

BACKGROUND MATERIAL FOR AN EU ROMA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK HUNGARY

"...no life is born useless, no life is unwarranted"
[Viktor Orbán, in response to a comment to his opening speech
by Gábor Vona, Hungarian Parliament, 4 Feb. 2011.]

I. Background and stylized facts

1. Problem areas

Unemployment and poverty

Only 40% of adult Roma men are employed and 10% out of this live on temporary (casual jobs or public works), often illegal work. The proportion of the poor in the Roma population is almost four times higher than the national average. Spatial and social mobility is very limited. The majority of Hungarian Roma have not had a stable income for 15-20 years, and are exposed to the whim of local politics and public administration. They have poorer physical health than the national average due to lack of education, poor housing conditions, and also inadequate access to health services. Their life expectancy is 10 years shorter than the Hungarian average (Janky 2004, Kemény-Janky 2003, Kertesi 2005, Kósa et al 2007, Vokó et al 2008).

Low education and spatial segregation

80% of Roma adults – compared to 33% in the total population – only have primary education.¹ Only 42% of Roma children go to nursery school, as compared to 88% of the total population. Among 20-24 year-olds, 5% of the Roma and 55 % of the total population completed secondary education (A levels). Though there has been some increase in levels of education, it has been much slower among Roma than among children from the majority, so that the ethnic gap has in fact increased.

In 2003, the Roma population numbered around 600.000 (6%), with almost two thirds living in Northern Hungary, one of the country's most underdeveloped regions. Around 40 % live in villages of below 5000 inhabitants, which is only slightly higher than in the total population (35%).² However, over 70% live in spatially segregated housing with only or mostly Roma neighbours and up to 26% of the Roma population live in segregated Roma settlements with basic or no infrastructure (6% in Kemény et al 2004, 20-26% in Ungváry et al 2005 and Kósa et al 2009).

But not a homogenous group/community

In terms of origin, the Roma population is divided into at least six clearly distinct groups. Around 90% speak Hungarian as their mother tongue, but this group is further divided according to their past vocation or trade (musician, basket maker etc.). Some 6% speak Romanian (the so-called *Beashi*), while 4% speak different Romani dialects as a first language (*Lovari*, *Kalderashi*). Language groups are further divided by kinship, craft, income and locality. Attitudes to majority norms and integration vary by subgroup (Szuhay 2000, Kemény et al 2004).

Welfare costs are by far lower than perceived (by the majority)

According to the estimations of Hablicsek (2007), the Roma population will number around 660.000 in 2011. The average number of children is higher in Roma families (3.5 per family) than in the non-Roma population, however, the gap is gradually narrowing. In 2003, 300.000 Roma were inactive in the 15-64 year-old age group, vis-à-vis the 3 million non-working adults within

¹ Kemény et al. 2004, Kertesi 2005.

² Based on the Roma survey of Kemény (2004) conducted in 2003 (where Roma were identified both by their neighbours and themselves).

the total population; that is, only 10% of the inactive adults are Roma. The proportion of Roma among recipients of child benefit and unemployment benefits is 10-12%, and below 1% in the case of pensions.³ Ear-marked government spending on Roma integration amounted to 26 billion HUF in 2006 (ÁSZ 2008), which is less than one-tenth of annual public expenditure on cultural, leisure and religious activities (330 billion HUF).

Escalating tensions

The share of Roma among convicted property offenders is relatively high, but not higher than for the similarly educated and poor non Roma (Huszár 1999, OKRI 2008). The police seem unable to give a sense of security to either party: the majority perceive the police as avoiding conflict and take that as a sign of partiality (i.e. a sort of badly implemented political correctness) or intimidation, while the Roma often experience prejudiced treatment (Pap-Simonovits 2007).

The emergence of Magyar Gárda and Jobbik⁴ and hesitant government communication with regard to ethnic conflicts that received extensive media coverage have reframed Roma–non-Roma relations and public discourse as well. The far right proposes illegal means (the Gárda calls on citizens to take the law into their own hands, while Jobbik calls on the government to take autocratic and racist measures) to reassure the public, which heightens tensions and makes it difficult for parties to stay in dialogue, while it also underlines the quite legitimate need for an appropriate response to the weakening of the sense of security in the general public (OKRI 2008). Government communication and actions have been incoherent, rebuking discriminative actions but overlooking racist attitudes in public institutions and giving gestures to appease the majority's demand for "law and order."

2. Causes

Economic shock of the transition

Demand for traditional Roma services declined during the early 20th century, but the decline was slow enough for Roma communities to adapt. Forced industrialisation in the state-socialist era provided ample employment opportunities for low-skilled workers. Until the mid-1980s, the employment rate of non-Roma and Roma men were similar, and the living standard of Roma families was close to the national average. The crisis of the planned economy and the transition to market economy was incredibly rapid: it eroded the market value of primary education within a few years' time and unskilled workers were the first to lose their jobs in declining industries (Kertesi 2005).

