

Situation of Roma in Hungary - United Nations Development Programme National Report

Introduction

Organised and supported by the Development Programme of the UN (UNDP) and the International Labour Organisation (ILO) a large-scale sociological research was carried out in 2001/2002, involving five countries of Central and Eastern Europe (Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia). The aim of this has been to enable researchers to gain comparable information on the Romani population of the region. The regional study seeks to provide exact, reliable and comparable statistical data that might be necessary for continuing work.

As it has been stressed in the report of the regional research, reliable data are needed for the elaboration of the guidelines of a policy to help Romani. However, the statistical data related to the situation of the Romani living in Central and Eastern Europe have been insufficient to this day. Naturally, researches, analyses and reports have been carried out and prepared on individual countries, but these do not enable comparison and standardisation due to differences of the situation in each country. This regional research aims to make up for that insufficiency.

According to the data of the regional research, the Romani minority tends to aim at integration rather than assimilation. Integration should replace the present dependence on state benefits; in order to achieve sustainability, three major deficiencies should be dealt with:

- Equal access to employment opportunities;
- Equal access to education;
- Participation in administration, especially at local level.

The primary objective of the regional report and review has been to collect and process the comparative data on the five countries; meanwhile, the researchers also intended to publish the data on each country separately in the form of national reports.

Several national reports have been prepared on the situation of the Romani population of Hungary¹. In preparing the present report, we aimed to introduce two of the above mentioned field in detail, in accordance with the results of the research: the relationship of the labour market and education to the Romani population of the country.

It is the issues related to the interest promotion and political representation of the Romani that prove most difficult to standardise with respect to the five countries examined. While Romani parties have been operating for several years in Romania and Bulgaria, they exist only formally in Hungary, and do not have any actual political role. At the same time, the Hungarian system of minority self-governments is unique, and cannot be found in the neighbouring countries. All these factors makes make it difficult to compare opinions on representation at either national or local level, as well as attitudes towards policies. As the questionnaire-based research aimed at international standardisation rather than the exploration of local features, we incorporated in the analyses of these fields the results of other researches carried out in the country, and prepared each chapter on the basis of these. We indicated the source researches in each chapter. The most important data of the ILO/UNDP research relating to Hungary are found at the

beginning of each chapter, and at the end of the report, including the description of the technical details of the data collection.

Education

Education is a crucial factor with regard to both the existing and the reproduced social inequalities. This is also highly manifest in the fact that the maximum educational achievement of 78% of the respondents involved in the questionnaire-based research is the general school (lower secondary level), and a significant proportion of these (one third of the total number of respondents) have not even accomplished the 8-grade general school. The "settlement slope" is also outstanding in terms of educational levels: while 10.5% of the Romani respondents living in Budapest have accomplished at least secondary school, this percentage is only 2.5% in the case of village-resident Romani. Segregation is also a drawback in educational promotion; the proportion of those holding a vocational or trade school qualification is a much smaller among residents of areas with mostly Romani population and geographically segregated Romani settlements than among residents of "mixed" settlements.

Respondents' educational achievement

	N	%
None, or lower than the 8-grade general school	339	34.0
8-grade general school	445	44.6
Unaccomplished secondary school	175	17.5
Secondary school and higher	39	3.9
NR.	2	0.2
Total	1000	100

		Respondents' educational achievement				Total
		lower than the 8-grade general school	8-grade general school	Unaccomplished secondary school	Vocational secondary school and higher	
Settlement type	Budapest	28,1	47,4	14,0	10,5	100
	Town	33,0	43,5	18,8	4,8	100
	Village	35,4	45,2	16,9	2,5	100
Respondent's residence	Mainly inhabited by Romani	43,0	41,7	13,4	1,9	100
	Mixed Romani and non-Romani population	30,4	44,9	19,8	4,9	100

	Mainly non-Romani population	18,9	53,7	21,1	6,3	100
	NR.	32,4	45,1	18,2	4,3	100
	Central part of the settlement	34,3	43,2	18,9	3,6	100
	Non-central part of the settlement	47,1	41,2	11,8		100
	Segregated part of the settlement	39,5	45,6	11,4	3,5	100
	Gypsy settlement	34,0	44,6	17,5	3,9	100
Total		34,0	44,6	17,5	3,9	100

Source: UNDP/ILO research (January 2002)

In reviewing the educational situation of Roma students, we must take into account a variety of factors. We must consider the results of surveys conducted in the past year, the measures taken and the promises made by the Ministry of Education, the status of state-funded programs, the impact of Roma projects operating on the basis of civil initiatives, as well as the effects of the social environment upon educational issues.

Studies analyzing the educational situation of the Roma unanimously state that the academic achievement of Roma children is below that of their classmates. When researchers examine the reasons for this disparity, they focus on kindergarten attendance, schools for children with moderate mental disabilities, tutoring, further education and vocational training.

Major surveys

Gabor HAVAS - Istvan KEMENY - Ilona LISKO: Roma children in elementary schools, Education Research Institute, Budapest, 2001

The purpose of this survey was to assess the levels of ethnic segregation in the Hungarian educational system. Towards this end, researchers examined the pedagogical methods in use, as well as the attitudes and aspirations of the local governments, teachers and parents. They found that while the level of education of the Roma is increasing over time, the education level among Roma parents is still far below average, and further, that the academic achievement of Roma children gradually decreases during the course of their elementary school studies.

Teachers have as many problems with Roma parents as with the children, because the attitude of Roma parents towards education is often different than the middle class behavioral norms that schools expect. A high percentage of local governmental leaders and school principals hold Roma parents responsible for the educational problems of Roma children. In the case of teachers there is a lower tendency to blame parents. The attitude of schools and teachers towards Roma students is well illustrated by the fact that in a number of schools it is regarded as a penalty if a teacher is put in charge of a so-called "Roma class". These classes are often given to teachers who are less qualified, lack seniority, or who are on probation for some reason. Further, in schools with an increasing proportion of Roma students there are many teachers who lack preparation for a career in education: 30% of them have no qualifications, and 60% do not teach the subject that they are qualified for.

This widespread lack of qualifications is particularly troublesome given the fact that resources are available for training. Of the schools examined in the survey, 46% received the supplementary normative

subsidy for the implementation of minority education, 33% received the nationality education subsidy and most of them also received the tutoring subsidy. Despite these resources, teachers did not prove to be sufficiently trained to execute minority programs with appropriate professional tools.

Just as administrators and teachers blame parents for the educational problems of Roma children, parents criticize teachers for these difficulties. A significant portion of Roma parents feel that teachers do not treat Roma children the same way they treat other students. Roma parents also feel that their children are not provided the level of service they should get in elementary schools. Roma parents strongly oppose the segregated education of their children, so all cases of segregation are against the parents will and are regarded as a violation of rights. Further, out of a fear of segregation and discrimination, Roma parents resist the teaching of the Romany language, Roma social history and arts at the school.

As far as the parents' ambitions for their children are concerned, 56% prefer that their children learn a skill while 20-25% prefer that their children continue their studies and graduate in secondary education. Most parents want their children to continue in school, although 16% of parents were uncertain about it.

Regarding the future career path of their children, 10% of parents hoped their children would work in some kind of white-collar jobs, while 10-15% preferred non-physical work as employees.

The term segregated education has not been legally defined. Segregation is used as a synonym for separation and negative discrimination. In the case of the Roma, the most controversial form of segregated education is teaching children with a moderate mental disability separately, in a special institute established for this purpose.

There have been efforts towards reforming this system. The term "subsidiary school" was cancelled by the educational law enacted in 1985. Since this change in the law, in Hungary the name of a school does not refer to its function of teaching disabled students. In addition, the law resolved some severely discriminative rules (e.g. the completion of eight classes in subsidiary schools was identical with six elementary classes). Further, the educational authorities have continuously aimed to make the criteria for relocating students to "special educational institutions for the mentally disabled" stricter. Such institutions include special institutions, schools or special "mostly unsplit" classes organized in normal elementary schools.

Despite these efforts toward progress, the segregation of Roma children within the educational system continues. In 1992, for example, 16% of Roma elementary school students still attended institutions or classes for mentally disabled children. According to the TARKI data published in February 2002, there are three times as many Roma students in "subsidiary" schools in the country (BP was not examined) as the Hungarian average -- 4.5% of the school-age population attend "subsidiary" schools, while 13.5% of Roma pupils study there. In certain regions this disproportion is even more significant. In the Mid-Transdanubian region and Pest County the proportion is quintuple, while in Northern Hungary it is double or triple.

The high rate of Roma "subsidiary students" relative to other students in Hungary is particularly striking when it is considered from a comparative international perspective. The general rate of "subsidiary students" is rather high in Hungary, compared to European figures: according to the 1996 report of OECD, while from 1000 students two are qualified as moderately mentally disabled in Turkey, 4 in Finland and 9 in Italy, their number is 35 in Hungary. In part, this figure is so much higher than other European countries because in Hungary so many Roma children are classified as moderately mentally disabled.

Open Society Institute Survey (2001)

In November 2001, Open Society Institute (OSI) reported its research results to the public in Bulgaria, the

Czech Republic, Hungary and Romania, that is, countries reprimanded in EU country reports for their prejudices against the Roma. In their statements, most of the Roma children qualified as mentally disabled could meet the requirements of the normal curriculum.

