

# The aspect of culture in the social inclusion of ethnic minorities: evaluation of the impact of inclusion policies under the open method of co-ordination in the European Union ; assessing the cultural policies of six member states ; final report Czech Republic

Horáková, Milada; Bares, Pavel

Abschlussbericht / final report

#### **Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:**

Horáková, M., & Bares, P. (2006). *The aspect of culture in the social inclusion of ethnic minorities: evaluation of the impact of inclusion policies under the open method of co-ordination in the European Union ; assessing the cultural policies of six member states ; final report Czech Republic.* (ECMI Working Paper, 29). Flensburg: European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI). <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-63067>

#### **Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

#### **Terms of use:**

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.



## **The Aspect of Culture in the Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities**

Evaluation of the Impact of Inclusion Policies under the  
Open Method of Co-ordination in the European Union:  
Assessing the Cultural Policies of Six Member States

Final Report

**Czech Republic**



An Evaluation Project under the EU's Social Protection and Social Integration Policy

**Milada Horáková  
Pavel Bareš**

RILSA Prague


**October 2006**

# **The Aspect of Culture in the Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities**

Evaluation of the Impact of Inclusion Policies under the  
Open Method of Co-ordination in the European Union:  
Assessing the Cultural Policies of Six Member States

Final Report

**Czech Republic**



VÝZKUMNÝ ÚSTAV PRÁCE A SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚCÍ  
**RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR LABOUR AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

**Milada Horáková  
Pavel Bareš**

**Prague**

**October 2006**

**ECMI Working Paper # 29**

**European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI)**  
**Director: Dr. Marc Weller**

**© 2006 European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI)**  
Published in March 2006 by the European Centre for Minority Issues

ISSN: 1435 - 9812

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|                                                                                                                              |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Executive Summary.....                                                                                                       | 7   |
| Introduction.....                                                                                                            | 8   |
| I. The Dimension of Culture in the Social Integration of Minorities.....                                                     | 10  |
| II. The Institutional Framework of Social Integration in the Czech Republic.....                                             | 13  |
| III. Basic Strategic Documents Articulating the Policies of Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities in Culture.....            | 18  |
| IV. National Minorities in the Czech Republic.....                                                                           | 26  |
| V. Roma Community.....                                                                                                       | 37  |
| VI. Foreign Communities.....                                                                                                 | 55  |
| VII. National Action Plan of the Czech Republic.....                                                                         | 58  |
| VIII. Indicators of Ethnic Minorities Inclusion in Relevant Areas.....                                                       | 60  |
| IX. Pilot Investigation among Professionals Dealing with Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities.....                                 | 65  |
| X. Cost-Effectiveness of Government Education Policies for the Roma Community.....                                           | 86  |
| Appendices:                                                                                                                  |     |
| 1) Relevant Legal Norms.....                                                                                                 | 104 |
| 2) Tables.....                                                                                                               | 106 |
| 3) Proposed Indicators: Czech Republic.....                                                                                  | 130 |
| 4) Hypotheses Testing the Meaning of Some Aspects of Culture<br>in the Process of Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities..... | 132 |
| 5) Form of the Questionnaire: Selected Aspects of Culture upon Social Inclusion<br>of Ethnic Minorities.....                 | 138 |
| 6) Review of Subsidiary Instruments Providing Education for the Roma Community.....                                          | 143 |
| 7) Model of Roma Education Policy Implementation.....                                                                        | 145 |
| References.....                                                                                                              | 146 |

## **Foreword and Acknowledgements**

This Working Paper is one in a series of country reports submitted under the ECMI project “The Aspect of Culture in the Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities: Assessing the Cultural Policies of six Member States of the European Union” (hereafter OMC Project). The OMC Project was conceived by the European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI) and established with the generous support of the European Commission’s Directorate of Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities and under the European Union’s Social Protection and Social Integration Policy (Grant Agreement VS/2005/0686). The present Working Paper was researched and authored by colleagues at the Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs, Prague, Czech Republic.

The OMC Project evaluates the National Action Plans (NAPs) of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Sweden under the European Union’s Open Method of Co-ordination (OMC) on Social Inclusion in terms of cultural policies and their impact on the social inclusion of ethnic minorities. The OMC Project is a twelve-month effort which began in December 2005. It focuses on three domains of social exclusion:

- Education,
- The media, and
- Public participation.

The aim of the OMC Project is to enhance cultural policies and NAPs with the overall goal to promote greater inclusion of members of ethnic minorities and Roma/Sinti groups in the socio-economic life of the European Union. The specific purpose of the OMC Project is to evaluate the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of these policies in the six member states through the piloting of an index of Common Inter-Cultural Indicators (CICIs).

The problem of indicators has been a central part of the social policies adopted under the Lisbon Strategy (2000) including the OMC on Social Inclusion and ongoing efforts to develop and refine social indicators continue under the auspices of the European Commission. One of the main objectives of the OMC Project is to contribute constructively to this effort in the area of cultural indicators.

The parties most deserving of recognition for the contents of these Working Papers are the members of the six country research teams who are listed on the front page of each report. ECMI would like to thank every member of these teams for their hard work and continued interest and support for the OMC Project. The research teams have benefited from consultation with several external experts during the research. First and foremost, the OMC Project and the research for the country reports could never have been conceived without the unique modelling of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness as well as the personal and energetic dedication of Prof. Francois Grin, Director of the “Economics-Language-Education” Observatory at the University of Geneva, formerly Acting and Deputy Director of ECMI. At the same time, the application of Prof. Grin’s model could not have been possible without the assistance and ever so patient didactic help of Mr. Michele Gazzola, of the “Economics-Language-Education” Observatory at the University of Geneva. ECMI owes much to these two experts on the economics of language policies. Credit also goes to Dr. Andreas Hieronymus of the Institute for Migration and Racism Research, Hamburg and Dr. Deborah Mabbett of the School of Politics and Sociology, Birkbeck College, University of London both of whom showed keen interest in seeing the OMC Project getting off the ground.

Within ECMI a number of dedicated persons who have worked with the OMC Project from the beginning deserve special thanks: Ms. Denika Blacklock, the first Project Manager and Ms.

Ulrike Schmidt, the second Project Manager have both been indispensable as have the continued support of Project Co-ordinator Ms. Maj-Britt Risberg-Hansen and IT Manager Matthias Voigt. ECMI's Deputy Director Ewa Chylinski has been instrumental in both the initial phase of the project design and the implementation phases as well as in the relations to the European Commission, and Senior Research Associate and eminent expert on Roma issues, Dr. Eben Friedman has lend us extensive support in every aspect of the Project. A special thanks goes to ECMI's Librarian Wes McKinney without whose professional dedication these reports would not reach the public. Finally, a warm thanks to those individuals who seldom get recognized: the interns who have worked every bit as hard as anyone else attached to this project: Ms. Jaimee Braun, Ms. Annika Salmi, Ms. Alina Tudose and Ms. Kate Corenthal.

ECMI hopes that these Working Papers will prove useful to researchers interested in or participating in the ongoing research on the social exclusion of ethnic minorities and the development of cultural policies within the European Union. Any inquires related to these reports should be address directly to the main authors of each Working Paper who are also individually responsible for the content of the Papers. A list of contact details as well as further information about the OMC Project can be found by visiting the homepages of the OMC Project at [www.ecmi-eu.org](http://www.ecmi-eu.org).

Dr. Tove H. Malloy  
Scientific Director of the OMC Project

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The social exclusion of members of ethnic minorities is viewed as a serious political problem that carries the potential danger of escalating ethnic violence. Consequently, EU member countries are looking for tools to help to prevent that happening. We understand social integration as a multi-dimensional process involving the integration of the individual into the broader social structures (social groups) of a given society and culture. Current social integration NAPs appraise differences in the populations of EU member countries using socio-economic indicators (gross domestic product, rates of employment and unemployment, poverty etc.) but they usually miss the cultural dimension. As far as the Czech Republic is concerned, cultural policy is a matter for the Ministry of Culture whereas social inclusion matters fall within the competence of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs. This Ministry supports research into social integration including that of ethnic minorities, particularly, as far as this report is concerned, the Roma community. Other state institutions play a complementary role within the inclusion process. Every ministry has its own concepts and distributes financial resources to projects in respective areas. The aim of this report is to provide a description of the concepts and policies towards and the current situation of national minorities and the Roma and foreign communities as regards participation, education and mass media publicity. These relatively independent populations occupy different positions in society and, in some cases, have different legal status so that different policies are required to bring about their social inclusion. Cost effectiveness analysis was limited in our report to educational policies concerning the Roma only, an approach which was agreed at the workshop in Flensburg. The measurement of cost effectiveness in the areas of participation and media policy is extremely complex due to the multilevel influences of social processes. In addition, finding the relevant indicators for an evaluation of the success of various policies in designated areas is also not an easy task. The data available for the measurement of cost effectiveness is limited and insufficient. However, the data which was available on preparatory classes, education assistants and the support programme for higher education and university students showed that the approach adopted in these areas is generally effective. Moreover, education is a value in itself and any improvement in this area is, in today's modern knowledge society, generally desirable.

## Introduction

Analysing the links between culture and social inclusion has a fundamental importance in the search for factors supporting cohesion and stability in countries with a large proportion of ethnic minorities in their population. Social exclusion of the members of ethnic minorities is viewed as a serious political problem that carries the potential danger of escalating ethnic violence. That is why EU member countries are looking for tools to help prevent that happening.

Although the link between culture and the social inclusion of ethnic minorities is evident, verification of intuitively felt connections is complicated by the vagueness and ambivalence of the conceptual apparatus and by the lack of conclusive empirical data that can be used to test hypotheses.

The project titled “The Aspect of Culture in the Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities: Assessing the Cultural Policies of Six Member States of the European Union<sup>1</sup>” aims to evaluate the cultural policies of six EU member states (Estonia, Lithuania, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia and Sweden) based on the substance of their National Action Plans<sup>2</sup> for social integration using the coordination method<sup>3</sup>. Appraising the influence of the aforementioned EU countries’ cultural policies on the social integration of their ethnic minorities (including Roma/Sinti communities) is expected to add a new, cultural dimension to the NAPs. Testing a set of inter-cultural indicators<sup>4</sup> and comparing them among EU member countries is one expected specific benefit of the project. During the assessment of the NAPs there is also intended to be improved cooperation between ministries, government agencies and citizens’ associations.

We understand social integration as a multi-dimensional process of the integration of the individual into the broader social structures (social groups) of a given society and culture. The process of an individual’s integration into a family, community and also state takes place under the influence of many mutually conditioning factors whose effect cannot be precisely defined, isolated and measured.

The current social integration NAPs appraise differences in the populations of EU member countries using socio-economic indicators (gross domestic product, the rate of employment, the rate of unemployment, poverty etc.). The selected indicators testify about certain aspects of social and economic development in EU member countries. The indicators are selected on the basis of consensus between the evaluators and cannot be treated as an objective gauge of the state of social integration or exclusion of an individual or group. They are an expression of the prevailing trend in evaluation, which is the level of economic growth and standard of living, but these are things that not all people participate in in equal measure<sup>5</sup>. In a way, the selection of indicators is a reflection of the values of consumer society, which may cease to apply if non-economic values prevail in the value system of society<sup>6</sup>.

As a social creature, during the life of an individual he joins various social groups (family, community, peers, minorities, work teams, social organisations, political parties etc.) which

---

<sup>1</sup> “The Aspect of Culture in the Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities: Assessing the Cultural Policies of Six Member States of the European Union”, coordinator European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI), Flensburg, Germany

<sup>2</sup> National Action Plans (NAPs)

<sup>3</sup> Open Method of Coordination (OMC)

<sup>4</sup> Common Inter-cultural Indicators (CICI)

<sup>5</sup> Factors of Social Exclusion, Petr Mareš, RILSA Brno, 2006

<sup>6</sup> The term “poverty and social exclusion” is defined as a state in which an individual or group does not fully participate in the economic and social life of society and/or its access to income and other resources prevent the individual or group achieving a standard of living that is regarded as acceptable in the society they live in. In this situation they often have no access to even basic rights. (Kotýnková, Laňka, 2002).

coexist as part of the broader national culture and its subcultures. In the context of social integration we understand culture to mean a set of living conditions, forms, notions of value and knowledge (philosophy, religion, science, art, morality, customs and conventions) passed down from generation to generation in a society existing at a given time and in a given geographical space.

The terms social inclusion or exclusion have two different levels of meaning: they do not just denote the degree of differences between individuals and groups; they also contain an evaluation of positive or negative development. Whereas social inclusion is regarded as a positive phenomenon, social exclusion is assessed as a negative phenomenon<sup>7</sup>, yet an objective measurement of these opposites is not possible.

Social inclusion or exclusion always takes a particular direction. What is usually meant is integration into majority society sharing a certain set of common values, standards and patterns of behaviour. The value systems of the groups an individual joins need not be identical and may entail some form of conflict. Social inclusion always takes place within a particular social context and is not a hollow abstraction.

Culture plays a significant role in the process of integrating ethnic minorities into majority society. Inclusion processes take place in parallel with processes designed to preserve the minority identity, whereby both trends are strengthened by the majority and the minority, may have contradictory effects and may bring about inner conflicts in members of the minority. The creation of inner conflicts is nothing out of the ordinary: they result from the individual's pertinence to various social groups that do not share the same values and may have nothing to do with ethnicity (e.g. family versus peers, political party versus family etc.).

On the one hand, cultural diversity and plurality of ideas are an important source of social innovation, but if they overstep a certain boundary – a boundary that is hard to define – they may lead to a disruption of fundamental shared values and become a source of instability in society. That is why ever-greater attention is being paid to processes of managing cultural diversity at local community level in ethnically pluralistic societies.

Elements of various cultures may be mutually compatible or exist in parallel, but some are incompatible in the context of one state. The key criterion is the degree of consensus on fundamental values and standards that can be incorporated into the law of a state or community of states (democracy versus autocracy, polygamy versus monogamy, the society-approved age for marriage, society's attitude towards birth control, education and career, participation in goings-on in society etc.).

Besides the wider, general, social level, social inclusion processes also have an individual level that indicates the degree to which the individual identifies himself with his social environment and its values. What may be denoted as a state of social exclusion by external assessors need not be subjectively perceived and felt in the same way by the individual. Here the individual's value system is key and this value system need not always be identical to the values shared by the majority of society. Processes of social inclusion or exclusion should be viewed as relative to the value systems of the society in which they take place.

---

<sup>7</sup> Preventing Spatial Segregation; Luděk Sýkora and Jana Temlová, Law Faculty of Charles University, Ministry for Regional Development, Prague 2005

## **I. The Dimension of Culture in the Social Integration of Ethnic Minorities**

The process of inclusion or exclusion of ethnic minorities may be analysed in four basic dimensions: (1) socio-economic; (2) cultural; (3) legal and political; and (4) in terms of the host country's attitude to immigrants. In this project we are concentrating on the dimension of culture. The process or social integration or exclusion is culturally determined. Cultural indicators have not previously been explicitly included in the NAPs of EU member countries, but implicitly cultural differences are regarded as one of the reasons for the social exclusion of certain members of ethnic minorities. NAPs should reflect the cultural aspect of social inclusion processes as well as the economic aspect. In the context of the social integration of ethnic minorities culture is particularly important from the point of view of shared values, conventions and patterns of behaviour.

Social inclusion or exclusion processes are structured, and they are influenced by many diverse and interlinked factors. The actual state of social inclusion or exclusion achieved by an individual or social group cannot always be regarded as definitive, because every society develops and is exposed to constant change. The tension that is created in a society in consequence of reactions to changes is simultaneously a driving force behind social innovations. Cultural diversity is considered an essential condition of progress, for the very reason that it forces people to adapt and seek equilibrium in a society exposed to changes.

The individual is born into a particular community that is part of a broader cultural unit. Every human community creates a historically variable set of written and unwritten standards of behaviour (traditions, customs, conventions, imperatives and laws) that regulate the relationships of individuals and groups within the community and peoples' relationships to society itself and its institutions. At the same time they define the functions of members within a community and their role in terms of the goals that society sets itself. Culture influences the individual's social standing, status and role.

Both the mentality and the behaviour of the individual are directly influenced by the personal experiences he gains in contact with his social surroundings. In the upbringing process the individual learns symbolic behaviour, spoken and written language, gestures and established patterns of behaviour. That gives him the ability to find his bearings in the cultural environment of a given society and to understand the behaviour of others. Social conventions become part of his personality and influence his feelings, experiences, endeavours, actions and judgements. Accepting social standards and values is a condition of the individual's acceptance by other members of society and normal interaction with people.

Every individual occupies a particular position in society. Social status and the role associated with it change in the course of life. Biological factors (sex and age) only partially influence status and role. How a person acts and how successful he is in a given community are reflected in his social status, which has either low or high prestige. Prestige, position in the social structure and social ties then play a very important role in the process of social inclusion or exclusion.

The personality has its own individuality which society may modify but never eliminates. Acquired traits, influenced by personal history and experiences, help shape the individual's psyche and influence his behaviour. Every individual has certain innate and acquired needs. Individual needs and interests may conflict with the demands placed by society.

**The individual learns social conventions and roles, but individually re-shapes, interprets and realises them. He adopts the value system of society to a certain extent, but also confronts it with the reality of his own life. Based on this he creates his own value system**

**which need not be identical to the one shared by the majority. He acts on the basis of his own experiences, feelings and attitudes and interprets everything taking place around him in his own way. All this influences his ability to integrate into the cultural environment. This takes place on the assumption that the individual shares common standards, values and goals and satisfies the expectations of other members of society. Then he feels part of a certain community and is accepted as an equal partner by the other members.**

The conventions and values of a culture or subculture the personality identifies with form the integrity of his mental world. Interiorised values that are the basis of attitudes are hard to change, if they can be changed at all. Pressure to change these values exerted by the social environment may bring serious psychological problems and result in mental breakdowns that are at the root of conflict behaviour. **No one can entirely abandon a culture he was integrated into and cast it off as an unwanted burden. He may accept new cultural standards and values that are not in stark conflict with the original ones, but he cannot abandon the deeply interiorised structures forming the basis of his personality.**

The switch from one cultural system to another is accompanied by mental stress; and a consistent endeavour to conserve one's cultural identity may complicate the everyday life of members of a minority. If minorities are not segregated, if the majority and minorities mutually interact, they must also influence each other. New generations of members of ethnic minorities coexisting with the majority find it hard to preserve their original culture, even though the majority do not necessarily exert pressure on them to assimilate. Minorities usually move closer to the majority culture. Preserving a minority culture unchanged can only be done among separated (segregated) communities.

Every society is in its way structured, organised and stabilised, which is reflected in its social climate. Difference necessitates adaptation and thus also social change. On the one hand, that brings a certain degree of conflict, but on the other hand it is also a source of innovation and progress. Openness or closedness to cultural differences and changes is the result of the current social climate in a society.

The integration of cultural and ethnic minorities is a gradual process. The first phase in the life of a minority is the **accommodation** necessary for survival. The next phase is **adaptation**, where a minority preserves most of its own culture and only adapts to those elements of majority culture without which it cannot successfully function in society. **Integration** comes about if the majority and minority culture form a functional whole in which majority culture is dominant. There is partial or complete **assimilation** if the original culture of a minority is systematically rejected, forgotten or merges with the majority culture<sup>8</sup>.

How successful the integration of minorities is depends on the society's capacities and resources enabling the saturation of fundamental economic and cultural needs. Spatial and social segregation makes social inclusion impossible. Unequal access to resources in education, preparation for a career and job opportunities can be a source of tension in society.

In the integration of minorities, culture's principal effect is found during the process of upbringing and education. A common language (which is a precondition of making oneself understood) plays a key role, but the sharing of key values and conventions of social behaviour

---

<sup>8</sup> New theories distinguish between (1) integration, which is understood to mean the coming together of two cultures, with the culture of the country of immigration having long-term dominance; (2) separation, where the original culture is preserved without any room for the entry of the culture of the country of immigration; (3) marginalisation, the loss of the original culture with only partial adaptation to the country of origin; and (4) assimilation, or absorption of the culture of the host country and abandonment of original culture. (Blaschke, 1996)

also plays an important part. At the same time the cultural identity of minorities needs to be conserved and their culture and language need to be developed. That is brought about by multicultural upbringing, which strives to develop and bring mutual understanding between members of various cultures settled in a particular geographical space. Nurturing tolerance, mutual respect and openness from early childhood may open up social structures. A lack of communication and interaction is a cause of social barriers. Social isolation prevents mutual recognition and allows prejudices to be formed, to persist and to be transmitted. Under certain circumstances the majority and minority populations may live side by side yet remain more or less isolated.

A targeted media policy may help break down barriers caused by mutual ignorance and help eliminate prejudices against minorities. The more subtle aspects of majority and minority culture may be brought closer together through art activities.

## **II. Institutional Framework of Social Inclusion in the Czech Republic**

### **1. Institutions Participating in Strategic Documents Relating to Social Inclusion**

The Government Commission for Preparation of a Common Memorandum on Social Inclusion and the National Action Plan of Social Inclusion consists of representatives of the government departments (ministries): Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Industry and Trade, Ministry of Informatics, Ministry of the Environment, Ministry of Agriculture. Only the Ministry of Culture is not represented. The members of the Commission are also the representatives of the following institutions: Government Committee for Handicapped Citizens, Government Council for the Roma Community Affairs, Czech Statistical Office, Office of the Public Guardian of Human Rights, Association of Regions of the Czech Republic, Union of Cities and Townships of the Czech Republic, Czech and Moravian Confederation of Trade Unions, Union of Industry and Transport, Union of the Czech and Moravian Manufacture Cooperatives, the Association of the Czech Catholic Charity, Man in Distress society, National Council of Handicapped People, Faculty of Social Sciences of the Charles University and Sociologic Institute of the Academy of Science of the Czech Republic. The Commission does not so far associate any Czech institutions and organizations from the culture field.

### **2. Institutions Participating in the Process of Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities**

The social inclusion matters fall within the competence of the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs. This Ministry supports a research in the given sector, which includes ethnic minorities, namely the members of the Roma community.

A government body for the national minority issues is the Government Council for the Roma Community Affairs. They solve the affairs of the population enjoying the statute of the national minority including issues of social inclusion, which again relate to the Roma minority.

The social inclusion of the Roma community is a matter attended to by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Culture.

The concept of integration of foreigners falls within the competence of the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, which updates annually the Concept of Integration of Foreigners and submits proposals of long-term legislation-related and practical measures. It coordinates the plans of individual departments elaborated as a part of a uniform concept of alien integration. Other ministries (Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Industry and Trade) prepare the departmental plans of integration policies. These policies are annually assessed. The Ministry of Culture is engaged in the policy of integrating foreigners in the field of culture through grant schemes. The academic institutions and non-governmental organizations also participate in the policy of integration of foreigners.

### **3. Institutions Involved in the Social Inclusion Processes based on NAP<sup>9</sup>**

#### **3.1 Government Level**

The participation on the government level occurs in particular through government councils and committees. 5 bodies play a key part in social inclusion: Council of Economic and Social Agreement, Government Council for Non-State Non Profit Organizations, Government Council

---

<sup>9</sup> MPSV 2004.

for the Roma Community Affairs, Government Committee for the Handicapped Citizens and Government Council for the National Minorities.

*The Council of Economic and Social Agreement* was established in 1990 as an institutional platform for a social dialogue between the government and the social partners. It is a voluntary search and initiation body operating in the unemployment sector and the area of social and economic policy. The supreme body of the Council is the plenary session, which consists of the Premier, 7 government representatives, 7 trade representatives and 7 representatives of employers. A contribution of the Council is *inter alia* a gradual establishment of tripartite structures in most afflicted regions and sectors.

*The Government Council for Non-State Not-for-Profit Organizations* was set up in 1992 as a permanent consulting, initiation and coordination body of the government for the area of non-state not-for-profit organizations (NNO). The Council has 36 members at most; its chairman is a member of the government (at present the vice-chairman of the government for research and development, human rights and human resources). Its members are the NNO representatives, who form always at least one half of all Council members, representatives of the state administration central bodies, whose competence includes the execution of the state policy towards NNO and representatives of the cooperating regions. The Council gathers, deals with and submits to the government the information concerning NNO, background documents and proposals relating to formation of a suitable environment for their existence and activities.

*The Government Council for the Roma Community Affairs* was established in 1997 as a permanent consulting and initiation government body for the Roma community issues. The Council has 28 members; it is chaired by a government member (at present the Vice-Chairman of the Government for Research and Development, Human Rights and Human Resources). One half of members consists of Roma community representatives (one from each region). Its objective is to assist in integration of the Roma community in the society. The Council secures the cooperation of departments responsible for implementation of partial measures and fulfillment of the tasks resulting from the government resolutions and international treaties binding the Czech Republic. It gathers, deals with and submits to the government the information, background documents and proposals related to formation and application of the government policies in the field of integration of the Roma community. It prepares the Concept of Roma Integration and evaluates the fulfillment of the applicable government resolutions. It also has a right to propose a distribution of financial funds reserved for the supplementary schemes to support the integration of the Roma community. In its activities it cooperates with the regional and municipal self-administrations, with the non-state non-profit organizations as well as international organizations, which contribute to the integration of Roma communities.

*The Government Committee for the Handicapped Citizens* was set up in 1991 as a permanent coordination, initiation and consulting body of the government for a support of handicapped citizens. The Chairman of the Committee is the Prime Minister, its members are high representatives of departments, four vice-chairman of the National Council of Handicapped People (through which the handicapped citizens themselves engage in the Committee activities), the Chairman of the Union of the Czech and Moravian Manufacture Cooperatives as a representative of the employers employing predominantly persons with disabilities (modified working ability) and the head of the Committee Secretariat. The Committee is dealing with problems, which a single department is unable to solve independently. Its aim is to help to create equal opportunities for disabled citizens in all areas of the social life. The Committee prepares a National Plan of Equalizing Opportunities for the Handicapped Citizens, monitors and helps in its implementation. It has a right to comment upon all proposals of materials presented to the government of the Czech Republic, which relate to the handicapped citizens. It cooperates with

the central bodies of the state administration, which present to it for discussion the proposals of measures related to issues of handicapped citizens and cooperates also with the civic associations of handicapped citizens. Its advisory body is the National Council of Handicapped People, the materials of which it deals with. The civic associations of handicapped people thus share through the Committee Secretariat in creating and commenting upon drafts of the pertaining legislative measures.

*The Government Council for National Minorities* was established based on Act No. 273/2001 Coll., on Rights of Members of the National Minorities and on Change of Some Laws as a permanent advisory and initiation body of the government for issues concerning national minorities and their representatives. The Council Chairman is a member of the government, usually the Deputy Prime Minister (at present the Deputy Prime Minister for the Research and Development, Human Rights and Human Resources). The Council has 29 members, of which at least one half is formed of representatives of national minorities (currently 18 members). The Council observes the compliance with the Constitution of the Czech Republic, Declaration of Basic Rights and Freedoms, international treaties on human rights and basic freedom by which the Czech Republic is bound, compliance with the laws and other legal standards in relation to the members of the national minorities. It secures a preparation of the government measures, which pertain to the rights of the members of national minorities in CR, expresses standpoints to the drafts of laws, drafts of the government regulations and measures pertaining to the rights of members of the national minorities prior to their submitting to the government. It prepares for the government, individual departments or other administrative authorities the recommendations to fulfill the needs of the national minorities in particular in the field of education, culture and media, use of the mother tongue, social and cultural life. It also prepares for the government the summary reports on situation of the national minorities on the territory of the Czech Republic. The Council cooperates with the central bodies of the state administration, other administrative authorities, self-administration bodies and with NNO. It is competent to propose distributions of financial funds from the state budget in support of activities pursued by national minorities.

The Council for ethnic minorities consists of representatives of 12 ethnic minorities - Bulgarian, Croatian, Hungarian, German, Polish, Roma, Ruthenian, Russian, Greek, Slovak, Serbian and Ukrainian. (Each minority is represented by one to three representatives).

### **3.2 Government – Self-administration**

The government regularly meets with representatives of 14 regions of the Czech Republic and discusses with them the main directions of policies with impacts on the regions. „In order to improve the performance of public administration and enhancement of the dialogue between the municipalities, towns, cities and the government of the Czech Republic“ the government concluded on 22nd April 2004 *Agreement on Mutual Cooperation with the Union of Towns and Municipalities* (based on Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic No. 359 executed on 14th April 2004). According to this Agreement, a system of regular consultations should be established between the government and the Union in respect of the government policies with the impact on towns and municipalities.

### **3.3 Regional Level**

After a reform of the public administration, the Czech Republic was divided into 14 regions. The regions are associated in the *Association of Regions of the Czech Republic*, which is an open interest non-party and non-governmental organization founded in 2001. The supreme body of the Association is the Council. The Council establishes commissions for individual sectors of policies as its initiation and advisory bodies. In the social inclusion area, two commissions are of

a particular priority: the Commission for Social Affairs and the Commission for the Health Sector.

Similar *Commissions* operate also in individual regions of the Czech Republic. Their members are delegated by political parties represented in the regional councils, but also depending on personal contacts of the representatives of these parties with the groups of handicapped citizens in terms of their health or social situation, the specific issues are dealt with in the sessions of the commissions also with the participation of representatives of these groups who thus have an opportunity of commenting upon the materials. A cooperation and involvement of *handicapped persons* is very frequent. As regards the Roma community, as it was already mentioned above, the *regional Roma community coordinators* are employed in the regional authorities. These positions were established by Act No. 129/2000 Coll. on Regions. During the years of 2002 – 2003, all regions have appointed their coordinators.

Based on the new Employment Act, the labor offices are responsible for constitution of *advisory boards* to pursue cooperation on the labor market. The advisory boards should consist in particular of the representatives of social partners, organizations of handicapped persons and representatives of the municipalities and regions. Their goal is coordination in implementing the state policy of employment. They assume standpoints to the provision of contributions to employers in the active policy of employment, retraining schemes, organization of the consulting activities etc.

### **3.4 Local Level**

The public administration reform abolished districts and a municipal system has been established (Act No. 128/2000 Coll., on Municipalities). The coordination body of municipalities is the *Union of Cities, Towns and Municipalities of the Czech Republic*, which originated in 1990. The Union is an open interest, non-party and non-governmental organization, the due members of which are municipalities in the meaning of the Act on Municipalities. The key objective of the Union is to promote the common interests and rights of the municipalities associated in the Union in the spirit of principles of the European Charts of the Local Self-Administration. The Union regularly communicates with the European Commission and promotes the interests of self-administrations also on the EU level. At present, the Union associates 2,469 municipalities (that is about 39%), in which almost 73% citizens of the Czech Republic live (over 7 million of inhabitants). The supreme body of the Union is the Assembly. In the periods between sessions of the Assembly, the Union is managed and supervised by the Board and its operation is secured by the Presidium.

The Presidium may as set up as its advisory bodies specialized *Commissions* composed of members of the Union or its experts. The members of the Commissions from among the members of the Union have a decisive vote; other members of the Commissions have an advisory vote. At present, there are two commissions with the relevance to the policy of social inclusion: Social Commission and the Commission for Handicapped Citizens. The Commissions meet jointly; they are formed of members of municipal boards and representatives of social departments in municipalities or regions. The professional consultants are representatives of non-state non-profit organizations and other experts. For instance, in the Commission for Handicapped Citizens, the professional consultants are representatives of organizations of handicapped people. The Roma community is not represented so far in these Commissions, but the representatives of the Government Council for the Roma Community Affairs participate in the meetings dealing with the Roma community issues.

An important role for participation and a mutual dialogue is played by the *Commissions operating directly in municipalities*, the legitimacy of which is based on the Act on Municipalities (128/2000 Coll.). These are consulting bodies of the Municipal Council, which have advisory and initiation roles. They prepare proposals and recommendations for the Council, assume standpoints. In some municipalities, they create a platform for a preliminary negotiation of the consensual proposal of a decision, elsewhere they have also a control function. In some municipalities, they work based on their own plan of work, in other municipalities, they deal with topics presented by the Municipal Council.

Their establishment is voluntary. It only depends on the municipality, what commissions it establishes (that is the reason, why some municipalities have social commissions, while others have social or health commissions). The commission members are appointed by the Council and approved by the municipal council. The members are proposed by individual political parties represented in the municipal council (sometimes with the exclusion of the opposition) in proportion corresponding to the election results, from among members of the political parties represented in the municipal council. However, the parties may appoint at their discretion also non-party members (for instance experts, representatives of handicapped persons, Roma community representatives and so on).

*The community planning of social services* also develops on the local level. It is an open and cyclic process of finding out the needs and resources and looking for solutions best fit for the local conditions and needs of the involved people. The process is entered by solicitors, providers and users of the social services. Its aim is the involvement of all concerned partners, a support of a dialogue between citizens, a support of the planning process, which will be permanent, preparation of community plans. Through the community planning, the availability and quality of the social services should be increased and the financial funds should be applied more effectively (see the good practice examples).

### **III. Basic Strategic Documents Articulating the Policies of Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities in Culture**

**Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic adopted on 10th January 2001 No. 40 on Update of the Strategy of a More Efficient State Support of the Culture until 2005** articulates the cultural policy of the government of the Czech Republic for the period of 2001-2006.

**Concept of a more efficient support of art for the period of 2007-2013 adopted by the Ministry of Culture in May 2006.** The subject of the concept is a support of the creative artistic work, obtaining, processing, preserving and presenting the art and making it more accessible to the citizens in the Czech Republic and abroad and the international cooperation in the area of art.

#### **1.1 Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic**

The culture is a significant factor in the process of social inclusion. Its main function consists in spreading and promoting intellectual, emotional, ethical and aesthetical values. The strategy and implementation of the cultural policy is in the competence of the Ministry of Culture. The maintenance of a cultural dialogue, without which the integration of the majority with minorities is unthinkable and the fight against racism and xenophobia are a part of the cultural policy of the state. A key instrument to fulfill this policy lies in the common cultural activities of members of the national minorities, foreigners with various ethnical backgrounds and the majority.

The cultural policy can be defined as an organized system of tools (legal regulations and political decisions), by which the state achieves the goals set in the field of culture. A part of the state cultural policy is a minority policy (policy of the state towards religious, cultural, ethnic and national minorities<sup>10</sup>).

**The tools of the cultural policy are in particular:**

- **legislative;** According to Article 2, Clause 2 of the Declaration of Basic Rights and Freedoms, the state power can be applied only in cases and in limits set by the law and in a manner defined by the law, therefore, it is necessary to define in the legislation the public services of the state in the area of culture as a legal authority (and determining of the duty) of the state to secure the cultural services as publicly beneficial services; creation of legal standards in particular for the non-profit sector in culture is also an obligation of the state;
- **economic;** The economic support of culture by the state is implemented indirectly (tax reliefs, support of the economic self-sufficiency of non-profit entities) and directly by subsidies from the state budget; it is desirable to increase the fund-based financing of cultural activities without the intervention of state administration bodies and to provide budgets supporting the decision-making of the state administration bodies in particular on subsidies, which have a nature of compensation for the forced restriction of the ownership rights of the owners of cultural heritage in the meaning of Article 11 Clause 4 of the Declaration of Basic Rights and Freedoms;

---

<sup>10</sup> A minority denotes any social group differing by an important common characteristics from other groups forming the majority in the given community. An ethnic or national minority denote less numerous communities found in a non-dominant position towards the majority and having, as citizens of the given state formation the ethnic, religious or language characteristics, by which they differ from the rest of the population and show, though only implicitly a sense of solidarity aimed at keeping their own culture, religion or language. The nationality policy of the state is formed of a set of legal regulations and political decisions governing the position and the rights of the national minorities in the state.

- **institutional**; state cultural institutions and their system are an important article of the culture system in particular in the area of access to information and in the system of taking care of the cultural heritage;
- **controlling**; consistent attitude of the state administration bodies in culture is one of the fundamental prerequisites to maintain an equal access of citizens to the cultural heritage;
- **methodical**; the cultural behavior of entities independent of the state administration bodies (regions, municipalities, churches, non-profit cultural organizations) may be guided by a methodical and educational influence<sup>11</sup>.

The access of the Czech Republic citizens to the cultural wealth and the right to share in its development is guaranteed by the Declaration of Basic Rights and Freedoms. The Ministry of Culture aims to secure an equal access of citizens of the Czech Republic to the cultural riches and to support the participation in all artistic activities. It does so in the form of grant schemes, which are available for the citizens as well as foreigners regardless of their ethnic origin. The support of cultural activities is a part of the cultural policy; a special attention is paid to the Roma community projects.

The practical implementation of the cultural policy of the state is a matter of the public administration and the local self-administration. Their task is in particular to create the financial, conceptual, legislative and to a certain extent also the organizationally institutional prerequisites for the active participation of the citizens and civic initiatives in the culture. The implementation of the cultural policy is inseparable from the citizens and civic initiatives; they are the creators and recipients of the cultural assets and values, protect the cultural heritage and pass them over to the next generations.

### **Primary Goals of the Cultural Policy:**

- to guarantee the protection of the freedom of creation of the artists and authors and to create the conditions for exploitation of this freedom,
- to create the conditions for implementation of the cultural activities of citizens in particular based on the civic association (consorting),
- to create the conditions for decentralization of decision-making in the whole cultural system and for transferring the decision-making processes outside the intervention of the state administration bodies and their independence including economic one („artists decide about themselves“),
- to guarantee the equality of access of citizens to the cultural wealth and to facilitate this access to disadvantaged social groups (minorities, handicapped persons),
- to guarantee the protection of the cultural heritage and to support the due care of it,
- to guarantee a free access of citizens to the information, to support the exchange of information within the system of culture, between the system of culture and the external environment regardless of the language and administrative limits,
- to promote the education in the system of creation and use of cultural values,
- to reduce the negative impact of the culture commercialization.

### **Sub-Policies of the State in the Area of Culture**

„The Strategy of a More Efficient State Support of the Culture“ has a total of 65 articles in which the sub-policies of the state in the area of culture have been formulated:

---

<sup>11</sup> Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic dtd. 10th January 2001 No. 40 on Update of the Strategy of a More Effective State Support of Culture

- equality of access of all citizens including ethnic minorities to the culture and the cultural heritage,
- grant policy,
- protection of monuments,
- support of the scientific and research activities in the defined areas of culture comparable with other scientific fields,
- gathering of databases of statistically economic data from the field of culture with a sufficient information value for the conceptual and legislative activities and for the international cooperation in the given area, for instance a support of the policy of self-financing cultural institutions.
- Position of the cultural institutions within the frame of the public administration reform,

The equal access to the material and the spiritual culture is supported economically by discounts granted to socially weak citizens. The public has a right to information on exploitation of the funds from the state budget designed for the culture. The funds reserved in the state budget for the culture should reach a comparable amount as in other member countries of EU, which is roughly 1% of the total expenses of the state budget<sup>12</sup>. The use of the funds is to be effective and their distribution is to follow the priorities set by the cultural policy of the state. The effectiveness could be measured in future using the databases of statistically economic data from the area of culture, the creation of which is still in the competence of IPOS (Information and Consulting Center for the Local Culture).

### **Priorities in the Support of Areas of the Cultural Policy of the State**

- Support of the cultural identity, rights to protection of the cultural heritage, relationship of the culture and the society, support of the cultural diversity in the civic society (using the methods and knowledge of anthropology, culturology, sociology, ethnography and ethnology),
- Research and scientific evaluation of the cultural values, environment, support of identification with the cultural values, protection, preservation and presentation of the immovable cultural heritage in a broader range (the schemes, which are to cater for this area correspond fully to the documents of the Council of Europe and UNESCO in the area of cultural heritage),
- Preservation, documentation and presentation of the movable cultural heritage in the broader range from the scientific processing of the collection items of museums and galleries, as source base of the natural, social and technical sciences, mapping of the historical technologies, up to the possible use of this knowledge in solving the specific tasks in individual fields of the national economy and with the objective to enhance the cultural standard and quality of life of the population,
- Protection of and provision of access to the library funds through digitalization and retroconversion using Internet and a gradual expansion of Caslin – the automated library network, creation of databases of regional information following the example of western libraries; protection of library funds from the microclimate point of view, support of automation of the librarian processes, conversion of catalogues into the electronic form and research of the user needs including the reader's needs of the national minorities,

---

<sup>12</sup> Article 4 – Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic adopted on 10th January 2001 No. 40 on Update of the Strategy of a More Effective State Support of Culture

- Scientifically documentary mapping of the development of the Czech musical, dramatic and creative arts, the Czech literary history, theory and critique – profiling of authors, personalities, institutions,
- Research and documentation of the disappearing values of the folk culture living and material, i.e. mapping and preserving the traditional folklore, music, dances, crafts, folk manufacturers and their techniques including documentation by audio-visual equipment,
- Scientific processing of the film history with the documentation outputs including preservation of the audio-visual heritage,
- Research, development, documentation and presentation in the area of press, television, radio, audiovision as well as new methods of propagation of the author crafts.

## 1.2 State Support of Culture of the National Minorities

The state support of the culture of national minorities relates to the area of library science, publishing of books and non-periodical publications, dramatic art, museum art, activities of art ensembles and amateur activities in the area of unprofessional art. **The culture of national minorities is developed in particular by their own cultural institutions and through national organizations and associations.**

### 1.2.1 Scope of State-Aided Activities:

- Art activities
- Educational activities in cultural fields
- Documentation of the national culture
- Publication activities
- Multiethnic cultural events.

The Ministry of Culture supports multiethnic activities, even though here it is not directly about a support of the culture of national minorities but about events, which are to lead to fighting the negative phenomena of the extremism, racial and national intolerance and xenophobia.

**The Summary of the State Fund of Culture of the Czech Republic in 2000 – 2004 shows that in 2002, only 280 thousand Czech Crowns were designated to support the projects serving to keep and develop the culture of national minorities.<sup>13</sup>**

In aggregate, after 1990, the state budget or the private funds did not create sufficient resources to finance the artwork and to preserve the cultural heritage<sup>14</sup>. The disestablishment of the culture was crowned with the transformation of the state administration and formation of self-governing units – regions. The responsibility and the funds for the promotion of culture were transferred to

---

<sup>13</sup> The Concept of a More Effective Support of Art for the Period of 2007-2013, MC ČR May 2006, Page 14

<sup>14</sup> After 1989, the Czech culture was notably supported by the international organizations (British Council, Goethe Institut, Institut Francois, ProHelvetia Swiss Foundation, the program of the Dutch Ministry of Health called MATRA and Open Society Found and the Center of Contemporary Art), which were gradually reduced after entry of the Czech Republic into EU. In 1993 – 2002, their support reached CZK 130 million. A number of projects were oriented at the international art cooperation and supported the art and culture as the integral part of the open civic society. In this respect, the priority was with projects supporting tolerance and multicultural orientation. Starting from the year of 2000, the Ministry of Culture is engaged in the Culture 2000 program, which supports the international projects of entities from various countries. In 2005, these projects were subvened by the sum of EUR 3,132,582.00. In 2000 – 2004, the Czech Republic contributed with the amount of EUR 651,060 every year in the Culture 2000 program, a part of the contribution (EUR 290,215.00 per year) was covered out of the Phare program. The EU Media support scheme sets as its objective to support the European audiovisual works. In 2005, the Czech projects obtained within MEDIA scheme the sum exceeding EUR 1 million..

the regions. The cultural activities are not supported from the regional budgets. In 2000 – 2004, some activities were not supported at all (including the research and development in this area). Most funds were used to support museums, galleries, libraries, monuments, etc. The privatization, liquidation and abolishment of organizations established in the past by the Ministry of Culture continue. The Ministry of Culture now administers the key organizations and starting from 2002, the allowance organizations may share in co-financing by revenues from their collateral activities and efficient use of the entrusted assets. The allowance organizations still remain an instrument of the state cultural policy and do not include any organizations serving national minorities. The proposed concept is absolutely absent of the programs for the development of minority cultures.

The area of art and culture is marginalized from the point of view of the state support; not only that its importance as a bearer of the identity and cultural heritage is not appreciated, but even the capacity of its economic contribution is underestimated, because it is perceived as a non-productive field. Unless the art and cultural activities are financed alternatively, we cannot expect even the improvement of the financial support of projects serving for the inclusion of ethnic minorities.

**Based on the data of the Concept of a More Efficient Support of Art for the Period of 2007 – 2013, the budget of Chapter 334 drops below 1% of the state budget, which is in contradiction with the recommendation of EU<sup>15</sup>. The approved budget of Chapter 334 for 2006 (Ministry of Culture) – expenses indicator – amounts to CZK 6,357,161 thousand. Of this amount, 40,000 thousand Czech Crowns were earmarked for the support of the cultural activities of national minorities and the Roma community.**

The grant schemes of the Ministry of Culture are framed by fields and structured formally by the type of the projects. One of the key goals of the present cultural policy is a support of the freedom of artistic expression. The support of art and culture of the national and ethnic minorities in the form of grants leads in particular to support the shows, festivals, which not only fulfill the art, but also the social and integration function. Due to a transformation of the state administration, a number of artistic and cultural activities were transferred to the competence of regions and municipalities, which are now responsible for the development of art and culture, but so far, the respective funds were not adequately earmarked in the state budget to support such activities.

