Ethnic and Linguistic Communities in the Czech Republic:

Their Situations and Language Problems

Jiří Nekvapil, Marián Sloboda and Peter Wagner

Country Report

Praha

2007

Contents

1. General Introduction of Minority Communities

1.1. Socio-Demographic and Linguistic Profile

1.1.1. Overall Census Figures

On the whole, the Czech Republic is by no means a homogenous society. Even at the present time, having been given the opportunity to identify their preferred ethnic association in the census, close to ten per cent of the population select a category other than "Czech". This survey will, however, demonstrate that had the count been taken a few decades earlier, when the process of assimilation was relatively undeveloped, the heterogeneity of the country would have been significantly higher than it currently is. This original situation still survives in the memory of the older members of the communities.

Figures in Table 1 represent responses to the 1991 and 2001 census questionnaire about the respondents' ethnicity (*národnost*). In Czech the question was: *uveďte národnost, ke které se hlásíte*. This was an open-ended question. The Instructions for filling in the census form emphasized that this self-categorization is independent of the person's 'mother tongue'

and the language he or she normally speaks. Although most respondents were expected to understand Czech, the Organizing Committee took account of the fact that speakers of other languages might complete the questionnaires and prepared them in 10 additional languages (though not in Slovak, cf. part 3.2. for possible reasons). The English translation of the question about ethnicity was 'indicate what nationality you consider yourself to be.' Since this question came after a question about the respondent's "citizenship", those who used the English questionnaire most probably wondered why the same question was asked twice, but some of them may have figured out that "nationality" meant "ethnic background". The French questionnaire suffered from the same translation problem and the German one, using the word *Nationalität* may also have presented problems to respondents who were not used to the idiom of the former communist regime. The Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, Chinese, Vietnamese and Romani questionnaires conveyed the same meaning as the Czech one. The 'mother tongue' (see Table 2) was defined as the language used in childhood by mother or other principal caretaker. Respondents were free to report more than one ethnicity or mother tongue. In the 2001 census foreigners were included if they possessed a permanent or long-term visa, but the 1991 census form covered only permanent residents. In 1991 the Czechoslovak Republic was still in existence but the Table 1 only reports data for the territory of the present day Czech Republic.

Table 1: Responses to ethnicity from 1991 and 2001 census

Ethnicity	1991		2001	
	Number	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Czech	8,363,768	81.2%	9,249,777	90.4%
Moravian	1,362,313	13.2%	380,474	3.7%
Slovak	314,877	3.1%	193,190	1.9%
Polish	59,383	0.6%	51,968	0.5%
German	48,556	0.5%	39,106	0.4%
Silesian	44,446	0.4%	10,878	0.1%
Roma	32,903	0.3%	11,746	0.1%
Hungarian	19,932	0.2%	14,672	0.1%
Ukrainian	8,220	0.1%	22,112	0.2%
Russian	5,062	0.1%	12,369	0.1%
Bulgarian	3,487	0.0%	4,363	0.0%
Greek	3,379	0.0%	3,219	0.0%
Ruthenian (Rusyn)	1,926	0.0%	1,106	0.0%
Rumanian	1,034	0.0%	1,238	0.0%
Vietnamese	421	0.0%	17,462	0.2%
Austrian	413	0.0%	-	-
Jewish	218	0.0%	-	-
Serbian	-	-	1,801	0.0%
Croatian	-	-	1,585	0.0%
Albanian	-		690	0.0%
Other	9,860	0.1%	26,499	0.3%
Undeclared	22,017	0.2%	172,827	1.7%
In total	10,302,215	100%	10,230,060	100%

Sources: Czech Statistical Office (1993, 1994, www.czso.cz).

Table 1 cannot be simply accepted as the 'accurate picture' of the ethnic composition of the population without a commentary. Answers to the census question correspond to the individual's sociocultural management with regard to his/her ethnicity and this management reflects the interests and power relationships within Czech society. For example, respondents themselves evaluate their own ethnic categories negatively or expect that they would be evaluated negatively by others. The result is a process of adjustment during which they self-categorize (or are being categorized) differently than in other situations with the expectation that they can, in that way, escape membership in a less powerfull social group.[1]

1.1.2. Distance between the Communities

It is also necessary to realize that different degrees of sociocultural distance obtain between various communities such as those in Table 1. Basically four groups may be distinguished:

(1) The Western group (e.g. North Americans or Germans newly arrived from Germany) that is characterized by higher incomes and managerial status. Their numbers are small and they do not appear prominently in Table 1.
(2) The Central European group: the Czechs, Moravians, Silesians, Germans (the local community), Poles, Slovaks, and Hungarians. There is little sociocultural difference among these groups.
(3) The Peripheral group, that comprises the Ukrainians, Russians, Armenians, and communities originating in the Balkans.
(4) The Outer group (the Roma, the Vietnamese, the Chinese, the Mongolians, etc.). These communities show considerable sociocultural differences.

This distance translates into status and other power relations between the communities and in view of this the differences may project into language management and must be taken into consideration.

1.1.3. Types and Size of the Ethnic Communities

The largest community is, of course, the Czech one, with its Moravian and Silesian branches which, while not accounting for the whole population of Moravia and Silesia, do in many respects claim a somewhat separate identity. Furthermore, the figures often given for the Czech community include a number of less than whole-hearted members: those who were afraid (socially, not politically) to declare other membership, those who changed their declaration recently and those who hesitated because of mixed allegiance. Not many (altogether 12,978) used the opportunity, given in the census, to claim plural ethnicity. Since membership is always a matter of degree and situation (see Nekvapil, 2000b), the Czech community, in particular, cannot be seen as entirely homogeneous. Moreover, there are differences of interests and power within the community.

Some communities can be designated as historical. The German community is the most representative of these, although its numbers have definitely been declining. Discrimination lasted for decades, and it seems too late now to restore the community at least to its post-WWII structure. The only historical community that is continuing its efforts for maintenance is the Polish community in the Těšín region; but its numbers are declining as

---

[1] Note that the numbers of Roma and Romani speakers as displayed in the Census is disputed *radically* both by the Roma organizations and Czech authorities, experts in demography and ethnologists. Using various indicators, the Roma population is estimated to be 200-300 thousand and the number of Romani speakers 100 thousand (for more detail see the section 3.3. on Roma community below).

well. The Roma were a historical community before the extermination of the Czech Roma in concentration camps during WWII; the contemporary Roma are immigrants from Slovakia. So are the Slovaks. Other groups are immigrant as well, except for the Germans-from-Germany, Anglo-Americans and some other expatriate communities whose members are sojourners.[2]

One of the specific features of the Czech situation seems to be that, apart from the Roma and the Slovaks, there are no really large communities. There is no clear boundary between middle sized and small communities and for some of them virtually no reliable data are available.

1.1.4. The Phenomenon of Assimilation

The most prominent feature of the non-Czech communities is their high degree of assimilation. There was political and social pressure in the case of Germans and, no doubt, social pressure in the case of others. The ideology of the Communist Party expected assimilation. However, there is no evidence of strong overt pressure toward giving up one's ethnic identity in recent history, and the dominant status of the Czech language is not fixed by law (Frištenská & Sulitka, 1995, p. 20). This fact notwithstanding, all communities in the Czech Republic do assimilate.

The basic factor in assimilation seems to be the fact that Czech society, until the political changes of 1989 and beyond, has been a Modern, rather than a Post-Modern society. Unlike an Early-Modern society, such as that of 19th century Europe, Modern society is deeply assimilative without exerting much overt pressure (Neustupný, 2006). Assimilation is expected: both by the matrix community and by other, minority, communities. It is not necessarily viewed as a tragic event. Members of many communities in the Czech Republic assimilate silently and, so to speak, "voluntarily".

The wave of the Post-Modern multiculturalist ideology arrived only in the 1990s and, in our view, has not yet fully established itself. The European Union requires that candidates for membership subscribe to it. In the Czech Republic, a new Minority Act was adopted in 2001 and active policy-making both preceded and followed it (see below). An inspection of the relevant documents reveals a willingness to comply. On the other hand, there is some doubt whether this willingness is genuine (is it in other countries?) and whether it is matched by changes in the consciousness of the general population.

1.1.5. Interests and Power

When observed historically the questions of interests and of power vary extensively. In relation to German community, it is notable that in some periods the power of the Czech majority asserted itself, but there were long historical stretches, such as that of Hapsburg rule (mainly from the 17th century to 1918) and of the wartime occupation of Czechoslovakia (1939-1945) when the interests of the German community, with the active assistance of external German states, absolutely prevailed. It is necessary to realize that, in the mid-20th century, people still remembered the Austro-Hungarian Empire not as a fairy tale kingdom under a benevolent Kaiser but as a stage for the struggle among ethnic interests and the struggle for power. It was obvious that the Czechs were the underdogs, with the German element retaining its privileges by using the support of the economic establishment and the

---

[2] According to the Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic (The Directorate of the Alien and Border Police) the number of long-term or permanently residing foreigners in the Czech Republic in June 2006 was 295,955: 93,466 from Ukraine, 54,201 from Slovakia, 38,566 from Vietnam, 18,386 from Poland, 16,910 from Russia, 8,116 from Germany, 5,352 from Moldavia, 4,610 from Bulgaria, 3,928 from the USA, 3,790 from China, etc.

Vienna dominated state. The first period of the Czechoslovak Republic (1918-1939) reversed the situation to some extent. However, the interests of the German community and of other minorities were safeguarded through international pressure. Nevertheless, the situation did not appear to the German community as satisfying its interests, which were seen in the context of the Modern paradigm as unification with bordering Germany and Austria. This unification was achieved through the Munich Agreement of 1938 which dictated that large territories be handed over by Czechoslovakia to Germany. The occupation of the remaining part of Czechoslovakia by Germany followed in 1939, and the ensuing period of terror is still vividly remembered by many Czechs.

The post-war period saw the reversal of the power relationship when, in the interest of removing the ethnic problem, Czechoslovakia deported over 2 million Germans. In the immediate postwar period, the memory of the war led to social stigmatization of those Germans who were not deported and of the German language. In addition, owing to the deportation of the Germans, the German interests within the society became indistinct. The fact that two German States existed and one of them was in very friendly relations with the Communist government of Czechoslovakia, made the exercise of overt political power against the Germans and German difficult. It remains to be ascertained whether the assimilation of the Germans in the 1970s and 1980s was still due to the negative attitudes of the matrix society. At present, the prestige of Germany is high, and discrimination hardly exists. Still, the community continues shrinking.

The problem of interests of the Těšín Polish community has also been connected with international relations. While Czechoslovakia was strong, the power of the Czechoslovak state prevailed. With its weakening at the end of 1930s, Poland occupied the Těšín region, but the situation returned to the domination of Czech interests after WWII. Since then, the Czech state has been careful not to initiate assimilative measures, but assimilation proceeded automatically as a process characteristic for a Modern society.

In the case of the Slovak community, Slovak interests were not safeguarded before WWII. This was one of the reasons why the Slovaks established their own state in 1939 which, however, had a short duration. Under the cover of Communist State control, ethnic problems appeared to be basically solved, although from time to time voices of protest were heard from the Slovak side. Slovak politicians held the opinion that their interests were not adequately served within the power structure of the Czechoslovak federation. The political party of the future Slovak premier minister Mečiar proposed a confederative system that was unacceptable for the Czech politicians, who offered either a federation or a separation of the two states (Rychlík, 2002: 280-284). A compromise was reached with the latter solution, and in 1993, the federation disintegrated, without a referendum. At present, the situation of the Slovak community in the Czech Republic seems to be satisfactory, although continuing assimilation requires detailed analysis of the underlying power relationships.

The Roma have been the most strongly affected population. Their interests have been neglected, as there is no international background power holder. After a short time of political awareness right after the end of the communist system, an organized political representation has formed, but subsequently lost its meaning and voter's support. Today the situation is ambiguous: Roma are named into minority related ruling bodies on local, district and national level, partially due to national and international legislation. On the other hand, Roma ethnicity ceases to be a recommended factor for the choice of actors in the integration process (streetworkers, teacher's assistants – former Roma assistants), and work is being done by "better qualified" Czechs.

1.1.6. What to Do?

On the surface, the ethnic situation in the Czech Republic seems to be well managed, with the exception of the Roma and some parts of the Polish community. There is no overt ethnic conflict. In fact, however, antagonism does exist, and may intensify, especially as Czech society immerges further into the Post-Modern era. For example, the question of schooling in native languages is likely to emerge. It is important not to succumb to the view that social problems can be totally eliminated through the action of a benevolent State. On the other hand, there is a need for the State to improve its management tools, and for the subjects of those policies to exert pressure within the State.

1.1.7. Linguistic Profile of the Country

Overall, the Czech Republic is not only a multicultural but also a multilingual country. Although figures available from the 2001 census (see Table 2) reflect only the declared 'mother tongue', not the languages actually used in daily communication, there can be no doubt concerning this claim.

Table 2: Mother tongue in the 2001 census

Mother tongue	Population	%
Czech	9,707,397	94.9
Slovak	208,723	2.0
Polish	50,738	0.5
German	41,328	0.4
Romani	23,211	0.2
Russian	18,746	0.2
English	3,791	<0.1
Other	99,258	1.0
Not declared	76,868	0.8
Total	10,230,060	100.0

Source: Czech Statistical Office, www.czso.cz.

Table 2 shows that, in the 2001 census, 522,663 people reported a 'mother tongue' other than Czech. This represents 5.1% of the target population. However, if we accept that some respondents failed to report their real 'mother tongue' as defined in the Instructions to census questionnaires (cf. part 1.1.1), it is probable that more than 6% of the inhabitants possess a close relationship with a language other than Czech.

1.1.8. Types of Languages

The largest non-Czech 'mother tongue' declared in the census was Slovak. Romani probably comes second (see Note 1), followed by Polish and German which were declared as 'mother tongue' by 51,000 and 41,000 people respectively, and Vietnamese which may be hidden in the category 'other' in the Table 2. Other languages are represented by smaller populations.

   With regard to their provenance, two languages have been at home in the Czech lands for centuries, or even longer: German and Polish. Romani is a special case in that the Roma have lived in the territory since the 15th century, but the bulk of the Roma who live in the

Republic now are migrants from the East. The other languages also arrived recently. Slovak, Hungarian, Ruthenian, Ukrainian and Russian came from the East; Croatian (in 16th century), Serbian, Albanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian and Greek came from the South. From still further East, the territory experienced the Kalmyck impact after World War I (Nekvapil & Neustupný, 1998), and in the second half of the century the arrival of the Vietnamese and Chinese languages (the latter unaccounted for in this study). A language that came from the West is English. This range of languages includes many Slavic languages which provide the challenge of the possible use of Haugen's *semicommunication* as a means of language management.[3] The rich linguistic variety of the territory is further enriched by languages such as Hungarian, Greek or Vietnamese – languages that are linguistically very distant from Czech and pose a question about the ways in which they can be developed as a resource by their hosts: will they be lost or will they be retained, both for their value as human experience and for their future economic potential (Clyne, 1991)? It is recommended that the latter path be selected, as it has been already done with Modern Greek to some extent, to prevent the need to build up the competence de novo at considerable cost.

Almost all of the languages represented in the territory of the Czech Republic have their center of gravity abroad. However, there are at least two which do not serve as national languages in other countries. One of them is Romani, which is not a national language anywhere. Noone seems to care about Romani. The other language is Ruthenian, which has only just started to appear as a codified minority language in Slovakia.

1.1.9. Maintenance and Shift

Throughout this study will be shown that language shift towards Czech is on the move. While communities may still retain their sense of ethnic identity (although there is a shift there as well), linguistically they assimilate at a high pace. This is a shame - both because the cultural and linguistic variety is impoverished, and because functional resources are lost. It is the Czech society that should stand up and try to stop the deprivation of its own linguistic environment.

However, communities and individuals who wish to assimilate should be given the right to pursue their intent. Language is not only a symbol of ethnic identity; it is also a symbol of social stability, cultured living and relative economic prosperity. While for many immigrants from the East and South their language represents their ethnic identity, Czech is a symbol of stability, culture and prosperity for them. Language managers should be prepared to provide advise to the communities and individuals about the deep motives for their language management decisions. When a community or an individual decides not to maintain its language, do they simply support the interests of the Czech matrix community, or do they act in their own interest? And how can they empower themselves to carry through what they decide to do?

1.2. Ethnic, Language and Education Policy of the State, Legal Matters

The problems of ethnic communities were not given adequate attention in the 1990s, but the situation has changed since the beginning of the present century. It is in particular the question of the entry of the Czech Republic into the EU that has played a key role in the change of heart of the Czech government. However, the change of the government, from conservative to social democratic, may also have contributed to the transformation in the atmosphere.

---

[3] On the concept of semicommunication see Note 10.

In 2005, 261 million Czech Crowns (8.7 mil. €) have been spent from the national budget to support minorities, according to the key reproduced in Table 3 (Zpráva, 2006: 53 and app. 6). Minority languages are also taken into consideration through the general intention to increase foreign language facilities (mainly affecting the so-called 'world languages,' i.e. English, French, etc.). The 'National Plan for Foreign Language Teaching' (Ministry of Education, 2005a) supports production and application of methodic materials and publications for education in minority languages. (For more details on education see part 2 below.)

Table 3: State financial support for ethnic minorities (2005)

Program	expenses (mil. CZK)	expenses (ths. €*)
Cultural activities	17.9	600
Publishing on a regular base	30.0	1,000
Education in minority languages	8.1	270
Multicultural education	6.1	200
Diverse Roma integration programs (culture and education)	16.6	550
Support for Roma assistants	1.9	60
Social and political measures for Roma inclusion	114.7	3,800
Reconstruction of a Polish school building	65.0	2,200
TOTAL	**260.6**	**8,690**

* Acc. to Czech National Bank course by 07/01/2005.

1.2.1. The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the Ethnic Minority Law

In 1997 the Czech Republic ratified The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, and in 2001 the Act on the Rights of Members of National Minorities (N. 273/2001 Coll.; the Minority Act for short) was passed in the CR. These two legal norms constitute the basis for the protection and promotion of the following ethnic minorities by the Czech state: Bulgarian, Croatian, German, Greek, Hungarian, Polish, Roma, Russian, Ruthenian (Rusyn), Serbian, Slovak, and Ukrainian. It is important to note that the Minority Act accepts the existence of minority groups as primary and derives the concept of its members from there. This is in opposition to the way of thinking of the previous conservative government which claimed that all rights were rights of the individual and not group rights (Frištenská & Sulitka, 1995).

The protection and promotion involves a number of linguistic aspects of the life of the above ethnic groups. Out of the eleven rights which the members of these groups are guaranteed by the Minority Act, seven concern language: (1) the right to use one's name and surname in the language of a national minority,[4] (2) the right to multilingual names and denominations, (3) the right to use the language of a national minority in official documentation and discourse and hearing before a court, (4) the right to use the language of a national minority during elections, (5) the right to education in the language of a national minority, (6) the right to develop the culture of members of national minorities (including

---

[4] The official documents, not only Czech but also European, tend to use the term "national" rather than "ethnic" in this compound lexeme. Accordingly, in this survey we use both terms as synonyms, preferring "national" in official contexts and "ethnic" in non-official ones.

maintenance and development of the language), and (7) the right to spread and receive information in the language of a national minority. These extensive guarantees are further supported by other laws, such as the Education Act of 2004 (N. 561/2004 Coll.) or the Code of Administrative Procedure (N. 500/2004 Coll.) from the same year.[5] Certainly, this is a positive development – nevertheless, it should be noted that these guarantees apply only to the *citizens* of the Czech Republic. In the Czech legal system the definitions of the terms "national minority" and "a member of national minority" involve Czech citizenship as one of the primary criteria. According to the Minority Act (Article 2):

> A national minority is a community of citizens of the Czech Republic who live on the territory of the present Czech Republic and as a rule differ from other citizens in terms of their common ethnic origin, language, culture and traditions; they represent a minority of citizens and at the same time they show their will to be considered a national minority for the purpose of common efforts to preserve and develop their own identity, language and culture and at the same time express and preserve interests of their community that has been historically formed.

This approach to the minorities represents a rather peculiar interpretation of The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, which derives from the absence of a definition of a minority in the Convention. In its 2005 Report the Advisory Committee on The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities therefore recommends the Czech state not to treat the criterion as absolute, and to extend the protection and support also to those inhabitants residing in the Czech Republic who do not meet the criterion of Czech citizenship.[6] This applies in particular to the large Vietnamese community, whose status poses a problem even to some Czech officials.[7] In contrast, all the members of the Greek ethnic community, even those who do *not* have Czech citizenship (69% in 1991, Czech Statistical Office, 1994: table C. 155/4), are *de facto* included in and treated as the 'Greek minority'.

1.2.2. European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages

As noted by Gáfrik (2006), the Czech Republic adopted a rather reserved approach to the Charter. The Czech Republic signed the Charter in the year 2000; however it was not until 2006 that the Czech Parliament approved of its ratification and the president's signature completed the whole process. By way of comparison, Hungary ratified the Charter as early as 1995 (it was one of the first countries of the Council of Europe to do so), Slovakia in 2001. On the other hand, due to the slow progress, the Czech state committed itself through the

---

[5] For more detail see Dovalil (2007).

[6] Cf. www.coe.int/T/E/human_rights/minorities/.

[7] When the *Report on the Situation of National Minorities in the Czech Republic for 2005* was being prepared, the Government Council for National Minorities addressed several questions to the representatives of Local and Regional Assemblies. One of these questions was: "In your opinion, what effect will the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages have on public life in your administrative district?" The Karlovy Vary (or Carlsbad) Region provided the following answer: "A clear specification and approach to European rules will definitely benefit the integration of national minorities, and therefore definitions are necessary in the fields of education, judicial authorities and the right to an interpreter, relations with public authorities, the mass media, culture, etc.; in our region it mainly concerns German, Vietnamese, and to some extent Slovak." It is symptomatic that the Government Council attached a footnote with the following statement to the Karlovy Vary Region's answer: 'This is an inaccurate interpretation; obligations under the Charter do not apply to the languages of migrants (i.e. in this case Vietnamese)' (see Zpráva 2006: 110). Obviously, the Vietnamese do not constitute a national minority for the experts (a national minority being an 'etic' category), even though they are regarded as one by ordinary people (a national minority as an 'emic' category).

Charter to take only the measures actually arising from the laws already in force (the 2004 Education Act in particular), and partly in operation in everyday life.[8] The Czech Republic committed itself to the protection and promotion of four languages only: Slovak, Polish, German and Romani. The provisions of Part II of the Charter (a lower and rather general degree of promotion and protection) will be applied to all these languages, while some of the provisions of Part III of the Charter (a higher and very concrete degree of promotion and protection) will be applied to Slovak and Polish only. In comparison, Hungary provides protection and promotion based on the provisions of Part II of the Charter to 14 languages, and applies the provisions of Part III of the Charter to 6 languages; Slovakia applies the Part III provisions to as many as 9 languages. The low number of languages protected by the Charter in the Czech Republic is in sharp contrast with the much higher number of minorities (and therefore also languages, although the correlation is not universal) supported on the basis of the Czech Minority Act from 2001 (the ratio is 4 to 12). In order to justify the reduction, some of the arguments the Czech state has used have been rather purpose-driven: it claims that Bulgarian, Hungarian, Rusyn, Serbian and Ukrainian cannot be protected on the basis of the Charter because they are not traditional or historical minority languages, their use being tied to the migratory processes *as recent as* the 1920s (Jirasová, Pospíšil and Sulitka, 2005). Note, however, that the reasons why the minorities using the above mentioned languages are protected on the basis of the Czech Minority Act include the fact that each of them constitutes a 'community that has been historically formed' (see above).

Let us add some remarks concerning the languages protected by the Charter. The higher degree of promotion and protection arising from Part III of the Charter applies to Slovak on the whole territory of the Czech Republic and to Polish in two districts of the Moravian-Silesian region (Těšín Silesia) inhabited by approximately 50 thousand Poles. 41 provisions are applied to Polish, 37 to Slovak.[9] While most of the provisions for Polish relate to education and judicial authorities, those for Slovak concern mostly judicial organs, administrative authorities and public services. This is due to the fact that there has long been a highly developed system of Polish schools in the territory of Těšín Silesia while the Slovaks do not have a single primary or secondary school in the whole Czech Republic, preferring to attend Czech schools instead (see below). The high number of provisions applied to Slovak in the area of contact with administrative authorities (typically, Article 10 (1.a.v.) or Article 10 (3.c.)) relies on the receptive bilingualism in communication between Czechs and Slovaks.[10] This type of bilingualism is presupposed also by the Czech legislative norms passed long after the division of Czechoslovakia in 1993. For instance, according to the Code of Administrative Procedure (N. 500/2004 Coll., Article 16 (1)) from 2004, 'The procedure shall be conducted and the deeds shall be effectuated in the Czech language. The parties to the procedure can act and deeds can be submitted also in the Slovak language.' However, there have been doubts recently concerning such bilingual competence of the Czech inhabitants, and the young generation in particular. The ratification of the Charter by the Czech Republic could therefore

---

[8] As the representatives of a small village of Vendryně aptly put it: 'The ratification of the Charter will only confirm what has already been working in the village naturally' (Zpráva 2006:79).

[9] It should be mentioned here that specific provisions which the Czech state should undertake to apply in accordance with the Charter were proposed only by the representatives of the Polish minority. The other eleven acknowledged minorities, that is, those represented in the Government Council for National Minorities, did not take this opportunity (see Zpráva 2006: 5).

[10] This phenomenon and the related ones have been referred to by various terms. Emphasizing that this mode of communication is valuable though not without problems, Haugen (1966) introduced the term 'semicommunication' to describe the uses of Danish, Norwegian and Swedish in situations in which each speaker continues speaking his/her own language. Another example of semicommunication suggested by Haugen is the communication between Czechs and Slovaks or Czechs and Poles. Others call such mode of communication polyglottic dialogue or model (see van Els 2006: 226).

serve as an impulse to resume systematic cultivation of the Czech-Slovak receptive bilingualism in the Czech society. The question remains as to why German and Romani are protected only on the basis of the provisions of Part II of the Charter (i.e. the lower degree of protection). In the case of German, the reason is the considerable dispersal of the German community which hinders the full exploitation of a number of language rights (as apparent e.g. in the area of education). As will be shown below, the position of German in the Czech society, however, is only loosely tied to the disappearing German minority in the CR, characterized by a high degree of assimilation and adverse age composition.[11] As far as Romani is concerned, in the expository report the authors of the Charter themselves use it as an example of a non-territorial language, i.e. a language difficult to promote by applying the provisions specified in Part III of the Charter. Moreover, in the Czech Republic there is no tradition of Roma education and the elaboration of Romani is restricted (a number of areas of language for special purposes are missing).

In the Roma case, a restriction to the exercise of the Charter is given indirectly. The local application of the regulations (e.g. the right to educate children in the minority language) is granted in communities, where an ethnic committee is established. This is obligatory in communities, where at least 10% of the local population pertains to any minority, "according to the previous census" (Community law, §117). Taking into consideration the high resulting underestimation rate (of 15 to 20) presented by both last two census, an effective language protection is taking place at sites, where

- the actual rate by far exceeds this threshold quantity, resulting in the needed formal 10%,
- on a local level more inhabitants accidentally declared the respective ethnicity,
- the coincidential existence of other ethnic minorities enables to pass over the 10% limit, or
- an ethnic committee is established voluntarily.

1.2.3. Language Cultivation

There is no evidence of language cultivation activities for any language other than Czech. This is not detrimental to the languages if they have a centre abroad which supports such cultivation. In fact, most community languages in the Czech Republic are branches of languages that are national languages in other states. However, since these languages are "isolated" (Vašek, 1976) branches in the Czech Republic, there is a need to give thought to the special features that arise under the conditions of such isolation. At present, this problem is no one's responsibility and the current cultivation theory barely pays any attention to the fact that the language, i.e. the object of cultivation, is used in a multilingual environment (Nekvapil 2007b). Moreover, in many instances, the community languages and their uses have not been given attention even at the level of description.

A language that is in urgent need of elaboration, not through committees but in actual use, is Romani. But apart from supporting modest literary production of the community, the State has done little indeed to activate networks in which such elaboration (as well as maintenance) could take place.

---

[11] Nevertheless, the Charter could perform a positive role also in the everyday life of the German community as shown by the representatives of the village of Krásno in their statement: "The use of the mother tongue [i.e. German] when dealing with the authorities would be convenient because very old people cannot speak Czech, which makes dealing with the authorities very difficult for them." (Zpráva 2006: 77)

1.3. Non-State Agencies: Czech Bureau for Lesser-Used Languages (CzechBLUL)

The EBLUL is now active in the following new member states of the EU: Slovakia, Poland, Hungary, Estonia, and the Czech Republic (since 2004). The seat of the CzechBLUL is in Český Těšín, i.e. in the territory of Těšín Silesia where Polish community is concentrated. The activities of the CzechBLUL have just started up. It follows from its statutes that the organization focuses excessively on the concept of a minority and minority language as promoted by the Czech authorities, quite surprisingly confusing lesser-used languages with minority languages. There are, however, signals of a more flexible approach in that the Bureau is willing to take into consideration the ideas of the representatives of the Moravians, i.e. a community recognized as a minority in Slovakia, but not in the Czech Republic. Vietnamese as a lesser-used language is not on the agenda yet.

2. Education: A General Overview

The basic legal documents that regulate the use of languages in Czech schools include the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages, and the Education Act (2004). The Act states that Czech shall be the language of instruction, but it guarantees the possibility to establish classes and schools that use the language of a national (ethnic) minority (Article 14), and guarantees certain support also for languages of foreign nationals in education (Article 20). Important documents of a 'lower' level include so-called Framework Educational Programs (for different levels of education) which, according to the Education Act, 'shall specify, in particular, the concrete objectives, form, length and compulsory content of education, [...] its organization, professional profile, conditions of the course of education and the manner of completing the education, principles for development of School Educational Programs [...]' (Article 4, Par. 1). In addition to the Framework Educational Programs, there is the *Národní plán výuky cizích jazyků* (National Plan for Foreign Language Teaching), approved in 2005, which concerns the languages of ethnic minorities as well. The role of these national documents will be dealt with subsequently below (for a discussion of the Framework Convention and the European Charter see parts 1.2.1. and 1.2.2. above).

According to the Educational Act, schools can be established by ministries, regions, municipalities, self-government bodies, churches or private legal persons. Most of the 'basic' (i.e. primary) and secondary schools (almost 90%) have been established by a region or municipality, whereas a majority of universities have been established by private legal persons (cf. Institute for Information in Education, 2006: table A1.1.4). They can be included in the network of schools of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports. All the schools with Polish as the medium of instruction, the only non-Czech monolingual medium schools in the country, have been part of the network (Zpráva, 2006: 50).

