



Acta Medicinae et Sociologica (2026)
Vol. 17. No. 42. (84-111)

doi:

<https://doi.org/10.19055/ams.2026.05/29/4>

UNIVERSITY OF
DEBRECEN
FACULTY OF
HEALTH SCIENCES
NYÍREGYHÁZA

Desegregation of Roma Pupils in Practice: A Realist Evaluation of the Krnov Case in the Czech Republic

Roma tanulók deszegregációja a gyakorlatban: A csehországi Krnov-i eset realista értékelése

Bohdana Richterová¹

¹University of Ostrava, Faculty of Education, Department of Social Pedagogy, Fráni Šrámka 3, 709 00 Ostrava, Czech Republic, [ORCID: 0000-0001-5372-4465](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5372-4465)

INFO

Bohdana Richterová
Bohdana.richterova@osu.cz

Keywords:

Roma pupils,
school desegregation,
context-mechanism-
outcome (CMO),
local governance,
educational exclusion

ABSTRACT

This paper examines Roma pupil segregation in the Czech Republic and explores why desegregation appears to succeed in some localities but not in others. Using a document-based realist evaluation, the study develops and refines context-mechanism-outcome (CMO) configurations for the city of Krnov, where a segregated primary school was closed in 2008 and Roma pupils were redistributed across the remaining schools. Drawing on publicly available policy analyses, reports, and media accounts, the paper identifies four linked mechanisms: dispersal that reduces school stigma, active municipal stewardship, a support infrastructure including tutoring and multi-agency cooperation, and school leadership that helps stabilise implementation. Secondary indicators suggest better-than-expected outcomes, including lower non-completion of primary education. The findings do not constitute causal proof, but they offer transferable principles and a “transfer test” for municipalities planning desegregation under different local conditions.

Kulcsszavak:

roma tanulók,
iskolai deszegregáció,
kontextus-mechanizmus-
eredmény (CMO),
önkormányzat,
oktatásból való
kirekesztettség

A tanulmány a csehországi roma tanulók szegregációját vizsgálja és feltárja, hogy a deszegregáció egyes helyeken sikerül, máshol viszont nem. Dokumentumalapú realista értékelést használva, a tanulmány továbbfejleszti és finomítja a kontextus-mechanizmus-eredmény (CMO) konfigurációját Krnov város számára, ahol 2008-ban egy szegregált általános iskolát bezártak és a roma gyerekeket a város megmaradt iskoláiban helyezték el. A rendelkezésre álló szakpolitikai elemzéseket, jelentéseket és a médiában megjelent tudósításokat figyelembevéve jelen tanulmány négyféle, egymással összefüggő működést azonosított be: iskolai megbélyegzést csökkentő beilleszkedés; aktív önkormányzati gondoskodás; egyéni oktatást és több szolgáltató közti együttműködést magában foglaló támogató infrastruktúra; és a végrehajtás stabilizálását elősegítő iskolavezetés. A másodlagos indikátorok az elvártnál jobb eredményt mutatnak, mivel alacsonyabb az általános iskolát be nem fejezettek száma. Bár az eredmény nem szolgál oksági bizonyítékkal, átvihető alapelveket és „átvihető tesztet” kínál azoknak az önkormányzatoknak, amelyek a szegregáció felszámolását tervezik eltérő helyi körülmények között.

Received: 2026.03.25

Assessed: 2026.05.05

Accepted: 2026.05.18

Introduction

Framing Roma School Segregation and the Realist Evaluation Approach

Segregation of Roma pupils in education in the Czech Republic remains a long-standing and repeatedly criticised phenomenon associated with unequal opportunities and the reproduction of social disadvantage (Merhaut, Fulková, & Rudorfer, 2022). In this paper, “segregation” is understood as the concentration of Roma pupils in particular schools or classes, often linked to catchment-area arrangements, residential segregation, and selective parental strategies such as school choice and the withdrawal of majority parents from schools perceived as Roma schools (Council of Europe, 2024a). In the Czech context, this concentration is described as persistent and self-reinforcing, driven by a combination of residential segregation, the configuration of school catchment areas, and institutional practices that ultimately result in unequal access to education (Open Society Justice Initiative, 2022). This matters because segregation is associated with poorer educational trajectories, a higher risk of early school leaving, and weaker transitions to upper-secondary education (Mikula & Montag, 2022). Yet both public debate and parts of the academic literature often focus on whether desegregation works, while paying

less attention to how it works and under which conditions it succeeds (Johnson, 2015).

Roma communities in the Czech Republic form a relatively small but socially significant minority. Their exact number is difficult to determine because many Roma do not declare Roma nationality in official census data, partly due to historical stigma, discrimination, and concerns about ethnic identification. For this reason, Czech policy documents usually rely on qualified estimates rather than census figures alone. The Czech Strategy for Roma Equality, Inclusion and Participation 2021-2030 works with an estimated Roma population of approximately 262,000 people (Office of the Government of the Czech Republic, 2021). Roma communities are internally diverse and should not be equated with social exclusion as such; nevertheless, Roma are disproportionately represented among people living in socially excluded localities and among pupils exposed to educational disadvantage, which makes school segregation both an educational and a broader social-policy problem (Merhaut et al., 2022; Office of the Government of the Czech Republic, 2021).

Beyond its educational significance, Roma pupil segregation is also relevant to the wider sociological and social-policy concerns reflected in this article. Unequal access to schooling forms part of a broader pattern of cumulative disadvantage that shapes later life chances, social participation, and long-term well-being. In this sense, school segregation should be understood not only as a problem of educational administration, but also as one of the social determinants of inequality, since it interacts with poverty, housing insecurity, stigmatisation, and limited institutional support in ways that may reproduce vulnerability across the life course. Examining desegregation is therefore relevant not only to debates on schooling, but also to broader questions of social inclusion, institutional equity, and the conditions under which public systems can mitigate rather than reinforce social disadvantage.

As an empirically grounded case, this article draws on the city of Krnov, which provides an analytically relevant example of local desegregation policy implementation. Since 2008, this approach has centred on the closure of a segregated primary school and the even distribution of Roma pupils across the remaining schools. Available secondary sources suggest outcomes that are better than might be expected given local social conditions, including a lower rate of non-completion of primary education. Because desegregation constitutes a complex intervention that depends on context, actors, and

implementation, the article adopts a realist evaluation perspective, which makes it possible to examine how mechanisms interact with context to produce outcomes. One example of realist evaluation in an educational setting focused on marginalised groups is a study that uses CMO configurations to articulate what works, for whom, and in what circumstances (Tyssen & McGregor, 2023). Building on this logic, the article uses the CMO framework to formulate and refine the programme theory underlying the Krnov approach, drawing on publicly available sources. Its contribution is to offer transferable principles for municipalities and school founders rather than a “copy-and-paste recipe”, and to indicate which combinations of conditions and mechanisms may be critical. In short, the aim is to explain which contexts and mechanisms in Krnov likely contributed to the observed outcomes; the guiding question is what works, for whom, and in what circumstances. The paper is structured as follows: it first outlines the Czech context of segregation, then describes the Krnov case and the methodology, presents the resulting CMO configurations, and finally discusses transferability and policy recommendations for municipalities and school founders.