### **1.2.2 Grants to Support Unprofessional Activities**

#### **Support of Cultural Activities of National Minorities**

It is declared as a separate program of the Ministry of Culture for legal and physical entities, which supportably perform activities to the benefit of national minorities for at least one year and it partially concerns also the artistic work (support of ensembles, for instance drama, choirs, dancing). DC is the sponsor of the Program of Support of Dissemination and Receipt of Information in Languages of National Minorities or predominantly in languages of national minorities or about national minorities in the society. This scheme has been in its agenda since 2002, before, it was guaranteed by the Treasury Department (Ministry of Finance). The financial funds are granted in two areas:

- a) for a periodical press published in languages of national minorities or predominantly in languages of national minorities or for information about the national minorities in the society;

---

<sup>15</sup> The Concept of a More Effective Support of Art for the Period of 2007-2013, MC ČR May 2006, Page 38

b) for operation of the radio or television broadcasting in the languages of national minorities or predominantly in languages of the national minorities or information about the national minorities in the society.

A significant part of the cultural life of the national minorities is represented by their folklore activities supported by the Folklore Association of the Czech Republic. It strives to keep the folk traditions and the national cultural values, in particular in the area of folk music, singing and dancing. The grant policy of the Ministry of Culture in the area of national minorities is in the competence of the department of regional and national culture, which also administers the scheme of support of integration of the Roma community. Apart from this, the Ministry of Culture provides subsidies for activities of the national minorities in the area of art, libraries, protection of cultural heritage, museum and galleries. The support concerns the projects in the grant scheme for the area of audiovision and mass media, with respect to the cultural activities of the national minorities<sup>16</sup>. The Department of Literature and Libraries declares a grant tender of the scheme for support of libraries and Concepts of Development of Libraries, one area of which is a support of the work with national minorities and integration of foreigners.

### **Support of Integration of Members of the Roma Community**

It has been declared since 2002 in relation to the Report on Situation of the Roma Community in the Czech Republic (see Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic adopted on 29th October 1997 No. 687 to the Report on Situation of the Roma Community in the Czech Republic and to the Present Situation in the Roma Community), Concept of the Government Policy towards the Roma Community Members helping their integration into the society (see Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic adopted on 14th June 2000 No. 599 + P No. 279 /1999) and Measure leading to arrangement of an all-society and parliamentary discussion on correction of relationships between the majority society and the Roma minority (see the Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic adopted on 11th November 2000 under No. 994). The program is a separate item of the budget of the Ministry of Culture and is declared for legal entities, which perform their activities to the benefit of the Roma community at least for one year, for projects focused on artistic, culturally educational and educational activities, study of the Romanic culture and traditions, documentation and edition activities, film, television and radio programs and multiethnic events. The integration of the Roma community is considerably supported also by the Museum of Roma Culture. The Museum of the Roma Culture was established in Brno in 1991 by initiative of the Roma and non-Roma origin intellectuals and experts with the support of the Ministry of Culture. By its mission and activities it continues in the legacy of the Union of Gypsies – Roma People (1969 – 1973). It is the first and so far the only institution of its kind in Europe. It gathers documents and proofs of the material and spiritual culture of the Roma people and their symbiosis with the majority from the oldest times up to the present. In 2005, the Museum of Roma Culture transformed as **a publicly beneficial society into a state allowance organization of the Ministry of Culture**.

### **1.3 State Support of Culture of Modern Foreign Communities**

Apart from the members of state-recognized national minorities, the Czech Republic is also populated with the members of ethnic minorities, who come as a result of the new-age migrations. The state equalizes a certain deficit in the rights of foreigners resulting from the fact, that they are not the citizens-residents through the integration policy. Its objective is to bring as

---

<sup>16</sup> Report on Situation of National Minorities in the Czech Republic for 2004, Office of the Government of the Czech Republic, Secretariat of the Government for National Minorities, Page 18

close as possible the position of the long-term and legally resident foreigners with the legal position of citizens. **The keeping of the cultural identity, the right to the culture development, the support of cultural variety and multiethnic events belongs to the policies of the Ministry of Culture, which pertain to the members of the communities of foreigners as well as to the citizens and the state-recognized national minorities.**

## **Support of Integration of Foreigners living in the Czech Republic in the Area of Culture, Traditions and Religions**

The grant scheme was first declared in 2001 based on Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic dtd. 11th December 2000 under No. 1266 on Implementation of the Principles of Concept of Integration of Foreigners on the Territory of the Czech Republic and on draft of the Concept of Integration of Foreigners on the Territory of the Czech Republic and Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic dtd. 10th January 2001 under No. 40, on Updating the Strategy of a More Efficient State Support of Culture (Culture Policy). It is designed for physical and legal entities to support the publicly beneficial projects contributing considerably to the dissemination of cultural values, protection of the human rights, development of democracy and humanism, tolerance and harmonic symbiosis in a multicultural society.

### **1.4 Bodies Authorized to Implement the Cultural and Minority Policy**

In 2001, the government of the Czech Republic established **an advisory board of the Deputy Minister for Issues of National Culture**. Its mission is to observe and evaluate the cultural needs of the members of national minorities living in the Czech Republic. The Board is a coordination, initiative and advisory body of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic is formed of members of the largest national minorities (Hungarian, German, Polish, Roma, Slovak and Ukrainian). The members of the Board are appointed for two years based on recommendations of the members of the **Council of the Government of the Czech Republic for Nationalities**. In the Board, there is also a director of the secretariat of the Council for Nationalities and two representatives of the professional institutions of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic. The advisory board shares in the creation of conditions of the tenders and evaluates the projects participating in the tender for a support of cultural activities of the national minorities living in the Czech Republic.

The Advisory Board monitors and evaluates the needs of cultural activities of national minorities living in the Czech Republic. It is a coordination, initiative and advisory body of the Ministry of Culture. It has 9 members, 6 representatives of the largest national minorities and three experts. The Advisory Board is a collective body with equal position of all members. The meeting is summoned and chaired by the Deputy Minister. The position of the secretary of the advisory board is assumed by an employee of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic. The Board is also engaged in the preparation of the tender for a support of cultural activities of the national minorities living in the Czech Republic and fulfills also the function of the tender commission evaluating the projects and awarding the state subvenes.

The Department of Mass Media of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic declares annually a grant tender in the area of audiovision and mass media. The grants are designed to support the publicly beneficial projects contributing to dissemination of the valuable audiovisual culture, cultivation of the mass media scene, to promote qualified knowledge and skills, to defend the ethic and humane values, to protect the human rights, to develop a democracy, **tolerance and harmonic coexistence in a multicultural society and to support the minority groups of the population**. The subvenes are designed for i) festivals, shows and exhibitions, ii) seminars, workshops and training promoting knowledge in the field of media, iii) television and

radio shows, when the subvene is designed for the authors of the television and radio programs and cycles of publicly beneficial nature dealing with serious social topics (educational programs, language courses and so on). The subvene may be granted also to increase **the opportunity of making programs accessible by minority groups of inhabitants.** iv) children media works and iv) projects promoting the Czech activities in foreign countries. The subvenes are granted for a specific purpose and the conditions for their use are determined by the Ministry of Culture including the method of accounting for the subvenes.

## **2. National Strategy of the Police of the CR for work with Ethnic Minorities**

The concept of the Strategy was drafted in connection with the Czech Republic accession to the EU and requirements and obligations resulting from the accession for the Police of the CR with respect to protection of minorities. The Strategy is primarily a response to an encouragement formulated in the Programme of the activities UN of the World Conference against Racism for 2002. In section 74 thereof the UN urges the states and invites NGOs and private sector to create and execute a policy supporting high quality and diversity of the police force bereaved of racism and carried out an active recruitment in all groups, including ethnic minorities for public administration, police and other bodies. Other documents important for drafting the Strategy are e.g.: The Covenant on Removal of all forms of Race Discrimination (UN, 1965), The Framework Covenant on protection of ethnic minorities (Council of Europe, 1995), related Act on rights of members of ethnic minorities and Directive implementing the principle of equal treatment of persons regardless of their race or ethnic origin. The Strategy defines principles of the police work vis-à-vis relation to persons or communities of persons, which differ from the point of view of ethnic, race, religious or general cultural uniqueness.

#### **IV. National Minorities in the Czech Republic**

In terms of national origin, the Czech Republic is a homogenous state; according to the population census, 94.2 % of inhabitants are Czech, 1.9% Slovak, 0.5% Polish, 0.4% German, 0.1% Hungarian and 2.8% other nationalities. For more details see the enclosure of the Table. During its history, it is possible to observe a tendency towards a certain nationality homogenization of the population<sup>17</sup>. Nevertheless, the comparison of results of two last population censuses performed in 1991 and 2001, when the population in 2001 included also the foreign nationals-residents, it is possible to observe a moderate decline of the population with the nationality forming the base of the nationality structure of the state (Czech, Moravian and Silesian), from 94.8% in 1991 to 94.2% in 2001.

The Act on Population Census<sup>18</sup> stipulated in relation to the duty to provide the data, that the nationality and religion will be completed based on every person's own decision, which also meant that people were not obliged to answer the question. In 2001, it was also allowed to state more than one nationality. Most often, the following combinations occurred: Czech and another, Czech and Slovak, Moravian and another. See the enclosure of Table 1 - 3.

The regional distribution of the national minorities was created during the history of the state. The highest representation of inhabitants with the Polish nationality is in the districts of Frýdek-Místek and Karviná, the highest share of persons with the German nationality is in districts of Cheb, Sokolov and Karlovy Vary. The most diversified nationality structure is recorded in the districts of Karviná, Sokolov, Frýdek-Místek, and Cheb, where more than 10% inhabitants have a different than Czech, Moravian or Silesian nationalities.

Although the Czech Republic shows a trend of a growing population of foreign nationals, the nationality composition of the population is not dramatically changed in any way. The overall trend leads to a slight increase of the ethnic heterogeneity of the population. The foreigners with the long-term residence in the Czech Republic include also the foreigners who have a nationality, which enjoys a minority status in the Czech Republic. There foreigners do not hold the minority rights as citizens professed to belong to the respective nationality, nevertheless, they change the actual nationality composition of the population.

The comparison of the nationality composition of the population based on the census of population, houses and apartments taken in 1991 and 2001 shows the highest relative growth of the population professed to belong to the Ukrainian (index of 269), Russian (index of 244.3), Bulgarian (index of 125.1), Romanian (index of 119.7) and the Czech nationalities (index of 110.6). On the contrary, the number of persons declaring the Silesian (index of 24.4) and Moravian (index of 27.9), Roma (index of 35.7), Ruthenian (index of 57.4), Slovak (index of 61.4), Hungarian (index of 73.6), German (index of 80.5), Polish (index of 87.5) and Greek (index of 95.3) nationalities dropped markedly.

---

<sup>17</sup> Determining the nationality in the population, houses and apartments census in the period of 1921- 2001, ČSÚ – Czech Statistical Office, [www.czso.cz](http://www.czso.cz). The „nationality“ term was defined during the history of Czechoslovakia or as applicable the Czech Republic in various ways. Determining the nationality is a permanent part of the census of population, houses and apartments in Bohemia. The data from various population censuses may be compared only indicatively, as the definitions and the determining methods changed in time and various significance was attributed to the found data. In the first population census already, the nationality was derived from the mother tongue, but at the same time it was found out by a direct free declaration of every present inhabitant older than 14 years of age. More nationalities were simply not admitted. The population censuses held in 1970, 1980, 1991 recognized the nationality as the belonging to a certain nation or the nationality, while the declaration of the same was a matter of a personal choice.

<sup>18</sup> Act No. 155/1999 Coll. on Census of Population, Houses and Apartments

## **1. General Characteristics of the Minority Policy and Culture**

The document, which regularly analyzes the government policy towards the national minorities, is the Report on Situation of the National Minorities in the Czech Republic. The Report summarizes the measures of the public administration towards the national minorities and evaluates the international obligations of the Czech Republic in the area of minority policies. It is a document of the Council for Nationalities of the Czech Republic, which is an advisory body of the government in this area.

The rights of the national minorities<sup>19</sup> are stipulated by Act No. 273/2001<sup>20</sup> (minority law), which determines the competence of the departments and other administrative offices of the self-governing regions or municipalities in this area. The Czech Republic has been bound by the General-Frame Agreement on Protection of National Minorities since April 1998.

The rights of the national minorities are protected by the law due to the fact, that the members of the national minorities do not achieve them automatically as the members of the majority due to their minority position (for instance education in the national language and so on).

Belonging to a certain national minority is a matter of a free choice and must not bring any nuisance to those professing to be a part of the minority. The bodies of the public administration do not keep any recording system of the members of the national minorities. Acquiring, processing and using the personal data regarding the membership in the national minority is governed by the provisions of special legal regulations<sup>21</sup>. The data on professing a nationality obtained by these bodies in the population census or based on another special law, which allows determining that the person belong to a national minority, must not be used for other purposes than for which it was gathered and lodged and after the data is statistically processed, it must be destroyed<sup>22</sup>.

## **2. Rights of Members of the National Minorities – State Policy towards Minorities**

- Right to associate
- Right to participate in the matters concerning the national minority
- Right to use the name and surname in the language of the national minority
- Right of multilingual names and identifications
- Right to use the language of the national minority in the official relations and before courts
- Right to use the language of the national minority in electoral matters
- Right to a development of the culture of national minorities
- Right to disseminate and receive information in the language of the national minority

---

<sup>19</sup> A national minority is a community of citizens of the Czech Republic living on the territory of the present Czech Republic, who differ from other citizens usually by a common ethnic origin, language, culture and traditions, represent a numerical minority of the population and at the same time express their will to be considered a national minority for the purpose of a common effort to preserve and develop their own origin, language and culture and at the same time to demonstrate and protect the interests of their community, which has been historically constituted. The member of a national minority is a citizen of the Czech Republic, who claims to have other than the Czech nationality and expresses a wish to be considered a member of the national minority together with others, who claim to have the same nationality.

<sup>20</sup> Act No. 273/2001 Coll. on Rights of Members of the National Minorities (Minority Law).

<sup>21</sup> Act No. 101/2000 Coll. on Protection of Personal Data and on Change of Some Acts, as amended.

<sup>22</sup> Act No. 273/2001

### **3. Participation – Policies**

The participation of the national minorities in the political, social and cultural life of the society is guaranteed by law. The members of the national minorities participate in the political life in particular as the state citizens, not as the national minority. The participation of the national minorities in the cultural and social life of the minority occurs in particular in organization of festivals and projects preserving the traditions and the cultural heritage.

#### **3.1 Basic Documents**

The basic document is Act No. 273/2001 Coll. on the Rights of National Minorities (Minority Act). The members of a national minority may associate in national associations as well as in political parties and movements under the conditions and in a manner set by special legal regulations.<sup>23</sup> Members of the national minorities have a right to participate actively in the cultural, social and economic life and in public matters, especially in those, which concern the national minorities, they are members of, on the level of a municipality, a region or even the nationwide level.

The right to an active participation in the cultural life is exercised by the members of the national minorities in particular through committees for the national minorities, established based on special legal regulations<sup>24</sup> and the Council of the Government for National Minorities. The details about the composition of the Council, method of appointment of members of the Council and on activities of the Council are determined by the statute of the Council approved by the government.

#### **3.2 Support Documents**

Act No. 83/1990 Coll., on Association of Citizens and Act on Freedom of Religion and Position of Churches and Religious Societies (on Churches and Religious Societies).

#### **3.3 Data**

The members of the national minorities organized in the political parties based on the nationality principle form a marginal group (at present only 3 of 92 political parties and 40 political movements<sup>25</sup> organize the members of the national minority (status as at 5th June 2006)).

The Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic recorded in June 2006 a total of 63,526 civic associations. The total number of national associations and corporations is not of course separately recorded but for 2006, it is possible to derive their number from the specific projects applying for subsidies or grants to support the culture of national minorities. In 2006, the Ministry of Culture supported a total of 51 projects supporting the development of the minority culture, traditions and cultural heritage by a total sum of CZK 7,712,000.00. Apart from this the Ministry of Culture supported 31 projects of integration of the Roma minority.

---

<sup>23</sup> Act No. 83/1990 Coll., on Association of Citizens, as amended.

Act No. 424/1991 Coll., on Association in Political Parties and Political Movements, as amended.

Act No. 220/1999 Coll., on the Course of the Compulsory Military Service or Civilian Service and Military Exercises and on Some Legal Relations of the Reserve Soldiers.

<sup>24</sup> Act No. 128/2000 Coll., on Municipalities (Municipal Establishment), as amended by Act No. 273/2001 Coll.

Act No. 129/2000 Coll., on Regions (Regional Establishment), as amended by Act No. 273/2001 Coll.

Act No. 131/2000 Coll., on the Capital City of Prague, as amended.

<sup>25</sup> (Moravians, Roma Democratic Social Party, Roma Civic Initiative of CR)

Only 32.1% of the Czech Republic inhabitants profess a religious belief, while the members of the national minorities show a higher percentage of believers. The highest number of religious citizens profess the Roman-Catholic Church (83.4%). The Czech Brotherhood Evangelic Church is professed by 3.6% believers and the Czechoslovak Hussite Church by 3.0% believers, other churches are professed by 10.1% believers<sup>26</sup>.

## 4. Education – Policies

### 4.1 Basic Documents

The members of the national minorities, who live traditionally and long on the territory of the Czech Republic, have a right to education in their mother tongue in schools, pre-school facilities and educational facilities under the conditions determined by the special legal regulations. The members of the national minorities may establish under the conditions set by the special legal regulations

- a) private schools with the teaching language of the national minority or with teaching language of the national minority as a teaching subject,
- b) private pre-school facilities and private educational facilities.

The education of the national minorities is stipulated by Act No. 561 (School Act)<sup>27</sup>.

The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (hereinafter referred to as “Ministry” only) elaborates the National Program of Education and submits it to the government for negotiation. The government then submits the National Program of Education to the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate of the Parliament for an approval. The National Program of Education elaborates on the goals of education set by this Act and defines the main areas of education, content of education and the means, which are necessary to achieve these goals. The education is organized in the individual school in accordance with the school educational programs. The schools are established in accordance with Section 8 of the School Act<sup>28</sup>. The schools may be established by regions, municipalities, voluntary union of municipalities, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, registered churches and religious societies (provided that they were issued an authorization to exercise a special right to establish church schools), as school legal entities or allowance organizations pursuant to the special legal regulation. The Ministries fulfil the function of the school establishing entities on behalf of the state.

Other legal entities or physical entities establish school and school facilities as the school legal entities or as legal entities pursuant to special legal regulations,<sup>29</sup> the subject of business of which is a provision of education or school services pursuant to the school act. The legal entity and the organization unit of the state may perform the activities of the school or the school facility, school and school facility or more schools or school facilities. The name of the legal entity and the organization unit of the state performing the educational activities, must contain the identification of the school type, or as applicable the kind or the type of the school facility; a part of the name may be a specifying attribute or as applicable an honorable name if awarded by the Ministry.

---

<sup>26</sup> Census 2001

<sup>27</sup> §14

<sup>28</sup> Section 8 Legal Position of Schools and School Facilities

The teaching language is a Czech language. The members of the national minorities<sup>8)</sup> have a right to education in the language of the national minority under the conditions set in Section 14. The Ministry may authorize teaching of some subjects in a foreign language. At higher vocational schools, the teaching language may be a foreign language.

(1) The municipality, region or as applicable the department secures for the members of the national minorities the education in the language of the national minority in nursery schools, elementary and secondary schools in municipalities in which a committee for national minorities was established in accordance with the special legal regulation<sup>9)</sup>, provided that the conditions set by this Act are fulfilled.

(2) A nursery class may be established, provided that at least 8 children who come from the national minority apply for the education in the language of the national minority, an elementary school class may be established provided that at least 10 pupils belonging to the national minority applies for the education in the language of the national minority; the nursery or the elementary school with the language of the national minority may be established under a condition that all classes will be filled up on average with at least 12 children or pupils belong to the national minority in one class.

(3) A secondary school grade may be established, provided that at least 12 students belonging to the national minority applies for the education in the language of the national minority; a secondary school with the language of the national minority may be established under a condition that all classes will be filled up on average with at least 15 students belonging to the national minority.

(4) When organizing the education in the language of the national minority, the municipalities, regions or as applicable the ministry take into account the availability of this education. The education in the language of the national minority may be secured also by a union of municipalities, or the municipalities may agree on the organization between themselves or as applicable a municipality may agree with a region on such organization.

(5) If the conditions stated in Clauses 2 and 3 are not fulfilled, the principal may designate in the educational scheme with the consent of the founder the subjects or their parts, in which the education is organized bilingually, both in the Czech language and in the language of the national minority.

(6) The schools with the education in the language of the national minority issue certificates, indentures, and bilingual leaving examination diplomas, both in the Czech language and in the language of the national minority.

The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports partakes in formation of the government policy in relation to the education of national and ethnic minorities and declares grant tender procedures for the projects in the given field<sup>29)</sup>. The following thematic areas were announced for 2006:

## 1. Language education of the children and youth of the members of the national minorities.

---

<sup>29)</sup> Ministry of Education, Youth and Physical Education (hereinafter referred to as „Department“ only declares in accordance with the Government Regulation No. 98/2002 Coll. by which the conditions and methods of providing grants from the state budget for activities of members of the national minorities and for a support of integration of members of the Roma community are set, the grant tender procedure for projects in the „Program of Support of Education in the Languages of the National Minorities and Multicultural Education for 2006“.

2. Projects commenced in 2005, in which the project author submitted the project intent and a preliminary budget for 2006

3. Social, cultural and other educational activities for the children and youth of the members of the national minorities and the majority society in relation to the minority societies.

4. Creation and implementation of the educational schemes (including teaching materials for these schemes), which lead to the abatement of racial and nationality intolerance.

5. Support of schools with the significant representation of pupils from ethnic minorities.

The objective of declaration of this point of the thematic area is to contribute to a solution of a problem, which is encountered by the elementary schools, which operate based on the general-frame educational scheme for elementary education, creating the necessary conditions for the pupils from sociocultural disadvantaging environment – in particular from ethnic minorities (apart from pupils from the Roma communities. The schools with a considerable representation of pupils from the Roma communities submit requests within the frame of the tender procedure „Program for a Support of the Roma Community in 2006“).

## **4.2 Support Documents**

The issue of education of the ethnic minorities is an integral part of comprehensive materials dealing with the situation of the national minorities, integration of Roma communities and integration of foreigners. Apart from these basic documents, the implementation of educational policies for ethnic minorities is based on the conceptual materials focused closely on this area:

- Strategy for Improvement of Education of the Roma Children – Version 2001
- Proposal for a solution of the problem of education of Roma community children or the children from other minorities through their special preparation and positive measures adopted in accordance with Clause 9 of the Final Recommendations
- Concept (project) of a timely care of children from socioculturally disadvantaging environment in the area of education
- Government Resolution No. 686/1997 to the Report on Situation of the Roma Community in the Czech Republic and to the present situation in the Roma Community
- Priorities of the Primary Prevention of the Department of Education for 2006 resulting from the Strategy of Prevention for the Period of 2005 – 2008

## **4.3 Grant Schemes**

Apart from the conceptual activities, the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports helps in the development of the area of nationality education, multicultural education and integration of pupils and students from the disadvantaging socio-cultural environment by a support of these activities in the form of grants.

The „One World“ project implemented at schools is a follow-up to the project of Education of Human Rights using documentary films, accompanied with discussions and chats held at schools has been pursued since 2003. The project was originally implemented only at Secondary Schools. Since January 2005, it has expanded also to the Elementary Schools.

**For 2006, The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports declared the following thematic areas for education and integration of members of the national and ethnic minorities:**

1. Language education of children and youth of national minorities.
2. Projects commenced in 2005, at which the author presented the project plan and a preliminary budget for 2006
3. Social, cultural and other educational activities for the children and youth of national minorities and the majority society in relation to the minority societies.
4. Creation and implementation of educational schemes (including teaching materials for these schemes), which lead to abatement of the racial and nationality intolerance.
5. Support of schools with a major representation of pupils and students from among ethnic minorities [1]. The objective of declaration of this thematic area issue is to contribute to the solution of the problem, which is encountered by elementary schools operating based on the general-frame educational scheme for the elementary education, with the creation of needed conditions for pupils from socioculturally disadvantaging environment – in particular from ethnic minorities (apart from pupils from Roma communities).

Within the frame of the strategy of primary prevention for the period of 2005 – 2008, the Department of Education supports grant schemes for activities in the area of prevention of socially pathological phenomena between the children and the youth. Within the frame of their priorities, the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports supports Projects focused on the work with the national minorities specifically in the area of prevention of socially undesirable phenomena.

#### **4.5 Data**

According to the population census results, the level of education of all inhabitants including the national minorities is permanently growing. The share of population with the elementary or incomplete elementary education is dropping and the share of persons with a vocational education without a school leaving examination and with a school leaving examination and with the complete university education grows. In 2001, the highest nationwide share fell to skilled workers or to persons with a secondary vocational school without a leaving examination (38%), almost 9% achieved the university education.

#### **5. Media – Policies**

The elemental conditions of operation of the radio and television broadcasting in the Czech Republic are stipulated by Act No. 231/2001, on Operation of Radio and Television Broadcasting and on Change of Other Acts. This Act stipulates the operation of the Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting, which is a body authorized to control the compliance with the legal regulations in the area of radio and television broadcasting and the conditions set in the decision on granting of a license or in the decision on registration of the operator of the radio or television broadcasting. This body is authorized to remove the license from the operator of the radio and television broadcasting, which includes in its broadcasting such programs, which would instigate hatred on grounds of race, sex, religion, nationality or belonging to a certain group of population (clause 12, Article 10 c).

The specified Act simultaneously determines the basic duties of the broadcasters and operators of the subscribed broadcasting. One of their core duties is to ensure that the broadcasted programs do not instigate hatred on grounds of race, sex, religion, nationality or belonging to a certain group of inhabitants (Section 32, Article 1 c, Section 48, Article 1 k).

Apart from this general stipulation regulating the radio and television broadcasting of all operators, the Act No. 483/1991, on the Czech Television as amended and Act No. 483/1991 on the Czech Radio as amended specify the role of the public media in relation to ethnic minorities.

The main tasks of the television of the public service set for the Czech Television by Act executed on 23rd January 2001 include in Section 2 Article 2 c) „the creation and propagation of programs and provision of a balanced offer of programs for all groups of inhabitants with regards to the freedom of their religion and belief, culture, ethnic or nationality origin, national identity, social origin, age or education in such a way, so that these programs and shows reflect the variety of opinions and political, religious and philosophical directions with the aim to strengthen the mutual understanding and tolerance and to support the solidarity of a plural society“; the same section, Article 2d) stipulates „the development of the cultural identity of the inhabitants of the Czech Republic including the national or ethnic minorities“.

This legal framework is used by the Czech Television in creating its program dramaturgy. It also relies on the fact, that no potential television viewer is always and in all merely a majority or merely a minority viewer that his or her behavior is variable and shows both minority and majority characteristics depending on its relationship to the facts mediated by the television. Therefore, it is necessary to take into account in the program dramaturgy also the fact, that the majority of the viewers have their majority-related or minority-related expectations in more than one direction.

For 2006 the Ministry of Culture allocated under the program of Support of dissemination of information in languages of ethnic minorities total CZK 30.269,750.

## **5.1. Minorities Press**

In the CR periodicals and electronic media of twelve national minorities are subsidised - Bulgarian, Hungarian, German, Polish, Roma, Ruthenian, Russian, Greek, Slovak, Serbian, Ukrainian and Jewish. Their list including publishers is given in annexed tables. in the period 2004 - 2005 total 32 periodicals and electronic media published by minority organisations were subsidised, in 2006 - 27 periodicals and electronic media (list - see Annex, tab. 36, 37).

## **5.2 Czech Television (CT)**

The program menu of the Czech Television prepared in 2005 contains several groups of programs about national and ethnic minorities, which are designed both for individual minorities and also for the general public, which is interested in the life of these minorities. The long experience confirms that this double designation of programs helps to support the coherence of the plural society and at the same time represents an efficient item in the prevention from creating minority ghettos. A great role in these tendencies taken in 2005 was played by programs of cyclic nature. In particular the multicultural magazines Babylon, Kosmopolis and Velký vůz (The Great Dipper) should be mentioned here.

Another group was formed in 2005 by programs, which informed of life in neighboring countries and in the European Union states. In this respect, it is necessary to mention in particular Kvarteto, a monthly, which brings closer the issues of countries of the Visegrad Group

and is implemented by regional studies in Slovakia, Poland, Hungary and in the Czech Republic (namely by Ostrava Studio of CT). This group also includes City Folk, showing the life of mainly European metropolises and weeklies U nás v Evropě (Here in Europe) and Evropa dnes (Evropa Today), which show everyday life from Lisbon to Vilnius.

In 2005, also foreign-language programs – Euronews, World net RZ and News Hour with Jim Lehrer in English, STV News in Slovak and regional News in Polish broadcast in Ostrava evening news program Report found its place in the program structure of the Czech Television.

The double mission is fulfilled by the broadcasting of foreign films in the original version with the Czech subtitles. Apart from the fact, that native Czechs mindful of their language endowment may watch foreign films in their original versions and people speaking other languages may watch the films in their mother tongue.

### **Broadcasting of the CT (Czech Television) for minorities and about them**

Transmissions dedicated to national and ethnic minorities are permanent part of its programme structure since foundation of this TV station as a public service television. Share of such transmissions in the period 1993 - 2004 was relatively stable - about 0,5 % of the total broadcasting time. In relation to gradual extension of the broadcasting time up to 24 hrs per day on both CT programmes this transmissions' share has slightly risen and in 2005 was 0,8% of the broadcasting time. In 2005 the CT total broadcasting time was (on both nation-wide programmes) 17 520 hrs, i.e. 156 927 transmissions. Broadcasting of the CT for minorities and about them took total 1 193 hrs with total 2 959 transmissions. Implicitly these themes can be found throughout the whole spectre of the CT broadcasting. **Transmissions for ethnic minorities represented 11% of the total broadcasting time dedicated to minorities<sup>30</sup>. From broadcasting on minorities national and ethnic minorities related were 26,3 % of transmissions .**

The volume of transmissions in other than Czech language is fluctuating both in years (Tab. III) and more so when comparing months in different years (Tab. IV); it depends on number of films and other transmissions in original languages with Czech subtitles and also on offer of news in foreign languages (e.g. this year besides international EURONEWS in English and NOVINY STV in Slovak also regional news in Polish, produced in Ostrava studio). The CT as the first TV station in the CR started broadcasting in Roma; latest transmission was e.g. AMARE ROMA.

### **5.3 Broadcasting of the CR (Czech Radio) for Minorities and about them**

The Act No. 483/1991, on Czech Radio stipulates that the „Czech Radio renders the service to the public of the Czech Republic by creating and distributing radio programs on the whole territory of the Czech Republic. Its mission is to provide objective, verified, universal and balanced information leading to a free formation of opinions, development of the cultural identity of the Czech nation and the national and ethnic minorities in the Czech Republic, to convey the environmental information, to serve for the education and to contribute to the entertainment of the listeners.“ (Section 2)

---

<sup>30</sup> Veřejná služba a vysílání České televize v roce 2005. Seminář Rady České televize 15.2. 2006 (Czech TV seminary 2006).

The Annual Report of the Council of the Czech Radio<sup>31</sup> on activities of the Czech Radio, which was presented to the Chamber of Deputies of the Parliament of the Czech Republic for a negotiation in 2006, devoted a separate chapter to the issue of broadcasting for ethnic minorities. The Report summarizes the current concept of broadcasting for minorities and presents statistical summaries on broadcasting of the Czech Radio and statistics on broadcasting of the individual stations of the Czech Radio.

„Apart from special programs designed directly for some nationalities (including broadcasting also in their language), the broadcasting increased the space for news programs, topical coverages and other radio forms, which allow both the majority society to get to know the life and culture of (not only) national minorities, but on the other hand, to integrate the minorities in the society. [...] This integration concept will be particularly promoted and developed by the Czech Radio without diminishing the space for special broadcasting designed for individual minorities.

With regards to entry of the Czech Republic to the European Union associated with a free movement of people, and with the arrival of asylum seekers and a greater immigration for which the Czech Republic becomes a target country on many occasions, the broadcasting for minorities becomes truly multilingual and multicultural. In addition to that, this broadcasting is also specifically divided into regions, in which some of the minorities are more numerous – so that the Czech Radio is closer to its listeners.

In 2003, the Czech Radio broadcasted a total of 42,237 minutes of programs designed for national minorities or about these minorities, of which 6,930 minutes were broadcasted on nationwide coverage stations and 35,307 minutes on regional stations.

In 2004, the Czech Radio broadcasted a total of 34,550 minutes of programs for national minorities or about these minorities on nationwide coverage and regional stations.

In 2005, the Czech Radio manufactured 988 programs, which is a total of 24,750 minutes of programs for national minorities or about these minorities on nationwide coverage and regional stations.

Specialized programs for minorities are prepared by 26 editors, of which 21 come from minorities, which is 80.7%. The share of broadcasting in the mother tongue of minorities in the total number of broadcast hours is 12,390 minutes, which is 50%.

The Czech Radio broadcasts extensively for the Slovak, Polish, Ukrainian, English and German minority. Separately, the Council of the Czech Radio evaluates the broadcasting of the Czech Radio to foreign countries prepared by the Czech Radio 7. “<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Council of the Czech Radio (hereinafter referred to as „Council“ only) is a body in the meaning of Act No. 484/1991 Coll., on Czech Radio as amended, by which the right of the public to control the activities and distribution of programs of the Czech Radio (hereinafter referred to as „CR“ only) is applied, however, it is not a part of CR. The inspection of activities and distribution of programs by the Council is external and subsequent, that means that the Council does not interfere with the direct management of CR, economic matters, operating and personnel matters (apart as defined by the law), which does not exclude the option of the Council assuming a standpoint to this. The Council is independent of the political parties. The members of the Council exercise their offices in accordance with their conscience and make their decisions completely freely and independently. The Council has nine members, for the III. Electoral Term, it was elected by the Chamber of Deputies in February 2002 and after adoption of Act No. 192/2002 Coll., the term of office of its members is six years, while after two years, one third of its members is always replaced. The Council reports its activities to the Chamber of Deputies of the Parliament of the Czech Republic.

<sup>32</sup> Council of the Czech Radio (2006).

### **5.3 Grant Schemes**

See Attachment II- Tables

### **5.4 Implementation of Programs in the Area of Education of Ethnic Minorities**

The members of the national minorities have a right to distribution and receipt of information in the language of their national minorities. To preserve and develop the culture, traditions and languages, the state subvenes publishing of periodical and non-periodical press published in the languages of the national minorities, which live traditionally and long on the territory of the Czech Republic and also the radio and television broadcasting in the languages of the national minorities, which live traditionally and long on the territory of the Czech Republic. For this purpose, the state provides grants from the state budget; conditions and method of providing the grants are set by a government regulation. The creation and distribution of the radio and television programs by legal broadcasters in relation to the members of the national minorities are governed by special legal regulations<sup>33</sup>. The Ministry of Culture has provided a total of 30.3 million Czech Crowns for the distribution and receipt of information in the languages of the national minorities.

---

<sup>33</sup> Act No. 483/1991 Coll., on Czech Television, as amended.  
Act No. 484/1991 Coll., on Czech Radio, as amended.

## V. ROMA COMMUNITY

The members of the Roma community are most often considered to be people jeopardized by the social exclusion. The Roma community is a broader term (and tells at the same time about a more numerous population), than the Roma national minority. The estimated counts are at least ten times higher than the number of members of the Roma national minority. Less than 12 thousand inhabitants claimed to have a Roma nationality during the 2001 population census.

Although the Roma people have made a giant step forward since the end of the World War II in overcoming the cultural gap, which separated them from the majority after their transmigration from Slovakia and Hungary to Bohemia and Moravia, many of them still belong today to the less integrated part of the Czech society. In order to be able to provide a greater care to all members of the Roma community, who need it, the government of the Czech Republic opted in its concept for an approach, which allows for a support of a larger range of people suffering from the social exclusion, than it would be possible to find among persons, who declare themselves to be the Roma minority. This helps to balance the deficit affecting still some Roma citizens. The Roma community is a target of the highest attention and the beneficiary of the highest number of programs as well as financial funds granted by the state.

The basic document of the government in relation to the social inclusion of the Roma community is the „Concept of Roma Integration“.

The Concept of the Roma Integration for 2005 elaborated for the period of the following three years is open to an all-society discussion. If needed, it may be updated earlier based on the results of yearly evaluation of fulfillment of the Concept of Roma Integration and the implementing resolutions.

### 1. Concept of the Roma Integration

#### 1.1 Starting Points of the Concept of Roma Integration and their Relevance to the Cultural Policy

The concept is built on three fundamental idea viewpoints: human rights perspective, nationality perspective and the sociocultural perspective, while these areas are considerably blending together.

**Human-Law Level** focuses in particular on the guarantee of the basic human rights and prevention of discrimination. With reference to the fact, that this issue falls within the competence of **the Council of the Government of the Czech Republic for Human Rights**, this area is outlined only generally. From the point of view of cultural aspects, this issue cannot be omitted, as the integral area of the human-law issue is also represented by the cultural rights and the discrimination may occur in any sphere of life of an individual not excepting the cultural area. The human-law perspective has a covering nature and is a basis for various legal implications, nevertheless the specific forms of support in the area of cultural policy are derived rather from the nationality perspective, or as applicable they lean on the sociocultural perspective.<sup>34</sup>

**Nationality Perspective** leans on the specific rights of the national minorities as they are defined in Head III. of the Declaration of Basic Rights and Freedoms, General-Frame Convention on Protection of National Minorities, including the collective rights. These specific

---

<sup>34</sup> Council for the Matters of the Roma Community (2005: 3).

rights are stipulated by Act No. 273/2001 Coll., on Rights of the National Minorities and on Change of Some Acts (hereinafter referred to as „Minority Act“ only, amended by Act No. 320/2002 Coll.). The national minority is defined in Section 2 Clause 1 of this Act by the subjective signs („express the will to be considered a national minority for the purpose ...“) as well as objective („community of citizens of the Czech Republic ..., who differ from other citizens usually by a common ethnic origin, language, culture and traditions“). Also the individual rights guaranteed by the Act as well as by the above-mentioned General-Frame Convention are closely related to the culture, language and subjectively felt collective identity (right to an education in the language of the national minority, right to use this language in the official contacts and before courts, the right to a distribution and receipt of information in this language, the right to a preservation and development of their own culture, and so on).

The Czech Republic recognizes Roma people as the national minority, which has its representatives in the Council of the Government for the National Minorities,<sup>35</sup> the advisory body of the government for the affairs of the national minorities, and may thus develop an „effort to preserve and develop their own origin, language and culture“, as stated in the provision of Section 2, Clause 1 of the specified Act. In this direction, the Roma people have the same rights as any other national minority living in the Czech Republic. In pursuing the support of the effort of the Roma minority to preserve and to develop their own culture and language, it is, nevertheless, also important to take sensitively and reasonably into account that the Roma culture cannot rest, unlike other national minority cultures, such as Polish, German or Slovak, on otherwise natural support of the institutions of their homelands.<sup>36</sup> It is sufficiently apparent then that the relationship to the culture represents dominant characteristics of this idea base.

**Sociocultural Perspective** is based on a broader concept of the „Roma Community“, contained in the explanatory report to the government resolution adopted on 29th October 1997 under No. 686 to the Report on Situation of the Roma Community in the Czech Republic and to the present situation in the Roma community. The activity of the third of the government advisory bodies, Council of the Government of the Czech Republic for Roma Community Affairs<sup>37</sup> rests on this perspective. The term „Roma Community“ overlaps only partially with the term „Roma national minority“. The definition sign of a member of the Roma national minority is its active will to be considered a member of the Roma minority and to develop in cooperation with others the language and the culture. The members of the Roma national minority are then defined subjectively. The term „member of the Roma community“ is defined rather objectively, to the contrary. The concept of the Roma integration (2004) stated, that „a member of the Roma community is de facto everyone, who is identified as a member of this socially and ethnically defined group by the majority.“ This definition was criticized as too broad and indefinite. From the point of view of formulating a measure to support the social and economic integration of the Roma people, it is however, necessary, to admit in the practical level, that the objective sociocultural characteristics of the „Roma community member“ include also the citizens, who do not claim the Roma nationality for instance in the population censuses or otherwise do not claim to be Roma nationals and do not express an active will to develop their own language and culture. The awareness of their difference is rather drawn from their position in the society, i.e. from the fact, that they are rejected and marginalized by the majority society. With regards to their distressful social situation, many Roma citizens may not even deal with the issue of their belonging to the national minority at all; while it is just this category of socially marginalized

<sup>35</sup>[The Council was established in accordance with Section 6 Clause 3 of Act No. 273/2001 Coll. on Rights of National Minorities and on Change of Some Acts.

<sup>36</sup> Ibidem

<sup>37</sup>[New Statute of the Council of the Government of the Czech Republic for Roma Community Affairs approved by Government Resolution No. 100 adopted on 28th January 2004 (formerly Interdepartmental Commission for Roma Community Affairs).

Roma people, which must be the addressee of the state policy, which will deal with and solve rather the social affairs (in the area of unemployment, social care and living), than the closely nationality issues (development of culture, language, nationality education). If the Concepts of the Roma Integration and public policies abandoned the term „member of the Roma community“, they would have to find another substitute so as to be able to interpret meaningfully and take into account the international documents, for instance the Council of Europe, and the documents of the European Union, which concern the position of Roma people. The mentioned concept also covers the fact, that persons of non-Roma origin, which became included in the Roma environment and live in it, permanently become also members of the Roma community under certain circumstances. A more precise term than „Roma community“ would be the use of the term in the plural number, „Roma communities“, namely in the meaning of the sub-ethnic or the local communities.<sup>38</sup> The mentioned relationships indicate that the socio-cultural perspective accentuates rather the issue of socially excluded communities, nevertheless as opposed to the National Action Plan of Social Inclusion<sup>39</sup>, this approach also contains the awareness of a cultural<sup>40</sup> component.

## **1.2 Approach of Integration based on the Concept of the Roma Integration from the Point of View of Cultural Aspects<sup>41</sup>**

Despite the basic division of the approach to Roma affairs into human-law, nationality-related and sociocultural ones, it is understandable, that at least two of these perspectives blend together in a number of areas. For instance in the educational issues or employment, the solution of the social problems is associated with a general protection of the human rights, in particular with the protection against discrimination. The concept of integration of members of the Roma communities itself as the government policy then combines two imperatives, namely overcoming the social exclusion and an effort to keep the Roma cultural identity. The integration of members of the Roma communities in the Czech society in all spheres and prevention of their further social exclusion is considered by the government to be an urgent task, which must reflect in the government policy.

The loss of the Roma identity, culture and language must not represent a condition of integration of the Roma citizens in the Czech society. The integration is meant here as inclusion of the Roma people in the society, which will give them a choice, which cultural specifics and diversities they wish to keep. Therefore, the principal attitude of the government in the pursuit of its policy towards the Roma minority is the respect to the Romaship, its traditions and culture.

The Declaration of the Basic Rights and Freedoms prohibits all ways of pressure leading to denationalization, the loss of own culture and language, including the indirect methods. The integration needs to be distinguished therefore from the assimilation that is the denationalization and a full cultural adaptation of the Roma citizens to the majority society. Every individual may decide to be assimilated, but such a choice must be free; nobody can be stopped from being a part of it but nobody can be forced either. Even though the assimilation way may lead to a full-

---

<sup>38</sup> Council for the Roma Community Affairs (2005: 3 - 4).

<sup>39</sup> The relationship of the Concept of Roma Integration and the National Action Plan of Social Inclusion is not parallel, but mutually supplementing. The Concept of the Roma Integration specifies procedures of social inclusion, as they are contained in the National Action Plan, in the specific measures aimed at one of special target groups. [ibidem: 4]

<sup>40</sup> At this point, the „cultural“ adjective means certain relatively established characteristics and ways of functioning of certain social entities, or as applicable the different nature between certain entities, not the cultural sphere of an individual or a social events as it is the case in the previous paragraph. For this reason, the socio-cultural perspective has a key relationship not only to the social exclusion but also to the culture, although this relationship is diametrically different from the nationality perspective.

<sup>41</sup> Ibidem, p. 4 – 5.

value citizenship, the government is convinced that it would be a cultural loss for the whole society, if the assimilation became a solution for all Roma people. The possible collective assimilation of the Roma people would always have to cause a suspicion that it is caused by unwillingness or inability of the majority society to accept Roma citizens while keeping their cultural identity.