In these countries OSI launched an experimental Roma public education program, that used the normal curriculum instead of the "subsidiary" syllabus containing lower requirements in 16 special schools.

According to the results published by OSI, in the second year of the three-year project, 64% of the children formerly qualified as mentally disabled met the normal curricular requirements. In the case of second-graders attending the "subsidiary Roma classes" of normal schools this rate reached 86%. The program included a further training and prejudice-management training program for teachers as well.

In Hungary, three-quarters of the children qualified as disabled are labeled as having a moderate mental disability^[2]. The main problem with the schools for the so-called moderately mentally disabled children lies in segregation and the reduced curriculum. Students in these schools only have to learn 4-26% of the syllabus required in normal schools and foreign languages are not taught below the 8th grade of elementary school. With such an educational background we can hardly expect students to continue their studies in a normal secondary school (or a vocational school teaching competitive skills).

Current data on the ethnic composition of students in special schools is not available, but nothing refers to any change in the rates or trends since the academic year 1992/93^[3].

Roma students in special schools

YEAR NUMBER OF STUDENTS PROPORTION OF ROMA CHILDREN

Total Roma students %

1974 29 617 7 720 26.1

1977 31 666 9 753 30.8

1981 33 079 12 107 36.6

1985 39 385 15 640 38.7

1992 32 090 13 662 42.5

(Roma students in elementary and secondary education, MM, Budapest, 1986, 1993.)

Both the report of the ombudsman responsible for minorities and the experts' studies called our attention to the importance of solving these problems - without any significant success so far.

On the one hand, efforts have been made to make the administration and control of relocation stricter and, on the other hand, to adjust the curriculum to local needs. Some experts are also skeptical in the judgement of modifications to the curriculum. In their views, the Roma cultural programs added to the subjects of special schools as a result of the "fashion" of multi-cultural education are mere phrases, which, instead of solving the problem of mentally disabled education, offer a pretence solution only, which release the leaders of education and the society from the responsibility of educating tens of thousands of young people in these schools without any useful and convertible skills^[4].

The enforcement of national and ethnic rights in higher education"survey (Dr. Jenő Kaltenbach, minority ombudsman), Budapest, 2001

At the beginning of the year, the results of the research ordered by minority ombudsman Jenő Kaltenbach made a stir. In 21 teachers colleges the ombudsman's office examined how the cultural and educational rights of minorities were enforced in higher education. The survey included the so-called subjective circumstances influencing education, for example, the opinions of future teachers regarding Roma students. The survey showed that 14% of the 447 graduating teachers answering the questionnaires were decidedly racist (definitely exclusive). The researchers found that only 7.4% of the graduating teachers were entirely free of prejudices, open and tolerant. 38.5% of the college students admit the "necessity" of coexistence without any hostile feelings and emotions, but they do not regard the members of the Roma minority as equal parties. 80% of those surveyed would not teach in a school where the Roma are in majority.

In the wake of this report from the ombudsman, the Ministry of Education was to review the reference materials on minorities used in teachers training institutions and the circumstances in which they are taught. He suggested that the department should set up a "traveling group" consisting of Roma experts, who would help universities and colleges that are less experienced in this topic.

An earlier survey^[5]

on secondary schools had already forecast the prejudices of college and university students. This survey asked 2600 graduating high school, technical high school and vocational school students about Hungarian minorities. The survey included a question regarding whether it would be a problem if the student sitting next to them belonged to any of the following minorities: Arab, Roma, Romanian, Transylvanian-Hungarian, Chinese, Russian, Slovakian, German, Jewish. Only 32-38% of the students answered no. One-third of vocational school students would not like to see five or more from the above minorities as their neighbors. 60 % of high school students disapprove of the Roma. 78% of vocational school students stated that they had negative feelings about Roma and Jewish people.

The textbooks in use do not help students in acquiring knowledge about Hungarian minorities either. A recent survey analyzed the two most frequently used textbooks of all subjects taught in 30 elementary and high schools of Budapest and 70 schools in the country, that is, a total of 200 books. This survey found that the new, revised edition of the eighth-grade history book used in most schools does not contain any references to the minorities living in Hungary. Further, a majority of currently taught history books do not mention a word about the half a million European Roma killed in the holocaust. On the other hand, a substantial part of textbooks imply prejudiced attitudes according to the survey.

Two years ago the Ministry of Education cancelled from its official list of textbooks the auxiliary book meant for 5th grade students published in 1998 and taught in a number of schools, which - among several other factual mistakes - said in its chapter about Hungarian Roma people: "*a high proportion of the Roma (&) could not and did not want to adopt the European civil form of life*" and that "*crime is impressed upon the lives of some Roma communities*". In response to protests, one of the largest textbook publishers of Hungary withdrew the book from circulation.

Governmental Activities and Promises

The program of the new government lays an increasing emphasis on tasks related to the integration of the Roma. The new government has promised to find a solution for the representation of minorities in the Parliament, pass an anti-discrimination law, take measures against hostile speeches, do away with Roma colonies and stop the educational segregation of Roma children.

The program section summarizing the government's tasks in 15 points declares that the social difficulties of the Roma are not regarded as an ethnic problem, but instead as a problem of poverty. Therefore the government plans to launch a comprehensive anti-poverty program. Support for the disadvantaged and the moderation of inequalities are the focus of the entire government program. In terms of education, the government has promised to ensure the kindergarten education of Roma children and to offer additional financial benefits to schools and teachers dealing with Roma children. These programs demonstrate the government's focus on the elimination of segregation.

In connection with this focus, on August 1, 2002, the Ministry of Education appointed a commissioner responsible for ensuring equal opportunity for Roma and disadvantaged children.

The key areas of the commissioner's activity:

- legislative work: advocacy of an anti-discrimination approach in the modification of education-related laws and in passing anti-discrimination laws
- financing reform: development of proposals for improved governmental oversight of the subsidies allocated for the education of Roma children and for the quality assurance of programs
- reduction of social and local disadvantages: recommendations for ensuring full kindergarten services and improving the conditions of education available for Roma children as a part of the development of educational institutions in underdeveloped regions and small settlements
- program development, quality assurance: encouraging the introduction and extension of innovation in teacher training, laying more emphasis on Roma ethnography and various prejudice-reducing programs as well as kindergarten pre-filtering and successful development programs.
- Phare programs: participation in the elaboration and monitoring of programs assisting the education of Roma children.

A national education-integration center and a related network will assist the government commissioner in the execution of the above tasks. In the disadvantaged regions there will be local integration network points connected to other disadvantage-compensation programs on the small regional level.

The commissioner will also be responsible for the "School of the 21st century" program, which provides assistance to the schools of 100 disadvantaged settlements through the modernization and reconstruction of the school buildings and the establishment of modern information and education technology and infrastructure. The ministry spends 2.68 billion forints for this program, completed with a Phare fund of HUF 4 billion forints.

To date, the commissioner's key task has been to negotiate the budget of the integration program at the advanced budget meetings. Another urgent issue for the commissioner has been the minority normative, which is subject to budget review

Currently the budget provides a special subsidy, the minority normative, for the education of national minorities. Originally, the subsidy was distributed to the school maintainer^[6]

for the explicit purpose of financing the education of national minorities. An extensive survey on the efficacy of the subsidy examined 120 kindergarten and school applications submitted to the ministry between 1994 and 1996 and came to the conclusion that the quality of most applications was unsatisfactory. According to the Directives (1997), the supplementary subsidy was to be used for an approved kindergarten-school pedagogical program, for the organization of the so-called Roma tutoring program, as well as for other nationality programs (German, Slovakian, Romanian, etc.). After criticism

from experts, the system was modified in 2001, so that the school maintainer can now apply for the supplementary funding to be spent on tutoring irrespective of ethnic background, and the program and financing of Roma minority education takes place according to the rules of the education of other nationalities. On a legislative level, this makes a difference between financing the compensation of disadvantages resulting from the socio-cultural situation (tutoring) and financing the school programs^[7] focusing on the preservation and fostering of the Roma culture.

A related problem is that the principle of financing education based on the number of participants in the programs has revived the non-official process of the segregation of Roma students between and within schools and, what is more, has given this process legitimacy^[8]. For a decade - since the free choice of schools was introduced - it has been a practice that non-Roma parents take their children out of the local school as the number of Roma students increases, thus creating fully homogeneous Roma schools. Thus as a result of "spontaneous" residential choices the institutions applying for the support of the Roma minority program have gradually become more homogeneous. Even the heterogeneous schools have organized Roma classes, thereby practicing internal segregation. This newly emerging segregation has the same social, personal and material consequences as the Roma classes created 20-30 years ago.

Segregation puts students at a disadvantage compared to "normal" schools and classes, and also adds a stigmatizing effect. Although officials try to justify the establishment of separate Roma classes based upon the pedagogical purpose of tutoring, statistics do not support this practice: the data taken by the Local Educational Centers in 1995^[9] show that the number of drop-outs is higher in segregated Roma classes and schools for the mentally disabled.