The Czech context of Roma pupil segregation

In the Czech Republic, Roma pupil segregation is most visibly expressed in the concentration of Roma children in particular schools and, in some cases, in particular classes within mainstream schools. This concentration matters not only as a descriptive pattern but also as a mechanism that produces unequal educational conditions. Public monitoring relies on more than one operational threshold to capture this phenomenon. This monitoring is based on qualified estimates rather than on official ethnic registration of individual pupils. Czech public institutions do not routinely collect individual ethnic data in education in the same way as they collect administrative data such as age, residence, or school attendance. The estimates should therefore be understood as a policy-monitoring tool, not as a precise ethnic census of pupils.

According to ministry data for the 2023/2024 school year, 10% of Roma pupils were educated in 46 primary schools where they constituted at least 50% of enrolment, including 16 schools where their share was 90% or higher (Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic, 2024). In wider public debate, however, a more pragmatic threshold of roughly one-third of Roma enrolment is often used to identify schools at risk of segregation. On

this basis, recent policy analysis points to more than 130 such schools nationwide, of which 78 have a Roma majority (Gargulák, 2025). Taken together, these indicators suggest that segregation is not a marginal but a systemic phenomenon, while also showing that the apparent scale of the problem depends partly on how concentration is operationalised.

The problem is also regionally uneven. For an international reader, it is useful to specify that the Ústí nad Labem Region is located in the north-west of the Czech Republic, while the Moravian-Silesian Region lies in the north-east, bordering Poland and Slovakia. Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic data show substantial territorial variation in the share of Roma pupils, with the highest proportions reported in the Ústí nad Labem Region and the lowest in Prague (Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic, 2024). Earlier strategic documents likewise noted that schools with very high concentrations of Roma pupils were disproportionately located in the Ústí nad Labem and Moravian-Silesian Regions (Office of the Government of the Czech Republic, 2021). This regional pattern matters analytically because it indicates that segregation cannot be reduced to individual parental preferences alone. Rather, it is embedded in broader local ecologies shaped by residential exclusion, poverty, uneven institutional capacity, and the way municipal school systems are organised. In this sense, segregation is best understood as a territorial and governance problem as much as an educational one.

A key reason why segregation in the Czech Republic persists is that concentration tends to generate self-reinforcing dynamics. Once a school becomes publicly perceived as a “Roma school”, this reputation may alter the behaviour of both Roma and non-Roma families, intensify selective school choice, and increase pressure on other schools to position themselves as more desirable alternatives. Available analyses suggest that segregation often does not simply mirror residential patterns; it is also produced by institutional arrangements such as catchment-area design, admissions practice, informal steering, and the cumulative effects of parental choice in quasi-competitive local school markets (Open Society Justice Initiative, 2022). In realist terms, the relevant issue is therefore not only who is present in a given school, but what concentration does: it can trigger reputation effects, lower expectations, reduce social mix, and stabilise a pattern in which one school increasingly functions as a default destination for disadvantaged Roma pupils. This is precisely why desegregation cannot be treated as a one-off administrative

correction. Where concentration has already acquired symbolic and organisational force, local systems may revert to prior patterns unless the underlying drivers are actively addressed.

The persistence of segregation is reinforced by the fact that effective change requires coordination across multiple actors and policy domains. Strategic and analytical documents repeatedly indicate that educational segregation is sustained not only by factors inside schools, but also by housing insecurity, social exclusion, unemployment, indebtedness, and wider forms of anti-Roma discrimination and antigypsyism (Council of Europe, 2024a; Office of the Government of the Czech Republic, 2021). Municipalities play a central role because they determine school capacity, shape catchment arrangements, appoint and evaluate school leaders, and can either connect or fragment the relationship between schools, social services, and non-governmental organisations (Gargulák, 2025). Where no actor assumes this coordinating role, the system tends to reproduce inherited inequalities. Equally important is the issue of sustainability. Available policy discussion stresses that desegregation requires long-term support, stable financing, and durable institutional backing rather than short project cycles (Council of Europe, 2024a; Gargulák, 2025). From a realist perspective, then, segregation persists in the Czech Republic because contextual constraints and mechanisms of concentration interact in the absence of stable coordination and support infrastructure. The result is a system with a strong tendency to reproduce inequality even where formal commitment to inclusion exists.

Krnov, the case analysed in this article, is a medium-sized town in Bruntál District in the Moravian-Silesian Region, situated in the north-eastern part of the Czech Republic near the Polish border. The town had 22,518 inhabitants as of 1 January 2025 (Czech Statistical Office, 2025). This location matters because the case is not drawn from a prosperous metropolitan setting, but from a peripheral borderland region where schools operate in a more demanding social environment. Available analyses describe Krnov and its wider area as structurally disadvantaged, with social problems that would normally predict weaker educational outcomes (Munich et al., 2020; Synková & Endršová, 2022).

This wider Czech context is important for interpreting the Krnov case. If segregation is understood as a persistent and self-reinforcing configuration rather than a temporary imbalance in pupil distribution, then a successful desegregation case becomes analytically valuable not simply because it

“worked”, but because it may reveal which mechanisms were able to interrupt that reproduction. The relevance of Krnov therefore lies in its potential to illuminate how local governance, school leadership, and support structures can alter the trajectory of a system that would otherwise tend toward reconcentration.

The Krnov Case: A Brief Timeline, 2008-2025

As a local case of desegregation, Krnov is analytically important because available public sources describe not a single isolated intervention, but a longer trajectory in which an initial structural decision was followed by sustained support and coordination. The starting point was the emergence of a concentrated school pattern in the first decade of the 2000s. According to later local analyses and retrospective media accounts, the incomplete primary school at Náměstí Míru had functioned as a locally recognised segregated school with an overwhelmingly Roma intake. Its closure led to a more even redistribution of pupils across the town’s remaining schools (Agency for Social Inclusion, 2018; Mačí, 2020; Plíhalová, 2025). Publicly available sources do not provide a complete enrolment table for the school before its closure, but the scale of concentration is visible indirectly in accounts of the redistribution process. One receiving headteacher later recalled the arrival of 46 Roma pupils as a major implementation challenge, while local accounts describe the subsequent practical target as keeping the number of Roma or socially disadvantaged pupils at approximately three to four per class in order to prevent renewed concentration (Mačí, 2020; Plíhalová, 2025). Publicly available sources differ slightly in dating this turning point, placing it in 2007 or 2008, but they agree on the substance of the intervention: the closure of the concentrated school functioned as the main trigger of desegregation.

