THE CR CULTURE ACCOUNT RESULTS FOR 2015

Prague, 2017

The Czech Statistical Office
The National Information and Consulting Centre for Culture

Prepared by:
NIPOS – Centre of Information and Statistics on Culture
CSO – Society Development Statistics Department

Table of Contents

1 Introduction 5

1.1 Demarcation and breakdown of the culture sector 6

1.2 Data sources and related problems 8

2 Management of cultural institutions in 2015 10

2.1 Culture funding 10

2.2 The micro-economic perspective 12

2.2.1 Financial management 12

2.2.2 Work effort engaged 12

2.2.3 Investments 14

2.2.4 Foreign trade 14

2.3 The macro-economic perspective 15

3 Conclusions 16

4 Sources and documents used 19

5 Tables Annex 21

1 Introduction

The satellite account of culture of the CR (hereinafter as the “Culture Account”) was tasked, following on from the **CR Government Resolution No. 1452 of 2008**, to provide the first verification report for reference year 2009. In the course of drawing up the account and in the evaluation of results for that and the following year, it became apparent that some of the assumptions and intentions contained in the original methodology manual for the account cannot be completely met, and must be amended.

The amendments apply in particular to the scope of the culture sector. Having regard to the complexity and diversity of cultural activities, we have addressed issues including the downstream production stages of incipient cultural assets (e.g. publishing and publication activities) and also retail activities (e.g. sales of books, antiques, etc.).

As part of the first verification of the Culture Account for the year 2009, the culture sector was demarcated by agreement of the interested parties/institutions (the CR Ministry of Culture, as well as NIPOS and the CSO). However, the autumn of 2011 saw the end of the ESSnet Culture project organized by Eurostat, whose task – among other things – was a unified definition of the culture sector across the EU. The results of the above project were incorporated into the revised methodology of reckoning up the Culture Account and became the starting point for summing up the account for the year 2010 and the following years.

As to changes – compared to the original concept of the Culture Account for 2009 – the culture sector was expanded to include some of the culture sector retail activity (NACE 47.63, 78 and 79), translation and interpreting services (NACE 74.30), rental of video tapes and disks (NACE 77.22) and art education (NACE 85.52). It should be said that some retail activities (NACE 47.78 and 79), relate to culture only partially, and the corresponding data must therefore be elaborately quantified (or even partially estimated).

Other differences compared to the first account verification process encompassed the range and quality of the data obtained. Via supplementary surveys (e.g. in crafts or in the archives) the range of respondents whose data is used to reckon up the Culture Account has gradually grown. Also of importance for the quality of the data was the fact that the respondents began gradually to get used to reporting economic data, which were only brought into the KULT statistical surveys in the reference year 2009.

From the above it is evident any comparison of the results of Culture Account over the entire time series has many pitfalls. In particular, data for the reference year 2009, based as they are on a narrower definition of the culture sector, are not comparable, to an acceptable extent, with data for later annual periods. This is something to keep in mind – when working with the information available.

In 2015 **CR Government Resolution No. 266 on the State Culture Policy concept for the years 2015-2020** (with a view to 2025) set the task to compile a satellite Culture Account extended into the next period, and also extended to include time-series evaluation of the results of the given account for the years 2010 to 2015. This task is formulated as a joint task for Ministry of Culture (MK), as well as NIPOS and the CSO, under MK stewardship (as is apparent from the above resolution).

1.1 Demarcation and breakdown of the culture sector

Prior to the survey and evaluation of the economic dimension of culture, we need to clearly map out the scope and structure of our subject of interest. Firstly, we have to distinguish between a substantive definition and that from the transverse perspective, based on purpose and function and the course of events in time. In the first case, we can speak of individual domains or spheres, of providers, of cultural and creative sectors, and in the second about what may be called the culture cycle.

In accordance with the available international documents (EUROSTAT, UNESCO, OECD) we recognize the following culture domains or sectors marked “O.11 – O.19” (also indicating the CZ-NACE):

- cultural heritage – O.11 (91.01, 02, 03, 47.78, 79)
- performing (scenic) arts – O.12 (90.01, 02, 04)
- fine (visual) arts and crafts – O.13 (74.10, 20, 90.03, part of section C)
- periodic and non-periodic press – O.14 (58.11, 13, 63.91, 74.30, 47.61, 62)
- audio-visual and interactive media – O.15 (58.21, 59.11, 12, 13, 14, 20, 60.10, 20, 47.63, 77.22)
- architecture – O.16 (71.11)
- advertising – O.17 (73.11)
- art education – O.18 (85.52)
- culture management incl. support – O.19 (84.11 – in part 12 – in part 94.99.2)

For practical reasons, related to problems obtaining and breaking down the necessary data, we have to supplement the above domains with one additional, unspecified domain or domains, which we will call the “unknown domain”.

Within each of the domains we distinguish cultural activities (these represent or mediate cultural expression) such as the activities of museums and galleries; and culture services or assets (for example, preservation and archiving within the museums, or original sound recordings). The bearer of those cultural activities or services or assets can also be collectively described as the provider of cultural assets and services (hereinafter as the “provider”). These include e.g. museums, libraries, theatres, cinemas, radio or TV broadcasters. It should be noted that their numbers are to a significant extent determined by the pragmatic reasons of statistical data availability (in particular, by way of statistical surveys). In other words, this means that data about some major cultural activities (e.g., archaeological sites, artistic crafts, writing, painting and sculptural activities, etc.) are currently not available, for the most part.

In keeping with the focus of the cultural surveys (KULT) we match the existing institutionally defined providers (the survey respondents) to the substantively defined culture domains (sectors) i.e. O.11 – O.19, as follows:

- historical monument – (O.11)
- museums and galleries – (O.11)
- archive – (O.11)
- library – (O.11)
- theatre – (O.12)
- concert hall – (O.12)
- culture centres – (O.12)
- exhibition hall – (O.13)

- publishing/publication – (O.14)
- manufacturers and distributors of audio-visual works – (O.15)
- radio – (O.15)
- TV – (O.15)
- schools of art education – (O.18)
- copyright protection organizations – (O.19)
- other providers – (O.11 – O.19)

As is evident from this breakdown, taking the example of the very important architectural activities domain (O.16) there is currently no major provider – due to the lack of commensurate data obtained by statistical surveys. Typically, the culture domains extend in scope beyond the activities of providers assigned against them. The providers are thus in some respects the selected representatives (statistically separately monitored) of each domain, who do not, however, cover the entire domain exhaustively.

Data which cannot be clearly assigned to the preceding providers (e.g., retail sale of books, antiques, objects d'art, the creation of musical recordings, design services, news agencies, administration activities of the Ministry of Culture and subordinate institutions etc.) are classified as data from 'other providers'.

For similar reasons, as in the case of domains – i.e. inability to break down summary data in a plausible way – we have need of an "unknown provider" category. In this respect, it is clear that a progressive lessening of the importance (weight) of data shown against an unknown domain or unknown provider in relation to the overall culture dataset should be a sign of the improving tractability of the Culture Account. This is, however, a very difficult and long-term task, which relates, in particular, to the feasibility of expanding and deepening statistical reporting (respondent willingness, financial and statistical analysis work capacities, initiatives to lessen the administrative burden, etc.).

As is evident from the above, the breakdown of culture services providers, which is largely influenced by the feasibility of obtaining the necessary data for the given culture activities domain, is likely to change in the course of statistical surveys over time.

