2015. *On the Procedure for Implementation in Implementing the Updated Policy for the Integration of Foreign Nationals for the Year 2015* [online]. [Accessed: 14.06.2016]. Available at: <<http://www.mvcr.cz/mvcren/article/integration-of-foreign-nationals-in-the-territory-of-the-czech-republic.aspx>>.

Interviews:

56. Interview 1. Anonymous respondent. Interview conducted by Natallia Allen on 13.10.2015.
57. Interview 2. Anonymous respondent. Interview conducted by Natallia Allen on 14.10.2015
58. Interview 3. Anonymous respondent. Interview conducted by Natallia Allen on 15.10.2015.
59. Interview 4. Anonymous respondent. Interview conducted by Natallia Allen on 16.10.2015.

60. Interview 5. Anonymous respondent. Interview conducted by Natallia Allen on 28.10.2015.
61. Interview 6. Anonymous respondent. Interview conducted by Natallia Allen on 30.10.2015.
62. Interview 7. Anonymous respondent. Interview conducted by Natallia Allen on 03.11.2015.
63. Interview 8. Anonymous respondent. Interview conducted by Natallia Allen on 04.11.2015.
64. Interview 9. Anonymous respondent. Interview conducted by Natallia Allen on 05.11.2015.
65. Interview 10. Anonymous respondent. Interview conducted by Natallia Allen on 16.11.2015.

SUPPLEMENT 1.

Questions for in-depth interviews.

RQ1. What is the relationship between the motivation of first-generation migrants for civic engagement and migration experience?

RQ2. In what ways does ethnic/national identity affect civic engagement of first-generation migrants?

Civic engagement in general/engagement in the country of origin (if existed):

- what do you think civic engagement is?
- do you think engagement in CSOs is important? why?
- do you remember when civic engagement started in your life?
- do CSOs exist in your country of origin?
- have you ever been involved in their activities?
- what kind of activities? what topics did CSOs deal with?

Migration experience and coming to the CR

- when did you come to the CR? why?
- how did you learn about CSOs in CR?
- how important is civic engagement in your life?

History of engagement in the CR, when it started, what organizations (their mission, projects if known), what activities

- how did you become engaged with this CSO/CSOs?
- what CSOs are you engaged in? what activities are you engaged with?
- why did you choose this organization/organizations?

- how did you become interested in the activities of the CSO/CSOs?
- what were you trying to achieve by being engaged with the activities of CSOs?
- are you still engaged in the CSOs activities in your country of origin? which activities? if there was a change in activities, why did it happen? (if relevant)

Identity

- what country/nationality do you identify with?
- what do you answer to the question 'where are you from'?
- what does it mean for you 'to be from X'?
- do you feel to be Czech? what is your relationship to the Czech Republic?

SUPPLEMENT 2.

Questionnaire. Civic engagement of first generation migrants in the non-profit sector.

Dear Sir or Madame, I would kindly ask you to fill in this questionnaire, which is a part of the preliminary research for my MA thesis at the Faculty of Humanities, Charles University Prague.

The questionnaire is aimed at first generation migrants (non-EU citizens), who were born outside of the Czech Republic and have lived here either long-term or permanently.

The research is dedicated to civic engagement of first generation migrants within non-profit organizations in the Czech Republic. The main objective of the research is to understand the relationships between migration experience, identity and civic engagement of first generation migrants. The research will continue in the form of interviews with active first-generation migrants.

If you have any questions or comments, I would be happy to answer them at the email address: nvbnew@gmail.com. The survey will be conducted until November 20th, 2015. The survey is completely anonymous and it should take about 10 minutes of your time.

Thank you in advance for participation in the survey, Natallia Allen, MA student, Civil Society studies, FHS, Charles University in Prague.

1. What country were you born in?
2. What citizenship/citizenships do you hold?
3. How long have you lived in the Czech Republic?
4. Which of the following best describes your age?
 - 18-25
 - 25-40
 - 40-60
 - Over 60

- Other, please specify

5. What gender are you?

- Male
- Female

6. Do you regularly take part in activities of non-profit organizations, associations etc.?

Note: please proceed with the questionnaire, only if you answered "Yes" to this question.

- Yes
- No

7. What non-profit organizations in the Czech Republic are you engaged with (or were engaged with in the past)? Please list the names of the organizations.

8. Have you been engaged with any of the following topics while working with the non-profit organizations in the Czech Republic? Part I. Question instructions: Please mark all the relevant answers.

- Czech culture
- Conservation of monuments and historic heritage (in the Czech Republic)
- Promotion of arts
- Sport
- Leisure activities/hobbies
- Health and medical services
- Pre-school education
- Secondary education
- Informal education
- Child protection
- Homelessness
- Drug addiction
- Social services
- Ecology (natural environment protection)
- Protection of animals
- Tourism in the Czech Republic

- Local community development
- Physical and mental disability
- Promotion of volunteering
- Urban development
- Housing
- Gender issues
- Consumer protection
- Employment
- Transparency of public administration
- Religion
- Roma minority in the Czech Republic

9. Have you been engaged with any of the following topics while working with the non-profit organizations in the Czech Republic? Part II.

- Culture of your country of origin/your ethnicity
- International cooperation (development aid - the country of your origin)
- Human rights
- Educational activities for migrants
- Promotion of multicultural/intercultural society
- International cooperation (development aid - all countries)
- Social or legal counselling for migrants
- Advocacy for migrants rights
- Humanitarian aid (countries outside the Czech Republic)
- Activities aimed at prevention of discrimination based on race, ethnicity or nationality
- Other, please specify

10. In what capacity are you engaged with non-profit organizations? Question instructions: Please mark all the relevant answers.

- Core employee
- Part time/temporary employee
- Board member
- Volunteer

➤ Other, please specify

11. Would you like to provide an interview on the topic of civic engagement of first generation migrants?

➤ Yes

➤ No

12. If you answered "Yes" to the previous question, please leave your email address for further contact.

Thank you for participating in the survey!