What followed was not a simple transfer of one school population into another institution, but a deliberate dispersal strategy. Available accounts stress that pupils from the former segregated school were divided among the remaining schools rather than moved together as intact groups. In later descriptions of the Krnov model, local actors repeatedly emphasised the effort to prevent a new concentration from emerging elsewhere. This was reflected in the practical rule of keeping the number of Roma or socially disadvantaged pupils in each class as low as possible, because higher concentrations were seen as increasing the risk of both intra-school clustering and majority parental

exit (Mačí, 2020; Plíhalová, 2025). The 2018 local educational analysis similarly describes the post-closure arrangement as one in which catchment areas were set so that Roma pupils would attend all schools more evenly, including the division of the largest socially excluded locality among several school catchments (Agency for Social Inclusion, 2018). In this sense, the desegregation logic in Krnov was not only redistributive but preventative: it sought to interrupt one concentration without allowing another to solidify.

The immediate implementation period was, however, demanding. Retrospective reporting on the reform suggests that the first year after redistribution was marked by tension, uneven preparedness, and the need to work actively with the concerns of school staff and parents. One school head described the sudden arrival of a larger group of Roma pupils as a major shock for a school that had previously enrolled almost none, while also recalling considerable conflict between newly mixed pupil groups in the first year of implementation (Mačí, 2020). The same account points to direct work with families and attempts to understand parental fears as part of early stabilisation. Although the publicly available sources do not provide a detailed procedural chronology for all stakeholder-management steps, they do support the interpretation that desegregation in Krnov required not only an administrative decision but also trust-building, capacity development, and active school leadership during the transition phase (Plíhalová, 2025).

A second phase of the Krnov case involved the gradual construction of a support infrastructure around the schools. Public reporting from 2020 describes an already established model in which after-school tutoring was available to all pupils, either in community-based clubs near their homes or directly in schools (Mačí, 2020). The *Doučovací klub Devítka*, developed in cooperation between *Janáčkovo náměstí Primary School* and the non-governmental organisation *Reintegra*, was presented as one of the instruments used to help children from socially excluded localities compensate for earlier educational disadvantage (Mačí, 2020). This support model was later expanded and formalised through a municipal project explicitly aimed at reducing selectivity in the local educational network. The project documentation from 2014-2015 describes a “complex systematic network” of seven tutoring clubs, a support centre for preschool children, educational seminars for teachers and teaching assistants, and extended counselling and assistance services for pupils with special educational needs, particularly those from socially excluded localities (Town of Krnov, 2014; Plíhalová, 2025). This suggests that the post-

closure period was not treated as complete once pupils had been redistributed. Rather, redistribution was followed by efforts to build the organisational conditions needed for it to succeed over time.

By the late 2010s, these measures appear to have become increasingly embedded in local practice. The 2018 situational analysis notes that the former risk of concentration did not disappear automatically even after the closure of the Náměstí Míru school. It identifies another school, ZŠ Dvořákův okruh, as having been at risk of concentration as recently as 2012, but adds that with municipal support and agreement among school leaders, catchment arrangements were adjusted so that Roma pupils would continue to be distributed more evenly across schools (Agency for Social Inclusion, 2018). The same source also documents institutional linkages between schools and preschool or social-support services located in the socially excluded locality on Vrchlického Street (Agency for Social Inclusion, 2018). These details are important because they show that Krnov's desegregation was not a single event completed in 2008. It was instead a process of maintenance and recalibration, in which the municipality, schools, and non-governmental actors repeatedly intervened to prevent renewed concentration.

The broader social context remained challenging throughout this period. Analytical work by PAQ Research and Aspen Institute Central Europe identified Krnov as a structurally disadvantaged area in which debt enforcement and other social stressors would normally predict a higher level of educational failure. Yet the same analysis highlighted the town as a case where targeted interventions appeared to reduce inequality more successfully than expected, citing the role of preschool support, tutoring, leisure-time activities, assistants, psychologists, special pedagogues, and a pilot school inclusion coordinator (Munich et al., 2020). Media reporting based on PAQ data later described Krnov as a positive outlier, noting that non-completion of primary education was about half the level found in similarly burdened areas and attributing this result to the combination of strong school leadership, preschool provision, support staff, tutoring, family clubs, and long-term municipal backing (Synková & Endršová, 2022). In a 2023 interview, the mayor likewise framed the even redistribution of pupils across school catchments as one element of a broader and long-standing strategy rather than a stand-alone reform (Vykoupilová, 2023). These indicators do not amount to causal proof, but they do support the claim that Krnov achieved outcomes better than might be expected given its social conditions.

By 2025, Krnov had also begun to function more explicitly as a reference point for other actors. Public accounts from that period present the town as an example of cross-sector cooperation and as a place where others come to observe how desegregation and early support can be connected within a wider local system (Platform for Early Care, 2025). In those accounts, desegregation is presented not as a closed historical achievement but as one element of a broader municipal strategy combining schools, social services, non-governmental organisations, and early childhood support. This is analytically significant because it reinforces the interpretation of Krnov not as a case of one-off reform, but as a case of sustained local stewardship.

Taken together, the timeline suggests a sequence with four analytically relevant moments: first, the emergence of a concentrated and stigmatised school pattern; second, the closure of the segregated school and dispersal of pupils across the town's remaining schools; third, the gradual building of tutoring, preschool, counselling, and outreach support; and fourth, the long-term stabilisation of these measures through continuing municipal coordination. In realist terms, what makes Krnov noteworthy is not simply that desegregation happened, but that it appears to have been maintained by an accumulating infrastructure of support, communication, and institutional cooperation. The next section therefore examines this trajectory not as a descriptive success story, but as a case from which provisional context-mechanism-outcome configurations can be developed.

Methodology: A Document-Based Realist Evaluation Design

This study uses a document-based realist evaluation design structured as a case study of local policy implementation over time. The focus is not on estimating an average effect of desegregation, but on explaining how a particular municipal strategy may have contributed to observed outcomes through the interaction of context, mechanisms, and implementation. In line with realist evaluation, the analytical question is not simply whether the Krnov approach “worked”, but what appears to have worked, for whom, in what circumstances, and through which causal processes. Realist evaluation is particularly suited to the study of complex social interventions because it treats programmes and policies as theory-laden interventions whose effects depend on context and on how actors respond to the resources and opportunities they encounter (Wong et al., 2016; Westhorp et al., 2017).