The Concept of the Roma Integration is fully compatible with the process of emancipation of the Roma citizens as the national minority, i.e. finding and strengthening their own cultural identity, which is already being developed among the Roma community. This approach is based on the persuasion that the more Roma people will feel as Roma, the freer and more responsible citizens will be. By its measures, the government will observe that no obstacles are put in the way of the emancipation efforts of the Roma citizens. However, emancipation as such is a result of the free decision of the Roma people themselves, not the result of the government policy.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Concept of Roma Integration and their Relationship to the Cultural Aspects**

The main goal of the Concept of the Roma Integration is the improvement of the position of the Roma community in all spheres of the society's life, where, the majority society and a great part of Roma community encounter unjustified and unacceptable differences to the disadvantage of the Roma people and achievement of a conflict-free common life of the members of the Roma communities with the rest of the society. The concept outlines seven priorities, which simultaneously reflect the principle of the gender mainstreaming:<sup>42</sup>

- a) removal of external obstacles, which prevent the inclusion of Roma communities in the society, that is in particular the elimination of all forms of discrimination of individuals as well as whole groups defined by the race, color of skin, nationality, language, nationality or ethnic origin
- b) help in elimination of internal obstacles, which prevent the inclusion of the Roma communities in the society that is in particular elimination of a handicap in education and qualifications
- c) The improvement of the social standard of members of the Roma communities needs to be considered in the nearest period a priority, which demands a specially intense attention, in particular then reduction of their unemployment, improvement of the housing situation and subsequently the health situation, prevention of social exclusion in the Roma communities and a removal of its consequences
- d) stopping the growth of establishing and spreading the Roma enclaves, the so-called ghettoization
- e) securing the development of the Roma culture and the Roma language
- f) creating a tolerant environment without prejudice, in which belonging to a group defined by the race, color of skin, nationality, language or nationality is not a reason for a different evaluation of the individual and for treating him differently
- g) securing the safety of members of the Roma communities

The development of the nationality culture is dealt with separately within a single priority (Clause e)), a great link is also present in the following priority underlining the importance of creation of a tolerant environment without a prejudice.

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibidem, p. 5.

## **1.4 Measures Contained in the Concept of the Roma Integration concerning the Issue of Social Exclusion and Cultural Aspects**

The concept of Roma integration contains a chapter on anti-discrimination measures. It deals with a negative attitude of the Czech society towards Roma minority and presents some key changes (for instance extension of the ombudsman powers) and activities implemented in this field (for instance campaigns against racism, educational campaign).<sup>43</sup>

In relation to the compensating procedures, a fact is repeatedly mentioned, that the disadvantaging of the Roma communities is conditioned socially and historically and the removal or at least a mitigation of this disadvantaging is a long-term process. For this reason, the need of adjustment of general measures and resources to the specific conditions and the needs of the Roma community are stressed out (in particular through the targeted assistance, not through the quotas or other forms of positive discrimination).<sup>44</sup> The balancing procedures thus reflect the socio-cultural perspective described above.

The following areas are also separately divided into topics: social exclusion of the Roma communities, education, integration on the labor market, living, social care, health care, safety aspects of the Roma integration and a support of development of the Roma language and culture, support of scientific research.

The Chapter<sup>45</sup> dealing with the issue of social exclusion summarizes the main causes of the social exclusion of the Roma communities (sociocultural factors are also discussed), evaluates the existing policies of the social inclusion in relation to the Roma community<sup>46</sup> and presents some proposals for improvement of the existing policies:

„The deepening social exclusion of the Roma communities and a parallel fragmentation of the network of the Roma consultants induce an urgent need of origin of an instrument to implement the state policy in cooperation with the self-administration. A real model appears to be authorization of an existing entity or creation of a new one to intermediate a direct social intervention in the localities where social exclusion occurs, prevention of such exclusion and a removal of its consequences. The authorized or a newly created body should prepare an offer of services for the self-administrations and the Roma communities in their competence. This offer should be directed to the area of living, where it could be linked for instance with registration of the municipality in the Program of Development of the State-Aided Apartments of the Ministry for the Local Development, provision of social services in the field and an assistance to members of the Roma communities in the access to the education and a gainful occupation. The authorized entity could draw the financial funds from the budget fund Prevention of Social Exclusion in the Roma Communities and a removal of the its consequences – chapter General

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibidem, p. 10 – 11.

<sup>44</sup> Ibidem, p. 11 – 12.

<sup>45</sup> Ibidem, p. 12 – 13.

<sup>46</sup> This evaluation follows the Analysis of Options of Intensification and Higher Effectiveness of the Work in the interest of prevention of social exclusion in the Roma communities and elimination of its consequences through a designated agency. This document states: „A low success rate of the existing measures aimed at elimination and prevention of the social exclusion or as applicable at integration of the Roma communities is caused in particular by the fact, that the individual entities implementing the measures – i.e. in particular the Ministries – solve only the partial problems. The Ministries implement the Concept of the Roma integration at most in a narrow section defined by the competence act. The problems associated with the social exclusion are however comprehensive, complex and internally linked. Most members of the Roma communities face a vicious circle of an aggravated access to a quality housing, education and possibilities of gainful activities.“ This material was taken into account by the government through Resolution No. 1113 adopted on 13th November 2002.

Treasury Administration of the State Budget or as applicable from the scheme, which is financed out of these funds.<sup>47</sup>“

The Chapter<sup>48</sup> dealing with the support of the Roma language and culture and a support of the scientific research emphasizes the need to pay a professional attention to the Roma language and the Roma culture, outlines the area of activities implemented in this field. The most significant activities include in particular: grants to support the projects of gathering the folk literature, organization of the regional and nationwide events for a support and promotion of the Roma language and culture (music, literary or theatre events), seminars of Romistics at the Philosophical Faculty of the Charles University, seminars organized by the Indological Institute of the same university or the program of the Roma education of the Palackého University in Olomouc. The world unique institution documenting the history and the material and spiritual culture of Roma people is the Brno Museum of Roma Culture (conducts field researches, sets up collections, operates as the center of multicultural education and issues a professional Roma-oriented literature and organizes courses of Roma language for the public). The provider of the state grants for the activities of editor's offices of the Roma national periodicals has been the Ministry of Culture<sup>49</sup> since 2002.

An integral part of development of the Roma culture and language is an ethnographic research activity (tradition, folklore) and linguistic tradition (including the dialectological studies). For the qualified creation of the policy of the Roma integration, it is, however, also of utmost necessity to conduct a research in the broader context, i.e. the culturally anthropological and sociological research of dynamics of the interior development of Roma communities and their interaction with the majority society. The priorities of such a research include in particular the relationships and experience of the Roma people with the attitudes of the majority, recognition of mechanisms of social exclusion, development of the methods of the social work, demographic development and a social mobility. The government and the competent bodies of the state administration should therefore seek effective forms of support also to finance these researches by other academic institutions (apart from the already mentioned ones) including universities, research and professional institutions and also by qualified non-state non-profit organizations and other entities.<sup>50</sup> In general, it is possible to state that the Concept of the Roma Integration does not neglect the issue of the cultural aspects and a relatively large space is reserved for it.

## 1.5 Social and Political Participation

The area of the social and political participation is not a part of the social and political participation. This fact is given in particular by the fact, that the structure of the Concept reflects the basic principles of the concept and the resulting main goals, which result from them.

---

<sup>47</sup> In 2005, the financial funds are awarded in this program by grants, but it is possible to consider also another form, which would best correspond to the nature and purpose of the provided funds (for instance a public contract).

<sup>48</sup> Ibidem, p. 24

<sup>49</sup> Government Regulation No. 98/2002 Coll., by which the conditions and a method of providing grants from the state budget for activities of members of national minorities and for a support of integration of the Roma community are set

<sup>50</sup> In the past years, for instance the Faculty of Social Studies of the Masaryk University in Brno, Faculty of Human Studies of the Western-Bohemian University in Pilsen, Ethnographic Institute of the Academy of Science of the Czech Republic, Research Institute of Labor and Social Affairs – Brno Center and from non-state entities, for instance Člověk v tísni, o.p.s., Advisory Center for Citizenship, Civil and Human Rights and the Prague office of the International Organization for Migration, Socioklub association. This research was significantly supported in some cases also by some ministries, for instance the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs and the Ministry of Interior.

1. **prevention of discrimination** (human-law perspective); the Concept deals with this issue in the Chapter devoted to antidiscrimination measures (both by the measure striving to protect the minority, and the programs of impact on the majority society) and partially the Chapter listing the balancing procedures,
2. **support of the Roma culture** (nationality perspective); for details see Chapter on Support of Development of the Roma language and culture and support of the scientific research) and
3. **prevention of the social exclusion** (socio-cultural perspective); partially the chapter detailing the balancing procedures and chapters on socially-excluded communities, education, integration on the labor market, living, social care, health care and safety aspects of the Roma integration.

The second objective concerns directly the specific area of the social participation, that is the participation in the cultural (in narrow sense of word) life of the society (artistic activities). The first and the third objective represent the key prerequisites providing all citizens of the Czech Republic with the same chance to engage in the social or political life of the society. The social participation in a broader sense and the political participation are based in the Czech Republic on the civic and not on the ethnic principle (unlike the right to maintain the originality of one's own culture and identity, represented by the second objective). Also with members of the Roma minority, it is possible to observe the concentration of attention on the above-mentioned areas (although here the attitudes between the individuals claiming to belong to the Roma community differ as well), rather than the articulation of the political interests and the citizen involvement in a broader sense (or as applicable in other than specified areas).

## 1.5 Education

The fundamental goal of the government activities<sup>51</sup> is to solve the education of the Roma citizens by alternative strategies with regards to their specific needs with an emphasis on the standard education and institutions, as necessary with the individual or group educational programs.

The objective of the balancing procedures in the area of education of the Roma people is a principal change of the existing situation, when a considerable number of Roma children achieve only the lowest possible level of education. A comprehensive approach to the Roma children prior to their start of the school life will be secured by implementation of the Concept of Timely Care of Children from Socioculturally Disadvantaging Environment. To overcome the sociocultural handicap, these children need a preparatory program and the targeted assistance. The optimum form is a preparation of these children for entry to nursery schools in a collective composed of the majority and the minority children. If the sociocultural handicap is to be overcome, it is necessary that the Roma children attended to nursery schools for the whole three years, that is from three years of age. The social situation of the family, which should be convinced of the usefulness of this measure by field social workers, Roma advisors or pedagogue assistants must not be an obstacle to such an attendance. The convincing may be effective if assisted by an optional social allowance for coverage of the costs of the nursery school for children from socioculturally disadvantaging environment (hereinafter referred to as „preparatory classes“). Experienced pedagogues must teach in these classes. The preparatory classes will be established at the elementary and nursery schools.

---

<sup>51</sup> Council for the Roma Community Affairs (2005: 14 - 16).

The form of the targeted assistance is a use of the pedagogue assistant<sup>52</sup> (formerly identified as „Roma pedagogical assistants“ and „Teacher Assistants - Preceptors“), who come predominantly from the Roma communities. These assistants work in all types of schools and school facilities. The pedagogue assistant in accordance with the instructions of the pedagogue helps the pupils to accommodate to the school environment and facilitates the communication of the pedagogue with the pupils, their parents and as applicable the whole Roma community. Assistants to pedagogues work in the nursery schools, prep-schools, elementary schools, special schools, secondary vocational schools and in institutional and protection education institutions, provided that these facilities have a higher percentage of pupils from the socio-culturally disadvantaged environment and all facilities, where the poor results of Roma children indicate the need of this assistance.

In the area of the secondary and tertiary education, these tools exist in particular in the area of scholarships, which help to overcome the social disadvantaged of the students.

Principal changes are desirable in particular in the prep-school education, as the nursery schools are still attended by an insufficient number of Roma children. As a result, many children then start the school education unprepared, which has a negative influence on their further success. The Act No. 561/2004 on Pre-School, Elementary, Secondary and Higher Vocational and other Education Systems (School Act) introduces in Section 123 a free education in the last year of the nursery school before enlistment in the elementary school. However, it is desirable, that the Roma children should attend the nursery school from three years of age, for the whole three years.

Although the number of preparatory classes and assistants is relatively high<sup>53</sup>, the actual need is higher. Still there are many places, where schools are attended by a negligible number of pupils from socio-culturally disadvantaged environment, have no established preparatory classes or any positions of assistants to pedagogue.

Gradually, the number of pedagogue assistants, who achieved a secondary and a higher education or who are interested in achieving a higher education grows. This desirable interest has been supported since the school year of 2003/2004 by establishing responsive programs on a higher professional pedagogical and social school in Most – Field of Study 75-31-J/001, which will enable these young people to achieve a pedagogical education through extramural studies.

The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports is not the founder of schools in the absolute majority and therefore may not apply direct methods of their management as in the past. However, it is not admissible that the state leaves the introduction of balancing procedures in education only on founders, as it is still responsible for the fulfillment of obligations resulting from the international treaties on human rights.<sup>54</sup> The Ministry may use a number of indirect

---

<sup>52</sup> The first „Roma pedagogical assistants“ were established by non-governmental organizations Nová škola (New School) and the Community of Roma People in Moravia. Starting from 1st September 1997 to 30th June 2000, the Ministry of Education, Youth and Physical Education verified the introduction of the positions of schoolmasters – teacher assistants, together with the creation of preparatory classes on an experimental basis. After evaluation of the experiment as a successful one, these classes and positions are established based on the Methodical Instruction of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Physical Education under proc. ref. 25484/200-22.

<sup>53</sup> As at 31st December 2004, there were a total of 126 with the total number of 1,779 pupils. In 2003, a total of 332 schoolmasters – teacher assistants worked in particular in the preparatory and first grades of the elementary and special schools – 52 more were hired in the next year.

<sup>54</sup> The unsatisfactory condition of the Roma people education concerns also the obligations resulting from the Convention on the Rights of the Child, International Pact on Social, Economic and Cultural Rights, as well as the International Covenant on Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination and is regularly a target of criticism by the respective committees.

motivational tools. A key role in the further extension of the number of schools, which utilize the option of designation of the position of a pedagogue assistant and establishment of a preparatory class, is played by the mediation of motivating information. The Ministry may also help to distribute practical experience in use of these procedures through the educational offer of pedagogical centers and the Institute of Pedagogically-Psychological Consulting. Therefore, the government imposed to the Minister of Education, Youth and Sports by Resolution executed on 7th November 2001 No. 1145 to intensify continuously the support and promotion of establishment of preparatory classes and the position of preceptor – teacher assistant with the objective to diversify these forms of balancing procedures systematically where educational problems appear in the Roma pupils and the preparatory classes and the positions of preceptor – teacher assistant have not been established yet.

The support in education of Roma pupils is solved on a system basis in the new school act, which does not separate the elementary and special schools, but designates within the frame of the basic education the conditions so that all pupils are provided with education and support adequate to their specific educational needs. The regulation on education of children, pupils and students with special educational needs of children, pupils and students with an extraordinary talent (No. 73/2005 Coll.) designates already the elementary schools for pupils with specific learning disorders, elementary schools for pupils with specific behavior disorders, practical elementary schools and special elementary schools, in which children from socio-culturally disadvantaging environment may be educated based on individual educational plans enabling a decrease of the number of pupils in the class as well as increase of the financial funds using the pedagogue assistants. The equalization of opportunities will be supported also by a change of the present elementary school and strengthening of its ability to maintain in the educational mainstream also the children from the socially and culturally handicapping environment. The way to this goal is a differentiated and individualized approach to the children in the elementary school – and in particular taking this task of the school into account both in the pregradual preparation of teachers and in their further education.

The compulsory preparation of teachers for multicultural approaches in education includes the prerequisite of familiarization also with the „minimum“ of knowledge about the Roma community, Roma language and the culture and special characteristics of the communication with the Roma parents. These topics will be included also in the postgradual studies of the teachers. The teachers and the future teachers should be advised of how stereotypes and prejudice originate and how it is possible to remove them using experience techniques. The work with the prejudice should be mastered by proper training and exercising.

The teachers of the Roma children must cooperate with the parents of these children. They should discuss with them in advance all the matters concerning the children (school boarding, staying in the public nursery or a school club, health of the child, trips, holiday camps and so on), emphasize the importance of a regular school attendance as well as home preparation. The relationship of the parents to the school should be the best possible, they should come to school to consult matters, which concern their children; the school must be still open for them.

The Roma children, as well as the Roma adults must be allowed to cultivate their Roma language in free-of-charge language courses. In these courses, children as well as other interested persons will be simultaneously familiarized with the Roma traditional culture, literature and history. For these courses, study texts will be prepared including the didactic manuals designed for teachers. The lecturers could be the graduates from the field of Romistics at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Charles University in Prague, or teachers whose mother tongue is a Roma language.

The equalization procedures in the Roma education do not include the establishment of a separated Roma education system such as the Polish nationality education system; the majority of the Roma citizens do not demand the establishment of such a nationality educational system. However, it is necessary to take into account the already existing schools with the prevailing number of pupils from a different socio-cultural environment (incorrectly referred to as the so-called „community schools“), which are attended territorially but also due to the approach of the majority society predominantly by the Roma children<sup>55</sup>. The objective of the state policy is not to increase artificially the number of such schools, which would be considered a support of segregation tendencies. The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports must however strive to achieve such a solution of the situation, when the educational segregation has already physically occurred, when these schools are able to provide the Roma children with a full-value education and to contribute to their integration into the society. Therefore, the government imposed to the Minister of Education, Youth and Sports<sup>56</sup> a task leading to preparation of the project of schools with all-day program and a voluntary participation of pupils in its non-tutorial part. Apart from the school education and provision of the space and opportunities for extracurricular activities of the children (all-day program), these schools will organize also an education for adults (cultivation of the Romani language and the knowledge of the Roma history, traditions and culture, furthering the elementary education, courses based on interest and need or as applicable the retraining courses in cooperation with the labor authorities) and social advisory services to the Roma families. The funds for these above-standard activities will be provided to schools out of grants based on the presented projects.

To create good relationships between the Roma pupils and their schoolmates, it is necessary to raise all pupils towards tolerance and multicultural education. It is necessary that the multicultural education be reflected in all subjects of the school educational schemes including schools, where there will be no Roma pupils.

The good results of Roma pupils at school are conditioned to a great extent by their home preparation and a support from their parents. Some parents need to be convinced to help their children or at least not to prevent them from doing their homeworks. The best convincing method is allowing the parents to be actively involved in the school work. The school must be open to the parents, they must be allowed to see for themselves at any time, how their children are doing and how they are treated. It is necessary to prepare for the parents at school also such opportunities (participation in courses, school performances, sports contests, exhibitions and so on) so that they could find their way to the school and so that they enjoy coming here.

The process of overcoming the educational handicap is also the education of adults, who completed only a special school in the past or interrupted the school attendance in a lower than ninth grade of the elementary school due to a socio-cultural disadvantaging and the door towards a further education has been closed for them. For these adults, we open courses, where they can complete their elementary education. However, such courses need not only a more active promotion; a greater orientation of these courses at skills practicable on the labor market is also desirable.

Many Roma children and adolescents are placed in the institutional and protection education facilities. It is desirable that these children grow up, if possible, in the adoptive families or in the foster care families or at least in the family-tape institutions. During holidays, these children will be allowed to see their original families or the families, which are interested in this kind of help

---

<sup>55</sup> Such schools exist for instance in Chánov (Most), Předlice (Ústí nad Labem), in Ostrava-Přívoz, in Prague 3 and in other locations.

<sup>56</sup> Clause II.1 b) of the Government Resolution executed on 7th November 2001 under proc. ref. 1145.

to children, or they will be allowed to participate in the camps, courses, summer schools, where they will be able to have contacts with children from Roma or non-Roma families.

Another priority is a need to allow the socially disadvantaged students, including those of Roma origin, to achieve in the increasing number the secondary, higher vocational and university education. The program of support of the Roma pupils of secondary and higher vocational schools has an explicitly equalizing (affirmative) character. Its objective is to allow the Roma students of secondary schools through the financial support (coverage of the tuition at private schools, travel costs, boarding allowance and the learning and protection aids) to continue in or to commence the studies, which they would otherwise have to abandon due to social reasons.<sup>57</sup> The program, which should fulfill a similar function, will be introduced also within the framework of the university education.<sup>58</sup> The financing of these programs will be apart of preparation of the draft of the state budget for the respective year and will not exceed the approved medium-term expense frames.

Other programs run by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports with a nationwide sphere of action are implemented in accordance with the Government Regulation No. 98/2002 Coll., which stipulates the conditions and a method of provision of grants from the state budget for the activities of the national minorities and for a support of integration of the members of the Roma community.

A total of CZK 6,223,309.00 was set aside for 2006 for the projects of MSMT program for a support of the Roma community.

## 1.7 Media

No separate chapter deals in the Concept with the issues of media activities in relation to the Roma community. Some key activities interfering with or directly falling within the media sphere are nevertheless described within the frame of other chapters. These concern in particular:

- support of the Roma periodicals (see Chapter 4),
- support of presentation of the Roma culture (support of projects in this area – Chapter 4),
- multicultural education projects (Chapter 6) and
- campaigns designed for the general public (Chapter 4).
- 

The periodical press of the Roma community was supported in 2006 by a total sum of CZK 6,012,000.00, see the above table **Grants awarded in 2006 in the Program of Support of Distribution and Receipt of Information in Languages of the National Minorities (page 25 – Report 2004)**

---

<sup>57</sup>[ In 2000, around 900 applications were supported, in 2001, the number grew to 1,531 applications, in 2002, approximately 2,500 applications were satisfied, in 2003, 2,577 applications and in 2004, 2,314 applications were approved.

<sup>58</sup>[ The information about a support of the studies of Roma students, was presented to the government on 3rd November 2004 (proc. ref. 1424/04).

## **2. Participation**

The existing situation in the area of the social and political participation is summarized in the **Report on Situation of Roma Communities in the Czech Republic 2004**.<sup>59</sup>

### **2.1 Associations and Other Civic Activities**

In 2003, the Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic registered 381 Roma organizations, predominantly civic associations. A great part of these organizations exists only formally, some were founded only to achieve a one-off purpose; however, they were never terminated, so they are still on the registration lists. Of the Roma political parties, only the Roma Civic Initiative remained in operation, for which the government of the Czech Republic proposed to the Supreme Administrative Court a suspension of activities by Resolution adopted on 12th March No. 253.

The Roma civic associations are financed predominantly by public budgets, partially by foreign and local foundation funds and to a minor extent by member contributions of their members, therefore, they are greatly dependent on the grant policy of the state, regions and municipalities. The Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs declares a grant for the Program of Support of Projects of Integration of the Roma Community Members; the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports has grants for the Program of Support of Projects of Integration of the Roma Community Members and the Program of Support of Roma Students of Secondary Schools; the Ministry of Culture has a grant for the Program of Support of Projects of the Roma Community Members; the Council of the Government of the Czech Republic for Roma Community Affairs declares grants from the chapter General Treasury Administration of the State Budget for Prevention of Social Exclusion in Roma Communities and Removal of its Consequences and a Support of Projects of the Roma Community Integration.

The majority of Roma civic associations are focused on the work with children and youth and on maintenance and development of the Roma culture and partially on the sports and recreational activities. Some civic associations were recently aiming at the consulting activities and on the field social work in excluded Roma communities. The government was informed of the successful work of some civic associations in excluded Roma communities or Roma communities at risk of exclusion on 15th December 2004 under proc. ref. 1674/04 in Information on Good Practices of Self-Administrations in Prevention of Social Exclusion of the Roma Communities.

### **2.2 Roma Community in the Public Administration**

After 1990, five Roma political parties originated, however, with regards to the number of the Roma communities, they could only hardly succeed in elections of their candidates in the lawmaking bodies taking into account the presently effective electoral act. This is also a result of the traditionally low participation of the Roma electors in elections. If some members of the Roma communities were elected in the past, it was on tickets of other political parties and movements (Civic Forum, Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia, Union of Freedom). At present, not a single Rom or a member of the Roma communities is the Parliament, one Rom is a mayor of a small municipality and six Roma people are members of the municipal boards in larger municipalities.

The situation is better in the executive. The positive discrimination is not exercised when employing the Roma applicants in the public administration, the applicants are hired based on their personal qualities. Of fourteen regional Roma coordinators, eight are of a Roma origin and the employees of municipalities responsible for the execution of the state administration, who

---

<sup>59</sup> The facts stated in this chapter are adopted from this Report (government of the Czech Republic 2005).

take care of the enforcement of rights of national minorities and protection of members of the members of the Roma communities (pursuant to Section 61 and subs. Act No. 128/2000 Coll. on Municipalities and pursuant to Section 6 Clause 8 of Act No. 273/2001 Coll. on Rights of Members of the National Minorities) include 32 members of the Roma communities. The Czech Trade Inspection employs four Roma inspectors, three Roma citizens work in the labor offices. The Office of the Government employs currently two Roma employees in the professional positions, the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports employ each one member of the Roma communities.

In 2003, municipal authorities employed 73 Roma field social workers with a substantial support of the state, 99 more worked with the state support in various civic associations (see also Unemployment and Social Situation section). In Ostrava, a Roma field health assistant is employed, who invites the Roma children and adults to participate in the preventive inspections and vaccinations, oversees the compliance with the treatment drug regimen in families and shares in the health education.

The social commissions, housing commissions of the municipal authorities and the commissions for national minorities and for integration of the Roma people employ 25 Roma citizens, in Přerov, Roma citizens are represented in all commissions established by the municipal authority. The office of the public guardian of the rights employs one Roma woman and one Rom is the Presiding Judge of the District Court.

Since 2000, the Secondary Police School in Brno has been organizing preparatory courses for the members of the national minorities for their recruitment into the corps of the Police of the Czech Republic. The objective is to create prerequisites for a successful undergoing of an entrance procedure for recruitment into the corps of the Police of the Czech Republic. 9 courses have been held so far and 30 persons (of 107 enlisted) passed the procedure. In 2005, the 10th run of the preparatory course will be held. The specific dates and requirements for enlistment in the course will be notified in advance to all recruitment centers of the Police of the Czech Republic and also the office of the Council of the Government for the Roma Community Affairs. The Ministry of Interior has prepared a *National Strategy for the Work of the Police of the Czech Republic in relation to National and Ethnic Minorities*. A part of this strategy is a proposal for inclusion of assistants of the Police of the Czech Republic to fight usury in socially excluded Roma communities the main task of whom will be to facilitate the contact and communication with the minority community. The proposal is based on foreign experience, the police assistants work in a number of European countries. They are mostly civil employees of the police department aiming at the prevention of criminal activities, at work in the community and at mediation of a contact between the police and the national and ethnic minorities in risky localities.

### 3. Education

The evaluation of educational programs for members of the Roma community members is a central theme of the report titled **Information on Fulfillment of the Government Resolutions concerning the Integration of the Roma Communities and the Active Approach of the State Administration in Implementation of Measures adopted by these Resolutions as at 31st December 2003**.<sup>60</sup>

Based on this Report, the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports managed to fulfill these tasks resulting from the provisions of 686/1997, 279/99:<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Government of the Czech Republic (2004).

<sup>61</sup> The same.

- to perform the analysis of the syllabus and the teaching content of the subjects of civic education and history from the point of view of issues of nationalities, minorities and ethnics and to use this analysis to adopt measures to reflect in this education not only the whole history of Czech people, but also the history of other communities, which lived or live on the Czech territory, that is German, Jewish, Slovak, Roma people and other communities, so that it deals more with the contemporary world history including the criminal essence of the Nazi ideology and the constant danger, which similar ideologies represent and to inform about the current tendencies towards the European integration, about the inclination to tolerance and the progress made in the area of human rights,
- to include in the National Program of the Education Development in the Czech Republic and by 31st December 2000 to elaborate for the elementary schools and secondary schools the issues of all ethnic groups, which lived or live on the Czech territory and the issues of keeping the human rights with the emphasis on the practical applications,
- to create prerequisites for the establishment of a professional facility for multicultural education
- to evaluate the programs of the so-called open schools, programs with the participation of parents in the work of the school, common programs of the school for parents and children, including the involvement of prep-school children, which are implemented experimentally in some schools in the Czech Republic and a comparison of these programs with similar programs implemented abroad,
- to secure by 30th June 2001 the trainings or another form of transferring the information from the field of Romistics for teachers of the nursery, elementary, special and secondary schools,
- to impose upon the pedagogical centers (preferentially in localities with a higher number of the Roma people) to include permanently and currently in the educational schemes for teachers the educational seminars on Roma people not only from the cultural, but also from the health and social point of view, and to furnish these centers with the corresponding Roma periodicals, literature, films and videotapes, which will be permanently available for schools and to recommend at the same time to the pedagogic centers to establish a cooperation with the local Roma associations and other representatives of Roma people
- to elaborate and to submit to the government by 31st March 2002 a comprehensive information on the possibility to establish a secondary vocational school with the prevailing orientation at the Roma culture,

The following tasks were fulfilled continuously:<sup>62</sup>

- expansion of the network of preparatory classes into the system of the elementary education for pupils from socio-culturally and language disadvantaged environment (see Attachment II.)
- to ensure a support of the information flows into all school levels regarding the available professional literature about issues of a multicultural society and the education towards tolerance (see Attachment II.),
- to proceed in granting exemptions for the minimum number of pupils in the class also in cases of classes with children from the Roma families just like in case of minority classes,
- to ensure an offer of a further education in the subject of national and ethnic minorities within the system of a further education of pedagogical employees,

---

<sup>62</sup> The same.

- to create the conditions preventing the racial (or a different) discrimination and if needed, to submit to the government the drafts of amendments of the applicable laws,
- to incorporate in the draft of amendments presented based on the previous clause the provisions, which will provide a legal option to implement equalization activities for the purpose of eliminating the possible disadvantaging of members of the Roma community and for the purpose of eliminating such a disadvantaging,
- to perform changes of educational programs at elementary schools and secondary schools in such a way, so that the syllabus contains teachings about Roma people, their history (including the history of the Nazi holocaust), their culture and traditions,
- to secure on a permanent basis for the pedagogues working in localities with the occurrence of ethnic conflicts special training courses in communication techniques oriented at the prevention of solution of the conflicts,
- to secure continuously in cooperation with the envoy for human rights the mutual transferability within special and elementary schools in the transformation of the education system
- to furnish continuously for the nursery schools in areas with higher concentrations of Roma citizens the positions of the Roma coordinator (assistant), who will perform the recruitment and secure the attendance of the children to these schools,
- to include continuously the research of the Roma issues among the significant researches of the department, to secure a systematic research of the common life of the ethnic groups,<sup>63</sup>
- to secure issuance of a methodical instruction for the directors of secondary pedagogical schools, pedagogical centers established by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports and other educational facilities established by the school authorities and issuance of methodical publications for the nursery school teachers and schoolmasters with the goal to support education in the teacher study fields and a further education of nursery school teachers and schoolmasters with the focus on multicultural education and work of nursery school teachers and schoolmasters with children from ethnic groups,
- to support seminars, meetings and similar events concerning the common life with the Roma minority organized at schools,
- to intensify on an on-going basis the support and promotion of establishment of preparatory classes and the positions of schoolmaster-assistant to a teacher with the goal to extend these forms of equalization procedures systematically where educational problems are encountered with the Roma pupils and the preparatory classes and schoolmaster-teacher assistant positions were not established yet, to try to achieve that the schoolmaster-teacher assistant position be established also on the second level of elementary schools in secondary vocational schools and in facilities designed for the execution of the institutional and protection education and
- to choose five schools for elaboration of a project with all-day program with the voluntary participation of pupils in its non-tutorial part and to initiate that the founders of these schools process such a project and that the Interdepartmental Commission for the Roma Community Affairs mediate a subsequent negotiation with the involved departments on the financial and organizational resources for the nationwide implementation of the project in such a way, so that the project could be implemented starting from the school year of 2002/2003,

---

<sup>63</sup> In 2003, these two fundamental research projects were implemented: *Analysis of Effectiveness of the Grant Program of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Physical Education – Support of Roma Students of Secondary Schools and Monitoring of Effectiveness of the Preparatory Classes for Pupils from Socio-Culturally Disadvantaged Environment*. The main findings of these studies are presented below.

## **Analysis of Effectiveness of the Grant Scheme of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports – Support of Roma Students of Secondary Schools<sup>64</sup>**

The empirical research occurred in four regions, with the largest number of applicants for grants. The regions were Moravia-Silesian, Middle-Bohemian, Ústí nad Labem and Prague Regions. The research showed a number of positive and negative aspects, which accompany the implementation of the grant scheme.

The research has proven that the scheme has its justification from the macrostructure point of view. The applicants, which were financially supported in the I.round of the declared grant title (January – June of 2000), in the absolute majority (77.4%) successfully completed the secondary school or a vocational school. Only 19% of grant recipients from this round did not complete the studies and 3.6% of the grant recipients are still studying. 69% of the grant recipients from the first half of the calendar year of 2003 continues in the studies at the selected secondary school or a vocational school, 17% of these students have already completed the school and 13.8% students left the school without the final certificates. What appears to be statistically significant is a fact that the grant recipients, who left the school without certificates have not used up a major part of the awarded funds in the given year (more than half of these students).

The problems, which were encountered during the analysis, are in particular of the administrative nature (tardiness of procedural steps in the application submitting process and a slow administration in the distribution of funds).

Based on the results of this analysis, it is possible to state, that the funds for implementation of the monitored program were effectively utilized.

## **Monitoring of Effectiveness of Preparatory Classes for Pupils from Socio-Culturally Disadvantaged Environment<sup>65</sup>**

In 2003, the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports initiated elaboration of the basic evaluation study „Monitoring of Effectiveness of Preparatory Classes for Children from Socioculturally Disadvantaged Environment“. The monitoring was implemented by the Faculty of Human Studies of the Charles University in Prague. The study was focused on answering four basic questions:

- Does the preparatory class help the pupils to complete successfully the elementary school? (confirmed)
- Does the type of the school [meaning elementary schools and special schools], at which the preparatory class is established, influence the subsequent choice of the school type, where the child starts its regular first class? (confirmed)
- Does the traffic availability influence the selection of the school type? (confirmed)
- Does the length of existence of the preparatory class influence the success rate of the graduates to start the elementary school? (not confirmed)

The analysis proved that the preparatory class graduates do better at the elementary school. The results of the specified study also confirmed that the success rate of pupils upon the subsequent study at the elementary school is influenced by the orientation of the educational program, which is implemented in the preparatory class and which differs a lot in individual schools.

---

<sup>64</sup> citováno podle vláda ČR 2004.

<sup>65</sup> citováno podle vláda ČR 2004.

However, the analysis also showed that the preparatory classes considerably improve the relationship of a child to the school and reduce thus the absence of the preparatory class pupils to 50% during the further school education. However, it does not solve the problem completely. The difference in attendance of Roma and non-Roma pupils at monitored schools does drop considerably, but still it remains high enough.

Another conclusion of the study is a statement that the preparatory classes are attended only by 15%<sup>66</sup> of Roma children from the anticipated number of 6,500 Roma children in the corresponding age category.

The final recommendations of „Report for the Project of Monitoring of Effectiveness of the Preparatory Classes for Children from Socio-Culturally Disadvantaged Environment“, composite authors, Faculty of Human Studies of the Charles University results [direct quotation from the stated document]:

- The case studies found out that the program of the preparatory classes is more effective, if the school does not concentrate only on the pupil but also cooperates with its family. Therefore, the program effectiveness is considerably assisted by the involvement of Roma assistants or the field social workers as the natural connection between the family and school.
- The difference between the Roma children, who completed the preparatory class and the non-Roma children is relatively small in the beginning of the elementary school. The imaginary scissorts start to open at the second level of the elementary school, where the problems of Roma children deepen, they fail classes and leave for special schools. The Roma families support their children in their studies much more on the first than on the second level. Pro-Roma programs should thus have another focal point on the second level of the elementary schools.
- The concentration of Roma pupils at certain elementary schools, which is usually often a side effect of the programs prepared by the school for these pupils, also has its negative aspects. The „ghettoized Roma schools“ – although not special - have a lower standard of the administered education compared with other elementary schools. This has an unfavorable influence on the integration of the Roma children and their subsequent educational career (see the case studies). The programs supporting the education of the Roma pupils are a signal to non-Roma parents, that the school is oriented at Roma people. The fear of the resulting drop in quality of the tuition usually leads to Non-Roma children leaving the school. We believe that the preparatory classes may be used as a tool to break the segregation. The most effective solution would be establishment of preparatory classes at schools, which are in the localities, where many Roma citizens live, however, it is not customary that the Roma children attend them (see the case studies from the South-Moravia region and Prague). The establishment of the preparatory classes in “Non-Roma” schools encounters the fears of the management of these schools. Without such a step taken soon enough, the segregation of the Roma pupils will only deepen.

Extensive Study dealing with the Public Education for Members of the Roma Minority “**Roma in Public Education**”<sup>67</sup> prepared by non-governmental organization<sup>68</sup> for the RAXEN National

---

<sup>66</sup> The figure is based on the data provided by Czech Statistical Office -ČSÚ: the results of Census for the years of 1980 and 1991, then by the estimate of the Czech Statistical Office of the current demographic development of the Roma population (pyramidal structure of the demographic development)

<sup>67</sup> RAXEN National Focal Point for The Czech Republic (2004).

<sup>68</sup> Člověk v tísni (Human in Need)

Center<sup>69</sup> in 2004 states that in the recent years, the volume of the funds invested in the improvement of the situation of the Roma people in education grew considerably and the first results indicate that the introduced activities and measures were successful.

However, the problem is a limited influence of the central bodies on the bodies operating on the local level, as the information about specific measures implemented by the school themselves is not sufficient. The lacks of the existing system are further supported by the fact, that under no circumstances is it possible to keep a record of a Roma origin of the pupil. The schools at the same time often express a fear of identifying their pupils as Roma people, as they could be accused of the illegal record-keeping of the Roma people. Confusion of the terms “Rom” and “socially-disadvantaged” is misleading – not all Roma people are socially disadvantaged. These terms may lead to a legalization of segregation of the Roma people in special schools. It is this practice, that is placement of a great number of Roma children in special schools, which is simultaneously the most criticized fact in the quoted report.

#### **4. Media**

See Chapter V. / 5.

#### **5. Grant schemes of socio-cultural integration of Roma<sup>70</sup>**

- 1) 8 000 000 CZK/ 280 702 EUR for grant scheme for socio-integration programmes
  - Cultural and education activities
  - Support of education and other facilities
  - Support of art activities
  - Cultural heritage support and Roma minority support
  - Publication
  - Social guidance
- 2) 4 000 000 CZK/140 351 EUR for socio-education programmes oriented on cultural and education activities
- 3) 1 500 000 CZK/52 632 EUR for Roma communities and majority coexistence programmes
- 4) 2 800 000 CZK/98 246 EUR for street workers support
- 5) 2 925 000 CZK/102 632 EUR for Roma pupils
- 6) 499 000 CZK/17 509 EUR for summitries of holocaust victims in Lety u Pisku
- 7) 250 000 CZK/8 772 EUR for Roma festival Khamoro 2000

---

<sup>69</sup> European Network for Monitoring Racism and Xenophobia.

<sup>70</sup> Šimíková, Navrátil, Winkler, 2004 (17 Reference)

## **VI. FOREIGN COMMUNITIES**

Basic document of the government in the area of social inclusion of foreigners is the „Updated concept of integration of foreigners“, 2005. Policy of the state vis-à-vis foreigners is based on principle of legal security, just handling and increasing rights with increasing length of stay ion the country. Basic integration measures are aiming at these targets:

- 1) knowledge of the Czech language;
- 2) economic support of foreigners;
- 3) orientation of foreigners in society; and
- 4) relations of foreigners vis-à-vis members of majority society.

Cultural integration means takeover of basic rules and norms of a host society by a foreigner and acquiring knowledge of the Czech language, which help in creating a new identity of an immigrant and serves as prevention against fragmentation of a society and segregation of immigrant communities. Knowledge of the Czech language is also a condition for possible future naturalisation.

Elaboration, update and implementation of the integration of foreigners<sup>71</sup> is a competence of the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, which coordinates the activities of other units of the state administration, academic community and non-governmental organizations in this area. The government of the Czech Republic invited the Chairmans of the Czech Statistical Office and the Academy of Science of the Czech Republic, region commissioners, Lord Mayors of the Capital City of Prague and statutory cities and towns, representatives of the Association of Regions and the Union of Cities, Towns and Municipalities of the Czech Republic, mayors of the municipalities with authorized municipal authorities, social partners of the Council of Economic and Social Agreement of the Czech Republic and representatives of private non-profit organizations and specific-purpose facilities of the churches to cooperate in implementing the procedures and tasks in the fulfillment of the concept of integration of foreigners.

The current updated concept changes the government policy in the area of integration of foreigners towards a greater conceptuality and sets the priorities and long-term tasks of the government policy. The proposal of the long-term legislative and practical measures is prepared in such a way, that it should enable the evaluation of the policy (sponsors, schedule of performance). The concept contains evaluation of activities implemented in the area of integration of foreigners for the year of 2005, which enables their quantification and evaluation of the three selected areas of the social inclusion of members of the ethnic minorities, which are: participation, education and media.

### **1. Participation**

The acquisition of the state citizenship is one of the indicators telling of the finalization of the process of inclusion of a foreigner in the Czech society. The record-keeping of the state citizenship is in the competence of the Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic. Together with the name, surname, date of birth, original citizenship, also a legal reason for citizenship granting

---

<sup>71</sup> Cizincem se rozumí fyzická osoba, která není státním občanem České republiky. Za cizince se považuje i osoba, která žádné občanství nemá.

is recorded. The state citizenship may be acquired a) by birth, b) by adoption, c) by filiation, d) by finding on the territory of the Czech Republic, e) by declaration and f) by granting<sup>72</sup>.

The naturalization of foreigners did not occur in the same manner in the past years. Whereas in 1999, more than 7.3 thousand foreigners were naturalized, in 2003, their number dropped to 3.4 thousand, but the next year it grew to 5 thousand. Whereas in 1999, 86% of granted citizenships fell to the former citizens of Slovakia, in 2004 their share was only 35%. The entrance of Slovakia and Poland in the EU decreased the interest of citizens of these states in the naturalization in the Czech Republic. The change of citizenship in the new European context appears less significant. The share of citizenships granted to the citizens of Ukraine grew more considerably in the past years. For more detailed information, see Attachment – Table 2

**The social participation of the foreigners cannot be found out for the time being due to unavailability of the data and also with regards to the legal position of the foreigners in the Czech Republic, who do not hold the active or the passive right to vote<sup>73</sup>.**

## 2. Education

The conditions of education of the foreigners are stipulated by the School Act No. 561/2004 on Pre-School, Elementary, Secondary, Higher Vocational and Other Education. The education provided based on this Act is a public service.

The most frequently completed level of education among ten foreign most numerous groups of foreigners was the complete secondary education<sup>74</sup> according to the 2001 census results.

The foreigners with the permit to reside permanently in the Czech Republic had a lower level of completed education than the foreigners with the long-residence permits, who more often achieved a university education or as applicable a complete secondary, higher or institute education and less often had only the elementary or the secondary vocational education.

## 3. Media

See Chapter V. / 5.

---

<sup>72</sup> Act No. 40/1993 Coll. executed on 29th December 1992 on Acquiring and Relinquishing the Czech Citizenship as amended;

<sup>73</sup> The Act on Association of Citizens No. 83/1990 Coll. stipulates in Section 6 Clause 2 the foundation of civic associations (CA); it stipulates that petition for registration of CA must be submitted at least by three citizens, of which at least one must be 18 years or older. Based on this, the Ministry of Interior deduces that the civic associations may not be founded exclusively by foreigners and uses for the events, when the foreigners wish to found a civic organization the Act No. 116/1985 Coll. on Conditions of Activities of Organizations with the International Element in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, which is not based on the registration principle, but on the permitting principle. In reality, it happens that the Ministry of Interior does not allow the foreigners to have their cultural and other unions or clubs, although the Declaration of the Basic Rights and Freedoms orders in Article 42 Clause 3 to read in cases of laws on human rights the term "citizen" as "every man". In reality, it is possible to circumvent this interpretation by three Czech citizens filing a petition for registration of the association and the foreigners may be a part of this association. The established practice reflects the fears of the state bodies of independent associating activities of the foreigners. This interpretation practice would make it impossible for the foreigners to establish the independent trade organizations, even though the Declaration of Human Rights and Freedoms simultaneously allows this. For the time being, the foreigners do not have any ambitions in this area, the cultural clubs or associations may be founded by their countrymen, who are citizens and they may affiliate with them.

<sup>74</sup> Census 2001

#### **4. Data**

In 2005, the Ministry of Culture issued the following sums from its own budget for preprojects supporting the integration of foreigners living in the Czech Republic: a) CZK 800,000.00 in an independent tender procedure, b) the amount of support in the grant programs of MC in this area amounted to CZK 2,635,000.00<sup>75</sup>. These projects were focused on multicultural activities, projects supporting the mutual cognition of the members of the foreign communities and the members of the majority, support of the cultural diversity, press for the foreign communities,

#### **Funds issued from the State Budget for Integration of Foreigners**

For 2006, CZK 25,000 thousand was released for integration of foreigners in the following budgetary chapter:

|                                            |                            |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| a) Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs    | CZK 9 000 000/315 790 EUR  |
| b) Ministry of Interior                    | CZK 5 000 000/175 439 EUR  |
| c) Ministry of Health                      | CZK 3 000 000/105 263 EUR  |
| d) Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports | CZK 3 800 000/ 133 333 EUR |
| e) Ministry of Culture                     | CZK 2 500 000/87 719 EUR   |
| f) Ministry of Industry and Trade          | CZK 600 000/21 052 EUR     |
| g) Ministry for Local Development          | CZK 600 000/ 21 052 EUR    |
| h) Czech Statistical office                | CZK 500 000/ 17 544 EUR    |

---

<sup>75</sup> Updated Concept of foreigners' integration pp. 17-21

## VII. NATIONAL ACTION PLAN OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC

### 1. General Characteristics of NAP from the Point of View of Cultural Aspects

The relationship between the cultural policies and social exclusion is not explicitly manifested in the National Action Plan of social inclusion. This fact is determined to a great extent already by the overall orientation of NAP, which places the greatest emphasis on the policy of employment and deals in particular with the economic aspects of the social exclusion.