We can also use a different breakdown of the culture sector than the above, which could be described as the default or primary approach. For example, we can group culture domains into four so-called spheres. Each of these reflects the distinctive characteristics of several domains. We can see such related domains when it comes to e.g. cultural heritage (tangible and intangible), including items such as monuments, archaeological sites, museums and galleries, archives and libraries; the sphere of live original artistic creation (e.g. the performing and visual arts, artistic crafts, design, architecture, advertising); and the culture media sphere (e.g. film, television, radio, software publishing and print media). The fourth sphere – though not purely cultural – could be made up of administrative (overhead) activities (including copyright protection and support of culture) that are inextricably linked to culture as with other areas of human activity – and in addition, art education and training.

Of course, other breakdowns of the culture sector are no less important. The European Commission divided up culture in principle into the culture sector and the creative sector. The first is the domain of traditional art (fine and performing arts, cultural heritage) and the cultural industries domain (film and video, TV and radio, video games, music, books, and printing), the second – creative sector, is the creative industries domain (design, architecture and the advertising industry) and a range of related industries (production of PCs, players, etc.). As we shall see, this breakdown has notable value, among other things, when viewed from the standpoint of applying market forces in relation to culture and to with the differing economic performance of culture domains.

In connection with the definition of culture from a purposive perspective we also speak of another cultural dimension – the culture cycle. This encompasses the phases or stages of the segmentation of culture (or its domains, rather) into creation or production, upkeep of assets, dissemination of culture services and assets, trading in them, education and consumption of cultural production. The transversal nature of the culture cycle concept can be said to go beyond the boundaries of the culture sector, extending to other domains or spheres of human activity (e.g. education, trade).

With regard to the time factor, we can see some commonalities between the culture cycle and cultural spheres (domain groups). While the cycle can be likened to a momentary slice of the ongoing cultural activities, the spheres divide up culture from a long-term perspective. With some degree of generalization, it can be said that while cultural heritage stems from the past, the creative arts and the production of culture services and goods consumed at a given time and place are tied to the present and the media that disseminate the given services and goods aim toward the future.

It can also be said that the above four spheres represent the basic stages of the culture cycle (preservation of cultural values, their creation, the dissemination of cultural goods and services, education and related administrative activities).

As shown by the results of the first Culture Account processing for 2009, from an economic point of view there is a strong dividing line between the so-called. ‘traditional’ and the ‘novelty’ cultural disciplines or sectors. Among the first to deserve a mention is the entire sphere of cultural heritage and a part of live original artistic creation (theatre, ensembles, festivals, exhibition halls and cultural centres as well as culture-related administrative activities). These activities are, in essence, not financially self-sufficient and 50-60% of public expenditure on culture is spent on them. The converse is true when it comes to sound recordings, television and radio broadcasting, the production and distribution of audio-visual works, the creation of video games, architectural, design and advertising activities.

As regards breaking down the culture sector, we can say that it can be done in various ways. To deal with it appropriately we need to obtain the necessary data down to the lowest component parts of the whole sector of culture as such, i.e. for each domain or culture services provider. By using these, we can satisfy the information needs of the various respective breakdown options for the culture sector.

1.2 Data sources and related problems

To assemble the Culture Account, we use diverse data from administrative sources as well as from statistical surveys. The first group includes primarily the data from public budgets (the State budget and local budgets). Also included here are data available on the Internet, about certain Culture Services Providers.

The second group consists largely of data from household surveys (via what are termed home budgets) and further surveys done directly with cultural institutions (under the KULT designation). The household surveys are done by the CSO, which also surveys radio and television broadcasting licence holders. Data from the vast majority of other cultural institutions (providers) is collected via the above-mentioned KULT (MK) NIPOS survey. Some of the data (in particular about news agencies, architectural, photographic and advertising agencies, retailers, etc. are collected as part of the corporate statistics survey by the CSO (SBS). The statistical surveys of this office (NI 1-01) also yield abstracted data on non-profit institutions (including copyright protection organizations).

In the reference year 2014, the methodology for quantifying the turnover of international trade in culture services and goods was refined in alignment with the aims of Eurostat and the specifications governing handicrafts set by the National Institute of Folk Culture. A year later, there was a marked shift in connection with access to a new data source that characterized the extent of active cultural activity and efforts, in cultural institutions as well as institutions where cultural activities predominated, and beyond (the Workforce survey).

For assembling the Account, various additional sources of information are used. Some employment data can be drawn from the labour and wage statistics, and also from the Registry of economic subjects (the numbers of persons insured). The aforementioned surveys are conducted by the CSO, which also supplies the state budget macroeconomic data (especially in the form of a supply and use matrix).

Information on archives is available to the Ministry (MV CR), some information about cinemas is held by the Union of film distributors, etc.

Finally, information about some of the cultural institutions and activities not included in the regular statistical investigation are polled by NIPOS from selected respondents by way of supplementary surveys (archives, artistic crafts, amateur theatre, etc.).

It has to be said that the cultural chart still has some ‘blank spaces’. Some of the activities are not covered by the surveys for the time being (e.g., archaeological sites), while others are only partially covered (e.g. artistic crafts). Nor is the inclusion of the given cultural activities in the statistical survey an easy matter, in terms of obtaining the necessary data. The basic obstacle is the high proportion of non-responses, in particular when it comes to economic data, which are essential for compiling the Culture Account.

Yet the difficulties don’t end with obtaining the data. The issues to be resolved are to do with data classification (NACE, COICOP, ISCO). Data about cultural activities are very often included under aggregated items, together with other activities. Where they are not, for frugality reasons, the sample surveyed is insufficient to obtain and tally the results down to the necessary level of itemized detail for the breakdowns (e.g. to four NACE digits).

It is one thing to obtain the data (which are often incomplete and not ‘clean’, or are categorized in some other way than is needed), but quite another to get these in the desired, or indeed an acceptable time-frame. Public expenditure data are available approximately five months later, data on household spending eight months later and data on enterprises or non-profit organizations up to thirteen months later than the reference period end. Much the same applies when it comes to tallied data collected from cultural institutions (providers). The data available last of all are those from the national accounts system (more than a year after the reference period), which are moreover prone to progressive revisions and/or clarifications. In comparison with the end of the reference period (a year) the summary results of the Culture Account are about 16 months behind.

Of course, significant differences exist in the quality of information. A high degree of credibility can be assumed for data concerning public expenditure on culture, which derive from State budget funding draw-down. More problematic in this regard are data collected by statistical surveys, whether for the home (household budgets, Workforce survey) or, in particular, specialized surveys on cultural institutions (the KULT selection of statistical surveys conducted by NIPOS and the CSO), and other CSO surveys in enterprises as well as supplementary surveys. The quality of such data is impacted by a range of difficulties, starting with the comprehensiveness of the respondent population, through techniques of establishing the representative sample, to non-response rates, degrees of interpolation, etc.

2 Management of cultural institutions in 2015

2.1 Culture funding

The total sum of financial resources entering the sector of culture in 2015 reached over 226.6 billion CZK (See Table 1 in the Annex). In comparison with the previous year, this was up by about 0.8 billion CZK (almost 0.4%). Applicable sources are deemed to be all operating revenues (net of taxes paid), investment grants, credits and loans received (net of repayments), donations, etc. obtained by institutions whose activities are prevailingly cultural, during the reference year.

As for the origin of the funding resources, the greater part of them comes from financial and non-financial enterprises (hereinafter as “enterprises”), followed in second place by households, thirdly by public funds, then non-profit institutions, and last of all the international environment (this order has not changed over many years).

In the individual domains (branches) of culture the funding shares look somewhat different. Whilst in cultural heritage, the performing arts, art education and administrative activities the public budgets are paramount (roughly two thirds share), in the market-oriented industries (visual arts, print, media, architecture, advertising) the funds from enterprises and households dominate.