Policy failures

Government employment and social policy has tended to have a narrow focus on easing social consequences of the transition, mostly by providing cash benefits, rather than supporting adaptation to the new circumstances. Workers without secondary education were typically excluded from re-training programmes (which were inefficient anyway). The repeated increases of the minimum wage, high taxes on labour and large administrative costs that disproportionately burden small firms have held back the growth of demand for unskilled labour (Nagy 2008, Kertesi-Köllő 2004, Köllő 2009).

The problem of low skilled workers is reproduced by the education system which magnifies the disadvantage of uneducated parents – rather than compensate for it. The inherent deficiencies of public education (lack of monitoring, adverse selection of teachers, obsolete teaching

³ Own calculations based on Kemény et al 2004 and government fiscal reports.

⁴ Established in 2003, far right Jobbik ('The Movement for a Better Hungary') won 3 of the 22 Hungarian seats at the EU elections in 2009 and won 12 % of seats in the national Parliament in 2010. Magyar Gárda (Hungarian Guard) is a closely related movement established in mid 2007 and banned in late 2008.

methods and curricula, the dysfunctional operation of the child-protection network) are worsened by segregation (cause and effect at the same time), and prejudice (strengthened by the earlier, ill-designed ear-marked funding for disadvantaged pupils, which provided an incentive for segregation) (Fazekas et al 2008).⁵

Public services devolved on a very fragmented municipal system in 1990 are seriously underfunded, which poorer regions are unable to compensate for. Since Roma are highly overrepresented in such localities, their access to such services is particularly limited. The evaluation of social benefit claims is also in the remit of municipalities, which, due to the lack of monitoring, stirs up ethnic tensions and/or reinforces the recipients' vulnerability (Nagy 2008, Szalai 2004, 2005).

Whether state-run or managed by NGOs, funding for the programmes promoting integration is volatile and unpredictable and their impact is rarely measured or evaluated (ÁSZ 2008). Integration programmes typically aim at alleviating deprivation and segregation, while there are no public institutions to promote tolerance and a formation of Roma identity (such as a national Roma Archive or a Roma Cultural Center).

Grassroots organisation, weak Roma elite, wrong role models

The Roma political, economic, and cultural elite is narrow, highly fragmented and – just as the non-Roma elite – does not act as a unified advocacy group. Although there are a number of truly devoted Roma activists who work for their community, most Roma organisations are not deeply rooted in local communities: they represent them without participating in their lives. State funding (including EU structural funds) for local private initiatives is erratic: even successful organisations work in precarious and unpredictable financial circumstances, which constrains capacity building. Typical routes of upward social mobility⁶ that are visible and feasible for the Roma (usury, receiving, illegal employment) do not conform to majority (middle-class or elite) norms. Limited access to resources and unequal opportunities lead to survival strategies condemned by the majority.

Politics

The system of minority self-governments can do little to facilitate Roma integration: their relation to local governments (the division of functions and responsibilities) is not clear, they lack professional and financial capacities, and they are often used by national politics as the means of building their clientele. Just as in the Communist era, governments aspire to control Roma organisations or use them to collect votes.

The political commitment to integration policies has never been very firm over the past 20 years, but the necessity of dealing with the problem has moved higher on the political agenda, partly due to increasing pressure from the EU. The previous government joined the Roma Decade and published a strategy in 2007 (SPH 2007) and the new government taking office in 2010 established a new ministerial unit with considerable resources for promoting the integration of disadvantaged (and among them Roma) people.

⁵ Education policy has improved considerably since 2002. EU funded integration projects in education have reached one fourth of public schools providing materials and training in up-to-date teaching methodology. The very thorough evaluation of the programmes has indicated a significant improvement in the school performance of disadvantaged (and within that, Roma) pupils with no negative side effect on the performance of non-Roma children (Kézdi and Surányi 2008). For a qualitative evaluation of the programmes in SROP, see Reszkető et al (2010).

⁶ The few alternatives (e.g. Romaversitas or REF scholarships) are far too small to reach all Roma communities.

Prejudices, legal environment, media

Prejudices persist – both in the general population and among employers.⁷ Anti-discrimination legislation and administrative procedures that tackle ethnic discrimination have taken a long time to establish and their enforcement is still quite weak (Majtényi 2009).

Many of the non-Roma poor live in deprivation, moreover, widening income inequalities and increasingly uncertain economic prospects have shaken the lower middle-class, who now feel left behind and their livelihood threatened. Many have had negative experiences during conflicts stirred up in ethnically mixed areas. Such experiences are exaggerated by the media that tend to present Roma in conflict situations in order to attract a wide audience, and make little effort to provide a balanced coverage of Roma people's lives (Bernáth-Messing 1998, Terestyéni 2004, SZMM 2007). Due to Magyar Gárda and the hesitant reactions of authorities to their activities, ethnic tensions have taken a fundamentally new framing that carries the possibility of intentional physical violence. The Gárda holds explicitly racist views (such as the genetic criminality of Roma people), and promises effective protection to non-Roma communities as a substitute to inept authorities. This offers an excuse, legitimation, support and the illusion of protection to all those who are prejudiced against Roma on account of their everyday grievances.