Representatives of ethnic minorities participate in decisions related to language teaching in schools, since they are members of, for example, the Governmental Council for National Minorities and advisory boards of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, namely, the 'Grant Selection Committee for Projects in the Program for the Support of Education in the Languages of National Minorities and Multicultural Upbringing' and the 'Advisory Group for Issues of Education in the Languages of National Minorities' (Zpráva, 2006: 23). These bodies decide not only on policy issues but also on state subsidies for individual schools or educational programs that concern ethnic-minority languages. In 2005, the highest amount of subsidies were granted to *Roma* ethnic minority organizations: 57%

subsidies of the regions, 73% subsidies of the self-governing bodies and 88% subsidies of the cities. However, 61% of all subsidies from the municipality authorities (excluding cities) were granted to *Polish* ethnic minority organizations (Zpráva, 2006: 55f.). That is, the level of subsidy does not correlate with the size of ethnic communities (cf. Table 1 in part 1.1.1. above) but depends on various other factors.

Members of non-Czech language communities can learn (about) their languages in several ways; their languages can be:

(1) the media of instruction at schools;
(2) taught as the school subject of 'Foreign Language' and 'Second Foreign Language';
(3) included in 'Multicultural Upbringing', a so-called cross-subject topic, within school curricula
(4) taught in extracurricular language courses organized by members of ethnic minorities, language schools, enterprises, or other organizations.

We will deal with these points separately below.

2.1. Languages as Media of Instruction

In addition to Czech, only the languages of 'national' (i.e. ethnic) minorities (as they are defined in the Minority Act, No. 273/2001 Coll., and *de facto* acknowledged, see part 1.2.1. above) can be the media of instruction at kindergartens, basic, and secondary schools. The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports can allow for other, so-called 'foreign', languages to become media of instruction, but only for some of the school subjects. However, at tertiary professional schools and universities, a foreign language can serve as the exclusive medium of instruction. Slovak is an exception as it can be used even in university programs with Czech medium: the Czech and Slovak ministries of education concluded the *Protocol on Cooperation in the Sphere of Education, Youth, Physical Training and Sports* for 2002-06, in which an article, proposed by the Slovak side, was included that enables the citizens of a contracting country to use their own language in entrance examinations and in the course of the studies at universities of the other contracting country (i.e. Czech in Slovakia and Slovak in the Czech Republic) (Zpráva, 2005: 42). Slovak, as we will see below, occupies a special position in other sections of education as well.

Concerning pre-school, basic and secondary educational establishments, minimal quota of students necessary for opening a class or school in which the language of ethnic minority is the medium of instruction are lower than for Czech-medium classes/schools. The Education Act stipulates that the minority-language-medium class in a kindergarten shall have at least 8 children, whereas Czech-medium class in a kindergarten with one class shall have 15 and with more classes 18 children (Bill No. 14/2005 Coll.: Article 2). As regards basic schools, the minimal quota is 10 students for schools with one class and 12 for two-class schools equally in the Czech-medium and minority-language-medium schools, but it is higher for Czech-medium schools with three or more classes (Bill No. 48/2005 Coll.: Article 4). As regards secondary schools, the quota is 12 students for a one-class school and 15 for a school with more classes, whereas for Czech-medium schools it is 17 students (Bill No. 13/2005 Coll.: Article 2).

In addition to the Czech-medium schools, in the Czech Republic there are schools with the Polish medium and a bilingual Czech–non-Czech medium. In numbers, 23 basic schools had Polish medium and one Czech-German medium; as regards secondary schools: three had Polish medium, six Czech-German, five Czech-English, five Czech-French, four Czech-Spanish and two had Czech-Italian medium in 2005 (Institute for Information in Education,

2006: tables C1.16 and D1.1.4). Thus, a great number of speakers of other languages (but even not all the children who speak the languages mentioned) are not provided with schooling in their own languages.

If a municipality, region or ministry intend to establish a school with a minority-language medium they must meet the condition that at least 10% of the inhabitants of the municipality in which the class is to be established belonged to the respective ethnic minority in the last population census. This condition can be met first of all with the Polish ethnic minority but not the vast majority of other ethnic minorities. Nevertheless, they have the right of being taught some of the schools subjects bilingually, in their own language and Czech (if the headmaster decides so and the establisher gives a consent). Or they can establish their own schools as private legal persons. However, these two possibilities are extremely rarely used in practice.

2.2. Languages Taught as 'Foreign Language'

So-called 'foreign' languages as well as ethnic-minority languages can be taught as the school subjects of 'Foreign Language' and 'Second Foreign Language' (for statistical information on languages taught as foreign see Table 5 in part 3.5.3 below). Teaching of a foreign language can start as early as at kindergarten, but it is compulsory as late as the third grade of basic school; a second foreign language is compulsory from the eighth grade. In this connection, the National Plan for Foreign Language Teaching is an important organizational document. In its action plan for 2005-08, it declares support for and invites schools to offer not only languages such as English or French but also languages of ethnic minorities. In particular, mentioned are German and the languages of the 'related linguistic area', i.e. the Slavic languages, explicitly Polish and Russian (Ministry of Education, 2005a). Unused capabilities of teachers, who were educated in the period of socialism for the purposes of the then language policy, serves as an argument for Russian. Polish (like German) is mentioned in this context as a language of neighbors. Slovak is explicitly considered a language that one can easily learn to comprehend, and thus it 'can be managed through the "across-the-subjects-of-basic-school" method, it is not necessary to include it as a second foreign language' (Ministry of Education, 2005a: 2). In this connection, therefore, the National Plan... implicitly presupposes on the part of all the students of Czech-medium schools a very good knowledge of Czech that would enable them to acquire receptive competence in Slovak. This, however, does not fully correspond to reality.

Before we turn our attention to the students whose dominant language is not Czech, it should be mentioned that the Framework Educational Programs expect that basic-school students shall reach the A2 level in the first foreign language and the A1 level in the second foreign language in the last grade. So, even though the members of non-Czech language communities could hypothetically use the subject of 'Foreign Language' as an opportunity to learn their language, in reality, the teaching is adapted to children with 'zero' knowledge of the taught foreign language. Students belonging to the respective non-Czech language communities already possess some knowledge of it, so for example, teaching of Russian from the '0' to A1-A2 level would not have much sense for a Russian-speaking student. In addition, by articulating preference for English as the first foreign language in the National Plan..., other foreign languages, in fact, languages of the most numerous non-Czech language communities in the Czech Republic, have a somewhat better chance to be taught only as a second foreign language.

2.2.1. Students with a Dominant Non-Czech Language in Czech-Medium Schools

The number of non-Czech students at Czech-medium schools is relatively low yet not inconsiderable. Table 4 provides numbers of basic-school students according to ethnicity (only data for the year 2000 and basic schools are available) and of students in educational establishments of different levels sorted by citizenship (as in 2005). Although the number of students with presumingly non-Czech dominant language is only about 1%, this percentage represents several thousands of individuals (Table 4). In fact, language problems were reported with students-foreigners (unlike ethnic-minority students). According to a recent report of the Czech School Inspection (2006), which is based on a visit to 33 basic and secondary schools in 2005, only 59% of teachers who taught students-foreigners managed to make themselves understood with them from the very beginning. Their initial communication took place mostly in English, Russian or German (cf. Table 4 for other languages possibly needed). Even though the knowledge of Czech was sufficient in many (83% of) students-foreigners, it was not so with respect to the rest of them. Insufficient proficiency in Czech was usually handled in four ways: (1) a facultative subject of the Czech language, (2) a 'hobby' group for learning of Czech, (3) extra tutorage beyond school classes, and (4) individualized approach of the teacher.

Table 4: Students by ethnicity, citizenship, and school level

	Ethnicity (in 2000)	Citizenship (in 2005)			
	'basic'	'basic'	secondary	tertiary**	total
Czech (incl. Moravian and Silesian)	1,812,553	904,296	572,665	303,458	1,780,419
Armenian	n/a	213	98	42	353
German	1,106	133	125	238	496
Greek	157	13	8	116	137
Hungarian	496	19	8	36	63
Kazakh	n/a	231	144	174	549
Mongolian	n/a	291	47	62	400
Polish	4,020	150	121	299	570
Roma	2,002	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Russian	1,786	940	664	816	2,420
Ruthenian (Rusyn)	77	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Slovak	8,585	2,074	739	14,761	17,574
Ukrainian	2,871	2,708	1,053	716	4,477
Vietnamese	n/a	3,473	1,031	381	4,885
Other	77	2,034	902	4,128	7,064
Total non-Czech	**21,177**	**12,279**	**4,940**	**21,769**	**38,988**
% of all the students	**1.1**	**1.3**	**0.9**	**6.7**	**2.1**
Total of all the students	1,940,857*	916,575	577,605	325,227	1,819,407

* The number of students that is missing to reach the sum total were not classified in the statistical source.
** Including tertiary professional schools.
Source: Institute for Information in Education
(www.uiv.cz; 2006: tables C1.6, D1.1.14, E2.8, F2.3)

The Education Act (2004) guarantees the EU citizens free preparation for integration into Czech-medium classes and a support for the teaching of their language (Article 20). This opportunity remained, however, almost totally unexploited in the visited schools (Czech School Inspection, 2006). A possible reason for this might be the fact that it applied predominantly to students from Slovakia who, thanks to the cultural and linguistic closeness between Slovak and Czech might have not experienced significant problems and, therefore, did not show interest in teaching of their language.

The report of the Czech School Inspection (2006) also mentions that, in spite of the fact that a majority of the schools supported multicultural education, in some of them the inspectors noted an indistinctive support for the 'mother tongue' of students-foreigners. Two reasons were singled out, namely, that teachers lacked knowledge of their languages, and that a majority of students and their parents, especially in case of strong Vietnamese communities, did not require teaching of their 'mother tongue' (Czech School Inspection, 2006: 6). In fact, many teachers highlighted the diligence of Vietnamese students in the acquisition of Czech, which allowed for their quick integration. The headmasters of the schools assessed the integration of students-foreigners as 'unproblematic' (ibid.).

2.3. Languages as Part of 'Multicultural Upbringing'

Both children who were dominant in Czech and those who were dominant in a non-Czech language can acquire partial knowledge about 'minority' and 'foreign' languages within the framework of the so-called cross-subject topic of 'Multicultural Upbringing'. This is a term for the method of incorporation of certain pieces of knowledge into the teaching of various school subjects (see e.g. Ministry of Education, 2005b). The National Plan for Foreign Language Teaching presupposes the use of this instrument also for informing students about non-Czech languages.

Taking into account unsuccessful attempts at returning Slovak texts and information on Slovak to the subject of 'Czech Language and Literature', as it was common up until 1993 (the disintegration of Czechoslovakia), and the exclusion of Slovak as a foreign language by the National Plan... (part 2.2. above), Slovak minority organizations and advocates of Slovak see a chance for it precisely within 'Multicultural Upbringing' (cf. Kopecký et al., 2005). For example, researchers of the Palacký University, Olomouc, worked up educational multimedia material, which is available in the Internet or on CD (Kopecký, n. d.) for Czech school teachers so that they can include pieces of knowledge about Slovak in teaching their subjects. 'Multicultural Upbringing' provides a possibility to inform students also about Vietnamese, which is important in connection to the fact that the Vietnamese have not been recognized yet as a 'national minority', and that is why they are not entitled to derive benefit from the state support assigned to 'national minorities'.

Implementation of 'Multicultural Upbringing' faces, however, certain problems (Czech School Inspection, 2006: 5, 8; Průcha, 2004). Průcha (2004) mentions the following ones: (1) the absence of application of scientific knowledge about multicultural upbringing in teaching; (2) unclearly specified content and aim of 'Multicultural Upbringing' (which, for example, leads to limiting the topic to the Roma community in the Czech Republic); (3) teachers are not qualified nor psychologically prepared for its teaching. The latter type of problem is a systematic inadequacy of the Czech education which is in the stage of problem-solving and solution-seeking today.

The situation in Czech education displays features of a transition from the education for monolingual, and otherwise homogeneous, Czech society to the education for multilingualism and multiculturalism. That corresponds to the present-time development of

Czech society as a whole which becomes ethnically more heterogeneous and the psychological climate in it has been undergoing fundamental changes. This is perceptible in the documents of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports as well. For example, in the Framework Educational Program for Basic Education (Ministry of Education, 2005b) in the part on the subject of 'Czech Language and Literature,' the words 'Czech language' and 'mother tongue' are freely interchanging as if there were only children with Czech as their mother tongue in the Czech-medium classes (but see part 2.2.1. above).[12] The text of the framework program contains also a chapter on 'Multicultural Upbringing' in which a multiculturalist discourse prevails, but still, the following formulation can be found there: '["Multicultural Upbringing"] teaches to perceive oneself as a citizen who actively participates in the formation of the relationship of *society to minority groups*' (p. 98). This formulation is at least inept, as it can easily suggest that *minority groups* and *society* are two different 'things' at the same level, i.e. as if 'minorities' were not part of 'society' but something distinct from it. Thus, even in official texts there is a layering of two types of discourse, a monolingualist one and a multilingualist one – a phenomenon that is characteristic of the whole present-time society of the Czech Republic and which will further develop in the direction of the latter discourse.

2.4. Languages in Extracurricular Language Courses

Teaching of non-Czech languages is also provided by ethnic-minority organizations in language courses which are more or less open to the public and often subsidized by the state and local authorities (see Zpráva, 2006). In addition to the so-called 'world languages,' firms, enterprises, as well as schools of languages teach languages of 'ethnic minorities,' esp. German, Russian, Polish, Modern Greek, Croatian, etc.

Some details on the teaching of the languages of particular ethnic and language communities are included in the following sections which deal with them separately.

3. Sociolinguistic Profile of the Ethnic Communities

3.1. THE CZECHS: THE CZECH, MORAVIAN AND SILESIAN COMMUNITIES

Historically speaking the territory of the Czech Republic consists of three parts: Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia. However, this division is not merely a matter of history. Although normally speaking and writing the same standard language, Czech, inhabitants of these three parts sometimes possess a different identity. The 1991 census provided, for the first time, the possibility to declare under the heading *národnost* "ethnicity" not only a Czech ethnic identity but also a Moravian or a Silesian one. There is no doubt that Moravia has always been considered a specific cultural entity not only in Moravia and Silesia, but also in Bohemia.

---

[12] For example: 'Skills acquired in the school subject of "Czech Language and Literature" are needed not only for high-quality language education but for a successful acquisition of knowledge in other areas as well. The use of *Czech as mother tongue* in its spoken and written forms enables the students to get to know and understand socio-cultural development of the human community' (this formulation refers only to students whose mother tongue is Czech and excludes others; p. 20, emphasis added). In a section on the subjects of 'Czech Language and Literature', 'Foreign Language' and 'Second Foreign Language': 'A success of language learning as a whole not only depends on the results of education in the mother tongue and foreign languages, but [...]' (in this context, 'mother tongue' must refer only to 'Czech'; p. 21, emphasis added). In the contents of a curriculum: '*Czech* (the national language, the *mother tongue*), groups of languages (Slavic ones – first of all Slovak – and other, *minority* languages) [...]' (i.e. the category 'mother tongue' is reserved for Czech, other languages are categorized as 'minority' ones here; p. 25, emphases added).

This was less so with regard to Silesia, the substantial part of which has been incorporated in Poland for most of the time. The Czech part of Silesia has traditionally been considered in the everyday awareness of inhabitants of Bohemia as a region belonging to Moravia. Throughout its history, Silesia was not only changing its political affiliation; it has also been an ethnically varied territory, and people who identified themselves ethnically as Silesians lived side by side with others who considered themselves Polish, German, Czech, Jewish or more recently also Slovak or Roma. In addition, a large portion of the population was ethnically indifferent (cf. Lozoviuk, 1997), switching its identity depending on the situation.

In the 1991 census 8,363,768 (81.2% of the population) declared Czech ethnicity, 1,362,313 (13.2%) Moravian and 44,446 (0.4%) Silesian. It is important to realize that the distribution of this reporting was geographically uneven. While none of the Bohemian regions reported more than 1.3% Moravians, in the South Moravian Region the number rose to 49.5 percent and in the other region of Moravia, the North Moravian Region, it represented 15.4 percent of all inhabitants. It was in North Moravia where virtually all people with Silesian identity resided. Most of them lived in the Opava District (11.2 percent of all inhabitants, cf. Czech Statistical Office, 1993: Table 15). The reporting of the Moravian and Silesian identity was thus closely connected with the Moravian and Silesian regions of the Republic. It is highly probable that, in previous censuses, when only the officially approved ethnicities (Czech, Slovak, Polish, German, Hungarian or Ukrainian/Ruthenian) could be reported, most of those who in 1991declared themselves as Moravians or Silesians had previously reported their ethnicity as Czech or Polish respectively.

The results of the 1991 census with regard to the Moravian and Silesian identity must be taken seriously. Of course, there were special circumstances. Firstly, the census took place not more than one and a half year after the Velvet Revolution of 1989. The result of that revolution was that the population felt liberated from any previously dictated social, economic or cultural categories, and plurality and diversity were becoming highly valued. The second, related, circumstance is that the census became a political issue and politically interested groups took up the question of the Moravian and Silesian ethnicity in the media and in the Parliament just before the census day. Therefore the possibility that the reporting was also motivated by momentary political concerns should not be discarded. Note that in the 2001 census, which was conducted in a substantially quieter atmosphere, only 380,474 people (3.7%) declared Moravian, and 10,878 (0.1%) declared Silesian ethnic identity. Within a decade, the number of individuals identifying themselves as Moravian or Silesian has declined by about 75%.

Some analysts conclude that the Moravian or Silesian ethnicity failed to prove its existence (Prokop, 2001). The Report of the Government Council for National Minorities also plays down the fact that considerable numbers of people reported as Moravians or Silesians by interpreting it as a sign of special regional (i.e., not ethnic) identity (Zpráva, 2002: 7). However, there is no doubt that this identity is based on cultural and linguistic differences supported by differences in socioeconomic interests and power. Throughout modern history, Moravia and Silesia played a subsidiary role within the Western part of the Czechoslovak State, economically and socially, and it is this reality that is being reflected in the consciousness of a part of the Moravian and Silesian population.

The cultural specificity of Moravia and the Czech part of Silesia are evident. However, their special position also manifests itself linguistically. In these regions, local dialects are better preserved than in Bohemia. This fact is connected with less vigorous industrialization at the outset of the industrialization process. Common Czech is frequently rejected, and the language spoken in semi-formal situations (and by some speakers on all occasions) is Standard Czech. This fact, as well as the influence of the local dialect (e.g., shortening of vowels in Silesia), distinguishes speakers from Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia on all but very

formal occasions. There were some attempts to use Moravian dialectal or dialectally tinted language in written communication. The first grammars of the "Moravian language" were published at the beginning of the 19th century, when the future shape of Standard Czech was still in its infancy and somewhat diffident attempts to establish "Moravian" as language even appear today.[13]

The question of what language was considered as 'mother tongue' (a term used in the census questionnaire) by those who reported as Moravians or Silesians is of interest. Even within the atmosphere of 1991, 1,356,605 of those who claimed Moravian ethnicity (out of the total number 1,362,313) cited Czech as their mother tongue; 2,702 reported Slovak, 794 reported Hungarian, and 422 reported German mother tongue. Surprisingly, only 151 reported Polish. Of those who reported Silesian identity, 43,474 (out of a total of 44,446) gave Czech as their mother tongue. Other mother tongues claimed were: Polish (449), German (237), and Slovak (103).

Since 8,332,500 of those who declared Czech ethnicity (out of a total of 8,363,768) reported their mother tongue as Czech, it can be concluded that a very high proportion of the population of the Czech Republic in 1991 (95.8 percent) claimed Czech as their native language. The results of the 2001 census confirmed the stability of this picture. However, as far as ethnic identity was concerned, 8,363,768 (81,2% of the population) claimed Czech identity in 1991 as compared to 9,249,777 (90,4%) in 2001.

3.2. THE SLOVAK COMMUNITY

The Slovak ethnic community, which in the 2001 census consisted of 193,190 people (1.9 percent of the population of the Czech Republic), has undergone remarkable changes in the course of the 20th century. These changes did not merely affect the size of the community. With respect to the status of the community, during the years of the Republic, Slovaks constituted one of the two principal contributors to the demographic, economic and cultural profile within the society; since the partition of Czechoslovakia in 1993 their status was again relegated to that of a minority.

Czechs and Slovaks have occupied separate territories that do not historically overlap. Slovakia starts where Moravia, the Eastern part of the Czech territory, ends. Still, the Czech-Slovak partnership has a long history. The territories are adjacent and the linguistic and cultural proximity overrode the fact that the Czech-Slovak border was also a political one. While Czechs had had their own strong and independent state and even later, under the Hapsburgs, had retained an independent identity, Slovaks had not enjoyed the same favourable conditions. Throughout the middle ages and up to 1918, they lived within a single state with the Hungarians. The close linguistic and cultural relationship between Czechs and Slovaks achieved particular relevance under the conditions of modernization when the formation of the Czech and Slovak ethnic identity rose to occupy the agenda of the day. Throughout the 19th century, contacts were comprehensive. Many Slovaks studied at Czech schools, and this fact transferred to the relationship between organizations to which former school friends belonged. The Slovak Protestant minority formed one confessional and cultural community with the Czech Protestants. Apart from students and the Protestants, Slovak laborers, seeking better working and pay conditions, came to the Czech lands. While, towards the end of the 19th century, the current Czech Republic already was an industrial society, Slovakia remained agricultural.

In 1918, on the debris of the Hapsburg monarchy, a new state, Czechoslovakia, was born. Within the state, Czechs and Slovaks were formally equal, but in fact the distribution of

---

[13] Note that also Czech Bureau for Lesser-Used Languages collaborate with the representatives of the Moravian community.

power was strongly biased toward the Czechs. Many Slovaks started moving to the Czech 'metropolitan' areas. In 1921 there were 16,000 Slovaks in the Czech lands, in 1930 the number rose to 44,000 and before the outbreak of WWII, in 1937, the census revealed the presence of 65,000 who were dispersed throughout the territory. After 1918, there also was migration from the Czech part of the Czechoslovak Republic to Slovakia. At least some of this migration consisted of intellectuals and public servants (Šrajerová, 1999), a development motivated by the fact that Hungarian rule left the Slovak territory with an extremely limited intellectual class[14] that would be loyal to the idea of the Czechoslovak state. The movement of Czechs and Slovaks within the territory of the Czechoslovak Republic is not easy to document on the basis of census data, because the censuses worked under the assumption of a single 'Czechoslovak' ethnicity. This assumption, incorporated into the Constitution, was partly pragmatically motivated (to show the strong Czech-Slovak "majority" within a state which incorporated 23 per cent Germans and almost 6 per cent Hungarians), but it had its ideological roots in the early 19th century belief of a single 'Slavic' ethnicity, which, for many people, was used as a programmatic statement. This program was more acceptable to the Czechs than to the Slovak intellectuals whose numbers were growing in Slovakia, because the 'Czechoslovak identity' was being formulated at the expense of the specificity of Slovakia (cf., Marti, 1993; Berger, 2003). Between the two World Wars, Slovakia became a kind of 'colony' of the Czech component of the state.

The discontent of the Slovaks with the state of affairs within the common Republic was one of the reasons why the independent Slovak State was created, under the sponsorship of the Nazis, in 1939, and which continued its existence throughout the period of WWII. Thanks to the anti-Nazi resistance in the so-called Slovak National Uprising of 1944, Slovakia was not treated as a defeated country, and it 'naturally' reincorporated into the liberated Czechoslovakia after WWII. However, the experience of independence left a strong mark on the ethnic consciousness of Slovaks.

The deportation of some 2.5 million Germans after the War (mid-1940s) left a vacuum in the formerly German parts of the Czech territory, and this vacuum could not be filled through appeals to the Czech population alone. As early as 1946, the cabinet plan counted on the arrival of Slovaks. Between 1945 and 1947 some 110,300 people migrated from Slovakia. Largely, they settled in Western and Northern Bohemia; very few went to Southern Bohemia and Moravia (Šrajerová, 1999; Prokop, 2000). However, a continuous Slovak settlement did not eventuate. Slovaks who arrived were primarily motivated by a desire to improve their economic conditions, to acquire land and real estate or to work in industrial enterprises. There were virtually no intellectuals among these people. Nevertheless, they were initially interested in maintaining their Slovak identity, a fact that surfaced in the foundation of local branches of the *Matica slovenská*, an ethnic maintenance-and-development organization that played an important role in Slovakia. Fifty-three branches of this organization were created in 1946-1947, engaging in establishing Slovak libraries, extending the distribution of the Slovak press and arranging theatre performances in Slovak. However, in a few years, a trend appeared that gradually strengthened through the end of the 20th century: a shift toward Czech culture and language. This trend developed not only to help simplify interaction within a new environment but also as a shift to a culture that was perceived to be more powerful and desirable. As a consequence, in the course of the 1950s, branches of *Matica slovenská* ceased to exist (Šrajerová, 1999: 144).

The main impulse for the massive migration of Slovaks to the Czech territory in the 1950s and 1960s, was the growth of heavy industry. Apart from Northern Bohemia, this

---

[14] For example, in the Slovak counties of the Hungarian Kingdom in 1910, there were only 6,206 persons among about 2 million people with Slovak as mother tongue who had secondary education (State Statistical Office, 1920: 37).

growth mainly took place in the Ostrava region in Northern Moravia, and that is where many Slovaks headed. Again, most of these people were unqualified labourous, but some of them came with the intention to gain qualifications and return to work in similar establishments in Slovakia. In the Ostrava region, workers from Slovakia were given special benefits, in particular in housing. This meant that in some areas of the region, such as in Havířov, Karviná or Petřvald, Slovaks were soon in the majority. In the Karviná district, 3,838 Slovaks were resident in 1950, but 30 years later the number had reached 25,558 (Prokop, 2000). In 1970, this district showed the largest concentration of Slovaks in the Czech lands. Karviná City established its first Slovak elementary school in 1956 and its second in 1969. In 1968 the city saw the rebirth of a branch of *Matica slovenská* that continued to be active until the mid-1970s. The introduction of Slovak schools was also considered in Havířov, Třinec and Ostrava, but these plans met with little enthusiasm among the Slovak population. The Karviná schools thus remained the only Slovak schools that ever existed **i**n the territory of the present day Czech Republic. It seems paradoxical that**,** throughout the duration of the Czechoslovak Republic**,** Slovaks, as one of the basic ethnic groups of the Republic, were legally not a minority, and consequently did not have a right to schools in their own language like the 'minorities'. Nevertheless, some legal provisions which allowed for Slovak-medium schools in the Czech Lands did exist.

Since the 1950s, the number of Slovaks in the Czech lands gradually rose: 258,025 in 1950, 275,997 in 1961, 320,998 in 1970 and 359,370 in 1980. Throughout this period, Slovaks were accepted by the Czech matrix population with a friendly but sometimes patronizing attitude, whether they spoke Slovak or Czech. In the 1950s most Slovak students who studied at Czech universities continued speaking Slovak while in the Czech lands. There was social pressure on the side of Slovak society to do so. After the introduction of the federation system in 1968, the Slovak community also included people who went to Prague to represent Slovakia in the federal government and in other institutions; these people, too, continued speaking Slovak. At the same time, Slovak culture, in particular popular music, television and films, as well as science and humanities were happily accepted by the Czech population. Nevertheless, the average level of education within the Slovak community remained at a level lower than that of the average for the Czech community, and this was reflected in the structure of Slovak employment. Davidová (1990), in the course of her research on communication within large enterprises of the Ostrava region, collected useful sociological data that bear witness to the position of Slovaks compared to that of other ethnic groups. For example, in a coal-mine in Petřvald close to Karviná, which employed 5,300 people, 81 per cent were Czechs (today some might categorize themselves as Moravians or Silesians), 15 per cent Slovaks and 3 per cent Poles. While 3 per cent of the Polish employees were in executive positions, only 1 percent of Slovaks could be included in the same category. Other enterprises demonstrated a similar power structure (Davidová, 1990: 43).

The 1991 census was the first in the 20th century that registered a decrease in the number of Slovaks in the territory of the present day Czech Republic. The decrease was about forty thousand people. Slovak ethnicity was recorded by 314,877 people – i.e., 3.1 per cent of the overall population. However, this was not the result of the return of Slovaks to the land of their origin. Two other factors were decisive: firstly, a number of people opted for Czech ethnicity both for themselves and for their children; secondly, many Roma, who had previously considered themselves Slovaks, reported for the first time as Roma. Census questions had not enabled the Roma to identify as Roma between 1930 and 1991. Since the bulk of the original Czech Roma were exterminated in the Nazi concentration camps, and the Roma who resided in the Czech lands were postwar immigrants from Slovakia, it was only natural that in the pre-1991 censuses they declared themselves as Slovaks. This has to be taken into consideration when evaluating demographic statistics. Šrajerová (1999: 149)

assumes that in 1970 the share of the Roma who declared Slovak ethnicity was 13.1 per cent, ten years later it was 15.6 per cent and in 1991 the number actually grew to 23.5 per cent (i.e., 74,000 individuals), notwithstanding that they could (and some did) report as Roma.

Slovak immigration to the Czech Republic of the 1990s was characterized by the fact that all strata of Slovak society were included. The decisive factors were no longer economic but social (e.g., the reunification of families) and, following the birth of an independent Slovakia, also political (dissent from Prime Minister Mečiar's authoritarian political attitudes). At the same time, 'symbolically' speaking, in the 1990s the situation of the Slovak community in a sense deteriorated. They now became a minority, and many regretted this change of status. According to sociological surveys, their majority disagreed with the partition of the Czechoslovak Republic (Šrajerová, 1999). Since dual citizenship was not allowed by the legislation of the day, they had to opt for one of the two and on the basis of pragmatic considerations they mostly opted for the Czech one. On the other hand, throughout the decade, politicians on both sides aimed for 'closer-than-standard' relations between the Czech and Slovak Republics and this favourably influenced the position of the Slovak Community in the Czech Republic. For example, on the basis of agreements between the two governments, thousands of Slovak students study free of charge at Czech universities. The freedom of thought characteristic of the 1990s enabled the cultural flourishing of the Slovak community, and its political as well as cultural diversification, especially in Prague (Haluková, 1998; Praha a národnosti, 1998).

The 2001 census showed a substantial decrease in the Slovak community, from 314,877 to 193,190 individuals within a decade. This decrease of more than 120,000 people is not easy to explain by any single factor. Probably the trend of the adult residents to declare Czech ethnicity of their children born in the Czech Republic had accelerated. At the same time, the trend for greater intermarriage between young Slovaks and Czechs has intensified, while recent migration from Slovakia that would have increased the numbers of Slovaks, has lost momentum. It is also likely that more and more Roma, who formerly registered as Slovaks, opted for Czech ethnicity.

On the whole, one might conclude that the shaping of the Slovak community in the Czech Republic has been determined largely by two factors:

- the low cultural and linguistic distance between Slovakia and the Czech lands which enables successful communication and fast reaction to changes in the labor market and networks of social contacts. The high rate of intermarriage is not surprising;
- the power structure. Since the Czech culture has been perceived as superior, Slovaks, especially those with lower educational levels, showed little inclination to pursue education in Slovak schools and participate in Slovak cultural institutions. The perceived superior status of the Czech culture can be assumed to have contributed substantially to the ethnic shift of the Slovak community in the Czech lands.