Currently, the minority normative contains two elements related to Roma children: tutoring programs and nationality (ethnographic) education. As a result of the activities of experts in non-governmental organizations engaged in the education of Roma children this duality does not seem likely to survive. In the future, the regulation of nationality education will be identical in the case of every minority. The tutoring normative, meanwhile, will become an integration normative with a relatively high head quota. The draft regulation aims to organize the "integration preparation" in a way that the students partaking in the integration preparation program are not concentrated in separate schools, classes or student groups within the settlement. Ideally, this reformation of the minority normative financing scheme will help to combat the problem of the segregation of Roma children in schools.

There are attempts to quantify efforts to reduce segregation. Students can no longer be split up into classes or schools based upon their participation in the integration preparation program. For example, the proportion of students attending integration preparation cannot vary by more than 25% from class to class. In settlements where there is a difference of over 50% in the proportion of students taking part in the integration program between the schools, this difference must be reduced by 10% in the second year of the program. This complicated regulation means that local governments which want to apply for the integration normative have to restructure the schools of their settlements in a way that the socio-cultural backgrounds of the students are more mixed. Tutoring ("ability development preparation") will continue to exist, but it will be extended to all students meeting the criteria and it will also be organized in an integrated form.

Both normatives contain input and output criteria. The input is the parents' level of education (at least elementary level) and the social situation of the family (entitlement to supplementary family allowance), while the output is the evaluation of the students' knowledge and the assessment of the success of the program. In both cases the parents must submit a statement of approval.

These elements are new and are not yet tried in the regulation process. Program financing would probably achieve the objective more efficiently, but this aspect is not likely to be considered now, because it does

not comply with the priorities of the budget. This regulation should definitely be completed with project financing, because it will not be successful in itself. Project financing may be possible through the proposal fund made available by the National Integration Center beginning next year.

As a result of the commissioner's intervention, the elements of the integration program for disadvantaged and Roma children elaborated so far have been included in the preparation materials of the National Development Plan.

The integration program currently focuses on 3 areas:

- Schools with a different curriculum (subsidiary schools)
- segregation and low quality education in normal divisions
- multicultural elements in education

Under the control of the newly appointed political secretary of state, a Roma strategy is now being developed in the Prime Minister's Office on the basis of a parliamentary resolution that establishes "The principles of the long-term Roma social and minority political strategy" (Roma Inter-Departmental Committee, 2001).

The key strategic objective is stated as follows:

"To make a clear distinction between those measures aimed at the compensation of social disadvantages and those aimed at the strengthening of minority identity in order to prevent and stop segregation processes".

Supplementary objectives include:

- make three-year kindergarten education universal
- eliminate negative discrimination resulting from the relocation of minorities to special schools
- increase continuing studies in secondary education
- establish the conditions of competitive vocational training,
- enhance the strengthening of Roma intellectuals, increase their participation in higher education
- train teachers to be skilled in reducing negative discrimination and prejudices against the Roma.

Now let us discuss the issues of kindergarten education, further education (vocational schools, high schools) and higher education that we have not mentioned yet.

Kindergartens

The importance of kindergarten in the education of Roma children is recognized by everyone. Later failures in school are often said to result from the very short period of kindergarten attendance (compulsory from the age of 5). Therefore, the extension of kindergarten education (in both the number of children and in time) is regarded as a key task. According to many, the root issue of the problem is the difficulty of informing and persuading Roma parents of the importance of kindergarten. There are more and more proposals for introducing compulsory kindergarten attendance from the age of 3 or 4. Some think that this should only be applied to children coming from disadvantaged families.

Obviously, the problem is more complicated than that. Since no systematic research has been made in Hungary in this subject, I just list a few questions that might be investigated in relation to this problem:

- How many kindergarten-aged children are unable to access this service in their settlement?
- Is every applicant admitted, and if not, for what reason, and who is denied services?
- How much more time and money (organization) must parents spend in order to use the service in another settlement?
- How much does kindergarten cost for the parents (clothes, meals, travel expenses, etc.)?
- What does the price of kindergarten depend on, and how much support do those concerned receive and

from whom?

- What reasons do parents give for not enrolling their children in kindergarten?
- What is the attitude of unemployed parents towards kindergarten?
- What is the reason for the fact that some children "do not like" going to the kindergarten?
- What is the nature of the parent-kindergarten relationship?
- What is the level of kindergarten education?
- What is the goal of kindergarten? Is preparation for school its task?
- Is there a harmony between education in the kindergarten and the school?
- What qualifications do the kindergarten teachers have and how well are they prepared?
- Is there segregation in the kindergarten, etc.?

Further education

There is no data regarding the further education of Roma youths. The general national figures and experience show that there are a rising number of children enrolled in secondary educational institutions. On the one hand, this is a significant improvement relative to the completion of elementary studies at the age of 14, the extension of the 16-year limit of compulsory school attendance and, due to the decreasing number of children, an increase in the ratio of secondary school enrollment (including high school). On the other hand, enrollment figures are not suitable for measuring the number of students in further education because of the high rate of dropouts. According to research based on the analysis of further education data covering a period of ten years (Kertesi, 1994.), Roma youths are over fifteen times less likely to continue their studies after elementary school and over fifty times less likely to graduate from secondary school compared to their majority contemporaries.

Another fundamental question of further education is what type of secondary school is chosen. The issue of Roma children's further education is still considered a problem in vocational training.

Unfortunately, today's prevailing approach is that the realistic aim for Roma youths is the mere completion of elementary school and the acquisition of certain uncompetitive skills. This view is closely related to educational institutions, which have struggled with how to provide a relevant course of studies in the wake of social changes. However painful it is for these institutions, we must admit: the solution does not lie in maintaining out-dated

forms of training to the disadvantage of helpless social groups, but to direct students to courses offering a high school diploma, the knowledge of foreign languages and computer skills. In the past decade no solution has been found for this problem. Today the future of Roma youths is still determined by the above-described pedagogical cul-de-sac ^[10].

The successful studies of Roma youths in secondary schools giving a high school diploma - in addition to the scholarship system - is assisted by Roma institutions and projects operating in the framework of foundations. The problem of further education of students in disadvantaged social circumstances is currently characterized by the initiative of foundations, churches and private entities.

Since the political changes several exemplary Roma educational institutions have been established. The only Roma high school in the world operates in P9cs and there are experimental Roma nursery schools and kindergartens in P9cs and in the Csepeli Kovacs Zoltan Nationality Kindergarten, for example. The Tanoda Foundation of Jozsefvaros supports the further education of students with an extra-curricular program of Amrita Association, while Romaversitas deals with students studying in higher education. Surveys on civil programs ^[11]

call our attention to the fact - among others - that the work going on in these institutions may suffer or

even discontinue once the grant-giving foundations and churches supporting these schools with foreign monies withdraw from Hungary. On the other hand, these institutions have accumulated knowledge that should be shared more extensively than before.

We can now see the government's intention to create an intervention fund for the regular support of these model programs beginning next year. Those concerned raise the option themselves whether the funder should apply in- and output criteria in their programs. This provides a guarantee for them that the financing will become regular if the efficiency of the programs is proved and it also prevents the emergence of initiatives for which "it is not worth" meeting these criteria, thus avoiding the deterioration of quality.

The government is also taking the initiative for supporting various programs on the basis of a calculation that will be applicable to any programs and will provide certain services. In Hungary, there have not been any calculations to indicate how much the subsidization of the successful secondary school education of a disadvantaged (Roma) student costs. In the Arany János Program, although strongly criticized by the civil side, this calculation was made with respect to students coming from disadvantaged settlements and enrolled in high schools and youth hostels in cities. To put it simply, this means a double school and hostel normative. Similarly, the civil programs dealing with the Roma intend to introduce this form of support.

The Arany Janos Program was criticized because the input criteria were not set in a single form, as a result of which the program is now mostly available for students in a relatively more favorable situation. In the past year the subsidization of further education concentrated on scholarships on the state level. Scholarship figures (their rise) were mentioned in public at an extent that exceeded the real significance of the scheme. Scholarships are available for students who admit their Roma identity. Since the beginning of the nineties, the establishment of the scholarship system has been partly linked to state sources and partly to the Soros Foundation. The state subsidies have been gradually extended from elementary school pupils with excellent grades to students studying in secondary and higher education.

Today there is a division of tasks among scholarship funders. The Public Foundation for National and Ethnic Minorities offer scholarships to Roma students taking part in adult training, the Public Foundation for the Roma of Hungary supports elementary school children as well as students in the day courses of secondary and higher education depending on their academic achievements. The Ministry of Education undertakes to cover the tuition fee of university and college students, and in the fall of 2001 the Soros Foundation (Open Society Institute) offered scholarships available for any Roma students studying in higher education. Further, the Prime Minister's Office has issued a call for proposals for the lease of computers for Roma higher education students. In addition to national sources, local funds are also allocated (in Budapest, on the county level and from other foundations) based on similar conditions. Scholarships may be acquired via application.

System of governmental scholarships for Roma youths, academic year 2001/2002

	No. of students
Elementary school (from 5th grade)	6995
Secondary school with a high school diploma, day courses	2838
Secondary school, vocational training - evening and correspondence courses	1514
University, college - day courses	950

University, college - evening and correspondence courses	267
University, college - abroad	24
Total	12 588 students

In the academic year 1996/97 785, in 1997/1998 805, in 1998/1999 1468, in 1999/2000 2881 and in 2000/2001 12588 Roma youths received scholarships.
(National and Ethnic Minority Office, 2002.)