Public discourse is dominated by biased emotional monologues leaving little room for the impartial discussion of facts and explanations. In the debates about possible solutions the two fractions do not listen to each other, unable to understand the other's point of view. One side emphasizes the harms caused by racism and ethnic discrimination, while the other points to the presupposed idleness, criminality, and irresponsibility of Roma people.

II. Policy solutions

The complexity of the above outlined problem obviously requires coherent and complex government action and sustained political commitment.

In the following, we review policy making itself and six selected policy areas. Four of these are Roma Decade focus areas (health, housing, education and employment), and two (empowerment and policy making) are added on account of their importance in the Hungarian context. The review examines strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in each policy area, focusing on issues within the remit of the national government. In particular, we consider the existing situation and resources, available policy tools and expert capacity, awareness of problems, stakeholder interests and political commitment.

The review is based partly on the previous section and partly on two workshops (with academic experts and practitioners) held on 25 February and 7 March 2011.⁸

⁷ A survey by Tárki in 2005 found that almost two thirds of the adult Hungarian population agree more or less with the statement: „criminality is genetically coded in gypsies” and 80% believe that the „problems of the Roma would be solved if they finally started to work”. Hungarians tend to be intolerant of other minorities and sub-cultures (Dencsó-Sik 2007).

⁸ The participation and valuable contributions of Eszter Berényi, Karolina Kósa, Ádám Kullmann, György Lukács, Jenő Setét, Nóra Teller, Erika Törzsök, and Miklós Vecsei are gratefully acknowledged. Participants on the part of the Budapest Institute included Mariann Dósa, Petra Reszkető, Ágota Scharle and Balázs Váradi. We also thank Angéla Kóczé and Deyan Kolev for very useful comments on an earlier version of this document.

SWOT analysis of six selected policy areas

1. MAJORITY ATTITUDES	
<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Equal Treatment Authority (EBH): small, but committed ▪ Some effort in previous govmts: Roma Media Green book identified problems and some solutions, pilots of media apprenticeship ▪ in public speech, PC expected of government level politicians ▪ some committed members in government (Balog, Navracsics) ▪ coming out of economic crisis 	<p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ massive negative attitudes ▪ limited NGO capacities (in shaping attitudes) ▪ quality and consistency of government communication has weakened ▪ consensus/commitment to PC weakened ▪ extreme right (Jobbik) in Parliament + Gárda ▪ Balog – more politician than expert ▪ demand for scapegoats (crisis)
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ some policy tools (RM green book) ▪ strong central government (2/3) ▪ strong media authority ▪ increased public trust in government ▪ firm handed government leadership 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ intra-government fights » negative outcomes or stalemate in integration policy ▪ redesign of welfare system generates new tensions, fuel to ethnic conflicts

2. EMPLOYMENT	
<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ nature of problem well understood by experts, tools clearly identified (Köllő 2009) ▪ PES relatively well organised and devoted ▪ Some NGO good practice 	<p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ low demand for unskilled labour (partly exogenous and slow to change) ▪ insufficient expert capacity in employment and rehabilitation services ▪ NGO innovations not mainstreamed ▪ discrimination by employers
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ high on political agenda / commitment ▪ high awareness of its importance ▪ municipal reform / strengthen employment services of PES+NGOs ▪ cut admin burden to support SMEs 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ impatience and ignorance leading to badly designed policies that worsen the situation (cf minwage rise in 2001) ▪ large rents in existing system of wage subsidies -> stakeholders block reforms