3.2.1. The Slovak Language: Situation, Problems

Language shift that characterizes the communicative attitudes of the Slovak community in the Czech Republic should be seen in the light of the economic, social and political power relationships within Czechoslovakia, where the Czech element was definitely the stronger partner. However, it should also be related to the close relationship between the two languages. Slovak and Czech historically belong to the same group of Western Slavic languages which, among living languages, also includes Polish and Sorbian (Upper and Lower). However, within this group, Slovak and Czech share a particularly close relationship.

Degrees of agreement between the two languages exceed differences. Even though the phonological systems are not identical (Standard Slovak has additional diphtongs *ô*, *ia*, *ie*, *iu* and the long sonorant sounds *ŕ* and *ĺ*, while Czech has the special consonant *ř*) most of the divergence falls within the range of differences usual between dialects of the same language. In the morphological system, nominal as well as verbal ending definitely differ, but these differences, although extensive, are usually systematic and easy to comprehend. Both languages possess basically the same lexicon. Zeman (1997a: 1653) notes that 'among the 500 most frequent words in both languages, 230 (46%) are the same and 154 (30.8%) are in partial coincidence.' A Slovak easily becomes a receptive bilingual in Czech and a Czech in Slovak (cf. Kořenský, 1998). However, active use of the other language is not automatic and must be specifically acquired. Since there are 'false friends' and idiosyncratic items in the lexicon, 100 percent competence is not guaranteed.

Of course, there was a question whether a 100 percent understanding was taking place when Czechs and Slovaks still lived in the same State. Lexical items that are completely different are rare but sometimes puzzling. They usually include non-abstract and non-technical words of everyday life and botanical and zoological denominations. Sl. *raňajky* against Cz. *snídaně* 'breakfast' is difficult to interpret unless the speaker has acquired the item. Sl. *ťava* corresponds to Cz. *velbloud* 'camel', Sl. *pivnica* means 'cellar' while Cz. *pivnice* designates a 'beer hall'. Words that sound the same and have a similar meaning can have very different stylistic values. The sociolinguistic profile of the two languages is also different. In Slovak the Standard is directly opposed to the dialects (i.e., there is no Common Slovak), and the dialects are vigorous. There are differences in sociolinguistic rules of address and there are other rules that have not been sufficiently examined. Prior to the division of Czechoslovakia, some authors had argued that assuming complete mutual understanding would be naive. In this sense, one can, with justification, use the term *semicommunication*, coined by Haugen (1966), who used the term to describe the uses of Danish, Norwegian and Swedish in situations in which each speaker continued speaking his/her own language. He described *semicommunication* as 'the trickle of messages through a rather high level of "code noise"' (Haugen, 1966). On the other hand, he also emphasized the idea that what was necessary was the good will to understand each other. Apart from the Nordic languages, Haugen referred to the case of Czech and Polish and, of course, Czech and Slovak. Budovičová (1987a, 1987b), who introduced Haugen's term to Czechoslovak linguistics, emphasized the existence of language problems. This orientation towards the negative aspects of Czech/Slovak *semicommunication* was fresh and useful in the 1980s when the establishment, by definition, saw all social problems as having been solved. At present, the phenomenon can be seen in a more positive way (for a survey see Sloboda, 2004).

It is doubtful whether the Czech-Slovak *semicommunication* during the time of the Czechoslovak Republic was equally developed in both directions. Czech was the language with more prestige and more power. On the whole, the receptive competence of Slovaks in Czech was superior to that of Czechs in Slovak. Slovaks read in Czech, while Czechs rarely touched a Slovak book. The hierarchical relationship between Czech and Slovak has a long history. In Slovakia, Czech fulfilled the role of the written language as early as the 15th century, and continued its supremacy until Standard Slovak was established in the first half of 19th century. Czech remained the written language of Slovak Protestants (Nábělková, 2002a) longer than it did in the case of Catholics, who had switched to a variety of Slovak earlier. It was the Protestants who, in the 17th century, formulated the idea of Czechoslovak unity (Pauliny, 1983: 112). At that time, the linguistic relationship was not paralleled by differential power: if anything, it supported the case for the liberation of Slovaks from Hungarian rule. The relationship changed, however, when the Czechoslovak Republic was born and Slovakia assumed second position in the new State. Czech intellectuals and public servants held the

power, and this was reflected in the power relationship between the languages. Even contemporarily, the presence of Czech in Slovakia is conspicuous. Bookshops keep Czech literature and even Czech translations from other languages. In 1999 the largest Slovak television channel, Markíza, broadcast more than one sixth of its programs in Czech. This programming comprised mainly television serials and films (Kompasová, 1999/2000). The privileged position of Czech seems to have been retained even among the youngest generation of Slovaks (Ivaňová, 2002).

Problems of communication are not exhausted by issues of grammatical competence. An important role is played by sociocultural competence. In this respect, Zeman (1997b) points to two circumstances: Firstly, prior to the division of Czechoslovakia, the federal media, accessible to the average listener/viewer emphasized the overall Czechoslovak context, rather than the specifically Slovak or Czech context. Secondly, after the division, the unfamiliarity of the specifically Slovak context may present a more serious hindrance to communication than do grammatical and lexical differences between Slovak and Czech. Needless to say, the lack of sociocultural knowledge of the other society negatively affects daily life communication as well.

3.2.2. The Slovak Language: Simple Management[15]

Never in the history of the Czechoslovak Republic have the modes of actual communication between Czechs and Slovaks become an object of linguistic research. Any understanding of simple language management throughout this period must therefore derive from data other than discourse interaction. Informal evidence must be considered, and more recent studies must be used for extrapolation of results in the direction to the past.

Eva Vrbová, a Slovak researcher who is a member of the Slovak community in Prague, has pointed out that in discourse between Slovaks and Czechs receptive bilingualism was not expected to function equally for all speakers (Vrbová, 1993). In the case of small children and also of old people there was automatic switching to the code of these addressees or at least presumably difficult features were transposed to the other code. These discourse management strategies, which remind one of Ferguson's 'simplified registers' (Ferguson 1981), were applied as pre-adjustment, before any communicative inadequacy occurred. Two conclusions can be derived from this fact:

(a) Czech-Slovak receptive bilingualism was not a 'natural' phenomenon that developed out of the similarity of two systems of grammatical competence, but was rather a management strategy that was tailored to the needs of particular speech situations;

(b) Such discourse management strategy was capable of growing into active bilingualism, particularly in the case of Slovaks. Except for small children and old people, Czechs and Slovaks applied their own system of grammatical competence, especially if they did not know each other well.

---

[15] This survey employs elements of Language Management Theory (see e.g. Jernudd and Neustupný, 1987, Neustupný, 2002) which differentiates between simple and organised language management. The speaker can manage individual features or aspects of his own or of his interlocuter's discourse here and now, i.e. in a particular interaction. Such management is simple or discourse-based. Organized language management is not restricted to one particular interaction, it is directed and more or less systematic. The organization of language management involves several layers. The growing complexity of social networks is accompanied by the increasing degree of organization of language management. In very complex networks the organized management often becomes the subject of public or semi-public discussion among a large number of participants (including specialists, institutions), many of them referring to various theories or ideologies (Nekvapil and Nekula, 2006: 310, Nekvapil, 2006).

However, according to Vrbová's observations, adjustment to the language system of the addressee was not unusual even in other situations. It occurred in the language of those who knew each other and were assured that the addressee lived on the territory of the other language on a long-term basis (Vrbová, 1993).

In discourse, Czechs have certainly not remained unaffected by Slovak. For example, in the following conversation, which took place in Prague in the 1990s, a Slovak female speaker SF1 speaks with a Czech female speaker CF1. SF1 speaks Slovak and CF1 Czech. However, CF1 takes over the word *korčuľovat'* from Slovak for Czech *bruslit* 'to skate,' giving it a Czech pronunciation *korčulovat* and dropping the reflexive particle *se/sa*. She also uses the Czech past tense of the verb (*korčulovala*); in this case the ending happens to coincide with the Slovak one.

> SF1: *My sme sa boli korčuľovat' v ňeďeľu.*
> "We went skating this Sunday."
> CF1: *Já neumím korčulovat, ja sem korčulovala naposledy, když mi bylo dvanáct. Pak sem jezdila na kolečkovejch teda.*
> "I cannot skate, I skated for the last time when I was twelve. Then I used roller (skates), you know." (from Ivaňová, 2002: 37)

In this example, CF1 probably uses the Slovak word for "skating" for complex discourse reasons. However, in the past, many Czechs used Slovak expressions in their conversation, even in the absence of Slovak speakers, as word play. Nábělková (2002b) reports that Slovaks, in pub conversation, also use Czech as word play.

Within contemporary Czech-Slovak communication, there are a number of communication problems that originate in 'semicommunication'; i.e., noting of problems, evaluation and adjustments. One example occurs across the two following conversational turns:

> CF2: *Sem dostala dneska takovej imejl, že se nemůžou dovolat a věčně se dovolaj k těm Moravákům.*
> "I got today such an e-mail, that they cannot get us on the telephone, and all the time they can get the Moravians."
> SF2: *Pretože si im dala <u>zlou zlú</u> linku.*
> "Because you gave them the wrong line."

CF2 is a Czech woman who claims to always speak with Slovaks in Czech. SF2, a Slovak woman, answers in Slovak, originally mixing into her Slovak a Czech form *zlou* for Slovak *zlú* "wrong". She notes, evaluates her usage negatively and immediately implements an adjustment. This example shows that communication problems are not always the result of misunderstandings. In this case no misunderstanding occurs: there is only a negative evaluation of her own grammatical choice in discourse.

Another discourse strategy is to pre-adjust individual items that might cause communication problems. This can be performed in three ways:

(1) As noted already by Budovičová (1986) for the situation of former Czechoslovakia, speakers avoided differing elements and selected elements that were shared by both languages. For example, a Slovak speaker may use the Slovak word *tužka* for Czech *tužka* 'pencil' rather than the synonym *ceruzka* which may be incomprehensible to his Czech interlocutor.

(2) Slovak speakers employ basically Slovak, but when a Slovak expression differs from its Czech counterpart, they use the Czech word (Ivaňová, 2002). The reverse is also true. As documented by Zeman (1988), Czech speakers who speak to Slovaks in Czech select Slovak alternatives for differing lexical items, e.g. Slovak *pečeň* for Czech *játra* 'liver'.

(3) Speakers may pronounce endings indistinctly in order to cover the difference between Slovak and Czech; for example *počkəj* to minimize the difference between Czech *počkej* and Slovak *počkaj* 'wait' (Hoffmannová & Müllerová, 1993: 316).

Ivaňová (2002; 2004) studied the interaction patterns of Czech and Slovak university students in Prague and formulated the following conclusions:

(1) Czech speakers are not bilingual, their competence in Slovak remains at the level of receptive bilingualism. However, on the basis of the knowledge of a few structural differences between the two languages, they modify their Czech structures in discourse and present them as Slovak. As they use, or attempt to use Slovak, they try to oblige, convey their liking of the other side, to use humour and language play. They do not expect the use of Czech from their partners; on the contrary, they encourage them to use Slovak. The results of a recent survey carried out by Sloboda (in print) corroborate this conclusion. In the opinion of the present authors, one can observe a friendly attitude on the Czech side, but it might be a patronizing attitude.

(2) Slovak speakers in the Czech Republic, on the other hand, are not merely receptively, but also actively, bilingual, and they use their active competence in communicating with some Czech interlocutors. There is shifting depending on their relationship to their partners and on the domain of communication (public or private). The closer the partner, the more Slovak will be used by the Slovak interlocutor.

Large-scale sociological investigations in the *Slezský ústav* (Silesian Institute) in Opava have been mainly directed towards the ethnic situation in Northern Moravia and partly also towards that in North-Eastern Bohemia in the 1980s. These investigations demonstrated that the shift of the Slovak community toward Czech is intensive in a number of situations and that it is continuing to intensify. There was a lack of agreement between declared ethnic membership (which remained Slovak) and declared language use (that was biased towards Czech). The last extensive research, conducted in 1994, showed that, according to their parents, only 5 five per cent of ethnically Slovak children spoke predominantly Slovak while 68.5% of children spoke predominantly Czech (Sokolová & Hernová & Šrajerová, 1997: 84). The number of mixed marriages is increasing: according to marriage statistics, Slovaks in 1994 reported only 16.2% of ethnically homogeneous marriages. Nevertheless, Sokolová et al. claimed that their Slovak respondents were not as much oriented to the use of Czech as respondents were in previous decades; it is possible to identify a more bilingual and bicultural orientation – as opposed to the Czech monoligual and Czech monocultural orientation of past decades. For language management, this means that, since all cases of shift start in discourse, it will be important to understand its mechanism if there is an intent to arrest this shift. Moreover, if some Slovaks assume more positive attitudes to the maintenance of Slovak, are such attitudes reflected in discourse, or are they rather a part of the ideological structure of the communities? If the latter, how can they be transferred to discourse, the only location in which maintenance can take place?

There are definitely changes (in comparison to the period of the common Czechoslovak state) in the behaviour of Czechs and Slovaks in contact situations. A Slovak woman T, who is a student and simultaneously works in an office in Prague (Ivaňová, 2002),

can serve as an example. In communication with her company's clients, who are mostly Czech, Czech is spoken and written. In communicating with her Czech colleagues of the same age she uses Slovak. However in discourse with a female colleague, who is her senior by age, she uses Czech in order "to be polite". This happens notwithstanding the fact that the older woman possesses considerable experience of being exposed to Slovak during the period of the Czechoslovak Republic. In this case, the atmosphere of the former Czechoslovak Republic, which would lead one to expect a 100% Slovak from T, is gone. T's usage resembles that of Czechs in the office. They would speak Standard Czech to their clients and to an older woman, and Common Czech to their peers. This new pattern does not place Czech and Slovak into a hierarchical relationship. The ideal relationship between Czech and Slovak probably lies in the retention of the Czech-Slovak receptive bilingualism devoid of any emotive management and accompanied by switching to the other language as the domain of communication and the situation require.

This attitude can be seen in the following testimony, where it seems to be conscious. For X, its author, the Czech Republic is just another foreign country. Why should one declare one's ethnic specificity and symbolize, through the use of Slovak, a non-existent past? In an internet magazine X formulated this view in the following way:

"[...] *ked som predtym par rokov hovoril v anglosaskom prostredi po anglicky, v cesku teraz hovorim cesky. ked na to pride, som slovak, ale nepotrebujem to neustale demonstrovat a riesit narodnostne vztahy* [...]" (Slovak, the writer does not use diacritics)
"[…] since I spoke in an Anglo-Saxon environment over a few years English, in Czechia now I speak Czech, when it matters I am Slovak, but there is no need to constantly reassert that and try to solve ethnic relations […]"

Nevertheless, the inequality problem persists. From the internet magazine *Inzine,* Ivaňová (2002) selected a number of strategies which Slovak contributors employ to legitimize the reason they select Czech in discourse in Czech environments (cf. also Nábělková, 2006b). Several of these legitimizations claim that Czech is richer in expressive power than Slovak. Czech is presented as a language in which all problems have been solved. Slovak intellectuals, rather than creating their own expressive means, just employ Czech. This practice provides a prerequisite for a massive influx of Czech elements into Slovak and creates problems for Slovak organized management.

3.2.3. The Slovak Language: Organized Management

In the first constitution of Czechoslovakia (1920), the national language, called the 'Czechoslovak' language, had two forms: Czech and Slovak. This was a legal construct. In fact it was assumed that the 'forms' were two national languages which were equal in law. However, Slovak occupied the position of the weaker partner. Since it had fewer speakers and was considered less developed than Czech, it could not in fact assume a position equal to Czech (Marti 1998). The inequality of Slovak surfaced in the fact that Czech started being widely used in Slovakia, serving partly, for example, as the language of instruction at the university in Bratislava. As late as the 1930, discussions were held as to whether it was feasible to develop Slovak as a language of science and technology, or whether it would not be more rational to use Czech in such contexts. In view of this situation, it is not surprising that Czech influence on Slovak was massive. While the existence of Czech elements in Slovak has persisted as a problem in organized language management in Slovakia up to the present, the influence of Slovak on Czech has been minimal, and when it occurred, it was not

considered a threat but rather an enrichment. This situation is typical for partnerships of unequal power. Towards the end of the second decade of the existence of Czechoslovakia, Slovak intellectuals, who were leaders in introducing Slovak to all registers of social life, were already emancipated and linguistically mature leaders in language management. However, there was no organized management with regard to Slovaks who resided in the Czech lands during the time of the inter-war Czechoslovak Republic.

Following the end of WWII, the situation changed. The concept of a 'Czechoslovak language' was abandoned, and Slovak intellectuals began to mount resistance to all forms of Czech domination. As massive emigration to the Czech lands proceeded, some weak attempts at organized language management also appeared. Šrajerová (1999:144) mentions a cabinet decision according to which, in the 1952/1953 school year, 'Slovak language circles' were to be established. The decision required that 279 such circles were to be established in the Karlovy Vary region and 38 in the Plzeň region. A provision for the training of 160 teachers was approved. There are no reports to assess to what extent these circles were successful, but it is evident that in the course of time they met the same fate as the local branches of *Matica slovenská*, mentioned in section 3.2; that is, they ceased to exist.

The equal rights of the Czech and Slovak languages were explicitly formulated in the 1968 Constitution that established the Czech-Slovak federal system. Both languages were supposed to be different from minority languages. These were the only languages in which laws were published and which were the official languages of the national administration. The State administration (within the Czech and the Slovak part of the Federation) could be addressed in either language, but the administration was not obliged to respond in other than the local language. The conviction that receptive bilingualism should be promoted was thus actively supported by organized language management. The idea of full bilingualism was still missing.

Budovičová (1987a, b) noted that the negative aspects of semicommunication were strongest in the language of literature (where understanding was most difficult), less pronounced in the language of the media and daily life, and least serious in specialized forms of language. This hierarchy can, in fact, be observed in acts of organized language management. Even prior to the division of Czechoslovakia, it was common for poetry and prose to be translated from one language to the other. In order to coordinate terminological work, joint terminological committees for individual disciplines worked to achieve parallel development of special terminologies. School curricula included teaching about the other language and specified that examples of texts had to be studied. The alternation of Czech and Slovak announcers on television and radio news and sports and in other programs was very effective.

After the division of Czechoslovakia in 1993, Slovak disappeared from school curricula. The situation at the universities was chaotic. Some institutions in the Czech lands continued teaching Slovak within the framework of Slavic or Czech studies; others discontinued it. However, towards the end of the 1990s, it was felt that systematic attention to Slovak was necessary. This impetus appeared in a most vocal way at a National Seminar on Teaching Slovak and Slovak Literature at Czech Universities, organized in 2000 by the University of Hradec Králové (Zeman, 1999/2000). Among the conclusions and recommendations of the Seminar the following should be mentioned.

(1) The Ministry of Education lacks a comprehensive policy concerning the teaching of Slovak.
(2) In view of the current estrangement of Czech and Slovak and the two nations, it is essential that at least some universities establish a Czech-Slovak major.
(3) It will be necessary to posit at least three aims for the teaching of Slovak:

     a. the education of students of the Czech language and literature with a wide background of the knowledge of Slavic languages;

     b. the education of teachers of Slovak to Czechs;

     c. the education of students of the Czech language and literature with a very high command of Slovak who could teach Slovak children in the Czech Republic.

(4) It is desirable to incorporate the teaching of Slovak and Slovak literature in primary and secondary schools within the fund allocation for multicultural education. This process has already begun.

The interest in reintroducing Slovak to Czech schools has also been confirmed in public opinion surveys. In an extensive survey carried out by Musilová and her colleagues in 1998, 53% of Czech respondents agreed with the suggestion to reintroduce Slovak. Among those who disagreed, one fourth claimed that this was unnecessary because 'everyone understands Slovak' (Musilová, 2000). Hence, even after the division of Czechoslovakia, the perception of receptive bilingualism appears to have been widespread.

A similar attitude exists at the highest level of the government. In a meeting held in 2002 between Czech Prime Minister Zeman and Slovak Prime Minister Dzurinda, the incorporation of Czech texts in textbooks of the national language and the showing of Slovak programs on the Czech TV were emphasized (Mlčoch, 2002). A significant language management act at the level of publishing is demonstrated in the publication of a new textbook authored by Sokolová, Musilová and Slančová (2005): *Čeština a slovenština: Synchrónne porovnanie s cvičeniami* (Czech and Slovak: a synchronical comparison with excercises).

What is the situation in Czech television? It has frequently been suggested that TV played a decisive role in the development of receptive bilingualism in the past. The media claim, with obvious partiality, that young Czechs no longer understand Slovak because of its disappearance from TV. This view can be only partly supported. While the Slovak cultural program that used to be scheduled every Monday on Czech television disappeared, it would be an exaggeration to claim that most viewers were waiting for it with bated breath. It is certainly more significant that the alternation of announcers in news and sports programs disappeared. However, it is important to realize that, in socialist Czechoslovakia, there was in principle only one TV program, and the share of it that Slovak got was overall limited. Today there are 4 channels and, although the occurrence of Slovak is not 'planned,' much Slovak can be heard in the speech of Slovak artists and other personalities who live in the Czech Republic and who are interviewed on Czech TV. Slovak sports personalities often speak, and they are the ones who are noticed by young people. Until empirical surveys become available, it will be necessary to listen with a grain of salt to arguments about the disappearance of Slovak from Czech TV. Such arguments may constitute one of the components of an overall myth about Czech and Slovak growing further and further apart. (Concerning the deconstruction of the myth see Nábělková, 2000; Nábělková, 2002b.)

On a number of occasions, it has been noted that organized management grows from the platform of simpler forms of management; e.g., management within families. This point can also be claimed in the case of Slovak in the Czech Republic. Maintenance within families has been minimal, and little interest has been shown in Slovak schools. The lack of interest in simple management has contributed to the scarcity of organized management. In Prague, where circa 20,00 Slovaks live there has never been a single Slovak school. In the mid-1990s, the association *Obec Slovákov v Českej republike*, organized a project, approved by the Education Ministry, to establish a Slovak High School (*gymnázium*) in Prague; however, that experiment failed because only eight applicants turned up, while the minimum target was 20 (Praha a národnosti, 1998: 96). The only primary Slovak school in the territory of the Czech

Republic, in Karviná, ceased to exist in 2001. On the other hand, the project of the V4 group 'Učíme se spolu' (We Learn Together), in which students have the opportunity to learn Slovak (or the other two languages of the V4 group, i.e. Hungarian or Polish), started in 2002 at a secondary school in Prague. In January 2007, the Pedagogical Research Institute published textbooks that should help teachers in providing information on and receptive competence in Slovak at the Czech schools (cf. part 2 above). However, Ministry of Education, the Youth and Sports leaves the decision to include information on Slovak on individual school administrations.

It has been argued that the old conception of the linguistic life of the Slovak community within the Czech Republic, based on the model of postwar Czechoslovakia, has been overtaken by time. Although a power relationship between the two societies and the two languages still exists, it is giving way to arrangements common in international society. There may be inequality, but it is covered under the ideology claiming that all states are equal. It is natural that more and more Slovaks in the Czech Republic speak Czech at work, in education or in the public domain as far as using Czech is still perceived as the 'default' language choice for the first contact between unfamiliar people. In any case, there is no reason to use Czech in the family or in the friendship domain. On the other hand, there will be Slovaks who want to assimilate, and language managers have no right to prevent this.

3.3. THE ROMA COMMUNITY

With the gradual decrease in the Slovak community within the Czech milieu, as described in the previous section, it is almost certain that the Romani community has become the largest non-Czech community in the Czech Republic. This is not a fact that is readily discernable in statistics. In the 2001 census only 11,000 persons explicitly stated Romani ethnicity. In the 1991 census almost 33,000 persons opted for this alternative, while official records kept by local authorities until 1989 (a tradition established by the Austro-Hungarian Empire) counted 145,000 persons (about the question of census data with respect to Roma, cf. Kalibová, 1999). Today it is generally estimated that, due to a high birthrate, immigration from Slovakia and other factors (such as underestimation in previous statistics), the number is between two-hundred- and three-hundred-thousand (Možný, 2002). The Roma live virtually everywhere in the country, but the largest concentration can be found in Northern Moravia and North-Central Bohemia (Zpráva, 2002). In comparison with the rest of Europe, the absolute number of the Roma is high, following Rumania, Bulgaria, Spain, Hungary, Slovakia, the former Yugoslavia and Turkey.

The basis of the Roma question is primarily not in the physical features of the Roma, which not always differ from the matrix population. (Dark complexion and certain features of the physique tend to be interpreted as Roma characteristics.) Rather, the Roma problem constitutes the most significant ethnic problem of present day Czech Republic because of sociocultural disparity between them and the matrix population. Sociocultural difference leads to differential socioeconomic power, and this projects into all domains of conduct, including linguistic behavior. It is necessary to realize that the problem is not based only in the Roma population but also in the matrix community. Hence, when policies are formulated, they must address the Czechs as well.

The Roma immigration to the Near East and Europe originated in India. Although the Roma themselves do not possess any memory of their Indian origin (Hancock, 1988), their language and culture point to India in an indisputable way. In the territory of the present Czech Republic, their appearance has been confirmed as early as the end of 14th century, and they have been present ever since. The original Czech Roma were (together with other Roma groups inhabiting Bohemia and Moravia) virtually exterminated in the Nazi concentration

camps during WWII, while Roma in Slovakia were not. (During the war the independent Slovak state was not directly governed by Nazi Germany.) The bulk of the contemporary Roma population arrived from Slovakia after WWII, and it is necessary to understand that even at the present time they retain sometimes close ties with the Roma in that country. Keeping up family relationships across national boundaries has also been the rule for other smaller Romani groups. While most prewar Czech Roma maintained the nomadic way of life often associated with the Roma as a whole, the Slovak Roma were basically sedentary.

Although the contemporary Roma community appears to the Czechs to be homogeneous, it is not. Linguistically it can be divided into the original Czech Roma (now a very small group), the Slovak-and-Czech Roma, the Hungarian Roma, the Vlach Roma and various other smaller groups. These groupings, already lacking homogeneity in themselves (Elšík, 2003), live side by side in their Czech environment, rather than in a single social structure. The Roma continue to be a sum of many smaller groups ("clans") based on family ties which lack cohesiveness, although there are attempts to create the consciousness of a whole.

One of the basic issues involved here is that the exercise of Roma ethnicity has not yet been fully established. The political elites within the community have realized this problem and are trying to amend it (Leudar & Nekvapil, 2000). The issue of an underdeveloped ethnicity creates not only inadequacies in the political representation of the Roma but also supports the ongoing loss of the Roma culture and language. Within the younger generation, the traditional value system has been seriously threatened. To many Czechs, the Roma appear to be a community without any culture. However, traditional culture – tales, proverbs or music – is in fact still alive and new culture forms – poetry, literature or painting – are quickly developing.

In Slovakia and other countries east of the Czech Republic the Roma typically live in settlements at the outskirts of villages or towns of the matrix population, but in the Czech Republic the usual domicile is within towns and cities, where the Roma are concentrated in areas, sometimes very central, which have been abandoned by other dwellers. These areas are normally characterized by low quality housing, frequently beyond repair. Prior to 1989, the Communist Party government exercised a policy of dispersing the Roma (which never succeeded completely), but within the more liberal atmosphere of the 1990s the concentration of the Roma in certain areas has continued to be the rule. The traditional occupations have long been lost (except for the Vlach, who continue door-to-door trading); men typically work in jobs in the construction industries, and women in cleaning. Their income is at the level of about 60 per cent of the average wage for men and about 25 per cent in the case of women. Additionally, there is a very high rate of unemployment, an amazing 70 per cent, in some areas and occasionally even as high as 90 per cent within a society where, in the 1990s, the overall unemployment was under 10 percent (Možný, 2002). It is not surprising that, under these conditions, delinquency within the community does occur; from the point of view of the matrix population, the Roma more than occasionally are seen as thieves and prostitutes. Also drug dependence is being reported. However, the extent of criminality together with comparisons across ethnic groups needs more objective assessment than is currently available.

The attitudes of the matrix population toward the Roma community are negative. While the overall indices of xenophobia are not particularly high (Jesenský, 2000; Bártová, 2002), the Roma are more than disliked. The behaviour that is stereotypically the object of criticism includes their lack of interest in children's education, the handling of apartments and other dwellings ("they burn parquets for heating"), the level of hygiene, the erratic attendance at work, etc. The problems, real or assumed, are not seen as a heritage of the past that cannot be overcome in a decade, but as personal deficiencies of individual Roma or of the group as such. Normally, however, such criticism is not based on personal experience. The Roma are

not invisible, but few people have had direct interaction with them. Still, when asked in 1999 whether they would like to have a Romani family as their neighbors, more than forty per cent of respondents in the survey answered univocally "no". (Incidentally, this is identical with the European average, cf. Možný, 2002:134.) In 1991 negative response had still been over seventy per cent. Seen from the Czech Republic point of view, one might reverse the judgment and say "only 40 percent said no". Bártová correctly points to the fact that, west of the Czech Republic, tolerance towards the Roma does not differ from tolerance to foreigners in general because, apart from Spain, the numbers of the Roma are small and the issue does not stand out. Within the Czech Republic, criminality on the Roma side is paralleled by discrimination and brutal attacks from the matrix community. Such attacks are usually performed by extremist right-wing groups, such as Skinheads or their sympathizers, but silently approved by many Czechs. The Roma community is frightened, because they can be killed for no apparent reason, including women and children. The Czech police are sometimes overtly anti-Roma, and Czech courts have so far been lenient towards the killers, except for single recent cases ending up with adequate fines or imprisonment.

A large comparative study of the presentation of the Roma in Czech, Slovak and Hungarian media was conducted by Nekvapil, et.al. (2000). For the Czech media, analyzed by J. Homoláč, four findings were of particular interest:

(1) The comparison of report on three separate killings of Roma (1991, 1993 and 1995) revealed that newspaper reporting increased in quantity as well as quality.
(2) The killings were not perceived as events in their own right but rather as responses to Romani criminality; they were not seen as racially motivated unless the victim was classified as a "decent Romany". There was a trend to present characteristics stereotypically attributed to the Roma and to employ them as a means of explaining the violence.
(3) Even when there was a one-sided attack, the situation was explained as a "skirmish" between the Roma and Skinheads, not an act of the majority community directed towards the minority.
(4) It was unusual for the Czech media to describe positive actions of the Roma, and when the media did describe positive actions, those actions were presented as exceptional. Negative reporting, based on stereotypes, abounded in the Czech press (see also Nekvapil and Leudar, 2002; Homoláč, Karhanová and Nekvapil, 2003).