The National Action Plans do however deal with the issues of cultural aspects of social exclusion in connection with the integration strategies and concepts (**creation of the tolerant environment without prejudice, field social work in excluded Roma communities, presentation of cultures of the national minorities, information in languages of the national minorities**). The meaning of the culture in integration processes is apparent in good practice examples related to the integration of Roma people (**field programs, Roma Center, Assistant to the Police of CR for Roma Citizens**). The National Action Plan does not refer to any good practice examples in the area of integration of foreigners (the target group of the program of integration of minorities mentioned by the document is the Roma citizens). In relation to other minorities, only the main goals of integration policies are outlined. These do refer also to some cultural aspects of integration, nevertheless they are considerably non-specific (NAP often refers in parts dealing with the integration strategies only to other government documents, i.e. to the **Concept of Roma Integration and Concept of Integration of Foreigners on the Territory of the Czech Republic** – see above). Even in case of Roma communities and immigrants, the attention is concentrated very highly on overcoming the apparent manifestations of the social exclusion – deprivation of aggravated access to the resources in the economic sector, in the area of housing and education.

The National Action Plan mentions some approaches and good practices, which may contribute to a multicultural symbiosis or as applicable, which may improve the ability of the society to respond to the situation of minorities (**liaison officer for minorities, inclusion of human rights, respect to minorities and their protection within the frame of the professional ethics in the work of the Police of the Czech Republic, assistant to the Police of the Czech Republic for a cooperation with the Roma community**). However, these activities are not sufficiently established, as the support of common life of ethnic minorities has not been included among the NAP priorities (not even as a separate priority or as an essential aspect of some of the already set priorities).

NAP deals a lot with the issue of education, extracurricular education and programs of prevention of socially pathological phenomena. Their relationship towards the cultural aspects of the social exclusion is not reflected in the text, nevertheless a certain correlation with the aspects of the social exclusion could be expected there. These three areas thus at least partially balance the overall concentration of NAP on economic aspects.

### 2. Social and Political Participation

The area of the social and political participation is not thematized separately, however, its certain aspects could be observed in the part dealing with the access to the sources, rights, goods and services in the part devoted to the prevention of social exclusion and prevention of socially negative phenomena and in the part engaged in the help to most jeopardized groups of the population. In both recently mentioned parts, the attention is devoted to the issues of the multicultural life, which were described in the previous chapter. In other words, the actual issue of the social and political participation in relation to the ethnic minorities is not dealt with

separately and only certain more general presumptions are observed, which may influence it substantially – employment, safety of ethnic minorities (racial crimes, usury), prevention of socially negative phenomena, housing, education or social environment without prejudice (for the last two areas see below).

### **3. Education**

In relation to the area of education, NAP also pays attention to the issue of access of the disadvantaged groups of inhabitants to the education. This issue directly concerns the ethnic minorities, which is also reflected in parts of NAP devoted to education (and repeatedly reminded in the part dealing with the situation of Roma people). The issue of access to the education is nevertheless dealt with only in close relation to the Roma community; in relation to immigrants, only the creation of foreign-language textbooks is mentioned.

The extracurricular education and a further education is observed only in relation to the general population. Even in this case, it is, however, possible to anticipate a disadvantaged access for certain groups of the population. This issue is not dealt with any further in NAP, as the state may intervene here only to a limited extent (the implementation of these activities has only a marginal involvement of the state, the main role is played here by NNO and the private sector).

### **4. Media**

The media area is not separately thematized, the attention is paid only to the issue of e-inclusion of the population, development of the information society and its approximation to the disadvantaged population groups. Nevertheless, the meaning of the media activities is still indicated in connection with the situation of ethnic minorities.

In case of the Roma community, one of the goals of NAP is to create the conditions for a development of a tolerant environment without prejudice. These efforts include equalization procedures (targeted assistance, field work in excluded Roma communities) and some other institutional prerequisites (conditions and method of awarding grants for activities of members of the national minorities and for a support of integration of the Roma community, which may include the presentation of cultures of the national minorities, distribution and receipt of information in the languages of the national minorities, education in languages of the national minorities).

As far as immigrants are concerned, NAP mentions a support of projects focused on improvement of the awareness of foreigners and citizens, continuance and development of the social and legal consulting for foreigners, support of education, language skills and other qualifications of foreigners, a support of employment of foreigners on the labor market, development of the cultural and religious life of foreigners, development of the relationship of foreigners and their communities with citizens, establishment and activities of the non-state non-profit organizations and associations of foreigners, development and activities of community and multicultural centers, support of prevention of intolerance of racism and discrimination of foreigners.

## **VIII. INDICATORS OF ETHNIC MINORITIES INCLUSION IN RELEVANT AREAS**

### **1. Participation (Political and Interest Participation and Association in Trade Union Organizations)**

The right to associate, i.e. the right to found civic associations with a legal subjectivity (legal identity) belongs to the fundamental civic rights and is contained in a number of international agreements on human rights, for instance in Article 11 of the European Convention on Protection of Human Rights and also in the Czech Declaration of Basic Rights and Freedoms Article 20.<sup>76</sup>

The Council of Europe states in its recommendations the following indicators and characteristics of the social participation (engagement in the social, political and cultural life)<sup>77</sup>:

- Number of persons involved in the local voluntary organizations;
- Number of persons involved in the social organizations;
- Number of persons involved in the trade unions;
- Number of persons in mutually (publicly) beneficial societies;
- Number of persons utilizing the options of cheap housing;
- Number of persons in employee organizations, school councils and so on;
- Number of members of the political parties;
- Number of registered voters;
- Number of persons involved in the European, regional and local elections;
- Ratio of candidates from among immigrants
- Number of persons involved in key institutions or bodies

### **2. Education**

The recommendation of the Council of Europe for education indicators. The level of education and qualifications may be determined partially from the results of Census, status as at 1<sup>st</sup> March 2001 and some information can be obtained from Labour Force Survey.

The level of qualifications (education) is observed in the following structure:

- None
- elementary education
- lower secondary education
- higher secondary education
- certified (secondary technical) education
- university education

---

<sup>76</sup> Amendment to the proposals of non-governmental organizations to the issue of integration of foreigners executed on 26th June 2003

<sup>77</sup> Effectiveness of the concept of integration of foreigners until 2002 (internal material), Concept of Processing and Selection of Statistical Data associated with Migration and Integration of Foreigners on the Territory of the Czech Republic, Prague October 2002

### **3. Media**

The publishing and distribution of the periodical press on the territory of the Czech Republic is governed by Act No. 46/2000 Coll., Act on Rights and Duties in Publishing Periodical Press and on Change of Some Other Acts (Press Act). The record-keeping of the periodical press is maintained by the Ministry of Culture. The Ministry of Culture keeps record of the name of the periodical, its content orientation, periodicity of publishing and the data on regional versions.

#### **Compulsory Data**

(1) The publisher is obliged to ensure that the following compulsory data be stated on each issue of the periodical press:

- a) name of the periodical press,
- b) frequency (periodicity) of its publishing,
- c) identification of the regional version, provided that the periodical press is published in regional versions,
- d) place of publishing,
- e) issue and date of publishing,
- f) reference number of the periodical press allocated by the Ministry,
- g) trade name, place of business and identification number of the publisher, provided that the publisher is a legal entity, or name, surname and place of residence of the publisher, provided that the publisher is a physical entity, which publishes press on the basis of a trade license, and also its trade name, identification number and address of the place of business, if it is different from the place of residence.

(2) The periodical press, which does not contain the data as specified in clause 1 must not be publicly distributed; this does not apply to the reference number of the periodical press allocated by the Ministry, if the Ministry did not advise to the publisher the record-keeping (reference) number in the term specified in the provision of Section 7 Clause 4.

4. Indicators based on data are available for<sup>78</sup>:

1) ethnicity (cultural diversity of the CR population)

- number of persons claiming to be a national minority based on the last census results (2001),
- number of foreigners with the permanent residence permit as at 31<sup>st</sup> December and
- number of foreigners with the long-term residence permit as at 31<sup>st</sup> December.).

---

<sup>78</sup> Figures are enclosed in Attachment II - Tables

## 2) naturalization<sup>79</sup>

- number of Granted Citizenships during the Year,
- number of Granted Citizenships / Number of Permanent-Residence Permits by Individual Former Citizenships in a certain year).

## 5. Examples

### 1) Ethnicity (cultural diversity of the CR population)

#### Population of the Czech Republic by nationality

| Census    | 1950      | 1961      | 1970      | 1980      | 1991      | 2001      |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Czech     | 8 343 558 | 9 023 501 | 9 270 617 | 9 733 925 | 8 363 768 | 9 249 777 |
| Moravian  | .         | .         | .         | .         | 1 362 313 | 380 474   |
| Silesian  | .         | .         | .         | .         | 44 446    | 10 878    |
| Slovak    | 258 025   | 275 997   | 320 998   | 359 370   | 314 877   | 193 190   |
| Roma      | .         | .         | .         | .         | 32 903    | 11 746    |
| Ukrainian | 19 384    | 19 549    | 9 794     | 10 271    | 8 220     | 22 112    |
| Russian   |           |           | 6 619     | 5 051     | 5 062     | 12 369    |
| Ruthenian | .         | .         | .         | .         | 1 926     | 1 106     |
| Polish    | 70 816    | 66 540    | 64 074    | 66 123    | 59 383    | 51 968    |
| Hungarian | 13 201    | 15 152    | 18 472    | 19 676    | 19 932    | 14 672    |
| German    | 159 938   | 134 143   | 80 903    | 58 211    | 48 556    | 39 106    |
| othes     | 19 770    | 26 554    | 26 273    | 18 264    | 18 812    | 69 835    |
| unknown   | 11 441    | 10 095    | 9 947     | 21 036    | 22 017    | 172 827   |

[www.czso.cz](http://www.czso.cz)

#### Population according to religious denomination

| Census                          | 1991             |                  | 2001             |                  |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                 | absolute figures | relative figures | absolute figures | relative figures |
| <b>Believers</b>                | 4 523 734        | 43.91            | 3 288 088        | 32.14            |
| Roma Catholic Church            | 4 021 385        | 39.03            | 2 740 780        | 26.79            |
| Czechoslovak Husit Church       | 178 036          | 1.73             | 99 103           | 0.97             |
| Evangelic Czech Brothers Church | 203 996          | 1.98             | 117 212          | 1.15             |
| <b>Without denomination</b>     | 4 112 864        | 39.92            | 6 039 991        | 59.04            |
| <b>Unknown</b>                  | 1 665 617        | 16.17            | 901 981          | 8.82             |
| Population total                | 10 302 215       | 100.00           | 10 230 060       | 100.00           |

[www.czso.cz](http://www.czso.cz)

<sup>79</sup> In 2005 state citizenship of the Czech Republic has acquired 2.626 of foreigners. By the Law No.. 40/1993 of Coll. Sb. the state citizenship has been granted to 1.423 persons and 1.013 of former Slovak Citizen has acquired the Czech citizenship by declaration (§18a, §18b, §18c). According to the Law No 193/1999 Coll. the CR citizenship has acquired 190 persons, former czechoslovak citizens. Source: © Český statistický úřad (Czech Statistical Office), 2006.

## Foreigners holding permanent, long-term and temporary residence permits in the C (as at December 31)

| Year | Foreigners holding permanent residence permits in the CR | Foreigners holding long-term, temporary and visa for residence over 90 days | Stateless | Total foreigners holding residence permits | Number of inhabitants of the CR* | Proportion of foreigners holding long-term, temporary and visa over 90 days of inhabitants of the CR in % | Proportion of total foreigners holding residence permits of inhabitants of the CR in % |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1993 | 31 072                                                   | 46 070                                                                      | 526       | 77 668                                     | 10 334 013                       | 0.45                                                                                                      | 0.75                                                                                   |
| 1994 | 32 468                                                   | 71 230                                                                      | 654       | 104 352                                    | 10 333 161                       | 0.69                                                                                                      | 1.01                                                                                   |
| 1995 | 38 557                                                   | 120 060                                                                     | 590       | 159 207                                    | 10 321 344                       | 1.16                                                                                                      | 1.54                                                                                   |
| 1996 | 45 837                                                   | 152 767                                                                     | 548       | 199 152                                    | 10 309 137                       | 1.48                                                                                                      | 1.93                                                                                   |
| 1997 | 56 281                                                   | 153 516                                                                     | 514       | 210 311                                    | 10 299 125                       | 1.49                                                                                                      | 2.04                                                                                   |
| 1998 | 63 919                                                   | 155 836                                                                     | 432       | 220 187                                    | 10 289 621                       | 1.51                                                                                                      | 2.14                                                                                   |
| 1999 | 66 754                                                   | 162 108                                                                     | -         | 228 862                                    | 10 278 098                       | 1.58                                                                                                      | 2.23                                                                                   |
| 2000 | 66 891                                                   | 134 060                                                                     | -         | 200 951                                    | 10 266 546                       | 1.31                                                                                                      | 1.96                                                                                   |
| 2001 | 69 816                                                   | 140 978                                                                     | -         | 210 794                                    | 10 269 726                       | 1.37                                                                                                      | 2.05                                                                                   |
| 2002 | 75 249                                                   | 156 359                                                                     | -         | 231 608                                    | 10 182 471                       | 1.54                                                                                                      | 2.27                                                                                   |
| 2003 | 80 844                                                   | 159 577                                                                     | -         | 240 421                                    | 10 211 455                       | 1.56                                                                                                      | 2.35                                                                                   |
| 2004 | 99 467                                                   | 154 827                                                                     | -         | 254 294                                    | 10 215 575                       | 1.52                                                                                                      | 2.49                                                                                   |
| 2005 | 110 598                                                  | 167 714                                                                     | -         | 278 312                                    | 10 251 100                       | 1.64                                                                                                      | 2.71                                                                                   |

Source:DABP-MI, calculations Milada Horáková, RILSA

\* Statistical yearbook of the Czech Republic, population as at December 31 2005

Note: Foreigners from the EU/EEA/EFTA have temporary or permanent residence permits, other foreigners (from third countries) have visas over 90 days (residence up to one year), long-term residence (over one year) and permanent residence

## 2) Naturalization<sup>80</sup>

### Number of Granted Citizennships during the Year,

| Year                           | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|--------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Total of granted citizennships | 7309 | 6436 | 4449 | 4532 | 3410 | 5020 | 2626 |

Source: Foreigners in the Czech Republic 2002 Czech Statistical Office, Scientia; Foreigners in the Czech Republic 2005 Czech Statistical Office, Scientia, Calculation by VÚPSV Horáková

<sup>80</sup> In 2005 state citizenship of the Czech Republic has acquired 2.626 of foreigners. By the Law No.. 40/1993 of Coll. Sb. the state citizenship has been granted to 1.423 persons and 1.013 of former Slovak Citizen has acquired the Czech citizenship by declaration (§18a, §18b, §18c). According to the Law No 193/1999 Coll. the CR citizenship has acquired 190 persons, former czechoslovak citizens. Source: © Český statistický úřad (Czech Statistical Office), 2006.

**Number of Granted Citizenships / Number of Permanent-Residence Permits by Individual Former Citizenships in 2005).**

**Czech citizenship acquired: number, by previous citizenship in 2005**

| Previous citizenship / legal basis of acquisition of citizenship | Number of persons | Number of refugees | Total        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| <b>Total</b>                                                     | <b>2 567</b>      | <b>59</b>          | <b>2 626</b> |
| acquisition by the Act No 40/1993, article 7                     |                   |                    |              |
| Total acquisition                                                | <b>1 364</b>      | <b>59</b>          | <b>1 423</b> |
| selected citizenship*                                            | <b>1 266</b>      | <b>36</b>          | <b>1 302</b> |
| Slovakia                                                         | 246               | -                  | 246          |
| Ukraine                                                          | 237               | 2                  | 239          |
| Poland                                                           | 167               | -                  | 167          |
| Romania                                                          | 143               | -                  | 143          |
| Russian Federation                                               | 133               | 1                  | 134          |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina                                           | 62                | 1                  | 63           |
| Vietnam                                                          | 62                | -                  | 62           |
| Bulgaria                                                         | 43                | 5                  | 48           |
| Kazakhstan                                                       | 40                | 3                  | 43           |
| Belarus                                                          | 26                | 9                  | 35           |
| Armenia                                                          | 18                | 14                 | 32           |
| Serbia and Montenegro                                            | 25                | 1                  | 26           |
| stateless                                                        | 19                | -                  | 19           |
| Macedonia                                                        | 13                | -                  | 13           |
| Moldova                                                          | 11                | -                  | 11           |
| USA                                                              | 11                | -                  | 11           |
| Cuba                                                             | 10                | -                  | 10           |
| others                                                           | 98                | 23                 | 121          |

**Declaration Act No 40/1993, articles 18a, 18b, 18c**

|                                          |     |   |     |
|------------------------------------------|-----|---|-----|
| Slovak Republic - § 18a                  | 565 | - | 565 |
| Slovak Republic - § 18b                  | 123 | - | 123 |
| Slovak Republic - § 18c                  | 325 | - | 325 |
| <b>by declaration by Act No 193/1999</b> |     |   |     |
| not registered                           | 190 | - | 190 |

Source: Ministry of the Interior of the CR

Source: Foreigners in the Czech Republic 2002 Czech Statistical Office, Scientia; Foreigners in the Czech Republic 2005 Czech Statistical Office, Scientia, Calculation by VÚPSV Horáková

## **IX. PILOT INVESTIGATION AMONG PROFESSIONALS DEALING WITH INCLUSION OF ETHNIC MINORITIES**

### **1. Methods**

#### **1.1 Basic Data**

The objective of the pilot investigation was to map the perception of the meaning of cultural aspects among professionals dealing with the issues of social inclusion of ethnic minorities. The representatives of associations and organizations associating the members of ethnic minorities and foreign communities, representatives of the state administration bodies and self-administration bodies and employees of the non-profit organizations and academic institutes engaged in the issues of minorities were approached (see below).

The pilot investigation followed up on the outputs gained through the focus group in which professionals dealing with the situation of ethnic minorities or as applicable with its human law, cultural or educational aspects, professionals dealing with the issue of social exclusion of ethnic minorities and with monitoring the situation of ethnic minorities participated (the professionals dealing with the cultural policy, or as applicable the issue of social inclusion in general were addressed as well, nevertheless none of them participated in the meeting). The facts discussed at this meeting were subsequently taken into account in the selection of the most significant available indicators, which currently speak of the ethnic structure of the Czech Republic, foreigner's policy of the Czech Republic from the point of view of integration of persons living on the territory of the Czech Republic and a situation of ethnic minorities in the area of social participation, education and the media area (see Attachment No. III.).

The indicators in three last mentioned areas represented the base indicators. All base indicators were then assigned disturbing factors and on this basis, always a single target indicator was identified in every area, which should be piloted through the implemented solution (piloted indicator) – see Attachment IV. The research investigation then focused not only on the main piloted indicator for every area as such, but also on the evaluation of the number of financial funds invested in the respective area (complementary piloted indicator).

Also, 13 areas of the individual's life were selected, in which social exclusion may occur. Some of these areas had a clear relationship to the culture (for instance the possibility of a social participation, access to the media) and some could be associated only with the culture in the most general sense (for instance access to employment, access to housing). All these 13 areas had to be characterized based on more different parameters: based on the existence or non-existence of the social exclusion, quality of the legislation environment, contribution of the non-profit organizations and state bodies to the social inclusion, perception of the quantity of the financial funds and effectiveness of the programs implemented in individual observed areas.

When designing the research tool, also the fact was taken into account that the evaluation of all these facts could differ depending on the type of organization and area of minorities, with which the queried organization is in contact. A form of an enquiry investigation was selected for the collection of the data – see Attachment V).

#### **1.2 Data Collection**

The respondents were addressed based on the criterion of availability as it was not possible to obtain the currently valid contacts for all key organizations operating in the area. The basic area of the addressed persons were formed of representatives of more significant organizations

operating in the area, whose contact was publicly available and the experts addressed already upon organization of the focus group (see above).

The contacts for the representatives of other institutions and organizations (state as well as non-state) operating in the area of inclusion of ethnic minorities were provided by the department of the social services of the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs. The area of such obtained and so-far up-to-date contacts was still relatively limited and in some cases, the contacts were not obtained for persons having the information about the issue. The investigation thus included also the respondents, to whom the enquiry was distributed further by the persons we addressed. The form of the enquiry was distributed through electronic mail, of 123 sent enquiries 20 (16.3%) could not be delivered. The contacted persons then distributed 26 additional enquiries. In total, the enquiry was delivered to 129 persons, of which 59 (45.7%) answered (electronically or by e-mail), 2 sent the enquiry incomplete or did not answer due to a time pressure and 2 respondents refused to complete it with regards to the methodological problems resulting from the nature and options of mapping the issues of the social inclusion of ethnic minorities. With regards to these circumstances (see below), the selection method based on the availability criterion and the rate of return, the hereafter presented data has a limited informational value and needs to be understood only as an indicative statement of the observed problem.

### **1.3 Limitation of the Applied Research Methodics identified by the Pilot Research**

The basic reproach against the concept of the whole research project was the fact, that „[already the selected concept of the research project] contains identification of the national minorities ([in Czech conditions then] in particular of the Roma minority) with the subset of socially weak, uneducated, ignorant and socially needy persons.“ However, what would be desirable would be such a change of the methodological approach, when „the subset of persons needful of social support within the frame of the set of the state population would be redefined and this subset would be defined by parameters of the level of education, level of income, living/housing, economic in(activity) and so on and not by belonging to an ethnic (national) minority. Unlike the hard-to-defined, unstable and impossible-to-prove “nationality” factor, the stated factors are measurable, provable and assessable. Apart from this, it is not clear, whether in case of Roma minority [the questions concern] about 12 thousand of inhabitants of the Czech Republic, who claimed in the 2001 population census to have the Roma nationality voluntarily and based on their own free decision, or whether these questions concerned the alleged 200,000 – 300,000 persons, who apply for various social benefits, supports and allowances designed for the alleged Roma people.“

Other very troublesome issues concerned the fact, that both the foreign communities and the ethnic minorities, [while] at least from the legislative point of view and the point of view of implemented measures, these are completely different groups of persons and at the fact, that in case of foreigners, a number of circumstances are based on the form of their residence status (far more than from their belonging to a certain community of foreigners). By checking some of the options, a considerable distortion would occur. What is more, some issues contain two different facts (for instance see Question No. 8 – Valid Legislation and Strategic Documents – according to the [respondent’s experience], it is just the strategic documents, that contain measures, which should result in a change of legislation in a number of cases) and therefore, it is not possible to express a standpoint to both at the same time. “

In both of these cases, simultaneously with these principal reservations, a specific angle of view of the observed issues resulting from the work orientation of the queried person was stated, which would probably represent another factor distorting the character of the stated answers.

Other considerable problems related to the options to answer some of these questions were also stated by the respondents, who sent the enquiries entirely completed (a total of 8 respondents). Some questions, comments or supplementing statements need an increased attention. This concerned:

- a lack of information about some areas (2 occurrences), or as applicable vice versa, stating relatively relevant information sources (1 respondent)
- a difficult option of understanding some questions (1 respondent),
- absence of an explicit statement, that the situation being monitored is that in the Czech Republic (questions 1 – 6 of the enquiry) (the answers may thus express general evaluation of certain types of measures without a link to the specific country – 1 respondent),
- two possible definitions of the “social inclusion” concept in Question 1 – as inclusion in the majority society or as inclusion in “their community” (a part of associations clearly supports the inclusion of their countrymen in the majority and for this reason, they were also determined, others do the opposite and develop relationships within the community, by which they actually prevent or as applicable slow down the process of inclusion in the majority society – 1 respondent).
- Two possible roles of the media (Question No. 5) – informing the members of the foreign communities about the events taking place in their homeland and mediation of the contact with the reality in the hosting society to a member of the foreign community (1 respondent).
- Including a distinguishing question „to which minority do your answers relate” only in the end and not in the beginning of the enquiry (after this problem was determined, the respondents were instructed by another letter, and although the answers should not be distorted in relation to this deficiency, this inadequacy could be a considerable cause of a low rate of return – the problem was solved with 2 respondents); asking this distinguishing question appears to be absolutely pivotal, nevertheless, with regards to the above-mentioned general problems and the following stated fact, it is not apparently a solution,
- Status of the client´s residence in the Czech Republic and its social situation represent the primary criteria for the work with the client (i.e. exclusion of any evaluation of the client from the point of view of ethnic origin or belonging to this or that ethnic minority or nationality) and it is necessary to avoid deliberately the categories as “nationality”, “ethnicity” and “ethnic origin”, as they are absolutely irrelevant, provided that the objective of activities of the organization is to be a successful integration of a foreigner into the society (1 respondent),
- Stipulation of the rights and duties of the foreigners directly derives from the type of the permitted residence; each answer therefore corresponds to a certain group of foreigners it is meaningless for another – for instance the children of foreigners do not attend the preparatory classes of schools, only a few communities of foreigners intend to issue a magazine and therefore it is impossible to assess, whether the state grant is sufficient (Question No. 6), the access to employment as well as the access to social services (by law) differs substantially from the type of permitted residence and so on.
- The need to distinguish between the preparatory classes established at elementary schools and special schools (Questions No. 3 and 4); preparatory classes established at elementary schools evaluated as very useful, on the other hand, the preparatory classes of special schools usually experience negative impacts on the educational career of the pupil with the significant influence on the pupil´s further life (1 respondent)

- The need to distinguish between the evaluation of activities of the state and evaluation of activities of non-governmental non-profit organizations (Question 9 and 11 – 2 respondents)
- Some of the notes in the open Question 12 (see below)

Apart from the troublesome issues mentioned by the respondents, it is necessary, in case of performing a more systematic investigation in this area to consider also the issue, whether in the assessed areas their usefulness should be evaluated only in the general level (as it is in the enquiry), or whether this category should be further operationalized and narrowed down into details. This, however subjective, information needs to be attended to greatly, as the possibility of finding other, objective and exactly measurable parameters telling sufficiently of the success rate of the adopted measures is almost excluded. The success of a certain measure in the area of the social inclusion may apparently be evaluated principally only by professionals operating in the respective area based on their expert opinion, while the main interfering variables and problems must be adequately taken into account (circumstances described above represent only some of these problems most of which were identified only in connection with the limited area of observed circumstances).

## 2. Results

### 2.1. Type of Organization and Minority, the Situation of which was Evaluated

Of 59 addressed organizations, 23 (39.0%) were the departments or offices of the state administration and self-administratoin, 32 respondents (54.2%) were represented by non-profit organizations, in one case (1.7%), the questioned organization was simultaneously classified as non-state non-profit organization and an association or organization associating the members of ethnic minorities or communities of foreigners. This enquiry was assigned to the group representing non-profit organizations. Three respondents (5.1%) represented academic institutes. With regards to a low number of respondents in the last group, only the first two groups of respondents will be compared, however for completeness purposes, the data from academic institutes will also be stated in the text.

**T a b l e 1 : Types of Organizations involved in the Research Investigation**

| Organization Type                                                 | Occurrence in % |       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------|
| Department or state administration and self-administration office | 23              | 39.0  |
| Non-state non-profit organization                                 | 33              | 55.9  |
| Academic institute                                                | 3               | 5.1   |
| Total                                                             | 59              | 100.0 |

Most answers (37 respondents; 62.7%) related to the Roma minority, 16 respondents answered generally in relation to all minorities (27.1%). In two cases, a combination of more different minorities was stated and one case related the answers to the communities of foreigners. All of these three answers represented separate entities and therefore were not assigned to any of both dominant groups and were not observed upon a further analysis. In three cases (5.1%), the question was not answered. At non-state, non-profit organizations, it was possible to observe a more considerable representation of answers related to the Roma minority than at the departments or offices of the state administration and self-administration.

**T a b l e 2 : Minorities, the situation of which was evaluated**

| Nationality, the situation of which was evaluated | occurrence | in % |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------|------|
| Roma minority                                     | 37         | 62.7 |
| Generally all minorities                          | 16         | 27.1 |
| Roma, Vietnamese, Mongolian                       | 1          | 1.7  |
| Ukrainian, Vietnamese                             | 1          | 1.7  |
| Foreigners in general                             | 1          | 1.7  |
| No answer, invalid answer                         | 3          | 5.1  |
| Total                                             | 59         | 100  |

**T a b l e 3 : Minorities, the situation of which was evaluated based on the organization type (data in %)**

| Nationality                            | Department or office of the state administration and self-administration | Non-state Organization | Academic Institute (Branch) | Whole Set |
|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Roma minority                          | 52.2                                                                     | 72.7                   | 33.3                        | 62.7      |
| Generally all minorities               | 39.1                                                                     | 18.2                   | 33.3                        | 27.1      |
| Roma, Vietnamese, Mongolian minorities | 0.0                                                                      | 3.0                    | 0.0                         | 1.7       |
| Ukrainian, Vietnamese minorities       | 0.0                                                                      | 0.0                    | 33.3                        | 1.7       |
| Foreigners in general                  | 4.3                                                                      | 0.0                    | 0.0                         | 1.7       |
| No answer, invalid answer              | 4.3                                                                      | 6.1                    | 0.0                         | 5.1       |
| Absolute occurrence                    | 23                                                                       | 33                     | 3                           | 59        |

## 2.2. Piloted Indicators

More than half of respondents considered the unions and associations, in which foreigners and members of ethnic minorities organize very useful from the point of view of their social inclusion and according to another almost one third of respondents, these unions and associations were “rather useful”. The evaluation of clubs and associations was more favorable from non-state, non-profit organizations and respondents expressing their standpoint to the situation of the Roma minority.

**T a b l e 4 : Usefulness of Clubs and Associations (in %)**

| Answer          | Type of Organization                                                     |                                   |                    | Evaluated Minority |                          |  | Full Set |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|----------|
|                 | Department or office of the state administration and self-administration | Non-state non-profit organization | Academic Institute | Roma Minority      | Generally all minorities |  |          |
| Not useful      | 4.3                                                                      | 0.0                               | 0.0                | 0.0                | 6.3                      |  | 1.7      |
| Not very useful | 0.0                                                                      | 12.1                              | 0.0                | 2.7                | 12.5                     |  | 6.8      |
| Rather useful   | 47.8                                                                     | 18.2                              | 33.3               | 21.6               | 43.8                     |  | 30.5     |
| Very useful     | 43.5                                                                     | 60.6                              | 33.3               | 67.6               | 31.3                     |  | 52.5     |
| Unable to judge | 4.3                                                                      | 9.1                               | 33.3               | 8.1                | 6.3                      |  | 8.5      |

Only two thirds of respondents expressed their standpoint to the amount of the financial funds. The numbers of respondents considering these funds “insufficient” or “very limited” were entirely comparable with the number of respondents evaluating the situation favorably, nevertheless the marginal level on the observed scale was more often chosen in case of a negative evaluation, in other words, the evaluation of the financial funds for the clubs and associations thus ended up rather negatively in general. In spite of the differing number of respondents, who expressed their opinion in respect of the issue in the individual observed

subgroups, there was a clear and apparent considerable polarization depending on the organization type – a substantially more negative attitude was assumed by a group representing the nonstate, non-profit organizations.

**T a b l e 5 : Evaluation of the Financial Funds designed for Clubs and Associations (in %)**

| Answer          | Organization Type                                                        |                                    |                    | Evaluated Minority |                      |     | Total Set |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-----------|
|                 | Department or office of the state administration and self-administration | Non-state, non-profit organization | Academic Institute | Roma Minority      | Generally minorities | all |           |
| insufficient    | 8.7                                                                      | 12.1                               | 0.0                | 10.8               | 6.3                  |     | 10.2      |
| Very limited    | 8.7                                                                      | 30.3                               | 33.3               | 24.3               | 18.8                 |     | 22.0      |
| Sufficient      | 60.9                                                                     | 15.2                               | 33.3               | 35.1               | 37.5                 |     | 33.9      |
| Excellent       | 0.0                                                                      | 3.0                                | 0.0                | 2.7                | 0.0                  |     | 1.7       |
| Unable to judge | 21.7                                                                     | 39.4                               | 33.3               | 27.0               | 37.5                 |     | 32.2      |

The absolute majority of the respondents evaluated a specialized pre-school education from the point of view of a further assertion of an individual at the elementary school as “very useful”. A relatively markedly difference between the respondents, who did not share this opinion, depending on the organization type<sup>81</sup> cannot be overestimated, as only two respondents belonged to this group from the employees of the state administration and self-administration.

**T a b l e 6 : Usefulness of the Pre-School Education (in %)**

| Answer          | Organization Type                                                        |                                  |                    | Evaluated Minority |                      |     | Total Set |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-----------|
|                 | Department or office of the state administration and self-administration | Nonstate non-profit organization | Academic institute | Roma Minority      | Generally minorities | all |           |
| Not useful      | 0.0                                                                      | 0.0                              | 0.0                | 0.0                | 0.0                  |     | 0.0       |
| Not very useful | 8.7                                                                      | 0.0                              | 0.0                | 5.4                | 0.0                  |     | 3.4       |
| Rather useful   | 0.0                                                                      | 15.2                             | 0.0                | 8.1                | 12.5                 |     | 8.5       |
| Very useful     | 91.3                                                                     | 84.8                             | 100.0              | 86.5               | 87.5                 |     | 88.1      |
| Unable to judge | 0.0                                                                      | 0.0                              | 0.0                | 0.0                | 0.0                  |     | 0.0       |

Only incomplete two thirds expressed their opinion to the amount of the financial funds. The number of respondents considering these funds “insufficient” or “very limited” exceeded slightly the numbers of respondents evaluating the situation favorably, nevertheless the marginal level on the observed scale was far more often chosen in case of a negative evaluation, in other words, the evaluation of financial funds used to organize the preparatory classes thus resulted in a negative rating in general. In spite of the differing number of respondents, who expressed their opinion in the individual observed subgroups, there was a clear polarization depending on the organization type – a considerably more negative attitude was assumed only by the group representing non-state, non-profit organizations.

---

<sup>81</sup> The respondents representing the department or a state administration and self-administration offices considered this type of a measure off-hand „not very useful“, whereas the employees of non-state, non-profit organizations considered these measures „rather useful“

**T a b l e 7 : Evaluation of Financial Funds designed for Organization of Preparatory Classes (in %)**

| Answer                    | Organization Type                                                        |                                    |                    | Evaluated Minority |                      |     | Total Set |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-----------|
|                           | Department or office of the state administration and self-administration | Non-state, non-profit organization | Academic Institute | Roma minority      | Generally minorities | all |           |
| Insufficient              | 17.4                                                                     | 21.2                               | 0.0                | 16.2               | 12.5                 |     | 18.6      |
| Very limited              | 13.0                                                                     | 21.2                               | 0.0                | 21.6               | 12.5                 |     | 16.9      |
| Sufficient                | 43.5                                                                     | 15.2                               | 33.3               | 27.0               | 31.3                 |     | 27.1      |
| Excellent                 | 0.0                                                                      | 3.0                                | 0.0                | 0.0                | 6.3                  |     | 1.7       |
| Unable to judge           | 26.1                                                                     | 36.4                               | 66.7               | 32.4               | 37.5                 |     | 33.9      |
| No answer, invalid answer | 0.0                                                                      | 3.0                                | 0.0                | 2.7                | 0.0                  |     | 1.7       |

Three fifths of respondents considered the existence of periodicals and programs for ethnic minorities and the community of foreigners “very needful” in an effort for their social inclusion. According to another approximately one quarter of respondents, these periodicals and programs were “rather needful”. More favorable statements to the influence of periodicals and programs on the social inclusion were made by respondents stating their opinions generally to the situation of all minorities, slightly less favorable statements were made also by the employees of the state administration and self-administration.

**T a b l e 8 : Evaluation of the Influence of Periodicals and Programs on the Social Inclusion (in %)**

| Answer                 | Organization Type                                                         |                                   |                    | Evaluated Minority |                      |     | Total Set |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-----------|
|                        | Department or offices of the state administration and self-administration | Non-state non-profit organization | Academic Institute | Roma Minority      | Generally minorities | all |           |
| Absolutely dispensable | 4.3                                                                       | 0.0                               | 0.0                | 2.7                | 0.0                  |     | 1.7       |
| Rather unneeded        | 0.0                                                                       | 9.1                               | 0.0                | 5.4                | 6.3                  |     | 5.1       |
| Rather needed          | 26.1                                                                      | 30.3                              | 0.0                | 29.7               | 12.5                 |     | 27.1      |
| Very much needed       | 65.2                                                                      | 57.6                              | 100.0              | 56.8               | 81.3                 |     | 62.7      |
| Unable to judge        | 4.3                                                                       | 3.0                               | 0.0                | 5.4                | 0.0                  |     | 3.4       |

Only three fifths of respondents answered regarding the amount of the financial funds. The numbers of respondents considering these funds “insufficient” or “very limited” were basically comparable with the number of respondents evaluating the situation favorably. Both marginal levels on the observed scale were chosen also to a comparable extent, the respondents thus assumed a neutral attitude regarding the amount of the financial funds available for issuance of the periodicals and creation of the programs. The non-state, non-profit organizations were characteristic by a high number of respondents, who were not willing to evaluate the question (in total, the evaluation for the financial funds in this area was provided by 15 representatives of non-state, non-profit organizations; a low number of respondents in this group considerably limits the possibilities of a further interpretation, nevertheless, still there is an apparently critical attitude present at this group).

**T a b l e 9 : Evaluation of Financial Funds for Publishing Periodicals and Creating Programs (v %)**

| Answer          | Organization Type                                                        |                                   |                    | Evaluated Minority |                      |     | Total Set |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-----------|
|                 | Department or office of the state administration and self-administration | Non-state non-profit organization | Academic Institute | Roma Minority      | Generally minorities | all |           |
| Insufficient    | 4.3                                                                      | 6.1                               | 0.0                | 8.1                | 0.0                  |     | 5.1       |
| Very limited    | 26.1                                                                     | 21.2                              | 33.3               | 18.9               | 31.3                 |     | 23.7      |
| Sufficient      | 52.2                                                                     | 15.2                              | 33.3               | 29.7               | 37.5                 |     | 30.5      |
| Excellent       | 0.0                                                                      | 3.0                               | 0.0                | 0.0                | 6.3                  |     | 1.7       |
| Unable to judge | 17.4                                                                     | 54.5                              | 33.3               | 43.2               | 25.0                 |     | 39.0      |

Of all three observed tools of inclusion of ethnic minorities, the pre-school education was perceived most usefully. It was followed then with a certain distance by periodicals and programs for ethnic minorities. The usefulness of this tool of inclusion of ethnic minorities was, however, basically comparable with the perception of usefulness of clubs and associations.

**T a b l e 10 : Comparison of Evaluation of Usefulness of all Selected Tools of Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities (in % Valid Cases)**

| Evaluation*                       | Clubs and Associations | Pre-School Education | Periodicals and Programs for Ethnic Minorities |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Not useful/absolutely dispensable | 1.9                    | 0.0                  | 1.8                                            |
| Not very useful /rather unneeded  | 7.4                    | 3.4                  | 5.3                                            |
| Rather useful/rather needed       | 33.3                   | 8.5                  | 28.1                                           |
| Very useful /very needed          | 57.4                   | 88.1                 | 64.9                                           |
| Percentage of valid cases         | 91.5                   | 100.0                | 96.6                                           |

\* In case of clubs and associations, or as applicable pre-school education, the first variant of the evaluation is valid, the second variant corresponds to the periodicals and programs as shown in the respective line

The evaluation of the financial funds was comparable in all three observed tools of inclusion of ethnic minorities, the most critical evaluation was attributed to the amount of funds available for organization of the pre-school education, the most favorable situation was recorded with the periodicals and programs for ethnic minorities.

**T a b l e 11 : Comparison of Evaluation of the Financial Funds available for Implementation o all Selected Tools of Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities (in % of valid cases)**

| Evaluation                | Clubs and Associations | Pre-School Education | Periodicals and Programs for Ethnic Minorities |
|---------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Insufficient              | 15.0                   | 28.9                 | 8.3                                            |
| Very limited              | 32.5                   | 26.3                 | 38.9                                           |
| Sufficient                | 50.0                   | 42.1                 | 50.0                                           |
| Excellent                 | 2.5                    | 2.6                  | 2.8                                            |
| Percentage of valid cases | 67.8                   | 64.4                 | 61.0                                           |

### 2.3. Existence of the Social Exclusion of Ethnic Minorities in Selected Areas

Most respondents were convinced of the existence of social exclusion in case of an access to employment, living opportunities, equality in wages and in options of political participation. On the other hand, the existence of social exclusion was least frequently stated in opportunities of participation in the life of the minority, opportunities of the cultural enjoyment and the possibilities of the sports enjoyment. The answer "Other" was given by two respondents (deciding about the placement of Roma children into special schools in educational consulting

and psychologist's offices and the possibility to use the Roma language; statement of another mentality as one of the circumstances contributing towards the social exclusion). The cultural aspects of the social exclusion were perceived as less<sup>82</sup> serious (generally as well as in individual subgroups). In general, the considerably higher<sup>83</sup> risk of social exclusion was stated in relation to the Roma minority, a slightly higher risk was stated also by the respondents representing non-state, non-profit organizations.

**T a b l e 12 : Evaluation of Existence of the Social Exclusion in Selected Areas**

| Evaluated Area                                             | State of Social Exclusion (in % of valid cases) |      |      |      |                          | Invalid answers (% of the whole set) |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|                                                            | 1<br>(definitely<br>not)                        | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5<br>(definitely<br>yes) |                                      |
| Access to employment                                       | 3.5                                             | 7.0  | 19.3 | 26.3 | 43.9                     | 1.7                                  |
| Equality in wages                                          | 5.9                                             | 15.7 | 25.5 | 33.3 | 19.6                     | 13.6                                 |
| Access to housing                                          | 5.4                                             | 10.7 | 23.2 | 26.8 | 33.9                     | 5.1                                  |
| Access to social services                                  | 24.6                                            | 19.3 | 28.1 | 21.1 | 7.0                      | 1.7                                  |
| Access to health care                                      | 30.4                                            | 19.6 | 30.4 | 10.7 | 8.9                      | 3.4                                  |
| Access to education                                        | 27.6                                            | 17.2 | 13.8 | 29.3 | 12.1                     | 1.7                                  |
| Access to legal services                                   | 16.7                                            | 22.2 | 29.6 | 22.2 | 9.3                      | 8.5                                  |
| Opportunities of political participation                   | 15.1                                            | 22.6 | 13.2 | 17.0 | 32.1                     | 10.2                                 |
| Opportunities of social participation                      | 5.3                                             | 19.3 | 35.1 | 22.8 | 17.5                     | 3.4                                  |
| Opportunities of participation in the life of the minority | 32.7                                            | 16.4 | 40.0 | 7.3  | 3.6                      | 6.8                                  |
| Access of the minority members to the public media         | 7.5                                             | 28.3 | 34.0 | 18.9 | 11.3                     | 6.8                                  |
| Opportunities of the sports enjoyment                      | 17.6                                            | 43.1 | 25.5 | 13.7 | 0.0                      | 11.9                                 |
| Opportunities of the cultural enjoyment                    | 16.4                                            | 41.8 | 29.1 | 10.9 | 1.8                      | 5.1                                  |
| Other                                                      | 0.0                                             | 0.0  | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0                      | 0.0                                  |
|                                                            |                                                 |      |      |      |                          | 96.6                                 |

<sup>82</sup> Indicative comparison of the weight of aspects of social exclusion related to the culture with other areas, in which social exclusion may occur, was based on the average calculated from the percentage representation of answers 4 and 5 and with options falling within each of these groups (see the identification in the table).

<sup>83</sup> Differences in the perception of social exclusion based on the type of organization and the observed minority were evaluated using the same procedure as upon the above-described comparison, the indication index was calculated now from the average for all observed groups.