3. EDUCATION	
<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Committed and highly qualified experts in/near policy-making ▪ increased capacities to support development: mentors, trainers in IPR ▪ monitoring tools (OKM, PISA) ▪ Green book: identified problems and solutions, a govmt initiative with strong expert involvement and extensive consultations (Fazekas et al 2009) ▪ Active NGOs, professional organisations ▪ IPR: a successful national programme ▪ conditionality of development funding (on equal opportunity): a promising tool ▪ some local success stories (and many mixed) 	<p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ system induces selection by family background and early tracking ▪ anti-Roma attitudes in EU ▪ IPR didn't take root in teacher training ▪ Rebirth of conservative family model hinders early childhood development ▪ Some badly designed programs (esp scholarships) and unstable financing ▪ NGO innovations not mainstreamed ▪ segregation persists in many areas/schools
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ majority less intolerant of equal opportunities (and positive discrimination) in education ▪ municipal reform ▪ political landslide weakened mayors' lobby: easier to close poor quality small schools ▪ continue Sure Start and IPR programme ▪ redesign scholarships ▪ support Gandhi, Romaversitas, etc ▪ publicity for role models 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ lack of political will, conflict within govmt ▪ adverse selection in exiting school staff ▪ schools remain a municipal responsibility with little monitoring ▪ NGO funding unstable/cut further ▪ dismantle conditional development funding ▪ discontinue existing successful programmes ▪ policy U-turn: benevolent expansion of segregation
4. HEALTH	
<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ existing services relatively high quality ▪ network of special medical personnel for pregnant women (védőnők) ▪ awareness/consensus on importance of public health/prevention at expert level ▪ govmt public health strategy (NNP2003) ▪ some pilot projects 	<p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ unequal access to services ▪ poor health consciousness of public ▪ poor understanding/misconceptions of cultural differences (??) across Roma communities re health/medical treatment ▪ lack of preventive measures, lack of political will to implement PH strategy ▪ corrupted financing (hálapénz) ▪ affordability of medication is critical
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ some pilot projects, good practices (CEE region) ▪ train/sensitise healthcare staff ▪ increase share of preventive healthcare ▪ raise health consciousness in Roma communities ▪ CCT to promote prevention ▪ reach parents via children (Sure Start) ▪ geographical targeting 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ short term costs dominate long term benefits ▪ deterioration of health care services reach a critical level – the poor are more vulnerable to consequences

5. EMPOWERMENT	
<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ some authentic Roma politicians (mostly women!) ▪ NGOs aware of lack of capacities/cooperation (social capital) at the local level ▪ equal opportunities policies mainstreamed during previous planning period in several sectors and urban development 	<p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ party politics hijacked/strangled grassroots initiatives ▪ token Roma representatives ▪ minority self-governments: ill-designed ▪ dependency on the state ▪ strong paternalist attitudes ▪ no expert consensus on solutions ▪ lack of capacities at local level to plan, apply for and absorb (EU) grants ▪ lack of national donors (or of a donor-strategy)
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some public support for political representation of minorities ▪ Evaluate and redesign minority self-gov. system (use 2/3 in parliament) ▪ monitoring of EU structural funds ▪ support choice of Roma identity for newly integrated Roma 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Soros-dependency

6. HOUSING	
<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ some pilot projects 	<p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ low-quality housing stock is high ▪ unresolved legal/property issues ▪ poorly designed/underfinanced pilots ▪ poor monitoring: no data on pilots ▪ bad targeting of housing subsidies (middle class instead of the poor) ▪ inappropriate policy tools (subsidies for buying property not renting/maintaining) ▪ weakness of local political institutions (civilian involvement, transparency etc) ▪ resources locked in past (badly designed) policy measures ▪ construction industry highly corrupted ▪ discrete problem: ghetto
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ analyse pilots, identify good practice ▪ understood need for complex solutions ▪ more flexible EU funding ▪ transfer of good practice (from edu): mentors in settlement elimination ▪ EU-wide mobility 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ housing conditions limit access to services, labour market and education ▪ no policy change aggravates situation as costs are increasing ▪ govt unable to design complex solutions ▪ EU migration (the lack of) ▪ migration of the Roma elite

SWOT analysis of policy making in roma integration

POLICY MAKING IN GENERAL	
<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integration is on the govmt agenda, assigned to separate govmt unit (KIM) ▪ EU presidency priority ▪ Well designed policy tools (esp conditionality of development funding) ▪ Increased centralisation of decision-making ▪ committed/highly qualified experts in/near policy-making 	<p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ divided discourse – no interaction bween liberal/conservative/extreme fractions ▪ new govmt not relying on expert input and consultation – or not in public ▪ no use of indicators / no accountability ▪ no evaluation and no feedback/sanctions to poor performers at any level of govmt ▪ no monitoring, no reliance on empirical evidence in policy design ▪ no long term strategy, no attempt at coherent policy formation ▪ lack of capacities for implementation ▪ no involvement of stakeholders ▪ poor management at National Development Agency/ in public admin. ▪ No legitimate Roma self-representation at central govmt level
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ strengthening the combination of Roma-targeted and mainstreaming approach ▪ geographical targeting (LHH) ▪ EU structural funds » may elicit strategic thinking, assessment ▪ external watchdogs ▪ involvement of NGOs +mainstreaming ▪ monitoring and evaluation 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ fragmented responsibilities: NEFMI, BM, KIM, NGM ▪ Jobbik as partner or rival ▪ criminalization of petty crime ▪ neo-paternalism ▪ dismantle conditional developmt funding ▪ unable to detect and correct mistakes ▪ unaware of (negative) impact of govmt communication

Abbreviations

- CCT Conditional Cash Transfer
 EBH Equal Opportunity Authority (Egyenlő Bánásmód Hatóság
<http://www.egyenlobanasmod.hu/index.php?g=english.htm>
 IPR Integrációs Pedagógiai Rendszer (teaching methods for integrated education)
 LHH leghátrányosabb helyzetű kistérségek (most disadvantaged small regions)
 NGO non governmental organisation
 OKM Országos Kompetencia Mérés (National Competence Test)
 PC politically correct
 PES Public Employment Services
 SME small and medium enterprise

III. Recommendations

Based on the above review of integration policies and following a consultation with experts, we identified five key measures that are feasible, in the remit of the Hungarian government and, if properly implemented, would efficiently and effectively contribute to integrating the Roma in Hungary. These are all specific to Hungary both in the sense that they relate to the Hungarian context and that they reflect inefficiencies in the Hungarian administration of EU or national funds rather than EU level rules (which would in fact allow most of what we propose).