As shown in the following table, in the five-year time series (2010-2015) we see an evident tendency of the household component to go up, and in particular as a share of total resources, a stagnation of public funding and even a drop (or in the last year, a stagnation), in the proportionate contribution by enterprises. Having regard to the relatively low absolute level, the fluctuations in other funding sources are very significant.

Share of individual funding sources on financing culture (in %)

Funding origin	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Index 2015/2010 in %
Public budgets	13.5	14.6	14.5	15.8	15.9	15.1	**111.9**
Homes	16.8	17.2	19.3	19.5	20.2	19.8	**117.9**
Enterprises	66.7	65.9	62.2	62.5	61.8	62.3	**93.4**
Non-profit institutions	2.8	1.2	3.2	1.1	1.1	1.6	**57.1**
Rest of the world	0.2	1.1	0.8	1.1	1	1.2	**600.0**

Of the public budgets in 2015, almost 34.3 billion CZK went to culture, i.e. about 1 599 million CZK (4.5%) less than the year before. This amount represents the consolidated operating and investment expenditure of organizational units of the State, territorial self-governing units and the State off-budget funds (the Fund for Culture and of the Fund for the support and development of Czech Cinematography), based on cash receipts.

Of the total amount of expenditure, more than 28.2 billion CZK went on operations and less than 6.1 billion CZK was spent on investments. From the public funding perspective, the greater part – of both operational and investment funds – was spent on culture out of municipal and city budgets (almost 49%), and in particular in the cultural heritage domain, in the performing arts and on art education.

The total amount of funding devoted to culture in 2015 was 1.93% of public budgets.

Indirect assistance from the State toward culture is impossible to quantify, in part because it can come via the expenditure of households and enterprises (tax rebates and offsets in lieu of a donation to a cultural institution).

Household spending on culture in 2015 as compared with the previous year decreased slightly (about 1.5%) and reached 44.9 billion CZK. The importance of these resources as part of the overall resources of culture has increased, however, over the last five years (the most markedly when we exclude sources from abroad).

Household spending in particular was aimed at the media and publishing (television, radio, cinema, books, and print, etc.) namely some 31.4 billion CZK, which represents a share of almost 70%. Much less funding by households went toward the domains of cultural heritage, the creative arts (the performing and visual arts) and art education (total 8.5 billion CZK). Household spending on culture mostly takes the form of admission fees, buying refreshments and souvenirs, handicrafts, licence fees, paying other service charges, tuition fees, enrolment fees and purchases of goods of a cultural nature (books, magazines, paintings, antiques, etc.).

The proportion of household expenditure spent on culture out of total net household expenditure reached about 3.2% in 2015.

As for other sources of funding for culture (65% share of total resources) the most important place goes to financial and non-financial sector enterprises (141.1 billion CZK), followed by non-governmental, non-profit institutions (3.5 billion CZK). Supplementary funding from abroad is a growing source (2.7 billion CZK). In comparison with the previous year, other sources totalled about 3.1 billion CZK (2.1%) more.

As regards their allocation to the respective domains, other sources went in particular toward advertising (67.4 billion CZK), the media (22.8 billion CZK) and print (20.7 billion CZK). On the other hand, much less went to live art, in which public resources are traditionally dominant.

The slight overall increase in culture funding is undoubtedly related to the gradual return of economic growth in real terms, beginning in 2013.

The different levels of resource deployment in the various culture domains reflect the different level of development of commercial ties in the respective parts of the culture sector. While public resources are most heavily engaged in the domains of cultural heritage, art education, the performing arts and administration, households and enterprises especially are active in the domains of print, audio-visual, advertising and architecture.

2.2 The micro-economic perspective

2.2.1 Financial management

Tables 3 and 4 set out in the Annex allow an assessment of the economic fundamentals from the profit and loss statements of cultural institutions, obtained mainly from the annual business-focused surveys (P 5-01 reports, NI and KULT). It should be added that enterprises are assigned to individual branches or disciplines based on their dominant category of revenues, whilst all of their revenues do not necessarily come from activities of a cultural nature. Conversely, not included are enterprises that, whilst able to perform cultural activities, obtain the predominant part of their revenues from activities of a non-cultural nature. The flip-side of taking a more comprehensive view is lesser precision (or rather 'branch-level' finesse or purity) of the data obtained.

As shown in Tables 3, 4 and 10, the business activities of the culture sector in 2015 produced a positive economic result of 16.6 billion CZK. This sum is roughly equivalent to the profit margin (profit after taxes divided by total revenues) namely 8.4% (i.e. about 1.5 percentage points more than in 2014). This result also indicates that the economic recovery observed since 2014 did not leave culture by the wayside.

The business performance of individual areas of culture and culture services providers is historically very uneven. Whilst cultural heritage and partly the performing arts made considerable losses (archives, libraries and festivals), other sectors were significantly profitable (advertising, architecture, media, print). Based on the level of economic self-sufficiency (the relationship between the revenues from own performance and overall expenditure) we can distinguish two different economic spheres within the culture sector. The first belongs to the area of traditional arts – oriented more towards audiences and attendance, where financial support from public sources is indispensable (cultural heritage, theatre, ensembles, festivals and the like) and the second – market oriented – encompassing the realm of creative activities (advertising, architecture, design) and media and print.

This is apparent even in terms of the self-sufficiency level (the relationship between revenues from own performance and total expenditure), which at an average level of 87.9% reaches lup to e.g. 143% in the creation of video games, 111.7% in design. Conversely, in the performing arts it stands as low as 36.6%.

2.2.2 Work effort engaged

Quantifying the work that goes into cultural activities is quite complex. Work effort takes many forms and, on a factual level the relatively most accurately tracked is the manpower effort of staff with an employment contract. More problematic is the charting of work done on the basis of work agreements, as well as the work of volunteers and the involvement of the self-employed or entrepreneurs, and their family members.

From reference year 2015 onward we have two different data sources available. Along with the classic statistical surveys in cultural institutions (KULT, SBS, NI and supplementary surveys) we have the option to call on the Workforce sample survey ("VŠPS"), with its – albeit less precise – broader scope. It allows us to gauge work effort in cultural activities, and beyond them.

Table 7 contains data on employment and wages in culture, derived from classic business-focus surveys. From the findings, in 2015 there were over 98 thousand people working in culture, of whom roughly 89 thousand were employees (FTE) and the remainder unpaid volunteers. Over and above this number it can be assumed there were several thousand staff working in the sector under temporary or part-time work agreements or as self-employed persons (not covered in the above surveys). If we were to cross-calculate the reported other staff fees and honorariums expended in culture with reference to average wages, we would arrive at an equivalent number of about 8 thousand other staff engaged, on the basis of agreements and copyright treaties. This makes a total of about 100 thousand people working in institutions where cultural activities predominate (in FTE terms).

The average gross monthly wage in culture in 2015 was 25,966 CZK. As compared to the previous year it had gone up by 1.5% (in real terms by only 1.1%), yet in comparison with the average wage across the entire economy (26,467 CZK) it was about 501 CZK (1.9%) lower. Particularly in the case of culture, the average (as a characteristic feature of the whole picture) has very low explanatory power. The wages area is also subject to the substantial differences between the two business levels of the two different realms of culture – the traditional branches on the one hand – and the media, print and creative disciplines on the other (see Table 10). Whilst in the classic cultural branch sector the average monthly wage was just over 20 thousand CZK, in the cultural industries (print, audio-visual) it was over 31 thousand CZK. Overall, it appears that more than 70% of the employees in the culture sector work for less than the national average wage (Table 7).