The unit of analysis is the municipal desegregation policy in Krnov and its implementation from 2008 to the latest publicly available sources in 2025. Krnov is treated as an explanatory case rather than a statistically representative one. The case is analytically relevant because publicly available sources describe a clearly identifiable desegregation intervention, a sequence of follow-up support measures, and later outcome indicators suggesting better-than-expected educational trajectories under structurally disadvantaged local conditions. The temporal scope of the analysis is therefore deliberately longitudinal. Rather than isolating the school closure in 2008 as a single event, the study examines the continuing implementation of desegregation as a policy process unfolding across institutional time.

The empirical material consists exclusively of publicly available documents. These include, first, analytical and evaluative reports relevant to segregation, local educational conditions, and secondary indicators of outcomes. Second, the study draws on in-depth and process-oriented journalistic reporting as a source of evidence on actors, decisions, implementation challenges, and the narrated logic of change. Third, where explicitly available in the same sources, the analysis incorporates contextual information on local conditions, including housing patterns, social exclusion, and the institutional configuration of local support. The use of documents in realist inquiry is methodologically defensible where the aim is to reconstruct programme theory, identify context-sensitive causal propositions, and compare how different sources describe the same intervention logic. In this sense, documents are treated not merely as background material but as evidence-bearing texts that can contribute to the refinement of context-mechanism-outcome explanations (Price et al., 2021).

The source selection strategy is purposive. Documents were selected according to four criteria: first, whether they contained a direct description of the desegregation step around 2008 and its implementation; second, whether they provided information on key actors and their roles, especially the municipality, schools, and non-governmental organisations; third, whether they contained claims about outcomes or outcome indicators; and fourth, whether they offered explicit or implicit clues as to why the intervention may have worked, failed, or required adaptation. This form of purposive selection is consistent with realist logic, in which evidence is judged primarily by its explanatory relevance to programme theory rather than by formal inclusion rules associated with effect-oriented review designs (Wong et al., 2016).

Data extraction proceeded through systematic identification of passages relevant to three interconnected dimensions. The first concerned contextual conditions, including features of the local school system, the housing and social policy environment, regional disadvantage, and institutional capacity. The second concerned mechanisms, understood in realist terms not as programme activities alone but as the interaction between resources introduced by the policy and the reasoning or responses they triggered in relevant actors. The third concerned outcomes, including both reported changes in school distribution or support provision and secondary indicators of educational trajectories. In addition, passages were marked for temporal significance wherever they helped locate developments within a sequence, for example as an initial trigger, a follow-up adaptation, or a later sign of stabilisation. This temporal layering is important because realist explanation is sensitive not only to which elements interact, but also to when and in what order they do so.

Coding combined deductive and inductive procedures. Deductively, the analysis used the CMO framework as an initial organising structure and applied a priori categories corresponding to context, mechanism, and outcome. Inductively, the coding remained open to emergent themes not fully anticipated in advance, such as school reputation, parental trust, leadership continuity, and the capacity of support services. This combined strategy was used to avoid two common risks: first, reducing the material to a mechanical catalogue of contexts, mechanisms, and outcomes; and second, imposing an overly rigid programme theory on evidence that might point to more complex or layered causal pathways. Realist analysis requires attention to how contextual conditions shape stakeholder reasoning and thereby influence outcomes, rather than treating context as a static backdrop (Westhorp et al., 2017).

The next analytical step was the construction and refinement of provisional CMO configurations. Individual claims extracted from the sources were compared and assembled into a small number of higher-order explanatory propositions. These propositions take the general form: in context C, the introduction of resource and response mechanism M contributes to outcome O. Wherever possible, these formulations also incorporate processual notes about sequencing, such as whether a mechanism appears to have operated immediately after the school closure or only after additional support infrastructure had been built. The purpose of this phase is not to produce a definitive causal map, but to refine a plausible programme theory of the Krnov

approach that can account for both its implementation logic and its apparent outcomes.

Triangulation was built into the analysis in two ways. First, the study triangulates between source types by comparing analytical and evaluative documents with process-oriented media accounts. These source types serve partly different functions: reports are more useful for structural context and indicators, whereas media accounts often provide richer evidence on decision-making, implementation struggles, and actor interpretations. Second, the study triangulates claims. Key interpretive conclusions are treated as stronger where they are supported by at least two independent sources that converge on the same substantive point. Claims supported by only one source are treated more cautiously and are used mainly as hypothesis-generating rather than as robust explanatory anchors. This procedure does not remove uncertainty, but it helps distinguish between more and less stable elements of the emerging programme theory.

To make this distinction explicit, the study uses a simple internal grading of evidential strength for major claims. Claims are treated as relatively strong when supported by quantified indicators or by consistent agreement across multiple independent sources. They are treated as medium in strength when supported by converging but largely narrative evidence. They are treated as weak when they rely primarily on isolated testimony or on a single public account without corroboration. This grading is not intended as a formal hierarchy of evidence in the positivist sense. Rather, it functions as an analytic transparency device, signalling to the reader which parts of the CMO account rest on firmer documentary support than others.

Several limitations follow from the design. First, the study does not use primary data and therefore cannot make strong claims of causal attribution. The analysis can identify plausible mechanisms and context-sensitive explanatory patterns, but it cannot demonstrate causality in the strict experimental or quasi-experimental sense. Second, reliance on publicly available texts introduces the risk of publication bias, selective visibility, and media framing. Some aspects of implementation may be over-reported because they are politically salient or narratively compelling, while others may remain largely undocumented. Third, outcome measurement is necessarily incomplete. Some potentially important outcomes, such as attendance patterns, transitions to upper-secondary education, or the long-term persistence of desegregated enrolment patterns, are not consistently available across the

accessible sources. Finally, the study does not aim at statistical generalisation. Its contribution is analytic rather than probabilistic: it offers transferable principles and testable hypotheses about desegregation under specific local conditions, not a universal recipe applicable irrespective of context.

Taken together, this methodological design is appropriate to the article's purpose. A document-based realist evaluation makes it possible to reconstruct how the Krnov approach has been publicly described, which mechanisms recur across sources, and under which contextual conditions the intervention appears to have become stabilised. The resulting CMO configurations should therefore be read as theoretically informed and evidence-constrained explanations of a complex local policy process rather than as definitive proof of effectiveness.

Results: Context-Mechanism-Outcome Configurations

Table 1 provides a synthetic overview of the main CMO configurations identified in the Krnov case. Taken together, these configurations suggest that the local approach was not a one-off technical intervention, but rather a combination of structural change in the organisation of schooling and the longer-term maintenance of support and coordination. In this sense, the Krnov case is better understood as a cumulative and context-sensitive policy process than as a single administrative decision.