1. *Additional public funding for mainstream employment and welfare services in disadvantaged communities, based on geographical targeting*

Extra funding should be given via regular channels of government finance in a way that it improves access to and quality of services. This requires a careful design of tools and targeting to safeguard for interference by political and stakeholder interests.

Positive examples:

- additional funding for integration programmes and mentoring made available to schools in areas with over 40% of disadvantaged population (implemented in SROP projects)
- additional central government funding for combined community and daycare services for children in disadvantaged rural areas (proposal by <http://www.childpoverty.hu/>)

Negative examples:

- general wage rise to teachers in public education as opposed to a bonus for teachers working with disadvantaged pupils (government plans vs proposal of Green Book)
- defining disadvantage too widely and on the basis of a multitude of indicators, whose selection is biased by political motivation and subject to frequent change (current practice)

2. *Identify and remove/curb mechanisms within mainstream welfare programmes (esp healthcare, education, housing, employment) that regenerate exclusion*

Targeted programmes for disadvantaged groups can never compensate for disadvantages generated by mainstream welfare services. For integration policies to be efficient and effective, regular policies must support equal opportunities and provide a basis for targeted programmes.

Positive examples:

- development project in public education improved general quality of teaching by promoting up-to-date methods, which supported teachers of disadvantaged children (implemented in SROP).
- development funds made conditional on designing and implementing local equal opportunities policy (implemented in education, plans of further extension suspended)

Negative examples:

- freedom of school choice and early tracking in public education contributes to the inability of the education system to compensate for disadvantaged family background (current practice)
- reducing the school leaving age will have the same effect (newly announced govmt plan)

3. *Social diagnosis based complex development in seriously deprived areas*

In some crisis-ridden areas human and social capital has been eroded to a degree that makes them incapable of absorbing funding via the regular channels and mainstream programmes, no matter how well designed and well targeted. No community planning is possible in places where there is no sense of community and no amount of grants will make a difference if there is no forum/tools to identify problems and no leaders to find and implement the right solutions. In such areas, development should be very specifically tailored to local needs

identified by social diagnosis, and combined with community development. Funding should be provided on the basis of need as opposed to competitive grants. The assessment of eligibility should rely on valid, internationally accepted indicators, and the involvement of experienced NGOs.

Good example:

- The Hungarian Maltese Charity has worked out this approach in Tarnabod (a small village in Eastern Hungary), securing funding from several sources. They recently started three other projects using the same approach (see <http://kktt.tutorialapitvany.hu/>)

Negative example:

- EU grants for disadvantaged regions have failed to reach the most disadvantaged villages, as they were unwilling or unable to prepare grant applications.

4. *Long term funding for complex programmes*

Complex programmes and especially those that involve community development as well (see No. 3 above) take longer to implement and become self-financing than most simple projects, such as infrastructure development. If the funding period is too short, projects are usually halted or abandoned before fruition, which may do more damage than good as it erodes even existing local reserves of trust, legitimacy and resources. The idea here is not about sustainability, but the preceding stage: the implementation phase should be long enough (5-8 years) and safely financed so that results are firmly established before the challenge of securing new sources of finance emerges.

Positive example:

- None in complex projects.

Negative examples:

- Roma community houses were established from EU funding and closed down as there was no follow up to help them secure stable funding.

5. *Complexity of programmes*

The disadvantages of the Roma are almost always multiple and therefore need to be tackled by complex programmes (even when communities are strong enough to absorb funding) with a strong employment component, making use of available multi-fund financing tools. Unidimensional programmes often do more harm than good.

Positive example:

- EU financed Sure Start provides early development, preventive health services, family care and community development via fostering relations between parents and school. (see www.biztoskezdet.hu)

- Complex housing project in Szomolya (unfinished yet) (see Petrovacz et al 2010)

Negative example:

- most housing projects aimed at roma settlements failed due to the failure to combine them with employment and social services and community development.

IV. Recommended targets for 2020

<i>EU 2020 Indicator</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Cautious target</i>	<i>Ambitious target</i>	<i>NRP target*</i>
Employment rate (aged 20-64)	20 (2003)	24	29	75
Early school leavers	55 (2009)**	30	20	10
Completed tertiary education	0.3 (2003)	10	15	30.3

*For the total population in the Draft NRP of 2010. Data for 2003 is based on Kemény (2004). ** estimate by Kertesi and Kézdi (2010) based on microdata on school attendance for 2007.