The Workforce sample survey conducted by the CSO broadens the catchment for viewing work effort on cultural activities to include institutions where other than cultural activities predominate, as well as the involvement of entrepreneurs, or their family members, as may be (see Table 7b). A certain limitation lies in the fact that it does not provide information concerning the costs of work effort expended, nor the number of volunteers.

The overall extent of the work effort engaged in cultural activities (including institutions with a not-cultural focus) was – according to the above data sources – nearly 211 thousand persons. Of this number, not quite 76 thousand were entrepreneurs. Of the remaining number of 134.8 thousand people, some 112.5 thousand were employed on a full-time basis and 22.3 thousand were part-time or under work activity agreements (as well as task-based agreements), or the assisting family members.

The results of that survey allow us to quantify the engagement of work effort in institutions (by a legal or natural person) with and without culture focused activities. Out of the total of nearly 211 thousand persons, those employed in culture non-focused institutions amounted to 37.5 thousand, i.e. less than 18%. Of the remaining number of 173.1 thousand workers in cultural institutions, those actively engaged amounted to some 89 thousand (51.4%) in cultural occupations (e.g. as singers, actors or designers) and 84.1 thousand (48.6%) in non-culturally focused occupations (administration, accounting, IT professions, etc.).

As is evident, cultural activities (professions) are not particularly heavily centralized within the culture sector, or rather in the institutions whose income is largely generated by cultural activities. Out of the total number of those whose job description has a cultural content (126.6 thousand people) some 70% belong in the culture sector.

The reapportioned number of employees working in the culture sector represent 2.3% of employees in the economy as a whole (if measured by wage outlays the weight of the culture sector would be slightly lower, at 2.2%).

If we add to the primarily culture-focused institutions the staff from culture professions outside the culture sector (from the VŠPS findings), we reach a proportion of 2.9%. Finally, counting all the people working both on a full-time basis or on the basis of agreements, as well as volunteers and entrepreneurs, we would reach a culture share of the economy of almost 4.4%.

2.2.3 Investments

In comparison with 2014, the level of capital expenditure increased by 12.5% (about 1.5 billion CZK).

Different economic conditions and outcomes among cultural institutions also have their reflection in investment activity. With an average investment level equivalent to 152 thousand CZK per employee in the entire culture sector, in the traditional arts fields it was 95.9 thousand CZK, while in the creative industries 196.9 thousand CZK and in the cultural industries (print and media) some 205.6 thousand CZK (see Table 10). The level of investment as compared with 2014 went up most in the traditional culture sectors (by about 1.6%), to a lesser extent also in the cultural industries, while conversely falling in the creative industries.

As regards the sources covering investment expenditure, public funds contribute some 45% of total (58% in the cultural heritage domain), foreign sources make up 5% and own or other resources the remaining nearly 50%. In comparison with 2014, the share of public resources went down by nearly 3 percentage points, whilst the foreign sources proportion went up by more than 4 percentage points (see Table 8).

2.2.4 Foreign trade

A look at the business performance of the sector can partially be augmented by data on exports and imports of cultural goods and services (see Table 9). Foreign trade in goods and services of a cultural nature reached – as in previous years – a positive balance (2.1 billion CZK). In comparison with 2014, the trade surplus went down by 40% (1.4 billion CZK), in particular as a result of weaker yields from performing arts, audio-visual and interactive technologies and advertising. From a geographical point of view, the drop in the positive balance was to a great extent influenced by growth in imports from non-European territories.

As to the veracity of the above results, however, it should be noted that these figures do not reflect the full range of commercial exchanges in the field of culture (the respective surveys are selective).

Any comparison with the years before 2014 is furthermore hampered by the fact that the methodology for the calculation of indicators of foreign trade in 2014 was updated, to follow Eurostat aims in this field, and furthermore in line with the specifications for handicrafts set by the National Institute of Folk Culture.

2.3 The macro-economic perspective

Any characterization of business performance in culture, as a whole and in its constituent parts, is quite naturally accompanied by the question of the scale and weight of this sector in the economy. When seeking answers, we need to make use of the national accounting data and methodology.

Having regard to the available data about the culture sector, the manufacturing (sector) reckoning of GDP seems most appropriate for quantifying the macro-economic indicators. According to this, the indicator equates to the sum obtained by deducting intermediate consumption from the production value added, giving the Gross Value Added, (GVA), plus net taxes, i.e. industry taxes, less subsidies granted to the sector.

The input data to the calculation should be based on data derived from the national accounts, and in particular, the supply and use tables. These data represent the optimal information system, in terms of its comprehensiveness, consistency, and international comparability. The stated advantages are, however, obtained at a cost, the very high level of effort required, and, from the user perspective, the long wait for (incrementally updated) results.

It needs to be said that based on such data the macroeconomic indicators of the sector are being estimated rather than precisely calculated. This applies especially to the – for our purposes – inappropriate breakdown of data on the supply and use tables which go down only to division level (2 NACE digits), while cultural activities are often itemized down to classes (4 NACE digits). One illustrative example might be the architectural activities in the supply and use tables, which include the entire division 71 of CZ-NACE. Only class 71.11 is considered a part of the culture sector, however. Data that do correspond to cultural activities have to be gleaned through a complicated procedure, making use of knowledge of the different relationships – e.g. about the labour productivity between classes or the share of consumption of materials, energy and services, revenue, etc. on overall revenues etc. – between the data found in the statistical surveys (business surveys, KULT, NI).

From the preliminary data contained in the supply and use tables, we can then calculate the weight of the culture sector within the total output of the CR in 2014 as being some 1.97% (201.2 billion CZK) and the gross value added being at 2.17% (83.5 billion CZK).

These data are prone to being revised, with more specific information. The culture sector's share of total production can be estimated at 2.01% (204.4 billion CZK), its share of GVA at 2.1% (82 billion CZK) and share of GDP at 1.35% (58.1 billion CZK). The relatively lower GDP figure in comparison with the GVA is due to relatively low levels of taxes applicable to the culture sector and the high level of operating subsidies received.

From the preliminary data, it can be surmised (assumed) for 2015 that the culture sector produced 213 billion CZK (2.01% of national production) and as for GVA, 87.4 billion CZK (i.e. 2.13% of total GVA created in the economy). The volume of GDP generated by culture may be estimated at about 65.6 billion CZK (1.44% of total GDP). These preliminary data will be updated and the foregoing estimate slightly amended.

However, the preliminary data does indicate that considering the growth of the entire economy, in 2015 the economic performance and effectiveness of cultural entities went up. A significant increase in production between the years 2014 and 2015, accompanied by a more moderate increase of intermediate consumption, led to an overall increase of Gross Value Added and Gross Domestic Product.

3 Conclusions

It should be added that although the Culture Account for 2015 is being reworked for the seventh time already, the verification of the methodological approaches can be considered almost as worthwhile as the quest for the substantive results. With regard to the broadening of the culture sector, its greater tractability by surveys and the partial application of amended methodological approaches, we are still in a period when the Culture Account time series is being tuned, which affects the credibility of the comparison and evaluation of the development dynamics of individual metrics. Regardless of this fact, however, this processing of the Culture Account has shown that some notable findings about the culture sector are being principally confirmed each year (e.g. the economic status of the individual domains within the sector, numbers of employees, level of investment, etc.).