From this can be understood, that in many official documents the term "Rom" is to some extend tabooed. Instead, one of the following circumscriptions occurs:

- Socially excluded person (*sociálně vyloučený*)
- Person with a socio-cultural disadvantage (*sociokulturně znevýhodněný*)
- Of Roma origin (*romského původu*), implicitly rejecting present Roma ethnicity
- Member of the Roma community (*příslušník romské komunity*)
- Member of the Roma communities (*příslušník romských komunit*, pl.)
- From the Roma population (*z romské populace*) etc.

Sometimes the use of alternative designations is motivated by the intention to address other social groups as well or for other pragmatic reasons (summarized in Zpráva-integrace 2005: pp. 57-58), but the frequency of substitute expressions exceeds this explanation scheme.

The sociologist Keller (2002) summarizes the discrimination against the Roma in the following points:

(1) A Roma child is discriminated against at the moment he or she enters a Czech school. There are sociocultural as well as linguistic barriers to education. Large numbers of Roma children have been placed in "special schools", a fact that seriously affects their further education. Only a small number of Roma children complete more than elementary schooling.

(2) The second level of discrimination occurs in employment. The rate of unemployment is huge. If unqualified work is available, it is often so poorly paid that social welfare benefits constitute the more attractive option. This is not to say that there are not many Roma who would like to work.

(3) Especially since the beginning of the 1990s, a trend has appeared in the matrix community to assert its "right to intolerance". The Roma have often been refused access to restaurants or swimming pools and have been physically attacked, though the agents were not normally typical members of the matrix community (Keller, 2002).

Another point should be added: the Roma have widely suffered the loss of their language. This matter will be dealt below.

This is a very dangerous situation. The political system of Czechoslovakia under the Communist government dealt with some of the issues within an assimilationist framework, but failed to solve them. Towards the end of the 1990s, more Roma attempted to improve their situation by emigrating, for example, to Britain or Canada.These avenues have been closed by the governments of the countries in question, but some migration goes on. Admittedly, some work has been done, and the future is not entirely grim. The Government of the Czech Republic is obviously under international pressure, particularly in view of its membership in the European Union which requires that all member countries have a clean record on human rights and ethnic relations. Hence, in the 2000s, more and more measures have been taken to improve the situation, including attempts to change the attitudes of the police force (Zpráva, 2002, Zpráva-integrace 2005, Zpráva 2006). In 2001, the Government reorganized its interdepartmental Council of the Czech Government for Matters of the Roma Community, to include 14 Roma out of the total membership of 28. The Government further approved a *Koncepce politiky vlády vůči příslušníkům romské komunity* "The Principles of Government's Policy Towards Members of the Roma Community", a document that must be welcome after a decade of a laissez fair policy, actualised last in 2004 as *Koncepce romské integrace* „Roma Integration Plan", approved on June 26th, 2004 (see the entire text in Zpráva-integrace 2005: 55-85). In 2005, Czech government has joined the iniciative of George Soros' Open Society Institute, the World Bank and other eight countries from Central and East Europe called the "Decade of Roma Inclusion" (2005-2015) (http://www.romadecade.org/), which is designed to combat Roma poverty, exclusion, and discrimination within a regional framework. Its Czech National Action Plan makes no mentioning of measures aimed at language management. The Government financially supports the Museum of Roma Culture in Brno as well as a number of Roma periodicals and cultural programs (Zpráva, 2006).

At present, the Roma are prepared to defend their interests; however, the matrix community often perceives its interests as being opposed to those of the Roma, and it possesses the power to realize its interests. The only power the Roma can exercise is through radical social and political action, and there is no doubt that they are able to do so. A question that is of importance is to what extent the interests of the Roma intellectual elites, which represent the Roma in the community at large, will in the future coincide with the interests of average members of the community. The establishment of a political representation standing for the whole of the Roma subpopulation – as it is urged by policy makers – is hard to realize,

because the social structure based on kinship relations has atomized after the migration to Czechia, where parts of one family merged with fragments from otherwhere (Raichova & al., 2001: 200). The Vlach community does have its own political and juridical system 'kris', independant of majority structures, but no communication with state representatives is taking place. Responsibility lies with the Government to show that it is prepared to elaborate existing and to take further effective measures to alleviate the situation. As Keller notes (2002), the basic prerequisite is the improvement of the economic performance of the country in general, but much more can be achieved before that happens if the ideology of the matrix community moves towards more ethnic tolerance.

A considerable number of cultural, social and political Roma organizations are oriented not only toward the left but also toward the right (cf. Zpráva, 2002: 71).

3.3.1. The Romani Langauge: Situation, Problems

Romani is structurally and lexically an Indian language, closely related to the languages of present-day northwestern India. A large number of grammatical features and common lexical items can easily be identified. On the other hand, Romani dialects also contain a number of lexical features borrowed from the languages with which its speakers have historically come in contact and, primarily, from the languages of the matrix societies in which the Roma have lived. These borrowings also include some grammatical words (e.g., in the Czech-Slovak dialect *al'e* "but") . Romani is divided into a number of dialects. The original Czech dialect and the Sinti (German) dialects spoken in pre-war Bohemia and Moravia have become virtually extinct since the holocaust (Elšík, 2000/2001), and continue to be used only in individual families. Present-day Romani as spoken in the Czech Republic derives mostly from Slovakia. The dialects are:

(1) Slovak-and-Czech Romani (the "Northern Central" group according to Boretzky's commonly accepted dialect classification, Boretzky 1999) is the majority dialect, which further splits into an Eastern and a rare Western variety.
(2) Hungarian Romani is a grammatically conservative dialect,strongly influenced by Hungarian. It came to the Czech Republic from Slovakia and is usually classified as "Southern Central" (Boretzky 1999).
(3) Vlach group. The particular dialect which is present in the Czech Republic is Lovari. Members of the Vlach group were itinerant until a strict law was adopted and enforced in 1958. It was formed originally in Rumanian speaking areas and came to the Czech Republic from Slovakia.

The dialects are distinct but there is at least basic inter-intelligibility among them (Hübschmannová & Neustupný, 1996:104). The Czech-and-Slovak and the Hungarian are culturally and linguistically very close and generally don't notice the difference. The intellegibility is much better between Vlach and Hungarian Roma, due to common influence from Hungarian.

3.3.2. Multilingualism of the Roma

While speaking about language management of the Roma, it is necessary to realize that every single Roma of the middle and older generation is bilingual or multilingual. This is unusual for the prevaliantly monolingual majority, for whom the only language contact situation consists of the use of English (or other) as a means of professional or touristic communication. The Roma multilinguism is a continuation of the status in India, where the

Roma's ancestors apparently employed a small segment of the socio-professional continuum (Hübschmannová 1999) and were used to communicate with clients and suppliers belonging to other language communities. In comparison to this status, the language has recently slightly expanded functionality, as some Romani courses are being held on public institutions (universities, high schools, NGO's, on voluntary basis on some elementary schools), and popular music and some media makers are making use of Romani, which Matras calls the emblematic function (Matras 1999). Speakers of the Vlach group are using Romani overtly, and not only as secret talk. Otherwise, in commercial use, in public health care, at local authorities, in courtrooms Czech is (beside Slovak and locally Polish) omnipresent, and the Roma are fully adapted to this. Therefor Romani is generally invisible to the surrounding, which leads to statements like that of a district responsible, that "the reason [for little demand of interpreters and of instruction in Romani] is given by the fact, that not all Roma have command of Romani" (Zpráva 2006: 111). Therefore, too, Romani is perceived as contradictory to progress and education, both by the majority and by the Roma themselves. E.g. an university professor is openly surprised that one of his master graduates, well-known to be Roma, is a native speaker of Romani, having no command of Czech until her school enrolment. So, apart from their dialect of Romani, they also use Czech, often Slovak, and sometimes Hungarian. The knowledge of Slovak and Hungarian is required to maintain personal networks abroad. The Czech they speak may be pidginized (Šebková 1995, Žlnayová 1995, Bořovcová 2007), and it will be necessary to determine whether they distinguish between a variety of Czech spoken among themselves and another variety spoken to the *gajo* (non-Roma people). Similarly, their Romani may be characterized by a smaller or larger admixture of the matrix language, and their Czech and Slovak may combine into a single variety. This situation resembles the relaxed strategies of language use described by Khubchandani (1981) for India, with the proviso that one cannot assume that the pattern is in any way necessarily connected to the Indian origin of the language. For many of the younger generation, a variety, or varieties, of Czech become the only language available for active use. Especially within this younger group, calls for renaissance of language and culture can be heard. The Government Council for National Minorities estimates that approximately one half of the Czech Roma uses Romani (Zpráva 2002: 4), and the Government's Council for Roma communities' affairs gives 55% (Zpráva-integrace 2005: 13), but the use of a language is a complicated phenomenon, and experts assume that, even in the case of those who do not actually conduct daily conversation in the language, sometimes amazing degrees of competence still remain.

3.3.3. The Romani Language: Simple Management

There is evidence that native speakers of Romani note and evaluate dialectal difference in discourse. In Hübschmannová & Neustupný (1996), apart from individual examples (p.97), three speakers of the Eastern dialect of Romani were asked to comment on a text written in the Western dialect of Slovak-and-Czech Romani. Certain, though not all, differing features were noted and some were evaluated by the judges. It was interesting that the word *mamuj* "against" (*prociv* in the Eastern dialect) was evaluated once negatively and once positively. On the whole, the management was not strong, with one of the three speakers, in particular, noting differences but refusing to evaluate. A stereotypic evaluation appeared in one case when the word *čulo* "a little" was marked as belonging to a *degeša* (unclean, language of dog and horse flash eaters) dialect despised by the *žuže* (clean) Roma. There is, in fact, no linguistic difference between the *degeša* and *žuže* communities, and the word *čulo* is simply a regional variant.

While Romani shows a relatively high degree of maintenance in the settlements of the Slovak type, within the Czech urban setting, shift is rapid and, unless the trend can be reversed, there may be nothing to maintain within single generations. One should realize that, not unlike many other communities, a number of Romani intellectuals do not support the maintenance of the language, rather claiming that their *romipen* "Roma-ness" does not depend on the language. Ironically, the writer Dezider Banga, who himself also publishes in Romani, is among such individuals. The stigma of the ethnic group has reached also one of its attributes, the language. Similar parallels are found in the transfer of attitudes of Czech-and-Slovak Roma to the Vlach towards their language. Generally they are conceived as traditional, and their language owes a prestige of being original and free of Czech influence. Non-Vlach children reportedly wish to learn the Vlach dialect.

There does not appear to be any study of Romani discourse that demonstrates how management takes place when the spoken language is used. Informal observations confirm that there is much switching at lexical and phrasal level between Romani and Czech, and such switching testifies to problems in communication that are solved through switching. Of course, this is not the case when a Czech expression is already a component of the Romani lexicon. When it is not, there is a possibility that switching will become automatized at the level of the speaker in question. This illustrates how language loss proceeds: from individual utterance, to the language of an individual, and then to the language of the whole community. In formal contexts, for example, when a Roma speaks at a conference, his/her Romani can be completely free of switching, but the language expression, in this case, is of course managed: within a very formal context such as this problems are noted, and adjustment is implemented so that no switching takes place.

Hübschmannová (1979) showed another important phenomenon connected with management of language by the Roma in discourse. The Czech of Romani children at Rokycany (Western Bohemia), where 82% of the children included in her study reported using Romani at home, was ungrammatical. However, the Czech of Romani children in a Prague sample, where only 6 percent of children used Romani at home, was equally ungrammatical. This example shows the lack of management of the children's Czech. A pidgin or a creole was being born. This process, typical for a situation of limited networks between native and non-native speakers (Hymes, 1971), still continues at the present time.

On the other hand, as the formation of ethnic awareness proceeds, more and more individuals try to speak and learn Romani. In some families, children are systematically addressed in the language. However, there is little opportunity to develop and reinforce this knowledge further in classroom situations.

3.3.4. The Romani Langauge: Organized Management

While the Romani language is still in use, attempts at its management appear at higher levels of organization as well. Although practically all political programs produced by Romani groups, and recently also by Governmental organizations, praise the language as a symbol of the existence of the Roma, little management is conducted. Most of the following management acts have been pursued with the strong assistance of agents who are not themselves Roma.

3.3.4.1. Romani at primary level

There is no primary, or other, education that uses Romani as the vehicle of instruction, although there are Romani children who arrive at school with a mixture of Romani and Czech, or with Czech that is lexically (and grammatically) pidginized. Romani is not mentioned in the educational part of the Report on the Situation of the Roma Communities

2004 (Zpráva-integrace 2005: 8-12). The language question is always posed from the perspective of a Czech native speaker, noting a „deficit in language skills [in Czech] ". Strictly speaking, there are no measures at all aimed especially at improving the education of Roma, because except for scholarship for Roma students the report mentions only "children from a socio-cultural disadvantaged environment." Nevertheless the context allows reading them as referring to Roma children. Most measures are aimed at combatting the alleged lack of integration ability, consisting of their cultural and social divergence.For example, the establishment of preparatory classes has contributed to the improvement of the education of Roma children. Such classes were originally designed for Roma children, but they are now open to all "socio-culturally disadvantaged children", having been acknowledged as suitable for children of foreigners in general (Praha a národnosti, 1998: 25). In 1998, the Ministry of Education approved the employment of Roma assistants whose task is to make it easier for Roma children, using their own language, to start school attendance at Czech primary schools. In the school year 2005/06, there were 123 preparatory classes operating at primary schools (79) and primary schools with some specific training program (44) . Towards the end of 2005, the Ministry employed 306 Roma assistants (Zpráva 2006: 46); however 34% of the socially excluded Roma localities had no assistants (GAC 2006). Further measures comprise the enrolment into kindergartens with mixed Czech and Roma environment, the expansion of kindergarten attendance to a maximum via persuasive campaigns by social workers and financial stimuli. Whole-day care schools and preparatory classes aim at redrawing the children from their environment seen as unsuitable to their welfare (which is a tradition from the Austrian-Hungarian empire).

The intentions fixed in the Roma Integration Plan (Zpráva-integrace 2005: 55-85) consider Romani as a school subject. However as a medium of instruction it is rejected: "For Romani children, as well as for adults Roma, it is important to enable Romani language cultivation in unpaid language courses. In these courses children are introduced into traditional Roma culture, literature and history as well. Text books will be elaborated for these courses, together with didactical manuals for teachers. Graduates in romistics from the Faculty of Arts of Charles' University could teach these courses, along with teachers whose mother language is Romani. The establishment of a separate ethnic educational system compared to the Polish one is not part of the affirmative actions in Roma education. The majority of Roma do likewise not demand to set up such an ethnic educational system." (Zpráva-integrace 2005: 72-73). Hereby policy carries on like a decade ago: „The Romani language is serving and will continue serving as auxiliary language to achieve elementary goals, meaning to equalize the educational handicap of the Roma population." (Frištenská & Sulitka, 1995, p. 17)

Because of different linguistic and social background, Roma children experience considerable communication difficulty, even if, on the surface, their Czech reveals no major problems (which is described for many bilingual communities, Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). A standard adjustment measure has consisted of transfer to "special schools" which were basically designed for mentally retarded children. Beginning with the revised school law Nr. 561/2004, these schools have formally changed to ordinary elementary schools with specially designed teaching plans, and after finishing school, the children receive an ordinary school degree. Still the quality level of these schools is very low, and they are continued to be viewed as „Romani schools". Parents endorse, or even initiate, the transfer if they know that the child is unhappy at the normal school. Roma children themselves mostly enjoy these schools where requirements are grossly reduced and where most children come from Roma families. Teachers in normal classes are glad to get rid of underachievers. None of the participants in this adjustment process worry about the fact that the children will be unable to proceed to higher education (because of low initial abilities) and that they are for life excluded from jobs

that require anything more than the very elementary education level. A new generation of the unemployed is in the making (Wilková, 1999). Czech authorities and teachers take the special schools and the treatment of the Roma children to be natural and unavoidable. The self-assured tone of their statements is frightening (cf. the daily MF Dnes 16/6/1999).

The NGO *Nová škola* „New School“ (www.novaskola.org) introduced in 1997 a competition in Romani written literature for school children *Romano suno* „Roma dream“ to rise awareness for Romani among this age group.

3.3.4.2. Secondary and adult education

The Roma Social Secondary School (*Romská střední škola sociální*) was founded in 1998. Seven further secondary schools of this type started to work by 2006 in areas inhabited by Roma. These schools provide full secondary level training in the area of social care for Roma ethnic communities. Graduates are expected to find employment in national or local government or in other social work institutions. The curricula include classes in Romani, a survey of the history and culture of the Roma and Roma literature (Praha a národnosti, 1998: 75). There is also a Protestant Academy (*Evangelická akademie*) in Prague which, since 1997, also includes a *Roma Academy*. This institution trains adult students of Roma extraction for social work as advisors in Roma problems in local government. The curricula also include Romani (Praha a národnosti, 1998:73). These schools receive financial support from the Government. Two further secondary schools, in Most and in Ostrava, provide Romani courses, too. In Brno, classes of Romani are available at the Cultural and Educational Centre for Roma Children and the Young (*Kulturní a vzdělávací centrum pro romské děti a mládež*), as well as some other NGO in other parts of the country. These courses also accommodate teachers, public servants and police officers (Lidové noviny 27/1/1999). A television course of Romani entitled *Amare Roma* was broadcast, by Czech TV, from 2000 to 2001 (Elšík, 2000/2001).

All these activities are related to the Czech-and-Slovak variety and indirectly also to the Hungarian Roma. For the Vlach there are no opportunities.

3.3.4.3. University courses

The fullest and most rigorous tertiary program is available in the Faculty of Arts at Charles University in Prague – a 5 year course, developed in 1991 by the specialist in Romani language and culture, Professor Milena Hübschmannová, in which 20 students devote themselves fully to the study of the Romani language and culture or the study of Romani together with another discipline. The students are partly of Czech, partly of Romani origin. Graduates of the program normally become teachers, public servants or work in other positions connected with the Roma issue. Part of the program is a compulsory one-year course of Vlach, the only occasion to learn this dialect.

The Romani language is also available in the Education Faculty of Charles University, where teachers are trained, in the Faculty of Arts of the Ostrava University in Ostrava and in the Education Faculty of the J.E. Purkyně University at Ústí nad Labem, in an area characterized by a high density of Roma population. Many students are connected with the Special Schools where Roma children form a majority. Teachers are non-native graduates of the Charles University program (Elšík, 2000/2001).

Research and documentation on language and culture varieties in Czechia are made at the Institute of Linguistics at Karl-Franzens-Universität in Graz, the Institute for Linguistics at Arhus University and at the School of Languages, Linguistics and Cultures at the University of Manchester (cf. the on-line dictionary on Czech-Slovak Romani, Matras & Halwachs 2007 and its ancient features at the Romani Morphosyntactic Database, Matras 2007).

Overall, the programs described constitute a very limited range for a country in which the Roma community is the second or third largest community.

3.3.4.4. Educational infrastructure

The compilation of textbooks is an important act of language management. Antonín Puchmajer's *Románi Čib*, published posthumously in 1821, was the first textbook of the language ever written. There were no other textbooks until *Cikánsky snadno a rychle* was launched in a popular series of textbooks in 1900. These books were based on the Czech variety of Romani, which has since become extinct. The first modern textbook was Jiří Lípa's *Příručka cikánštiny* (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1963) this was followed by two short books authored by Milena Hübschmannová: *Základy romštiny* (Prague: Academia, 1973) and *Cikánština* (Ústí nad Labem: Krajský pedagogický ústav, 1976). The most recent textbook is *Romaňi čhib*, published in 1999 by Hana Šebková and Edita Žlnayová by the Fortuna publishing house. This was the first "full" textbook of the language. All texts published after Lípa's present the Slovak-and-Czech variety of the language (Elšík, 2000/2001), equally like the Romani grammar by Hana Šebková and Edita Žlnayová (Šebková & Žlnayová 1998). More advanced teaching material (e.g. multimedial, with modern teaching methods) is not available, neither is qualified personnel, consultancy or training institutions. On the other hand, native speakers, competent in the application of the language, are not authorised for teaching. Therefor, quite a low quality level of education may be expected, which might prevent authorities, parents, and pedagogic staff even from any initial experiment. But some teaching has started, and some material, personnel and experience can be used to gradually improve the situation.

Of great importance is the *Romsko-český a česko-romský kapesní slovník* by Hübschmannová, Šebková and Žigová, published in 1991 (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství), one of the most rigorous dictionaries of Romani that has ever been published, recently transferred to partial on-line use as one of 25 European Romani dialects on the so called RomLex lexical database (Matras & Halwachs 2007).

A collection of Romani written books useful for educational purposes, sorted by dialects, has been collected by Peter Bakker and Hristo Kyuchukov (Bakker & Kyuchukov 2003). In or about Vlach, not more than half a dozen books have been issued. Teachers of Vlach have to rely on material from Hungaria (in Hungarian, Choli-Daróczi et al. 1988, Rostás-Farkas et al. 1991/2001) or Austria (Halwachs et al. 1998).

3.3.4.5. Standardization and Elaboration

Throughout history writing skills have been acquired by the mediation of Czech, being the exclusive medium of literacy, and so today the prime-choice language for written communication is Czech. The Roma have adapted to some kind of radical diglosia with extreme differences between colloquial [diˀkʰes] and literal "vidíš" language (meaning "you see"). More memorable representation systems (dikhes) are felt uncommon and are hardly accepted. Spontaneous codification (e.g. "dykes") is – by a lack of confidence with other systems – grounded on habits from the official writing system, not reflecting particularities of Romani. From bilingual texts, and also for internal communication, the Czech version is chosen. E.g. Romani speaking families exchange their greetings, emails, and personal telling in the majority language. Due to this, neither producers nor consumers are familiar with or even aware of Romani writing. Therefor publications in Romani are to be considered organized management. Books for the Roma audience comprise novels and poetry, fairy tales, oral history, riddles, proverbs, receipes and broshures with legal, administrative and health care information. They are monolingual in Czech or, by intention of individuals, bilingual Romani-Czech. Two authors belong to the Vlach group.

Concerning media as the co-producers and executers of standardization, "the situation of the Roma reached during the last years a development comparable with the situation of the other ethnic minorities. The Roma have access to public media: in radio broadcasting 'O Roma vakeren', … in occasional programs by the Czech television …, in state funded internet broadcasting 'Radio Rota'". Roma periodicals Romano Hangos (3600 issues), Romano Vodi (3000 issues) and Kereka (4700 issues) are receiving subsidies, further on internet sites www.romea.cz and www.dzeno.cz and the journal for documentation and presentation of the Romani culture Romano Dzaniben" (Zpráva-integrace 2005: 13). This sounds magnificent, but the language of publishing is generally still Czech, apart from single articles offered parallelly in Romani. In Vlach, some single pages are published per year.

No attempts at standardization have been made, except for the standardization of spelling and awareness building for word formation. The spelling rules were developed at the end of the 1960s by the Linguistic Commission of the Union of Gypsies-Roma, and they have been adhered to with relative consistency (cf. Hübschmannová & Neustupný, 1996, Hübschmannová & Neustupný, 2004), comments in "Romano hangos" are such an exception.

Elaboration of Romani takes place in individuals´ efforts on the pages of Romani journals such as *Romano džaniben* (published in Prague, 1994 –to date). No systematic attempts at elaboration of the lexicon or the grammar are known, although Hübschmannová, Šebková and Žigová (1991) in fact has developed the language in many respects.

Following the first workshop for Romani linguists, editors and other users of Romani in 2003 in Luhačovice, a sampler (Andrš 2003) was published containing analyses of actual problems in codification and word formation, and a detailled recapitulation of its state-of-the-art by Šebková and Hübschmannová. Recommendations aiming at the establishment of a medial committee, at further university courses on Romani and at the intensification of broadcasting in Romani haven't been realized yet.

3.3.4.6. Governmental Level Management

The Czech government has always featured Romani on its list for potential language management action. One reason for this was the pressure from the USA to keep the Roma problem under control. However, under the new-liberalism philosophy of the Klaus government, the status quo was to be preserved. In the eyes of the Government, ethnic issues were sufficiently attended to, and positive discrimination with regard to any group was out of question. The following Social Democratic Government of Miloš Zeman appointed Petr Uhl as a Cabinet Commissioner for Human Rights. Uhl submitted a number of proposals to solve the Roma question, including special provisions within the proposed Ethnic Minorities Act.

It was only in the late 1990s that the attitude of Czech politicians changed. The Czech Republic ratified the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and signed the Charter of European Regional or Minority Languages; the Ethnic Minorities Law was accepted in 2001. A number of special measures which also affect the Roma have been adopted. Of basic importance for future language policy is the establishment of the Government's Council for Matters of the Roma Community, stating, among others, that "the assimilative way may lead to a complete citizenship, but the government is persuaded, that it would be a loss to the whole of society", and "the loss of Roma identity, culture and language must not be a condition to the integration of the Roma." Priority e) out of seven named grants "the development of the Romani culture and language" (Zpráva-integrace 2005: 59-60). At present, university research and education, documentation and archivation activities, presentation of the Roma culture, as well as publication and broadcasting for the Roma are supported (Zpráva-integrace 2005: 83-84) Nevertheless, the section "Support to the Development of the Roma Language and Culture and to Scientific Research" constitutes the last one out of 23 pages of the Roma Integration Plan. Within a recent study on possible

measurements to improve the living situation in socially excluded Roma localities (GAC 2006), the language question wasn't examined. It was addressed in the recommendation to provide "socio-linguistic research about the language facilities of Roma children born in socially excluded enclaves." (GAC 2006: 104)

As it is true that there is no international hinterland for support of develpoment and standardisation of Romani, the widespread character of the Roma population is tightly connected with miscellaneous activities abroad which can be used for local language management (e.g. the above mentioned Matras 2007, Matras & Halwachs 2007, Bakker & Kyuchukov 2003). Another partner body is the European Centre for Modern Languages, which is actually developing a Common curriculum framework for Romani (www.ecml.at). The Romani variety most frequently used in Czechia and Slovakia is being introduced into the Slovak school system, which might solve as a blueprint base for Czech efforts of the same kind. The experimental introduction is co-ordinated by the *Štátny pedagogický ústav* "National pedagogical institute" (www.statpedu.sk), which uses Czech expertship for language and culture implementation.

3.3.4.7. Further Management?

One of the basic problems unlikely to be attended to at the educational or governmental level is the issue of networks. One branch of this problem consists of networks between the Roma and the matrix population. Only such networks can contribute to arresting the pidginization of Czech spoken by the Roma and open the way to wide-ranged acquisition of the matrix system of communication. At the same time, such networks will, without necessarily wiping out their specificity, help to integrate the Roma into the matrix community from the point of view of their sociocultural behaviour. The second branch of the issue consists of networks within the Roma community – networks that will reinforce the process of formation of Roma ethnicity and that will make it possible for the Roma to join forces in order to maintain their language – should this be their wish.

Another issue that may appear on the program of the day is standardization. In Hübschmannová & Neustupný (1996), the authors argued that old (modern) models of standardization should not be used for Romani. Whether or not to standardize, and in what way, should be a choice for the community as it achieves maturity and as it faces the issue.

Whatever language management at whatever level may take place, one thing is certain: language management will not succeed unless it is preceded by empowering the Roma through socioeconomic and communicative management (Neustupný, 1993). Perhaps it is possible to exterminate the language without socioeconomic planning, because maintaining the current socioeconomic regime is in fact a policy. However, to solve existing problems, to maintain the language and to develop it requires the strengthening of the socioeconomic position of the Roma.

3.4. THE POLISH COMMUNITY

In the 2001 census, 51,968 people reported Polish ethnicity. In 1991, the number was 59,383. Most of these people live in the Těšín region, a relatively small North Moravian territory which is a component of the Czech part of historical Silesia that borders on Poland. It consists of two districts: Karviná, where, in 2001, 19,040 people (6.8 per cent of the population of the district) registered as Poles, and Frýdek-Místek, 18,077 people (8 per cent of the population). The remaining Poles live dispersed among the Czechs and other ethnic groups, essentially over the whole territory of the Czech Republic – a higher density can be observed only in Northern, Eastern and Central Bohemia. It is necessary to also take into consideration that at present several thousand Poles work on long-term permits in the Republic. In the Škoda-

Volkswagen automobile factory in Mladá Boleslav alone, several hundreds were employed in 1996. In the case of Poles in the Czech Republic it is therefore possible to identify at least three categories (Zeman, 1994):

1. the Těšín community,
2. Poles living in other districts, and
3. foreign workers.

However, it is the first category that attracts most attention, and that category will constitute the target of this account.

Maximum size was attained by the Polish community in 1910 when 158,261 people reported Polish as their mother tongue. In the following decade the number dropped to 103 521, a decrease caused partly by a change in patterns of reporting in the Těšín region where many people were ethnically indifferent, and partly by emigration. Since then, the number of people who declared themselves to be Poles has consistently declined to the current level. It seems that, in the years from 1950 to 1980, almost 33,600 Poles (46.2 per cent of the 1950 community) changed their ethnic allegiance, now mostly reporting as Czechs (Srb, 1987).

The Polish minority of the Těšín region originates in the decision of the post-WWI negotiations about Central Europe when the region was allotted to the Czechoslovak state. This was an act of management by force, and there was no way of opposing the power of those who made the decision. Many Poles, who in this way found themselves living outside of Poland, considered the decision as unjust. This feeling marked the cohabitation of Poles and Czechs on the territory ever since, and language management within the situation has attracted much attention from Czechoslovak (now Czech) and Polish authorities (Borák, 1999) ever since. At the end of the 1930s, and also immediately following WWII, the incorporation of the region into Czechoslovakia became the object of severe conflict between Czechoslovakia and Poland. The postwar conflict was only terminated following strong pressure from the Soviet Union in 1947.

In the period between the two World Wars, the Těšín region witnessed the development of a dense network of Polish schools and a large number of Polish cultural, sports and economic institutions. Initially, there were few Polish intellectuals of local origin, and these were mostly school teachers. The population predominantly found employment in the mining and iron works industries. The process of further industrialization which followed WWII led to the dissolution of the original ethnic structure. It brought to the Těšín region tens of thousands of Slovaks whose overall percentage in the Karviná district in 1991 was as high as that of Poles. In 2001 Poles (19,040) were, however, again more numerous than Slovaks (15,948). In comparison, the Czech element comprised 229,658 people. Polish ethnicity was also negatively influenced by the disappearance of Polish villages and the movement of the population to urban centres such as Havířov, Karviná, Orlová, Třinec. Under the Communist Party government, Polish associations were reduced to a single organization, the *Polský kulturně-osvětový svaz* (in Polish *Polski Związek Kulturalno-Oświatowy*), founded in 1947. This name itself makes it clear that the aim of this organization was strictly non-political. At the beginning of the 1950s, the network of Polish schools expanded, but subsequently, with the decline in demand, the number of schools also decreased. In 1955, the principle of bilingualism, which guaranteed bilingual signs on buildings, bilingual official notices, etc. in towns and villages with a larger number of Polish inhabitants, was accepted in the region (obviously approved by a top organ of the Communist Party) before it was codified in official regulations. The implementation of the principle has been a sensitive issue up to the present time. There are indications that, for the Polish community, it has primarily been understood as a strategy symbolizing the equality of Poles and Czechs within the region (Sokolová 1999b).