Notes for the recommended targets:

Ambitious targets are assuming above average improvement in the Roma population in relative terms, so that the ethnic gap is narrowing.

Cautious targets:

- employment: 24% is the pre-crisis employment rate for the total population with only primary education.
- school dropout rate: the proposed 30% is based on the argument that earlier reforms in public education should make it possible to considerably reduce inequality in education and on the recent, fast-improving trend (see Kertesi and Kézdi 2010). (Note that the definition of this indicator is not completely clear for Hungary as it depends on the distinction between lower and upper secondary education. Figures reported to Eurostat have been contested by some experts.)
- tertiary education: 5% is based on the proportion of Roma youth with upper secondary education (about 5% in 2003 and 21% in 2009, for the youngest cohort).
- poverty: no target is proposed as the indicator for the national target set in the draft NRP was not clearly defined.

V. References

- Andor Mihály (2005): Lépéskényszer. Az extenzív fejlődés lehetőségeinek kimerülése az oktatásban. *Iskolakultúra* 3. 57-70
- ÁSZ (2008) A magyarországi cigányság helyzetének javítására és felemelkedésére a rendszerváltás óta fordított támogatások mértéke és hatékonysága, Állami Számvevőszék, 2008. április
[http://www.asz.hu/ASZ/tanulmányok.nsf/0/79ED5720B293EBC9C12574F30031B5C7/\\$File/t206.pdf](http://www.asz.hu/ASZ/tanulmányok.nsf/0/79ED5720B293EBC9C12574F30031B5C7/$File/t206.pdf)
- Bernáth Gábor - Messing Vera (1998): "Vágóképként, csak némában" Romák a magyarországi médiában
<http://mek.oszk.hu/00100/00144/00144.pdf> Budapest: Nemzeti és Etnikai Kisebbségi Hivatal.
- Bundula István interjúja Szalai Júlia szociológussal a romák iskolai szocializációjáról "Nagy súlyú új történelmi fejlemény" *Magyar Narancs* 2008
<http://www.narancs.hu/index.php?gcPage=/public/hirek/hir.php&id=16108>
- Cs. Czahesz E. és Radó P. (2003): Oktatási egyenlőtlenségek és speciális igények. In: Halász G. és Lannert J. (szerk.): *Jelentés a magyar közoktatásról 2003*. Országos Közoktatási Intézet, Budapest.
- SPH (2007): Decade of Roma Inclusion Programme: Strategic Plan of Hungary, Ministry of Welfare and Employment <http://www.szmm.gov.hu/download.php?ctag=download&docID=14787>
- Dencső Blanka- Sik Endre (2007): Adalékok az előítéletesség mértékének és okainak megismeréséhez a mai Magyarországon, *Educatio*, 2007/I szám (Előítéletek tematikus szám, vendégszerkesztő: Erős Ferenc)
- Enyedi Zs. – Fábíán Z. – Sik E. (2004) Nőtt-e az előítéletek Magyarországon? Megjelent: Társadalmi Riport 2004, TÁRKI
- Farkas Dalma (2009): Szomolya a romákért vagy a romák Szomolyáért? ELTE szakdolgozat, 2009
- Fazekas et al (2009) Green Book for the Renewal of Public Education in Hungary
<http://mek.oszk.hu/08200/08221/08221.pdf>
- Fazekas K – Köllő J. – Varga J. (2008) (szerk.): Zöld könyv a magyar közoktatás megújításáért. Oktatási és Gyermekesély Kerekasztal, Budapest, 2008
- Fehérvári Anikó (2007): A hátrányos helyzetű tanulókat oktató tanárok, *Educatio*, 2007/I szám
- Havas G.–Liskó I.–Kemény I. (2002): *Cigány gyerekek az általános iskolában*. Budapest: Oktatáskutató Intézet– Új Mandátum Kiadó.
- Huszár L. (1999): Roma fogvatartottak a büntetés-végrehajtásban, *Belügyi szemle* 47. évf. 7-8. sz. 124-133. o. <http://dev.romapage.hu/tudomany/hircentrum/article/70991/73/page/1/>
- Janky, B. (1999): Lakóhely-változtatások a cigányok körében, In: Glatz, F. (ed) : *A cigányok Magyarországon*, Budapest, MTA, pp.73-101
- Janky Béla (2004): A cigány családok jövedelmi helyzete, megjelent: Társadalmi Riport 2004, TÁRKI
- Janky Béla (2007): A korai gyermekvállalást meghatározó tényezők a cigány nők körében. *Demográfia* 50. évfolyam 1. szám 55-73.o.
- Kemény I (2004): A magyarországi cigány népesség demográfiája, *Demográfia*, 2004 (3-4) 335-346. o. http://www.demografia.hu/Demografia/2004_3-4/Kemeny%20Istvan_kozl.pdf
- Kemény I.–Janky B. - Lengyel G. (2004): A magyarországi cigányság 1971–2003. Budapest: Gondolat.
http://www.mtaki.hu/kiadvanyok/kemeny_janky_lengyel_moi_ciganyag_main.html
- Kemény, I. – Janky, B. [2003]: A 2003. évi cigány felmérésről. *Beszélő*, 2003/október
- Kertesi G. – Kézdi G. (2006): A hátrányos helyzetű és roma fiatalok eljuttatása az érettségijéhez. Egy különösen nagy hosszú távú költségvetési nyereséget biztosító befektetés, *BWP – 2006/6*
<http://www.econ.core.hu/doc/bwp/bwp/bwp0606.pdf>
- Kertesi G. - Köllő J. (2004): A 2001. évi minimálbéremelés foglalkoztatási következményei, *Közgazdasági szemle*, 2004. április, 293-324. o.
- Kertesi G. (1995): Cigánygyerekek az iskolában, cigányfelnőttek a munkaerőpiacon. *Közgazdasági Szemle*, 42.
- Kertesi G. (2005): Roma foglalkoztatás az ezredfordulón. *Szociológiai Szemle*, 2: 57-87
- Kertesi G.-Kézdi G. (2005): A foglalkoztatási válság gyermekei, Roma fiatalok középiskolai továbbtanulása az elhúzódó foglalkoztatási válság idején *BWP* 2005/5 <http://mek.oszk.hu/03600/03675/03675.pdf>