As far as scholarships are regarded, two problems are usually raised. First, we do not know if the beneficiaries are really only Roma. The second question is if those concerned are all appropriately informed and if they dare to accept the stigmatization they are exposed to if they admit their Roma origin. A further problem is that financial support based on ethnic origin may fuel conflicts between the poor Roma students and the similarly poor non-Roma students. In addition to the scholarship scheme, the enhancement of the social integration of accumulatively disadvantaged, primarily Roma youths is significant on the governmental level, HU-99.04-01. Phare program.

Winners:

Topic	Number of successful proposals	Budget (thousand Euro)
I: Kindergarten and elementary school (nurse training, teachers further training, purchases, etc.)	78	3 000
II: Vocational training in and outside the school system	45	3 600
III. Talent development in secondary schools and higher education	15	1 500
Secondary school hostels (investment)	2	1 100
Technical implementation		400
Total:	140	9 600

Source: Information, Phare Program Office of the Ministry of Education, Budapest, 2001

With regard to the fact that only a part of the programs have been completed, there has not been any summarizing evaluation. However, we can state that the participants did expect the continuation of the Phare program, because that is what they had heard. Only now is it becoming clear that continuation does not mean that they will continue to get funds for their programs. Instead, there will be new education-related Phare programs for this target group to apply for. In many cases this probably implies that the initiated programs must be suspended due to a lack of financial resources.

Recent events made public in relation to the education of the Roma

1997: **Tiszavasvari:** Roma children were separated into a Roma class, they could not use the gymnasium or the school cafeteria, and they had their own graduation ceremony at the end of the year.

1999: According to a final court decision the local government of Tiszavasvári had to pay compensation

to the Roma students.

1999: Solidarity campaign (joint graduation ceremony in Budapest) in favor of segregated Roma children.

2001: The Supreme Court rejected the local government's appeal to review the decision.

2001: Students are still segregated, they are not only taught in a separate Roma class but in a different building.

2000: **Erdőtelek:** In an elementary school, a biology teacher taught the students, from his lesson outline, that the Roma have a characteristic smell and one of their personal traits is aggressiveness. The school's principal instructed the teacher to rewrite his outline and delete the controversial parts. In his proposal, the ombudsman asked the minister of education to investigate whether the teachers are appropriately trained for teaching Roma ethnography and if their opportunities for further training are guaranteed.

2001: **Bogacs:** Roma children are made to eat at separate tables and with separate tableware. The minority normative subsidy is not used for the right purpose and education is segregated. In the ombudsman's report the school violated several elements of the principle of equal treatment. In the school, Roma children are still taught in a separate class and, although they stopped using separate tableware, they continue to eat at different tables and use different toilets.

2001: **Halmajugra:** The school principal blamed for racism was appointed in spite of the fact that neither the minority self-government nor the school staff supported him. The settlement's local government withdrew the appointment upon the initiative of the ombudsman.

2001: The labor court of Eger decided to return the principal to his post upon his appeal. Based on a mutual agreement, the principal finally decided to leave, because several teachers threatened to leave and the parents did not want to allow their children to go to school.

2000 **Verpelet:** In the first and fifth years Roma and non-Roma students were put in separate classes at the beginning of the academic year. In the fifth year they explained the segregation with the results of an aptitude test.

2002 The ombudsman's report stated that the segregation of first-year students was regarded as negative discrimination. They also declared that splitting the fifth-graders according to abilities was also against the laws, because it leads to indirect discrimination. According to an international convention any restrictive measure resulting in discrimination is regarded as discrimination itself.

Jaszládany

2000 The mayor made a written proposal for the establishment of an exclusive private foundation school, which they planned to implement by splitting the local governmental school. Their purpose was to make sure that local children do not enroll in the schools of other settlements in order to satisfy their higher educational requirements. (in other words, the purpose of the foundation school was to prevent the flight of ethnic Hungarian students from the settlement's school, which has become "overly populated" with Roma.)

2001 The local Roma minority self-government protested against the exclusive policy in a letter.

The minority self-government held a hunger strike.

1000 inhabitants of the village supported the decision of the board with their signatures.

2002 The local notary public made a decision to grant the operation license to the foundation school.

The Administration Office initiated a legal procedure to abolish the decision.

The Administration Office cancelled the operation license issued by the local notary of the foundation school.

The minister of education rejected the request for the support of the Ministry of Education.

The parents requesting the establishment of the foundation school submitted a petition to the minister and

protested against the closure of the foundation school.

The education minister offered the foundation school a so-called integration program package and the funds necessary for its accomplishment.

The County Procurator submitted a petition to the County Administration Office.

The Ministry of Education did not agree with the Procurator's petition, so he appealed to the Chief Procurator.

Labour market chances and opportunities

In Hungary, one of the first steps of pauperisation and the social exclusion of Romani from the middle of the 1980s was their becoming unemployed and inactive in increasing proportion and at increasing speed. The transformation of the socialist economy triggered the nearly total restructuring of the labour market. The demand for unskilled labour decreased, and Romani *formerly used to employment* -using Gabor Kertesi's term - became permanently unemployed.

Respondent's economic status

	Total (%)	Budapest (%)	Town (%)	Village (%)
Employed	20.2	28.1	23.9	16.3
Student	0.7	0	1.2	0.4
Maternity leave	14.2	8.8	14.2	14.8
Housekeeping	6.8	19.3	5.5	6.5
Retired	24.7	14.0	28.2	23.0
Unemployed	26.2	26.3	21.8	29.8
Other inactive	7.2	3.5	5.2	9.2
Total	100	100	100	100

In 2002, one fifth of the country's Romani population claimed to be employed and have a job. A quarter of Romani above 18 considered themselves unemployed, and 7% of them were inactive for other reasons. Although only 8% of the adult Romani population are above 59, nearly a quarter of them are retired, that is, the percentage of those retired by waiving of age-limit or for impaired health is 12%.

Regarding economic activity, the situation is most hopeless in villages: only 16% of the residents have a job, and the proportion of inactive persons is highest there.

How important are the following problems? (Percentage of those answering "yes")

	Total	By settlement type			By age groups		
		Budapest	Town	Village	15-29	30-49	>=50
Economic difficulties	65.7	63.2	65.5	66.2	63.4	66.2	67.6
Labour market discrimination	51.8	45.5	57.6	47.7	51.8	53.5	47.9
Unregulated housing problems	31.7	56.1	38.5	23.5	37.6	30.4	28.5

Low level of social benefits available	21.6	12.3	23.7	20.9	22.8	21.3	20.8
Absence of educational opportunities	12.9	17.9	15.6	10.1	12.4	13.2	12.7
Criminality	8.8	3.5	10.2	8.3	8.3	9.4	7.9
Loosening of family bonds	6.5	5.3	7.6	5.8	5.3	6.3	8.4
Restriction of free movement, migration	6.1	7.0	6.4	5.8	6.6	4.5	9.8
Lack of respect for old people	5.6	1.8	5.5	6.2	3.5	5.1	8.9

How important are the following problems? (Percentage of those answering "yes")

	Total	By educational attainment			
		below the 8-grade general school	8-grade general school	Unfinished secondary school	Vocational secondary school and higher
Economic difficulties	65.7	69.6	66.4	58.6	56.4
Labour market discrimination	51.8	56.0	51.9	42.8	51.3
Unregulated housing problems	31.7	34.0	31.5	27.0	33.3
Low level of social benefits available	21.6	25.7	21.8	15.6	10.3
Absence of educational opportunities	12.9	14.7	11.7	12.6	12.8
Criminality	8.8	8.9	9.2	8.6	5.1
Loosening of family bonds	6.5	5.9	7.6	5.7	2.6
Restriction of free movement, migration	6.1	5.4	6.7	5.7	7.7
Lack of respect for old people	5.6	4.5	6.3	6.9	2.6

The vast majority of the Romani involved in the research consider sustenance and employment their most significant problems. Nearly two thirds of them mentioned economic hardships and pauperisation, 52% of them considered labour market discrimination as their primary concerns. Two thirds of the respondents claim that they have difficulties in finding employment. This problem is most pressing to those with a maximum of basic educational qualification, and those living in villages. More than half of the respondents claimed that the reason for their unemployment was their Romani origin.

Do you find it difficult to find employment?

	Total		By settlement types			By age groups		
			Budapest	Town	Village	15-29	30-49	>=50
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes, definitely	633	63.3	47.4	59.2	68.3	61.1	66.1	57.9
Rather yes	226	22.6	36.8	21.8	21.7	22.3	22.7	22.9
No	106	10.6	5.3	15.2	7.5	10.5	10.5	11.2
NR	35	3.5	10.5	3.8	2.5	6.1	0.7	7.9
Total	1000	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Do you find it difficult to find employment?

	Total		By educational attainment			
			Below the 8-grade general school	8-grade general school	Unfinished secondary school	Vocational secondary and higher
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Yes, definitely	633	63.3	70.8	64.3	50.9	43.6
Rather yes	226	22.6	15.3	24.9	28.0	33.3
No	106	10.6	6.8	9.2	19.4	20.5
NR	35	3.5	7.1	1.6	1.7	2.6
Total	1000	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Why is it difficult to find employment?