In daily life most Poles are at least receptively bilingual in Polish and Czech. However, an important non-symbolic role was played by Polish libraries, or the Polish section within local libraries, as well as by the Polish section of the Těšín Theatre. Since 1951, Polish broadcasting is also available on Czech national radio.

Following the changes of 1989, social organization became freer, and Poles diversified in their allegiances. Apart from the *Polský kulturně-osvětový svaz*, a more ambitious *Rada Poláků* (today *Kongres Poláků v ČR*) came into being in 1991. However, it seems that no major change in the life of the community eventuated (Borák, 1998). Previous trends continue, and the most prominent of these is assimilation. According to the available statistics in 1994, Poles entered into only 27.9 percent of ethnically homogeneous marriages. One of the factors in the decline of opting for Polish ethnicity has been the emergence of the Silesian ethnic category, which attracted 44,446 people in 1991 and 10,878 in 2001.

The trends mentioned above notwithstanding, Poles in the Těšín region remain the only territorially bound historical ethnic minority in the Czech Republic. Hence they have attracted the attention of a number of specialists, for example from the *Slezký ústav* (Silesian Institute) in Opava. Since the end of the 1980s sociolinguistic work has started to appear. In 1991, University of Ostrava established a special *Ústav pro výzkum polského etnika v České republice* (Institute for Research of the Polish Ethnic Group in the Czech Republic), the function of which is today partly replaced by *Ústav pro regionální studia* (*Institute for Regional Studies*). After the demise of Czechoslovakia in 1993, more attention of the Czech and Polish authorities has concentrated on the Polish minority of the Těšín region than had occurred in the ethnically more varied Czechoslovak state.

At the beginning of the 21st century, there were definitely Poles who felt that their interests were being suppressed through the power of the Czech State. The Report of the Government Council for National Minorities mentions that its Polish member negatively evaluated the conduct of the 2001 census because, immediately prior to that census, the Czech media reported that the census documents might be misused, thus in fact deterring minority individuals from declaring their true feelings. According to the Polish member of the Council, the actual number of Poles in the territory of the Czech Republic was 70,000. In this figure, he included all those who had declared Silesian ethnicity. In that part of the Report that conveys the views of individual members of the Council, the Polish representative criticized the current situation on many counts, including hidden intolerance and discrimination (Zpráva, 2002: 68). His attitude shows that problems do exist. It is an important question to what extent the joint entry of Poland and the Czech Republic into the European Union in 2004 will change the overall situation.

3.4.1. The Polish Language: Situation, Problems

Polish shares with Czech, Slovak and Sorbian membership in the group of Western Slavic languages. This fact alone indicates the closeness of the two languages. Though at present Czech and Polish show a number of structural differences (see Lotko, 1997; Lotko, 1998), the comprehensibility of speech in the other language is relatively high. Haugen (1966) correctly included Czech and Polish among his examples of the phenomenon he called *semicommunication*. The best conditions for receptive Czech-Polish bilingualism no doubt exist in the Těšín region, but it could become a wider phenomenon in other Czech territories as well. For example, when, in the 1970s and 1980s, Polish TV was more attractive than Czech TV, many television antennas in Czechoslovakia were set to receive Polish signals. This was true not only of the Czech-Polish border areas but also of some large East Bohemian towns such as Hradec Králové, and the occurrence was not limited to intellectuals. It seems that between Poles, Czechs and Slovaks potentially a similar communicative relationship can

obtain as between Danes, Norwegians and Swedes. This fact awaits the attention of language managers, especially in view of the expected entry of the three central European nations into the European Union.

In the Těšín region, the Polish community, in daily communication, employs three different varieties of language: their Těšín region mother dialect, a locally influenced variety of Standard Czech and an equally locally affected variety of Standard Polish (cf. Bogoczová, 1994). More than half of the Poles have been reported to use these three varieties in the family domain as well (Bogoczová, 1994: 24). The most extensive use is made of the Těšín dialect. This phenomenon is connected with the fact that Standard Polish is seen as a hard variety, used principally in official Polish schools, minority social organizations, newspapers (e.g. *Głos Ludu*), radio and television programmes and during the Mass in church (Muryc 2005: 44). A sophisticated form of conversational Standard Polish could not develop in the region because, due to politically induced isolation from the Polish spoken in Poland, contacts were limited. In view of this, Poles from the Těšín region experience difficulty in everyday conversation with Poles from Poland: the amount of discourse management in which they must engage is excessive. The prestige of the Těšín dialect is increased by the fact that it is also used by a population that reports Czech ethnicity. For such speakers, it may be either the native dialect or a form of speech they acquired through long residence in the region. The dialect stands linguistically half way between Polish and Czech, however, Bogoczová (2001: 15) showed that the linguistic system of the dialect is closer to Polish. Ironically, the variety which enjoys the highest prestige in the Polish community is Standard Czech which connects with the power of the state and of the Czech matrix community in general. Czech is also the language offered by Poles in communication in first encounters with strangers. The degree of Standardness of Czech used by members of the Polish community is often higher than in the case of Czech speakers of the same region. (An illustrative example is provided below.) Hence, one cannot easily derive conclusions about ethnicity on the basis of speech behaviour alone. Bogoczová (1997) showed that, in the language of the youngest generation of Poles, it is the influence of Czech, not of Polish, which asserts itself strongly in the lexicon and with regard to prepositions, conjunctions and particles. Less influence of Czech is noticeable in pronunciation, and still less in inflection.

A note on the attitudes of the Czech population to Polish seems useful. This attitude largely reflects their relationship with the Poles and with Poland. Bogoczová (2002) claims that when the Polish economy began to prosper during 1990s, Czech attitudes to Poles and Polish improved. The current interest in Polish has partly been invoked by the demise of the linguistic monopoly formerly held by Russian. Polish is becoming one of the leading Slavic languages studied by Czechs studying in departments of Slavic Studies at Czech universities.

Investigations by the *Slezký ústav* confirm that the language shift of Poles towards Czech is not as extensive as in the case of Slovaks, but it does reach high levels. The most recent extensive research conducted in 1994 revealed that, according to the opinions of parents, only 24.1% of children spoke (given no specification of a domain) predominantly Polish, 40% spoke Polish and Czech, and 31.9% predominantly used Czech (Sokolová & Hernová & Šrajerová 1997: 84). However, considering long-term trends, it seems that there is an accompanying increase in the orientation of the Polish community towards bilingualism and biculturalism (Sokolová & Hernová & Šrajerová 1997: 88). This trend is less evident among Slovaks in the Těšín region, and the bilingualism of the Czechs clearly lags behind both groups. Two languages are spoken by only 16% of Těšín Czechs, and those languages are Czech and Polish (Sokolová, 1999b: 130). Incidentally, it is necessary to add that figures from the investigations just quoted, as well as from the 1991 and 2001 censuses, must be interpreted with care, because the Těšín dialect used by both Poles and Czechs is often taken

for Polish by Poles and for Czech by Czechs (Bogoczová, 2000: 28; Sokolová, 1999a; cf. also Lotko 1994: 15).

3.4.2. The Polish Language: Simple Management

In the work domain, the selection of varieties is normally determined by the variety preferred by the superior. Bogoczová (2000: 21) notes that, when the superior is oriented towards the use of Czech, Czech is used. On the other hand, if the code preferred by the superior is the Těšín dialect, subordinate employees use the dialect or Czech. It is not unusual that subordinates have a better command of the variety than their superior. In the following conversation, which is a fragment of a meeting in the Třinec Iron Works, A is the superior (over 50, local origin, Czech), while B is a female employee within his section (37, local origin, ethnically Polish, graduate of a Polish primary and high school).

> A: *É tady mi řikate konkretňi vjeci, ale vysledeg je takovy, že komunykace vazne ...*
> "Well, here you tell me concrete results, but the result is that communication comes to a deadlock…"
> B: *Já jesli dovolíte, doplňím, doplňím trošku šéfa ...*
> "If you allow me, I'll supplement, supplement the chief's …"

It seems clear that A is oriented towards the use of Czech, but his management of Standard Czech is limited. B, who uses the Těšín dialect in her daily life, adjusts her language to the choice of her superior. Her Czech, unlike the Czech of her superior, is managed and void of the influence of the dialect. In the language of A, there is a shortening of long vowels (*řikate* instead of *říkáte* "you say", *takovy* instead of *takový* "such") and an assimilation of voiceless consonants before voiced ones (*vysledeg je* instead of *výsledek je* "the result is") (from Bogoczová, 2000, simplified).

3.4.3. The Polish Language: Organized Management

Reference to organized language management has been made throughout this section; at this point, a more detailed note on Polish schools should suffice to complete the review. The Polish community has at its disposal a relatively extensive network of kindergartens and primary schools, a high school (gymnázium) and Polish classes at a number of other secondary schools. In the Polish primary schools, the language of instruction is Polish but, starting from year 2, pupils must attend the subject "Czech language" which has been allocated the same number of hours as Polish. There has been a decrease in the number of students (in 1950: 81 Polish primary schools with 8,176 pupils; in 1995: 29 schools with 2,617 pupils) , but this decrease is not only caused by the decrease in the number of Poles but also by smaller families. In families of those who reported as Poles in 1991 only 142 children (out of the total number of 3,279) in the Těšín region attended Czech primary schools. More recent data show that interest in Polish schools is increasing (Sokolová & Hernová & Šrajerová, 1997: 104). It appears that problems are caused not so much by a lower number of schools as by their location (Sokolová, 1999b). A matter that is being discussed is the minimum number of children per class.

Language management for Polish has as its target the language of the only historically established and geographically specific minority in the Czech Republic. Historically, there has been a power element accompanied throughout the Soviet period by the "friendly" relations between Poland and Czechoslovakia. Unlike the case of German, management has not been affected by memories of WWII. However, there are few indications so far that the

management would be moving over into a "postmodern" system. If this trend actually exists, it may be more characteristic for regions other than the Těšín region, where older patterns of relationship seem to survive.

The Slovak community in the Těšín region has already been mentioned. Its position can be characterized in the following way: Slovaks have lost the character of one of the constituent ethnic groups of the state, but they have not yet accustomed themselves to the position of a minority. Hence, they are not sure how to use their minority rights. However, many of them feel that the authorities in the Těšín region should not limit their attention in language management to the relationship between Czechs and the Poles. Statements by only two Slovak respondents who evaluate the language management principles as currently practiced in the Těšín region negatively are provided. The first comment is:

"Why Polish only? All citizens of the Republic know Czech. If more than Czech, then Polish *and* Slovak should be acknowledged as equal."

The second respondent commented:

"This region is settled not merely by Czechs and Poles but by other ethnic groups as well. Bilingualism is discriminating against other groups." (cf.. Sokolová, 1999b)

3.5. THE GERMAN COMMUNITY

Germans, or German-speaking inhabitants, have lived in the territory of the present Czech Republic for more than 10 centuries. The co-existence of the Czech and German elements has had a special historical significance. The current situation will be the focus of the following text.

As mentioned above, the largest number of Germans in the territory of the Czech Republic was attested in 1910, when the population reached 3,492,362 (Srb, 1988). Old continuous settlements could be found, primarily near the borders with Germany and Austria, but there were ethnic islands within areas that were almost totally Czech. The German element was particularly strong in cities and towns, especially in Prague, Brno, and Jihlava. The wide distribution of the German population is attested by the fact that a recent project to produce an *Atlas historických německých nářečí* (Historical Atlas of German Dialects) found it necessary to collect data from nearly one third of the present day territory of the Czech Republic (Bachmann, 2002). After WWI, large numbers of Germans -- e.g., Austrian officials and others who were not native to the country-- left; a similar exit of foreign officials, soldiers and others brought in by the occupation during the period between 1939 and 1945 occurred after WWII. Nevertheless, in the middle of 1945 the remaining native German element represented approximately 2,809,000 individuals--i.e., 26.3 per cent of the entire population. Yet, two years later, following the large scale deportation of Germans to Germany and Austria, only some 180,000 (2.1 percent of the population) remained (Srb, 1988). This deportation was arranged on the basis of agreements reached at the Potsdam Conference (1945) and the implementation of the agreement was accepted by virtually the entire Czech population which considered the deportation a logical conclusion to WWII, a period marked by atrocities committed by the Nazi who, in their turn, had been enthusiastically supported by the majority of Czech Germans. No major objections were raised abroad either. At present, a number of people, including many Czechs, see the decision in a different light, but both the emotional and ideological atmosphere of the mid-1940s led to virtual universal acceptance of its justification at that time. Deportation did not affect German antifascists (often Social

Democrats or Communists), some old people, Germans from mixed marriages, and persons who were necessary for the functioning of the economy. These exemptions, of course, did not guarantee that such people would not be discriminated against. Often the decision regarding who should be allowed to stay was a matter of chance. The implementation of the deportation was not always compassionate; on the contrary it was sometimes even brutal --a record that has been reported in biographical research by many participants (see, e.g., Stehlíková, 1997: 70).

Over the course of the following decades the numbers of Germans decreased further: 159,938 in 1950; 134,143 in 1961; 80,903 in 1970; 58,211 in 1980 and 48,556 in 1991. The most recent figure represented only 0.5 percent of the population. This decline was partly due to emigration to the German Federal Republic and partly to rapid assimilation. In the period from 1965 to 1969 alone, when emigration procedures were eased, some 48,000 thousand people left. The process of assimilation was aided by territorial dispersion, mixed marriages, the absence of German schools and negative attitudes among the Czech majority to anything German, based on the experience of repression by the Nazis during wartime. Demographic research conducted in the 1980s showed that the German community was characterized by a low percentage of children and a high participation in the economy, mainly in working class jobs. The majority in the German population consisted of women (a higher ratio than in the matrix population), and 55 per cent of the community was over 50 years of age. The education profile of the community was one of the worst in the country (Srb, 1988).

Assimilation of the German community further deepened in the 1990s. In 1991, within the group up to 35 years of age there were only 9 per cent homogeneous marriages (i.e. both husband and wife German), while a few years later this figure declined to a mere 3 per cent. Sokolová &Hernová & Šrajerová (1997: 67) spoke about the dissolution of the community in the Czech matrix community. This view seems to be confirmed by the most recent census (2001), when only 39,106 (0.4 percent of the population of the country) claimed German ethnicity, 10,000 less than in 1991. This drift occurred notwithstanding the fact that German ethnicity no longer carried any social or political stigma or disadvantage.

Although in the course of the deportation the composition of the remaining German community was selected to suit the world view of the Communist Party, when the Party assumed unlimited political power in 1948 its approach to the community was guided by principles of discrimination rather than "proletarian internationalism". It is true that, at the beginning of the 1950s, four persons of German origin were "elected" (i.e., in fact appointed by the Party) to the parliament, but it was not until 1953 that all Germans were granted Czech citizenship, and the community did not achieve the legal status of a "minority" until 1968, eight years after other groups. After the Prague Spring, the first official organization of the Community, founded in 1969, was the *Kulturní sdružení občanů ČSSR německé národnosti* (The Cultural Association of Citizens of German Ethnicity) which continued to exist through the following decades. Before the Velvet Revolution (1989) it had 8,000 members in 60 branches.

After the social change of 1989 a number of changes took place. However, these changes pertained largely to the political rather than to the daily-life domains. The most prominent feature of the change was the appearance of a new organization, *Shromáždění Němců v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku* (Assembly of Germans in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia). This body tries to work within the spirit of the democratic society of the 1990s. However, the survival of the *Kulturní sdružení* shows that not all Germans negatively evaluated their previous form of association. At the beginning of the 1990s, intensive contact took place between the *Shromáždění Němců* and representatives of the *Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft*, which represents one segment of the Germans deported to the German Federal Republic. Through this channel, economic aid was directed to Germans in the Czech

Republic (Staněk, 1998). Later, however, aid was distributed by official organs of the German government, because the *Landsmannschaft* was viewed with concern not only by the Czech community but also by some members of the *Kulturní sdružení*. The attempt, in 1992, to found in Plzeň a political party called *Demokratická strana Sudety* (Democratic Sudeten Party) met with considerable resistance not only in the Czech community but even among Czech Germans (Leudar & Nekvapil, 1998). This attempt clearly opposed the interests of the Czech community, being interpreted as an attempt to return to the prewar period when Henlein's Nazi Sudeten Party pursued a clear policy of attaching the Sudeten region to Germany. Within the Czech community as well as within the German community itself the question appeared regarding what German organizations in the Czech Republic should actually do. Should they concentrate on revitalization of German culture and language, or should they include political programs, such as the abolition of the 1945 Beneš Decrees through which German property in Czechoslovakia was confiscated? It is an undisputable fact that the issue of compensation for the deported Germans will remain as an international political issue. However, equally undecided is the question of compensation for Germans who lost their property even though they were permitted to stay in the country. The economic situation of some members of the German community in the Czech Republic is at present satisfactory. Those who possess a knowledge of German often work in foreign (German) companies where pay is much higher than in Czech enterprises. Many others work in Germany. The case of the Hlučín region (cf. MFD 11.5.2000) shows that such arrangements can affect thousands of people.

The German community is not restricted to Germans who were born and educated in the country. A considerable number of German companies are active in the Czech Republic with the consequence that a number of sojourner executives and other employees arrive from Germany. The number is not easy to establish. The 2001 census showed 3,438 persons who possessed German citizenship. These Germans, mainly managers, enjoy a high socioeconomic status which is at variance with the Czech Germans. While an average Czech hardly notices that remnants of a formerly huge German community still live in the country, the "German Germans" are in focus. They are the bearers of foreign capital, which is important to the country but that foreign capital is also frequently viewed as a risk (Houžvička, 2001). This group of German Germans have tried to prevent resistance due to the fear of German economic dominance by representing their companies as international rather than German (Nekvapil, 1997a, Nekvapil and Nekula, 2006).

3.5.1. The German Language: Situation, Problems

The boundaries between Czech and German, as they are attested from the first half of the 20th century, had stabilized at the roll over from the 18th to the 19th century. One of the extreme positions of the German isogloss was situated only 40 km north of Prague (Skála, 1977). Although most of the population was monolingual in either Czech or German, up to the end of the 18th century the use of one language or the other did not constitute a waterproof testimony of ethnic membership. The belief that Czechs speak Czech and Germans German was the result of sociopolitical polarization that took place in the 19th century. Even then it was possible to witness a numerous group of speakers who were bilingual and in principle ethnically uncommitted (Trost, 1995).

In the second half of the 19th century, Czech-German bilingualism received a strong blow from the nationalistic feeling, developed on both the Czech and German side, that language and ethnic loyalty are inevitably connected. German still remained the language of the top levels of the society, intertwined with foreign elites, but, following the inauguration of Czech as the language of instruction at the university level (1882), it became possible to

achieve the highest level of education in that language. This development further decreased the need for bilingualism. Fewer and fewer Czech pupils enrolled in German middle schools (Nekula, 2002b). The foundation of Czechoslovakia in 1918 resulted in a language law, adopted in 1920 (amended in 1926) that required, of public servants and employees in the public sector, knowledge of Czech or Slovak (Staněk, 1999: 98). This requirement meant that, among other things, Czech officials took over positions in the Sudeten areas close to the border, because there were few local German speakers who possessed a sufficient knowledge of the new official language (cf. Povejšil, 1997).

The occupation of Czechoslovakia by Germany at the beginning of WWII brought a complete reversal of the relative weight of the two languages. Within the remaining Czech territory of the *Protektorat Böhmen-Mähren*, German was the language of the masters. On the other hand, after WWII German became a despised language, and a trend appeared to discourage Germans who were not deported from speaking their language (Nekvapil, 2000b). The negative attitudes toward the Germans extended to attitudes toward the German language, including words of German origin (Tejnor et al.,1982). Pragmatic decision at the end of 1947 to reintroduce German as an elective subject in schools was commented on in the press in the following way: "all right, let's learn the language, but let's not speak it, especially not with the Germans!" (from Staněk, 1993: 52). More than half a decade of terror, with daily executions, mass murders, and concentration camps, all associated with the German language, were not easily forgotten. In the 1960s, a revival of interest in learning German first appeared, but it was not until the 1990s that a more tolerant attitude to borrowings and calques from German emerged (Nekula, 1997).

Germans who were not deported gradually altered their language behaviour. Owing to the fear of discrimination and the complete absence of German schools, Germans oriented their language management toward the use of Czech. Sociological research demonstrated that, within a single generation after WWII, the role of German as an ethnic symbol substantially declined. While in 1970 only 7.2% of Germans considered Czech to be their native tongue, by1987 the figure had risen to 33%. In the same year, from among those who considered German their native language, 8% used Czech predominantly at home, and 79.8% used Czech and German; only 5% used German alone (Sokolová, 1991). Linguistic studies, which employ more detailed scales (minimally, German dialect, Standard German, Czech), confirm the importance of generational classification. For example, these studies have revealed that, in the 1960s in the Cheb region, the oldest generation of Germans used their native dialect together with dialectally influenced Standard German, while the middle generation added Czech, and the youngest generation retained only the German dialect and Czech (Povejšil, 1975). Research conducted in the town of Jablonec and its surroundings 20 years later showed a definite decline in bilingualism in the middle generation and a substantial decline in the youngest generation, which tended to be monolingual in Czech. The oldest generation still retained German within the family domain but spoke Czech in public (Bezděková, 1988). These studies demonstrate a significant assimilation trend in all generations of the German population. These results are supported by additional evidence arising from qualitative methodology using biographical research (Nekvapil, 2001; Nekvapil 2003a). Biographies of Germans who were approximately 20 years old in 1945, confirmed that their grand-children first started acquiring German at school – if they started learning it at all.

Nevertheless, the German community has not completely lost its language. Dialectologists who work on the Atlas of Historical German Dialects discovered, to their surprise, that competent informants could be found in all the main centres of their research (Bachmann, 2002). Admittedly, it is a different matter to provide responses to a dialectological questionnaire and to use the language proficiently as a means of daily communication. Leaving the on-going work on the Atlas aside, the German of the original

German population has not yet been subjected to systematic description. That variety seems to be strongly dialectal; there is a lack of labialization of vowels (*ö, ü* are replaced by *é, í* ; cf. Krčmová, 1993), and the phraseology is influenced by Czech (e.g. *ich habe keine tschechische Schulen* modeled after *nemám žádné české školy*). Many Czech Germans are ashamed to use their German in communication with Germans from Germany.

What is the Czech of the German population of the Czech Republic? In the case of the middle and young generation it is undistinguishable from the Czech of other native speakers. The Czech of the oldest and old generations of speakers shows specific features: replacement of voiced by unvoiced consonants (*tobytek* for *dobytek* "cattle"), lack of palatalization of dental plosives (*nedelal* for *nedělal* "he didn't do"), replacement of ř by other consonants (*žeknu* for *řeknu* "I'll say"), and displacement of the accent connected with lengthening (*vychovála* for *vychovala* "she educated") (Hašová, 2000); there are also problems with the Czech aspectual system and with gender (Skála, 1977), as well as with nominal and adjectival declension (Hašová, 1996).

In the context of German expatriate managers' use of Czech, research conducted in the Škoda-Volkswagen joint venture company at the beginning of the 1990s showed that the initial enthusiasm to learn Czech was soon replaced by the realization that the language is not easy to acquire, and active competence stopped at a few greetings such as *dobrý den* "hello" and a few other words such as *porada* "meeting".

3.5.2. German Language: Simple Management

Thanks to language biographical research, a number of narratives in which members of the German community reflect on their language management are available. Such reflections show that, on occasion, the subjects immediately react to language problems as those problems appear in discourse. This practice is demonstrated in the following extract from the narration of Mr. S:

> S: ... now look, the fact that I learned Czech, I moved only among Czechs. There was nothing else I could do but learn the language. Well and I was lucky, for I always bumped into people, who were willing to help me. When I asked, when I say something wrong, correct me, and the same goes for grammar too. When I began to write in Czech, I was working in the mine and there we had boys, down from South Bohemia or some such place, so we became friends and Peter in particular, you know, any time when I began to write Czech, he'd say write something, and I'll correct it for you, and so I did. Well, at first he explained this and that and then he says, you know what, to hell with you, you're you're pretty good now, us having Czech schooling, unlike you, but we make mistakes the same as you do.
> (translated from Czech)

This passage directly refers to processes of simple management, particularly in the case of written Czech. Correction in discourse by native Czechs was a necessary prerequisite for integration of the German community into mainstream society. For the older generation, no opportunity for organized management existed.

When the Czech society implemented the strategy that Germans should not use German, a crucial decision for each German family arose about how to conduct language management of their children. This problem is well illustrated in another fragment from Mr. S.'s narrative:

> S: We were, when eh the children came, the first-born was Horst,so we were telling ourselves, well eh to teach him bad Czech,that would be a bad thing. He'd better speak proper German, 'cos he'll learn Czech among children in no time at all. And that's what happened. There was this kindergarten teacher, I went to see her when he was old enough to go to the kindergarten, and said: Look here. That's the way it is with him, he doesn't speak Czech too well yet, and she says: Mr S. don't you worry, I'll teach him and so she did.

The passage indirectly refers to simple management of German within family situations that led to the acquisition of the German. At the same time simple management of Czech within the kindergarten situation is also described.

Another strategy that has been attested in more than one family concerns the functional distribution of a dialect and the Standard in the case of German. Parents who spoke a dialect to each other reported that they intentionally selected Standard German when speaking to their children. This was a consequence of the fact that, after 1945, no German schools existed, and any variety of German could only be transmitted to the next generation within the family domain. The important point is that the informants themselves selected speaking the Standard as a management strategy.

However, anti-assimilationist management was not as widely practiced as the examples given so far might indicate. On the contrary. A large proportion of the Germans who escaped deportation selected pro-assimilation management. No doubt, this management performed a social function: assimilation was socially advisable. At the same time, the energy needed for simple management in discourse is considerable, and simple management was no doubt also avoided on this account. At the present time, the attitude of those concerned is different. Here is what Mr. S. reports.

> S: Many regret today that they put aside German then, after forty five, so that today they don't speak German any more. Many regret it. And they almost envy us now that our two sons speak perfect German.

3.5.3. German Language: Organized Management

Czech language policy in relation to German passed through several stages. In the 1920s and 1930s, Germans, like other minorities within Czechoslovakia, enjoyed a number of linguistic and cultural privileges. Special rights could be claimed in districts where a minority represented more than twenty per cent of all inhabitants. The German minority was granted an extensive system of primary, secondary and specialized schools, and a German university continued operating in Prague.

During the occupation of Czechoslovakia, from 1939 to 1945, Czech language policy was in fact suspended: German was the language of the masters, and it was Czech that had to defend itself. However, formally, the state was a "protectorate", and since Czech-German bilingualism was rare by then, an immediate removal of Czech was impracticable. However, a strong program of Germanization was mounted; the overall aim of Germany was a complete liquidation of Czech and the Czech nation (Malý, 1991). All public announcements and radio broadcasting were in German, followed by Czech; public notices and signs were in German (large) with Czech translations (small) ; publication in Czech was restricted; secondary schools were only allowed a limited intake, and Czech universities were closed.

Language policy with regard to those Germans who were allowed to remain in the country after WWII reflected the wartime experience of the Czechs and was in accordance

with discriminatory state policies in other respects. An important role in the policy was played by the school system. Compare the experience of Mr P. who described the interrelation of the family, individual and organized management in the following way:

> P: ... my wife, she spoke German also, she was from a mixed marriage. From the very beginning we spoke German with our children. Well,right, it worked till a certain point, until they went to school. And then the children came home and said: We don't want to speak German any longer, because they keep telling us we are fascists. Right,) in the books it was simply so, Germans and so on they were fascists. (translated from German)

Only after 1968 were Germans granted a constitutionally guaranteed right to education in their first language. However, no German schools were opened. The main argument of the government was the high dispersion of the German population and its progressive assimilation, especially in the youngest generation. According to statistics, in 1990 only 585 ethnically German children attended primary schools in the territory of present day Czech Republic.

Commencing in mid-1950s, German children could improve the knowledge of their mother tongue in elective "language circles". This, however, did not contribute much to their competence. On the other hand, the 1950s witnessed the introduction of some other elements into the life of the German community. From 1951, a weekly magazine in German, *Aufbau und Frieden*, was published. In court proceedings, the use of German was allowed. In the case of contact with state and local authorities, the practice was uneven. It was recommended that, where the community was large, German should be used both in written and oral contact, even should such a practice entail the use of translators or interpreters, but such practices were not common. German broadcasting, to a limited extent, commenced in 1957. The *Kulturní sdružení*, mentioned above, was founded in 1969, with one of its aims being the support of the knowledge and use of German in the community. However, such support only became operative with the help of the German Federal Republic after the Velvet revolution in 1989. It should be mentioned that, on the basis of the Czechoslovak-German treaty of 1992, a number of Czech-German Encounter Centres sprang up. In 2001 there were 14 such Centres, especially in localities with a higher density of German population. German schools are still difficult to establish because of the high degree of dispersion of the German element, and also because of a lack of demand. A viable project proved to be the establishment of a private German primary school and a high school (gymnázium) in Prague; these are open not only to ethnic Germans but to all interested parties. This project was initiated and implemented by the Association of Germans in Prague and Central Bohemia. The languages of instruction are German and Czech. German has been given the role of a means for the creation of a multicultural identity as well as the re-creation of the lost ethnic identity of the German students. The question remains whether such a re-creation is in fact possible. The last census figures do not seem to give much hope, and specialists who compare the situation of the German element in the Czech Republic and in Hungary have assumed a skeptical attitude (cf. Stevenson, 2000).

It is true that the German community can profit from a considerable interest in German as a foreign language, an interest based on a long tradition. In the early 1990s German was still preferred to English at primary schools (in 1991/92 it was chosen by almost 100 thousand more pupils than English), and only afterwards English has gradually gained ground: in 1997/98 it was chosen by more students than German for the first time, and since then the

number of students who prefer English to German has been increasing steadily. The recent development is shown in Table 5.[16]

Overall, the promotion of German as a foreign language is unusually high, and not all of that is due to foreign encouragement (cf. Deutsch in der Tschechischen Republik, 2000/2001). The study of German is supported by the interests of Czechs who work or intend to work in Germany as well as by those employed in Czech-German joint ventures operating in the territory of the Czech Republic (Zich, 2001). However, so far there are no indications that this instrumental role of German will influence the revitalization processes within the German community.