**T a b l e 1 3: Evaluation of Existence of the Social Exclusion based on the Type of Organization and the Evaluated Minority (percentage of respondents giving the answers 4 or 5 on the given scale – see previous table)**

| Evaluated Area <sup>1</sup>                                                        | Organization Type                                                                     |                         |                    | Evaluated Minority |                  | Total set <sup>2</sup> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|
|                                                                                    | Departments or offices of the Non-state, state administration and self-administration | non-profit organization | Academic Institute | Roma               | General minority |                        |
| Access to employment                                                               | 65.2                                                                                  | 71.0                    | 100.0              | 75.0               | 60.0             | 70.2                   |
| Equality in wages                                                                  | 52.6                                                                                  | 51.7                    | 66.7               | 54.5               | 42.9             | 52.9                   |
| Access to housing                                                                  | 54.5                                                                                  | 64.5                    | 66.7               | 64.9               | 50.0             | 60.7                   |
| Access to social services                                                          | 30.4                                                                                  | 22.6                    | 66.7               | 32.4               | 21.4             | 28.1                   |
| Access to health care                                                              | 27.3                                                                                  | 12.9                    | 33.3               | 19.4               | 6.7              | 19.6                   |
| <b>Access to education</b>                                                         | 26.1                                                                                  | 56.3                    | 0.0                | 54.1               | 20.0             | 41.4                   |
| Access to legal services                                                           | 19.0                                                                                  | 41.9                    | 0.0                | 38.9               | 23.1             | 31.5                   |
| <b>Opportunities of political participation</b>                                    | 52.4                                                                                  | 48.3                    | 33.3               | 50.0               | 42.9             | 49.1                   |
| <b>Opportunities of social participation</b>                                       | 34.8                                                                                  | 45.2                    | 33.3               | 45.9               | 21.4             | 40.4                   |
| <b>Opportunities of participation in the life of the minority</b>                  | 9.5                                                                                   | 9.7                     | 33.3               | 13.9               | 7.7              | 10.9                   |
| <b>Access of the minority members to the public media</b>                          | 23.8                                                                                  | 34.5                    | 33.3               | 45.5               | 6.7              | 30.2                   |
| <b>Opportunities of the sports enjoyment</b>                                       | 0.0                                                                                   | 22.2                    | 33.3               | 17.1               | 0.0              | 13.7                   |
| <b>Opportunities of cultural enjoyment</b>                                         | 0.0                                                                                   | 20.0                    | 33.3               | 20.0               | 0.0              | 12.7                   |
| Index of perception of social exclusion <sup>3</sup>                               | 30.4                                                                                  | 38.5                    | 41.0               | 40.9               | 23.3             | 35.5                   |
| Index of perception of aspects of social exclusion related to culture <sup>4</sup> | 20.9                                                                                  | 33.7                    | 28.6               | 35.2               | 14.1             | 28.3                   |
| index of perception of other observed aspects of social exclusion <sup>5</sup>     | 41.5                                                                                  | 44.1                    | 55.6               | 47.5               | 34.0             | 43.8                   |

<sup>1</sup> Highlighted – areas related to culture.

<sup>2</sup> Highlighted – areas with most frequent occurrence of answers 4 and 5 on the given scale.

<sup>3</sup> Average from the values of the percentage representation of answers 4 and 5 in all selected options except for the option “other”.

<sup>4</sup> Average from the values of percentage representation of answers 4 and 5 in highlighted options.

<sup>5</sup> Average from the values of the percentage representation of answers 4 and 5 in all selected options except for “other” option and in highlighted options.

## 2.4. Evaluation of the Influence of the Valid Legislation and Strategic Documents on Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities in Selected Areas

The highest impact on the social inclusion was according to the respondents from the legislative and strategic documents (compare with Chapter 1.3) concerning the access to education, opportunities of cultural enjoyment, access to social services and access to health care. On the other hand, the lowest influence of documents was admitted by respondents in relation to the equality of the wages and access to housing. The “other” answer was stated by three respondents (once the answer was “social programs”, twice the answers were not further specified).

The legislation and strategic documents related to the cultural aspects had slightly better <sup>84</sup> influence on the social inclusion than the documents concerning other areas. A higher influence

<sup>84</sup> Indicative comparison of the weight of aspects of social exclusion related to the culture with other areas, in which social exclusion may occur, was based on the average calculated from the percentage representation of answers 4 and 5 and with options falling within each of these groups (see the identification in the table).

was manifested by legislation and strategic documents on aspects related to the culture according to the representatives of the state administration and self-administration and according to the respondents evaluating generally the situation of all minorities. A higher aggregate<sup>85</sup> rate of influence on the social inclusion of ethnic minorities was attributed to the documents by respondents, who evaluated the situation of all minorities and to a smaller extent also by the representatives of state administration and self-administration offices.

**T a b l e 14 : Evaluation of the Influence of Valid Legislation and Strategic Documents in Selected Areas**

| Evaluated Area                                             | Rate of Influence (in % of valid cases) |      |      |      |                | Invalid answers (% of the whole set) |                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------|------|------|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                                                            | 1<br>(principal)                        | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5 (negligible) | Unable<br>to judge                   | No<br>answer,<br>invalid<br>answer |
| Access to employment                                       | 10.7                                    | 17.9 | 30.4 | 23.2 | 17.9           | 3.4                                  | 1.7                                |
| Equality in wages                                          | 10.0                                    | 4.0  | 44.0 | 26.0 | 16.0           | 13.6                                 | 1.7                                |
| Access to housing                                          | 14.0                                    | 3.5  | 26.3 | 31.6 | 24.6           | 3.4                                  | 0.0                                |
| Access to social services                                  | 19.6                                    | 26.8 | 32.1 | 12.5 | 8.9            | 5.1                                  | 0.0                                |
| Access to health care                                      | 26.8                                    | 19.6 | 33.9 | 8.9  | 10.7           | 3.4                                  | 1.7                                |
| Access to education                                        | 29.3                                    | 31.0 | 19.0 | 15.5 | 5.2            | 1.7                                  | 0.0                                |
| Access to legal services                                   | 17.0                                    | 22.6 | 32.1 | 17.0 | 11.3           | 8.5                                  | 1.7                                |
| Opportunities of political participation                   | 9.8                                     | 17.6 | 27.5 | 23.5 | 21.6           | 10.2                                 | 3.4                                |
| Opportunities of social participation                      | 11.5                                    | 17.3 | 32.7 | 21.2 | 17.3           | 10.2                                 | 1.7                                |
| Opportunities of participation in the life of the minority | 17.0                                    | 26.4 | 34.0 | 13.2 | 9.4            | 8.5                                  | 1.7                                |
| Access of the minority members to the public media         | 7.8                                     | 17.6 | 35.3 | 15.7 | 23.5           | 11.9                                 | 1.7                                |
| Opportunities of the sports enjoyment                      | 18.8                                    | 25.0 | 29.2 | 10.4 | 16.7           | 16.9                                 | 1.7                                |
| Opportunities of the cultural enjoyment                    | 18.5                                    | 31.5 | 25.9 | 11.1 | 13.0           | 8.5                                  | 0.0                                |
| Other                                                      | 0.0                                     | 0.0  | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3           | 0.0                                  | 94.9                               |

<sup>85</sup> Differences in the perception of social exclusion based on the type of organization and the observed minority were evaluated using the same procedure as upon the above-described comparison, the indication index was calculated now from the average for all observed groups.

**T a b l e 15 : Evaluation of the Influence of the Valid Legislation and Strategic Documents based on the Type of Organization and Evaluated Minority (percentage of respondents stating Answer 1 or 2 on the given scale – see the previous table)**

| Evaluated Area <sup>1</sup>                                                        | Organization Type                                                          |                                    |                 | Evaluated Minority |                           | Total Set <sup>2</sup> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
|                                                                                    | Departments or Offices of the State Administration and Self-Administration | Non-State, Non-Profit Organization | Academic Office | Roma Minority      | All Minorities in general |                        |
| Access to employment                                                               | 30.4                                                                       | 30.0                               | 0.0             | 31.4               | 26.7                      | 28.6                   |
| Equality in wages                                                                  | 20.0                                                                       | 11.1                               | 0.0             | 3.1                | 35.7                      | 14.0                   |
| Access to housing                                                                  | 26.1                                                                       | 12.9                               | 0.0             | 13.5               | 33.3                      | 17.5                   |
| Access to social services                                                          | 47.8                                                                       | 45.2                               | 50.0            | 48.6               | 46.2                      | 46.4                   |
| Access to health care                                                              | 50.0                                                                       | 45.2                               | 33.3            | 41.7               | 53.3                      | 46.4                   |
| <b>Access to education</b>                                                         | 65.2                                                                       | 53.1                               | 100.0           | 54.1               | 60.0                      | 60.3                   |
| Access to legal services                                                           | 42.9                                                                       | 36.7                               | 50.0            | 37.1               | 42.9                      | 39.6                   |
| <b>Opportunities of political participation</b>                                    | 31.6                                                                       | 24.1                               | 33.3            | 28.1               | 35.7                      | 27.5                   |
| <b>Opportunities of social participation</b>                                       | 42.1                                                                       | 23.3                               | 0.0             | 26.5               | 46.2                      | 28.8                   |
| <b>Opportunities of participation in the life of the minority</b>                  | 50.0                                                                       | 36.7                               | 66.7            | 38.2               | 61.5                      | 43.4                   |
| <b>Access of the minority members to the public media</b>                          | 30.0                                                                       | 20.7                               | 50.0            | 17.1               | 50.0                      | 25.5                   |
| <b>Opportunities of the sports enjoyment</b>                                       | 68.4                                                                       | 28.6                               | 0.0             | 36.4               | 75.0                      | 43.8                   |
| <b>Opportunities of cultural enjoyment</b>                                         | 66.7                                                                       | 36.7                               | 66.7            | 44.4               | 76.9                      | 50.0                   |
| Index of perception of social exclusion <sup>3</sup>                               | 43.9                                                                       | 31.1                               | 34.6            | 32.3               | 49.5                      | 36.3                   |
| Index of perception of aspects of social exclusion related to culture <sup>4</sup> | 50.6                                                                       | 31.9                               | 45.2            | 35.0               | 57.9                      | 39.9                   |
| index of perception of other observed aspects of social exclusion <sup>5</sup>     | 36.2                                                                       | 30.2                               | 22.2            | 29.3               | 39.7                      | 32.1                   |

<sup>1</sup> Highlighted – areas related to culture.

<sup>2</sup> Highlighted – areas with most frequent occurrence of answers 1 and 2 on the given scale.

<sup>3</sup> Average from the values of the percentage representation of answers 1 and 2 in all selected options except for the option “other”.

<sup>4</sup> Average from the values of percentage representation of answers 1 and 2 in highlighted options.

<sup>5</sup> Average from the values of the percentage representation of answers 1 and 2 in all selected options except for “other” option and in highlighted options.

## 2.5. Evaluation of the Influence of State Bodies and Non-Profit Organizations on the Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities in Selected Areas

The most significant influence on social inclusion according to the respondents was exercised by the activities of the state bodies and non-profit organizations (compare with Chapter 1.3) concerning the access to the social services, access to education and the opportunities of cultural enjoyment. On the other hand, the lowest influence was recorded in relation to the options of political participation and equalities in the wages. The answer “other” was given by three respondents (once the respondent stated “giving self-confidence”, twice the answers were not further specified).

The activities of the state bodies and non-profit organizations related to the cultural aspects were considered comparably<sup>86</sup> significant as activities concerning other areas (in general as well as in individual subgroups). Depending on the organization type and the evaluated ethnic minority, the perception of influence on the implemented activities differed only to the smallest extent.<sup>87</sup>

**T a b l e 1 6: Evaluation of Influence of the State Bodies and Non-Profit Organizations in Selected Areas**

| Evaluated Area                                             | Rate of Influence (in % of valid cases) |      |      |      |                | Invalid answers (% of the whole set) |                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------|------|------|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                                                            | 1<br>(principal)                        | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5 (negligible) | Unable<br>to judge                   | No<br>answer,<br>invalid<br>answer |
| Access to employment                                       | 14.5                                    | 30.9 | 29.1 | 16.4 | 9.1            | 1.7                                  | 5.1                                |
| Equality in wages                                          | 6.3                                     | 12.5 | 43.8 | 20.8 | 16.7           | 15.3                                 | 3.4                                |
| Access to housing                                          | 8.9                                     | 26.8 | 33.9 | 17.9 | 12.5           | 1.7                                  | 3.4                                |
| Access to social services                                  | 51.9                                    | 25.9 | 14.8 | 5.6  | 1.9            | 5.1                                  | 3.4                                |
| Access to health care                                      | 20.4                                    | 35.2 | 33.3 | 7.4  | 3.7            | 3.4                                  | 5.1                                |
| Access to education                                        | 36.4                                    | 40.0 | 16.4 | 3.6  | 3.6            | 1.7                                  | 5.1                                |
| Access to legal services                                   | 22.6                                    | 43.4 | 28.3 | 3.8  | 1.9            | 6.8                                  | 3.4                                |
| Opportunities of political participation                   | 9.8                                     | 7.8  | 35.3 | 31.4 | 15.7           | 8.5                                  | 5.1                                |
| Opportunities of social participation                      | 7.5                                     | 32.1 | 45.3 | 11.3 | 3.8            | 5.1                                  | 5.1                                |
| Opportunities of participation in the life of the minority | 19.2                                    | 36.5 | 36.5 | 3.8  | 3.8            | 5.1                                  | 6.8                                |
| Access of the minority members to the public media         | 8.2                                     | 18.4 | 30.6 | 28.6 | 14.3           | 8.5                                  | 8.5                                |
| Opportunities of the sports enjoyment                      | 22.0                                    | 38.0 | 28.0 | 6.0  | 6.0            | 10.2                                 | 5.1                                |
| Opportunities of the cultural enjoyment                    | 25.9                                    | 48.1 | 18.5 | 3.7  | 3.7            | 5.1                                  | 3.4                                |
| Other                                                      | 0.0                                     | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 0.0            | 1.7                                  | 93.2                               |

<sup>86</sup> Indicative comparison of the weight of aspects of social exclusion related to the culture with other areas, in which social exclusion may occur, was based on the average calculated from the percentage representation of answers 4 and 5 and with options falling within each of these groups (see the identification in the table).

<sup>87</sup> Differences in the perception of social exclusion based on the type of organization and the observed minority were evaluated using the same procedure as upon the above-described comparison, the indication index was calculated now from the average for all observed groups.

**T a b l e 1 7: Evaluation of Influence of the State Bodies and Non-Profit Organizations based on the Organization Type and Evaluated Minority (percentage of respondents giving answers 1 or 2 on the given scale – see previous table)**

| Evaluated Area <sup>1</sup>                                                        | Organization Type                                                          |                                     |                 | Evaluated Minority |                        | Total set <sup>2</sup> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|                                                                                    | Departments or offices of the state administration and self-administration | Non-state, non-profit organizations | Academic Office | Roma Minority      | General all minorities |                        |
| Access to employment                                                               | 31.8                                                                       | 60.0                                | 0.0             | 55.6               | 30.8                   | 45.5                   |
| Equality in wages                                                                  | 16.7                                                                       | 22.2                                | 0.0             | 21.9               | 16.7                   | 18.8                   |
| Access to housing                                                                  | 18.2                                                                       | 48.4                                | 33.3            | 40.5               | 30.8                   | 35.7                   |
| Access to social services                                                          | 63.6                                                                       | 89.7                                | 66.7            | 75.7               | 83.3                   | 77.8                   |
| Access to health care                                                              | 59.1                                                                       | 51.7                                | 66.7            | 55.6               | 61.5                   | 55.6                   |
| <b>Access to education</b>                                                         | 72.7                                                                       | 80.0                                | 66.7            | 78.4               | 75.0                   | 76.4                   |
| Access to legal services                                                           | 63.2                                                                       | 71.0                                | 33.3            | 74.3               | 53.8                   | 66.0                   |
| <b>Opportunities of political participation</b>                                    | 11.1                                                                       | 20.0                                | 33.3            | 15.6               | 23.1                   | 17.6                   |
| <b>Opportunities of social participation</b>                                       | 26.3                                                                       | 45.2                                | 66.7            | 44.1               | 30.8                   | 39.6                   |
| <b>Opportunities of participation in the life of the minority</b>                  | 47.4                                                                       | 60.0                                | 66.7            | 60.6               | 38.5                   | 55.8                   |
| <b>Access of the minority members to the public media</b>                          | 26.3                                                                       | 28.6                                | 0.0             | 28.1               | 23.1                   | 26.5                   |
| <b>Opportunities of the sports enjoyment</b>                                       | 55.6                                                                       | 60.0                                | 100.0           | 60.0               | 54.5                   | 60.0                   |
| <b>Opportunities of cultural enjoyment</b>                                         | 60.0                                                                       | 80.6                                | 100.0           | 77.8               | 66.7                   | 74.1                   |
| Index of perception of social exclusion <sup>3</sup>                               | 42.5                                                                       | 55.2                                | 48.7            | 52.9               | 45.3                   | 49.9                   |
| Index of perception of aspects of social exclusion related to culture <sup>4</sup> | 42.8                                                                       | 53.5                                | 61.9            | 52.1               | 44.5                   | 50.0                   |
| index of perception of other observed aspects of social exclusion <sup>5</sup>     | 42.1                                                                       | 57.2                                | 33.3            | 53.9               | 46.2                   | 49.9                   |

<sup>1</sup> Highlighted – areas related to culture.

<sup>2</sup> Highlighted – areas with most frequent occurrence of answers 1 and 2 on the given scale.

<sup>3</sup> Average from the values of the percentage representation of answers 1 and 2 in all selected options except for the option “other”.

<sup>4</sup> Average from the values of percentage representation of answers 1 and 2 in highlighted options.

<sup>5</sup> Average from the values of the percentage representation of answers 1 and 2 in all selected options except for “other” option and in highlighted options.

## 2.6. Evaluation of the Amount of Financial Funds from the State Budget devoted for Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities in Selected Areas

The funds devoted to social inclusion of ethnic minorities were most favorably perceived in the evaluation of access to the health services, opportunities of cultural enjoyment, access to education and access to social services. On the other hand, the least favorable evaluation was given to the situation from the point of view grant programs at the access to employment, opportunities of social participation, equality in wages and access to housing. The “other” answer was stated by three respondents (once the social programs were stated, in two cases, the answer was not further specified).

The amounts of the financial funds provided for the areas in which the social exclusion may occur and which are related to the culture, were evaluated less favorably<sup>88</sup> than the funds

<sup>88</sup> Indicative comparison of the weight of aspects of social exclusion related to the culture with other areas, in which social exclusion may occur, was based on the average calculated from the percentage representation of answers 4 and 5 and with options falling within each of these groups (see the identification in the table).

provided for other areas (they were evaluated as higher ones by the employees of the state administration and the self-administration and by respondents, who expressed their standpoints generally to all minorities). The clearly more favorable<sup>89</sup> overall evaluation of the financial funds was stated by the respondents, who evaluated the situation of ethnic minorities generally, slightly less favorable evaluation was recorded also among the employees of the state administration and the self-administration.

**T a b l e 18 : Evaluation of the Amount of Financial Funds in Selected Areas**

| Evaluated area                                             | Evaluation of the amount of financial funds<br>(in % of valid cases) |      |      |      |                                | Invalid answers (%<br>of the total set) |                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                                                            | 1<br>(completely<br>sufficient)                                      | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5 (absolutely<br>insufficient) | Unable<br>to judge                      | No<br>answer,<br>invalid<br>answer |
| Access to employment                                       | 6.5                                                                  | 6.5  | 39.1 | 21.7 | 26.1                           | 22.0                                    | 0.0                                |
| Equality in wages                                          | 5.0                                                                  | 15.0 | 42.5 | 22.5 | 15.0                           | 32.2                                    | 0.0                                |
| Access to housing                                          | 6.4                                                                  | 14.9 | 17.0 | 19.1 | 42.6                           | 20.3                                    | 0.0                                |
| Access to social services                                  | 8.0                                                                  | 38.0 | 32.0 | 18.0 | 4.0                            | 15.3                                    | 0.0                                |
| Access to health care                                      | 19.6                                                                 | 32.6 | 26.1 | 15.2 | 6.5                            | 22.0                                    | 0.0                                |
| Access to education                                        | 17.0                                                                 | 30.2 | 24.5 | 17.0 | 11.3                           | 10.2                                    | 0.0                                |
| Access to legal services                                   | 8.5                                                                  | 23.4 | 34.0 | 21.3 | 12.8                           | 18.6                                    | 1.7                                |
| Opportunities of political participation                   | 12.8                                                                 | 12.8 | 30.8 | 12.8 | 30.8                           | 33.9                                    | 0.0                                |
| Opportunities of social participation                      | 10.9                                                                 | 8.7  | 47.8 | 19.6 | 13.0                           | 22.0                                    | 0.0                                |
| Opportunities of participation in the life of the minority | 13.3                                                                 | 26.7 | 40.0 | 13.3 | 6.7                            | 23.7                                    | 0.0                                |
| Access of the minority members to the public media         | 10.3                                                                 | 15.4 | 38.5 | 20.5 | 15.4                           | 30.5                                    | 3.4                                |
| Opportunities of the sports enjoyment                      | 8.7                                                                  | 32.6 | 43.5 | 4.3  | 10.9                           | 20.3                                    | 1.7                                |
| Opportunities of the cultural enjoyment                    | 8.5                                                                  | 40.4 | 38.3 | 8.5  | 4.3                            | 16.9                                    | 3.4                                |
| Other                                                      | 0.0                                                                  | 0.0  | 33.3 | 66.7 | 0.0                            | 0.0                                     | 94.9                               |

<sup>89</sup> Differences in the perception of social exclusion based on the type of organization and the observed minority were evaluated using the same procedure as upon the above-described comparison, the indication index was calculated now from the average for all observed groups.

**T a b l e 19 : Evaluation of the Amount of Financial Funds based on the Organization Type and the Evaluated Minority (percentage of respondents giving answer 1 or 2 on the given scale – see previous table)**

| Evaluated Area <sup>1</sup>                                                        | Organization Type                                                         |                                    |                  | Evaluated Minority |                  | Total set <sup>2</sup> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|
|                                                                                    | Departments or offices of the state administration or self-administration | Non-state, non-profit organization | Academic Offices | Roma Minority      | General minority |                        |
| Access to employment                                                               | 10.5                                                                      | 15.4                               | 0.0              | 12.5               | 20.0             | 13.0                   |
| Equality in wages                                                                  | 25.0                                                                      | 17.4                               | 0.0              | 13.8               | 44.4             | 20.0                   |
| Access to housing                                                                  | 31.6                                                                      | 14.8                               | 0.0              | 18.2               | 40.0             | 21.3                   |
| Access to social services                                                          | 40.0                                                                      | 48.3                               | 100.0            | 45.7               | 45.5             | 46.0                   |
| Access to health care                                                              | 45.0                                                                      | 56.0                               | 100.0            | 51.5               | 50.0             | 52.2                   |
| <b>Access to education</b>                                                         | 56.5                                                                      | 37.9                               | 100.0            | 38.9               | 66.7             | 47.2                   |
| Access to legal services                                                           | 30.0                                                                      | 30.8                               | 100.0            | 27.3               | 44.4             | 31.9                   |
| <b>Opportunities of political participation</b>                                    | 28.6                                                                      | 20.8                               | 100.0            | 24.1               | 50.0             | 25.6                   |
| <b>Opportunities of social participation</b>                                       | 16.7                                                                      | 22.2                               | 0.0              | 18.2               | 25.0             | 19.6                   |
| <b>Opportunities of participation in the life of the minority</b>                  | 44.4                                                                      | 38.5                               | 0.0              | 34.4               | 75.0             | 40.0                   |
| <b>Access of the minority members to the public media</b>                          | 29.4                                                                      | 22.7                               | 0.0              | 18.5               | 55.6             | 25.6                   |
| <b>Opportunities of the sports enjoyment</b>                                       | 57.9                                                                      | 26.9                               | 100.0            | 27.3               | 90.0             | 41.3                   |
| <b>Opportunities of cultural enjoyment</b>                                         | 55.0                                                                      | 42.3                               | 100.0            | 37.5               | 81.8             | 48.9                   |
| Index of perception of social exclusion <sup>3</sup>                               | 36.2                                                                      | 30.3                               | 53.8             | 28.3               | 53.0             | 33.3                   |
| Index of perception of aspects of social exclusion related to culture <sup>4</sup> | 41.2                                                                      | 30.2                               | 57.1             | 28.4               | 63.4             | 35.5                   |
| index of perception of other observed aspects of social exclusion <sup>5</sup>     | 30.4                                                                      | 30.4                               | 50.0             | 28.2               | 40.7             | 30.7                   |

<sup>1</sup> Highlighted – areas related to culture.

<sup>2</sup> Highlighted – areas with most frequent occurrence of answers 1 and 2 on the given scale.

<sup>3</sup> Average from the values of the percentage representation of answers 1 and 2 in all selected options except for the option “other”.

<sup>4</sup> Average from the values of percentage representation of answers 1 and 2 in highlighted options.

<sup>5</sup> Average from the values of the percentage representation of answers 1 and 2 in all selected options except for “other” option and in highlighted options.

## 2.7. Evaluation of Effectiveness of the Programs supporting the Social Inclusion of Ethnic Minorities in Selected Areas

The effectiveness of programs supporting the social inclusion of ethnic minorities was perceived highest in social services, opportunities of cultural enjoyment and opportunities of the sports enjoyment. On the other hand, the lowest effectiveness was recorded with the political participation and equality in wages. The “other” answer was given by three respondents (once the creation of legal standards was answered, twice the answers were not further specified).

The programs related to the cultural aspects were considered comparably<sup>90</sup> effective as activities concerning other areas (they were evaluated more effective by employees of the state

<sup>90</sup> Indicative comparison of the weight of aspects of social exclusion related to the culture with other areas, in which social exclusion may occur, was based on the average calculated from the percentage representation of answers 4 and 5 and with options falling within each of these groups (see the identification in the table).

administration and self-administration and the respondents, who express standpoints in general to all minorities). The overall evaluation of effectiveness of was recorded as favorable slightly less frequently<sup>91</sup> among the employees of the state administration and self-administration.

**T a b l e 20 : Evaluation of Effectiveness of the Programs in Selected Areas**

| Evaluated Area                                             | Effectiveness of Programs (in % of valid cases) |      |      |      |                                  | Invalid answers (% of the whole set) |                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                                                            | 1<br>1<br>(very<br>effective)                   | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5<br>(absolutely<br>ineffective) | Unable<br>to judge                   | No<br>answer,<br>invalid<br>answer |
| Access to employment                                       | 5.6                                             | 20.4 | 31.5 | 37.0 | 5.6                              | 8.5                                  | 0.0                                |
| Equality in wages                                          | 0.0                                             | 9.8  | 41.5 | 36.6 | 12.2                             | 30.5                                 | 0.0                                |
| Access to housing                                          | 5.7                                             | 11.3 | 34.0 | 35.8 | 13.2                             | 10.2                                 | 0.0                                |
| Access to social services                                  | 22.6                                            | 39.6 | 26.4 | 7.5  | 3.8                              | 10.2                                 | 0.0                                |
| Access to health care                                      | 12.0                                            | 34.0 | 38.0 | 14.0 | 2.0                              | 15.3                                 | 0.0                                |
| Access to education                                        | 10.9                                            | 40.0 | 30.9 | 12.7 | 5.5                              | 6.8                                  | 0.0                                |
| Access to legal services                                   | 8.5                                             | 36.2 | 42.6 | 10.6 | 2.1                              | 20.3                                 | 0.0                                |
| Opportunities of political participation                   | 0.0                                             | 9.8  | 46.3 | 17.1 | 26.8                             | 30.5                                 | 0.0                                |
| Opportunities of social participation                      | 0.0                                             | 22.0 | 48.0 | 22.0 | 8.0                              | 15.3                                 | 0.0                                |
| Opportunities of participation in the life of the minority | 8.0                                             | 32.0 | 44.0 | 12.0 | 4.0                              | 15.3                                 | 0.0                                |
| Access of the minority members to the public media         | 2.2                                             | 15.6 | 51.1 | 20.0 | 11.1                             | 20.3                                 | 3.4                                |
| Opportunities of the sports enjoyment                      | 14.6                                            | 39.6 | 37.5 | 4.2  | 4.2                              | 16.9                                 | 1.7                                |
| Opportunities of the cultural enjoyment                    | 19.6                                            | 39.2 | 33.3 | 5.9  | 2.0                              | 10.2                                 | 3.4                                |
| Other                                                      | 0.0                                             | 0.0  | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3                             | 0.0                                  | 94.9                               |

<sup>91</sup> Differences in the perception of social exclusion based on the type of organization and the observed minority were evaluated using the same procedure as upon the above-described comparison, the indication index was calculated now from the average for all observed groups.

**T a b l e 21: Evaluation of Effectiveness of the Programs based on the Organization Type and Evaluated Minority (Percentage of Respondents stating answers 1 or 2 on the given scale – see previous table)**

| Evaluated Area <sup>1</sup>                                                        | Organization Type                                                          |                                   |                 | Evaluated Minority |                           | Total Set <sup>2</sup> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
|                                                                                    | Departments or offices of the state administration and self-administration | Non-state non-profit organization | Academic Office | Roma Minority      | All minorities in general |                        |
| Access to employment                                                               | 19.0                                                                       | 30.0                              | 33.3            | 36.1               | 0.0                       | 25.9                   |
| Equality in wages                                                                  | 20.0                                                                       | 0.0                               | 33.3            | 7.7                | 18.2                      | 9.8                    |
| Access to housing                                                                  | 9.5                                                                        | 20.7                              | 33.3            | 22.9               | 8.3                       | 17.0                   |
| Access to social services                                                          | 47.6                                                                       | 72.4                              | 66.7            | 70.3               | 60.0                      | 62.3                   |
| Access to health care                                                              | 47.8                                                                       | 41.7                              | 66.7            | 48.5               | 46.2                      | 46.0                   |
| <b>Access to education</b>                                                         | 52.2                                                                       | 44.8                              | 100.0           | 51.4               | 46.2                      | 50.9                   |
| Access to legal services                                                           | 50.0                                                                       | 40.0                              | 50.0            | 45.5               | 45.5                      | 44.7                   |
| <b>Opportunities of political participation</b>                                    | 28.6                                                                       | 0.0                               | 0.0             | 7.1                | 25.0                      | 9.8                    |
| <b>Opportunities of social participation</b>                                       | 31.6                                                                       | 17.9                              | 0.0             | 24.2               | 27.3                      | 22.0                   |
| <b>Opportunities of participation in the life of the minority</b>                  | 52.6                                                                       | 32.1                              | 33.3            | 39.4               | 54.5                      | 40.0                   |
| <b>Access of the minority members to the public media</b>                          | 27.8                                                                       | 8.3                               | 33.3            | 13.3               | 36.4                      | 17.8                   |
| <b>Opportunities of the sports enjoyment</b>                                       | 63.2                                                                       | 46.4                              | 100.0           | 51.4               | 70.0                      | 54.2                   |
| <b>Opportunities of cultural enjoyment</b>                                         | 66.7                                                                       | 55.6                              | 33.3            | 58.8               | 66.7                      | 58.8                   |
| Index of perception of social exclusion <sup>3</sup>                               | 39.7                                                                       | 31.5                              | 44.9            | 36.7               | 38.8                      | 35.3                   |
| Index of perception of aspects of social exclusion related to culture <sup>4</sup> | 46.1                                                                       | 29.3                              | 42.9            | 35.1               | 46.6                      | 36.2                   |
| index of perception of other observed aspects of social exclusion <sup>5</sup>     | 32.3                                                                       | 34.1                              | 47.2            | 38.5               | 29.7                      | 34.3                   |

<sup>1</sup> Highlighted – areas related to culture.

<sup>2</sup> Highlighted – areas with most frequent occurrence of answers 1 and 2 on the given scale.

<sup>3</sup> Average from the values of the percentage representation of answers 1 and 2 in all selected options except for the option “other”.

<sup>4</sup> Average from the values of percentage representation of answers 1 and 2 in highlighted options.

<sup>5</sup> Average from the values of the percentage representation of answers 1 and 2 in all selected options except for “other” option and in highlighted options.

## 2.8. Most Significant Aspects in Culture operating in Prevention of Social Exclusion

Of all respondents, 77.6% stated at least one aspect significant from the point of view of prevention of social exclusion, 34.5% respondents emphasized two and 13.8% three such areas. In 6.8% cases, the respondents stated areas, which did not relate directly to the culture, other 6.8% respondents said that the aspect of culture is secondary, or as applicable that the multicultural programs cannot solve the issues of social exclusion. In 5.1% cases, the respondents answered unclearly or “I don’t know”.

The most frequently mentioned aspect in the area of culture was the positive example from the minority (27.1% respondents). Then followed the presentation of minorities in the media (with the occurrence between 10 to 15%), the category included also the attention paid by the media to the issues of integration and multicultural education), area of educational activities and an effort to include the members of minorities in the regular schools, support of cultural traditions and the

opportunity of participation in the social life (including the options of utilization of leisure and organization of leisure activities; the category applied both to programs for children and youth and to the opportunity of participation of the adult members of the minorities).

**T a b 1 e 2 2: Stated Aspects in the Area of Culture operating in Prevention of Social Exclusion**

| Classification of the answer                                                                                        | Occurrence in % |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Positive examples from the minority                                                                                 | 27.1            |
| Presentation of minorities in the media, issues of integration, multicultural education                             | 13.6            |
| Educational activities, inclusion in regular schools (not the special ones)                                         | 11.9            |
| Support of cultural traditions                                                                                      | 11.9            |
| Opportunities of participation in the social life, leisure                                                          | 10.2            |
| Mutual meeting and intermingling of cultures, events with the participation of the majority as well as the minority | 8.5             |
| Events and festivals presenting the traditions and culture                                                          | 8.5             |
| Learning the language of the majority, communication in the official language                                       | 6.8             |
| Respect from the majority, reflection of the minority situation by the majority                                     | 5.1             |
| Support of mother tongue                                                                                            | 1.7             |
| Support of members of minorities in general                                                                         | 1.7             |

**T a b 1 e 2 3: Another answer, other stated aspects operating upon prevention of social exclusion**

| Classification of the answer                                            | Occurrence in % |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| The culture aspect is secondary, the multicultural programs do not work | 6.8             |
| Unclear answer or "I do not know" answer                                | 5.1             |
| Legislation, removal of barriers                                        | 3.4             |
| Access to employment and housing                                        | 3.4             |

### 3. Conclusions

#### 3.1. The reliability and validity of pilot indicators, possible scope and limits of their application

Almost all respondents agreed that the three selected instruments for integrating ethnic minorities were useful. That fact indicates that the question posed in the given form to **respondents specialised in the field** was sufficiently comprehensible and that specialists probably have access to the sufficient information and experience needed to answer. However, the manner in which the question was put does not allow differentiation in terms of how much the answers were based on the subjective view of the respondent and how much on relevant experience and information.

From the study carried out it is clear that the answers of respondents – despite agreement in terms of overall character of approach<sup>92</sup> – differed greatly in various subgroups (according to

---

<sup>92</sup> Absolute (over 90% of valid cases) predominance of positive evaluation in all three monitored instruments of integration of ethnic minorities

type of organisation and minority evaluated) in terms of degree<sup>93</sup>. Therefore specialists do not represent a homogenous whole in this case and in the monitored sample there is clear interference of concrete professional alignment (in particular arising from the information and experience of the respondent).

In the case of the inclusion of questions of this type among indicators corresponding to aspects of culture during social integration of minorities it can be expected that subjective appraisal will distort the situation to a large degree. As well as the necessity to reflect these distorting influences it would at the same time be necessary also to reflect other methodological problems (discussed in chapter 1.3; this is also an example of the dilemma of whether and in what way to further operationalise “helpfulness”, respectively “usefulness”, respectively the question of accompanying questions put with definitions explaining the chosen understanding of given terms).

The relevance of such indicators also reduces the risk of high variability across different subgroups of respondents (this can be expected not only among lay people but also – as shown in the pilot study – among experts). It is clear that the averaged values for all monitored groups could be much distorted. A certain improvement could be brought about by a differentiation in use of scale – the employed scale of respondents satisfied with the usefulness of the evaluated instruments for integrating ethnic minorities (those in the pilot study between specialists represented more than 90% of respondents) offered de facto only two possible answers (“rather helpful” or “very helpful”) and therefore created a somewhat artificial new dichotomy. However this approach need not be the most worthwhile – despite the ascertaining of significant differences and existences differentiating the subgroups, respondents who are experts in the field are a relatively specific group and a change in the circle of persons interviewed could be expected to result in even greater variability in the answers received. For that reason it would be desirable to first test whether diametrically differentiated subgroups (and with it the risk of distortion in the results of averaging incomparable values) will be formed even during the carrying out of the study of a less specific population, or whether answers approach normal fragmentation.

While indicators of this type would not be monitored among experts but within the context of a whole-population selective study (such as EU-SILC for instance) it is clear that the answers received would not apply to realised measures themselves but would correspond to the public stance towards them. Despite this significant shift the data acquired can be important from the perspective of reflection of the cultural aspects of social integration of ethnic minorities; however instead of the helpfulness, usefulness and possible impact of the measures, they would correspond to the degree of tolerance in society, respectively awareness of their usefulness (or absence) among the general public. It is apparent that in such a case the climate in society at large would be characterised more than the actual question of social integration; on the other hand, the significance of this social climate cannot be marginalised by any means, because it is used as the basis for the formulation of all policy, not excluding policy in the field of social integration.

In the case of complementary indicators (level of financial means available for the realisation of selected instruments of integration of ethnic minorities) even respondents from the ranks of professionals in the field do not have at their disposal sufficient information to evaluate questions posed. Only around two thirds of respondents provided an evaluation in all three fields monitored. This fact not only reduces the corresponding value of the ascertained results themselves but represents, together with the subjective character of the answer and other problems, a fundamental obstacle to practical usage of questions of this type as a relevant indicator. On the basis of complementary indicators piloted in this study therefore it is not

---

<sup>93</sup> i.e. in groups there was great differentiation in representation of respondents regarding relevant instruments of integration of ethnic minorities as “rather useful” and respondents who regarded them as “very useful”.

possible to create functional indicators which apply to the cultural aspects of social integration of ethnic minorities.

### **3.2. A summary of the main findings of the pilot study**

All the selected instruments of integrating ethnic minorities (preschool education, clubs and associations organised by foreigners and members of ethnic minorities and periodicals and programmes) were viewed as helpful by the overwhelming majority of respondents (over 90% of valid cases). Of the monitored instruments of integration of ethnic minorities preschool education was seen as the most helpful (96% respondents said it was “rather useful” or “very useful”). That was followed some way behind by periodicals and programmes for ethnic minorities (93%, though most respondents “only” said it was “rather useful”). The usefulness of this instrument of integration of ethnic minorities was comparable in essence with the view of the usefulness of clubs and associations (90.7%). Only around two thirds of those addressed responded to questions regarding the financial means accessible for the realisation of the monitored instruments of integration of ethnic minorities. The number of respondents with a positive attitude to the level of funding was in all three monitored instruments of integration of ethnic minorities comparable to the number of respondents who gave a critical response; nevertheless between respondents with a critical viewpoint borderline evaluations of the situation were more common than in the second group.

Overall therefore answers were negative in the case of preschool education, rather negative in the case of clubs and associations in which the organisers are foreigners or members of ethnic minorities and neutral in the case of periodicals and programmes for ethnic minorities.

In evaluations of the usefulness of instruments of integration of ethnic minorities there were, despite agreement in terms of overall character of attitude<sup>94</sup>, great differentiation in the opinions of various subgroups (according to type of organisation and minority evaluated) in terms of degree<sup>95</sup>.

In the case of evaluation of level of funding even more variable answers were recorded. Experts therefore do not form a homogenous whole in relation to the monitored questions and in the monitored model there was clearly marked interference of concrete professional alignment (in particular arising from the information and experience of the respondent).

The existence of social exclusion was ascertained most often in the areas of life of the individual which did not apply to cultural aspects directly (access to employment, access to housing, equality in salary appraisal). Among areas where connection with culture was most apparent, the existence of social exclusion was most often ascertained in the possibility of political participation, access to education and the possibility of social participation.

Legislation and strategic documents, like the activities of state bodies and non-profit organisations, contributed – according to the majority of respondents – to social integration in the areas of access to education, possibility of cultural self-realisation and access to social services; in comparison with other fields, access to health care was rated noticeably higher in terms of appraisal of the influence of legislation and strategic documents. In all four areas at the same time the highest number of respondents positively appraised the level of funding devoted from the state budget for the field of social integration of minorities. The effectiveness of programmes supporting social integration of members of ethnic minorities was most highly evaluated in the case of access to social services, possibility of cultural self-realisation and possibility of sporting self-realisation. In the case of all four parameters (legislative and strategic

---

<sup>3</sup>Absolute (over 90% of valid cases) predominance of positive evaluation in all three monitored instruments of integration of ethnic minorities

<sup>95</sup>i.e. in groups there was great differentiation in representation of respondents regarding relevant instruments of integration of ethnic minorities as “rather useful” and respondents who regarded them as “very useful”.

documents, activities of state bodies and non-profit organisations, level of funding, effectiveness of programmes) the area concerning culture was comparable with evaluations in the other areas monitored. The most common aspect mentioned in the field of culture contributing to overcoming social exclusion were positive models from the minorities (27.1% of respondents). That was followed (with an occurrence between 10 and 15%) by presentation of minorities in the media (this category included attention paid by dedicated media to questions of integration and multicultural education), the field of educational activities and efforts to integrate minority members into regular schools, support of cultural traditions and the opportunity to participate in social life (including the possibility of using free time and organising free-time activities; categories concerned both programmes for children and young people and possibilities for older members of minorities to participate).

## **X. COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF GOVERNMENT EDUCATION POLICIES FOR THE ROMA COMMUNITY**

### **1. General Design of Education Policies for the Roma Community**

#### **1.1 General Objectives and Key Policies**

In terms of educating the Roma, the aim of so-called equalizing action is to bring about a significant change in the present situation in which a high number of Roma children attain only the lowest possible level of education. A comprehensive approach to Roma children before they attend school should be guaranteed by the implementation of the **Policy of Early Care for Children from Socio-culturally Disadvantaged Environments**. If they are to overcome their socio-cultural handicap, such children require a **preparatory programme** and targeted assistance the most effective form of which is to prepare them for school enrolment in nursery schools as part of a group of children made up of those from mainstream society as well as from the minority.<sup>96</sup>

In order to overcome their socio-cultural handicap, such children need to attend nursery school for the whole three year period, i.e. from the age of three. Attendance must not be hindered by the social situation of the family. Moreover, the parents might be persuaded of the benefits of such action by social field workers, **Roma advisors or education assistants**. In the case of failure to enrol a Roma child at nursery school for the whole three years, it would be necessary to include the child in a so-called **preparatory programme - preparatory classes for children from socio-culturally disadvantaged environments** (hereinafter referred to as “preparatory classes”). **Support for Roma students in secondary schools** should also be given high priority.<sup>97</sup>

If the general aim (promoting higher education levels for the Roma community) is to be achieved, the provision of these key educational policies must be accompanied by **subsidiary education policies** (see Annex VI). Relevant projects should be supported from the **Support for Projects for the Integration of the Roma Community grant scheme**.

**Nursery and elementary schools are established and financed by municipal authorities. Certain activities should be supported by regional government, European structural funds or various foundations active in this field. The aim of the aforementioned government schemes is to provide additional support for suitable projects and increase their current capacity. Thus financial resources allocated in Ministry of Education and Sport grant schemes are merely complementary to those provided by municipal and regional authorities. The following analysis will concern the government level only since detailed information on regional spending is not available. Consequently, the cost-effectiveness ratio cannot be calculated since only “additional” spending will be investigated. However, the data below will provide an outline of the priorities of government supplementary policy.**

The figure in Annex VII provides a summary of government education policies regarding the Roma community.

The grant scheme designed to support projects for the integration of the Roma community is open to a wide range of projects (i.e. it is not designed exclusively for specific projects such as the three core measures). Therefore those responsible for project evaluation assess each project within the scheme according to various criteria. Such criteria, however, are not available to the

---

<sup>96</sup> The Roma Integration Policy Concept, p. 17-19.

<sup>97</sup> Ibidem.

general public (public information is restricted only to a general description of the criteria; those responsible for evaluation only enjoy access to specified methodical guidelines).

In such circumstances, ex-post evaluation of projects (or assessment of the relevance of the criteria preferred by those responsible for evaluation) is the only method able to provide effective analysis. However, the ex-post evaluation of such projects is restricted by their sheer number (it is possible to evaluate only a selected number of projects and the sample chosen may be non-representative). A further problem is the selection of the criteria to be analyzed in such ex-post analysis (they should reflect the multi-dimensional nature of social inclusion). Such problems, as well as the question of the correspondence between the characteristics identified as ex-post analysis evaluation criteria and the criteria applied in reality, should be considered in any criteria relevance evaluation.

Consequently, this analysis will involve only three government education policies – preparatory classes, education assistants and the support for Roma higher and university education. Attention will be devoted to the issue of school performance.