	N	%
General economic difficulties of the country	288	28.8
His/her origin	576	57.6
Bad health condition	177	17.7
Gender	73	7.3
Age	221	22.1
Bad luck	219	21.9
No difficulties	106	10.6

An increasing number of non-governmental and governmental programmes are initiated to fight unemployment, by now involving EU and Phare finances as well. A significant proportion of such programmes aim to support the population in a definitely disadvantaged situation, mainly the Romani. This is also important because a very low proportion, only 8.7% of the respondents claimed that they had participated in labour market training or employment programmes. In the analysis of the data, we should emphasise the overrepresentation of men: 12.5% of the male respondents participated in labour market programmes, whereas this proportion is only 5.3% among women. Another reason for emphasising the very low participation rate measured by the questionnaire is that Romani residents are highly overrepresented among the unemployed and inactive. This indicates that in spite of the high number of programmes, the supports mentioned reach an extremely low number of Romani.

	Total		Men	Women
	N	%	%	%
Have you ever participated in labour market programmes?	87	8.7	12.5	5.3
<i>Distribution by types of programmes</i>				
Large public work projects	24	2.4	2.8	2.1
Training organised by the job centre	29	2.9	4.7	1.3
Support for small enterprises	4	0.4	0.6	0.2
Training organised by an NGO	8	0.8	1.1	0.6
Training organised by the employer	22	2.2	3.8	0.8

The vast majority of the Romani asked had not tried launching their own enterprise. This is justifiable by the fact that half of the Romani entrepreneurs reported that although they tried to become independent they eventually failed. It is not only the relative shortage of successful examples, but also the insignificant number of supports available for this that hinders the initiation of Romani enterprises: only four of the 1000 respondents claimed to have received support for small enterprises.

Have you ever tried initiating your own enterprise?

	Total		By settlement types			By age groups		
			Budapest	Town	Village	15-29	30-49	>=50
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes, I still have my enterprise	35	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.3	2.2	3.6	4.7
Yes, but I sold my enterprise	22	2.2	1.8	3.3	1.3	1.3	2.0	3.7
Yes, but I went bankrupt	53	5.3	3.5	6.9	4.2	4.4	6.1	3.7
No, NR	890	89.0	91.3	86.0	91.2	92.1	88.2	87.9

Have you ever tried initiating your own enterprise?

	Total		By educational attainment			
			Below the 8-grade general school	8-grade general school	Unfinished secondary school	Vocational secondary and higher
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Yes, I still have my enterprise	35	3.5	0.6	4.7	4.6	10.3
Yes, but I sold my enterprise	22	2.2	1.8	1.3	5.1	2.6
Yes, but I went bankrupt	53	5.3	2.7	5.6	8.6	10.3
No	890	89.0	95.0	88.3	81.7	76.9

The transformation of the labour market in the 1990s, with special respect to the Romani

For a relevant understanding of the necessity of labour market programmes for the Romani, it is advisable to get an overview of the changes in the labour market situation of the Romani during the past decade. The results of the 1971 research of Romani have shown that the employment rate of Romani adults of working age was close to that of the non-Romani population: the rate of active wage-earners was 87,7 % in the entire population, and the same ratio was 85,2 % among the Romani. However, the seemingly minor difference was more significant than that indicated by numbers. Employment of Romani men was total in the industrial regions, and not in agricultural regions, the proportion of those incapable of work or inactive being 8% in the Hungarian Plain, and 10% in the Eastern region. In the case of women, differences were greater; 64% of the women of working age were active wage-earners in the entire population, whereas this proportion was 30% in the case of Romani women, 70% being dependant. In addition to the employment rate, differences were also observed in the income. Nearly half of the active wage-earner Romani were employed as unskilled workers, around 10% worked as semi-skilled workers, and another 10 % as skilled workers. This means that although the vast majority of Romani worked and were incorporated in the new structure of the socialist labour market, they could only find jobs in the lower levels of the hierarchy. In the second half of the 1980s, employment rates got worse, which meant an increase in the unemployment rate on one hand, and an increase in the rate of inactive people on the other.^[12]

Employment indicators changed earliest and most rapidly in the case of the Romani population, which resulted in an unemployment rate of 50% among working age Romani at the time of the 1993 research. As G1bor Kertesi has put it, the Romani population lost their bases of existence for the second time in the past one hundred years with the change of the regime^[13]. In the first half of the 20th century the traditional Romani sustenance modes and crafts were eliminated, losing their market and social bases. This process launched and forced the Romani on the course of modernisation, and offered it to them as an opportunity. Modernisation meant the achievement of at least primary educational qualification, employment and the related income based on work, as well as a change in housing conditions. However, the fact that masses of Romani lost their jobs after the change of the regime has eliminated nearly all of the benefits of this process. The educational level and employment rate achieved in the socialist economic model lost its value nearly altogether - within just a few years. During the past ten years, nearly two thirds of the jobs formerly filled by Romani were terminated. The vast majority of the

Romani lost their jobs, and became permanently unemployed, their qualifications lost their value; the non-Romani population tends to move out of most settlements and parts of settlements inhabited by Romani - leaving Romani families who worked and were on the way of (forced) assimilation in the 1980s in ghettos organised on an ethnic basis. As a result of this devaluation, however, the Romani were not cast back to the position they were in at the beginning or near the middle of the past century, as those market and living conditions are history rather than economic models that can be followed today.

Changes in employment and the labour market were dramatic for the entire population of Hungary, but statistics show that the Romani were struck by this shock two or three times as much as the rest of the population.

Three factors must be emphasised as the major causes of these processes:

- disadvantages in the field of education,
- territorial differences (60% of the Romani population of Hungary lives in villages, regions with small settlements, economically depressed areas, as opposed to the non-Romani population, where the same ratio is 35%),
- The disadvantages stemming from the former vocational structure (a significant proportion of the Romani used to work in industries which were the first to collapse with the change of the regime, and the knowledge and experience obtained there can not be utilised or is difficult to utilise in other fields).

Labour market discrimination should be mentioned as a further cause. As G1bor Kertesi reports, the demographic characteristics of the Romani population, the disadvantages arising from their educational qualification and the inequality of domiciles, account for two thirds of the difference in the relative labour market chances of the Romani and non-Romani population. The remaining 35% of the difference marks the ethnic discrimination prevalent in the labour market.^[14]

Numbers - that is, how many Romani are unemployed

As to the size of the Romani population in Hungary, we have an exact number on one hand, and significantly divergent estimates on the other. The specific data available are based on censuses. According to these, 142 thousand people considered themselves Romani in 1990, this number was 190 thousand in 2001. Former Romani research and the demographic forecasts prepared on their basis, however, estimate the number of Romani at over 400 thousand in 1990, and 500-600 thousand in 2001. We find it justified to consider the estimate as well as the official number in our research. The estimate is based on the results of research conducted by István Kemeny, and the collection of statistics compiled by Gabor Kertesi and Gabor Kezdi. A common feature of these is that they consider not only the data based on self-identification, but also those who are regarded as Romani by their environment, regarding membership of the Romani community not only as a feature based on biological factors, but also as a social product. The use of the latter definition is justified in this case by the fact that labour market disadvantages and discrimination affect not only Romani who consider themselves Gypsies, but also those who are regarded as such by their environment. Based on their research in 1993, István Kemeny et al. estimated the number of the Romani population of Hungary at 450 - 500 thousand. Considering demographic processes, this number should be around 550-600 thousand after nearly a decade.^[15] The basic demographic characteristics of the Romani population differ significantly from those of the non-Romani society. 38% of the Romani population was under 15 years of age in 1993 (as opposed to 19% in the case of the entire population), and 4,5% was above 59 years of age (as opposed to 19% in the case of the entire population). Assuming that the above demographic composition has changed somewhat during the past decade, we estimate the number of Romani between 15-59 at 320-350 thousand, counting 35% under 15, and 7% above 59. The number of retired persons and pupils should be deducted from this

figure. The number of Romani children born yearly is around 13 thousand.^[16] According to a research conducted at the National Institute for Public Education (OKI) in 2000, around 85% of Romani accomplishing the 8-grade general school continue their education, so we assume that around 33-38 thousand of the Romani between ages 15-18 are pupils. Assuming that some 10% of the Romani population are retired based on reasons other than their age, which amounts to some 24 thousand people. Distracting these population numbers from the above estimate, the result is some 250-290 thousand Romani of working age and capable of work.

In 1993, the number of active wage-earners was 3 698 000, and according to Kemeny's research, the number of employed Romani within this was 58 thousand. The number of active wage-earners was 3 848 000 in 2001, which meant an increase by 200 thousand. According to István Kemeny's estimate, the number of Romani in the increment of active wage-earners is around 10-20 thousand, and he has prognosed further increase in employment for the period 1999 - 2001.^[17] According to the data of the Central Institute for Statistics (KSH), this increase has not happened, and further expansion in employment was halted at the above number. If we assume an optimistic increase by 20 thousand in the employment of Romani, the number of employed Romani can be around 80 thousand in 2001.