Table 5: Pupils learning foreign languages at primary schools between 2000/01 and 2005/06

	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06
English	435,918	456,265	477,071	492,727	497,391	503,215
German	300,563	274,522	246,787	218,033	187,285	166,808
French	7,971	8,287	7,277	7,082	9,056	7,250
Russian	1,046	1,683	1,953	2,896	3,952	5,657
Spanish	553	610	685	725	1,036	1,235
Italian	22	19	46	43	49	44
Latin	-	-	-	-	-	-
Classical Greek	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other European languages	-	-	34	205	194	29
Other languages	737	201	296	113	46	48

Source: The Yearbook of the Development of the Educational System – Education in the Czech Republic in 2000/01-2005/06: Tab. B6.2.1

3.6. THE RUTHENIAN, UKRAINIAN AND RUSSIAN COMMUNITIES

The arrival of large numbers of Ruthenians (Rusyns), Ukrainians, and Russians in the territory of present day Czech Republic occurred after WWI as a consequence of the October Revolution in Russia and, in the case of Ruthenians, the incorporation of Ruthenia (presently a part of the Ukraine adjoining Eastern Slovakia) into the newly formed Czechoslovakia. In the first days of Czechoslovakia, it was once suggested that the country should be called *Česko-slovenská-rusínská republika* "Czecho-Slovak-Ruthenian Republic" (Praha Osobnosti 2000: 127).

Following the Russian Revolution, a refugee assistance program resulted in the arrival from former Czarist Russia of a large number of Russians and Ukrainians and a number of members of other ethnic groups (Georgians and Kalmycks for example). This program was organized by the Czechoslovak government, with the first President, T.G. Masaryk, playing a leading role. It has been estimated that the number of refugees increased from an original 6,000 to more than 20,000 in the 1920s and 1930s (Sládek, 1999: 14). Initially, the Soviet regime in Russia was expected to be a temporary phenomenon, and consequently the refugees considered their stay as a temporary one. They did not enter into local networks, living mostly in their closed communities, a lifestyle for which they were provided excellent conditions by the Czechoslovak government which supported their associations and paid for Russian and

---

[16] For more detail see Nekvapil (2007c). For the statistical data concerning the 1990s see Nekvapil (2003c).

Ukrainian schools from kindergarten to university. Both a Russian and a Ukrainian university operated in the Republic (for details see Veber et al. 1996; Zilynskij, 1995).

However, the refugee assistance program was made problematic in the 1930s, when Czechoslovakia, like France, realized that the Soviet Union was both a large export market and politically a potential ally against the German threat. The anti-Soviet émigré community was considered a nuisance and its financial support dried up. Under these conditions, émigrés started leaving the country. On the other hand, Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia did not result in the demise of the Russian and Ukrainian organizations: for example, the Russian and Ukrainian gymnasia (high schools) as well as the Ukrainian University were active throughout WWII (Zilynskij, 1995: 54; Kopřivová-Vukolová, 1993) -- this despite the fact that the operation of the Czech universities was suspended. The end of the "good days" arrived with the termination of the War, when the Soviet Army, as it advanced, detained approximately one thousand émigrés, mainly members of the Russian intelligentsia, and hauled them off to concentration camps in the Soviet Union. Only a small number of those people survived and still fewer returned to Czechoslovakia after a long period of forced labor in the camps (Kopřivová-Vukolová, 1993). Many members of the Ukrainian community, seizing the opportunity presented by Hitler's advance into the Soviet Union to further their claims for independence, collaborated with Nazi Germany, but managed to escape to the West before the Red Army arrived.

With the end of WWII, Ruthenia was claimed by the Soviet Union and this resulted in bringing an end to any further reinforcement of the Ruthenian community. New additions could only arrive from Eastern Slovakia, but reliable statistics do not exist, because Ruthenians were now identified as a subset of Ukrainians and were registered as such. In Eastern Slovakia, a program of forced Ukrainization of the Ruthenians started in 1953 and, interestingly, was also directed against their Russification. Under these circumstances, many declared Slovak identity. However, the situation was not entirely clear, and the category and term Ruthenian did not entirely disappear. The constitutional law of 1968 used a strange formulation to describe one of the officially acknowledged nationalities – 'Ukrainian (Ruthenian)'.

According to the authoritative work about national minorities published in Czechoslovakia before the Velvet Revolution, in the 1950 census 19,384 people resident in the Czech lands registered as being of Ukrainian/Russian ethnicity. Thirty years later the number decreased to 15,322 (Sokolová et al. 1987:35). Note that the category used was Ukrainian/Russian and that the term *Ukrainian* was intended to include Ruthenians.

For the first time, the 1991 census allowed individuals to opt freely for either Ruthenian, Ukrainian or Russian ethnicity; 1,926 respondents living in the Czech part of the then Czechoslovakia, reported as Ruthenians, but ten years later, in the 2001 census, the number had decreased to 1,106. The community itself claims 10,000 individuals (Zpráva, 2002: 74). Although their number is small, they are well organized (see, particularly, the *Společnost přátel Podkarpatské Rusi* "The Society of Friends of Ruthenia") and they have developed wide-ranging publication activities. Thanks to their long-term status, their importance has been acknowledged in the fact that they are represented on the Government Council for National Minorities and in organs of the Prague City office.

As for Ukrainians, the 1991 census registered 8,220 individuals, while ten years later the number had increased to 22,112. In the contemporary Czech Republic, Ukrainians represent the largest group of foreign workers; it is assumed that the 2001 census captured only part of them.[17] Whether university graduates or individuals with only basic education, they are mostly active as manual workers. Attitudes of the matrix community are more often

---

[17] In total, 100,000 to 150,000 foreigners are estimated to be illegaly employed in the Czech Republic (Václavíková, 2000). Many of them are Ukrainians.

negative than positive (Zilynskij, 1996) because, for an average Czech, they are not easily distinguished from Russians, and the media often refer to "Russian-speaking gangs and mafia". Ukrainians, like other ethnic groups, receive financial support from the government for their social, cultural and publication activities. The most active organization is *Ukrajinská iniciativa v ČR* 'Ukrainian Initiative in the Czech Republic'.

Russian ethnicity was declared in 1991 by 5,062 people, but in 2001 the number rose to 12,369. This increase is no doubt partly due to Russian foreign workers who are active in the Czech Republic under conditions similar to those of the Ukrainians. However, not a negligible segment of the new arrivals consists of well-to-do Russians who own shops and real estate. Among Czechs, the view – not quite without substance – prevails that this segment of the Russian community has established itself particularly well in the internationally well-known resort, Karlovy Vary (Karlsbad). The social life of the Russian community has only commenced – the Czech population still vividly remembers the Soviet invasion of 1968 and the ensuing occupation, and these memories do not favour the existence of organized elements of Russian society in their midst.

3.6.1. Ruthenian, Ukranian and Russian Languages: Situation, Problems

The three languages discussed in this section belong to the Eastern group of Slavic languages. (Concerning the linguistic features of Ruthenian see Jabur, 2000; Vanko, 2000.) While mutual comprehension is relatively easy within the Western group (Czech, Slovak, Polish), the case of Czech and the languages of the Eastern group requires some previous study, experience and effort. However, the closeness of the languages assists acquisition to a considerable degree proceeding much faster than in the case of unrelated languages. With regard to Czechs the position of the three languages is very different. Russian was an obligatory school language between 1945 and 1989; consequently, its existence is well known, and it is seen as a language having international status. The existence of Ukrainian is recognized, but it remains vague in the consciousness of most people. On the other hand, very few people know the term *rusínština* (Ruthenian), to say nothing of possessing the information that the status of the language is rising. It has recently been codified, and it is now being taught in some schools in Slovakia (Magocsi,1996). Hence, in the awareness of the people all three groups are thought to 'speak Russian'. Incidentally, the view that all languages East of the Czech Republic (including Slovak!) are Russian appears occasionally among poorly educated people (Nábělková, 2000). The identification of Ruthenian and Ukrainian with Russian does not favour speakers of these languages, because, due to the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union in the immediate past, many Czechs still maintain a negative attitude to Russian-speaking foreigners and to the Russian language itself.

So far the language of Ruthenians, Ukrainians and Russians who live in the territory of the Czech Republic has not been subjected to study. Those who have lived in the country for a long time, as well as their children, have been linguistically assimilated, except that first generation immigrants usually speak with a "Russian" accent. Integration seems to be thorough in the case of Ruthenians who do not have a program for the maintenance of their language, an aim that would be difficult in view of the fact that Standard Ruthenian has only recently been introduced in Slovakia, where the number of Ruthenians is much higher (Zimek, 1999/2000), and in view of the fact that many Ruthenians abroad use Ukrainian or Russian as their written language. On the other hand, Ukrainian associations strongly support the introduction of at least basic forms of Ukrainian schooling (Praha a národnosti, 1998: 113) and over a number of years have operated a "Sunday school", in the framework of which Ukrainian children learn Ukrainian and take other subjects taught in that language. This school is not a part of normal school system; rather, the practice resembles the "Saturday

School" pattern widely employed in such places as Australia, Canada, and the USA for the support of minority languages.

The situation of Russian is quite different. Russian is still being taught at a number of primary and high schools. As a result, the Russian community can mount more ambitious plans, such as the reopening of the bilingual Czech-Russian high school (gymnázium), scheduled for 2004 (Vesti, 2002: 2).

Foreign workers from Eastern Europe communicate with each other in Ukrainian or Russian, while in relation to the matrix community they often use pidginized Czech or a foreigner-talk variety of their own language.

3.7. THE VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY

Larger groups of Vietnamese have been present on the territory of what today is the Czech Republic since the 1950s on the basis of a series of agreements on economic, research and technical collaboration between Czechoslovakia and the Vietnamese Democratic Republic. In the beginning the Vietnamese came to Czechoslovakia to study at secondary schools and universities, particularly in the field of engineering and metallurgy, and since the 1980s as guest workers. Their numbers increased gradually, reaching the peak in the early 1980s when about 30,000 Vietnamese were resident in Czechoslovakia. Due to the social changes in 1989, the close contacts between the two countries were temporarily broken off, which resulted in a decrease in the number of Vietnamese in the Czech Republic. Their population, however, started growing again, also increased by the influx of the Vietnamese from the eastern parts of Germany, where the conditions for their business activities were not as liberal as in the CR. In the 2001 census, which comprised not only permanent but also long-term residents in the Czech Republic, Vietnamese ethnicity was declared by 17,462 respondents. According to the statistics of the Ministry of Interior (Directorate of the Alien and Border Police) 38,566 Vietnamese inhabitants were officially residing in the Czech Republic in June 2006. The number of Vietnamese with the Czech citizenship is approximately 2,000 (see Lidové noviny, May 23, 2006) (note that the Vietnamese with Czech citizenship outnumber the members of the Croatian, Rusyn and Serbian communities, i.e. the national minorities recognized by the state).

The Vietnamese in the CR do not constitute a homogenous community. Czechs are mostly familiar with the Vietnamese vendors at kiosks and stands in the streets or in market halls, but other Vietnamese own shops and shopping centres, establish business organizations and chains as well as software companies, invest in production, and have Czech employees. The Association of Vietnamese Entrepreneurs was founded in 1992, the Association of Vietnamese in the Czech Republic in 1999. Several Vietnamese magazines are published. There is also a generational stratification in the Vietnamese community. Due to its socio-cultural behaviour, the youngest generation clearly stands out, having been born in the Czech Republic and studying (mostly with success) at Czech primary and secondary schools. The members of this generation speak flawless Czech and unlike the generation of their parents, they feel more closely tied to the Czech Republic than to Vietnam. While the parents of this generation of children often have persistent problems with using the Czech language and communicative patterns, their children often have problems with Vietnamese since they use it only to a limited extent, and some of them never master it fully.

The case of the Vietnamese community in the Czech Republic may serve as an illustration of the process whereby a former group of temporary migrants has acquired the features of traditional minorities not only in terms of its socio-cultural but also linguistic behaviour. Therefore it should also be (eventually) granted the language rights guaranteed e.g. by the Czech Minority Act. This is in the interests not only of the Vietnamese community but

also of the Czech Republic (and the EU in general): it is a question of the preservation and development of natural language resources which contribute to the language diversity of the country, may be used in international contact, and represent economic potential. One way or another, the quality of the relation to the Vietnamese community and its communicative patterns remains indicative of the extent to which Czech society is capable of coping with a considerable socio-cultural and linguistic dissimilarity.

3.7.1. The Vietnamese Language: Situation, Problems

Vietnamese is a language that differs completely from Czech both genetically and typologically. Since working knowledge of the language is limited to only a few individuals in the Czech Republic, the Vietnamese who reside in the country, must learn Czech if they wish to communicate with the matrix community. Learning Czech is a difficult task, and not all Vietnamese successfully achieve fluency. In interviews conducted by Jitka Slezáková, one Vietnamese respondent says that learning Czech is the most difficult task for these people:

> V: *Jazyk, ten nejhorší pro nás. Já něco umím, ale třeba starší lidi to těžký, oni nebudou učit. Třeba moje mamka tady taky byla už sedm let a taky blbý. To těžký, pro ní strašně těžký. No tak ona nemůže.*
> "Language, it worst for us. I know something, but for example older people, that difficult, they will not learn. For example my mum was here already seven years and it also silly. It difficult, for her terribly difficult." (Slezáková, mimeo)

Slezáková (mimeo) characterizes in the following way the language of a Vietnamese retailer who has been in the Czech Republic for one year:

> "In view of the shortness of his sojourn in this country he failed to understand questions and was totally unable to answer when they were more complicated."

The pronunciation of the Vietnamese often renders sentences incomprehensible, their morphology is simplified and syntactically their language consists of short sentences piled one on another. As would be expected, Vietnamese children who attend Czech schools often speak Czech better than Vietnamese and use Czech not only with Czechs but also with their siblings and cousins, irrespective of the insistence of their parents that they speak Vietnamese. Vietnamese adults often use their children as interpreters.

The typical network existing between Vietnamese and Czechs is a commercial transaction. Apart from this, the two communities also interact in official contacts with Czech authorities. Official interpreters and unofficial interpreters (such as children) are sometimes used, but the Vietnamese community has already acquired knowledge of the typical content of negotiation, and it is not unusual for individuals to be able to manage on their own. Other networks were infrequent during the 1980s (Heroldová & Matějová, 1987), and there is no reason to think that the situation will have changed in the intervening time. No wonder that the mother of the retailer quoted above mastered no Czech during the seven years of her residence. Similar conditions obtain in the case of immigrants in many countries, particularly when older women are involved. Conversation with customers, beyond the commercial transaction itself, is difficult, not only because of the immigrant's limited grammatical competence, but also because of the differences that obtain in the non-linguistic communication system, such as topics that are constrained in Czech (e.g. the marital status of customers, their financial situation, the age of female speakers , etc.). No doubt further research will identify even more communication problems, similar to those common between

speakers of other European and Asian languages (cf. Neustupný, 1987).

Although in Czech the use of the familiar second person pronoun *ty* "you" is subject to a number of constraints (Nekvapil & Neustupný 2005), it often happens that Czech customers use this pronoun, rather than the more "polite" *vy* to adult Vietnamese speakers. The reason for this behaviour is undoubtedly complicated: problems in judging the age of the interlocutor, the use of foreigner talk, or a feeling of superiority. Some Vietnamese whose sociolinguistic competence in Czech is sufficiently developed evaluate such usage negatively. It is necessary to note that some Vietnamese also use *ty* in first-encounters with Czechs, but in this case the reason seems to be that the Vietnamese are not (yet) familiar with the *vy* forms.

3.7.2. The Vietnamese Language: Simple Management

As already mentioned, problems in discourse between Czechs and Vietnamese are of considerable magnitude, resulting not only from the lack of grammatical competence but also from non-grammatical strategies of communication and from violations of the sociocultural rules of conduct. Frequently, differences in the duration, frequency, and "form" of smiling are mentioned. An interesting adjustment strategy, also occurring in intercultural situations in other communities, is illustrated by the fact that the Vietnamese make address easier for their Czech interlocutors by asking to be addressed by Czech names, e.g., *Antonín.* Individual language management occurs, and the proof is that the Vietnamese sometimes keep a Czech textbook or a Vietnamese-Czech conversation book under the counter.

3.7.3. The Vietnamese Language: Organized Management

In Communist Czechoslovakia, the Vietnamese were, on arrival, channeled through intensive three month long courses of Czech (or Slovak), and these courses were concluded by an examination (Heroldová & Matějová, 1987). Actually, some of the Vietnamese had gone through similar courses in Vietnam, before their departure for Czechoslovakia. In such cases, their teachers were Vietnamese; as a consequence, the students acquired reasonable competence in grammar and in the written language, though little competence in comprehension or in speaking (Müllerová, 1998). In the case of some undergraduate and postgraduate students one-year intensive courses in Czech were organized in the 1980s. Such programs produced people with a good knowledge not only of Czech grammar, but also of communicative and sociocultural strategies which, to a considerable extent, prevented the occurrence of interaction problems (Müllerová, 1998). Overall, Vietnamese who were active in the Czech territory before 1980 possessed interactive competence much superior to that of most of their countrymen who came to the Czech Republic later. Especially since 1990 the new arrivals have no language education at their disposal. They acquire their competence through unorganized "natural" acquisition processes in the marketplace; first generation speakers are hardly able to communicate about anything other than prices and types of merchandize.

At present, organized management only impacts some children. In our field work conducted at Vejprty in 2002, there were only 2 Vietnamese children in the local school, one in the 1st and one in the 4th form. These two are children of parents who arrived in Czechoslovakia before 1989. (The total number of the Vietnamese in the 2001 census in Vejprty was 60; in this number, which no doubt underestimates the total number, there must have been more than 2 children of the school age.) The field work revealed that formerly five other children had attended, but these had either left for another location with their parents or had completed compulsory education. In 1995, four children had arrived from Germany and had attended a special school because they possessed no Czech at all. Additionally, there are

Vietnamese children in a nearby high school (gymnázium) in Chomutov. The experience of teachers with these children has been very positive. They are talented and eager to learn. Some of them are offspring of parents who possess university degrees but work in retail because such employment is more lucrative. According to the Education Law of 2004 (N. 561/2004 Sb.), children of all legal foreign residents are entitled to receive education under the same conditions as Czech citizens. This means that they do not have to pay for education, including college and university education, provided they follow the common curricula in Czech language. According to official statistics, there were 4036 Vietnamese children at Czech primary and lower secondary schools, 2753 of the children coming from permanently resident families and 1281 from families with a temporary resident status. Temporary resident status is being granted for purposes of business, family reunion or education.

The Vietnamese case shows a number of weaknesses in contemporary Czech language management. Materials on linguistic minorities in the Czech Republic, published by the central or local governments, pay minimal attention to the Vietnamese. One of the reasons for this neglect presumably stems from the fact that, as a rule, they do not possess Czech citizenship. However, dividing residents, whether short or long term, according to their citizenship is an outdated principle. Here is a large community, probably between twenty and thirty thousand people, that actively contributes to the economic life of the Czech Republic. The public, though not openly hostile, is not always friendly to this community, not because it creates socioeconomic problems, but simply because of its foreignness and its inability to communicate. Huge numbers of communication problems are not attended to at all in the system of organized management. The Report of the Government Council for National Minorities (Zpráva, 2002) only mentions this community because the 2001 census questionnaires were also printed in Vietnamese (p.2), a measure that was the result of pragmatic considerations, and in connection with the Vietnamese program on radio (p. 15, p. 23). A Vietnamese representative was not nominated to be a member of the Consultative Group for ethnic radio programs but was invited to participate by the Director of Czech Radio.

3.8. THE HUNGARIAN COMMUNITY

Hungarian ethnicity was claimed in 2001 by 14,672 inhabitants. Ten years earlier the number was 19,932. It is necessary to realize that the character of the Hungarian community radically differs from that of the Hungarian minority in Slovakia (see, e.g., Lanstyák, 2002) or Rumania. They are a small group with an opaque history which has always lived dispersed rather than in a single coherent settlement. Also, there is no common border between Hungary and the Czech lands; apart from some memories of WWI, when Czech soldiers, drafted into the Austrian army, passed through Hungary and a later limited experience with Hungarians from Slovakia, for Czechs Hungary has never been a country on which they focused much attention. In 1921 the number of Hungarians in the Czech lands was 7,049 – mostly people who migrated from Slovakia or Ruthenia during the Hapsburg era, but from that time up to 1991 the community experienced a continuous, though limited, increase. Most of these people came because of work opportunities. A sharp and sudden increase occurred in 1945 and 1946 when approximately forty-five thousand Hungarians were deported from Southern Slovakia to the Bohemian border zone with Germany. This was a phenomenon similar to the deportation of Germans. (Hungary was an ally of Germany throughout WWII and occupied parts of Slovakia during the war.) However, this was not a case of deportation to the "home" country, and it did not last. When it was cancelled in 1948, most of those concerned returned to the place of their origin. Statistics from1950 showed only 13,201 people. Hungarians have lived dispersed in all regions of the present day Republic, especially in the industrial areas of Northern and Western Bohemia, in Silesia (the Karviná district) and in Prague, which is the

cultural centre of Czech Hungarians. Between 1954 and 1989 Hungarians living in the Czech lands did not have an independent cultural organization. Only after the political changes of 1989 was the *Svaz Maďarů žijících v českých zemích* (The Association of Hungarians Living in the Czech Lands) formed. This organization engages in publication activities (e.g. in publishing the cultural revue *Prágai tükör* "The Prague Mirror"), among other activities, i.e., it cooperates in broadcasting Hungarian programs on radio. (For more details see Praha a národnosti, 1998: 34-49.)

The decrease in the number of people who declared Hungarian ethnicity in the 1991-2001 decade was more than twenty-five per cent. On the one hand, this change can be explained by deepening assimilation; on the other, by the fact that replacement of natural decreases by new immigrants became difficult, because what was now involved was migration from abroad rather than from other areas of the same State.

Although the Hungarian community is not one of the smallest, apart from the activities of Hungarian intellectuals (who, however, are often not identified as such, because many Slovaks also have Hungarian names), it is one of those which is least visible. A sociological survey conducted in 1992 showed that many Hungarians did not wish others to know about their ethnicity (Sadílek & Csémy, 1993: 17).

3.8.1. The Hungarian Language: Situation, Problems

Hungarian belongs to the Finno-Ugric language family which is usually supposed to be unrelated to Indo-European languages (such as English, French, the Slavic languages or most Indian languages including Romani); Hungarian also possesses a grammatical structure different from that of the Indo-European languages. This lack of affiliation means that no "natural" receptive bilingualism between the languages is likely. Additionally, while in the case of other European languages (including Czech), extensive lexical similarities exist, resulting from the shared interference of Latin and Greek and mutual borrowing, no such similarity exists in the case of Hungarian, which has applied strict puristic attitudes. A number of pages of a Hungarian book must be inspected before a single familiar word can be identified. Since the knowledge of Hungarian has always been close to zero in the Czech lands, communication between Czechs and Hungarians required the use of an intermediate language such as German (or more recently English) or quick linguistic adaptation to Czech. Adaptation was facilitated in the case of those who were coming from Slovakia and possessed the knowledge of Slovak which could easily be transformed into competence in Czech. Unfortunately, this aspect of communication cannot be ascertained from the sociological and sociolinguistic surveys of the 1990s carried out in the Czech Republic because they did not consider the issue of the knowledge of Slovak in the case of Czech Hungarians as worthy of noticing.

The statistically representative sociological survey of the Hungarian community conducted in 1992, in which more than 1,000 Hungarians took part, showed that 66.3% of the respondents predominantly spoke Czech at home, 18.3% spoke Hungarian and Czech and only 12.9% principally spoke Hungarian (Sadílek and Csémy, 1993: 29). Note that this distribution occurs in spite of the fact that Czech is not a language easily acquired by Hungarians (unless they already know Slovak) and that the family domain is the only one in which there is any chance that Hungarian could be maintained. A more recent survey, conducted in 1997-98 (Eőry and Hašová, 2003) was oriented qualitatively. Its authors summarized the results as follows:

"The process of language loss is fast among Hungarians; in general it is completed by the second generation, but invariably by the third. This is proved by the fact that

among 32 informants there was not a single third-generation speaker of Hungarian, and they could not even mention such a person in their families." (Eőry and Hašová, 2003: 99)

This process may be difficult to alter, even though some Hungarian intellectuals have produced a program to reverse it. However, it appears that, in families of Hungarians with tertiary education, the language shift in the second generation is most pronounced (Sadílek & Csémy, 1993:29).

3.8.2. The Hungarian Language: Simple Management

Simple management processes are, to a large extent, reflected in the results of surveys that investigate competence in Hungarian. In the Sadílek and Csémy's (1993:26) survey, 45.5% of members of the Hungarian community evaluated their knowledge of Hungarian as very good, 31.8% as good, 19.2% as poor while 3.5% declared no knowledge of the language. The strictest self-evaluation appeared, as could be expected, in the case of the youngest group (18-29 years of age) which assessed its knowledge as poor in 25.7%, and as zero in 13.1%. On the other hand, irrespective of their generational membership the respondents evaluated their Czech as very good in 53.1% of cases; 40.9% of them assessed it as good and only 6% assessed it as poor or nil. On the basis of these results, the authors concluded that Hungarians in the Czech Republic were more competent in Czech than in Hungarian (Sadílek and Csémy, 1993). This conclusion may be questioned because the evaluation of the non-native language (Czech) may be more positive than that of the native Hungarian. These figures, however, are most obviously valid for the youngest generation which, not surprisingly, seems to be most strongly assimilated. Results of the assimilation process have also been reflected in the 2001 census (see section 3.8). The survey reported in Sadílek and Csémy bears witness to extensive communication problems experienced by speakers in discourse, in their use of both Hungarian and Czech.

It is remarkable that, in the same survey, 41.7% of respondents reported that they were not interested in teaching their children Hungarian, while 32.3% were undecided. Women were twice as interested as men.

There is still too little data derived directly from discourse. From the data available, it can be assumed that speakers frequently do not notice interference. In the following conversation, the Hungarian speaker of Czech omits the reflexive particle *se*, probably because in Hungarian it often corresponds to a suffix which cannot be separated from the word.

> P: … *aby mě zabrzdil prostě, tak já jsem už ty věci z lavice naházela. A vrhla jsem k tomu oknu ...*
> "… so he puts on the break for me, so I throw away things from the bench. And I threw (myself) to the window…"

The unnoted deviation is in the form *vrhla jsem* which, according to Czech norms, should be *vrhla jsem se* (from Hašová, 2001: 53).

In the following example, P incorporates the Czech word *podpora* "subsidy" into his Hungarian utterance. The Czech element is given the Hungarian accusative ending *–t* , and the final vowel is lengthened.

> P: *Én is nyugdíjas én is podporát kapok mondom magamnak semmi baj.*
> "I am also retired, I am getting a subsidy, I tell myself it doesn't matter"

(Hašová, 1996:90)

Adjustment drawing material from the other language is common in contact discourse for items with culturally specific meaning. Neither in this nor in the preceding discourse samples is there any evidence of noting of the deviation by participants in the encounter.

3.8.3. The Hungarian Language: Organized Management

In the case of Hungarian, no organized management at the governmental level could be discovered. However, financial support for Hungarian press and organizations (Zpráva, 2002) should be mentioned here.

At the level of education, Charles University has been teaching Hungarian philology for more than a century. The program is significant, but its motivation is not primarily language management for the Hungarian community. One of the aims of the *Svaz Maďarů žijících v českých zemích* (Association of Hungarians in the Czech Lands) is "to develop the cultivation of the mother tongue and support its natural link with Hungarian culture" (Praha a národnosti, 1998: 43). The *Svaz*, in cooperation with the *Maďarské kulturní středisko* (Hungarian Cultural Centre in Prague, founded in 1977), offers courses in Hungarian for children from Hungarian families. The problem is that these courses are limited to Prague. Also, it seems to be difficult for the Centre to obtain information from schools that would indicate interest in courses in Hungarian. This may be a problem common to a number of minority languages: as long as such basic information is missing, mounting a course is difficult .

The picture of language management by the Hungarian community in the Czech Republic is at a considerable distance from the situation evident in some other countries. There is little sense of patriotism. Evaluation of inadequate language maintenance is not necessarily negative, and adjustment that would lead to maintenance is weak. A similar situation obtains with regard to Hungarian in such other countries as Australia, where Hungarian belongs to the group of low-maintenance languages (Clyne 1991). Although the overall power of the Czech community is paramount, its impact does not take the form of forced assimilation. On the other hand, there is no evidence that, in deciding not to maintain their language, Hungarians in the Czech Republic act without expecting that such maintenance might be negatively evaluated by Czech speakers. There is a need for work at the discourse level of management which should show where the sources of evaluative attitudes within the community can be identified.

3.9. THE GREEK AND MACEDONIAN COMMUNITIES

Significant numbers of Greeks and Macedonians appeared in the Czech territory as a consequence of the Greek civil war between 1946 and 1949. As a result, approximately 80,000 refugees left for Eastern European countries; 12,500 of them arrived to Czechoslovakia in two waves, including about 4,000 children who had arrived without their parents (cf. Papadopulos, 1998; Ristović, 2000 [1998]). Subsequently, the size of the immigrant community fluctuated due to family reunions and increased somewhat in 1956 as a result of an influx of re-emigrants from Hungary, where refugees were afraid that the Hungarian uprising might lead to the persecution of people with left-wing political views. Communist ideology was typical for the majority of the Greek and Macedonian communities (Otčenášek, 1998).

The refugees from Greece were assigned domicile in border areas sparsely populated after the deportation of Germans, in particular in Northern Moravia, or in the case of children

who had lost their parents, in children's homes. In Northern Moravia, almost purely Greek villages came into being, and there was a high concentration of Greeks in some towns, particularly Krnov, which had a Greek population of almost 3,000 – approximately twelve per cent of the total population – in the mid-1950s (Papadopulos, 1999). The immigrants from Greece worked principally in the textile and machine manufacturing industries (cf. Hradečný, 2000; Otčenášek, 2003a).

Since both Greek and Macedonian groups arrived from Greece under the same circumstances and together, the numerical relationship between them is difficult to establish and has been the object of debate (cf. Dorovský, 1998; Robovski, 1988; Sloboda, 2002, 2003). However, since the sociocultural and communicative behavior of the two groups shows differences, it is necessary to deal with them separately.[18]

3.9.1. Greeks

Members of the Greek ethnic community hoped that they would soon be able to return to their country and the Communist Party of Greece did not, therefore, make any effort to adapt the immigrants to the Czech environment. The communist parties of Greece and Czechoslovakia performed a policy of isolation (cf. Hradečný, 2000). Children were initially educated as Greek children in Greece. However, it soon became obvious that return to Greece would not be a matter of months or years, and in the 1951-52 school year children started attending Czech schools.

A Greek newspaper *Aghonistis* (Fighter), among other periodicals, was published from 1950 and up to 1969 it included a Macedonian page (*Borets*). There was also radio broadcasting in Greek. However, the community was still oriented towards returning to Greece, a fact clearly visible in marriage preferences, the range of which was restricted to the community. When return became possible, approximately three-quarters of the Greeks opted to go back; this happened in three waves, between 1975 and the end of the 1980s. In the 1990s, the number of Greeks stabilized at approximately 3,300 individuals (3,379 in the 1991 census and 3,219 in 2001). However, representatives of the community itself estimate the number of individuals of Greek origin at 7,000 (Zpráva, 2002). Greeks who remained in the Czech Republic and those who returned to Greece developed an active relationship, often of a commercial nature. Slovaks apart, Greeks represented the largest single non-Czech group of students enrolled at Czech universities in the 1990s and early 2000s (500 in 2000). Some of the students settled in the Czech Republic where they joined the post-war-immigrant Greeks, Greek business people and other Greeks who have arrived more recently (cf. Otčenášek, 2003a; Sloboda, 2002, 2003; Zissaki-Healey, 2003).