- Kertesi G.-Kézdi G. (2010): Roma Employment in Hungary After the Post-Communist Transition, BWP 2010/9. <http://www.econ.core.hu/file/download/bwp/bwp1009.pdf>
- Kézdi G. (2007): Az integrált oktatás hatása roma és nem roma tanulókra, OKM, előadás http://www.okm.gov.hu/letolt/kozokt/felmeres_071115.pdf
- Kézdi Gábor és Surányi Éva (2008): Egy sikeres iskolai integrációs program tapasztalatai. A hátrányos helyzetű tanulók oktatási integrációs programjának hatásvizsgálata. Educatio Közhasznú Társaság. Budapest, 2008.
- Kézdi Gábor, Surányi Éva, Varga Júlia (2008) [III. Tanárok, diákok, társadalmi környezet](#) in: Fazekas (szerk) Közoktatás, iskolai tudás és munkapiaci siker, MTA-KTI 2008 <http://econ.core.hu/file/download/ktik9/tarsadalom.pdf> ; Tudósítás: Sikeres a roma integrációs program. Köznevelés 2007 november <http://www.koznev.hu/cikk.php?uid=2268&rov=1> ; http://idea.nolblog.hu/?post_id=33285 ; <http://nol.hu/cikk/477759/>
- Kopasz M. (2004): Lakóhelyi szegregáció és társadalmi feszültségek a magyarországi településeken, megjelent: Társadalmi Riport 2004, TÁRKI
- Kósa K., Daragó L., Ádány R: Environmental survey of segregated habitats of Roma in Hungary: a way to be empowering and reliable in minority research. The European Journal of Public Health Advance Access published July 17, 2009.
- Kósa, Zs. et al: A Comparative Health Survey of the Inhabitants of Roma Settlements in Hungary. Am J Public Health. 2007 May; 97(5): 853-859.
- Köllő J. (2009) A pálya szélén. Iskolázatlan munkanélküliek a poszt-szocialista gazdaságban, Osiris
- Ladányi János és Szelényi Iván (2002): Cigányok és szegények Magyarországon, Romániában és Bulgáriában, Szociológiai Szemle 2002/4. 72–94. o.
- Loss Sándor-H. Szilágyi István (2001): A "cigány per", megjelent: Beszélő 2001 április <http://beszelo.c3.hu/01/04/26loss.htm>
- Majtényi Balázs (2009 szerk.): Lejtős pálya - Antidiszkrimináció és esélyegyenlőség - Föld-rész Könyvek, L'Harmattan Kiadó, 2009
- Nagy Gy. (2008): Önkormányzati szociális segélyezés, in: Nagy Gy. szerk.: Jóléti ellátások, szakképzés és munkakínálat, MTA-KTI.
- NNP(2003): Nemzeti Népegészségügyi Program <http://color.oefi.hu/melleklet/NNP.pdf>
- OKRI (2008): Állásfoglalás a magyarországi bűnözési helyzetről, az elkövetők etnikai hovatartozásának nyilvántartásáról és a „cigánybűnözésről”, Országos Kriminológiai Intézet http://www.okri.hu/images/stories/doc_files/allasfoglalas_hossz.doc
- Otlakán Krisztián (2007): Diszkriminálnak-e a hazai munkáltatók? I-II. rész Munkaügyi szemle
- Pap A. L. – Simonovits B. (2007): Látható és mégsem látható előítéletesség a rendőri igazoltatási gyakorlatban – adalékok a rendészeti jog felülvizsgálatának kérdéséhez. Rendészeti Szemle. 2007/5. 27–56. o. (kivonatot ld „Igazolt diszkrimináció. Etnikai alapú kiválasztás a magyar rendőrség igazoltatási gyakorlatában,” Élet és Irodalom 2007 május 20. szám <http://www.es.hu/pd/display.asp?channel=PUBLICISZTIKA0720&article=2007-0521-0709-05KALO>
- Petrovác, R, Somogyi, E, Teller, N. (2010): Telepeken és telepszerű lakókörnyezetben élők integrációs programjának értékelése, Városkutatás kft, 2010. június 1.
- Rádai Eszter interjúja Bíró András polgárjogi aktivistával „Hogy itt gyilkosságoknak leszünk tanúi, az nem kétséges” Élet és Irodalom 52/29. szám
- Reszkető P.E., Scharle Á, and Váradi, B. (2010): Evaluation of the Equal Opportunity and Integration Project SROP 331 (full report available in Hungarian only) http://www.budapestinstitute.eu/uploads/BI_SROP331_evaluation_summary.pdf
- Roma Média Zöld Könyv (2007) http://www.romaweb.hu/doc/kormanyzat/2007/zoldkonyv_romakmediaabrazolasa.pdf
- Szalai, Júlia (2002) A társadalmi kirekesztődés egyes kérdései az ezredforduló Magyarországon. Szociológiai Szemle, 2002/4. 34-50
- Szalai Júlia (2004, 2005): A jóléti fogda I. és II., Esély, 2004/6; Esély 2005/1.
- SzMM (2007): Zöld könyv. A romák médiaábrázolása, Szociális és Munkaügyi Minisztérium, Budapest, 2007. http://www.romaweb.hu/doc/kormanyzat/2007/zoldkonyv_romakmediaabrazolasa.pdf