## 1.2 Data on the Situation of the Roma Community in General

According to expert estimates approximately 70% of the Roma are unemployed and 50% depend on social benefits. Around 60% do not complete elementary education, 29% complete only elementary education and 9.3% complete secondary or upper secondary education.<sup>98</sup>

**T a b l e 1 :Relative indicators of employment by nationality as at 1 March 2001 in per cent**

| Nationality | Proportion of population, (15-64 age group) | Measure of economic activity | Unemployment measure | Proportion of females of the employed | Proportion of females of the unemployed | Proportion of retired of the employed |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Czech       | 89.9                                        | 61.7                         | 9.1                  | 45.5                                  | 48.5                                    | 3.8                                   |
| Moravian    | 3.9                                         | 62.5                         | 8.8                  | 38.8                                  | 42.5                                    | 3.1                                   |
| Silesian    | 0.1                                         | 61.7                         | 10.7                 | 31.1                                  | 34.0                                    | 3.1                                   |
| Slovak      | 2.1                                         | 56.2                         | 14.2                 | 43.8                                  | 44.0                                    | 5.7                                   |
| Polish      | 0.5                                         | 57.2                         | 10.0                 | 52.5                                  | 60.3                                    | 3.1                                   |
| German      | 0.3                                         | 44.1                         | 9.1                  | 34.5                                  | 31.6                                    | 8.1                                   |
| Roma        | 0.1                                         | 65.7                         | 57.3                 | 36.6                                  | 37.8                                    | 3.5                                   |
| Hungarian   | 0.2                                         | 55.8                         | 17.9                 | 38.1                                  | 43.0                                    | 6.9                                   |
| Ukrainian   | 0.2                                         | 74.0                         | 7.5                  | 49.4                                  | 59.7                                    | 1.1                                   |
| Russian     | 0.1                                         | 64.8                         | 10.3                 | 56.3                                  | 70.4                                    | 3.3                                   |
| Vietnamese  | 0.2                                         | 87.5                         | 1.9                  | 32.0                                  | 31.8                                    | 1.8                                   |

Census 2001

Note:

- 1) Measure of economic activity = proportion of economically active of the 15+ population
- 2) Unemployment measure = proportion of unemployed of the number of economically active

---

<sup>98</sup> Data from 2003 research quoted in the Report on the status of Roma communities in the Czech Republic in 2004, p.8-9. [www.vlada.cz](http://www.vlada.cz)

**T a b l e 2 :Roma population unemployment by education (in per cent)**

| Country        | Incomplete elementary/<br>no education | Elementary | Incomplete secondary | Secondary and upper | Total |
|----------------|----------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------|
| Czech Republic | 75.7                                   | 55.6       | 33.8                 | 10.3                | 46.3  |
| Hungary        | 78.7                                   | 57.0       | 41.5                 | 39.1                | 56.5  |
| Romania        | 82.7                                   | 76.6       | 66.9                 | 63.6                | 76.9  |
| Bulgaria       | 89.5                                   | 80.9       | 73.7                 | 53.3                | 80.0  |
| Slovakia       | 94.1                                   | 87.6       | 85.0                 | 56.1                | 84.8  |

Source: UNDP 2000/2001 quoted in the Report on the status of Roma communities in the Czech Republic in 2004, p. 15. [www.vlada.cz](http://www.vlada.cz)

**T a b l e 3 : Roma subjective evaluation of the reasons for difficulties in finding work**

|                                   |       |
|-----------------------------------|-------|
| Ethnicity                         | 80.4% |
| Insufficient qualifications       | 65.9% |
| Economic recession in the country | 53.3% |
| Insufficient luck                 | 39.2% |
| Bad health status                 | 9.1%  |
| Age                               | 19.8% |
| Gender                            | 8.1%  |

Source: UNDP 2000/2001 quoted in the Report on the status of Roma communities in the Czech Republic in 2004, p. 16. [www.vlada.cz](http://www.vlada.cz)

**T a b l e 4 : Social position of the Roma compared with that of their majority neighbours**

| Social and economic position | Roma minority |         |       | Majority neighbours |         |       |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------|-------|---------------------|---------|-------|
|                              | males         | females | total | males               | females | total |
| Employed                     | 44.3          | 19.1    | 32.3  | 63.7                | 50.3    | 56.8  |
| Unemployed                   | 30.0          | 23.2    | 26.6  | 7.4                 | 6.0     | 6.7   |
| Economically non-active      | 2.6           | 36.7    | 19.8  | 8.8                 | 17.9    | 13.6  |
| Retired                      | 11.8          | 14.2    | 13.1  | 19.0                | 24.9    | 21.9  |
| No answer                    | 11.3          | 6.8     | 8.2   | 1.1                 | 1.2     | 1.1   |
| Total                        | 100.0         | 100.0   | 100.0 | 100.0               | 100.0   | 100.0 |

Source: Inter-ethnic relations 2002, FSU Masaryk University Brno completed as part of the Phare project Improvement in Relations between the Roma and Czech Communities CZ 9901.01, [www.fss.muni.cz](http://www.fss.muni.cz) quoted in the Report on the status of Roma communities in the Czech Republic in 2004, [www.vlada.cz](http://www.vlada.cz)

Non-qualified labour unemployment in the Czech Republic stands at about 20% whereas skilled labour unemployment stands at only 8%<sup>99</sup>. Roma unemployment is 5 times higher than that of the majority in respective qualification groups.<sup>100</sup> Roma adults generally have very low levels of education, qualifications and skills and moreover they tend to experience discrimination in the labour market (58% of Roma described discrimination as a very serious problem, 18% described it as a problem)<sup>101</sup>.

<sup>99</sup> Labour force survey, CZSO

<sup>100</sup> Report on the status of Roma communities in the Czech Republic in 2004,p. 15 [www.vlada.cz](http://www.vlada.cz)

<sup>101</sup> Report on the status of Roma communities in the Czech Republic in 2004, p. 15 [www.vlada.cz](http://www.vlada.cz),

**T a b l e 5 : Educational Structure of Selected Nationality Groups in the 15 Years of Age and Older Population (in %)**

| Nationality                  | Proportion of Persons with Education |      |                          |      |                    |      |            |      |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|--------------------------|------|--------------------|------|------------|------|
|                              | Elementary                           |      | Secondary and Vocational |      | Complete Secondary |      | University |      |
|                              | 1991                                 | 2001 | 1991                     | 2001 | 1991               | 2001 | 1991       | 2001 |
| Population in total of which | 33.1                                 | 23.0 | 35.4                     | 38.0 | 22.9               | 28.4 | 7.2        | 8.9  |
| Czech                        | 32.0                                 | 22.7 | 35.9                     | 38.5 | 23.5               | 28.8 | 7.3        | 8.8  |
| Moravian                     | 32.4                                 | 21.6 | 36.3                     | 39.8 | 23.4               | 29.0 | 7.2        | 9.2  |
| Silesian                     | 33.5                                 | 19.4 | 36.0                     | 37.3 | 23.1               | 30.7 | 6.6        | 11.8 |
| Slovak                       | 51.0                                 | 35.9 | 26.9                     | 31.4 | 13.6               | 20.5 | 5.8        | 9.4  |
| Polish                       | 41.8                                 | 29.0 | 29.5                     | 34.7 | 20.6               | 25.7 | 6.3        | 9.3  |
| German                       | 54.6                                 | 37.6 | 29.5                     | 38.2 | 11.5               | 16.7 | 2.5        | 5.7  |
| Roma                         | 78.4                                 | 65.4 | 10.0                     | 17.3 | 0.9                | 5.0  | 0.3        | 1.6  |
| Hungarian                    | 58.3                                 | 41.8 | 24.7                     | 31.3 | 10.2               | 16.2 | 4.4        | 7.9  |
| Ukrainian                    | 48.8                                 | 20.0 | 20.3                     | 27.2 | 18.8               | 35.4 | 9.0        | 12.4 |
| Russian                      | 30.5                                 | 13.0 | 15.4                     | 8.8  | 24.4               | 33.7 | 26.9       | 40.8 |
| Vietnamese                   | 29.2                                 | 31.5 | 33.3                     | 21.7 | 22.1               | 32.2 | 7.1        | 6.5  |

Census 2001

**T a b l e 6 : Estimates of dropout rates of Roma in the Czech Republic**

| Year | Estimated drop-out rate | Data source                  |
|------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1997 | 75 – 85%                | estimate                     |
| 2003 | 44%                     | research on selected schools |

Source: Nová škola (1997), Nová škola (2003).

**T a b l e 7 : National composition of the CR**

| National identity   | 2001          |       |                     |      | 1991          |       | INDEX<br>2001/1991<br>in % |  |
|---------------------|---------------|-------|---------------------|------|---------------|-------|----------------------------|--|
|                     | absolute data | in %  | Long-term residence |      | absolute data | in %  |                            |  |
|                     |               |       | absolute data       | in % |               |       |                            |  |
| Population in total | 10 230 060    | 100.0 | 69 654              | 0.7  | 10 302 216    | 100.0 | 99.3                       |  |
| Czech               | 9 249 777     | 90.4  | 1 269               | 0.0  | 8 363 768     | 81.2  | 110.6                      |  |
| Moravian            | 380 474       | 3.7   | 96                  | 0.0  | 1 362 313     | 13.2  | 27.9                       |  |
| Silesian            | 10 878        | 0.1   | 1                   | 0.0  | 44 446        | 0.4   | 24.4                       |  |
| Slovak              | 193 190       | 1.9   | 10 967              | 5.7  | 314 877       | 3.1   | 61.4                       |  |
| Polish              | 51 968        | 0.5   | 3 366               | 6.5  | 59 383        | 0.6   | 80.5                       |  |
| German              | 39 106        | 0.4   | 1 377               | 3.5  | 48 556        | 0.5   | 87.5                       |  |
| Roma                | 11 746        | 0.1   | 59                  | 0.5  | 32 903        | 0.3   | 35.7                       |  |
| Hungarian           | 14 672        | 0.1   | 827                 | 5.6  | 19 932        | 0.2   | 73.6                       |  |
| Ukrainian           | 22 112        | 0.2   | 11 876              | 53.7 | 8 220         | 0.1   | 269                        |  |
| Russian             | 12 369        | 0.1   | 6 322               | 51.1 | 5 062         | 0.0   | 244.3                      |  |
| Ruthenian           | 1 106         | 0.0   | 55                  | 5.0  | 1 926         | 0.0   | 57.4                       |  |
| Bulgarian           | 4 363         | 0.0   | 1 384               | 31.7 | 3 487         | 0.0   | 125.1                      |  |
| Romanian            | 1 238         | 0.0   | 333                 | 26.9 | 1 034         | 0.0   | 119.7                      |  |
| Greek               | 3 219         | 0.0   | 319                 | 9.9  | 3 379         | 0.0   | 95.3                       |  |
| Vietnamese          | 17 462        | 0.2   | 11 876              | 68.0 | 421           | 0.0   | 4 147.7                    |  |
| Albanian            | 690           | 0.0   | 390                 | 56.5 | -             | -     | -                          |  |
| Croatian            | 1 585         | 0.0   | 392                 | 24.7 | -             | -     | -                          |  |
| Serbian             | 1 801         | 0.0   | 712                 | 39.5 | -             | -     | -                          |  |
| other or double     | 39 477        | 0.4   | 13 136              | 51.2 | 9 860         | 0.1   | 400.4                      |  |
| unidentified        | 172 827       | 1.7   | 5 075               | 2.9  | 22 017        | 0.2   | 785                        |  |

Source: [Czech Statistical Office](#), Prague 1991, 2001

Support for national minority grant projects for civic association in 2004: total 356,567 EUR (10,162,149 CZK),

Roma national minority project grants for civic association in 2004: 120,608 EUR (3,437,330 CZK)<sup>102</sup>.

<sup>102</sup> Report on the situation of national minorities in the Czech Republic in 2004

### **1.3 Funds Allocated to Roma Integration Policies in General and to Educational Programmes**

**T a b l e 8 : Roma programmes funded in 2004-2005**

| State budget chapters                                                                                                   | 2004 in thousands of CZK | 2004 in thousands of EUR | 2005 in thousands of CZK | 2005 in thousands of EUR |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs</b>                                                                           |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Programmes supporting Roma integration projects                                                                         | 16 265                   | 570                      | 34 185                   | 1 199                    |
| <b>Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport</b>                                                                           |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Programmes supporting Roma integration projects                                                                         | 14 700                   | 516                      | 14 700                   | 516                      |
| Programmes supporting secondary education of Roma students                                                              | 0                        | 0                        | 10 000                   | 351                      |
| <b>Ministry of Culture</b>                                                                                              |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Programmes supporting Roma community projects                                                                           | 2 000                    | 70                       | 2 000,00                 | 70                       |
| <b>Ministry of the Interior</b>                                                                                         |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Programmes supporting Roma integration projects                                                                         | 5 000                    | 175                      | 5 000                    | 175                      |
| <b>General Treasury Administration (state budget)</b>                                                                   |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Programmes supporting prevention of social exclusion of the Roma and the elimination of the impacts of social exclusion | 30 000                   | 1 053                    | 30 000                   | 1 053                    |
| Programmes supporting Roma community projects                                                                           | 20 000                   | 702                      | 10 000                   | 351                      |
| <b>Total</b>                                                                                                            | <b>92 945</b>            | <b>3 261</b>             | <b>110 885</b>           | <b>3 891</b>             |

Source: Report on the status of Roma communities in the Czech Republic in 2004, [www.vlada.cz](http://www.vlada.cz)

### **GRANT SCHEMES FOR ROMA SOCIO-CULTURAL INTEGRATION:**

#### **1) 8.000,000 CZK/ 280,702 EUR in grants for socio-integration programmes**

- Cultural and educational activities
- Support of education and other facilities
- Support for art initiatives
- Cultural heritage support and Roma minority support
- Publications
- Social guidance

#### **2) 4,000,000 CZK/140,351 EUR for socio-educational programmes targeted at culture and education**

#### **3) 1.500,000 CZK/52,632 EUR for Roma communities and majority coexistence programmes**

#### **4) 2.800,000 CZK/98,246 EUR for street worker support**

#### **5) 2.925,000 CZK/102,632 EUR for Roma students**

#### **6) 499,000 CZK/17,509 EUR for cemeteries for holocaust victims at Lety u Pisku**

#### **7) 250,000 CZK/8,772 EUR for the Khamoro 2000 Roma festival**

Source: Evaluation of programmes for the prevention of Roma social exclusion / Hodnocení programů zaměřených na snížování rizika sociálního vyloučení romské komunity, evaluace programů; Ivana Šimíková, Pavel Navrátil, Jiří Winkler, VÚPSV Praha, výzkumné centrum Brno, 2004.

**T a b l e 9 : Project support for national minority activities in 2005**

| Area            | Specification                                                                                              | Founder                                                   | Grant in CZK | Grant in EUR |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| a)              | Cultural activities for national minorities                                                                | Ministry of Culture (grant programme)                     | 8 035 000    | 281 930      |
|                 | World Roma festival KHAMORO Prague                                                                         | Ministry of Finance (general treasury)                    | 1 600 000    | 56 140       |
|                 | Theatre, music, literature, art, film                                                                      | Ministry of Culture (grant programme)                     | 8 158 000    | 286 246      |
|                 | Library of the 21st century                                                                                | Ministry of Culture (grant programme)                     | 130 000      | 4 561        |
| b)              | Periodic press for national minorities                                                                     | Ministry of Culture (grant programme)                     | 30 000 000   | 1 052 632    |
| c)              | Education in national minority languages and multicultural education                                       | Ministry for Education, Youth and Sport (grant programme) | 14 244 000   | 499 789      |
| d)              | Integration of Roma community members                                                                      | Ministry of Culture (grant programme)                     | 1 580 000    | 55 439       |
|                 | Improvement of education at schools and school facilities and development of support for education systems | Ministry for Education, Youth and Sport (grant programme) | 3 797 536    | 133 247      |
|                 | Integration of Roma community members                                                                      | Ministry for Education, Youth and Sport (grant programme) | 9 993 050    | 350 633      |
|                 | Integration of Roma community members-support for secondary education of Roma students                     | Ministry for Education, Youth and Sport (grant programme) | 1 239 100    | 43 477       |
|                 | Education assistant grant programme                                                                        | Ministry for Education, Youth and Sport                   | 1 877 202    | 65 867       |
|                 | Campaign against racism (tolerance project)                                                                | CR Government Office                                      | 4 000 000    | 140 351      |
|                 | Programme for social exclusion prevention                                                                  | CR Government Office                                      | 30 000 000   | 1 052 632    |
|                 | Roma coordinators at regional level (regional offices)                                                     | CR Government Office                                      | 5 000 000    | 175 439      |
|                 | Integration of Roma community members                                                                      | CR Government Office                                      | 10 000 000   | 350 877      |
| Ad hoc projects | Integration of Roma community members                                                                      | Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs                    | 65 685 800   | 2 304 765    |
|                 | Henryk Sienkiewicz Polish elementary school reconstruction                                                 | Ministry of Finance (general treasury)                    | 65 000 000   | 2 280 702    |
|                 | Greek memorial at Krnov                                                                                    | Ministry of Culture                                       | 260 000      | 9 123        |
|                 | Total                                                                                                      |                                                           | 260 599 688  | 9 143 849    |

Source: Report on the situation of national minorities in the Czech Republic in 2005, Úrad vlády České republiky Sekretariát Rady vlády pro národnostní menšiny, Praha 2006. (Office of the Government of the Czech Republic, Government of the Czech Republic Council for National Minorities). Recalculation into EUR VÚPSV Milada Horakova

The total amount provided for educational programmes for children and students from socio-culturally disadvantaged environments, Roma or disabled children, in 2005 was approximately 2.568,438 EUR (pre-school education, education assistants and elementary schools with all-day programmes).

## **1.4 General Assessment of the Effectiveness of Policies aimed at the Integration of Roma Communities**

The Roma Integration Policy Concept is critical of the overall effectiveness of policies generally (i.e. concerning not only educational policies):

Every year the government provides considerable amounts of money on the integration of Roma communities<sup>103</sup>. However, fieldwork feedback indicates that not all of this money is appropriately targeted and so far no systemic solution for the integration of socially excluded Roma communities has been found. An evaluation of certain programmes indicates that such low effectiveness is caused partly by the fact that the government gives priority to integration efforts based on an ethnic viewpoint rather than socially based inclusive intervention.<sup>104</sup> Substantial resources are spent inappropriately on short-term ad hoc activities. A further problem regarding the distribution of government funds in the form of subsidies for the purpose of improving the social inclusion of Roma communities is the lack of coordination between ministries resulting in a “scattering” of such funds. At the same time, there is de facto no authority that is able to effectively coordinate ministry policies and determine priorities for a comprehensive government subsidy policy for each calendar year in this area. To increase the effectiveness of the implementation of the Roma Integration Policy Concept, it is necessary to re-asses the current financial support system and to propose a framework that will permit the implementation of the long-term measures proposed in the Concept at the local level and in cooperation with all the relevant partners.<sup>105</sup>

## **2. The Policy: Preparatory Classes for Children from Socio-culturally and Language Disadvantaged Environments**

### **2.1 Objective**

To improve the chances of children from socio-culturally disadvantaged environments being integrated into the school curriculum from the first class and to avoid failure at the commencement of their educational careers. This aim shall be achieved by the application of a wide range of educational methods. The basic tenet is the organisation and structuring of children’s leisure time – various games, interviews, walks, musical or creative performances and education analogous to school programmes. The core issue lies in improving language, communication, mathematical and practical skills and in cultivating cognition.

### **2.2 Outcome Observed**

Approximately 39% of Roma children in the 5-6 year age group attend preparatory classes (an estimate based on a hypothetical Roma population of 180 000 – 200 000 determined from 1991 census data).<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> According to information provided by the Ministry of Finance of the Czech Republic, individual ministries spend over CZK 100,000 on subsidy programmes focusing on the integration of Roma communities. However, this figure does not include all the funds provided by the state for the integration of Roma communities, but only those provided as part of the subsidy procedure. For details see *Report on the State of Roma Communities*, Prague, Council of the Government of the Czech Republic for Roma Community Affairs, 2005.

<sup>104</sup> Ivana Šimíková, Pavel Navrátil, Jiří Winkler: *Hodnocení programů zaměřených na snižování rizika sociálního vyloučení romské komunity (Evaluation of Programmes Focusing on the Reduction of the Social Exclusion of the Roma Community)*, Prague, VÚPSV (Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs) – Research Centre Brno, 2003, p. 53.

<sup>105</sup> The Roma Integration Policy Concept, p. 9.

<sup>106</sup> Report on the status of Roma communities in the Czech Republic in 2004, [www.vlada.cz](http://www.vlada.cz),

The following data was collected from a sample of 103 schools with preparatory classes (11 kindergartens, 65 elementary schools and 27 special schools<sup>107</sup>) involved in an evaluation undertaken in 2003 (75% per cent of all such schools in 2003).<sup>108</sup>

A total of 1,993 children attended elementary school preparatory classes of whom 1,779 continued to mainstream elementary schools and 64 were placed in special schools.

A total of 1,315 children attended preparatory classes in special schools of whom 645 continued to mainstream elementary schools and 251 remained at special schools.

A total of 360 children attended preparatory classes in kindergartens of whom 329 continued to mainstream elementary schools and 10 went on to special schools.

**Preparatory classes at mainstream elementary schools were successful in 89% of cases. Preparatory classes at special schools were successful in 49% of cases and kindergarten preparatory classes were successful in 92% of cases.**

The ratio of those children who commenced elementary school to all pupils who successfully completed the preparatory class might be seen as a simple indicator of the effectiveness of preparatory classes.<sup>109</sup> A further important criterion is the number of pupils who commenced neither elementary nor special schools. Any interpretation of these two indicators must reflect the fact that children attending preparatory classes suffer from varying levels of disadvantage thus limiting the extent to which better results are attainable. Nevertheless, preparatory classes scored highly as regards the first indicator and poorly regarding the second, both of which are positive. Preparatory classes were, in this regard, seen to be very stable over the school years observed. The best figures were found with regard to those preparatory classes at nursery schools while the worst were found to be those at special schools.

---

<sup>107</sup> The proportion of Roma and non Roma at so called “special schools” and educational institutes is 1:2 meaning that Roma children are over-represented at “special schools”. The report “Special provision 1999” quotes that Roma children have about a 15 times higher chance of attending “special schools” than the majority population. Source: Romství v systému speciálního školství a institucionální výchovy očima kompetenčních profesionálů: Etnicita jako jeden ze zamlčených parametrů pro výběr do deviantních populací /The Roma issue in the special education system and institutional education in the view of competent Professionals: Ethnicity as one of the non-declared parameters for the selection of deviant populations, Mgr. Karel Červenka IVRIS project <http://ivris.fss.muni.cz/>.

<sup>108</sup> Report on the Project Monitoring the Effectiveness of Roma Preparatory Classes, Faculty of Humanities at the Charles University, 2003, quoted in the Status report of Roma communities in 2004, www.vlada.cz

<sup>109</sup> Hůle, D. (2003), p. 11.

**T a b l e 10 : Absolute figures on children entering and leaving preparatory classes**

|                   |                                                                         | 1999/2000 | 2000/2001 | 2001/2002 | 2002/2003 | Total |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Elementary school | children entering preparatory classes                                   | 489       | 463       | 494       | 547       | 1993  |
|                   | children completing preparatory classes, ordinary                       | 450       | 451       | 463       | 479       | 1843  |
|                   | children attending neither special nor elementary schools               | 39        | 12        | 31        | 68        | 150   |
|                   | children entering elementary school at the beginning of the school year | 427       | 438       | 444       | 470       | 1779  |
|                   | children entering special school at the beginning of the school year    | 23        | 13        | 19        | 9         | 64    |
| Special school    | children entering preparatory classes                                   | 302       | 312       | 337       | 364       | 1315  |
|                   | children completing preparatory classes, ordinary                       | 216       | 214       | 233       | 234       | 897   |
|                   | Children attending neither special nor elementary schools               | 86        | 98        | 104       | 130       | 418   |
|                   | children entering elementary school at the beginning of the school year | 156       | 172       | 166       | 151       | 645   |
|                   | children entering special school at the beginning of the school year    | 60        | 42        | 67        | 83        | 252   |
| Nursery school    | children entering preparatory classes                                   | 82        | 81        | 101       | 96        | 360   |
|                   | children completing preparatory classes, ordinary                       | 81        | 77        | 93        | 88        | 339   |
|                   | children attending neither special nor elementary schools               | 1         | 4         | 8         | 8         | 21    |
|                   | children entering elementary school at the beginning of the school year | 76        | 76        | 90        | 87        | 329   |
|                   | children entering special school at the beginning of the school year    | 5         | 1         | 3         | 1         | 10    |

Source: Hůle, D. (2003), p. 11, summarizing calculations by Pavel Bareš, VÚPSV

**T a b l e 11 : Relative figures on children entering and leaving preparatory classes**

|                                                                  | 1999/2000 | 2000/2001 | 2001/2002 | 2002/2003 | Average % |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>Elementary school</b>                                         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Children entering elementary school (in %)                       | 94.5      | 97        | 96        | 98        | 96        |
| Children attending neither special nor elementary schools (in %) | 8.5       | 2.5       | 6         | 12.5      | 7         |
| <b>Special school</b>                                            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Children entering elementary school (in %)                       | 72.5      | 80.5      | 71        | 64.5      | 72        |
| Children attending neither special nor elementary schools (in %) | 29        | 31.5      | 31        | 36        | 32        |
| <b>Nursery school</b>                                            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Children entering elementary school (in %)                       | 94.5      | 98.5      | 97.5      | 99        | 97        |
| Children attending neither special nor elementary schools (in %) | 1.5       | 5         | 6.5       | 8.5       | 5         |

Source: Hůle, D. (2003), p. 11, summarizing calculations by Pavel Bareš, VÚPSV

**An improvement in the attitude of Roma children to school after completing preparatory classes was proven by qualitative analysis. Moreover, a substantial decrease in absence was observed during the course of a selected semester.**<sup>110</sup>

Roma children who attended preparatory classes felt more comfortable about school and later education was found to be less stressful for them. However, a higher than average absence rate should be expected in future amongst Roma as compared to non-Roma children.<sup>111</sup>

Preparatory classes led to an increase in attendance with only a slight direct influence on academic performance. However, more frequent attendance should indirectly improve academic performance since there is a significant correlation between poor marks and high absenteeism. **Analysis shows that school marks are 1 to 3 grades lower than average when absence amounts to 100 hours. Absence among Roma pupils can reach 80 hours which might be lowered to 40 hours by attending preparatory classes. This would tend to suggest that Roma pupils, on average, attain 2 grades lower than non-Roma pupils, whereas the difference between Roma pupils who have completed preparatory classes and non-Roma pupils should be just a single grade.**<sup>112</sup>

The study pointed out the high success rate of preparatory schools in terms of Roma pupils going on to attend mainstream schools. Although no statistics were available on changes in drop-out rates, the qualitative part of the study proved their effectiveness in terms of a decrease in absenteeism. **This suggests that attending preparatory classes at nursery and elementary schools significantly improves the academic performance of Roma pupils.** The question of whether preparatory classes at special schools have the same effect is open to debate.

An even better impact than that observed in the study may be expected in the period to be assessed in the cost-effectiveness analysis (school years 2004 / 2005 and 2005 / 2006) since, under the new education act which came into force 1 January 2005, the “special schools” category was abolished and such schools were to be considered in the same way as elementary schools, differentiated only by the number of special programmes employed in the curriculum (sceptics might argue that this is merely a formal change and that it will in fact have no real impact). **This suggests that a decrease in absenteeism of approximately 40 hours and an improvement in academic achievement of one grade might be expected from around 39% of Roma pupils.** A lower drop-out rate might also be expected, however the above results are

<sup>110</sup> Ibidem, p. 23

<sup>111</sup> Ibidem, p. 23

<sup>112</sup> Ibidem, p. 24

unable to provide concrete evidence either way since the regular monitoring of ethnicity-related data is forbidden. A further positive influence is that a high percentage of Roma pupils who complete preparatory school go on to attend elementary rather than special schools at which such children would be at a disadvantage due to lower overall educational standards. It is also important to take into account the higher level of self-confidence of Roma pupils brought about by the sense of achievement in attending elementary school and the diminished fear of dropping out of the school system; such a fear is often the main reason for families preferring special schools. All the above would tend to prove the inclusive capacity of this policy although there is no relevant unit of measurement for this effect.

### 2.3 Costs

**T a b l e 12 : Funds allocated to the pre-school education of Roma children in regions of the Czech Republic in 2005**

| Region          | Grant in CZK     | Grant in EUR  |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
| Jihomoravský    | 417 220          | 14 639        |
| Královéhradecký | 110 000          | 3 860         |
| Liberecký       | 350 000          | 12 281        |
| Moravskoslezský | 65 000           | 2 281         |
| Olomoucký       | 70 000           | 2 456         |
| Pardubický      | 150 000          | 5 263         |
| Plzeňský        | 198 500          | 6 965         |
| Vysočina        | 234 900          | 8 242         |
| Ústecký         | 90 000           | 3 158         |
| Zlínský         | 250 000          | 8 772         |
| <b>Total</b>    | <b>1 935 620</b> | <b>67 916</b> |

Source MSMT

It is not possible to provide a numerical unit of measurement which would reflect the impact of this policy on academic performance as a whole and which would be suitable for monitoring purposes. Therefore, the capacity of the programme to involve the target group instead of changes in pupil performance will be the criterion employed in comparing this policy with the following.

Due to a lack of information on the number of preparatory classes supported by this scheme, it was not possible to deliver an accurate figure on government support per class or per pupil. The total number of pupils must therefore be considered for orientation bearing in mind however the risk of substantial bias.

**T a b l e 13 : Number of preparatory classes for children from socio-culturally and language disadvantaged environments (mainly Roma children)**

| School year | Number of classes | Number of pupils |
|-------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 2003/2004   | 137               | 1 824            |
| 2004/2005   | 126               | 1 779            |
| 2005/2006   | 123               | 1 441            |

Source: Report on the status of Roma communities in the Czech Republic in 2004, [www.vlada.cz](http://www.vlada.cz), MSMT

Figures on classes and pupils refer to school years whereas funds are allocated for the accounting period (1 January to 31 December). Hence, the average amount spent on pupils for the school years 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 was determined by using a formula calculating average spending:

$$\text{Government support per pupil in preparatory classes} = 67,916 / 1,610 = 42 \text{ EUR}$$

The Needs Assessment Study for the Roma Education Fund (2004)<sup>113</sup> estimated the total cost of providing preparatory classes at 22,583 CZK (792 EUR) per pupil in 2003. If one considers that there was no substantial change in existing financial needs in the interim period, the average cost in 2005 would be approximately 25,000 CZK (877 EUR). Government support provides 5% of total spending on preparatory classes.

### **3. The Policy: Education Assistants**

#### **3.1 Objective**

The idea behind employing education assistants is to help the teacher to organise individual education plans, to assist in promoting constructive leisure activities in breaks and after the end of the normal school day, to help Roma children by supervising the completion of homework and by providing complementary training and a channel of communication with the children's families. Education assistants should be employed in nursery and elementary schools as well as in preparatory classes.

The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport has designed a special funding programme to compensate for reduced financial support for education assistants from regional administrations (mainly responsible for educational programmes).

#### **3.2 Outcome Observed**

There are no appropriate statistics available to demonstrate the general impact of this policy on the academic performance of Roma children the reason being that no central data is collected in this area since each individual school is responsible for hiring education assistants and for implementing procedures for the monitoring and evaluation thereof (i.e. there is no central pool of such assistants). Differences in drop-out rates, absenteeism and school marks between schools employing education assistants and those not are influenced by a number of additional factors – differing proportions of Roma pupils (the monitoring of which is forbidden), different “scores” in terms of the socio-culturally disadvantaged environment in which the school is located or the overall quality of education in the school (the performance of a Roma pupil depends on a whole range of home and school inputs of which the education assistant is only one). Furthermore, the assistant is interested not merely in the education of the individual pupil but also in contributing towards creating ideal educational conditions within the school. This second issue reflects the multidimensional nature of social inclusion the monitoring and evaluation of which however is practically impossible.

Therefore the effects should be assessed according to special research techniques involving the questioning of teachers and school heads, education assistants, families and children. Such research however is still in the early stages. The “Research Component of the PHARE Project for the Support of Roma Integration”,<sup>114</sup> is to date the only source of such information. Regional

---

<sup>113</sup> Roma Education Fund (2004), p. 33.

<sup>114</sup> PHARE (2000).

Departments of Education, Youth and Sport (11 of 14), regional coordinators for minority issues (5 of 14), school heads (66 of 164), teachers in schools where education assistants are employed (216 teachers from 164 schools) and education assistants themselves (84 from 164 schools) were invited to complete a questionnaire which reflected the actual conditions for establishing work places for education assistants and their performance.

The study came up with the following important findings:

- 55% of employees of regional Departments of Education, Youth and Sport considered the role of education assistant very important. 45% declared a marked improvement in educational conditions for all pupils.
- School heads were influenced in their decision to establish such a position due to the high number of Roma pupils in their schools (33%), the need to improve cooperation with family (30%) and the high number of socio-culturally disadvantaged pupils (21%).
- School heads reported improved cooperation with families (39%), high or very high level of satisfaction with the performance of education assistants (27%), a considerable contribution to their school (15%), assistance in work with groups or individuals (9%), assistance in teaching (8%), both good and bad experience (8%) and contribution towards leisure activities (6%).

Although there are methodological problems with such an evaluation and an apparent lack of data upon which to accurately assess all the outcomes, the above research study illustrated a high level of inclusive capacity regarding this programme.

### **3.3 Costs**

In 2003 a total of 366 education assistants for Roma children were employed in elementary schools; 332 in 2004. A total of 326 work places for education assistants were supported by the government in 2005.

**T a b l e 14 : Education assistants for children and students from socio-culturally disadvantaged environments in 2005**

| Region          | Number of education assistants (EA) | Number of EA work places | Grant in CZK | Grant in EUR |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Jihočeský       | 11                                  | 11                       | 1 990 725    | 69 850       |
| Jihomoravský    | 35                                  | 34                       | 7 168 214    | 251 516      |
| Karlovarský     | 14                                  | 14                       | 2 915 192    | 102 287      |
| Královehradecký | 13                                  | 12                       | 2 547 187    | 89 375       |
| Liberecký       | 19                                  | 19                       | 4 118 138    | 144 496      |
| Moravskoslezský | 68                                  | 67                       | 15 056 906   | 528 312      |
| Olomoucký       | 35                                  | 34                       | 6 655 657    | 233 532      |
| Pardubický      | 9                                   | 8                        | 1 811 398    | 63 558       |
| Plzeňský        | 3                                   | 3                        | 640 465      | 22 472       |
| Praha           | 11                                  | 11                       | 2 399 141    | 84 180       |
| Středočeský     | 28                                  | 25                       | 5 503 890    | 193 119      |
| Ústecký         | 61                                  | 60                       | 13 497 803   | 473 607      |
| Vysočina        | 9                                   | 9                        | 2 016 730    | 70 762       |
| Zlínský         | 10                                  | 9                        | 1 740 833    | 61 082       |
| Total CR        | 326                                 | 315                      | 68 062 279   | 2 388 150    |

Source: MSMT

Analogous to the previous case of preparatory classes, there is no relevant unit of measurement for changes in the social inclusion of Roma pupils. The capacity of this programme to involve the target group will be measured instead in terms of the change in pupil performance.

**Government support per education assistant = 2,388,150 / 326 = 7326 EUR per year.**

According to the Needs Assessment Study for the Roma Education Fund (2004),<sup>115</sup> the average gross monthly salary for education assistants was 9,000 -12,000 CZK (316-421 EUR) in 2003. A salary of around 15,000 CZK (526 EUR), i.e. an annual salary of 180,000 CZK (6,312 EUR) might be expected in 2006 due to inflation and changes in the position of the education assistant under new legislation.

The total cost of training education assistants in 2003 is estimated at 3,000,000 CZK (105,263 EUR).<sup>116</sup>

**Estimated cost of education assistants = 6,312 + 105,263 / 326 = 6636 EUR per year.**

The estimated cost is lower than government spending, the consequence of the underestimated figures above and to full or almost full reimbursement of this policy by the government.

<sup>115</sup> Roma Education Fund (2004), p. 38.

<sup>116</sup> Ibidem.

If we suppose that each education assistant positively influences the teaching performance of 15 pupils on average, then the formula is as follows:

**Governmental support per pupil influenced by education assistant = 2,388,150 / / 326 / 15 = 488 EUR per year.**

#### **4. The Policy: Support of Roma in Higher and University Education**

Since 2000 a proportion of government grants have been allocated to Roma students in higher education.

##### **4.1 Objective**

The objective is to provide financial support for accommodation, board and school equipment for Roma higher education and university students.

##### **4.2 Outcome Observed**

In 1989 a total of 30 Roma students attended higher education institutions. In 2003, 1,441 Roma students applied for grants to support their higher education. Approximately 5.8% of the juvenile Roma population study at higher education institutions compared to 49.2% of the juvenile majority population<sup>117</sup>. The total number of supported Roma students is not available, however the rising number of applicants for grant support should indicate rising numbers of higher education and university students. However, the limitations of this indicator must be borne in mind (a strong correlation should be considered but not a causal relationship). Targeted financial support strengthens the ability of Roma students to continue their studies. On the other hand, the higher numbers of Roma students in higher education is also influenced by other inclusive measures. The Report on the Results of the Programme Supporting the Higher Education of Roma Students in 2003 shows that the majority of Roma students receiving grant support completed their higher education. In 2003, of a total of 672 such students, only 93 did not complete their studies (13.8%)<sup>118</sup>. A total of 51.9% of respondents (135 heads of higher education institutions) agreed that the support programme for Roma higher education motivated students; 34.8% had the opposite opinion<sup>119</sup>.

##### **4.3 Costs**

The average cost was calculated from the number of pupils and the amount allocated in the first call in 2005 and estimates of the second call. This support scheme is fully organized and funded by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport.

**Governmental support per applicant = 403,256 / 1342 = 307 EUR per year.**

---

<sup>117</sup> Source: Report on the status of Roma communities in the Czech Republic in 2004, [www.vlada.cz](http://www.vlada.cz), MSMT, p.12

<sup>118</sup> Report on the results of the programme supporting the higher education of Roma students, p.8, 2004

<sup>119</sup> Report on the results of the programme supporting the higher education of Roma students, p.16, 2004

**T a b l e 15 : Support for Roma Higher and University Education from 2000 to 2005**

| Round / year | Number of pupils | Amount in CZK per round | Year average number of students | Amount in CZK per year | Average amount in CZK | Average amount in EUR |
|--------------|------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| I / 2000     | 333              | 2,344,000               | 447                             | 2,854,000              | 6,385                 | 224                   |
| II / 2000    | 561              | 510,000                 |                                 |                        |                       |                       |
| I / 2001     | 511              | 3,437,000               |                                 |                        |                       |                       |
| II / 2001    | 1,021            | 3,400,000               | 766                             | 6,837,000              | 8,926                 | 313                   |
| I / 2002     | 941              | 3,488,000               |                                 |                        |                       |                       |
| II / 2002    | 1,409            | 4,992,948               | 1,175                           | 8,480,948              | 7,218                 | 253                   |
| I / 2003     | 1,136            | 5,230,599               |                                 |                        |                       |                       |
| II / 2003    | 1,441            | 4,742,833               | 1,289                           | 9,973,432              | 7,740                 | 272                   |
| I / 2004     | 1,069            | 5,015,063               |                                 |                        |                       |                       |
| II / 2004    | 1,244            | 4,976,900               | 1,157                           | 9,991,963              | 8,640                 | 303                   |
| I / 2005     | 1,292            | 5,989,200               |                                 |                        |                       |                       |
| II / 2005    | 1,391            | 5,503,600               | 1,342                           | 11,492,800             | 8,567                 | 301                   |
| I / 2006     | 1,315            | 6,716,500               |                                 |                        |                       |                       |

Source: MSMT.

## 5. Conclusions

Both the lack of research activity in the area and the absence of information on detailed municipal and regional budgets restrain cost-effectiveness analysis. Data at government level is available but the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport provides only additional subsidies to strengthen current capacity in the area. The ratio of its financial participation to the total amount spent was unavailable; total spending can be determined only from estimates based on former funding schemes administered by the ministry.

Although it was not feasible to compare each of the policies described using numerical units of measurement, the following characteristics of existing policies were observed:

- All three policies evaluated here are complementary, they should be implemented simultaneously and their design reflects the multidimensional nature of social inclusion in the area of Roma education.
- Data available on preparatory classes, education assistants and support programmes for secondary and university students showed a high level of effectiveness.
- Because of the different focus of these three measures the only suitable criterion is the ratio of people from the target group involved. However, this indicator represented the total cost in the case of the financial support programme and probably in the case of education assistants. In the case of preparatory classes, government support was merely complementary.