The first configuration, dispersal instead of concentration, points to the importance of preventing self-reinforcing segregation dynamics at an early stage. In the Krnov context, the key mechanism appears to have been the reduction of school stigma and the weakening of parental incentives to concentrate pupils in one "preferred" school. The even distribution of Roma pupils across several schools may therefore be interpreted as a way of interrupting the reputation effects and school-choice dynamics that elsewhere often contribute to renewed concentration. From a realist perspective, the significance of this configuration lies not only in redistribution as such, but in its possible capacity to prevent a new segregated pattern from becoming established.

The second configuration highlights the role of the municipality as steward of the reform. The available sources suggest that active municipal involvement provided both legitimacy and continuity, so that schools did not face the desegregation process in isolation. In this context, municipal coordination may have triggered mechanisms of trust and collaboration across institutions,

especially where schools could perceive the reform as politically backed and organisationally supported. The importance of this configuration lies in the fact that desegregation appears to require not only a formal decision, but also a continuing actor capable of holding the system together over time.

The third configuration links desegregation to the existence of a support infrastructure. Redistribution alone would likely not have been sustainable without accompanying forms of assistance that addressed the everyday risks of school failure. The available materials describe tutoring, after-school clubs, outreach work, and school-service cooperation as resources that may have strengthened pupils' sense of competence, reduced barriers for families, and enabled earlier identification of difficulties. Within this interpretive frame, the comparatively favourable secondary indicators reported for Krnov, including lower non-completion of primary education, can be read as consistent with a broader support-based mechanism rather than as the product of redistribution alone.

The fourth configuration presents leadership as the stabilising element of everyday implementation. In the available accounts, school leadership appears to function as a mechanism of translation and sensemaking: it helps teachers and parents understand the purpose of the reform, maintain rules and expectations, and reduce the risks of resistance, overload, or burnout. Its effect is less visible in conventional outcome indicators, but it may be crucial for sustaining a workable school climate and enabling schools to manage heterogeneous classes over the longer term. In this respect, leadership acts as a form of institutional glue connecting policy intent with day-to-day practice.

Overall, the configurations suggest that what appears to work in Krnov is not a single measure, but a combination of dispersal, active municipal stewardship, support infrastructure, and school-level leadership. Their effect is not likely to be uniform across settings, however, because each depends on specific contextual conditions. The explanatory value of the Krnov case therefore lies less in offering a ready-made formula than in identifying a set of interacting mechanisms whose relevance may vary under different local circumstances.

Table 1.: Overview of the main CMO configurations

CMO configuration	Context	Mechanism (resources + reasoning)	Outcome	Strength of evidence
CMO 1: Dispersal instead of concentration	Several primary schools; municipality able to redistribute pupils after school closure; risk of a new “magnet” school and majority exit.	Resource: Even distribution of Roma pupils across schools and classes; no transfer of whole Roma classes. Reasoning: Lower school stigma and weaker incentives for renewed concentration.	More stable social mix; lower risk of resegregation.	Moderate
CMO 2: The municipality as steward	The municipality had authority to coordinate schools and services; desegregation required continuity over time.	Resource: Active municipal coordination and sustained support. Reasoning: Greater legitimacy of the reform and stronger school cooperation.	More sustainable and stable implementation.	Moderate
CMO 3: Support infrastructure	Social disadvantage increased the risk of school failure; local services and NGOs were available.	Resource: Tutoring, clubs, outreach work, and school-service cooperation. Reasoning: Higher pupil self-efficacy, fewer family barriers, earlier problem detection.	Lower risk of educational failure; indicatively lower non-completion of primary education.	Moderate to strong
CMO 4: Leadership as sensemaking	Reform created uncertainty among teachers and parents; daily implementation required communication and support.	Resource: Strong school leadership, clear communication, and staff support. Reasoning: Less resistance, greater predictability, and stronger staff capacity.	More stable school climate and greater capacity to sustain heterogeneous classes.	Moderate

Source: Author’s own elaboration.

Discussion: From Local Success to Transferable Conditions

The purpose of this discussion is to translate the identified CMO configurations into an answer to the realist question of what appears to work, for whom, and under what conditions, and to clarify what may be transferable from the Krnov case. The central argument is that Krnov should not be treated as a universal model to be copied mechanically. Rather, it is better understood as a configuration of conditions in which several mechanisms appear to have been activated in a mutually reinforcing way. This interpretation is broadly consistent with the wider literature. While many sources document the persistence of Roma school segregation, the literature is less unified on the effectiveness of specific desegregation strategies and on the pace of progress across European settings. Czech-oriented work tends to stress local governance, school practice, and concrete implementation, whereas European-level analyses more often emphasise legal obligations, policy frameworks, and structural barriers to inclusion (Council of Europe, 2024b; Němec, 2021; Open Society Justice Initiative, 2022).

In this light, the Krnov case is transferable primarily at the level of principles rather than instruments. What appears portable is not the exact institutional form adopted in one municipality, but the combination of mechanisms and the way they are activated under particular local conditions. This is precisely where realist logic is useful: instead of asking whether one measure “works” in the abstract, it asks which intervention triggers which response in which context. The same formal measure may therefore activate different mechanisms in different municipalities. A redistribution policy, for example, may reduce stigma and stabilise social mix in one setting, while in another it may trigger resistance, parental withdrawal, or rapid reconcentration. The relevant task is thus not replication but adaptation (Němec, 2021).

On the basis of the Krnov case, three conditions appear especially important and may be close to necessary in comparable municipal contexts. The first is municipal capacity and political will. Without an actor able to coordinate schools, maintain direction, and absorb conflict over time, the local system is likely to drift back toward concentration. This inference corresponds to Czech evidence suggesting that successful desegregation depends on cooperation among municipalities, schools, and other actors, and also to broader critiques showing that segregation persists where governments fail to prioritise implementation or continue to treat segregation as an inevitable by-product of

residential patterns (Němec, 2021; Open Society Justice Initiative, 2022). The second likely necessary condition is some form of structural intervention in concentration itself. The Krnov case suggests that dispersal matters because it directly addresses the emergence of a “Roma school” and the reputation spiral attached to it. This is consistent with Czech discussions showing that catchment arrangements, school closure in selected cases, or other forms of redistribution may play a role in desegregation where they are carefully managed and politically sustained (Němec, 2021). The third likely necessary condition is sustainability over time. European analyses repeatedly stress that desegregation should be understood as a long-term process rather than a single reform event. The Krnov case fits this interpretation closely: the initial structural intervention appears to have mattered, but only in conjunction with continuing support, recalibration, and institutional maintenance (Council of Europe, 2024a).