Szuhay Péter (2000): A cigány etnikai csoportok öndefiníciói, megjelent Kemény (2000, szerk): A magyarországi romák, Változó Világ 31., Budapest.

http://www.sulinet.hu/oroksegtar/data/Magyarorszag_i_nemzetisegek_kotetei/Valtozo_vilag_sorozat/A_magyarorszag_i_romak/pages/006_a_ciganysag.htm

Takács Géza: Roma napló Gondola.hu

[Terestyéni Tamás](http://www.mediakutato.hu/cikk/2004_02_nyar/08_sajto_roma/01.html) (2004): A sajtó roma vonatkozású tartalmai a 2002-es parlamenti választások kontextusában, Médiakutató, 2004.

http://www.mediakutato.hu/cikk/2004_02_nyar/08_sajto_roma/01.html

Ungváry Gy., Odor A., Bényi M., Balogh S., Szakmáry É.: Romatelepek Magyarországon - gyermekek egészségügyi ellátása, higiénés viszonyok. Orvosi Hetilap 146(15): 691-699, 2005.

Vokó Z., Csépe P., Németh R., Kósa K., Kósa Zs., Széles Gy., Ádány R. (2008): Does socioeconomic status fully mediate the effect of ethnicity on the health of Roma people in Hungary?, J Epidemiol Community Health doi:10.1136/jech.2008.079715

V. Appendix

CROSS CUTTING ISSUES AFFECTING ALL POLICY AREAS	[repeated from the policy SWOT above]
<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased centralisation of decision-making 	<p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ lack of capacities at local level to plan, apply for and absorb (EU) grants ▪ unequal access to existing services ▪ unstable financing of int programmes ▪ NGO innovations not mainstreamed ▪ dependency on the state ▪ strong paternalist attitudes ▪ lack of political will to continue integration effort ▪ new govt not relying on expert input and consultation ▪ no evaluation and no feedback/sanctions to poor performers at any level of govt ▪ no monitoring, no reliance on empirical evidence in policy design ▪ no long term strategy, no attempt at coherent policy formation ▪ poor management at National Development Agency/ in public admin.
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ strong central government (2/3) ▪ increased public trust in government ▪ firm handed government leadership ▪ municipal reform ▪ targeting mostly in socio-economic and not ethnic terms ▪ geographical targeting (LHH) ▪ monitoring of EU structural funds ▪ EU structural funds » may elicit strategic thinking, assessment ▪ external watchdogs ▪ monitoring and evaluation ▪ involvement of NGOs +mainstreaming 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ impatience and ignorance leading to badly designed policies that worsen the situation ▪ discontinue existing successful programmes/ conditional development funding ▪ govt unable to design complex solutions/ detect and correct mistakes ▪ neo-paternalism ▪ intra-government fights ▪ short term costs dominate long term benefits ▪ Jobbik as partner or rival ▪ Soros-dependency