- APPENDIX 1: RELEVANT LEGAL NORMS

1. Ústava České republiky, Zákon č.1/1999 Sb. ze dne 16. prosince 1992, ve znění pozdějších předpisů a Listina základních práv a svobod (zákon č. 2/1993 Sb., o vyhlášení Listiny základních práv a svobod jako součásti ústavního pořádku České republiky);
2. Zákon č. 40/1993 Sb. ze dne 29. prosince 1992 o nabývání a pozbývání státního občanství ČR ve znění pozdějších předpisů;
3. Zákon č. 155/1999 Sb. o sčítání lidu, domů a bytů
4. Zákon č. 83/1990 Sb., o sdružování občanů
5. Zákon o svobodě náboženského vyznání a postavení církví a náboženských společností (o církvích a náboženských společnostech).
6. Zákon č. 273/2001 Sb. o právech příslušníků národnostních menšin (menšinový zákon).
7. Zákon 561 ze dne 24. září 2004 o předškolním, základním, středním, vyšším odborném a jiném vzdělávání (školský zákon)
8. Zákon č. 101/2000 Sb., o ochraně osobních údajů a o změně některých zákonů, ve znění pozdějších předpisů;
9. Usnesení vlády č. 126 ze dne 8.února 2006 ke koncepci integrace cizinců v roce 2005
10. Zákon 157/2000 Sb., o přechodu některých věcí a práv a závazků z majetku České republiky do majetku krajů;
11. Zákon č. 231/2001 Sb., o provozování rozhlasového a televizního vysílání a o změně dalších zákonů
12. Zákon č. 46/2000 Sb. o právech a povinnostech při vydávání periodického tisku a o změně některých dalších zákonů (tiskový zákon), ve znění pozdějších předpisů
13. Zákon 129/2000 Sb. o krajích
14. Zákon č. 128/2000 Sb., o obcích
15. Zákon o provozování rozhlasového a televizního vysílání a o změně dalších zákonů, ve znění zákona č. 309/2002 Sb. a zákona č. 274/2003 Sb., zákona č. 341/2004 Sb. a zákona č. 501/2004 Sb., zákona č. 626/2004 Sb., zákona č. 82/2005 Sb. a zákona č. 127/2005 Sb. č. 231/2001 Sb.
16. Vyhláška Ministerstva kultury, kterou se vydává Seznam událostí značného společenského významu č. 233/2001 Sb.
17. Zákon ČNR o České televizi, ve znění zákona ČNR č. 36/1993 Sb., zákona č. 253/1994 Sb., zákona č. 301/1995 Sb., zákona č. 39/2001 Sb. a zákona č. 231/2001 Sb., zákona č. 82/2005 a zákona č. 127/2005 Sb. č. 483/1991 Sb.
18. Zákon ČNR o Českém rozhlasu, ve znění zákona ČNR č. 36/1993 Sb., zákona č. 253/1994 Sb., zákona č. 301/1995 Sb., zákona č. 135/1997 Sb. a zákona č. 192/2002 Sb. a zákona č. 127/2005 Sb., č. 484/1991 Sb.
19. Zákon ČNR o České tiskové kanceláři, č. 517/1992 Sb.
20. Zákon o zrušení Československého rozhlasu, Československé televize a Československé tiskové kanceláře, č. 597/1992 Sb.
21. Zákon ČNR o některých opatřeních v oblasti rozhlasového a televizního vysílání č. 36/1993 Sb.
22. Zákon o rozhlasových a televizních poplatcích a o změně některých zákonů, č. 348/2005 Sb. .
23. Vyhláška ministerstva kultury o způsobilosti k promítání 35 mm filmů, č. 121/1954 Ú. I.
24. Zákon o některých podmínkách výroby, šíření a archivování audiovizuálních děl, o změně a doplnění některých zákonů a některých dalších předpisů, ve znění

- zákon č. 40/1995 Sb., zákona č. 121/2000 Sb. a zákona č. 132/2000 Sb. a zákona č. 499/2004 Sb., č. 273/1993 Sb.
- 25. Zákon o právech a povinnostech při vydávání periodického tisku a o změně některých dalších zákonů (tiskový zákon), ve znění zákona č. 302/2000 Sb. a zákona č. 320/2002 Sb., č. 46/2000 Sb
  - 26. Zákon o neperiodických publikacích, ve znění zákona č. 320/2002 Sb. č. 37/1995 Sb
  - 27. Vyhláška Ministerstva kultury, kterou se provádí některá ustanovení zákona č. 37/1995 Sb., o neperiodických publikacích, ve znění vyhlášky č. 156/2003 Sb. č. 252/1995 Sb
  - 28. Usnesení vlády České republiky ze dne 8. února 2006 č. 126 ke koncepci integrace cizinců v roce 2005
  - 29. Usnesení vlády České republiky ze dne 10. ledna 2001 č. 40 o aktualizaci Strategie účinnější státní podpory kultury (kulturní politiky)
  - 30. Usnesení ze dne 28. dubna 1999 č. 401 o Strategii účinnější státní podpory kultury (kulturní politiky)
  - 31. Nařízení vlády 98/2002 Sb. ze dne 20. února 2002, kterým se stanoví podmínky a způsob poskytování dotací ze státního rozpočtu na aktivity příslušníků národnostních menšin a na podporu integrace příslušníků romské komunity, ve znění nařízení vlády č. 262/2005 Sb. ze dne 11. května 2005
  - 32. Statut Rady vlády pro národnosti schválila vláda usnesením ze dne 15. června 2005 č. 746.
  - 33. Usnesení vlády č. 1574 ze dne 7. prosince 2005 s přílohou Prohlášení České republiky týkající se splnění závazků vyplývajících z Evropské charty regionálních či menšinových jazyků.
  - 34. Rámcová úmluva o ochraně národnostních menšin, č. 96/1998 Sb.
  - 35. Evropská charta regionálních či menšinových jazyků (doposud neratifikovaná vládou ČR, která s ní ale vyslovila souhlas ve vládním usnesení ze dne 16. září 2000).
  - 36. Pokyn MŠMT číslo 21836/2000-11 ke vzdělávání cizinců v základních školách, středních školách a vyšších odborných školách, včetně speciálních škol, v České republice;
  - 37. Pokyn MŠMT číslo 35471/99-22 pro zajištění povinné školní docházky žadatelů o azyl z azyllových zařízení;
  - 38. Usnesení vlády ČR č. 359 ze dne 14. dubna 2004 -Dohoda o vzájemné spolupráci se Svazem měst a obcí

## APPENDIX 2: TABLES

**T a b l e 24 : Population by Nationality as at 1st March 2001**

| Nationality                 | abs        | % of the total number of inhabitants |
|-----------------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|
| Czech                       | 9 249 777  | 90.42                                |
| Moravian                    | 380 474    | 3.72                                 |
| Silesian                    | 10 878     | 0.11                                 |
| Slovak                      | 193 190    | 1.89                                 |
| Polish                      | 51 968     | 0.51                                 |
| German                      | 39 106     | 0.38                                 |
| Roma                        | 11 746     | 0.11                                 |
| Hungarian                   | 14 672     | 0.14                                 |
| Ukrainian                   | 22 112     | 0.22                                 |
| Russian                     | 12 369     | 0.12                                 |
| Ruthenian                   | 1 106      | 0.01                                 |
| Bulgarian                   | 4 363      | 0.04                                 |
| Romanian                    | 1 238      | 0.01                                 |
| Greek                       | 3 219      | 0.03                                 |
| Vietnamese                  | 17 462     | 0.17                                 |
| Albanian                    | 690        | 0.01                                 |
| Croatian                    | 1 585      | 0.02                                 |
| Serbian                     | 1 801      | 0.02                                 |
| Other                       | 26 499     | 0.26                                 |
| Double nationality in total | 12 978     | 0.13                                 |
| Not found                   | 172 827    | 1.69                                 |
| Population in total         | 10 230 060 | 100.00                               |

Source: Finding out the nationality in the census of population, houses and apartments in the period of 1921-2001, ČSÚ, [www.czso.cz](http://www.czso.cz)

**T a b l e 25 : Persons with a Double Nationality as at 1st March 2001**

| Nationality                 | abs.   | in % of the number of persons with the double nationality | in % of the total number of inhabitants |
|-----------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Czech and Roma              | 698    | 5.38                                                      | 0.01                                    |
| Czech and Slovak            | 2 783  | 21.44                                                     | 0.03                                    |
| Czech and other             | 4 656  | 35.88                                                     | 0.05                                    |
| Slovak and Roma             | 77     | 0.59                                                      | 0.00                                    |
| Moravian and Slovak         | 74     | 0.57                                                      | 0.00                                    |
| Moravian and Roma           | 9      | 0.07                                                      | 0.00                                    |
| Moravian and other          | 2 412  | 18.59                                                     | 0.02                                    |
| Other combinations          | 2 269  | 17.48                                                     | 0.02                                    |
| Double nationality in total | 12 978 | 100.00                                                    | 0.13                                    |

Source: Determining the Nationality in the Census of Population, Houses and Apartments in the Period of 1921-2001, ČSÚ, [www.czso.cz](http://www.czso.cz)

**T a b l e 26 : Population by Nationality in the Years of 1991 and 2001**

| Census           | 1991             |                           | 2001             |                           |                                                       |                                        |
|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Nationality      | Absolute figures | In per cent of population | Absolute figures | In per cent of population | Of the total long-term residences<br>Absolute figures | Of the total long-term residences in % |
| Population total | 10 302 215       | 100.0                     | 10 230 060       | 100.0                     | 69 654                                                | 0.7                                    |
| Czech            | 8 363 768        | 81.2                      | 9 249 777        | 90.4                      | 1 296                                                 | 0.0                                    |
| Moravian         | 1 362 313        | 13.2                      | 380 474          | 3.7                       | 96                                                    | 0.0                                    |
| Slovaks          | 314 877          | 3.1                       | 193 190          | 1.9                       | 10 967                                                | 5.7                                    |
| Polish           | 59 383           | 0.6                       | 51 968           | 0.5                       | 3 366                                                 | 6.5                                    |
| German           | 48 556           | 0.5                       | 39 106           | 0.4                       | 1 377                                                 | 3.5                                    |
| Silesian         | 44 446           | 0.4                       | 10 878           | 0.1                       | 1                                                     | 0.0                                    |
| Romany           | 32 903           | 0.3                       | 11 746           | 0.1                       | 59                                                    | 0.5                                    |
| Hungarian        | 19 932           | 0.2                       | 14 672           | 0.1                       | 827                                                   | 5.6                                    |
| Ukrainian        | 8 220            | 0.1                       | 22 112           | 0.2                       | 11 876                                                | 53.7                                   |
| Russian          | 5 062            | 0.0                       | 12 369           | 0.1                       | 6 322                                                 | 51.1                                   |
| Ruthenian        | 1 926            | 0.0                       | 1 106            | 0.0                       | 55                                                    | 5.0                                    |
| Bulgarian        | 3 487            | 0.0                       | 4 363            | 0.0                       | 1 384                                                 | 31.7                                   |
| Greek            | 3 379            | 0.0                       | 3 219            | 0.0                       | 319                                                   | 9.9                                    |
| Rumanian         | 1 034            | 0.0                       | 1 241            | 0.0                       | 333                                                   | 26.9                                   |
| Vietnamese       | 421              | 0.0                       | 17 462           | 0.2                       | 11 876                                                | 68.0                                   |

Source: Determining Nationality in the Census of Population, Houses and Apartments in the Period of 1921- 2001, ČSÚ, [www.czso.cz](http://www.czso.cz)

**T a b l e 27 : Czech Citizennships acquired per Year**

| Year                          | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|-------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Total of granted citizenships | 7309 | 6436 | 4449 | 4532 | 3410 | 5020 | 2626 |

Source: Foreigners in the Czech Republic 2002 ČSÚ – Czech Statistical Office, Scientia; Foreigners in the Czech Republic 2005 ČSÚ, Scientia.

**T a b l e 28 : Citizenships of the Czech Republic Obtained During the Year, by Former Citizenship (as at 31st December)**

| Year/ Former State Citizenship | 1999 | %      | 2000 | %      | 2001 | %      | 2002 | %      | 2003 | %      | 2004 | %      |
|--------------------------------|------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|
| Total                          | 7309 | 100.00 | 6436 | 100.00 | 4449 | 100.00 | 4532 | 100.00 | 3410 | 100.00 | 5020 | 100.00 |
| Slovakia                       | 6278 | 85.89  | 5377 | 83.55  | 3378 | 75.93  | 2109 | 46.54  | 989  | 29.00  | 1741 | 34.68  |
| Ukraine                        | 273  | 3.74   | 376  | 5.84   | 173  | 3.89   | 251  | 5.54   | 419  | 12.29  | 446  | 8.88   |
| Poland                         | 23   | 0.31   | 8    | 0.12   | 163  | 3.66   | 304  | 6.71   | 170  | 4.99   | 298  | 5.94   |
| Romania                        | 47   | 0.64   | 68   | 1.06   | 142  | 3.19   | 109  | 2.41   | 116  | 3.40   | 101  | 2.01   |
| Bulgaria                       | 85   | 1.16   | 105  | 1.63   | 133  | 2.99   | 95   | 2.10   | 54   | 1.58   | 62   | 1.24   |
| Russia                         | 104  | 1.42   | 74   | 1.15   | 87   | 1.96   | 65   | 1.43   | 7    | 0.21   | 86   | 1.71   |
| Vietnam                        | 111  | 1.52   | 112  | 1.74   | 80   | 1.80   | 29   | 0.64   | 46   | 1.35   | 47   | 0.94   |
| Greece                         | 45   | 0.62   | 26   | 0.40   | 38   | 0.85   | 19   | 0.42   | 26   | 0.76   | 16   | 0.32   |
| Serbia and Montenegro          | 50   | 0.68   | 12   | 0.19   | 35   | 0.79   | 16   | 0.35   | 14   | 0.41   | 42   | 0.84   |
| Macedonia                      | 16   | 0.22   | 18   | 0.28   | 28   | 0.63   | 18   | 0.40   | 21   | 0.62   | 19   | 0.38   |
| Kazakhstan                     | 3    | 0.04   | 17   | 0.26   | 25   | 0.56   | 43   | 0.95   | 156  | 4.57   | 89   | 1.77   |
| Belorussia                     | 7    | 0.10   | 13   | 0.20   | 23   | 0.52   | 13   | 0.29   | 14   | 0.41   | 21   | 0.42   |
| Cuba                           | 29   | 0.40   | 30   | 0.47   | 23   | 0.52   | 28   | 0.62   | 12   | 0.35   | 9    | 0.18   |
| Armenia                        | 40   | 0.55   | 36   | 0.56   | 20   | 0.45   | 8    | 0.18   | 18   | 0.53   | 23   | 0.46   |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina         | 10   | 0.14   | 22   | 0.34   | 18   | 0.40   | 20   | 0.44   | 47   | 1.38   | 62   | 1.24   |
| Georgia                        | 8    | 0.11   | 8    | 0.12   | 10   | 0.22   | 5    | 0.11   | 12   | 0.35   | 9    | 0.18   |
| Algeria                        | 9    | 0.12   | 11   | 0.17   | 8    | 0.18   | 3    | 0.07   | 6    | 0.18   | 5    | 0.10   |
| German                         |      | 0.00   |      | 0.00   | 7    | 0.16   | 3    | 0.07   | 3    | 0.09   | 3    | 0.06   |
| Syria                          | 22   | 0.30   | 7    | 0.11   | 7    | 0.16   | 13   | 0.29   | 11   | 0.32   | 10   | 0.20   |
| Congo                          |      | 0.00   | 1    | 0.02   | 6    | 0.13   | 2    | 0.04   | 4    | 0.12   | 5    | 0.10   |
| Iraq                           | 8    | 0.11   | 15   | 0.23   | 6    | 0.13   | 8    | 0.18   | 7    | 0.21   | 5    | 0.10   |
| Egypt                          | 7    | 0.10   | 2    | 0.03   | 5    | 0.11   | 3    | 0.07   | 2    | 0.06   | 2    | 0.04   |
| Sudan                          | 3    | 0.04   | 5    | 0.08   | 5    | 0.11   | 2    | 0.04   | 2    | 0.06   | 2    | 0.04   |
| Ethiopia                       | 5    | 0.07   | 2    | 0.03   | 2    | 0.04   | 5    | 0.11   | 1    | 0.03   | 3    | 0.06   |
| Jordan                         |      | 0.00   | 1    | 0.02   | 4    | 0.09   | 1    | 0.02   | 3    | 0.09   | 5    | 0.10   |
| Croatia                        | 4    | 0.05   | 4    | 0.06   | 3    | 0.07   | 8    | 0.18   | 10   | 0.29   | 7    | 0.14   |
| Hungary                        | 6    | 0.08   | 5    | 0.08   | 2    | 0.04   | 3    | 0.07   | 1    | 0.03   | 6    | 0.12   |
| China                          | 2    | 0.03   | 2    | 0.03   | 2    | 0.04   |      | 0.00   | 1    | 0.03   | 3    | 0.06   |
| Tunisia                        |      | 0.00   | 1    | 0.02   | 2    | 0.04   | 1    | 0.02   | 4    | 0.12   | 5    | 0.10   |
| none                           | 8    | 0.11   | 5    | 0.08   | 7    | 0.16   | 7    | 0.15   | 15   | 0.44   | 20   | 0.40   |
| Total selected countries       | 7203 | 98.55  | 6363 | 98.87  | 4442 | 99.84  | 3191 | 70.41  | 2191 | 64.25  | 3152 | 62.79  |
| other                          | 106  | 1.45   | 73   | 1.13   | 7    | 0.16   | 1341 | 29.59  | 1219 | 35.75  | 1868 | 37.21  |

Source: Foreigners in the Czech Republic 2002 Czech Statistical Office, Scientia; Foreigners in the Czech Republic 2005 Czech Statistical Office, Scientia, Calculation by VÚPSV Horáková

**T a b l e 29 : Population Based on the Religion and Nationality**

| Nationality               | Total believers |      | Of which              |      |                                    |     |                             |     |          |      |
|---------------------------|-----------------|------|-----------------------|------|------------------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|----------|------|
|                           |                 |      | Roman-Catholic Church |      | Czech-Brotherhood Evangelic Church |     | Czechoslovak Hussite Church |     | Other    |      |
|                           | abs.            | % 1  | abs. 2                | %    | abs.                               | % 2 | abs.                        | % 2 | abs.     | % 2  |
| Total population of which | 3 288 088       | 32.1 | 2 740 780             | 83.4 | 11 721 2                           | 3.6 | 991 03                      | 3.0 | 33 099 3 | 10.1 |
| Czech                     | 2 854 529       | 30.9 | 2 399 074             | 84.0 | 107 243                            | 3.8 | 950 73                      | 3.3 | 253 139  | 8.9  |
| Moravian                  | 181 185         | 47.6 | 162 676               | 89.8 | 4 561                              | 2.5 | 2 916                       | 1.6 | 11 032   | 6.1  |
| Silesian                  | 6 468           | 59.5 | 5 161                 | 79.8 | 90                                 | 1.4 | 76                          | 1.2 | 1 141    | 17.6 |
| Slovak                    | 104 131         | 53.9 | 85 846                | 82.4 | 2 441                              | 2.3 | 189                         | 0.2 | 15 655   | 15.0 |
| Polish                    | 41 092          | 79.1 | 28 066                | 68.3 | 324                                | 0.8 | 16                          | 0.0 | 12 686   | 30.9 |
| German                    | 21 960          | 56.2 | 19 080                | 86.9 | 770                                | 3.5 | 57                          | 0.3 | 2 053    | 9.3  |
| Roma                      | 6 184           | 52.6 | 5 082                 | 82.2 | 64                                 | 1.0 | 16                          | 0.2 | 1 022    | 16.5 |
| Hungarian                 | 7 513           | 51.2 | 5 939                 | 79.0 | 268                                | 3.6 | 18                          | 0.2 | 1 288    | 17.1 |
| Ukrainian                 | 11 306          | 51.1 | 2 398                 | 21.2 | 68                                 | 0.6 | 32                          | 0.3 | 8 808    | 77.9 |
| Russian                   | 4 739           | 38.3 | 304                   | 6.4  | 29                                 | 0.6 | 14                          | 0.3 | 4 392    | 92.7 |
| Vietnamese                | 1 091           | 6.2  | 104                   | 9.5  | 4                                  | 0.4 | 2                           | 0.2 | 981      | 89.9 |

<sup>1</sup> share of total persons of the respective nationality

<sup>2</sup> share of total persons of believers

**T a b l e 30 : Educational Structure of the Selected Nationality Groups of Population of 15 Years of Age and Older (in %)**

| Nationality         | Share of Persons with Education |      |                          |      |                    |      |            |      |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|------|--------------------------|------|--------------------|------|------------|------|
|                     | Elementary                      |      | Secondary and Vocational |      | Complete Secondary |      | University |      |
|                     | 1991                            | 2001 | 1991                     | 2001 | 1991               | 2001 | 1991       | 2001 |
| Population in total | 33.1                            | 23.0 | 35.4                     | 38.0 | 22.9               | 28.4 | 7.2        | 8.9  |
| Of which            |                                 |      |                          |      |                    |      |            |      |
| Czech               | 32.0                            | 22.7 | 35.9                     | 38.5 | 23.5               | 28.8 | 7.3        | 8.8  |
| Moravian            | 32.4                            | 21.6 | 36.3                     | 39.8 | 23.4               | 29.0 | 7.2        | 9.2  |
| Silesian            | 33.5                            | 19.4 | 36.0                     | 37.3 | 23.1               | 30.7 | 6.6        | 11.8 |
| Slovak              | 51.0                            | 35.9 | 26.9                     | 31.4 | 13.6               | 20.5 | 5.8        | 9.4  |
| Polish              | 41.8                            | 29.0 | 29.5                     | 34.7 | 20.6               | 25.7 | 6.3        | 9.3  |
| German              | 54.6                            | 37.6 | 29.5                     | 38.2 | 11.5               | 16.7 | 2.5        | 5.7  |
| Roma                | 78.4                            | 65.4 | 10.0                     | 17.3 | 0.9                | 5.0  | 0.3        | 1.6  |
| Hungarian           | 58.3                            | 41.8 | 24.7                     | 31.3 | 10.2               | 16.2 | 4.4        | 7.9  |
| Ukrainian           | 48.8                            | 20.0 | 20.3                     | 27.2 | 18.8               | 35.4 | 9.0        | 12.4 |
| Russian             | 30.5                            | 13.0 | 15.4                     | 8.8  | 24.4               | 33.7 | 26.9       | 40.8 |
| Vietnamese          | 29.2                            | 31.5 | 33.3                     | 21.7 | 22.1               | 32.2 | 7.1        | 6.5  |

Census 2001

**T a b l e 31 : Education of Foreigners in 2004/2005 School Year**

| Státní občanství/<br>State citizenship | Mateřské školy/<br>Nursery schools | Základní školy/<br>Elementary schools | Speciální školy(/)<br>Special schools | Školy při výchovných ústavech/<br>Schools established with educational institutions | Gymnázia/<br>Grammar schools | Střední odborné školy/<br>Secondary technical schools | Střední odborná učiliště/<br>Secondary vocational schools | Vyšší odborné školy/<br>Higher professional schools | Vysoké školy/<br>Universities |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Total                                  | 280 487                            | 917 738                               | 64 193                                | 2 349                                                                               | 143 238                      | 226 706                                               | 193 389                                                   | 29 759                                              | 294 182                       |
| Citizens of the Czech Republic         | 227 284                            | 905 878                               | 63 877                                | 2 296                                                                               | 141 483                      | 225 097                                               | 192 486                                                   | 29 406                                              | 275 713                       |
| foreigners                             | 3 203                              | 11 860                                | 316                                   | 53                                                                                  | 1 755                        | 1 609                                                 | 893                                                       | 353                                                 | 18 369                        |

Source: Institute for Information in Education, Foreigners in the Czech Republic, Scientia, Czech Statistical Office, 2005

**T a b l e 32 : Amount of CT's programmes intentionally designed for national and ethnic minorities 1993 – 2005**

| year | Total amount of programmes intentionally designed for ethnic minorities (in hours) | Share of these programmes on total broadcasting time (%) | Total brodcasting time of both CT's programmes (in hours) |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 1993 | 53.0                                                                               | 0.4                                                      | 13 297                                                    |
| 1994 | 42.2                                                                               | 0.3                                                      | 15 336                                                    |
| 1995 | 60.7                                                                               | 0.4                                                      | 15 369                                                    |
| 1996 | 50.5                                                                               | 0.3                                                      | 15 188                                                    |
| 1997 | 84.7                                                                               | 0.5                                                      | 15 524                                                    |
| 1998 | 67.5                                                                               | 0.4                                                      | 16 029                                                    |
| 1999 | 82.1                                                                               | 0.5                                                      | 17 397                                                    |
| 2000 | 90.7                                                                               | 0.5                                                      | 17 568                                                    |
| 2001 | 98.5                                                                               | 0.6                                                      | 17 520                                                    |
| 2002 | 82.1                                                                               | 0.5                                                      | 17 520                                                    |
| 2003 | 56.1                                                                               | 0.3                                                      | 17 520                                                    |
| 2004 | 105.6                                                                              | 0.6                                                      | 17 568                                                    |
| 2005 | 148.7                                                                              | 0.8                                                      | 17 520                                                    |

Source: CT

**T a b l e 33 : Amount of Czech Televisions' programmes broadcasted in respective languages 1993 – 2005 (in hours)**

| Year | Czech   | Slovak | Polish | German | English | French | Spanish | Italian | Russian | Other |
|------|---------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| 1993 | 12390.6 | 298.9  | 21.3   | 111.5  | 291.8   | 77.4   | 31.9    | 41.7    | 7.4     | 31.9  |
| 1994 | 13461.3 | 700    | 4.4    | 33.2   | 843.9   | 280.9  | 5       | 2       | 1.5     | 5.3   |
| 1995 | 13267.2 | 244.1  | 3      | 64.5   | 1755    | 19.8   | 8       | -       | 1.5     | 7.4   |
| 1996 | 13548.9 | 234.3  | -      | 30.4   | 1352.7  | 4.8    | 4.3     | 4       | 1.3     | 8.6   |
| 1997 | 14225.8 | 364.7  | -      | 15.4   | 898.5   | 10.5   | 2       | 3       | -       | 4.1   |
| 1998 | 16395.7 | 279.5  | -      | 3.3    | 715.5   | 2.5    | -       | -       | -       | 0.5   |
| 1999 | 16453.2 | 228.4  | -      | 8      | 702.7   | 3.6    | -       | -       | -       | 1.1   |
| 2000 | 16405   | 210.3  | -      | 16.9   | 934.2   | 1.6    | -       | -       | -       | -     |
| 2001 | 16602   | 217.4  | -      | -      | 692     | 1.6    | -       | 4.8     | -       | 2.2   |
| 2002 | 16656.1 | 219.5  | -      | 3.7    | 637.4   | -      | -       | -       | 0.8     | 3.3   |
| 2003 | 16443.1 | 127.5  | 3.8    | 87.1   | 641.7   | 68.3   | 35.2    | 20.3    | 9.5     | 83.5  |
| 2004 | 16604.1 | 144.3  | 5.1    | 46.5   | 551.4   | 47.9   | 30.6    | 27.3    | 10.7    | 99.9  |
| 2005 | 16462.2 | 152.7  | 7.6    | 27.5   | 649.6   | 41.3   | 18      | 10.6    | 9.5     | 141   |

Source:CT

## Grant Schemes

**T a b l e 34 : The State Cultural Policy and Support of Art in 2000 – 2005 (in CZK thousand)**

| Year | Total Expenses of the State Budget | Expenses of the Chapter 334-MK | Expenses for Churches and Religious Societies (CRS) | Expenses of the Chapter of 334-MK for the Culture in % (i.e. without expenses of CRS) | Share of Expenses of the Chapter of 334-MK for Culture in % (i.e. without expenses for CRS) | Share of the Chapter of 334-MK in the state budget | Support of the Art Works, Presentation of Science and Research of Private Entities ** from Chapter 334 | Support of Non-Professional Activities** |
|------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 2000 | 627 336 000                        | 5 050 556                      | 732 788                                             | 4 326 768                                                                             | 0,69 %                                                                                      | 0,81 %                                             | 356 925                                                                                                | 20 551                                   |
| 2001 | 685 177 300                        | 5 157 053                      | 916 963                                             | 4 240 090                                                                             | 0,62 %                                                                                      | 0,75 %                                             | 146 329                                                                                                | 23 258                                   |
| 2002 | 739 622 657                        | 4 879 882                      | 971 097                                             | 3 908 785                                                                             | 0,53 %                                                                                      | 0,66 %                                             | 155 616                                                                                                | 61 793                                   |
| 2003 | 795 362 391                        | *6 159 905                     | 1 130 844                                           | 5 029 061                                                                             | 0,63 %                                                                                      | 0,77 %                                             | 152 962                                                                                                | 73 392                                   |
| 2004 | 869 050 652                        | 6 045 710                      | 1 248 194                                           | 4 797 516                                                                             | 0,55 %                                                                                      | 0,70 %                                             | 186 370                                                                                                | 76 458                                   |
| 2005 | 908 415 643                        | 5 757 145                      | 1 195 036                                           | 4 562 109                                                                             | 0,50 %                                                                                      | 0,63 %                                             |                                                                                                        |                                          |

Source: Concept of a More Efficient Support of Art for the Years of 2007-2013, Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic – May 2006, Page 50

\* including the costs of damage arising after floods in the amount of CZK 1 billion

**T a b l e 35 : Funds for a Support of Culture of National Minorities and Roma Community for 2006 in thousand Czech Crowns**

|                                                                                         |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Support of Cultural Activities of National Minorities                                   | 8 000  |
| Support of Projects of Integration of the Roma Community                                | 2 000  |
| Support of Dissemination and Receipt of Information in Languages of National Minorities | 30 000 |

Source: Ministry of Culture

**T a b l e 36 : The grants awarded in 2006 in the program of Support of Distribution and Receipt of Information in Languages of the National Minorities**

| Title                                                  | Approved Grant    |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Polish Minority                                        |                   |
| Glos ludu                                              | 4 893 750         |
| Nasza Gazetka                                          | 944 000           |
| ZWRÓT                                                  | 1 100 000         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                           | <b>6 937 750</b>  |
| Bulgarian Minority                                     |                   |
| Roden glas                                             | 400 000           |
| Balgari                                                | 300 000           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                           | <b>700 000</b>    |
| Russian Minority                                       |                   |
| Ruské slovo (Russian Word)                             | 1 200 000         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                           |                   |
| Ruthenian Minority                                     |                   |
| Podkarpatská Rus (Subcarpathian Rus)                   | 90 000            |
| Ukraininan Minority                                    |                   |
| Porohy                                                 | 850 000           |
| Ukrajinský žurnál (Ukrainian Journal)                  | 500 000           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                           | <b>1 350 000</b>  |
| Roma Minority                                          |                   |
| Kereka                                                 | 1 850 000         |
| Romské int.radio Rota (Roma int. Radio Rota)           | 1 000 000         |
| Romano vodi                                            | 1 470 000         |
| Romano hangos 14                                       | 1 300 000         |
| Romano džaniben                                        | 392 000           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                           | <b>6 012 000</b>  |
| Jewish Minority                                        |                   |
| Maskil                                                 | 465 000           |
| Slovak Minority                                        |                   |
| Korene (Roots)                                         | 2 575 000         |
| Slovenské dotyky (Slovak Touch)                        | 2 600 000         |
| Listy Slovákov a Čechov (Papers of Slovaks and Czechs) | 2 000 000         |
| Zrkadlenie (Mirroring)                                 | 500 000           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                           | <b>7 675 000</b>  |
| German Minority                                        |                   |
| Laneszeitung                                           | 1 850 000         |
| Prager Volkzeitung                                     | 1 600 000         |
| Brněnský zpravodaj (Brno News Bulletin)                |                   |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                           | <b>3 450 000</b>  |
| Hungarian Minority                                     |                   |
| Pragai Tükör                                           | 770 000           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                           |                   |
| Greek Minority                                         |                   |
| Kalimera                                               | 410 000           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                           |                   |
| Serbian Minority                                       |                   |
| Srbské slovo (Serbian Word)                            | 460 000           |
| Multinational                                          |                   |
| BABYLON                                                | 500 000           |
| XENY                                                   | 250 000           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                           | <b>30 269 750</b> |

Source: Ministry of Culture

**T a b l e 37 : Minority periodicals and electronic media**

| <b>Minority press</b>       | <b>Publisher name</b>                                         | <b>Periodical name</b>                                        | <b>Subsidy in 2004</b> | <b>Subsidy in 2005</b> |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>BULGARIAN PERIODICAL</b> | Bulgarian cultural and education association                  | Roden glas (Czech –Bulgarian magazine)                        | 140 000-               | -                      |
|                             | Civic association Vazraždane                                  | Bulgary                                                       |                        | 400 000                |
| <b>HUNGARIAN PERIODICAL</b> | Association of Hungarians living in the Czech countries       | Prágai Tükör                                                  | 1 150 000-             | 997 000                |
| <b>GERMAN PERIODICALS</b>   | Association of Germans living in Czechia, Moravia and Silesia | Landes-Zeitung (until 1999 Landes-Anzeiger)(issued bi-weekly) | 2 200 000,             | 1 900 000              |
|                             | Cultural association of Czech citizens of German nationality  | Prager Volkszeitung (bi-weekly)                               | 2 000 000              | 1 900 000              |
|                             | German cultural and language club                             | Kleiner Brünner Gassenbote (published bi-monthly)             | 17 500                 | 30 000                 |
| German periodicals total    |                                                               |                                                               | 4 017 500              | 3 830 000              |
| <b>POLISH PERIODICALS</b>   | Council of Poles in the Czech Republic                        | Głos Ludu (bi-daily)                                          | 4 850 000              | 4 850 000              |
|                             | Polish cultural-education association in the Czech Republic   | Zwrot (monthly)                                               | 1 106 000              | 1 100 000              |
|                             | Hercerstwo Polskie in the Czech Republic                      | Nasza Gazetka (bi-weekly)                                     | 1 114 000              | 974 000                |
|                             | Civic association "Pražský kurýr"                             | Pražský kurýr (monthly)                                       | 100 000                | 99 000                 |
| Polish periodicals total    |                                                               |                                                               | 7 170 000              | 7 023 000              |

| <b>Minority press</b>                 | <b>Publisher name</b>                                                 | <b>Periodical name</b>                   | <b>Subsidy in 2004</b> | <b>Subsidy in 2005</b> |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| ROMANY PERIODICALS (ELECTRONIC MEDIA) | Civic association for Roman national press in the Czech Republic      | Romano kurko (bi-weekly)                 | 0                      | 0                      |
|                                       | Association of friends of DŽENO foundation                            | Amaro gendalos(monthly)                  | 0                      | 0                      |
|                                       | Association of friends of DŽENO foundation                            | Radio rota                               | 1 000 000              | 1 250 000              |
|                                       | Civic association of Romans in the Czech Republic                     | Kereka - Kruh(monthly)                   | 1 700 000              | 1 850 000              |
|                                       | Association of Romans in Moravia                                      | Romano hangos(bi-weekly)                 | 1 719 000              | 1 300 000              |
|                                       | Romea, civic association                                              | Romano vodi (monthly)                    | 1 990 000              | 1 736 000              |
|                                       | Association of friends of Romano džaniben magazine, civic association | Romano džaniben (published semiannually) | 0                      | 221 000                |
| Romany periodicals total              |                                                                       |                                          | 6 409 000              | 6 357 000,             |
| RUSYN PERIODICALS                     | Association of Rusyns and friends of Subcarpathian Russia             | Sub-Carpathian Russia                    | 70 000                 | 113 000                |
| RUSSIAN PERIODICALS                   | Russian Institute                                                     | Vesti                                    |                        |                        |
|                                       | Civic association of Russian tradition                                | Ruské slovo (Russian Word)               | 1 000 000              | 1 000 000              |
| Russian periodicals total             |                                                                       |                                          | 1 000 000              | 1 000 000              |
| GREEK PERIODICALS                     | Greek community in the Czech Republic                                 | Kalimera (6 times a year)                | 400 000                | 400 000                |

| <b>Minority press</b>               | <b>Publisher name</b>                            | <b>Periodical name</b>                                                                       | <b>Subsidy in 2004</b> | <b>Subsidy in 2005</b> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| SLOVAC PERIODICALS                  | Club of the Slovak culture in the Czech Republic | Listy Slovenské listy until 2000, monthly)                                                   | 2 550 000              | 2 550 000              |
|                                     | Slovak-Czech Club in the Czech Republic          | Slovenské dotyky Magazín Slovákov v ČR (Magazine of Slovaks in the Czech Republic) (monthly) | 2 650 000              | 2 650 000              |
|                                     | Community of Slovaks in the Czech Republic       | Korene (monthly)                                                                             | 2 600 000              | 2 600 000              |
|                                     | Association of Slovaks                           | Slovenské rozhľady                                                                           | 0                      | 0                      |
|                                     |                                                  | Zrkadlenie                                                                                   | 200 000                | 400 000                |
| Slovak periodicals total            |                                                  |                                                                                              | 8 000 000              | 8 000 000              |
| UKRAINE PERIODICALS                 | Ukraine initiative in the Czech Republic         | Porohy (published quarterly)                                                                 | 850 000                | 850 000                |
|                                     | Civic association RUTA                           | Ukrajinský žurnál (monthly)                                                                  |                        | 204 000                |
| PERIODICALS OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY | Jewish liberal union in the Czech Republic       | Hatikva (monthly)                                                                            | 0                      | 0                      |
|                                     | Jewish congregation                              | Maskil                                                                                       | 300 000                | 300 000                |
| SERBIAN PERIODICAL                  | Serbian association of St. Sava                  | Srbské slovo(The word of Serbia) (published bimonthly)                                       | 0                      | 300 000                |

Source: [www.vlada.cz](http://www.vlada.cz) (Czech Government web site)

**T a b l e 38 : Projects recommended by the tender commission for grants within the Program of Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports to support the integration of the Roma community in 2006**

| Project Name                                                                                                                           | Grant     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Game as the basic activity of a children's self-fulfillment – or how to play, learn and create in the Pampeliška games center          | 70 000    |
| Integration of Roma Community – Support of extracurricular activities and preparation for a successful entry in the Elementary School. | 124 574   |
| Afternoon at school                                                                                                                    | 73 360    |
| INTERNET KLUB                                                                                                                          | 60 000    |
| Little Club for Roma Prep-School Boys and Girls and their Mothers                                                                      | 219 000   |
| Amicus Community Center                                                                                                                | 150 000   |
| Educational schemes designed for the Roma population                                                                                   | 469 000   |
| Activities open to everybody                                                                                                           | 165 780   |
| Open doors                                                                                                                             | 242 000   |
| "Ambrela – Community Center for Children and Youth in Třebíč" (formerly Roma Center – Club of Children and Youth)                      | 300 000   |
| Roma Community Center – Travelling in History of the Region                                                                            | 86 000    |
| Lentilky Community Center                                                                                                              | 64 000    |
| Music Club.                                                                                                                            | 50 000    |
| Afternoon without Boredom                                                                                                              | 53 000    |
| Music helps Children                                                                                                                   | 86 540    |
| KŘENKA Low-Threshold Club                                                                                                              | 418 770   |
| IN-ROM                                                                                                                                 | 849 680   |
| Support of Education of the Roma People                                                                                                | 188 940   |
| Help in Education of the Roma Children                                                                                                 | 231 000   |
| School as a Game                                                                                                                       | 306 400   |
| Children, come to school!                                                                                                              | 396 240   |
| Doors still open                                                                                                                       | 385 325   |
| Community Center – Low Threshold Facility                                                                                              | 492 700   |
| No Difference Low-Threshold Center – Educational and Leisure Activities                                                                | 300 000   |
| Singing Course – Support of the Vocal Development                                                                                      | 441 000   |
| Total                                                                                                                                  | 6 223 309 |

Source: MSMT

**T a b l e 39 : Approved Amount of Grants of the Ministry of Culture for Cultural Activities of Members of the National Minorities for 2006 in CZK**

| National Minority                      | Total Amount of the Grant for Projects of Minority Organizations in the Area of Culture | Share in the total Amount of Grants in Percentage |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Bulgarian                              | 260 000                                                                                 | 3.37                                              |
| Hungarian                              | 620 000                                                                                 | 8.04                                              |
| German                                 | 573 000                                                                                 | 7.43                                              |
| Polish                                 | 2 335 000                                                                               | 30.28                                             |
| Roma                                   | 237 000                                                                                 | 3.07                                              |
| Ruthenian                              | 28 000                                                                                  | 0.36                                              |
| Russian                                | 170 000                                                                                 | 2.20                                              |
| Greek                                  | 470 000                                                                                 | 6.09                                              |
| Slovak                                 | 2 194 000                                                                               | 28.45                                             |
| Serbian                                | 160 000                                                                                 | 2.07                                              |
| Ukrainian                              | 535 000                                                                                 | 6.94                                              |
| Other OS + multiethnic                 | 90 000                                                                                  | 1.17                                              |
| Jewish Museum in Prague,               | 40 000                                                                                  | 0.52                                              |
| Total Amount of Grants for the Culture | 7 712 000                                                                               | 100.00                                            |

Source: Ministry of Culture, Support of Activities of Members of the National Minorities in 2006, calculation by Milada Horáková, VÚPSV

**T a b l e 40 : Support of Professional Artistic Cultural Projects of Non-State Non-Profit Entities of MC Program– Cultural Activities from 2000 (in CZK thousand)**

| Grant Procedure                                               | 2000           | 2001           | 2002           | 2003           | 2004           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Theatre                                                       | 14 886         | 18 513         | 15 060         | 17 044         | 16 838         |
| Music                                                         | 9 670          | 11 148         | 8 869          | 11 229         | 32 145*        |
| Fine arts, architecture, design                               | 10 450         | 11 565         | 8 855          | 11 987         | 15 044         |
| Dance                                                         | 0              | 0              | 0              | 0              | 5 870          |
| Publishing of non-commercial Czech and translation literature | 2 814          | 2 850          | 2 167          | 2 700          | 3 090          |
| Publishing the children's illustrated literature              | 550            | 650            | 500            | 700            | 600**          |
| Other literary projects (events, periodicals...)              | 8 210          | 8 751          | 6 729          | 7 417          | 11 105         |
| Creating and publishing of literary work                      | 859            | 644            | 500            | 830            | 620            |
| Translations of Czech literature abroad                       | 1 750          | 1 430          | 1 238          | 1 100          | 1 935          |
| Czech Library                                                 | 2600           | 2 600          | 2 168          | 1 800          | 1 900          |
| Participation in the international book trade fairs           | 2 720          | 3 410          | 3 014          | 6 200          | 4 374          |
| Program for orchestras and choirs                             | 15 000         | 11 000         | 13 000         | 12 404         | 11 104***      |
| Program for theatres                                          | 50 000         | 30 000         | 44 000         | 35 000         | 38 600***      |
| Creative stays(Český Krumlov)                                 | 146            | 146            | 146            | 146            | 146            |
| Audiovision                                                   | 5 650          | 6 156          | 5 000          | 5 555          | 6 330          |
| European City of culture 2000 – Investments                   | 57 950         | 0              | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| European City of Culture 2000 – Non-Investments               | 147 600        | 0              | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| State Prizes, Prizes of MC                                    | 375            | 375            | 375            | 775            | 775            |
| Science and Research in the Area of Professional Art          | 9 011          | 16 896         | 13 789         | 10 566         | 9 370          |
| Co-Organizing Events - Professional                           | 15 212         | 17 800         | 15 050         | 13 930         |                |
| Support of Cinematographz                                     | 20 900         | 27 855         | 47 180         | 63 321         | 35 953         |
| Foreign Cooperation                                           | 4 019          | 2 945          | 15 606         | 13 579         | 22 689         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                                  | <b>380 372</b> | <b>174 734</b> | <b>203 246</b> | <b>216 283</b> | <b>168 784</b> |

Source: Collection of Papers on Culture in 1998 – 2003, Orague, 2004.

**T a b l e 41 : Support of Non-Professional Artistic Cultural Projects of Non-State Non-Profit Entities of the Program of the Ministry of Culture – Cultural Activities from 2000 (in CZK thousand)**

| Grant Program                                            | 2000   | 2001   | 2002   | 2003   | 2004   |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Program of Support of Culture of National Minorities     | 9 620  | 8 220  | 7 656  | 11 071 | 10 162 |
| Support of Projects of Integration of the Roma Community | -      | -      | 1 650  | 1 985  | 2 224  |
| Integration of Foreigners                                | -      | 1 330  | 1 900  | 2 932  | 2 000  |
| Total                                                    | 22 534 | 27 009 | 65 519 | 78 805 | 82 342 |

Source of the Ministry of Culture – Concept of a More Effective Support for the Period of 2007 – 2013, MC CR May 2006, Page 48

**T a b l e 42 : Support of Unprofessional Art and Cultural Projects of Non-State Non-Profit Entities of the Program of MC – Cultural Activities starting from 2000 (in CZK th.)**

| Grant procedure /Grant program                                                             | 2000   | 2001   | 2002   | 2003   | 2004   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Support of non-professional art activities                                                 | 5 501  | 5 115  | 11 202 | 12 251 | 13 658 |
| Support of interest cultural – extra-artistic activities                                   | 344    | 502    | 479    | 671    | 680    |
| Program of support of cultural activities of national minorities                           | 9 620  | 8 220  | 7 656  | 11 071 | 10 162 |
| Support of projects of integration of the Roma community                                   |        |        | 1 650  | 1 985  | 2 244  |
| Integration of foreigners                                                                  |        | 1 330  | 1 900  | 2 932  | 2 000  |
| Support of cultural activities of handicapped citizens                                     | 3 774  | 5 092  | 5 457  | 6 030  | 6 435  |
| Support of foreign contacts in the area of non-professional art activities                 |        | 250    | 984    | 1 116  | 1 549  |
| Protection of the traditional folk culture including the traditional folk art handicrafts  |        | 1 348  | 1 392  | 5 000  | 5 000  |
| Czech Music 2004                                                                           |        |        |        |        | 2 955  |
| Support of the Local Cultural Traditions (Anniversaries)                                   | 1 312  | 1 401  | 1 263  | 1 786  | 2 071  |
| Support of distribution and receipt of information in languages of the national minorities |        |        | 29 810 | 30 550 | 29 704 |
| Prizes of the Ministry of Culture in the area of non-professional art activities           |        | 180    | 150    | 150    | 150    |
| Prizes of the Ministry of Culture in the area of traditional folk culture                  |        | 150    | 120    | 150    | 120    |
| Research and development in the area of non-professional art activities                    |        |        |        | 990    | 1 066  |
| Research and development in the area of traditional folk culture                           | 1 983  | 3 421  | 3 456  | 4 123  | 4 548  |
| Total                                                                                      | 22 534 | 27 009 | 65 519 | 78 805 | 82 342 |

Source: Annual Reports. \*The prizes of MC in the area of non-professional art activities and Prizes in the area of traditional folk culture have been awarded since 2001.