The basic question that the Culture Account is to answer concerns the origin, scope and use of financial resources in the culture sector. From the administrative data it was found that the public sector is involved in funding cultural institutions to the tune of 34.3 billion CZK (i.e. 15.1%) with these funds being channelled largely into cultural heritage, live art and art education. According to the household surveys, the sums expended out of family budgets on culture, in particular on the media and on live performance, came to 44.9 billion CZK (i.e. 19.8% of total resources). Compared to the drop in public funding and household expenditure on culture, the funds coming from enterprises (141.1 billion CZK i.e. 62.3% of total resources), from non-profit institutions (3.5 billion. CZK) and from abroad (2.7 billion CZK) had gone up, compared with 2014. The total funding directed toward cultural institutions thus rose 0.4% (about 0.8 billion overall year-on-year). The more favourable economic circumstances of the years 2014-2015 in comparison with the prior period contributed to the growth in available funding (both the operational and investment variety) in the culture sector by about 7.3 billion CZK (i.e. more than 3.3%) overall. It is also a fact that in comparison with 2014 the growth rate of financial resources in 2015 has slowed.

It is further confirmed that the individual cultural areas are becoming more divergent in their subscribing to market principles and, accordingly, in their business performance, with the concomitant levels of average wages, investment activities, etc. Any deepening of this differentiation will probably depend on technical developments on the one hand as well as, on the other hand, the extent of support of non-profit activities (cultural heritage and a portion of the performing arts) from public funds.

The problematic economic results of the above mentioned cultural areas might be attributed to the limited explanatory scope of financial indicators as a gauge of the extent and quality of certain activities undertaken (e.g. the care of cultural heritage, cultural institutions, educational activities, the impact of culture and its values on the individual and society at large). It is thus fitting to supplement the economic indicators with more down-to-earth measures, of which the most appropriate for its overreaching explanatory power might well be the numbers of visitors. It should be added that the total attendance of cultural institutions had risen in comparison with 2014 by 2.6% (see Table 13). Growing visitor numbers were a feature for most of the major traditional culture services providers.

Better economic results in comparison with the previous year are illustrated by greater profit levels (an increase of 14.7 billion. CZK to 16.6 billion. CZK (about 13%) and of profit margins (from 6.9% to 8.4%, i.e. about 1.5 percentage points – see Tables 3 and 10). The annual growth rates of these indicators were also considerably lower than in 2014.

In the macroscopic metrics, comparison against the refined data for 2014 seems favourable. With a faster growth of production (about 4.2%) there was a slight increase in intermediate consumption (2.6%) and gross value added increased by 6.6%. Even greater was the annual increment in GDP (see Table 11).

As it turns out, the culture sector weight or share of the economy as a whole shows oscillations in several important indicators (over a fairly wide range) from 1.4 to 4.4%.

Public resources dedicated to culture represent 1.93% of total consolidated expenditure from public budgets and the proportion of expenditure on culture out of total household expenditure is at 3.2%. The extent of manpower effort in culture can be deemed to range from 2.2% (as measured by wage cost) to 4.4% (as measured by the number of all persons working in the cultural institutions and activities). The summed up provisionally estimated shares of gross value added and output in culture are just above the two per cent mark (2.13% 2.01% respectively), while the share of the estimated level of the gross domestic product of culture does not reach this level (1.44% of the national indicators). As is evident from comparisons of the contributions made by culture using the indicators of inputs (the extent of manpower effort) and outputs (GVA and GDP), this sector lags behind others in its level of productivity.

If, however, we were to add onto the imaginary scales the intangible aspects of the productions and the social reach of the culture sector, its contribution would certainly be much higher. We are not, however, in a position to express anything that cannot be expressed financially. We need to focus on what we can influence, and implement desirable change – in particular in the area of statistical surveys – in order to gradually increase the range of cultural activities encompassed by the satellite culture account, whilst reducing its degree of imprecision.

4 Sources and documents used

1. Systém účtů kultury. Prague: NIPOS, 2011 and 2014.
2. Výsledky účtu kultury ČR za rok 2009 - 2014. Prague: NIPOS, 2011-2016.
3. ESSnet on Culture statistics 2009 – 2011, Task Force 1: Framework and definitions (Final Report 2011)
4. National report on public expenditure. Eries, 2004.
5. The Economy of Culture. KEA Study of European Affairs for the European Commission, (2006).
6. CSO and NIPOS surveys and administrative data from the MF, MV, ČSSZ and the Union of motion picture distributors and various supplementary surveys conducted NIPOS.
7. Supply and usage tables from the CSO in 2014 and 2015.
8. Classification of economic activities (CZ-NACE). Prague: CSO, 2008

5 Tables Annex

Table 1 Sources of Culture Funding by Culture Domains in 2015 23

Table 2 Allocation of Funding by Culture Domains and Culture Services Providers in 2015 25

Table 3 Income and Expenditure of Cultural Institutions by Culture Domains in 2015 27

Table 4 Income and Expenditure of Cultural Institutions by Culture Services Providers in 2015 29

Table 5 Macroeconomic Indicators by Culture Domains in 2015 (estimated) 31

Table 6 Selected Indicators in a tri-sector Breakdown for Culture in 2015 (columns 3-5 estimated) 33

Table 7a Employment and Wages in Culture in 2015 35

Table 8 Sources and Extent of Investment in the Culture Sector in 2015 39

Table 9 Foreign trade in Goods and Services in the Culture Sector in 2015 41

Table 10 Analytical Table of Basic Indicators of the Culture Sector for 2015 43

Table 11 Time-series of Selected Indicators of the Culture Sector for 2010-15 45

Table 12 Number of Selected Culture Services Providers in 2015 47

Table 13 Relatively ranked performance by Culture Services Providers using standardized indicators in 2015 49

Note:

-	a dash in place of a number indicates no occurrence
.	a dot in place of a number indicates that the data is not available or is unreliable
x	an x in place of a number indicates that no such entry is logically possible
0	a zero figure indicates the value is less than half the selected unit of measurement
i.d.	individual data

Table 1 Sources of Culture Funding by Culture Domains in 2015

in thous. CZK

DOMAIN	Central government institutions	Local government institutions	Public sector total	Direct household expenditure	Non-financial and financial enterprises [1]	Non-governmental non-profit institutions [1]	Private sector total	European structural funds	Other international institutions	From abroad total	RESOURCES TOTAL
Cultural heritage	4 838 821	7 645 733	**12 484 554**	2 757 748	3 313 711	379 850	**6 451 309**	483 887	16 754	**500 641**	**19 436 504**
Performing arts	1 064 217	3 360 842	**4 425 059**	2 519 491	4 527 542	231 018	**7 278 051**	244 133	23 273	**267 406**	**11 970 516**
Fine art	38 279	36 623	**74 902**	2 222 346	5 678 999	104 296	**8 005 641**	26 963	6 525	**33 488**	**8 114 031**
Periodic and non-periodic press	34 390	17 344	**51 734**	11 837 368	20 738 105	.	**32 575 473**	10 223	-	**10 223**	**32 637 430**
Audio-visual and interactive media	643 603	778 316	**1 421 919**	19 565 503	18 516 011	2 353 214	**40 434 728**	49 477	1 853 975	**1 903 452**	**43 760 099**
Architecture	.	.	.	136 524	20 781 136	262	**20 917 922**	23 735	-	**23 735**	**20 941 657**
Advertising	.	.	.	110 981	67 350 304	.	**67 461 285**	-	-	**-**	**67 461 285**
Art education	14 508	7 608 079	**7 622 587**	1 012 500	.	.	**1 012 500**	6 601	-	**6 601**	**8 641 688**
Management and support of cultural activities	1 768 032	17 655	**1 785 687**	70 010	243 025	476 722	**789 757**	637	-	**637**	**2 576 081**
Unknown domain	336 669	6 078 478	**6 415 147**	4 653 692	-	-	**4 653 692**	-	-	-	**11 068 839**
TOTAL	**8 738 519**	**25 543 070**	**34 281 589**	**44 886 163**	**141 148 833**	**3 545 362**	**189 580 358**	**845 656**	**1 900 527**	**2 746 183**	**226 608 130**

[1] Total revenues are reduced by revenue from the public sector, households, the international environment, taxes paid and increased (decreased) by changing the status of loans, etc.