Let us now examine the changes in the number of registered unemployed during the past eight years. At the time of the 1993 research, the number of registered unemployed was 640 thousand, 57 thousand within this being Romani. In 2001, the number of registered unemployed was 340 thousand, the number of Romani within this estimated at 57 thousand^[18]. This means that the number of registered Romani unemployed has not changed during these eight years, whereas their proportion among the unemployed has. Whereas 9% of the registered unemployed were Romani in 1993, this proportion was 16% in 2001. We may thus conclude that the number of registered unemployed decreased by nearly 50 % during the past decade, while the proportion of Romani among them has increased by nearly 100%. The fact that the number of Romani in working age has increased by 40-50 thousand by our estimates, and the number of active wage-earners has increased by 20 thousand, while number of registered Romani unemployed has remained practically unchanged means two things. On one hand, the number of Romani continuing their education between ages 15-19, which makes them inactive dependants, but they do not appear in the statistics as unemployed. (As regards the schooling opportunities of Romani children, see the research carried out in 2000 by the Educational Research Institute.)^[19] On the other hand, the above data also mean that the number of officially inactive Romani not appearing in registration has also significantly increased during recent years. Naturally, this does not mean that they are actually inactive: they are more likely to sustain themselves from grey and black economy.

Non-governmental initiatives at the beginning of the 1990s The beginning of the 1990s was an age of resurgence in the non-governmental sector, organisations and associations were being founded with some zeal. Naturally, this also affected Romani communities, the number of Romani NGOs founded in the first half of the 1990s is estimated at several thousand, and these entered into national associations - a Romani non-governmental organisational framework not existing before was created.

The 1993 Act on Minorities enabled the establishment of the system of Romani minority self-governments. Minority self-governments could be set up in the settlements; 500 were created in 1994, 750 in 1998, and nearly 1000 in 2002. Although the minority self-governments were delegated primarily cultural roles and opportunities of preserving tradition in the Act, it soon turned out that this would work differently. A significant proportion of the newly founded organisations and minority self-governments faced an expectation from their members, the local Romani community to address their most pressing problems, namely unemployment and the intensification of poverty.

As it happened, at the beginning of the 1990s Romani organisations found almost exclusively non-

governmental donors for their sustenance and economic programmes. The country's first major donating organisation, the Soros Foundation started its operation before 1990, and the Hungarian Foundation for Self-Reliance (*Autonomia Alapítvány, AA*) was founded in 1990

The primary aim of non-governmental labour market programmes implemented in Hungary was to support income-generating programmes initiated by Romani organisations in the countryside. The principle of supporting and the applied technique was the adaptation of "western" programmes for Hungary. The foundations dealing with donation and development in the United States and Western Europe developed similar techniques through supporting programmes fighting poverty in the third world. This is based on the idea that programmes should not be based on simply distributing financial assets, but must be adapted to local needs, with the consideration of opportunities and limitations, and should actively involve the local communities. The aim is not simply to diminish poverty, but also the empowerment of communities by fostering development and promoting their ability to elaborate and operate similar programmes in the future.

The Public Foundation for Romani in Hungary (*Magyarországi Ciganyokért Közalapítvány, MCKA*), founded in 1995, was based on similar principles.^[20] The MCKA was founded by the government, which provides for the foundation's financial resources from its yearly budget. Since 1996, the programmes supported by the MCKA have been targeted at the initiation of sustenance activities and the support of Romani enterprises,^[21] and support has been available to Romani minority self-governments and private persons, not only NGOs.

The Soros Foundation, the AA and the MCKA were especially important in the 1990s because the majority of the programmes initiated by Romani organisations were supported by these three organisations.

Governmental programmes for Romani

Each central government dealt with the Romani minority after the change of the regime - though the volume and meaning of measures taken varied. The first steps taken at governmental level were the establishment of the Office for National and Ethnic Minorities (1990) and the Interdepartmental Committee for Romani Affairs. At the level of legislation, the opportunities of the Romani in Hungary were defined by the Act on Minorities adopted in 1993.

Planned and elaborated governmental measures have been taken after 1997, a legislative framework for these being provided by the Governmental Decree No. 1093/1997 (29.07.) on the medium-term measures to improve the living conditions of the Romani.

The medium-term measures were defined along the lines of the following priorities with respect to employment:

- to support the employment of Romani in public utilities in regions struck by the highest rates of unemployment, by calling for public project proposals,
- to encourage the labour force development and training centres to launch more training programmes aimed at enhancing the chances of Romani in the labour market,
- to launch agricultural and stock-farming programmes - mainly linked to the social land programme, in cooperation with the Public Foundation for Romani in Hungary.

At institutional level, the government decree delegated the responsibility of implementing organisations of the above programme plans to the regional development centres, the employment councils and training councils at county level.

The subsequent modifications of the government decree also urged the extension of public utility work programmes, this being the basis of the Romani labour market support policy. A new element has been the positive discrimination to be implemented through extra support provided within the normative financing system. At the same time, modifications also included guidelines aimed at programmed development. One of these is the involvement of the National Public Foundation for Employment in the implementation of the action plan through programmes specifically targeted at the Romani, and the development of social land programmes in order to enable participants to become independent farmers, croppers and entrepreneurs, or even to join various types of associations, integrators.

The Government Decree No. 1047/1999 (05.05.) stipulates the further development of the original set of regulations. This involves several innovations. The most important one relates to the financial aspect, as it articulates as an objective for the ministries concerned to involve more PHARE resources in the financing of the programmes. It is also a sign of development that the Decree encourages the support of dropouts of the school system - especially the Romani - in obtaining vocational qualifications and finding employment by complex programmes. In a further modification, the Decree prescribes for county employment centres or their delegated offices to sign professional cooperation agreements with Romani minority self-governments, and, if possible, also employ a Romani expert in the employment centre.

In the following section we cover three major governmental support programmes: the social land programme, the Romani programme of the National Public Foundation for Employment, and the supports available at the employment centres.

Social land programme

The social land programme is a unique borderline between enterprise development and sustenance support, and aims to promote the sustenance of village communities in a hopeless situation. The target group of the social land programme are not specifically and exclusively the Romani, but they are found in a large proportion among the participants.

The beginning of the social land programmes dates back to 1992, when the first programmes of this type were launched in Bekes county. The finances of the programme are provided by the Ministry of Social and Family Affairs. The programmes *"& were initiated as part of the social crisis management programme, in the settlements of the small territories most struck by the effects of permanent unemployment and increasing poverty. The primary objective of the programmes has been to offer social support - in kind - for those living from unemployment benefit or supplementary benefits, by linking the agricultural and social fields"*.^[22]

NGOs and local authorities can access this form of support by application, and implement various agricultural programmes. Persons in need are involved in specific local programmes based on application. During the 10 years of the programme, a total of 216 projects were running in 352 settlements, with 140 thousand participants. The programmes were primarily based on specific local characteristics, and beneficiaries received support for agriculture, plant-growing, and/or animal husbandry or other services, with the aim of enabling the beneficiaries to sustain themselves from the products of their activities. *"& In a number of cases, the social land programmes functioned as "quasi-cooperatives" in the life of a settlement, adopting or fulfilling the economic and social roles previously played by the*

agricultural cooperatives."^[23]

41% of the participants of social land programmes are Romani, which means nearly 12 600 people and 2100-2500 families. Researchers found 14 programmes in which the proportion of Romani participants exceeded 50%. As described by Anna Maria Bartal, "& the Romani population is overrepresented in social land programmes, their proportion among the participants being twice as large as their proportion in the population of the settlements."^[24]

The proportion of Romani participants is especially high in Bekes, Hajdu-Bihar, Jasz-Nagykun-Szolnok and Nograd counties, whereas they are underrepresented in the programme in the two counties with the highest proportion of Romani residents - Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén and Baranya. The author also refers to other analyses in stating that the social land programmes play an especially significant role in the integration of rural Romani residents, as the general labour market programmes do not or hardly ever reach them, whereas they can utilise their experiences in husbandry within the social land programme.^[25]

No data are available on which group the programmes involving mostly Romani participants belong to: those supporting sustenance or those oriented at the market. The social land programme has been defined by the government decree mentioned above (1047/1999) as one of the institutionalised tools of Romani programmes. However, our experience shows that cooperation between the MCKA and the social land programme as prescribed in the medium-term government decree works only occasionally. There is no official, formal cooperation among the various agricultural programmes supporting mainly village resident Romani.

The Romani Programme of the National Public Foundation for Employment (Országos Foglalkoztatási Alapítvány, OFA)

In accordance with the stipulations of the government decree 1047/1999, the OFA intends to take an active part in the promotion of the employment of disadvantaged people - including Romani -, and their reintegration in the labour market. The support programmes of the OFA belong to the following major groups:

- programmes providing labour market services and supporting reintegration
- labour force development, training, working experience, integration programmes
- income generating programmes supporting the employment of the beneficiaries
- research in labour issues, professional, methodological, developmental work.

In 2001, the OFA supported 16 nonprofit organisations within its alternative labour market service programme, involving 2500 participants. The proportion of Romani among the participants was around 30% (approximately 800-900 persons).

The Return to Work programme provides personalised services for the unemployed. These programmes reach some 5-6000 permanently unemployed persons yearly, the proportion of Romani among them being around 20% (1000-1200 persons).