**T a b l e 43 : Projects recommended for allocation of a grant from the state budget to support the education in languages of the national minorities and multicultural education in 2005**

| Project Name                                                               | Awarded Grant in CZK |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Czech Children in the Second World War                                     | 85,000               |
| Sports and Cultural Activities of Nursery Schools with the Polish Language | 40,000               |
| Educational Server for the Support of Education leading to Tolerance       | 617,000              |
| Total                                                                      | 742,000              |

Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports

**T a b l e 44 : Support of Projects for Education and Integration of Ethnic Minorities for 2006**

| Budget chapter / grant scheme                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Funds of the state budget (CZK thousand) | Used as at 5th May 2006 (in CZK th.) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Support of Projects of Integration of the Roma Community                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 25 000 <sup>1</sup>                      | 8 998.78 <sup>2</sup>                |
| Program of Support of Education of Ethnic Minorities and Multicultural Education                                                                                                                                                                                            | 19 000 <sup>1</sup>                      | 2 985.386 <sup>3</sup>               |
| Development Program of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports for 2006 "Organization of a Free Preparation for Inclusion in the Elementary Education of the Children of Persons with the Citizenship of another Member State of the European Union "                   | Not found                                | 652.148 <sup>4</sup>                 |
| Program "Financing of Pedagogue Assistants for Children, Pupils and Students with Social Disadvantage for 2006"                                                                                                                                                             | Not found                                | 70 761.024 <sup>5</sup>              |
| Program "Securing the Conditions of the Elementary Education of Pupils with the Position of Asylum Holders or Participants in the Asylum Granting Procedure on the Territory of the Czech Republic or Children of Foreigners kept in the Foreigners' Custodial Facilities " | Not found                                | 9 431.512 <sup>6</sup>               |

<sup>1</sup> Source: web pages of the Ministry of Finance of the Czech Republic  
[http://www.mfcr.cz/cps/rde/xbrf/mfcr/543\\_2005\\_P4\\_pdf.pdf](http://www.mfcr.cz/cps/rde/xbrf/mfcr/543_2005_P4_pdf.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Source: web pages of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports  
<http://www.msmt.cz/Files/HTM/INseznamprojektu.htm>

<sup>3</sup> Source: web pages of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports  
<http://www.msmt.cz/Files/XLS/INseznamdotacintegraceromskekomunityokruh3.xls>

<sup>4</sup> Source: web pages of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports  
<http://www.msmt.cz/Files/XLS/OKvysledkyzincizEU.xls>

<sup>5</sup> Source: web pages of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports  
<http://www.msmt.cz/Files/HTM/MRDotacenawebq.htm>

<sup>6</sup> Source: web pages of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports  
<http://www.msmt.cz/Files/XLS/OKVysledkyazylanti.xls>

**T a b l e 45 : Absolute and relative figures on children entering and leaving preparatory classes**

|                          |                                                                                              | 1999/2000 |     | 2000/2001 |     | 2001/2002 |     | 2002/2003 |     | <b>Total/<br/>Average %</b> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|-----------------------------|
|                          |                                                                                              | F         | M   | F         | M   | F         | M   | F         | M   |                             |
|                          |                                                                                              | 0         | 1   | 2         | 3   |           |     |           |     |                             |
| <b>elementary school</b> | children entering in preparatory class                                                       | 203       | 286 | 216       | 247 | 214       | 280 | 245       | 302 | 1993                        |
|                          | children finishing preparatory class ordinary                                                | 179       | 271 | 205       | 246 | 206       | 257 | 213       | 266 | 1843                        |
|                          | children, who don't attend neither the special nor the elementary schools                    | 24        | 15  | 11        | 1   | 8         | 23  | 32        | 36  | 150                         |
|                          | children entering elementary school at the beginning of school year                          | 169       | 258 | 199       | 239 | 195       | 249 | 208       | 262 | 1779                        |
|                          | children entering special school at the beginning of school year                             | 10        | 13  | 6         | 7   | 11        | 8   | 5         | 4   | 64                          |
|                          | <b>children entering elementary school in per cent</b>                                       | 94        | 95  | 97        | 97  | 95        | 97  | 98        | 98  | 96                          |
|                          | <b>children, who don't attend neither the special nor the elementary schools in per cent</b> | 12        | 5   | 5         | 0   | 4         | 8   | 13        | 12  | 7                           |
| <b>special school</b>    | children entering in preparatory class                                                       | 143       | 159 | 153       | 159 | 163       | 174 | 166       | 198 | 1315                        |
|                          | children finishing preparatory class ordinary                                                | 93        | 123 | 106       | 108 | 107       | 126 | 99        | 135 | 897                         |
|                          | children, who don't attend neither the special nor the elementary schools                    | 50        | 36  | 47        | 51  | 56        | 48  | 67        | 63  | 418                         |
|                          | children entering elementary school at the beginning of school year                          | 69        | 87  | 87        | 85  | 72        | 94  | 62        | 89  | 645                         |
|                          | children entering special school at the beginning of school year                             | 24        | 36  | 19        | 23  | 35        | 32  | 37        | 46  | 252                         |
|                          | <b>children entering elementary school in per cent</b>                                       | 74        | 71  | 82        | 79  | 67        | 75  | 63        | 66  | 72                          |
|                          | <b>children, who don't attend neither the special nor the elementary schools in per cent</b> | 35        | 23  | 31        | 32  | 34        | 28  | 40        | 32  | 32                          |
| <b>nursery school</b>    | children entering in preparatory class                                                       | 38        | 44  | 41        | 40  | 32        | 69  | 41        | 55  | 360                         |
|                          | children finishing preparatory class ordinary                                                | 37        | 44  | 40        | 37  | 31        | 62  | 36        | 52  | 339                         |
|                          | children, who don't attend neither the special nor the elementary schools                    | 1         | 0   | 1         | 3   | 1         | 7   | 5         | 3   | 21                          |
|                          | <b>children entering elementary school at the beginning of school year</b>                   | 37        | 39  | 40        | 36  | 31        | 59  | 36        | 51  | 329                         |
|                          | <b>children entering special school at the beginning of school year</b>                      | 0         | 5   | 0         | 1   | 0         | 3   | 0         | 1   | 10                          |
|                          | children entering elementary school in per cent                                              | 100       | 89  | 100       | 97  | 100       | 95  | 100       | 98  | 97                          |
|                          | children, who don't attend neither the special nor the elementary schools in per cent        | 3         | 0   | 2         | 8   | 3         | 10  | 12        | 5   | 5                           |

Source: Hůle, D. (2003), p. 11, summarizing calculations by Pavel Bareš, VÚPSV

**T a b l e 46 : Program of Support of Integration of Foreigners living in the Czech Republic 2006 – Summary of Awarded Grants**

| Project                                                                                                                                            | Awarded grant |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Related by music – music bridges                                                                                                                   | 70000         |
| Integration and not ignorance                                                                                                                      | 0             |
| Circles – Multicultural Women Bands                                                                                                                | 110000        |
| Student Film Clubs – documentary films on human rights                                                                                             | 200000        |
| Let us know each other                                                                                                                             | 25000         |
| Junior 2006                                                                                                                                        | 0             |
| Month of Black History                                                                                                                             | 40000         |
| Moravian Year – Folklore Dictionary                                                                                                                | 0             |
| Cultural and Social Lifeof the Iraqi Minority in CR                                                                                                | 60000         |
| Days of Kurdish Literature in Prague                                                                                                               | 0             |
| Country, where I will live                                                                                                                         | 80000         |
| Increase of professional level and inclusion of services for foreigners in the community                                                           | 80000         |
| Dialogue of Cultures 2006 – 3rd Year of the Festival devoted to encounters and mingling of cultures, languages and religions in the Czech Republic | 150000        |
| Library as a gateway to the integration of foreigners in the EU – Final Conference and Integration Activities in the Public Libraries              | 90000         |
| Active Entering in the New Home                                                                                                                    | 0             |
| Allowing a further existence and extension of the reach of Nairi magazine                                                                          | 100000        |
| RefuFest or PříšelSvátek                                                                                                                           | 150000        |
| Cultural and educational afternoon, aimed at deepening the knowledge about the culture and traditions of the Czech nation for Vietnamese children  | 0             |
| Contribution to a celebration of the greatest holiday of Vietnamese children with the social and cultural program                                  | 40000         |
| About Culture and History of Prague through Architecture                                                                                           | 40000         |
| Culture and Folk Traditions of the Nations of Caucasus                                                                                             | 50000         |
| Camp Afghanistan                                                                                                                                   | 200000        |
| Indonesia-Czech Meeting 2006                                                                                                                       | 10000         |
| Multicultural Festival "Color Planet VII." v Ústí nad Labem                                                                                        | 350000        |
| Introduction of Cultures of Ethnic Communities living in Ústí nad Labem, Teplice and Prague                                                        | 100000        |
| Special edition of "Ukraine Journal - Theme 2006" in the Czech language                                                                            | 100000        |
| Cultural and Religious Center for Migrants and Fugitives                                                                                           | 250000        |
| Total                                                                                                                                              | 2295000       |

**T a b l e 47 : Development of the Number of Preparatory Classes**

| School Year | Total   |          | Of which        |          |                    |          |                 |          |
|-------------|---------|----------|-----------------|----------|--------------------|----------|-----------------|----------|
|             |         |          | Nursery schools |          | Elementary schools |          | Special schools |          |
|             | Classes | Children | Classes         | Children | Classes            | Children | Classes         | Children |
| 1997/98     | 47      | 638      | 1               | 18       | 24                 | 366      | 22              | 254      |
| 1998/99     | 99      | 1237     | 8               | 128      | 50                 | 670      | 41              | 439      |
| 1999/00     | 114     | 1425     | 11              | 150      | 62                 | 834      | 41              | 441      |
| 2000/01     | 110     | 1364     | 7               | 107      | 63                 | 829      | 40              | 428      |
| 2001/02     | 109     | 1467     | 13              | 198      | 66                 | 927      | 30              | 342      |
| 2002/03     | 116     | 1489     | 11              | 171      | 72                 | 915      | 33              | 403      |
| 2003/04     | 137     | 1824     | 11              | 181      | 84                 | 1152     | 42              | 491      |

Source: Government of the Czech Republic (2004).

**T a b l e 48 : Summary of Incurred Financial Costs of Information Materials about Roma People**

| Year | Number of Published Titles | Financial Funds |
|------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| 1997 | 2                          | CZK 500 th.     |
| 1998 | 6                          | CZK 2,100 th.   |
| 1999 | 12                         | CZK 3,180 th.   |
| 2000 | 10                         | CZK 1,477 th.   |
| 2001 | 15                         | CZK 4,390 th.   |
| 2002 | 7                          | CZK 318 th.     |
| 2003 | 5                          | CZK 2,280 th.   |

Source: Government of the Czech Republic (2004).

### Program Structure of the Czech Television for Ethnic, National and Religious Minorities

**Kosmopolis** – magazine about a different way of life.

**Velký vůz** – multicultural magazine.

**Babylon** – magazine not only for young viewers about minorities.

**Kvarteto** – a joint program of the countries of the Visegrad Group, a monthly responding to everyday problems of all candidate countries created based on the principle of a mutual exchange of reportages of regional studies of Slovakia, Poland, Hungary and Czech Republic.

**City Folk** – documentary portraits of non-ordinary inhabitants of large cities.

**Here in Europe** – EU is not only Brussels full of bureaucrats but also everyday life from Lisbon to Vilnius.

**Europe Today** – adopted cycle of WDR programs, reflection of the current problems of Europe.

### Religion

**Ways of Faith** – a cycle of documents about various religious streams and a man-to-God relationship.

**Christian Magazine** – interesting facts and news from the world of religion designed not only for the believers.

**Holiday Word** – meditatively tuned speeches about the essential issues of life.

## Divine Services Oecumenical Gatherings

**Worlds Mingling** – a reminiscence of the fact, that the European perception of the world is not the only one. Seeeking the traces of the fundamental human experience in the main religious systems of the world.

**T a b l e 49 : Broadcasting of Czech Radio for Ethnic Minorities**

| Stations of the Czech Radio<br>(Český rozhlas = Czech Radio) | Total Number of<br>Programs in 2005                                           | Total Number in Hours |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Český rozhlas 1 – Radiožurnál                                | 416                                                                           | 101                   |
| Český rozhlas 2 - Prague                                     | 233                                                                           | 93                    |
| Český rozhlas 3 - Vltava                                     | Throughout the whole program, the individual topics are hard to distinguish   |                       |
| Český rozhlas 6                                              | 53                                                                            | 26                    |
| Český rozhlas 8 - Online                                     | 1200 programs and contributions                                               | --                    |
| Český rozhlas Leonardo                                       | 175                                                                           | 157                   |
| Český rozhlas Brno                                           | 430                                                                           | 215                   |
| Český rozhlas České Budějovice                               | 261                                                                           | 79                    |
| Český rozhlas Hradec Králové                                 | 233                                                                           | 55                    |
| Český rozhlas Olomouc                                        | 1208                                                                          | 520                   |
| Český rozhlas Ostrava                                        | 542                                                                           | 222                   |
| Český rozhlas Pardubice                                      | 198                                                                           | 48                    |
| Český rozhlas Plzeň                                          | 260                                                                           | 130                   |
| Český rozhlas Regina and Region, Middle Bohemia Region       | 519                                                                           | 104                   |
| Český rozhlas Region, Vysočina                               | Programs broadcasted in times shared with the Český rozhlas Regina and Region |                       |
| Český rozhlas North                                          | 269                                                                           | 106                   |

Source: Council of the Czech Radio (2006).

## Interest, Religious or Cultural Organizations of Immigration Communities in the Czech Republic

**1. Artek** – a club of Russian speaking students and their supporters. Organizing of cultural and social events (discos, concerts) not only for Russian speaking students. The club also provides information about possibilities of studying in the Czech Republic.

**2. Bulgarian cultural and education organization of st. Cyril and Method**. The organization publishes the magazine, Rodná řeč (Native language) in Bulgarian language and is also active in the area of culture and education.

**3. Club Bambus**. The association publishes its own magazine Cay Tre in Vietnamese language and operates a Saturday school for children. The association also provides consulting and translation services.

**4. Czech – Korean Christian society.** The religious society organizes church services for Christian community of Koreans in the Czech Republic. The society publishes a monthly, Nanumto magazine in Korean language and a special issue in Czech and Korean languages published twice a year.

**5. Czech – Vietnamese society.** The society informs broader public of the culture, history and economic situation in Vietnam in the form of various events: photo exhibitions, discussions and seminars.

**6. Native association of Chinese in the Czech Republic** (Krajanské sdružení Číňanů v ČR.). The association focuses on cultural and education activities within the community and informing the Czech public of the Chinese community.

**7. Civic association Arménský dům.** The association organizes cultural and social events and publishes "Nairi", published bi-monthly in the Czech and Armenian languages.

**8. Civic association Vazraždane.** The association publishes the magazine, Bulgarians (published 6 times a year in Bulgarian language).

**9. ORER-** the magazine of Armenians living in the Czech Republic. The monthly published in the Czech and Armenian languages.

**10. The educational club SKARYNA** (Osvětový a vzdělávací spolek SKARYNA.) The objective of this club is to disseminate information and knowledge about Byelorussia, Byelorussian nation and its history, language and culture while also supporting Czech-Byelorussian relationships.

**11. Russian Club (Ruský Klub).** The key mission of this association is a continuous development of mutual cultural exchange, organizing adaptation assistance of the Russian speaking foreigners.

**12. Association of natives and friends of the Russian tradition in the Czech Republic.** Association of mostly Czech citizens organizes interest, culture and social events: concerts, publication activities. The association publishes magazine Ruské slovo (Russian Word).

**13. Association for Bulgaria – Bulgarian Club in Brno.** The association focuses on supporting Czech-Bulgarian relationships: cultural activities and dissemination of information about Bulgaria.

**14. Association of Russian citizens in the Czech Republic.** The association is active in the area of culture and social events, it informs broader public about the culture and history of Russia.

**15. Association of Ukrainians and friends of Ukraine.** The association is focused on education and organization of cultural events.

**16. Association of Ukrainian women in the Czech Republic.** The association provides information about culture and history of Ukraine: special interest seminars, cultural events, publication activities.

**17. Slovo 21 (Word 21).** Slovo 21 actively speaks against racism through media; in addition it is active in the area of education and integration of foreigners living in the Czech Republic.

**18. Association of Volyn Czechs and their friends** (Společenství Volyňských Čechů a jejich přátel). The key activities include documentation of history of Volyn Czechs.

**19. Association of Belarus in abroad.** The association disseminates information and knowledge of Belarus. It provides legal, psychology and social assistance to Byelorussians living in the Czech Republic.

**20. Ukrainian Initiative (Ukrajinská iniciativa).** It organizes publishing of Porohy magazine. In addition it organizes cultural events (concerts, exhibitions and others) and provides consulting and translation services. This organization associates the Czech citizens of Ukraine nationality and Ukrainian citizens living in the Czech Republic.

**21. Zaedno – a civic association of Bulgarians and friends of Bulgaria.** It organizes cultural, education, information and social events of Bulgarian and multicultural topics.

Catalog of links of the civic society and their web sites

(Informace na míru v neziskovém vesmíru – Information service for NNO (NGO): [nno.ecn.cz](http://nno.ecn.cz). > Human rights > Minorities rights > Rights of ethnic and nation minorities > NGOs (not-for-profit organizations)

**1. Commission for Racial Equality (Výbor pro rasovou rovnost).** Language: English. The website of the British organization offering a direct help in UK to discriminated groups and individuals in the legal and social areas. It was established in 1976 on the basis of Race Relations Act, however it is independent of the Government. URL: <http://www.cre.gov.uk/>

**2. European bureau for lesser used languages** (Evropský úřad pro méně frekventované jazyky). Language: English. European bureau for lesser used languages (EBLUL) endeavors an active enforcing of active EU policy in favor of regional or lesser used languages and protection of language rights of minorities. URL: <http://www.eblul.org/>

**3. Ukrainians Forum in the Czech Republic (Fórum Ukrajinců v ČR).** Language: Czech, English, Russian, Ukrainian. Website of civic association of Ukrainians Forum focused on the Ukrainian minority in the Czech Republic; it organizes cultural events of Ukrainians in the Czech Republic. Selected articles from Ukrainian press and articles of Forum addressing discrimination of Ukrainians living in the Czech Republic URL: <http://www.ukraine.cz>

**4. Human Rights Action.** Language: English. Independent initiative with a seat in Chicago, with the objective of informing about breaching of human rights in Turkey and by Turkey beyond the territory of Turkey. For example it focuses on occupied Cyprus, Kurds ethnic in Turkey. Information about the war in Iraq also available on the web site. URL: <http://www.humanrightsaction.org/>

**5. Human Rights Watch.** Language: English, German, Russian, French, Spanish, other. The largest non profit, non-government organization focusing on human rights, established in 1978, based in US. It collects, processes and publishes number of information – publication about human rights adherence, its cooperates with other NNO (NGOs) in campaigns for human rights support. The website includes information according to individual countries, topics. Other offices of HRW are located in Brussels, Moscow, Hong Kong, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Washington. URL: <http://www.hrw.org>

**6. Minority Rights Group International (MRG).** Language: English. International non-government organization focusing on protection of ethnic, religious and language rights of minorities and original inhabitants around the world. It supports cooperation among

communities. It acts as a consultant to OSN - ECOSOC. As part of its activities, MRG supports communities in participation in decisions about their rights, ensuring the implementation of international norms, inclusion of rights of minorities into development policies. MRG is based in London and has a track record of more than 30 years. URL: <http://www.minorityrights.org>

**7. Civic Association Rozvoj.** Language: Czech, English, Polish. Civic association with the objective to develop programs focusing on criminality and drug prevention, creation of and organizing of cultural and educational projects for Romany community, assistance in resolving human rights and minority freedom issues of nation and ethnic minorities. URL: <http://www.rozvoj.com>

**8. Community of Slovaks in the Czech Republic** (Obec Slováků v České republice). Language: Slovak. Website of a voluntary association of citizens of Slovak nationality living in the Czech Republic and of friends of Slovakia and Slovak culture. The website includes information about the Community, overview of regional communities, Slovak clubs and magazines in the Czech Republic, Korene magazine, Slovak links. URL: <http://www.slovak.cz/>

**9. Polonica.cz.** language: Polish. Server of the Congress of Poles in the Czech Republic. Internet service about Poles for Poles in the Czech Republic. Website only in the Polish language. URL: <http://www.polonica.cz/>.

**10. Polski Związek Kultralno-Oświatowy w Republice Czeskiej** (Polský kulturně-osvětový svaz v České republice). Language: Polish. The goal of PZKO is to maintain the ethnic identity of the Polish part of inhabitants of Těšín Silesia and Poles living in the Czech Republic by a broad development of culture and education following the local cultural traditions and traditional and current values of the Polish culture. Events, articles, links. The website only in Polish, so far. URL: <http://www.pzko.cz/>

**11. Řecká obec Krnov** (Greek Community in Krnov) – city. Language: Czech, other. Association of the Greek communities in the Czech Republic is a voluntary, non-political association independent of any state or government institutions. The goal of AŘO focuses on social and nonprofit areas. URL: <http://rokm.aktualne.cz/>

**12. Řecká obec v Ostravě** (Greek Community in Ostrava) Language: Czech, other. Website of the Greek community in Ostrava. The overview of members of the Board of the Community, business activities of the Community members, information about the history, tourism in Greece and Greek winery. URL: <http://www.reckaobec.zde.cz/>

**13. Association for Bulgaria** Language: Czech, English, other. The goal of the association which is active in the Czech Republic since 2001 is to support Czech-Bulgarian relationships, education about Bulgaria and cultural activities. Since 2002, the association organizes the international competition in the best photograph of Bulgaria. The website includes information about Bulgaria and travel tips for Bulgaria, information on Czech-Bulgarian relationships, up-to-date information about life in Bulgaria, Bulgarian proverbs. URL: <http://www.bgr.cz>

**14. Assembly of Germans in Czech Lands, Moravia and Silesia.** Language: Czech, German. It is a body of the Associations of the German minority in the Czech Republic. It associates 21 independently registered Associations, it is a partner to the Office of the Czech Government. URL: <http://www.landesversammlung.cz> .

**15. Association of Hungarians living in the Czech Lands.** Language: Czech. It associates Czech citizens professing to the Hungarian nationality. It was established in 1990 in Prague with several branches in Czechia and Moravia. URL: <http://www.csmmsz.cz/>.

**16. Jewish and liberal Union in the Czech Republic.** Language: Czech, other. ŽLU associates citizens (individual members of ŽLU) and independent legal entities (collective members of ŽLU), professing to the Jewish religion, nationality or origin and who are admitted by the prospective bodies of ŽLU. The website includes links to individual Jewish communities - Bejt Praha, Bejt Holešov, Bejt Simcha;

**17. Prague Jewish Muzeum** URL: <http://www.volny.cz/zlu/>

Financed from Phare 2000 and 2001 of EU

This category is administered by: Multikulturní centrum Praha - [www.mkc.cz](http://www.mkc.cz). The creation of the Kormidlo catalogue is coordinated by the civic association contact: kormidlo@ecn.cz©2003; webhosting, webdesign, editing and publication system Toolkit, coordination -

### APPENDIX 3: PROPOSED INDICATORS: THE CZECH REPUBLIC

| Population characteristics            |                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                    |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Indicator                             | Characteristics - content                                                                                                                  | Data source                                                                                                                        |
| Ethnic diversity of the CR population | The share of the national minorities members in the CR population (in absolute figures)                                                    | Census 2001                                                                                                                        |
| Ethnic diversity of the CR population | Number of different recognised national minorities in the CR                                                                               | Data of the Council for National Minorities of the Government of the Czech Republic                                                |
| Ethnic diversity of the CR population | The share of immigrants in the CR population (permanent and long-term residence permit holders (as at December 31, 2005), absolute figures | Ministry of the interior of the CR (MI)                                                                                            |
| Ethnic diversity of the CR population | Number of different citizenship of permanent and long-term residence permit holders (as at December 31, 2005)                              | Czech Statistical Office (CZSO), MI,                                                                                               |
| Measure of foreigners' integration    | Total number of foreigners' naturalisations (absolute figures) per year                                                                    | CZSO                                                                                                                               |
| Measure of foreigners' integration    | Czech citizenship acquired per year: number, by previous citizenship                                                                       | Czech Statistical Office                                                                                                           |
| Measure of foreigners' integration    | The share of naturalized on total number of permanent residence holders                                                                    | Czech Statistical Office                                                                                                           |
| Religious diversity                   | The share of believers in the CR population                                                                                                | Census 2001                                                                                                                        |
| Religious diversity                   | Number of the recognised churches                                                                                                          | Ministry of the Culture                                                                                                            |
| Languages' diversity                  | Number of recognised mother tongues declared by nationals within census                                                                    | Census 2001                                                                                                                        |
| Languages' diversity                  | Number of individuals using particular mother tongue                                                                                       | Census 2001                                                                                                                        |
| Participation                         |                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                    |
| Local Organisation and Programmes     | Number of minorities and foreigners' associations or clubs, multi/cultural local programmes and responsible bodies                         | Ministry of the Culture, Ministry of the Interior, Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports |
| Regional Organisations and Programmes | Number of minorities and foreigners' associations or clubs, multi/cultural regional                                                        | Ministry of the Culture, Ministry of the Interior, Ministry for Labour and                                                         |

|                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                    |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                       | programmes and responsible bodies                                                                                                                                                                                               | Social Affairs, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports                                                                            |
| National Organisations and Programmes | Number of minorities and foreigners' associations or clubs, multi/cultural national programmes and responsible bodies                                                                                                           | Ministry of the Culture, Ministry of the Interior, Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports |
| <b>Education</b>                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                    |
| Education diversity                   | Number of minorities schools                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Ministry of the Culture                                                                                                            |
| Education diversity                   | Number of different national languages used in minorities education system                                                                                                                                                      | Ministry of the Culture                                                                                                            |
| Education diversity                   | The share of pupils educated in minorities schools                                                                                                                                                                              | Ministry of the Culture                                                                                                            |
| Education diversity                   | Number of school with other than Czech teaching language                                                                                                                                                                        | Ministry of the Culture                                                                                                            |
| Education diversity                   | Number of pupils/students studying in school with other than Czech teaching language                                                                                                                                            | Ministry of the Culture                                                                                                            |
| Education diversity                   | Number foreigner students in different type of curriculum (nursery schools, basic and special schools and schools established with educational institutions, secondary, higher professional, higher technical and universities) | Czech Statistical Office                                                                                                           |
| Education diversity                   | Number of prep-schools for Roma children                                                                                                                                                                                        | Ministry for Education and Sports<br>Government Office for Roma issues                                                             |
| Education diversity                   | Number of children visiting prep-schools                                                                                                                                                                                        | Ministry for Education, Youth and Sports<br>Government Office for Roma issues                                                      |
| Education diversity                   | Number of Roma school assistants                                                                                                                                                                                                | Ministry for Education and Sports                                                                                                  |
| Education diversity                   | NGO, Foundations and Churches supporting Roma education                                                                                                                                                                         | Government Office for Roma issues                                                                                                  |
| Education diversity                   | Number of compulsory multi cultural programmes at education curricula                                                                                                                                                           | Ministry for Education and Sports                                                                                                  |
| <b>Media</b>                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                    |
| Mass media diversity                  | Number of journals and newspapers published for ethnic minorities and their                                                                                                                                                     | Ministry of the Culture                                                                                                            |

|                                                                                                |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                | printings                                                                                                               |                                                                                 |
| Mass media diversity                                                                           | Number of programmes published for ethnic minorities in the public TV programmes and Radio including broadcasting times | Council of Government for minority issues                                       |
| Mass media diversity                                                                           | Number of TV and Radio consumers of programmes for minorities                                                           | Council of Government for minority issues                                       |
| Mass media diversity                                                                           | Number of multi cultural TV and Radio programmes                                                                        | Council of Government for minority issues                                       |
| Mass media diversity                                                                           | Internet, web sites for foreigners or minorities, and about foreigners or minorities                                    |                                                                                 |
| Mass media diversity                                                                           | NGOs' public relations' advertisements and medial activities                                                            |                                                                                 |
| <b>Institutional support of foreigners' integration</b>                                        |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                 |
| Concepts and programmes for foreigners' and Roma integration in different resorts (ministries) | Number of projects or grants supporting foreigners, integration                                                         | Financial support of programmes and grants                                      |
| <b>Leisure</b>                                                                                 |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                 |
| Cultural activities diversity                                                                  | Creative leisure activities of Roma children and youth                                                                  | Research results of different institutions dealing with Roma children and youth |
| Cultural activities diversity                                                                  | Receptive leisure activities of Roma children and youth                                                                 | Research results of different institutions dealing with Roma children and youth |

#### **APPENDIX 4: HYPOTHESES TESTING THE MEANING OF SOME ASPECTS OF CULTURE IN THE PROCESS OF SOCIAL INCLUSION OF ETHNIC MINORITIES**

**H 1. The political, social and cultural participation of the ethnic minorities support their social inclusion.** Testing of the hypothesis: the amount of the financial funds from the state budget for a support of the programs (programs financed by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, Ministry for Local Development, EU) supporting the participation of members of the national minority in the social, political and cultural life of the minority. Methodology: analysis of the documents (policy and programs stated in NAPS and their evaluation);

1.1 It is possible to record a substantially lower rate of disadvantaging in some or more cultural aspects of the social exclusion (education, living, employment, income and so on) with a group of members of the ethnic minorities, which had an opportunity to use and did use the projects supporting the political participation and participation in the social and cultural life of ethnic minorities (hereinafter referred to as "participation" only) than with the members of the ethnic minority, where the rate of social exclusion was comparable with the rate of social exclusion observed with these persons and they did not use this opportunity. Verification of the hypothesis: analysis of the specific projects supporting participation of the ethnic minorities in the political, social and cultural life of ethnic minorities on the national, regional and local levels (*frequency*

*and evaluation of programs of NNO, Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic, Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs and their participants; the condition of verification of the hypothesis is the empirical definition of the social exclusion in the relevant area*

1.2 The localities with the comparable rate of social exclusion (observed in the area of education, housing, employment, income and so on) recorded a significant difference after implementation of the projects supporting the participation, which was characteristic by statistically supportable improvement of the situation in the locality, where the projects of this type have been implemented. The verification of the hypothesis is conditioned by existence of the methodology for calculation of the rate of social exclusion and an empirical definition of the state of social exclusion: *the evaluation of NNO programs, or as applicable the programs of the Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic, Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs concerning the implemented programs or as applicable the observed localities;*

1.3 The programs supporting the participation take into account the situation of the target groups and the programs implemented in socially excluded communities include a corresponding number of activities concentrating on the reduction of the social exclusion in target groups. Verification of the hypothesis: finding out the rate of social exclusion of individuals from the area of target groups before and after the application of the program: *content analysis of these programs; finding out the rate of social exclusion of individuals from the area of target groups before and after application of the program*

1.4 The programs for a support of participation of the minorities are open to the same extent to all members of the ethnic minority, the possibility of participation in these activities depends on the uniform and sufficiently understandable criteria; the requirements set by these criteria are adequate to the possibilities of the ethnic minority member and do not exclude anyone in advance. The access to the decision-making and executive functions is not reduced only to a narrow part of representatives of the ethnic minority. The verification of the hypothesis is possible by finding out the rate of social exclusion of individuals from the area of target groups before and after application of the program (*content-related analysis of these programs*);

1.5 The members of the Roma communities trust their social assistant, who is a person mediating a contact between the majority and the Roma community. The confidence to the social assistant may be evaluated based on the intensity and nature of contacts of the Roma citizens themselves with this assistant. Verification of the hypothesis: the frequency of contacts of the Roma people and consultants and measurement of the social climate in municipalities with and without advisors; (*perhaps, it is given by the respective municipality, possibly by the non-profit organizations, which implement the service, which is recorded – these statistics could serve as an indicator;*)

**H 2. The education strengthens the social inclusion of the members of ethnic minorities by supporting their employment on the labor market and increasing the social prestige of the minority. Testing of the hypothesis: the amount of the funds reserved in the state budget for programs supporting educational activities of the members of ethnic minorities or facilitating the course of the educational process. Methodology: content analysis of the documents (policies and programs stated in NAP ČR or other government documents and their evaluation);**

2.1 The projects supporting the pre-school education of the Roma children facilitate their inclusion in the regular elementary schools. This reduces the risk of poor results and narrowing down of the range of educational opportunities of the Roma children after completion of their schools. Testing of the hypothesis: the Roma children, which completed the pre-school education have better results in the elementary school. Verify through the evaluation of the projects run by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports.

2.2 The programs of Roma assistants in elementary schools help towards an easier adaptation at school and towards a successful flow of the process of education and completion of the elementary education. Testing of the hypothesis: the Roma children, who attended to a class with an assistant had better results than the children, who did not have an assistant in the tuition. Verify through the evaluation of projects of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports or as applicable by a specialized research.


2.3 A higher education facilitates the integration of the Roma community members on the labor market. The work inclusion of the school and vocational school graduates is better than that of those, who completed only the elementary school or have not completed any school.


**H 3. The media support the social inclusion of ethnic minorities by mediating a dialogue between the culture of the majority and the minority cultures. Testing of the hypothesis: the amount of the financial funds used from the state budget for a support of the multicultural dialogue in the media and the funds for a support of presentation of the minority cultures and broadcasting for the minorities.**


3.1 The media presentation of the life of members of the ethnic minorities is not observed only by the members of minorities, but also by the general public, and at the same time, the media presentation does not support with minorities their effort to separate from the majority society and to concentrate exclusively on their own culture. Verification of the hypothesis: content analysis of the publicity of the public television, main periodicals, radio broadcasting? Ratings of programs, frequency of periodicals?

3.2 The majority is sufficiently informed of the life of ethnic minorities in the Czech Republic. Verification of the hypothesis: specially oriented public opinion toll;

3.3 The majority is able to accept most of the differences in the lifestyle of ethnic minorities (these differences do not include such, which would be in contradiction with the legislation of the Czech Republic). Verification of the hypothesis: specially-oriented public opinion toll.







## **APPENDIX 5: FORM OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE: SELECTED ASPECTS OF CULTURE UPON SOCIAL INCLUSION OF ETHNIC MINORITIES**

1. How do you evaluate the usefulness of clubs and associations in which the foreigners and members of the ethnic minorities organize from the point of view of their social inclusion?

|                                        |                                             |                                           |                                    |                                             |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Not useful<br><input type="checkbox"/> | Not very useful<br><input type="checkbox"/> | Rather useful<br><input type="checkbox"/> | useful<br><input type="checkbox"/> | Unable to judge<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|

2. How do you evaluate the amount of financial funds provided by the Ministry of Culture or other bodies of the state administration and self-administration to these clubs and associations?

|                                          |                                          |                                        |                                       |                                             |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| insufficient<br><input type="checkbox"/> | very limited<br><input type="checkbox"/> | sufficient<br><input type="checkbox"/> | excellent<br><input type="checkbox"/> | unable to judge<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|

3. How do you evaluate usefulness of pre-school education for children from socio-culturally disadvantaging environment (we have in mind the members of some ethnic minorities, for instance Roma people or children from the communities of foreigners) from the point of view of their future success at elementary school (preparatory classes) ?

|                                        |                                             |                                           |                                    |                                             |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Not useful<br><input type="checkbox"/> | Not very useful<br><input type="checkbox"/> | Rather useful<br><input type="checkbox"/> | useful<br><input type="checkbox"/> | Unable to judge<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|

4. How do you evaluate the amount of financial funds provided by bodies of the state administration and self-administration for administration of preparatory classes for children from socially-disadvantaged environment (members of some ethnic minorities, for instance Roma people or children from the communities of foreigners)?

|                                          |                                          |                                        |                                       |                                             |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| insufficient<br><input type="checkbox"/> | very limited<br><input type="checkbox"/> | sufficient<br><input type="checkbox"/> | excellent<br><input type="checkbox"/> | unable to judge<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|

5. What is your opinion about the influence of magazines, newspaper, radio or television programs and web pages on ethnic minorities and communities of foreigners upon their social inclusion ?

|                           |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| absolutely<br>dispensable | rather<br>unneeded       | rather<br>needed         | very<br>needed           | unable to<br>judge       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

6. How do you evaluate the amount of financial funds used from the state budget for periodicals or programs (printed, audiovisual and other electronic media) designed for members of the ethnic minorities (national and foreign communities)?

|                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| insufficient             | very<br>limited          | sufficient               | excellent                | unable<br>to judge       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |

7. In your opinion, are ethnic minorities socially excluded in the following areas at present ?

In the following questions, cross out the number of the answer, which best expresses your opinion between 1 to 5 values expressing two opposite views.

|                                                           | Definitely not           |                          |                          |                          |                          | definitely yes |  | unable<br>to judge |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--|--------------------|
|                                                           | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |                |  |                    |
| a) Access to employment                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| b) Equality in wages                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| c) Access to housing                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| d) Access to social services                              | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| e) Access to health care                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| f) Access to education                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| g) Access to legal services                               | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| h) Opportunities of political partic.                     | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| i) Opportunities of social partic.                        | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| j) Opportunities of partic. in the life of<br>of minority | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| k) Access of minority members<br>To public media          | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| l) Opportunities of sports enjoyment                      | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| m) Opportunities of cultural enjoyment                    | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |
| n) other (state)                                          | <input type="checkbox"/> |                |  |                    |

8. How in your opinion does the valid legislation and strategic documents of the Czech Republic support the processes of the social inclusion of ethnic minorities and communities of foreigners in the following areas?

|                                                     | principally<br>1         | 2                        | 3                        | negligibly<br>4          | 5                        | unable<br>to judge       |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Access to employment                             | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Equality in wages                                | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Access to housing                                | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Access to social services                        | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Access to health care                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Access to education                              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Access to legal services                         | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Opportunities of political partic.               | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Opportunities of social partic.                  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Opportunities of partic. in the life of minority | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k) Access of minority members<br>To public media    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l) Opportunities of sports enjoyment                | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| m) Opportunities of cultural enjoyment              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| n) other (state)                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> |

9. How in your opinion do the state bodies contribute (for instance by establishment of an institute of a Roma advisor) and non-profit organizations to social inclusion of ethnic minorities and the communities of foreigners in the following areas?

|                                                     | principally<br>1         | 2                        | 3                        | negligibly<br>4          | 5                        | unable to<br>judge       |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Access to employment                             | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Equality in wages                                | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Access to housing                                | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Access to social services                        | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Access to health care                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Access to education                              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Access to legal services                         | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Opportunities of political partic.               | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Opportunities of social partic.                  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Opportunities of partic. in the life of minority | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k) Access of minority members<br>To public media    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l) Opportunities of sports enjoyment                | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| m) Opportunities of cultural enjoyment              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| n) other (state)                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> |

10. What is according to your opinion, the amount of financial funds from the state budget devoted to a solution of the following problems associated with the social inclusion of ethnic minorities and communities of foreigners.

|                                                           | absolutely<br>sufficient | absolutely<br>insufficient | unable to<br>judge       |                          |                          |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                                                           | 1                        | 2                          | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |                          |
| a) Access to employment                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Equality in wages                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Access to housing                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Access to social services                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Access to health care                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Access to education                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Access to legal services                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Opportunities of political partic.                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Opportunities of social partic.                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Opportunities of partic. in the life of<br>of minority | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k) Access of minority members<br>To public media          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l) Opportunities of sports enjoyment                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| m) Opportunities of cultural enjoyment                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| n) other (state)                                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

11. What is in your opinion the effectiveness of programs supporting the social inclusion of members of ethnic minorities and communities of foreigners in the following areas:

|                                                           | very<br>effective        | absolutely<br>ineffective | unable to<br>judge       |                          |                          |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                                                           | 1                        | 2                         | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |                          |
| a) Access to employment                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Equality in wages                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Access to housing                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Access to social services                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Access to health care                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Access to education                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Access to legal services                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Opportunities of political partic.                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Opportunities of social partic.                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Opportunities of partic. in the life of<br>of minority | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k) Access of minority members<br>To public media          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l) Opportunities of sports enjoyment                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| m) Opportunities of cultural enjoyment                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| n) other (state)                                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

12. State which aspects from the area of culture have the greatest influence in prevention of the state of social exclusion:

13. Your organization is

- department or office of the state administration or self-administration
- non-state, non-profit organization
- academic office (institute)
- association or organization associating members of ethnic minorities or foreign communities living in the Czech Republic

14. Can you please state, what ethnic minority or foreign community are your answers related to?

to ..... minority  
generally to all minorities

**Thank you for your time and patience**

## **APPENDIX VI: REVIEW OF SUBSIDIARY INSTRUMENTS PROVIDING EDUCATION FOR THE ROMA COMMUNITY<sup>120</sup>**

- Instruments employed in secondary and tertiary education include e.g. scholarships which help students overcome social handicaps,
- Specialized education offered by teaching centres and the Institute of Teaching and Psychological Consulting,
- Basic schools for pupils with specific learning and behavioural disorders, basic practical schools and special basic schools which educate children from socio-culturally disadvantaged environments in accordance with individual education plans.

Other measures are designed (or their implementation is expected) to achieve the following results (more information can be found in chapter V / 1.6):

- to increase the number of pre-school education places in order to pre-empt the problem of low school attendance (a high percentage of children commence compulsory education unprepared which has a negative impact on later academic performance),
- to intensify support for and the promotion of preparatory classes and the position of tutor - education assistant with the aim of expanding such forms of equalizing action systematically in places where Roma pupils display educational problems and where preparatory classes and the position of tutor - education assistant have not yet been established,
- to increase funding and the use of education assistants,
- to support the transformation of the basic school system and to enhance its ability to maintain within the educational mainstream children from socio-culturally disadvantaged environments (with respect to the university training and further education of teachers),
- to provide general multicultural education and special teacher training which will include a compulsory minimum knowledge of the Roma community, the Roma language and culture, and the specifics of communicating with Roma parents,
- to offer the opportunity to become acquainted with the Roma language through free language classes which would acquaint Roma children and adults and other interested parties with traditional Roma culture, literature and history,
- to prepare textbooks, including teaching manuals for teachers, for such classes,
- to allocate funds for such activities to schools in the form of grants based on submitted projects,
- to establish good relations between Roma and other pupils and to support mutual tolerance and multicultural education which must be reflected throughout the whole curriculum even at schools which have no Roma students,
- to improve communication between parents and the school (attendance of courses, school plays, sports contests, exhibitions etc.) in order to improve parental assistance for their children (or at least not to hinder their children) in their homework which in turn should improve the academic performance of Roma pupils at school,
- to educate those adults who, as a result of past socio-cultural deprivation, only attended special schools or dropped out of basic school earlier than in the ninth grade thus closing the door to further education; to create courses for such adults or to promote existing courses

---

<sup>120</sup> The Roma Integration Policy Concept, p. 18-21.

more actively and to direct courses more towards skills that can be applied in the labour market,

- to ensure that more Roma children and juveniles placed in institutional and protective care facilities grow up, if possible, in adoptive families or are involved in foster care in these facilities (or at least in family-type facilities) and
- to enable socially handicapped students, including Roma students, to undergo secondary, tertiary and university education (The programme for the support of Roma secondary and tertiary professional school students described in chapter V / 1.6 and an analogical programme that would provide the same assistance for university students); to allocate funding for such programmes.


Other nationwide Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport programmes are implemented in accordance with Government Regulation No. 98/2002 Coll. determining the conditions and method of provision of state budget subsidies for the activities of members of national minorities and in support of the integration of the Roma community.

**T a b l e 1: Funding for the three-year project “All day programme school” for Roma children and other children from socio-culturally disadvantaged environments**

| Grant                               | 2003      |           | 2004      |        | 2005      |        | Total     |         |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|-----------|---------|
|                                     | CZK       | EUR       | CZK       | EUR    | CZK       | EUR    | CZK       | EUR     |
| Elementary school Brno              | 362 000   | 12 701,75 | 460 000   | 16 140 | 300 000   | 10 526 | 1 122 000 | 39 368  |
| Elementary school Prague            | 297 000   | 10 421,05 | 450 000   | 15 789 | 390 000   | 13 684 | 1 137 000 | 39 895  |
| Elementary school Ostrava (all day) | 260 000   | 9 122,81  | 250 000   | 8 772  | 110 000   | 3 860  | 620 000   | 21 754  |
| Elementary school Ústí nad Labem    | 570 000   | 20 000,00 | 450 000   | 15 789 | 210 000   | 7 368  | 1 230 000 | 43 158  |
| Total                               | 1 489 000 | 52 245,61 | 1 610 000 | 56 491 | 1 010 000 | 35 439 | 4 109 000 | 144 175 |

Source MSMT

## APPENDIX VII. MODEL OF ROMA EDUCATION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION



## REFERENCES

1. Kulturní politika , Ministerstvo kultury, Praha, 2001
2. Zpráva o situaci národnostních menšin v České republice za rok 2004, Úřad vlády České republiky Sekretariát Rady vlády pro národnostní menšiny, Praha 2005
3. Koncepce romské integrace 2004, Rada vlády ČR pro záležitosti romské komunity
4. Koncepce integrace cizinců v roce 2005 (aktualizovaná koncepce integrace cizinců), MPSV, 2006
5. Prevence prostorové segregace; Luděk Sýkora a Jana Temlová, PFUK, MMR, Praha 2005
6. Migrace v roce 2004 základní migrační trendy v evropském kontextu, Analytická studie, Úřad vlády pro zahraniční styky a informace, Praha 2005
7. Faktory sociálního vyloučení, Petr Mareš, VÚPSV Praha, výzkumné centrum Brno, 2006
8. Hodnocení Vládního programu podpory terénní sociální práce v sociálně vyloučených romských komunitách (hodnoty a fakta), Jiří Winkler Ivana Šimková ; VÚPSV Praha výzkumné centrum Brno, 2005
9. MPSV(2004):NAP 2004-2006, pp. 53-56 czech version, pp. 61-64
10. Vláda ČR (2004): Informace o plnění usnesení vlády týkajících se integrace romských komunit a aktivního postupu státní správy při uskutečňování opatření přijatých těmito usneseními ke dni 31. prosince 2003. [online] dostupný na: <http://wtd.vlada.cz/scripts/detail.php?id=6207>
11. Vláda ČR (2005): Zpráva o stavu romských komunit v České republice 2004 [online]. Dostupný na <http://wtd.vlada.cz/vrk/vrk.htm>
12. RAXEN National Focal Point for The Czech Republic (2004): Roma in public Education. 2004 [online]. dostupný na: <http://www.clovekvtisni.cz/download/pdf/24.pdf>.
13. Vláda ČR (2004): Informace o plnění usnesení vlády týkajících se integrace romských komunit a aktivního postupu státní správy při uskutečňování opatření přijatých těmito usneseními ke dni 31. prosince 2003. [online] dostupný na: <http://wtd.vlada.cz/scripts/detail.php?id=6207>
14. Zjišťování národnosti ve sčítání lidu, domů a bytů v období 1921- 2001, ČSÚ, [www.czso.cz](http://www.czso.cz)
15. Rada Českého rozhlasu (2006): Výroční zpráva Rady Českého rozhlasu o činnosti Českého rozhlasu za rok 2005. [online] Dostupný na [http://www.rozhlas.cz/rada/dokumenty/\\_zprava/236122](http://www.rozhlas.cz/rada/dokumenty/_zprava/236122)
16. Hodnocení projektů zaměřených na snižování rizika sociálního vyloučení romské populace, část I, typologie projektů; Pavel Navrátil, Ivana Šimková, VÚPSV, výzkumné centrum Brno, únor 2002
17. Hodnocení programů zaměřených na snižování rizika sociálního vyloučení romské komunity, evaluace programů; Ivana Šimková, Pavel Navrátil, Jiří Winkler, VÚPSV Praha, výzkumné centrum Brno, 2004
18. Analýza vývoje zaměstnanosti a nezaměstnanosti v roce 2005, MPSV 2006-08-08
19. Zpráva o stavu romských komunit v České republice; Rada vlády pro záležitosti romské komunity, 2004, [www.vlada.cz](http://www.vlada.cz)
20. Monitoring of effectiveness of Roma preparatory classes. Prague: MŠMT.
21. Nová Škola (1997). The Romani Education Programme of the New School Foundation, Patrin Web Journal, <http://www.geocities.com/Paris/5121/romaeducation.htm>.Quoted in

- Needs Assessment Study for the Roma Education Fund Background Paper. Czech Republic. Paris: Roma Education Fund 2004.
22. Nová škola (2003): Podpora integrace Romů v základním vzdělávání, Výzkumná zpráva, [http://www.mkc.cz/download/Phare\\_zpravavyzkum\\_phare.doc](http://www.mkc.cz/download/Phare_zpravavyzkum_phare.doc). quoted in Needs Assessment Study for the Roma Education Fund Background Paper. Czech Republic. Paris: Roma Education Fund 2004.
23. Roma Education Fund (2004): Needs Assessment Study for the Roma Education Fund (2004) Background Paper. Czech Republic. Paris: Roma Education Fund.
24. PHARE (2000): Education methodology to support Roma pupils. National programme PHARE 2000, Czech Republic CZ 00-02-03, Support of Roma integration – Improving Quality of Roma Education.