Greeks living in the Czech Republic have formed a number of associations, the majority of which (numbering 11-13) comprise of so-called *Řecké obce* (Greek Communities). These local organizations form the *Asociace řeckých obcí v České republice* (Association of Greek Communities in the Czech Republic) which operates nationwide. The Communities concentrate on such tasks as maintenance of the Greek language, Greek dances, festivals, and the local Greek press. A representative of the Greek community has been a member of the Government Council for National Minorities.

3.9.2. The Greek Language

Greek immigrants arrived mostly from economically underdeveloped mountainous regions. Many of them spoke only Greek but some possessed additional knowledge of another

---

[18] Refugees from Greece included not only Greeks and Macedonians but also small groups of Greek Albanians, Aromunians, Sephardic Jews and Turks (see Otčenášek, 1998; Sloboda, 2003).

language, e.g. Slavic Macedonian or Aromunian (Sloboda, 2003). Many refugees originally restricted their contact with the matrix community to the bare minimum, because they hoped for a speedy return to their homeland. Czech was not in focus; this attitude also occurred among the educators of the Greek children (who were placed in children's homes) and were initially provided with schooling exclusively in Greek. However, starting in 1951, when it became clear that the immigrants cannot return due to political reasons, the children were enrolled in Czech schools. It was then that the lack of knowledge of the Czech language emerged as a problem (Papadopulos, 1998). Intensive courses were provided and extended through the summer vacations. The curricula were adapted, with some subjects being dropped to make space for extra Greek tuition. Greek was a compulsory subject until 1956, and some other subjects (such as Greek geography and history) were taught in the language (ibid.). Thus, the children were acquiring both languages, and in view of the fact that many of them lived and/or attended classes with Macedonian children, some of them also acquired some knowledge of Macedonian. Teaching materials for the Greek and Macedonian children were produced in and imported mainly from Romania and Poland. So-called 'Greek Schools' (extracurricular courses in the Greek language, literature, history and geography) began to disappear as a consequence of the return of a large number of families with children, as well as teachers, to Greece. However, the teaching of Greek as a subject has been revived after 1990 and is still being practiced in towns of Northern Moravia, in Brno and Prague, involving a total of 100-200 students (Sloboda, 2002, 2003). Tuition is normally provided in two competence grades (beginners and advanced) and classes are held extracurricularly after class hours of the Czech school. There are also classes for pre-school children (Zpráva, 2002). The Greek language competence of older emigrants is still relatively high; at the same time, the competence in Czech with some of them was not always sufficient and they needed interpreters when in contact with the authorities (Zpráva, 2002). For those who were born in the 1960s and 1970s, Czech often became the dominant language, even though Greek was maintained because a strong ethnic consciousness and the idea of re-emigration to Greece was intergenerationally transmitted (cf. Otčenášek, 2003a; Sloboda, 2003: 14-17).

3.9.3. Macedonians

Macedonians emerged as an ethnic community in the Czech lands under the same historical circumstances as the Greeks – i.e., as a consequence of the Greek civil war. They represented approximately a third of the arrivals from Greece (Hradečný, 2000: 44; Robovski, 1988: 20). Their reception paralleled that of the Greeks in that they received schooling in Macedonian (textbooks were provided from abroad), broadcasting in Macedonian was instituted, and there was a Macedonian press. Exact numbers are difficult to establish because the emergence of the Macedonian ethnicity was still recent, and because some speakers of Macedonian considered themselves to be Greeks, Bulgarians or were ethnically indiferent (Sloboda, 2002, 2003). A basic difference between them and the Greeks was that they were not able to return to their homes in Northern Greece even after the end of the dictatorship in 1974, because Greek authorities continued to refuse their applications, unless they declared Greek nationality and ethnicity and changed their names. This practice resulted in a higher degree of assimilation of Macedonians to Czech society which was linguistically facilitated by the fact that, unlike Greek, Macedonian is a Slavic language (Dorovský, 1998). Being barred from Greece, the only possibility for them, if they wanted to move closer to their homeland, was to resettle in the Yugoslav republic of Macedonia, which welcomed them (Dorovský, 1998; Papadopulos, 1999). Many, indeed, left for that destination. Among those who remained in the Czech lands, some assimilated to the matrix population while others opted for Greek ethnicity (Dorovský, 1998). There were new Macedonian arrivals in the 1990s (Otčenášek,

2003b). However, it is interesting that the Macedonian ethnicity was not reported at all in either the 1991 or the 2001 censuses, although some other very small groups (413 Austrians in 1991 or 690 Albanians in 2001) were. Some of them may have been included in the category *Others*.

3.9.4. The Macedonian Language

Macedonian refugees who arrived from Greece were mostly bilingual in a Macedonian dialect and a northern dialect of Greek. However, some of them were probably only competent in the former (Sloboda, 2003). At the end of the 1940s, the process of the formation of Standard Macedonian had not yet been completed. The first Macedonian school was established in Greece in 1947 (Dorovský, 1998: 210; Robovski, 1988: 37), and this fact alone indicated that the knowledge of written Macedonian was close to zero (Sloboda, 2003). Competence in Standard Greek was unlikely to be much better, since most of the refugees came from poor rural areas of Northern Greece. The structure of school education for Greek and Macedonian children when they arrived was almost identical to that for the Greek ones, the main difference being that Macedonian children were given a few hours of tuition through the medium of and about Macedonian (Dorovský, 1998; Papadopulos, 1998; Robovski, 1988). Such children thus received bilingual education, and when Czech was added later as the principal medium of instruction, trilingual education. It can be assumed that, owing to the features shared by Macedonian and Czech, their competence in Czech developed faster than in the case of children with a pure Greek background. Hence, it is not surprising that the community "dissolved" within the Czech matrix society – unless individuals identified with the Greeks and accepted their identity. In addition to the language instruction for children, courses in Macedonian were organized also for adults, many of whom had been completely illiterate (Robovski, 1988: 42f.). After the 1960s, the teaching of Macedonian gradually disappeared with the re-emigrations of Macedonians to Yugoslav Macedonia and possibly due to the political changes of 1968-69 as well.

3.10. OTHER COMMUNITIES

In this section, some other smaller communities residing in the territory of the Czech Republic will be mentioned. Nekvapil and Neustupný (1998) speaks of the smaller communities as groups characterized not only by their size, but also by their relatively "limited visibility". This is still true of some of those groups, although others, such as the Vietnamese group, do attract considerable attention from the matrix community. In Nekvapil and Neustupný (1998) it was pointed out that "no community is too small to be ignored" (p. 126), and this point of view has recently been endorsed by others within the Czech Republic (Šatava, 2001).

Some of those communities are known to the authors from personal experience, while the presence of others is also attested in the existing literature. However, such information is rarely sufficient to provide a clear picture of the present state of their range of interaction within the Czech Republic. In preparing the 2001 census, the Czech authorities anticipated the existence of some of these smaller communities when they prepared their questionnaires not only in Czech, Polish, German, Romani, Ukrainian and Russian, but also in English, French, Arabic, Vietnamese and Chinese (see above). But even this linguistic diversity did not cater for the whole range of ethnic diversity in the country.

The 2001 census documented the presence of 690 Albanians, 1,801 Serbs and 1,585 Croats. These numbers may underestimate the real strength of those communities. The numbers reflect the unrest of the 1990s in the Balkan peninsula. Nevertheless, the unrest is

not the only factor, at least not in the case of the Croats whose presence in the Czech territory has a long history. As mentioned above, since the sixteenth century, several Croat villages have existed in Southern Moravia. In view of the support by the Croatian government of Nazi Germany during WWII and in view of the alleged collaboration with the Nazis by the Croat community in Moravia, the then over 2,000 Croats were forcibly dispersed into more than one hundred Moravian towns and villages where they were soon assimilated. Only after 1989 could those who still possessed their former identity form an association. From 2001 their representative is a member of the Government Council for National Minorities. Apart from concern about the maintenance of their folkloristic traditions, they have also declared an interest in the maintenance of their *čakavian* dialect of what used to be called *Serbo-Croatian*. The community had never had the opportunity to receive education in their own language. Before and during the war they attended German schools; then Czech schools became the only option. A brief account of their language was written 70 years ago (Vážný, 1934) but no further research has been published to date. In 2004 a representative of the Serbian community has become a member of the Government Council for National Minorities, which means de facto that Serbians has been acknowledged as "national minority" by the Czech government. The most ambitious project of the Serbs seems to be the magazine Srpska reč (Serbian Speech) published by the civic association Srbské sdružení S. Sávy and supported by the State since 2005.

Bulgarians and Rumanians (4,363 and 1,238 persons respectively in the 2001 census) are more recent, though not very recent, arrivals. Both groups participated in the resettlement of the border areas vacated after the original German population was deported. Members of the Bulgarian community are presently organized in a number of associations, publish periodicals and have a representative on the Government Council for National Minorities. There is an elementary and a middle school bearing the name of Petr Beron collectively accommodating120 students. These schools were established by the Bulgarian Embassy in Prague (Zpráva, 2002). There is little information available concerning the language behavior of the Bulgarians; however, some are known to use Russian, which is linguistically close to Bulgarian, a feature which has sometimes elicited negative comment. In the Report of the Government Council for National Minorities, the representative of the Bulgarian community was critical of some attitudes of the administration, but he anticipated that improvement would be imminent due to the adoption of the new Law. The Rumanian community has always been much smaller than the Bulgarian community, and information on its behavior is scarce.

A significant post-1989 community originates from North America. During various points in the 1990s, folk estimates from within the community placed its number at 20-50,000 in Prague alone, although the 2001 census recorded just over 3,000 people with U.S. nationality, with a greater concentration in Prague (and, as shown in Uherek 2003, in traditionally wealthier sections of Prague). From a linguistic perspective, this group also forms a community with other English speakers, who have developed their own media (newspapers, magazines, and internet discussion forums), and businesses and advertising which cater toward this group as non-Czech speakers are on the increase. Sherman (2001) noted that these 'western' foreigners tend to move to the Czech Republic for other than economic or political reasons. They are also marked by their young age, high level of education and mobility. There are many cases of intermarriage with Czechs and subsequent bilingual childrearing (explored in greater detail in Sherman 2003). Language management issues faced by this group include the problem of how and to what degree to acquire the Czech language, as it is often not a prerequisite for their employment, predominantly positions in foreign companies or as 'language workers' - English teachers, proofreaders and editors. Also relevant is question of the use of the Czech language within social networks and

in individual interactions, marked by a discursive portrayal of Czechs as unwilling speak 'foreigner Czech' (cf. Crown 1996) and by the growing number of English-speaking young people in the CR. Finally, as this group is highly media-literate, its organized language management concerns the discursive construction of their identity as native English speakers or Americans – how individual instances of their behavior toward language in a foreign country marks them as instruments of linguistic imperialism or hegemony (see Sherman in preparation).

In the most recent census (2001), no respondents reported Jewish ethnicity (*národnost*), although 218 individuals claimed being ethnically Jewish in 1991. There is a private elementary school (serving about 100 students) as well as a Jewish high school (a 4 year *gymnázium* with approximately 80 students), which teach Hebrew as part of their curricula. These institutions receive a governmental grant (Zpráva, 2002: 34). In the Government Council for National Minorities there is an active Jewish observer. However, it is apparent that at present members of the Jewish community in the Czech Republic consider themselves as a religious rather than an ethnic group. The history of the Czech Jews may provide an explanation. Unlike in Eastern Europe, in the Czech territory they had begun to migrate from the country into towns and cities in the 19th century. They became merchants, industrialists, lawyers, doctors or intellectuals and this change contributed both to their loss of religiosity and to their linguistic assimilation (Kieval, 1988). At the beginning of WWII, many emigrated and during the war most of those who did not, perished in German concentration camps. There was another wave of emigration when the Communist Party took power in 1948, and these population movements left only some 3,500 people to enter the 1990s (Pěkný, 1993).

This brief survey of "other communities" does not mention many other groups. There are, for example, refugees from various parts of the world, e.g., Armenia. The study of Turks and Arabs has only begun. There are quite a few individuals from societies which were a part of the Soviet Union, such as the countries of the Caucasus, or which maintained friendly relations with the Soviet block, such as Cubans or Africans, who settled in the Czech Republic after WWII. There is a Chinese community (more than 1,500 people with Chinese citizenship[19]). There are Mongolian migrant workers in a number of factories. In Blansko, a town of 20 thousand inhabitants, they even form about 2.5 per of the local population. The 1991 census registered 413 people with Austrian ethnicity, while the 2001 census does not speak of this group at all; however, the most recent census noted 1,000 people with Austrian citizenship. Furthermore, there are student communities that deserve special treatment. Neustupný (2003) reports on communication problems of Japanese students in Prague, but his paper represents only a limited contribution to a vast area. Tourists have not been mentioned at all.

References

Andrš, Z. (2003) *Jekhetanutňa čhibaha... Společným jazykem...* [With a common language...]. Brno: Společenství Romů na Moravě.

Bachmann, A.R. (2002) Atlas historických německých nářečí v České republice [Atlas of historical German dialects in the Czech Republic]. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 84, 112-113.

Bakker, P. & Kyuchukov, H. (2003) *Publications in Romani, useful for Romani language education.* Online document at URL: http://www.hum.au.dk/lingvist/lokal/pdf/romedu-prefinal-november-20.pdf

---

[19] Some information on this community can be found in an important study by Uherek (2003).

Bártová, A. (2002) Jsou Češi tolerantní? [Are Czechs tolerant?]. In *Novinky.cz* 15.4.2002 (http://www.novinky.cz/Index/Politika/10741).

Berger, T. (2003) Slovaks in Czechia – Czechs in Slovakia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 162, 19-39.

Bezděková, E. (1988) Deutsch als Muttersprache und Fremdsprache in Böhmen und Mähren. *Germanistische Mitteilungen* 27, 115-138.

Bogoczová, I. (1994) K jazykové a komunikativní kompetenci polské dvojjazyčné mládeže na Těšínsku [On the linguistic and communicative competence of Polish bilingual youth in the Český Těšín region]. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 76, 19-27.

Bogoczová, I. (1997) Míra interference z češtiny do primárního jazykového kódu u nejmladších členů polského etnika v České republice [The rate of penetration of Czech into the primary linguistic code of the youngest members of the Polish community within Czech Republic]. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 79, 4-19.

Bogoczová, I. (2000) Stylizace – druhá přirozenost (K jazykové komunikaci na Těšínsku) [Wording – the second nature (On language communication in the Těšín region]. *Slovo a slovesnost* 60, 18-29.

Bogoczová, I. (2001) *Typologicky relevantní rozdíly mezi polštinou a češtinou jako zdroj jazykové interference* [Typologically relevant differences between the Polish and Czech languages as a source of language interference]. Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita v Ostravě.

Bogoczová, I. (2002) České Těšínsko. Obecné a jedinečné rysy periferního regionu [The Těšín region in Czechia: General and particular features of a peripheral region]. Paper presented at the conference *Okraj a střed v jazyce a literatuře*. Ústí nad Labem 3.-5.9.

Borák, M. (1998) Problémy polské menšiny v ČR v 90. letech [Problems of the Polish minority in the Czech Republic in 1990s]. In G. Sokolová and O. Šrajerová (eds) *Národnostní menšiny a majoritní společnost v České republice a v zemích střední Evropy v 90. letech XX. století* (pp. 230-241). Opava/Praha: Slezský ústav Slezského zemského muzea/Dokumentační a informační středisko Rady Evropy.

Borák, M. (1999) Polská menšina v České republice [Polish minority in the Czech Republic]. In I. Gabal et al. *Etnické menšiny ve střední Evropě* (pp. 120-127). Praha: G plus G.

Boretzky, N. (1999) Die Gliederung der Zentralen Dialekten und die Beziehungen zwischen Südlichen Zentralen Dialekten (Rumungro) und Südbalkanischen Romani-Dialekten. In D. Halwachs and F. Menz (eds) *Die Sprache der Roma: Perspektiven der Romani-Forschung in Österreich im interdisziplinären und internationalen Kontext* (pp. 210-276). Klagenfurt: Drava.

Bořkovcová, M. (2007). *Romský etnolekt češtiny v romské komunitě na Smíchově* [The Romani induced ethnolekt of Czech spoken by a Roma community in Smichov]. Praha: Signeta (in print)

Budovičová, V. (1986) Literary languages in contact (A sociolinguistic approach to the relation between Slovak and Czech today). In J. Chloupek and J. Nekvapil (eds) *Reader in Czech Sociolinguistics* (pp. 156–175). Praha: Academia.

Budovičová, V. (1987a) Semikomunikácia ako faktor medzijazykovej dynamiky [Semicommunication as an aspect of interlanguage dynamics]. In *Dynamika současné češtiny z hlediska lingvistické teorie a školské praxe* (pp 45-54). Praha: Univerzita Karlova.

Budovičová, V. (1987b) Semikomunikácia ako lingvistický problém [Semicommunication as a linguistic problem]. In J. Mistrík (ed.) *Studia Academica Slovaca 16* (pp. 49-66). Bratislava: Alfa.

CENSUS (2001) *Results of Population and Housing Census March 1, 2001*. Online documents available at URL: http://www.czso.cz/.

Choli-Daróczi, J., Feyér, L. (1988) *Zhanes Romanes? – Cigány nyelvkönyv* [Do you know Romani?]. Budapest: A Madyarországi Cigányok Kulturális szövetsége.

Clyne, M. (1991) *Community Languages. The Australian Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Czech School Inspection (2006) *Tematická zpráva: Souhrnné poznatky České školní inspekce o vzdělávání cizinců v základních a středních školách ve školním roce 2005/2006* [Thematical report: Summarized findings of the Czech School Inspection about the education of foreigners in basic and secondary schools in the 2005/2006 school year]. Praha: Česká školní inspekce. Online document at URL: http://www.csicr.cz.

Czech Statistical Office (1993) *Národnostní složení obyvatelstva ČR – výsledky sčítání lidu, domů a bytů 1991* [Ethnic compostion of the population of the Czech Republic – Results of the census of people, houses and flats 1991]. Praha: Český statistický úřad (= Zprávy a rozbory, řada 23, No 2).

Czech Statistical Office (1994) *Národnostní složení obyvatelstva České republiky* [Ethnic composition of the population of the Czech Republic]. Praha: Český statistický úřad.

Davidová, D. (1990) Překonávání a využití interference češtiny, slovenštiny a polštiny v komunikaci velkých podniků ostravské aglomerace [Interference between Czech, Slovak and Polish: ways of coping with it and profiting from it in communication in large factories in the Ostrava conurbation]. *Acta Facultatis Paedagogicae Ostraviensis/Sborník prací Pedagogické fakulty v Ostravě 121, Series D-27 (Jazyk, literatura, umění)*, 31-46.

Deutsch in der Tschechischen Republik (2000/2001). Praha: Goethe-Institut Prag etc.

Dorovský, I. (1998) *Makedonci žijí mezi námi* [Macedonians living among us]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, Společnost přátel jižních Slovanů v ČR.

Dovalil, V. (2007) Sprachenpolitik in der Tschechischen Republik (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Beziehungen zur EU und zum Europarat). In: D. Blanke/J. Scharnhorst (eds.), *Sprachenpolitik und Sprachkultur*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Education Act (2004) Zákon č. 561 ze dne 24. září 2004 o předškolním, základním, středním, vyšším odborném a jiném vzdělávání (školský zákon) [Act No. 561 of 24th September 2004 on Pre-school, Basic, Secondary, Tertiary Professional and Other Education (the Education Act)]. *Sbírka zákonů: Česká republika*, částka 190. Also available online in English at URL: http://www.msmt.cz/dokumenty/act-no-561-of-24th-september-2004.

Elšík, V. (2000/2001) Romština jako cizí jazyk [Romani as a foreign language]. *Cizí jazyky* 44,. 7-9.

Elšík, V. (2003) Interdialect contact of Czech (and Slovak) Romani varieties. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 162, 41-62..

Eőry, V. and Hašová, L. (2003) Hungarians in the Czech Republic. On the emergence of a "new" linguistic minority after the division of Czechoslovakia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 162, 85-102..

Ferguson, C. A. (1981) 'Foreigner talk' as the name of a simplified register. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 28, 9-18.

Frištenská, H. and Sulitka, A. (1995) *Průvodce právy příslušníků národnostních menšin v ČR* [A guide to the rights of members of ethnic minorities in the Czech Republic]. Praha: Demokratická aliancia Slovákov v ČR (Second edition).

GAC, s.r.o. (2006) *Analýza sociálně vyloučených romských lokalit a komunit v České republice a absorpční kapacity subjektů působících v této oblasti* [Analysis of socially excluded Roma localities and communities in the Czech Republic and the absorption capacity of participants in this field]. Praha: GAC, s.r.o. http://www.gac.cz/documents/brozura_4.pdf

Gáfrik, J. (2006) Právny stav používania menšinových jazykov v Českej republike / The legal status of the usage of minority languages in the Czech Republic. In: M. Nagy (ed.), *Menej používané jazyky v nových členských štátoch EÚ / Lesser-Used Languages in the New Member States of the EU*. Šamorín, Dublin: Slovakian Bureau for Lesser-Used Languages, European Bureau for Lesser-Used Languages, pp. 75-82 (in Slovak), pp. 77-84 (in English).

Haluková, J. (1998) Občanská sdružení a instituce slovenské národnostní menšiny a kulturní aktivity Klubu slovenské kultury v ČR [Civic associations and institutions of the Slovak ethnic minority and cultural activities of the Slovak Culture Club in the ČR]. In G. Sokolová and O. Šrajerová (eds) *Národnostní menšiny a majoritní společnost v České republice a v zemích střední Evropy v 90. letech XX. století* (pp. 130-135). Opava/Praha: Slezský ústav Slezského zemského muzea/Dokumentační a informační středisko Rady Evropy.

Halwachs, D., Cech, P., Heinschink, M. F. (1998) *Basisgrammatik der österreichischen Lovara*. Wien: Verein Romano Centro.

Hancock, I.F. (1988) The development of Romani linguistics. In M.A. Jazayeri and W.Winter (eds) *Languages and Cultures: Studies in Honor of Edgar C. Polomé* (pp.183-223). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hašová, L. (1996) Z výzkumu jazykové situace v Nejdku u Karlových Varů [From the study of the language situation in Nejdek by Karlovy Vary]. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 78, 88-96.

Hašová, L. (2000). K jednomu případu česko-německé interference [One instance of Czech –German interference]. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 82, 22-28.

Hašová, L. (2001) K problematice střídání a míšení kódů (na česko-maďarském jazykovém materiálu) [On code-switching and code-mixing as exemplified in Czech-Hungarian language contact]. *Jazykovědné aktuality* 38 (4), 52-57.

Häufler, V. (1976) *Národnostní poměry České socialistické republiky* [The ethnic situation in the Czech Socialist Republic]. Praha: Academia.

Haugen, E. (1966) Semicommunication: the language gap in Scandinavia. *Sociological Inquiry* 36 (2), 280-297.

Heroldová, I. and Matějová, V. (1987) Vietnamští pracující v českých zemích [Vietnamese workers in the Czech lands]. *Český lid* 74, 194-203.

Homoláč, J., Karhanová, K. and Nekvapil, J. (eds) (2003) *Obraz Romů v středoevropských masmédiích* [Presentations of Roma in the Central European Media]. Brno: Doplněk.

Houžvička, V. (2001) Wie Tschechen die Deutschen wahrnehmen. In K. Roth (ed.) *Nachbarschaft. Interkulturelle Beziehungen zwischen Deutschen, Polen und Tschechen* (pp. 79-97). Münster/New York/München/Berlin: Waxmann.

Hradečný, P. (2000) *Řecká komunita v Československu, její vznik a počáteční vývoj (1948-1954)* [The Greek community in Czechoslovakia: its emergence and initial development (1948-1954)]. Praha: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR.

Hübschmannová, M. (1979) Bilingualism among the Slovak Rom. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 19, 33-50.

Hübschmannová, M. and Neustupný, J.V. (1996) The Slovak-and-Czech dialect of Romani and its standardization. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 120, 85-109.

Hübschmannová, M. (1999) Od etnické kasty ke strukturovanému etnickému společenství [From an ethnic caste to a structured ethnic community]. In SOCIOKLUB *Romové v České republice* (pp. 115-136). Praha: Socioklub.

Hübschmannová, M (2000) Inspirace pro rozvoj romštiny [Inspiration for the development of Romani]. In *Člověk a spoločnosť: internetový časopis pre pôvodné, teoretické a výskumné štúdie z oblasti spoločenských vied [online]* [Man and society: internet journal for original, theoretical and research studies in the field of social sciences]. 2000, 3, 1. http://www.saske.sk/cas/1-2000/hubschmann.html

Hübschmannová, M. and Neustupný, J.V. (2004) 'Terminological' processes in North-Central Romani. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 5, 83-108.

Hübschmannová, M., Šebková, H. & Žigová, A. (1991) *Romsko-český a česko-romský kapesní slovník* [Romani-Czech and Czech-Romani Pocket Dictionary]. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Hymes, D.H. (ed.) (1971) *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Institute for Information in Education (2000) *Statistická ročenka školství 1999/2000* [Statistical yearbook of education, 1999/2000]. Praha: Ústav pro informace ve vzdělávání.

Institute for Information in Education (2006) *Statistická ročenka školství 2005/2006: Výkonové ukazatele* [Statistical yearbook of education, 2005/2006: efficiency indices]. Praha: Ústav pro informace ve vzdělávání. Also available online at URL: http://www.uiv.cz/rubrika/98.

Ivaňová, T. (2002) *Cizinka S (Dvojjazyčná česko-slovenská komunikace)* [Foreigner S.: On Bilingual Czech-Slovak Communication]. Praha: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy, Ústav bohemistických studií (diss.).

Ivaňová, T. (2004) O tom, ako Slováci mluví a Česi povedajú [How Slovaks 'mluví' and Czechs 'povedajú']. In M. Šimková (ed.) *Varia* XI (pp. 30-36). Bratislava: Slovenská jazykovedná spoločnosť pri SAV.

Jabur, V. (2000) Das Rusinische in der Slowakei. In B. Panzer (ed.) *Die sprachliche Situation in der Slavia zehn Jahre nach der Wende* (pp. 117-132). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Jernudd, B. H. and Neustupný, J. V. (1987) Language planning: for whom? In L. Laforge, (ed.) *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning* (pp. 69-84). Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Jesenský J. (2000) *Základy komprehenzivní speciální pedagogiky* [Foundations of Comprehensive Special Pedagogy]. Hradec Králové: Gaudeamus.

Jirasová, M., Pospíšil and M. Sulitka, A. (2005) Česká republika v přípravě na ratifikaci Evropské charty regionálních či menšinových jazyků [Czech Republic in preparation for the ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages]. *Veřejná správa*, No 46.

Kalibová, K. (1999) Romové z pohledu statistiky a demografie [The Roma from a statistical and demogrphical perspective]. In SOCIOKLUB *Romové v České republice* (pp. 91-114). Praha: Socioklub.

Keller, J. (2002) Romové – v bludném kruhu stigmatizace [The Roma – in the vicious circle of stigmatization]. In W. Koschmal, M. Nekula and J.Rogall (eds) *Češi a Němci. Dějiny – kultura – politika* (pp. 273-276). Praha/Litomyšl: Paseka.

Khubchandani, L. (1981) *Language, Education, Social Justice*. Poona: Centre for Communication Studies.

Kieval, H.J. (1988) *The Making of Czech Jewry: National Conflict and Jewish Society in Bohemia, 1870-1918.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kocourek, J. and Pechová, E. (eds.) (2006) *S vietnamskými dětmi na českých školách.* [With Vietnamese children at the Czech schools]. Praha: H&H.

Kompasová, S. (1999/2000) Čeština ve vysílání slovenské televizní stanice Markíza [The Czech language in the broadcasting of the Slovak television station Markíza]. *Češtinář* 10, 156–163.

Kopecký, K., Musilová, K., Pláteník, P., Mitter, P. & Skalský, V. (2005) *Slovenský jazyk na české škole* [The Slovak language in the Czech school]. Praha: Slovensko-český klub.

Kopecký, K. (n. d.) *Slovenština v současné základní škole* [Slovak in today's basic school]. Online documents at URL: http://cz-language.upol.cz/slovenstina/.

Köppen, B. (2000) Auswirkungen des Einkaufstourismus im nordböhmischen Grenzraum. *Europa regional* 8 (2), 19-31 (Leipzig: Institut für Länderstudien).

Kopřivová-Vukolová, A. (1993) Osudy ruské emigrace v ČSR po r. 1945 [History of he Russian émigré community in Czechoslovakia after 1945]. In V. Veber et al. *Ruská a ukrajinská emigrace v ČSR v letech 1918-1945* (pp. 80-94). Praha: Seminář pro dějiny východní Evropy při Ústavu světových dějin FF UK v Praze.

Kořenský, J. (1998) Čeština a slovenština [Czech and Slovak]. In J. Kořenský (ed.) *Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich. Český jazyk* (pp. 20-33). Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski, Instytut Filologii Polskiej.

Krausová, H. (2006) Mongolská komunita na Blanensku. [The Mongolian community in Blansko area]. In *Informační bulletin Společnosti přátel Mongolska a Klubu přátel Asie Pražská jurta*. No. 3-4, pp. 29 – 31. Praha.

Krčmová, M. (1993) Brněnská městská mluva – odraz kontaktů etnik [Urban speech in Brno as a reflection of ethnic contacts]. *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzit*y, A 41, 77-86.

Lanstyák, I. (2002) Maďarčina na Slovensku – štúdia z variačnej sociolingvistiky [Hungarian in Slovakia – a study in variational sociolinguistics]. *Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review* 38, 409-427.

Leudar, I. and Nekvapil, J. (1998). On the emergence of political identity in the Czech mass media: the case of the Democratic Party of Sudetenland. *Czech Sociological Review* 6, 43-58.

Leudar, I. and Nekvapil, J. (2000) Presentations of Romanies in the Czech media: on category work in televison debates. *Discourse and Society* 11, 487-513.

Lotko, E. (1994) O jazykové komunikaci polské národnostní menšiny v České republice [On the linguistic communication of Polish ethnic group in the Czech Republic]. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 76, 9-19.

Lotko, E. (1997*) Synchronní konfrontace češtiny a polštiny* [Synchronic confrontation of Czech and Polish languages]. Olomouc: Vydavatelství Univerzity Palackého.

Lotko, E. (1998) Čeština a polština [Czech and Polish]. In J. Kořenský (ed.) *Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich. Český jazyk* (pp. 33-43). Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski, Instytut Filologii Polskiej.