Table 2 Allocation of Funding by Culture Domains and Culture Services Providers in 2015

in thous. CZK

DOMAIN	Historical monuments	Museums and Galleries	Archives	Libraries	Theatres	Musical ensembles	Culture centres	Exhibition halls	Radio	Television	Art education colleges	Copyright protection organizations	Other providers	TOTAL
Cultural heritage	3 145 595	6 340 855	1 558 523	3 238 178	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	5 153 353	**19 436 504**
Performing arts	x	x	x	x	5 342 767	1 306 520	3 327 803	x	x	x	x	x	1 993 426	**11 970 516**
Fine art	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	613 943	x	x	x	x	7 500 088	**8 114 031**
Audio-visual and interactive media	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	4 944 879	20 255 581	x	x	18 559 639	**43 760 099**
Art education	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	821 151	x	7 820 537	**8 641 688**
Management and support of cultural activities	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	507 620	2 068 461	**2 576 081**
Unknown domain	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	132 109 211	**132 109 211**
TOTAL	**3 145 595**	**6 340 855**	**1 558 523**	**3 238 178**	**5 342 767**	**1 306 520**	**3 327 803**	**613 943**	**4 944 879**	**20 255 581**	**821 151**	**507 620**	**175 204 715**	**226 608 130**

Table 3 Income and Expenditure of Cultural Institutions by Culture Domains in 2015

in thous. CZK

DOMAIN	Income (revenue) total	of which: revenues from own operations	Expenditure (costs) total	of which			Difference between income (revenue) and expenditure (costs)
				consumption (material, energy) re goods and services	personnel cost	other expenditure (costs)	
Cultural heritage	**18 604 654**	9 326 215	**18 527 856**	5 616 822	6 663 541	6 247 493	**76 798**
Performing arts	**11 537 870**	4 211 774	**11 514 338**	4 865 541	5 100 717	1 548 080	**23 532**
Fine art	**8 419 212**	7 631 985	**7 097 923**	4 376 742	1 008 877	1 712 304	**1 321 289**
Periodic and non-periodic press	**40 937 888**	34 723 123	**35 993 541**	17 222 204	10 280 687	8 490 650	**4 944 347**
Audio-visual and interactive media	**46 133 754**	34 589 123	**42 811 729**	27 386 477	6 621 300	8 803 952	**3 322 025**
Architecture	**21 493 562**	20 813 473	**18 904 830**	13 151 496	3 077 454	2 675 880	**2 588 732**
Advertising	**68 039 997**	64 592 374	**63 842 501**	42 862 427	6 248 859	14 731 215	**4 197 496**
Art education	**785 960**	533 322	**671 885**	312 909	274 572	84 404	**114 075**
Management and support of cultural activities	**2 495 259**	993 854	**2 481 145**	918 906	1 173 890	388 349	**14 114**
TOTAL	**218 448 156**	**177 415 243**	**201 845 748**	**116 713 524**	**40 449 897**	**44 682 327**	**16 602 408**

Table 4 Income and Expenditure of Cultural Institutions by Culture Services Providers in 2015

in thous. CZK

PROVIDER	Income (revenue) total	of which: revenues from own operations	Expenditure (costs) total	of which			Difference between income (revenue) and expenditure (costs)
				consumption (material, energy) re goods and services	personnel cost	other expenditure (costs)	
Historical monuments	2 606 082	1 706 127	2 513 870	926 063	814 156	773 651	**92 212**
Museums and Galleries	5 272 367	1 120 333	5 107 909	1 754 002	2 375 763	978 144	**164 458**
Archives	1 558 523	472 410	2 070 678	822 452	1 135 703	112 523	**-512 155**
Libraries	3 282 897	285 838	3 373 191	1 112 651	1 934 637	325 903	**-90 294**
Theatres	5 217 708	1 875 747	5 220 855	1 639 927	2 613 866	967 062	**-3 147**
Musical ensembles	1 307 471	540 050	1 239 499	413 561	759 709	66 229	**67 972**
Festivals	1 223 811	484 146	1 298 414	822 121	404 872	71 421	**-74 603**
Culture centres	2 985 380	1 031 375	2 955 047	1 488 324	1 079 542	387 181	**30 333**
Exhibition halls	600 561	212 820	625 567	329 098	221 546	74 923	**-25 006**
Radio	5 565 344	2 593 221	4 287 031	1 965 958	1 664 816	656 257	**1 278 313**
Television	20 764 593	13 380 108	20 312 646	13 137 044	3 819 538	3 356 064	**451 947**
Other providers	168 063 419	153 713 068	152 841 041	92 302 323	23 625 749	36 912 969	**15 222 378**
TOTAL	**218 448 156**	**177 415 243**	**201 845 748**	**116 713 524**	**40 449 897**	**44 682 327**	**16 602 408**

Table 5 Macroeconomic Indicators by Culture Domains in 2015 (estimated)

in thous. CZK b.c.

DOMAIN	Production at basic prices	Intermediate consumption at purchase prices	Gross value added	Share by the respective domains on the total gross value added in %
Cultural heritage	14 342 225	5 501 418	8 840 806	**10.1**
Performing arts	13 864 935	6 538 404	7 326 531	**8.4**
Fine art	9 693 964	6 141 150	3 552 815	**4.1**
Periodic and non-periodic press	33 742 179	18 937 210	14 804 969	**16.9**
Audio-visual and interactive media	49 791 091	28 234 341	21 556 750	**24.7**
Architecture	20 963 394	13 526 917	7 436 477	**8.5**
Advertising	58 994 451	43 706 260	15 288 191	**17.5**
Art education	7 882 041	1 805 770	6 076 270	**7.0**
Management and support of cultural activities	3 752 286	1 221 269	2 531 017	**2.9**
TOTAL	**213 026 566**	**125 612 739**	**87 413 826**	**100.0**

Table 6 Selected Indicators in a tri-sector Breakdown for Culture in 2015 (columns 3-5 estimated)