The Restart programme provides opportunities for unemployed without an eight-grade general school qualification, delivering marketable knowledge, vocational training and working experience through employment opportunities. The OFA supported 14 organisations implementing programmes of this type in 2001, involving 320 participants. 30-40% of the participants were Romani, which meant some 100-120 persons.

Within the framework of Transit Employment programmes, disadvantaged unemployed with no

vocational qualification can enter the labour market in the framework of vocational training linked to employment. The duration of the programmes is 2 years, the 15 organisations implementing Transit Employment programmes in 2001 reached 530 persons, the number of Romani among these being some 160 - 180.

Within the framework of local employment programmes aiming to promote the permanent employment of the unemployed, 21 projects were running in 2001, providing income for 340 persons. The organisations implementing the projects were mainly associations established by the local authorities, employment associations and foundations. Within the framework of these, several projects were organised for the Romani in Kaposvár, Barcs, Siklóc and Hajdúszoboszló. The number of Romani employed by them was 50 - 60.

Minor projects co-financed by the AA are also part of the Romani employment strategy of the OFA. Since 1996, 60 - 80 projects have been implemented yearly in this scheme.

In 2000, the OFA launched a separate employment programme for Romani, with the primary aim of supporting the initiation and financing of model Romani community employment programmes. The OFA started to support 7 Romani organisations in 2000, and 11 others in 2001; the duration of the programmes is three years. The budget of the programme was 136 million HUF in 2000, and 300 million HUF in 2001, and it provided employment and income for 300 persons.

The Romani employment programme is supplemented by the Romani Employment Workshop, which provides an institutionalised form of evaluating and developing the programmes.

We may conclude that the support of Romani unemployed and the increase of their proportion has been part of nearly all of the support programmes of the OFA, and as a result, there were some 2500-2800 Romani among the beneficiaries and supported persons in 2001.

Programmes implemented by the employment centres

Complex programmes aimed at the reintegration of the Romani population into the labour market were organised by employment centres in 12 counties, involving 2000 participants altogether. Employment centres contacted the greatest number and proportion of Romani through publicly useful work programmes and large public work projects, involving 17 thousand and 3800 participants respectively. 4300 Romani participated in vocational training and retraining programmes organised by employment centres in 2001. If we examine the various forms of support, we find that the more targeted the given tool, the smaller the number of Romani participants tends to be: 1800 persons in programmes aiming at the extension of employment, 800 persons in programmes where the supporter takes over the payment of contributions, 400 persons in programmes supporting new entrants to the labour market, and 160 persons in programmes covering travel costs. Based on the reports of the county employment centres and the estimates of the offices, 31 500 Romani received some kind of labour market support, the total amount being over 5 milliard HUF. (This means an average of 160 thousand HUF/person/year.) The exact meaning of this is illustrated by the yearly amount of support (income supplement or regular social benefit) paid to those receiving unemployment benefits, which was 36.5 milliard HUF in 2001. (This means an average number of 119 thousand beneficiaries monthly.) This means that the participation of Romani is proportionate in the case of basic benefits, whereas it is very low in the case of support promoting actual reintegration, and the amounts involved are also small.

The proportion of Romani unemployed in the programmes of employment offices

	2001.06.20	2001.06.20
--	------------	------------

	Total number of persons	Estimated percentage of Romani (%)	Estimated number of Romani	Total number of persons	Estimated percentage of Romani (%)	Estimated number of Romani
Registered unemployed	356 240	15,46%	55 084	341 284	17,17%	58 599
Distribution:						
Unemployment benefit	98 743	7.51%	7 414	112 165	10.74%	12 046
Unemployment assistance	63 896	18.33%	11 709	27 349	18.98%	5 191
Social benefit	72 681	22.96%	16 685	87 655	25.43%	22 288
Unassisted registered unemployed	114 485	18.89%	21 628	110 124	20.06%	22 089
Pre-retirement benefit	732	5.00%	37	650	5.00%	33

2001. term IV.	Total number of persons	Estimated percentage of Romani (%)	Estimated number of Romani ¹	Estimated amount of support (million HUF)
Active programmes	135 792	12.54%	17 025	4 651
Retraining	40 621	7.89%	3 206	573
Publicly useful work	34 414	21.88%	7 531	2 157
Local public works	9 521	28.32%	2 697	
Large public work projects	4 797	44.10%	2 115	890
Wage subsidy	20 364	7.26%	1 479	372.4
Travel to work subsidy	4 306	8.22%	354	0.8
Wage tax subsidy	5 096	16.96%	864	59.5
Other programmes	11 971	7.12%	852	
Special programmes for Romani			2 782	540

¹ based on the calculation of the offices

We noted above that the total amount of support concerning the Romani was 5 million HUF - this figure comprises the total amount of normative and project supports. If we examine the proportion of the two forms of support, we find that the amount allocated to targeted project supports was slightly over 600 million HUF, which is nearly 12% of the total amount of support. Almost two thirds (65%) of the total amount of support calculated by us is covered by the budget of publicly useful work and large public work projects.

Support based on application

As a result of our data collection, we have information on 543 Romani labour market programmes implemented in 2001. The database only includes supports defined by either the supporter or the implementing organisation as Romani programmes and project supports. The 543 projects were implemented in 338 settlements, utilising a total amount of 5,8 milliard HUF of funds. (We calculated the amount of support on the basis of the figures provided by the supporter or the implementing organisation. However, the supported organisations often could not recall the amount of the support, or they could only tell us its measure, e.g. 70% of the wages, etc. In such cases, we tried to calculate the data on the basis of the amount support for wages in the given year, and the data provided by the supporters.) Most of the programmes were implemented by Romani NGOs, but the largest amount of support was granted to activities proposed jointly by local authorities and minority self-governments. The latter are predominated by large public work projects supported jointly by the regional development councils and the National Romani Self-Government (Országos Cigány és Kormányzat, OC&K). (The considerable difference between the data included in the table of the programmes implemented by the minority self-governments and those in the table covering the whole sample is explained by the fact that Romani minority self-governments also indicated the latter programmes as their own in the questionnaire, whereas we handled it as a different category.)

Implementing organisation	N	Average amount of support (HUF)	Total amount of support (HUF)
Roma Minority Self-Government	110	9 733 387	1 070 672 623
NGO	159	3 590 543	570 896 401
Local authority	71	9 139 627	648 913 521
Private enterprise	61	1 250 984	76 310 000
Roma Minority Self-Government - Local authority *	141	24 371 849	3 436 430 661
Total	543	10 689 177	5 804 223 206

* (financed by the Regional Development Council and National Roma Self-government)

With respect to the content of the projects, the large public utility work programmes predominate both in terms of their number and the amount of the support, comprising nearly half of the supports, and 77% of the total amount. If we take the total of public work programmes (large public work projects, publicly

useful work and local public works), we find that they comprise 85% of the total amount of support for 2001 - that is, the programmes organised and supported by the state take up the overwhelming majority of support. As regards the number of projects, agricultural programmes are also significant, and as regards the amount of support, the Roma programme of the National Employment Fund (OFA) represents a considerable proportion in addition to those mentioned above.

With respect to the territorial distribution of supports, three counties dominate: over 50% of the support has been utilised in Szabolcs-Szatmar-Bereg, Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok and Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén counties. The greatest number of programmes were implemented in Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén county, but in case of the amounts of support we must take into consideration the fact that regional development supports and the large public work projects of the Ministry of Social and Family Affairs were related primarily to the flood of the Tisza and the preventive actions and arrangements it entailed. If we examine the supports without the categories discussed above, we find that the counties with the highest proportion of Roma residents could mobilise 250 million HUF in a broad approximation. Although the proportion of villages is high in the number of supports, an effect of the settlement inclination is that programmes operating in towns usually receive twice as much support as those operating in villages.

Both as regards the number of supports and their amount, state finances are almost exclusive. Hardly more than a quarter of the programmes was implemented with support from NGOs, the amount of support provided by them (around 200 million HUF) is almost insignificant as compared to the total support (5.8 milliard HUF). Within state resources, it is worth dealing with public foundations (OFA, MCKA) separately. These two foundations also supported around a quarter of the supported programmes, and though the amount of support is more than three times as much as the amount of funds granted by NGOs, this is still hardly more than one tenth of the total amount of support. All this is interesting because it is by these governmental resources that long-term development programmes can operate, and not just mass employment can be implemented.

Supported programmes by types and the amount of support

Type of programme	N	Average amount of support (HUF)	Total amount of support (HUF)	Percentage of total support (%)
Large public work projects	229	19 525 945	4 471 441 322	77.0%
Agricultural	135	948 893	128 100 602	2.2%
Enterprise (private)	60	1 255 167	75 310 000	1.3%
Publicly useful work	29	12 497 933	362 440 055	6.2%
National Employment Foundation's programme for Roma	19	20 116 737	382 218 000	6.6%
Employment (employment centre)	16	3 662 163	58 594 600	1.0%
Training and linked employment	15	4 175 069	62 626 030	1.1%
Complex re-integration (employment centre)	12	2 727 344	32 728 127	0.6%
Employment, enterprise (NGO)	11	3 926 455	43 191 000	0.7%

Health and public work	8	1 733 334	13 866 670	0.2%
Training	7	6 672 400	46 706 800	0.8%
Local public works	2	63 500 000	127 000 000	2.2%
Total	543	10 689 177	5 804 223 206	100

If we add up the number of participants of the above programmes targeted at the Romani, the result is a broad estimate of 5 - 6000 people.