Other conditions appear better described as supportive or enabling. They may not be sufficient on their own to produce desegregation, but they often determine whether more necessary structural conditions are translated into workable outcomes. One such factor is support infrastructure. In Krnov, tutoring, after-school clubs, outreach work, and inter-agency cooperation appear to have reduced the practical risks associated with heterogeneous classrooms and with the educational consequences of social disadvantage. This interpretation is compatible with broader research showing that Roma participation and continuity in education are shaped not only by school placement but also by trust, communication, and the availability of mediating forms of support between families and institutions. Klaus and Siraj (2020), for example, emphasise the importance of cultural brokering and trusted intermediaries in improving Roma participation in early childhood education, while the Council of Europe (2024a) stresses that desegregation cannot be separated from wider questions of poverty, residential exclusion, and access to support. In this sense, support infrastructure is not merely an optional supplement. It is the layer that helps ensure that desegregation does not simply reappear inside schools in the form of school failure, absenteeism, or more hidden exclusion.

A second enabling condition is communication and work with parents and school staff. The Krnov case suggests that desegregation becomes more viable when local actors actively manage majority fears, explain the rationale of change, and reduce incentives for families to seek out a single “preferred”

school. This point resonates with earlier Czech and international work describing how school labelling, majority parental exit, and informal parental selection contribute to persistent segregation. In such contexts, parental choice is not neutral. It is filtered through reputation, stigma, and racialised assumptions about school quality. Where these dynamics remain unchecked, even a formally desegregated system may quickly produce a new concentration pattern (Němec, 2021; Open Society Justice Initiative, 2022).

A third enabling condition is school leadership. Although harder to measure directly, leadership appears crucial as a mechanism of translation and stabilisation. It helps schools convert policy into daily routines, maintain expectations, support teachers, and reduce the risk that uncertainty hardens into resistance or burnout. This is strongly suggested by the Krnov process evidence and is compatible with the more general realist view that implementation succeeds where local actors are able to make interventions meaningful and workable in everyday practice (Němec, 2021). In this respect, leadership acts less as a stand-alone intervention than as a practical mechanism through which policy is interpreted, communicated, and sustained.

The distinction between necessary and supportive conditions should nevertheless be treated cautiously, because context sensitivity remains central. What is necessary in one locality may be insufficient in another. Some municipalities may require additional enabling conditions before dispersal can function as intended, such as a larger number of schools, greater transport accessibility, or a different response to local patterns of residential segregation. European evidence also shows that unregulated school choice, anti-Roma discrimination, antigypsyism, poverty, and unequal school quality can alter the way apparently similar interventions operate. In realist terms, the same measure can trigger different mechanisms under different contextual constraints. This means that transferability depends less on copying the visible reform than on diagnosing the local configuration into which it would be introduced (Council of Europe, 2024b).

Several risks of transfer follow from this. First, simple redistribution without support may activate negative mechanisms, including teacher resistance, parental backlash, increased absence, or new forms of pupil stigma. The broader literature warns that desegregation can fail when implemented without sufficient preparation, institutional backing, or attention to school climate (Němec, 2021). Second, reconcentration may emerge even after a formally successful desegregation step if school-choice and reputation

mechanisms remain untouched. This is one of the key lessons of the Czech debate, where segregated schools persist not solely because of housing patterns but also because of institutional practices and informal hierarchies between schools (Open Society Justice Initiative, 2022). Third, project volatility presents a serious risk. If funding and organisational support are interrupted, the mechanisms that stabilise desegregation, especially institutional capacity and trust, are likely to weaken. European policy analysis repeatedly stresses that isolated projects are insufficient where structural inequality is reproduced over time (Council of Europe, 2024a).

For that reason, transferability is best operationalised not as a checklist of copied tools but as a transfer test. At minimum, a municipality considering desegregation should ask whether it has the governance capacity and political will to sustain the reform over time; whether some support network already exists or can realistically be built; whether pupil redistribution can be designed so as to avoid the creation of a new magnet school; and whether there is a credible stakeholder plan for working with parents and teachers. These questions do not guarantee success, but they provide a practical way of assessing whether the mechanisms identified in Krnov are likely to be activated in another setting. They also align with the wider literature's insistence that desegregation requires both local implementation capacity and broader policy support (Council of Europe, 2024a; Němec, 2021).

The Krnov case therefore contributes to the Czech debate in two ways. First, it suggests that desegregation can be feasible at the municipal level when combined with an appropriate policy package and sustained governance, rather than treated as an isolated moral appeal or a purely legal requirement. Second, it shows the value of a mechanism-oriented explanation. Focusing on mechanisms helps explain why municipalities facing broadly similar structural disadvantages may nevertheless produce different trajectories. Some may enact a formal redistribution but fail to stabilise it; others may build support services without addressing concentration itself. Krnov appears notable precisely because these elements were combined rather than pursued in isolation (Němec, 2021).

Finally, the scope of these conclusions should remain analytically modest. The findings are not statistically generalisable and do not demonstrate causality in a strict sense. What they provide instead are transferable principles and empirically grounded hypotheses for other municipalities and for future evaluation. In that respect, the value of the case lies less in proving that one

model works everywhere than in clarifying which combinations of conditions and mechanisms may deserve closer attention when desegregation is attempted elsewhere (Council of Europe, 2024b).

Policy Recommendations for Municipalities and School Founders: Concrete Steps for Implementation

If the Krnov case is interpreted through a realist lens, its practical value lies not in offering a model to be copied mechanically, but in identifying conditions that may increase the likelihood that desegregation will be implemented and sustained. The following recommendations translate the preceding CMO analysis into practical principles for municipalities as school founders. Their purpose is not to prescribe a universal sequence, but to indicate actions that may help local actors reduce concentration, prevent renewed segregation, and stabilise more equitable educational conditions across schools.

A first step should be a rapid local segregation audit. Before any intervention is designed, municipalities should map the distribution of pupils across schools and classes, identify trends over time, and assess whether concentration is being reinforced by parental exit, selective school choice, or the emergence of a locally “preferred” school. Such a diagnosis should include not only formal enrolment patterns, but also less visible dynamics, including within-school clustering, informal reputational hierarchies, and the risk that one school may become a new concentration point. Without such a baseline, desegregation efforts risk addressing visible symptoms while leaving the underlying drivers untouched.

The policy goal should then be defined realistically. Municipalities should frame desegregation primarily as a process of dispersal and stabilisation rather than promise immediate improvements in academic outcomes. A realistic objective is to reduce concentration and create more equitable conditions across schools, including more balanced pupil composition, fairer access to support, and a lower risk that any one school becomes marked by stigma. If structural intervention is needed, the design should avoid transferring entire classes or intact peer groups. Pupils should, where feasible, be distributed across several schools and classes so that redistribution does not create a new “Roma school” or strengthen the reputation of another school as protected or selective.