in thous. CZK

SECTOR	DOMAIN	INCOME (REVENUE) TOTAL	EXPENDITURE (COSTS) TOTAL	VALUE PRODUCTION (in mn CZK)[1]	INTERMEDIATE CONSUMPTION (in mn CZK)[1]	GROSS ADDED VALUE (in mn CZK)[1]	QTY EMPLOYEES (CONVERSION.) in pers.	EXPENDITURE FOR INVESTMENTS	EXPORT GOODS AND SERVICES [2]	IMPORT GOODS AND SERVICES	QTY LEGAL AND PHYSICAL PERSONS	NACE
a	b	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
CULTURE SECTOR	Cultural heritage	18 604 655	18 527 856	14 342	5 501	8 841	18 951	2 761 596	386 948	641 559	10 523	91.01, 02, 03, 47.78, 79 [3]
	Performing arts	11 537 870	11 514 338	13 865	6 538	7 327	14 787	443 953	1 120 968	1 196 521	6 820	90.01,02,04
	Visual Arts [4]	5 103 663	4 322 714	5 876	3 681	2 195	1 865	362 300	598 759	626 492	8 963	74.20,90.03
	Cultural and artistic education	785 960	671 885	7 882	1 806	6 076	599	23 622	.	.	1 050	85.52
	Artistic crafts	496 910	446 770	573	316	257	1 301	6 377	1 177 107	2 210 505	976	division 14, 15, 16, 23, 25, 31, 32, 43 (part)
	Sector total	**36 529 058**	**35 483 563**	**42 538**	**17 842**	**24 696**	**37 503**	**3 597 848**	**3 283 782**	**4 675 077**	**28 332**	–
CULTURAL INDUSTRIES	Film and video	16 334 622	15 679 185	17 626	10 952	6 674	1 444	2 139 648	3 765 079	1 955 951	1 541	59.11,12,13,14, 77.22, 47.63 (in part) [3]
	Music	1 953 812	1 627 851	2 111	1 104	1 007	248	63 169	5 213 737	4 427 356	2 245	59.20, 47.63 (in part) [3]
	Radio	5 565 344	4 287 031	6 004	2 027	3 977	2 195	108 262	i.d.	12 339	72	60.10
	Television	20 764 593	20 312 646	22 411	13 792	8 619	4 804	2 583 649	i.d.	556 087	116	60.20
	Books and print	40 937 888	35 993 540	33 742	18 937	14 805	20 339	965 974	9 254 460	9 972 472	38 812	58.11,13,14,63.91,74.30,47.61,62 [3]
	Video games	1 515 382	905 017	1 639	359	1 280	334	175 739	.	.	35	58.21
	Sector total	**87 071 641**	**78 805 270**	**83 533**	**47 171**	**36 362**	**29 364**	**6 036 441**	**18 337 475**	**16 924 205**	**42 821**	–
CREATIVE INDUSTRIES	Architecture	21 493 562	18 904 830	20 964	13 528	7 436	6 734	735 215	1 024 328	137 373	10 529	71.11
	Advertising	68 039 997	63 842 501	58 995	43 707	15 288	12 237	3 037 844	10 482 753	9 283 539	12 725	73.11
	Design	2 818 639	2 328 439	3 245	2 144	1 101	707	100 910	529 820	578 020	2 645	74.10
	Sector total	**92 352 198**	**85 075 770**	**83 204**	**59 379**	**23 825**	**19 678**	**3 873 969**	**12 036 901**	**9 998 932**	**25 899**	–
Management and support of cultural activities		2 495 259	2 481 145	3 752	1 221	2 531	2 785	69 997	.	.	180	84.11, 12 (in part), 94.99.2
CULTURE IN TOTAL		**218 448 156**	**201 845 748**	**213 027**	**125 613**	**87 414**	**89 330**	**13 578 255**	**33 658 158**	**31 598 214**	**97 232**	**–**

[1] estimate based on own calculations from the national accounts data
[2] for radio and television broadcasts only individual data are available, which may not be disclosed
[3] the data for retail sales apply only to columns 1 to 6
[4] without design and arts and crafts

Table 7a Employment and Wages in Culture in 2015

PROVIDER	Profession of a cultural nature in an organization with predominantly cultural activities	Profession of a 'non-cultural' nature carried out in an organization with predominantly cultural activities	Profession of a cultural nature carried out in an organization with predominantly other than cultural activities	Volunteers	Unspecified profession	TOTAL		
						Total employees	Wages in thous. CZK	**Average wage in CZK**
Historical monument	417	.	.	1 017	1 687	2 104	546 384	**21 641**
Museums and Galleries	2 977	.	.	1 622	3 390	6 367	1 639 642	**21 460**
Archive	.	.	.	.	2 318	2 318	823 338	**29 599**
Library	4 627	.	.	.	839	5 466	1 343 950	**20 490**
Theatre	3 534	.	.	4 602	3 703	7 237	1 839 866	**21 186**
Culture centre	1 638	.	.	1 730	1 583	3 221	713 385	**18 457**
Publishing/publication	6 750	.	.	.	8 699	15 449	5 122 810	**27 633**
Film and video	.	.	.	.	1 444	1 444	498 007	**28 740**
Radio	948	.	.	.	1 247	2 195	1 138 294	**43 215**
Television	3 719	.	.	.	1 086	4 805	2 766 011	**47 971**
Copyright protection and cultural activities support organization	.	.	.	.	339	339	126 000	**30 973**
Other providers	.	.	.	.	38 385	38 385	11 277 050	**24 482**
TOTAL	**24 610**	.	.	**8 971**	**64 720**	**89 330**	**27 834 737**	**25 966**

Table 7b: Employment in Culture by Culture domains in 2015 (using the Workforce sample survey)

DOMAIN	Professions of a cultural nature carried out in an organization with predominantly cultural activities	Profession of a 'non-cultural' nature carried out in an organization with predominantly cultural activities	Profession of a cultural nature carried out in an organization with predominantly other than cultural activities [1]	Total persons employed [2]	of which		
					entrepreneurs	staff on a work contract or agreement	of which employees engaged full time
Cultural heritage	8 546	12 070	.	20 616	3 197	17 417	13 363
Performing arts	11 776	6 035	.	17 811	5 528	12 066	10 405
Fine art	20 197	2 229	.	22 426	16 103	6 047	5 296
Periodic and non-periodic press	13 773	15 182	.	28 955	11 067	17 485	15 133
Audio-visual and interactive media	11 649	6 080	.	17 729	4 823	12 748	10 715
Architecture	5 622	16 520	.	22 142	14 138	7 852	7 299
Advertising	7 065	23 659	.	30 724	12 442	17 833	14 419
Art education	10 402	2 292	.	12 694	1 136	11 558	8 094
Management and support of cultural activities [3]	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Uncategorized to any domain	.	.	37 562	37 562	7 445	29 840	27 742
TOTAL	**89 030**	**84 067**	**37 562**	**210 659**	**75 879**	**132 846**	**112 466**

[1] Some of the selected occupations span different culture domains and it cannot be determined with certainty where they belong (e.g. actors may fall under the performing arts domain in terms of their theatrical activities, as well as the audio-visual and interactive media domains in terms of activities associated with films or advertising). Therefore, cultural occupations outside the cultural organizations are not included in the specific domain and are analyzed only as a whole.

[2] The number of persons working includes employees (having an employment contract or agreement), entrepreneurs (with or without employees) and assisting family members. Assisting family members are not included in the detailed breakdown.

[3] Data on employment within administrative activities associated with culture and the activities of culture supporting organizations, broken down to four digit NACE codes, are not obtainable from the Labour force sample survey.

Table 8 Sources and Extent of Investment in the Culture Sector in 2015

in thous. CZK

PROVIDER	Investment in culture sector	Investment source				of total investments	
		State	from abroad	of which: EU	own and other	tangible fixed assets	intangible fixed assets
Historical monument	**735 666**	169 278	306 288	306 237	260 100	710 292	25 374
Museums and Galleries	**1 208 945**	937 985	95 393	95 393	175 567	1 190 922	18 023
Archive	**468 350**	229 251	.	.	239 099	465 245	3 105
Library	**246 115**	208 318	5 461	3 028	32 336	195 456	50 659
Theatre	**264 978**	130 298	446	446	134 234	263 955	1 023
Concert hall (musical ensembles folk ensembles and festivals)	**19 083**	53 236	.	-	.	19 008	75
Culture centres	**142 724**	132 477	216 496	216 496	x	131 198	11 526
Exhibition hall	**14 682**	11 400	4 755	4 755	x	13 039	1 643
Radio	**108 262**	80	.	.	108 182	96 548	11 714
Television	**2 583 649**	573	.	.	2 583 076	1 117 186	1 466 463
Other providers	**7 785 801**	4 203 507	70 160	70 160	3 270 259	5 491 300	2 294 501
TOTAL	**13 578 255**	**6 076 403**	**698 999**	**696 515**	**6 802 853**	**9 694 149**	**3 884 106**