Lozoviuk, P. (1997) K problematice „etnické indiference" (Příklady z českého jazykového prostředí) [Revisiting the issue of 'ethnic indiference' (examples from the Czech linguistic setting)]. *Český lid* 84, 201–212.

Magocsi, P.R. (ed.) (1996) *A New Slavic Language is Born. The Rusyn Literary Language of Slovakia.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Malý, K. (1991) Sprache – Recht und Staat in der tschechischen Vergangenheit. In J. Eckert and H. Hattenhauer (eds) *Sprache – Recht – Geschichte* (pp. 257-281). Heidelberg: C.F. Müller.

Marti, R. (1998) Sprachenpolitik im slavischsprachigen Raum. Das Verhältnis „großer" und „kleiner" slavischer Standardsprachen. *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 57, 353-370.

Marti, R. (1993) Slovakisch und Čechisch vs. Čechoslovakisch, Serbokroatisch vs. Kroatisch und Serbisch. In K. Gutschmidt, H. Keipert and H. Rothe (eds) *Slavistische Studien zum XI. internationalen Slavistenkongreß in Preßburg/Bratislava* (pp. 289–315). Köln/Weimar/Wien: Böhlau.

Matras, Y. (1999) Writing Romani: The Pragmatics of Codification of a Stateless Country. In: *Applied Linguistics*, Nr. 20 (pp. 481-502). Oxford: Oxford University Press

Matras, Y., Halwachs, D. & Bakker, P. (eds) (2007) *ROMLEX*. Online documents at URL: http://romani.uni-graz.at/romlex/lex.xml.

Matras, Y. (ed.) (2007) *The Romani Linguistics Page.* Online documents at URL: http://www.llc.manchester.ac.uk/Research/Projects/romani/index.html.

Ministry of Education (2005a) *Národní plán výuky cizích jazyků* [National plan for foreign language teaching]. Online document at URL: http://www.msmt.cz/vzdelavani/narodni-plan-vyuky-cizich-jazyku.

Ministry of Education (2005b) *Rámcový vzdělávací program pro základní vzdělávání* [Framework educational program for basic education]. Praha: Výzkumný ústav pedagogický.

Mlčoch, M. (2002) K problematice česko-slovenských a slovensko-českých jazykových vztahů [On Czech-Slovak and Slovak-Czech language relationship]. *Jazykovědné aktuality* 39, 46-47.

Možný, I. (2002) *Česká společnost: Nejdůležitější fakta o kvalitě našeho života* [The Czech Society: Basic Facts Concerning the Quality of our Life]. Prague: Portál.

Müllerová, P. (1998) Vietnamese diaspora in the Czech Republic. *Archív orientální* 66, 121-126.

Muryc, J. (2005) Jazyková kompetence bilingvního obyvatelstva v české části Těšínského Slezska [Language competence of bilingual population in the Český Těšín region]. In J. Štefánik (ed.) *Individuálny a spoločenský bilingvizmus* (pp. 43-50). Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Univerzity Komenského.

Musilová, K. (2000) Česko-slovenský pasivní bilingvizmus [Czech-Slovak passive bilingualism].In S. Ondrejovič (ed.) *Mesto a jeho jazyk* (= *Sociolinguistica Slovaca* 5) (pp. 280-288). Bratislava: Veda.

Nábělková, M. (2000) Rozdelenie a "vzdaľovanie". Niekoľko pohľadov [Division and dissociation. Several views]. In I. Pospíšil and M. Zelenka (eds) *Česko-slovenská vzájemnost a nevzájemnost* (pp.104-112). Brno: Ústav slavistiky Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity.

Nábělková, M. (2002a) "K dverím ňebe se mej ..." Bibličtina na Slovensku v 20. storočí [The language of the Bible in Slovakia in the 20th century]. In I. Pospíšil and M. Zelenka (eds), *Literatury v kontaktech (Jazyk – literatura – kultura)* (pp. 71-87). Brno: Ústav slavistiky Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity.

Nábělková, M. (2002b) Medzi pasívnym a aktívnym blingvizmom (poznámky k špecifiku slovensko-českých jazykových vzťahov) [Between a passive and active bilingualism: notes on the specific features of Slovak-Czech language relations]. In J. Štefánik (ed.) *Bilingvizmus: Minulosť, prítomnosť, budúcnosť* (pp. 101-114). Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press.

Nábělková, M. (2006a) V čom bližšie, v čom ďalej... Spisovná slovenčina vo vzťahu k spisovnej češtine a k obecnej češtine [Standard Slovak in relation to Standard Czech and Common Czech]. In H. Gladkova and V. Cvrček (eds) *Acta Slavica et Baltica VI: Sociální aspekty spisovných jazyků slovanských* (pp. 93–106). Praha: Euroslavica 2006.

Nábělková, M. (2006b) Slovenčina v súčasnom českom prostredí (sonda do internetovej komunikácie) [Slovak in the Czech environment today (an inquiry into Internet communication)]. In J. Mlacek and M. Vojtech (eds) *Studia Academica Slovaca* 35 (pp. 451– 464). Bratislava: Stimul.

Nábělková, M. (2007) Closely-related languages in contact: Czech, Slovak, "Czechoslovak". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 183 (= *Small and Large Slavic Languages in Contact*), 53-73.

Nekula, M. (1997) Germanismen in der tschechischen Presse und Werbung. Die Einstellung gegenüber dem Deutschen. In S. Höhne and M. Nekula (eds) *Sprache, Wirtschaft, Kultur. Deutsche und Tschechen in Interaktion* (pp. 147-159). München: Iudicium.

Nekula, M. (2002) Česko-německý bilingvismus. [Czech-German bilingualism]. In W. Koschmal, M. Nekula and J.Rogall (eds) *Češi a Němci. Dějiny – kultura – politika* (pp. 152-158). Praha/Litomyšl: Paseka.

Nekvapil, J. (1997a) Die kommunikative Überwindung der tschechisch-deutschen ethnischen Polarisation. *Deutsche*, *deutsche Kollegen*, *Expatriates* und andere soziale Kategorien im Automobilwerk Škoda. In S. Höhne and M. Nekula (eds) *Sprache, Wirtschaft, Kultur. Deutsche und Tschechen in Interaktion* (pp. 127-145). München: Iudicium.

Nekvapil, J. (1997b) Tschechien. In H. Goebl, P. H. Nelde, Z. Starý and W.Wölck (eds) *Kontaktlinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung* (pp.1641-1649). Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Nekvapil, J. (2000a) Sprachmanagement und ethnische Gemeinschaften. In L. N. Zybatow (ed.) *Sprachwandel in der Slavia* (pp. 683–699). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Nekvapil, J. (2000b) On non-self-evident relationships between language and ethnicity: How Germans do not speak German, and Czechs do not speak Czech. *Multilingua* 19, 37-53.

Nekvapil, J. (2001) From the biographical narratives of Czech Germans: Language biographies in the family of Mr and Mrs S. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 11, 77-99.

Nekvapil, J. (2003a) Language biographies and the analysis of language situations: on the life of the German community in the Czech Republic. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 162, 63-83.

Nekvapil, J. (2003b) On the role of the languages of adjacent states and the languages of ethnic minorities in multilingual Europe: the case of the Czech Republic. In J. Besters-Dilger, R. de Cillia, H.-J. Krumm and R. Rindler-Schjerve (eds) *Mehrsprachigkeit in der erweiterten europäischen Union / Multilingualism in the Enlarged European Union / Multilinguisme dans l'Union Européenne élargie* (pp. 76-94). Klagenfurt: Drava Verlag.

Nekvapil, J. (2006) From language planning to language management. *Sociolinguistica* 20.

Nekvapil, J. (2007a) On the relationship between small and large Slavic languages. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 183, 41-60.

Nekvapil, J. (2007b) Language cultivation in developed contexts. In B. Spolsky and F. Hult (eds) *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Nekvapil, J. (2007c) On the language situation in the Czech Republic: What has (not) happened after the accession of the country to the EU. *Sociolinguistica* 21.

Nekvapil, J. and Leudar, I. (2002) On dialogical networks: arguments about the migration law in Czech mass media in 1993. In S. Hester and W. Housley (eds) *Language, Interaction and National Identity. Studies in the Social Organisation of National Identity in Talk-in-Interaction* (pp. 60-101). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Nekvapil, J. and Nekula, M. (2006) On language management in multinational companies in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 7 (2&3), 307-327.

Nekvapil, J. and Neustupný, J.V. (1998) Linguistic communities in the Czech Republic. In Ch.B. Paulston and D. Peckham (eds) *Linguistic Minorities in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 116-134).Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Nekvapil, J. and Neustupný, J.V. (2005) Politeness in the Czech Republic: distance, levels of expression, management and intercultural contact. In L. Hickey and M. Stewart (eds) *Politeness in Europe* (pp. 247-262). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Nekvapil, J. et al. (2000) The presentation of Roma/Gypsies in the central European mass media. In *Přednášky z XLIII. běhu Letní školy slovanských studií* (pp. 65-76). Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta.

Neustupný, J.V. (1987) *Communicating with the Japanese*. Tokyo: Japan Times.

Neustupný, J.V. (1993) Language management for Romani in Central and Eastern Europe. *New Language Planning Newsletter* 7(4), 1-6.

Neustupný, J.V. (2002) Sociolingvistika a jazykový management [Sociolinguistics and language management]. *Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review* 38, 429-442.

Neustupný, J.V. (2003) Japanese students in Prague. Problems of communication and interaction. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 162, 125-143.

Neustupný, J.V. (2006) Sociolinguistic aspects of social modernization. In U.Ammon, N.Dittmar, K.J.Mattheier and P.Trudgill, eds. *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society* (pp. 2209-2223). Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Neustupný, J.V. and Nekvapil, J. (2003): Language management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4, 181-366 [reprinted in Baldauf R.B. and Kaplan, R.B. (eds.), *Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol. 2.: The Czech Republic, The European Union and Northen Ireland*. Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2006, pp. 16-201]

Otčenášek, J. (1998) Řecká národnostní menšina v České republice dnes [The Greek minority in the Czech Republic today]. *Český lid* 85, 147–159.

Otčenášek, J. (2003a) Řekové a řečtí etničtí Makedonci v České republice [Greeks and Greek ethnic Macedonians in the Czech Republic]. In Z. Uherek (ed.) *Integrace cizinců na území České republiky* (pp. 273-292). Praha: Akademie věd České republiky. Also available online at URL: http://www.cizinci.cz/clanek.php?lg=1&id=108.

Otčenášek, J. (2003b) Chorvaté, Srbové a Makedonci z vybraných zemí bývalé SRFJ v ČR [Croats, Serbs and Macedonians from selected countries of former Yugoslavia in the Czech Republic]. In Z. Uherek (ed.) *Integrace cizinců na území České republiky* (pp. 305-318). Praha: Akademie věd České republiky. Also available online at URL: http://www.cizinci.cz/clanek.php?lg=1&id=108.

Papadopulos, L. (1998). *Παιδιά της Θύελλας: Děti bouře* [Children of the storm]. Praha: Nemesis.

Papadopulos, L. (1999). *Νόστιμον Ήμαρ (Ημέρα Επιστροφής): Nostimon hémar (Den návratu)* [Nostimon hemar (The day of return)]. Praha: Nemesis.

Pauliny, E. (1983) *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny od začiatkov po súčasnosť* [The History of Standard Slovak from the Beginnings up to the Present]. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.

Pěkný, T. (1993) *Historie Židů v Čechách a na Morav*ě [The history of Jews in Bohemia and Moravia]. Praha: Sefer.

Pišlová, A. (2002) *Mluva Čechů z Ukrajiny po deseti letech integrace v českém prostředí.* [Speech of the Czechs from Ukraine after ten years of their integration into the Czech milieu]. Praha: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy, Ústav bohemistických studií (diss.).

Povejšil, J. (1975) Deutscher Dialekt und fremde Hochsprache bei zweisprachiger Bevölkerung. *Philologica Pragensia* 18, 100-110.

Povejšil, J. (1997) Tschechisch-Deutsch. In H. Goebl, P. H. Nelde, Z. Starý and W.Wölck (eds) *Kontaktlinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung.*(pp. 1656-1662). Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Praha a národnosti (1998) [Prague and Ethnic Minorities]. Praha: Odbor školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy Magistrátu hl. m. Prahy.

Praha. Osobnosti národnostních menšin (2000) [Prague. Important Names in Ethnic Minorities]. Praha: Komise Rady hl. m. Prahy pro oblast národnostních menšin na území hl. m.Prahy.

Prokop, R. (2000) Problémy národní identity Slováků v multietnických oblastech České republiky [Ethnic identity of Slovaks in the multiethnic regions of the Czech Republic]. In O. Šrajerová (ed.) *Formování multikulturní společnosti v podmínkách ČR a v zemích střední Evropy* (pp. 103-113). Opava/Praha: Slezské zemské muzeum, Slezský ústav/Dokumentační a informační středisko Rady Evropy při Evropském informačním středisku UK v Praze.

Prokop, R. (2001) Identita moravské a slezské národnosti v podmínkách České republiky se nepotvrdila [Moravian and Silesian ethnic identity in the territory of the Czech Republic has not been confirmed]. In O. Šrajerová (ed.) *Otázky národní identity – determinanty a subjektivní vnímání v podmínkách současné multietnické společnosti* (pp. 182-193). Opava/Praha: Slezské zemské muzeum, Slezský ústav/Dokumentační a informační středisko Rady Evropy při Evropském informačním středisku UK v Praze.

Průcha, J. (2004) Multikulturní výchova; problémy spojené s její realizací [Multicultural Education; problems of its implementation]. *Metodický portál*. Online document at URL: http://www.rvp.cz/clanek/276/32.

Raichová, I. & al. (2001) *Romové a nacionalismus?* [The Roma and nationalism?]. Brno: Irena Raichová.

Ristović, M. (2000) *A Long Journey Home: Greek Refugee Children in Yugoslavia 1948-1960*. Thessaloniki: IMXA. [Translated from Ristović, M. (1998) *Dug povratak kući: Deca izbeglice iz Grčke u Jugoslaviji 1948-1960*. Beograd: Udruženje za društvenu istoriju, Čigoja štampa.]

Robovski, N. (1988). *Македонците од егејскиот дел на Македонија во Чехословачка* [Macedonians of the Aegean part of Macedonia in Czechoslovakia]. Скопје: Наша книга.

Rostás-Farkas, Gy. & Karsai, E. (1991, 2001) *Cigány-magyar, magyar-cigány szótár* [Gypsy-Hungarian, Hungarian-Gypsy dictionary]. Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó.

Rychlík, J. (2002) *Rozpad Československa: Česko-slovenské vztahy 1989-1992* [The disintegration of Czechoslovakia: Czech-Slovak relations 1989–1992]. Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press.

Sadílek, P. and Csémy, T. (1993) *Maďaři v České republice – Magyarok a Cseh Köztársaságban 1918–1992* [Hungarians in the Czech Republic 1918–1992]. Praha: Svaz Maďarů žijících v českých zemích – Cseh- és Morvaországi Magyarok Szövetsége.

Sherman, T. (2001) The experience of Czech-English bilingualism for Czech-American families. In O. Šrajerová (ed.) *Otázky národní identity – determinanty a subjektivní vnímání v podmínkách současné multietnické společnosti* (pp. 268-274). Opava/Praha: Slezské zemské muzeum, Slezský ústav/Dokumentační a informační středisko Rady Evropy při Evropském informačním středisku UK v Praze.

Sherman, T. (2003) *On post-1989 contact between Czech and English: Language use in Czech-American families*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Prague: Charles University.

Sherman, T. (in preparation) Managing a Discourse of Hegemony: Native English speakers in the Czech Republic. In J. Nekvapil and T. Sherman (eds) *Language Management in Situations of Intercultural Contact.*

Skála, E. (1977) Vznik a vývoj česko-německého bilingvismu [The rise and development of the Czech-German bilingualism]. *Slovo a slovesnost* 38, 197-207.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000) *Menšina, jazyk a rasizmus* [Minority, Language, and Racism]. Bratislava: Kalligram

Sládek, Z. (1999) České prostředí a ruská emigrace (1918-1938) [The Czech environment and the Russian émigré community, 1918-1938]. In L. Běloševská (ed.) *Duchovní proudy ruské a ukrajinské emigrace v Československé republice (1919-1939)* (pp. 7-46). Praha: Slovanský ústav AV ČR.

Slezáková, J. (mimeo) *Výzkum identity a vztahu k české veřejnosti skupiny Vietnamců v Jihlavě* [A Survey the identity of a group of the Vietnamese in Jihlava and their relationship to the Czech public].

Slezáková, J. (2005) Vietnamská komunita v Jihlavě (identita a vztah k české veřejnosti) [The Vietnamese community in Jihlava (their identity and the relationship to the Czech public]. In D. Bittnerová, M. Moravcová et al. (eds) *Kdo jsem a kam patřím? Identita národnostních menšin a etnických komunit na území České republiky* (pp. 389-402). Praha: SOFIS.

Sloboda, M. (2002) Řecká a makedonská etnická skupina v Česku: lingvistické aspekty jejich vzniku a vývoje [The Greek and Macedonian communities in Czechia: Linguistic aspects of their rise and development]. In O. Šrajerová (ed.) *Národnostní menšiny na přelomu tisíciletí* (pp. 234–242). Opava/Praha: SÚ SZM / DIS RE. Also available online at URL: http://www.migraceonline.cz/studie_f.shtml?x=138656.

Sloboda, M. (2003) Language maintenance and shifts in a Greek community in a heterolinguistic environment: the Greeks in the Czech Republic. *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora*, 29 (1), 5–33.

Sloboda, M. (2004) Slovensko-česká (semi)komunikace a vzájemná (ne)srozumitelnost [The Slovak-Czech (semi)communication and mutual (un)intelligibility]. *Čeština doma a ve světě* 12 (3–4), 208–220.

Sloboda, M. (in print) Užívání češtiny a slovenštiny u Slováků v ČR a jazykové postoje majority (ve výsledcích dotazníkového výzkumu) [The use of Czech and Slovak by Slovaks in the Czech Republic, and language attitudes of the Czech majority (results of a questionnaire survey)]. In M. Nábělková and J. Pátková (eds) *Česko-slovenské vztahy v aktuálních souvislostech*. Praha: Euroslavica.

Sokolová, G. (1991) O jazykovém zaměření Slováků a Němců žijících v severních Čechách – na základě sociologických výzkumů [On language orientation of Slovaks and Germans living in North Bohemia – based on sociological research]. *Slezský sborník* 89, 172-180.

Sokolová, G. (1999a) O vztahu k místnímu nářečí u obyvatel českého Těšínska [On the attitudes to the local dialect of the population of the Czech Těšín region.]. *Slezský sborník* 97, 211-226.

Sokolová, G. (1999b) Problematika polské menšiny v České republice a slovenské menšiny v České republice z perspektivy sociologických výzkumů [Problems of the the Polish and Slovak minority in the Czech Republic from the sociological perspective]. In I. Gabal et al. *Etnické menšiny ve střední Evropě* (pp. 128-139). Praha: G plus G.

Sokolová, G. et al. (1978) *Současný rozvoj národnostních kultur na Ostravsku* [Current Development of Ethnic Cultures in the Ostrava Region]. Ostrava: Profil.

Sokolová, G. et al. (1987) *Soudobé tendence vývoje národností v ČSSR* [Contemporary Trends in the Development of Nationalities in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic]. Praha: Academia.

Sokolová, G., Hernová, Š. and Šrajerová, O. (1997) *Češi, Slováci a Poláci na Těšínsku a jejich vzájemné vztahy* [Czechs, Slovaks, and Poles in the Těšín Region and their Mutual Relationships]. Opava: Tilia.

Sokolová, M., Musilová, K. and Slančová, D. (2005) *Čeština a slovenština: Synchrónne porovnanie s cvičeniami* [Czech and Slovak: A synchronical comparison with excercises]. Bratislava : Univerzita Komenského.

Srb, Vl. (1987) Demografický profil polské menšiny v Československu [The demographic profile of the Polish minority in Czechoslovakia]. *Český lid* 74, 151-167.

Srb, Vl. (1988) Demografický profil německé menšiny v Československu [The demographic profile of the German minority in Czechoslovakia]. *Český lid* 75, 29-42.

Staněk, T. (1993) *Německá menšina v českých zemích (1948-1989)* [German minority in the Czech lands, 1948-1989]. Praha: Institut pro středoevropskou kulturu a politiku.

Staněk, T. (1998) K současnému postavení německé menšiny v České republice [On the present-day position of the German minority in the Czech Republic]. In G. Sokolová and O. Šrajerová (eds) *Národnostní menšiny a majoritní společnost v České republice a v zemích střední Evropy v 90. letech XX. století* (pp. 88-101). Opava/Praha: Slezský ústav Slezského zemského muzea/Dokumentační a informační středisko Rady Evropy.

Staněk, T. (1999) Německá menšina v českých zemích v letech 1918-1989 [The German minority in the Czech lands in 1918-1989]. In I. Gabal et al. *Etnické menšiny ve střední Evropě* (pp. 97-108). Praha: G plus G.

State Statistical Office (1920) *Statistická příručka republiky Československé* [Statistical handbook of the Czechoslovak Republic], vol. I. Praha: Státní úřad statistický.

STATISTICKÁ ROČENKA (2000) *Statistická ročenka České republiky 2000* [Statistical Yearbook of the Czech Republic 2000]. Praha: Scientia.

Stehlíková, E. (ed.) (1997) *Čeští Němci nebo němečtí Češi?* [Czech Germans or German Czechs?] (= *Biograf. Časopis pro biografickou a reflexivní sociologii* 10-11). Praha: Fakulta sociálních věd UK.

Stevenson, P. (2000) The ethnolinguistic vitality of German-speaking communities in Central Europe. In S. Wolff (ed.) *German minorities in Europe* (pp. 109-124). New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Šatava, L. (2001) *Jazyk a identita etnických menšin: Možnosti zachování a revitalizac*e [Language and Identity of Ethnic Minorities: Is their Maintenance and Revitalization Possible?]. Praha: Cargo Publishers.

Šebková, H. (1995) *Jazyková situace Romů a její vývoj* [The language situation of the Roma and its development]. Praha 1995: MENT.

Šebková, H. and Žlnayová, E. (1998) *Nástin mluvnice slovenské romštiny (pro pedagogické účely)* [Outline of a grammar of Slovak Romani]. Ústí nad Labem: Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Turkyně, 1998.

Šrajerová, O. (1999) Slováci v České republice. Historický pohled na Slováky v českých zemích v letech 1918-1995 [Slovaks in the Czech Republic. A historical perspective on Slovaks in the Czech lands, 1918-1995]. In I. Gabal et al. *Etnické menšiny ve střední Evropě* (pp. 139-153). Praha: G plus G.

Tejnor, A. et al. (1982) Soziolinguistische Untersuchungen zur Sprachkultur. Probleme der tschechischen Orthographie und des Fremdwortgebrauchs im Spiegel der öffentlichen Meinung. In J. Scharnhorst and E. Ising (eds) *Grundlagen der Sprachkultur. Beiträge der Prager Linguistik zur Sprachtheorie und Sprachpflege*. Teil 2. (pp. 272-302). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Trost, P. (1995) *Studie o jazycích a literatuře* [Essays on languages and literature]. Praha: Torst.

Uherek, Z. (2003) Cizinecké komunity a městský prostor v České republice [Foreign communities and urban space in the Czech Republic]. *Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review* 39, 193-216.

Václavíková, A. (2000) Zaměstnávání cizích státních příslušníků v České republice jako jedna z forem utváření multikulturní společnosti [The employment of foreign nationals in the Czech Republic as a form of developing a multicultural society]. In O. Šrajerová (ed.) *Formování multikulturní společnosti v podmínkách ČR a v zemích střední Evropy* (pp. 193-198). Opava/Praha: Slezské zemské muzeum, Slezský ústav/Dokumentační a informační středisko Rady Evropy při Evropském informačním středisku UK.

Van Els, T.J.M. (2006): The European Union, its institutions and languages: Some language political observations. In: R.B. Baldauf/R.B. Kaplan (eds.), *Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol. 2.: The Czech Republic, The European Union and Northen Ireland* (pp. 202-251). Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Vaňko, J. (2000) *The Language of Slovakia's Rusyns* . New York: Columbia University Press.

Vasiljev, I. (1986) Vietnamští pracující ve vědomí naší společnosti [Vietnamese workers as perceived by the Czech society]. In *Etnické procesy* 4 (pp. 153 – 164). Praha: ÚEF ČSAV.

Vasiljev, I. (1990) Působení vietnamských pracujících v Československu v celkovém kontextu vzájemných hospodářských vztahů a stavu ekonomiky VSR [Vietnamese workers in Czechoslovakia: economic aspects]. In *Československo - vietnamský ekonomický seminář (červen 1989) - Sborník materiálů* (pp. 50 – 59). Praha: EÚ ČSAV, Čs. společnost ekonomická při ČSAV.

Vasiljev, I. (1990) K problému adaptace vietnamských pracujících v naší společnosti - normy zdvořilého chování. [Integration of Vietnamese workers in the Czech society: politeness norms]. In *Zpravodaj Koordinovaného systému vědeckých informací v etnografii a folkloristice (KSVIEF)*, No 9, pp. 50 – 71. Praha: ÚEF ČSAV.

Vasiljev, I. (1993) Tschechoslowakei (Ex-CS). *Sociolinguistica* 7 (= Mehrsprachigkeitskonzepte in den Schulen Europas), 49 - 57.

Vasiljev, I. (2006) *Český učitel a vietnamský student v utkání s češtinou* [How the Czech teacher and the Vietnamese pupil cope with Czech]. In *Sborník Asociace učitelů češtiny jako cizího jazyka* (pp. 145 – 152). Praha: Akropolis..

Vašek, A. (1976) On the problems of the isolated language. *Folia Linguistica* 9-1-4, 85-124.

Vážný, V. (1934) Mluva charvátských osad v republice Československé [Speech of Croatian settlements in the Czechoslovak Republic]. In *Československá vlastivěda.* Vol. III. Jazyk (pp.518-523). Praha: Sfinx.

Veber, V., Sládek, Z., Bubeníková, M. and Harbuľová, Ľ. (1996) *Ruská a ukrajinská emigrace v ČSR v letech 1918-1945* [The Russian and Ukranian émigré communities in Czechoslovakia in 1918-1945]. Praha: Seminář pro dějiny východní Evropy při Ústavu světových dějin FF UK v Praze.

Vesti. Žurnal russkoj diaspory v Češskoj respublike (2002) [News. Magazine of the Russian community in the Czech Republic]. No 5.

Vrbová, E. (1993) *Language Use as an Aspect of Ethnicity in Intermarriage. A Study from Czech and Slovak Settings*. Praha (mimeo).

Vývojová ročenka (1999) *Vývojová ročenka školství v České republice 1989/90 – 1998/99* [Yearbook of the development of the school system in the Czech Republic from 1989/90 to 1998/99]. Praha: Ústav pro informace ve vzdělávání.

Wilková, S. (1999) Romské děti berou docházku do zvláštní školy jako samozřejmost [Roma children take attending a special school as a matter of course]. *Mladá Fronta Dnes*, 15/7/1999, p.6.

Zeman, J. (1988) K jazykovým kontaktům mezi češtinou a slovenštinou [On language contacts of Czech and Slovak] . In J. Nekvapil and O. Šoltys (eds) *Funkční lingvistika a dialektika* (= *Linguistica* XVII/1) (pp. 172-175). Praha: Ústav pro jazyk český ČSAV.

Zeman, J. (1994) K problému výzkumu česko-polského kontaktu z hlediska komunikace [On Czech-Polish contact from the point-of-view of communication]. In *Kształcenie porozumiewania się* (pp. 115-120). Opole: Wyższa szkoła pedagogiczna.

Zeman, J. (1997a) Czech-Slovak. In H. Goebl, P. H. Nelde, Z. Starý and W.Wölck (eds) *Kontaktlinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung* (pp. 1650-1655). Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Zeman, J. (1997b) K výzkumu percepce slovenské kultury Čechy po rozpadu Československa [Research on perception of Slovak culture after the dissolution of Czechoslovakia]. *Český lid* 84, 175-178.

Zeman, J. (1999/2000) Seminář o výuce slovenštiny [A workshop on the teaching Slovak]. *Čeština* 10, 164-166.

Zich, F. (2001) *The bearers of development of the cross-border community on Czech-German border* (= *Sociologické texty* 01:4) Praha: Sociologický ústav Akademie věd České republiky.

Zilynskyj, B. (1995) *Ukrajinci v Čechách a na Moravě (1894) 1917 – 1945 (1994)* [Ukranians in Bohemia and Moravia, (1894) 1917 – 1945 (1994)]. Praha: X-egem.

Zilynskyj, B. (1996) Ukrajinci u nás – problémy minulé i současné (I), (II) [Ukranians in this country – problems of the past and of the present]. *Most* 2 (11-12), 4-5, *Most* 2 (14-15), 4-5.

Zimek, R. (1999/2000) O Rusínech a rusínštině [The Ruthenians and the Ruthenian language]. *Čeština* 10, 8-15.

Zissaki-Healey, T. (2003) The Hellenic community in Prague – toward harmony. In J. Balvín *Politika Prahy a dalších měst ve vztahu k národnostním menšinám* (pp. 126-130). Praha: Komise rady hl. m. Prahy pro oblast národnostních menšin.

Žlnayová, E. (1995) *Pojmový svět žáků prvního ročníku základních škol z hlediska romštiny* [Word concepts of first-grade elementary school pupils from the viewpoint of Romani]. Praha 1995: MENT.

Zpráva (2002) *Zpráva o situaci národnostních menšin v České republice za rok 2001* [Report on the situation of ethnic/national minorities for 2001]. Attached to the Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic from 12th July 2002, No. 600 (in English available at URL: https://web2006.vlada.cz/scripts/detail.php?id=18378).

Zpráva (2005) *Zpráva o situaci národnostních menšin v České republice za rok 2004* [Report on the situation of ethnic/national minorities for 2004]. Praha: Úřad vlády České republiky, Sekretariát Rady vlády pro národnostní menšiny (in English available at URL: https://web2006.vlada.cz/scripts/detail.php?id=18262).

Zpráva (2006) *Zpráva o situaci národnostních menšin v České republice za rok 2005* [Report on the situation of ethnic/national minorities for 2005]. Praha: Úřad vlády České republiky, Sekretariát Rady vlády pro národnostní menšiny (in English available at URL: https://web2006.vlada.cz/scripts/detail.php?id=18934).

Zpráva-integrace (2005) *Zpráva o stavu romských komunit české republiky 2004 a koncepce romské integrace*. [Report on the situation of the Roma communities 2004 and Roma integration plan] Praha: Úřad vlády české republiky, Kancelář rady vlády ČR pro záležitosti romské komunity. The Roma Integration Plan is also available on http://www.vlada.cz/dokument6206.html, the Report on: http://www.vlada.cz/assets/cs/rvk/rzrk/dokumenty/archiv/zpravy/1997-2004/4_Zpr_va_o_situaci_romsk_ch_komunit.doc.