Such a reform requires a medium-term implementation plan. Desegregation should be treated as a process rather than a one-off administrative act. The plan should include a timeline, responsibilities, required capacities, a risk register, a communication strategy, and a monitoring framework. This longer horizon is important because the most difficult challenges often arise after formal redistribution, when schools, families, and support services are adapting to new arrangements.

A further priority is to establish a coordinating function and a multi-agency platform. Municipalities should convene a working group linking the city administration, schools, social services, and relevant non-governmental organisations, while also appointing a coordinator who can maintain continuity across institutional changes and political cycles. Such coordination can support trust, shared responsibility, and policy continuity. Without it, desegregation may remain fragmented across institutions and vulnerable to drift.

Redistribution should also be accompanied from the outset by support infrastructure. Tutoring, after-school clubs, teaching assistance, outreach work with families, and systems for early identification of learning or attendance-related difficulties should be developed in parallel with pupil redistribution rather than added later. Particular attention should be given to attendance, because absenteeism often functions as an early signal that barriers are accumulating for pupils and families. Early warning systems and clear case-management procedures can help local actors intervene before difficulties escalate into educational disengagement.

Desegregation further requires investment in school capacity. Teachers and school leaders need support for working in heterogeneous classrooms, including mentoring, peer learning across schools, and measures aimed at preventing burnout. This is important because the success of desegregation depends not only on pupil distribution, but also on whether schools can sustain inclusive and predictable daily practice.

No less important is a deliberate communication strategy directed toward parents and the wider public. Municipalities and school founders should explain the purpose of the reform, the rules governing implementation, and the support measures that accompany it. They should also engage directly with concerns and uncertainties rather than allowing rumours, reputational spirals, or selective information to shape public understanding. In contexts where school reputation strongly influences parental behaviour, communication is part of the intervention itself.

At the level of admissions and school organisation, municipalities should ensure fair and predictable enrolment practices while monitoring possible circumvention strategies through which segregation may reappear in less visible forms. This includes tracking pupil transfers, postponements of school entry, parallel classes, and patterns of within-school segregation. Formal redistribution between schools does not guarantee that segregation will not be reproduced inside schools.

The sustainability of support must also be secured financially. Municipalities should avoid building the entire support infrastructure on short project cycles alone and should plan a combination of resources and institutional capacities that can continue beyond a single grant period. Project volatility can weaken precisely those processes, such as trust, continuity, and service coordination, on which long-term desegregation depends.

Finally, progress should be measured through intermediate indicators that make ongoing adaptation possible. In addition to long-term educational trajectories, municipalities should monitor the stability of pupil distribution, attendance, grade repetition, school climate, and parental engagement. Such indicators provide earlier signals of whether implementation is moving in the intended direction and support adaptive management.

Taken together, these recommendations suggest that desegregation is most likely to succeed when it is approached as a governed and adaptive process rather than as a single corrective act. The practical lesson is not simply that concentration should be reduced, but that redistribution must be combined with coordination, support, communication, institutional capacity, financial sustainability, and long-term monitoring if it is to remain stable over time.

Conclusion

This article has addressed the persistent segregation of Roma pupils in the Czech Republic and has argued that understanding the success or failure of desegregation requires more than asking whether a reform works in general. The more analytically useful question is the realist one: what works, for whom, and in what circumstances. By shifting the focus from abstract effectiveness to context-sensitive explanation, the study has sought to clarify how desegregation may become feasible and sustainable under specific local conditions.

The main contribution of the article lies in its use of a document-based realist evaluation to reconstruct and refine the programme theory underlying the Krnov approach. Drawing on publicly available reports, analyses, and media accounts, the study developed a set of context-mechanism-outcome configurations that make it possible to interpret the case not simply as an example of apparent success, but as a case of sustained local policy implementation. The central finding is that what appears to work in Krnov is not an isolated measure, but a combination of structural dispersal, municipal stewardship, support infrastructure, and school leadership. At the same time, the analysis shows that the effects of this combination remain highly context-sensitive, and that the value of the case lies less in offering a ready-made model than in identifying transferable principles and mechanism-based hypotheses for other municipalities (Council of Europe, 2024b; Němec, 2021).

Available secondary indicators further suggest outcomes that are better than might be expected given the town's structurally disadvantaged context, especially with regard to the risk of educational underachievement and non-completion of primary education. These findings are important, but they should be interpreted with caution. The article does not claim direct causal attribution. Rather, it offers a plausible and evidence-constrained explanation of how the Krnov approach may have contributed to more favourable educational trajectories than local social conditions alone would predict.

The discussion also suggests that some elements of the Krnov configuration appear especially important for sustaining change. Structural intervention in concentration, municipal coordination, and long-term continuity are central to preventing the system from reverting to earlier patterns, while support infrastructure, communication with parents and staff, and school-level leadership often determine whether these structural conditions are translated into stable and workable outcomes. This distinction should be treated cautiously, since what is necessary in one setting may be insufficient in another, but it helps explain why formally similar reforms may produce different trajectories across municipalities (Council of Europe, 2024b; Němec, 2021; Open Society Justice Initiative, 2022).

From a practical perspective, the main implication is that desegregation should be planned as a long-term process of governance rather than as a single administrative decision. Municipalities need to treat redistribution, support, communication, and monitoring as interconnected parts of a sustained strategy. Multi-agency coordination and continuity of support are especially important

because they increase the likelihood that desegregation will remain stable rather than dissolve into renewed concentration or more hidden forms of exclusion (Council of Europe, 2024a; Němec, 2021).

At the same time, the study has clear limitations. Because it relies on public documents and media accounts, the available evidence is necessarily selective and incomplete. Outcome measurement remains limited, and some aspects of implementation may be shaped by publication bias or media framing. For this reason, the findings should be read as a realist explanation grounded in documentary evidence rather than as a definitive evaluation of effectiveness.

Future research could strengthen these conclusions by incorporating primary data and more direct forms of inference. Interviews with municipal actors, school leaders, teachers, and families could deepen understanding of the reasoning processes behind the mechanisms identified here. Administrative data on attendance, grade repetition, and transitions to upper-secondary education could clarify outcome patterns more precisely. Comparative case studies with other municipalities would also help determine which aspects of the Krnov configuration are more broadly transferable and which depend on highly specific local conditions.

Taken together, the Krnov case suggests that desegregation may be feasible in the Czech context when it is designed so as to weaken mechanisms of concentration while simultaneously strengthening the capacities of schools and families, and when it is sustained through long-term municipal stewardship and coordination. Its significance lies less in proving that one model works everywhere than in showing that desegregation can be understood and advanced as a context-sensitive process of structural change, institutional support, and sustained local commitment (Council of Europe, 2024a; Němec, 2021).