Table 9 Foreign trade in Goods and Services in the Culture Sector in 2015

in thous. CZK

CULTURE DOMAIN	Geographical breakdown								
	EU		USA		REST OF THE WORLD		TOTAL		
	EXPORTS	IMPORTS	EXPORTS	IMPORTS	EXPORTS	IMPORTS	EXPORTS	IMPORTS	BALANCE
Cultural heritage	361 203	435 728	14 491	164 257	11 254	41 574	**386 948**	**641 559**	**-254 611**
Performing arts	649 921	475 249	52 472	236 878	418 575	484 394	**1 120 968**	**1 196 521**	**-75 553**
Fine art	1 532 137	2 312 331	197 212	52 183	576 337	1 050 503	**2 305 686**	**3 415 017**	**-1 109 331**
Periodic and non-periodic press	8 168 016	6 431 449	331 875	205 796	754 569	3 335 227	**9 254 460**	**9 972 472**	**-718 012**
Audio-visual and interactive media	6 840 465	4 110 650	1 134 095	1 279 371	1 108 455	1 561 712	**9 083 015**	**6 951 733**	**2 131 282**
Architecture	978 708	124 848	298	2 104	45 322	10 421	**1 024 328**	**137 373**	**886 955**
Advertising	9 020 993	6 505 794	255 048	559 557	1 206 712	2 218 188	**10 482 753**	**9 283 539**	**1 199 214**
Art education	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Management and support of cultural activities	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
TOTAL	**27 551 443**	**20 396 049**	**1 985 491**	**2 500 146**	**4 121 224**	**8 702 019**	**33 658 158**	**31 598 214**	**2 059 944**

Table 10 Analytical Table of Basic Indicators of the Culture Sector for 2015

in thous. CZK, in %

DOMAIN SECTOR	PUBLIC RESOURCES		MANAGEMENT LEVEL		GROSS VALUE ADDED		EMPLOYEES		WAGES		INVESTMENTS	
	in thous. CZK	share of the sector in %	degree of self-sufficiency in %	profit margin in %	in millions CZK	share of the sector in %	#	share of the sector in %	average monthly wage in CZK	index to sector average wage	in thous. CZK	subsidies and grants share in %
Cultural heritage	12 484 554	36.4	50.3	6.0	8 841	10.1	18 951	21.2	21 363	82.3	2 761 596	74.9
Performing arts	4 425 059	12.9	36.6	2.3	7 327	8.4	14 787	16.6	20 185	77.7	443 953	100.0
Fine art	74 902	0.2	107.5	16.6	3 553	4.1	3 873	4.3	15 702	60.5	469 587	3.3
Periodic and non-periodic press	51 734	0.1	96.5	13.5	14 805	16.9	20 339	22.8	25 810	99.4	965 974	2.9
Audio-visual and interactive media	1 421 919	4.2	80.8	7.7	21 557	24.7	9 025	10.1	43 826	168.8	5 070 467	0.0
Architecture	68 999	0.2	110.1	10.4	7 436	8.5	6 734	7.5	27 158	104.6	735 215	0.0
Advertising	87 800	0.3	101.2	5.3	15 288	17.5	12 237	13.7	30 366	116.9	3 037 844	0.0
Art education	7 622 587	22.2	79.4	19.9	6 076	6.9	599	0.7	26 042	100.3	23 622	0.0
Management & support of cultural activities and unknown domain	8 044 034	23.5	40.1	0.9	2 531	2.9	2 785	3.1	25 708	99.0	69 997	100.0
TOTAL	**34 281 588**	**100.0**	**87.9**	**8.4**	**87 414**	**100.0**	**89 330**	**100.0**	**25 966**	**100.0**	**13 578 255**	**21.4**
of which: Culture sector	24 591 763	71.7	53.8	8.3	24 696	28.2	37 503	42.0	20 363	78.4	3 597 848	37.8
Cultural industries	1 473 653	4.3	88.0	10.6	36 362	41.6	29 364	32.9	31 181	120.1	6 036 441	0.5
Creative industries	172 138	0.5	103.4	6.9	23 825	27.3	19 678	22.0	28 900	111.3	3 873 969	0.0
Management and support of cultural activities	**1 785 687**	**5.2**	**40.1**	**0.9**	**2 531**	**2.9**	**2 785**	**3.1**	**25 708**	**99.0**	**69 997**	**100.0**

Table 11 Time-series of Selected Indicators of the Culture Sector for 2010-15

in millions CZK

INDICATOR	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Index 2015/2014 in %	Index 2015/2010 in %
Public funds in total	36 283	34 739	34 322	34 644	35 881	34 282	95.5	94.5
Total expenditure	219 816	204 341	205 850	198 111	193 500	201 846	104.3	91.8
Total revenues	229 110	216 212	217 971	206 727	208 191	218 448	104.9	95.3
Degree of self-sufficiency in %	87.1	89.1	84.9	85.7	89.4	87.9	98.3	100.9
Number of employees, headcount	87 018	81 521	79 785	81 417	80 740	89 330	110.6	102.7
Average gross monthly wage in CZK	24 406	24 704	24 982	24 431	25 588	25 966	101.5	106.4
Investment in millions CZK	13 748	11 416	10 369	10 676	12 067	13 578	112.5	98.8
Gross Value Added in bn CZK[1)]	86.1	80.4	84.4	81.4	82.0	87.4	106.6	101.5
Gross Domestic Product in bn CZK[1)]	59.5	53.1	57.3	54.5	58.1	65.6	112.9	110.3
Culture share of GDP in % [1)]	2.40	2.21	2.31	2.22	2.10	2.13	101.4	88.8
Culture share of GDP in % [1)]	**1.50**	**1.32**	**1.41**	**1.33**	**1.35**	**1.44**	**106.7**	**96.00**

[1)] **for 2015 – estimate from preliminary data**

Table 12 Number of Selected Culture Services Providers in 2015

PROVIDER	Cultural enterprises and institution total	of which		
		State	private	other
Heritage site accessible via entrance fee	**315**	207	54	54
Museums and Galleries (Fine Arts Museums)	**484**	385	55	44
Exhibition hall	**284**	97	105	82
Public library	**5 354**	5 354	0	0
Theatre	**214**	77	56	81
Musical ensemble	**208**	38	51	119
Radio	**57**	2	55	0
Television	**150**	13	137	0
Festivals	**485**	153	93	239
Culture centres	**555**	486	36	33
Periodic and non-periodic press publishers	**968**	79	803	86
Total	**9 074**	**6 891**	**1 445**	**738**

Table 13 Relatively ranked performance by Culture Services Providers using standardized indicators in 2015

PROVIDER	Number of visits to cultural facilities per 10K people	Number of titles issued per 10K people	Number of broadcasting hours per 1 broadcast licence holder	Index 2015/2014 in %
Historical monuments	12 412	x	x	**107.8**
Museums and Galleries	11 260	x	x	**101.7**
Exhibition halls	1 973	x	x	**78.3**
Libraries	22 410	x	x	**98.1**
Cinemas	12 292	x	x	**111.9**
Theatres	7 148	x	x	**102.4**
Concert halls (ensembles and festivals)	2 801	x	x	**98.8**
Publishing and publication	x	26	x	**x**
Radio	x	X	17 884	**108.7**
Television	x	x	10 450	**92.5**
Culture centres	8 853	x	x	**105.8**
TOTAL	**79 149**	**26**	**28 334**	**102.6** [1)]

1) covers only attendance