References

Agency for Social Inclusion. (2018). *Situační analýza v oblasti vzdělávání ve městě Krnov*. https://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/wp-content/uploads/Krnov_situacni_analyza_final_pub.pdf

Council of Europe. (2024a). Feasibility study on desegregation and inclusion policies and practices in the field of education for Roma and Traveller children. <https://rm.coe.int/item-02-cdadi-2024-19rev-feasibility-study-on-desegregation-and-inclus/1680b32a13>

Council of Europe. (2024b). *Mapping study: Trends and pathways towards educational inclusion* (Roma and Traveller education; section on school segregation). Council of Europe. <https://rm.coe.int/mapping-study-trends-and-pathways-towards-educational-inclusion/1680b1d13b>

Czech Statistical Office. (2025). *Population of municipalities, 1 January 2025*. Czech Statistical Office. <https://csu.gov.cz/produkty/population-of-municipalities-t4l3n8d2iw>

Gargulák, K. (2025, April 8). *Segregované školy najdeme téměř v každém kraji. Odpovědnost nesou obce, potřebují ale podporu státu*. PAQ Research. <https://www.paqresearch.cz/post/segregovane-skoly-najdeme-temer-v-kazdem-kraji-odpovednost-nesou-obce-potrebuji-ale-podporu-statu/>

Johnson, R. C. (2015). *Long-run impacts of school desegregation and school quality on adult attainments* (NBER Working Paper No. 16664; originally issued January 2011, revised August 2015). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://gsppi.berkeley.edu/~ruckerj/johnson_schooldesegregation_NBERw16664.pdf

Klaus, S., & Siraj, I. (2020). Improving Roma participation in European early childhood education systems through cultural brokering. *London Review of Education*, 18(1), 50-64. <https://doi.org/10.18546/LRE.18.1.04>

Mačí, J. (2020, January 27). *Tři romské děti ve třídě. Kritické číslo, aby školy nezačaly upadat*. Seznam Zprávy. <https://www.seznamzpravy.cz/clanek/tri-romske-deti-ve-tride-kriticke-cislo-aby-nevznikaly-odpadni-skoly-86877>

Merhaut, M., Fulkova, M., & Rudorfer, L. F. (2022). Social Services Management in the Context of Ethnic Roma Issues in the Czech Republic with a Focus on Education for Roma Children. *Social Sciences*, 11(10), 477. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci11100477>

Mikula, Š., & Montag, J. (2022). Roma and bureaucrats: A field experiment in the Czech Republic. *MUNI ECON Working Papers*, 2022(1). https://doi.org/10.5817/wp_muni_econ_2022-01

Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic. (2024). *Zpráva ke zjišťování kvalifikovaných odhadů počtu romských žáků v základních školách ve školním roce 2023/2024*. <https://msmt.gov.cz/vzdelavani/zprava-ke-zjistovani-kvalifikovanych-odhadu-poctu-romskych>

Munich, J., Prokop, D., Korbela, V., & Kment, Š. (2020). *Background to failures in education: Social problems and early inequalities*. PAQ Research and Aspen Institute Central Europe. <https://www.aspeninstitutece.org/wp-content/uploads/aspen-media/2020/11/Education.pdf>

Němec, Z. (2021). Change Must Come From Below but Also From the Top': Strategies for Roma School Desegregation in the Czech Republic. *Eduport*, 5(1), 18-28. <https://doi.org/10.21062/edp.2021.005>

Office of the Government of the Czech Republic. (2021). *Strategy for Roma equality, inclusion and participation (Strategy for Roma integration) 2021-2030*. https://vlada.gov.cz/assets/ppov/zalezitosti-romske-komunity/aktuality/Strategy-for-Roma-Equality--Inclusion-and-Participation-_Strategy-for-Roma-Integration_-2021-2030.pdf

Open Society Justice Initiative. (2022). *The persistence of segregation of Roma students in the Czech Republic*. Open Society Foundations. <https://www.justiceinitiative.org/uploads/082c893e-836b-412b-a0f7-92e2160f23ef/The-Persistence-of-Segregation-of-Roma-Students-in-the-Czech-Republic.pdf>

Platform for Early Care. (2025, May 12). *Krnov propojuje síly: Jak město vybuodovalo úspěšný systém podpory rodin s dětmi v raném věku*. <https://vcasnapece.cz/2025/05/12/krnov-propojuje-sily-jak-mesto-vybudovalo-uspesny-system-podpory-rodin-s-detmi-v-ranem-veku/>

Plíhalová, M. (2025, May 20). *Konec segregace: Jak město Krnov řeší problém, s nímž si jinde nevědí rady*. Respekt. <https://www.respekt.cz/tydenik/2025/23/konec-segregace-jak-mesto-krnov-resi-problem-s-nimz-si-jinde-nevedi-rady>

Price, H., Bird, A., King, Z., Stewart, D., & Kelly, L. (2021). Documentary analysis within a realist evaluation: Learning from the experiences of young

people and staff in sexual assault referral centres. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211047818>

Synková, M., & Endršová, M. (2022, February 23). *Nedodělají ani základní školu. Chudým dětem se vzdělání nedaří, zmapovali výzkumníci*. Aktuálně.cz. <https://zpravy.aktualne.cz/domaci/ceske-skoly-deli-propastne-rozdily/r~f1fdf45892fb11ec9136ac1f6b220ee8/>

Town of Krnov. (2014, October 22). *Odstranění selektivnosti vzdělávací sítě v Krnově*. <https://www.krnov.cz/odstraneni-selektivnosti-vzdelavaci-site-v-krnove/d-14843>

Tyssen, J., & McGregor, L. (2023). *Realist evaluation case study: Evaluation of Gypsy, Roma, Traveller community outreach programme*. Transforming Access and Student Outcomes in Higher Education. https://taso.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023-12_Case-study_Small-cohort_Realist-Evaluation_Uni-Centre-Leeds_TASO-1.pdf

Vykoupilová, K. (2023, November 4). *Krnov jako dobrý příklad ve vzdělávání. „Děti z vyloučených lokalit nesegregujeme,“ říká starosta*. iROZHLAS. https://www.irozhlas.cz/zpravy-domov/krnov-vzdelavani-zakladni-skoly-dokonceni-zakladni-skolni-dochazky_2311041742_vtk

Westhorp, G., Manzano, A., Greenhalgh, J., Jagosh, J., & Greenhalgh, T. (2017). *What realists mean by context; or, why nothing works everywhere or for everyone*. The RAMESES II Project. https://www.ramesesproject.org/media/RAMESES_II_Context.pdf

Wong, G., Westhorp, G., Manzano, A., Greenhalgh, J., Jagosh, J., & Greenhalgh, T. (2016). RAMESES II reporting standards for realist evaluations. *BMC Medicine*, 14(1), Article 96. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-016-0643-1>