This figure does not include the approximately 10 thousand participants (2 thousand families) in the social land programme. (According to Anna Mlria Bartal, around 40% of the participants are Romani, which meant 12 600 persons and 2100 - 2500 families in 1999. In my opinion, it is more advisable to rely on the number of families, as the practice has been to allocate a piece of land or a benefit to a family rather than to each member separately.) The estimate of 5-6 thousand persons does not include the number of those participating in large public work projects, we only have estimates on this as well. As it is a requirement to provide employment of at least 100 persons within the public work project, the 229 such supports examined by us mean at least 23 thousand participants. Based on the report of the employment centres and the Ministry of Economy, around 40% of the participants of large public work projects are Romani, which is exactly 9 thousand people.

Applying two approaches, we may say that labour market programmes targeted at the Romani reached 5-6 thousand people in 2001, whereas this number is between 15 and 20 thousand persons if we include programmes where the participation rate of Romani is especially high (either spontaneously or as a result of positive discrimination by the state).

Individual, or, to a somewhat smaller extent, community entrepreneurial programmes can operate successfully on a short-term basis. If we define successful operation as the initiation of a venture, and perhaps its income-generation, the most prosperous ones are the private enterprises, though in such cases the cost of the project is higher, as the support is granted to a single person (family), and its extent is close to the amount of the support for community entrepreneurial programmes.

It is the programmes that are built on operating more or less financially sustainable activities that can operate successfully. In such cases, the utility of the project lies in its potential to provide further resources to the activity, or white a grey employment. However, the danger of this often lies in the fact that the logic and financial demand of unregistered employments and enterprises differs significantly from that of legal activities. (Taxes and contributions, invoicing, accounting, employment regulations, etc.) This indicator also includes activities and links that operated before the programme, but in a number of cases it is the programme (and the resource) that mobilises the links.

Participants of successful programmes are unemployed persons whose unemployment is temporary, or they work otherwise in a more or less legal form. A further reason for the enhanced risk of programmes initiated with permanently unemployed, unmotivated participants is that implementing organisations are potentially unprepared for handling such a situation. The most general case with the latter type of programmes is that their logic is incompatible with the rationale of poverty: one being aimed at planning and establishing the future, and the other being motivated by the fulfilment of daily needs.

Another major question is that of the importance of economical thinking when initiating a project. The initial conditions are not market conditions, and there is no economic responsibility, as nearly all the

supporters only require a refund if a financial infringement or abuse is detected. However, this also disparages the credit of the supporters, as it implies that they did not follow the use of the money and the proceedings of the project, not taking the stated objectives of the programme seriously themselves. In a number of cases, supporters grant further amounts to help programmes in financial danger, or some other supporter "helps them out" with further support or loan. Naturally, the latter does not operate on a market basis either. Whether secondary labour market programmes should consider economic priorities, and to what extent, is an important question, as in this case the primary aim is to make the programme sustainable and self-sustaining rather than to produce profit, and the process of learning implied is equally important. It is also worth considering the fact that it is almost impossible to return from the secondary labour market to the primary labour market without market principles and priorities.

Part of the Romani organisations (some 10-15 organisations) work as quasi-companies, running several training, employment and entrepreneurial programmes simultaneously. The selection of programmes receiving state or non-governmental support and those which are marketable and can sustain the entire employment portfolio in "dead seasons" of support can vary from time to time. Although it would be economically rational to terminate non-profitable or uneconomic elements, but these are the activities for which support can be obtained later, the wages of the employees are financed, or continuous employment formerly undertaken is in process. This is a significant difference between market-oriented and non-profit employment. Although the organisation may operate as a company running and being supported by several activity profiles, its internal rationale (the necessity to apply for support) has different requirements.

Organisations operating as quasi-companies face two basic problems: on one hand, they suffer from a chronic shortage of active capital, on the other hand, their entry to the market is not or only partially ensured. The preparation of application materials takes place at organised training sessions in the case of the OFA, while with other applications targeted at larger support experts or hired application writers are involved. However, no such professional assistance is available to the organisation during the implementation of the programmes. In the case of programmes financed from several resources, different supporters tend to monitor and control the programme part supported by them, rather than the whole activity. They often set the decision of another supporter as a prerequisite for granting support (that is, if "A" gives money for investment, then "B" gives money for wages, etc.). In most cases, whole programmes are not assessed from an economic aspect, or with an eye to sustainability.

In the case of Romani organisations and minority self-governments the question often arises whether they are actually the tools of Romani self-organisation, or to what extent they are the Romani branches of the local authority, serving the self-justification of non-Romani power. Programmes applied for, organised and initiated by the Romani often become programmes of the local authority and majority. The ideology is a paternalistic attitude, "we just want to help you", "they will learn it with us", "this is a more efficient way of operation, and it is a more important aspect", etc..

We must pay special attention to the evolution of mediating organisations. An increased amount of support is available yearly through labour market programmes, especially if they are targeted at Romani unemployed with multiple disadvantages. One characteristic of the increased amount of support is that it can only be gained through fairly complicated application procedures, while the supervision of the utilisation of the money takes place only at the level of invoices, that is, it can be regarded as soft money. The majority of Romani organisations do not have the human resources inevitable for successful

application. Mediating organisations enter the system at two levels: at the level of application, and at the level of project management. We have no specific data concerning the amount a Romani organisation has to pay for the preparation of an application, but the fact that this activity provides substantial income for many is telling. In other cases, the entire project is run by the mediating organisation, with the priority of producing their own operation costs and profit from the programme, in addition to implementing the project objectives. The process turns into ethno-business at the point where the production of their own profit becomes the first priority, and Romani unemployed are merely a tool for this.

An argument for involving Romani organisations as labour market organisers is that they can contact the Romani more easily and efficiently than other offices. As a result, organisations operating efficiently in this field may turn into quasi employment or training centres at local level. This can be claimed to promote segregation by creating an alternative minority institutional system, by partially duplicating the standard institutional system. However, another interpretation would be that a state responsibility is delegated to an NGO that can fulfil the same task much more flexibly, quickly, and even at lower costs.

It is also quite common in small settlements that the minority self-government or a Romani NGO becomes a major employer in addition to the local authority and a number of small local enterprises. This practically indicates that in places where there is no really strong local market, an organisation utilising labour market benefits and opportunities can become a quasi market actor, and thereby expand the market.

It is worth dealing with public work type programmes separately for two reasons. Gábor Kertesi distinguishes population *used to employment and linked to the labour market*, and population *excluded* from these. Based on our statistical data related to labour market support, we may speak about Romani population *used to quasi work-based benefits* (publicly useful work and large public work projects) and Romani population with links only to the *secondary labour market*. However, the case studies reveal how the same form of support can be utilised in different ways. The project character of publicly useful work is not clear in most of the programmes, and the wages for publicly useful work are often considered as a kind of benefit rather than remuneration for actual, "normal" work. The main objective of publicly useful work is often that of registering the working days necessary for the benefits for the permanently unemployed. In many places, even the Romani themselves regard publicly useful work as a kind of "Gypsy employment". However, a discriminative attitude can be observed even with large public work projects. In our case studies, we find examples for Romani to be only allowed to do publicly useful work, while non-Romani participate in local public work programmes - the difference between the two is in the amount of wages and the measure of the supported remuneration budget. A further discriminative element is that Romani work by hand whereas non-Romani do the same work with machinery. Publicly useful programmes often do not even enable participants to achieve a financial competence, and remuneration is so low that it can only cover sustenance at a very basic level. Participants remain unmotivated in their working activity and its aims, to them it means no more than a compulsory "alibi-work" for access to social benefits. It has no other use affecting the labour market. Meanwhile, support for publicly useful employment was used smartly in a number of places, even though this required cooperation between local authorities, minority self-governments and Romani NGOs. In such cases, publicly useful employment was turned into a kind of outlet for people who recently became unemployed or no longer received benefits as unemployed. For them, the minority self-government or the local authority ensured publicly useful work opportunity, and meanwhile they could find a job or prepare for a different, self-sustaining or self-employed form of existence.

A primary aspect in evaluating Romani labour market programmes is that 60% of the Romani population lives in small settlements, where the number of employers other than agricultural is rather limited. The local market is also limited, and we cannot even speak of a local market per se in a number of places. A significant proportion of Romani labour market programmes is agricultural, but these cannot be turned into self-sustaining or profitable programmes. Entrepreneurial programmes face similar difficulties, thus the secondary labour market plays a decisive role in these areas.

It is increasingly common for the programmes to take on a certain activity of the social provision system. The most commonly adopted responsibilities include home care, caring for elderly and prostrate people, helping them in shopping, delivering food. According to Miria Frey, it is in this supplementary social provision role that the non-profit sector could take on greater responsibilities, and this could resolve employment problems more efficiently and on a larger scale at least, this is what Western examples demonstrate. Romani organisations could also play an increasing role in this process, although it seems unlikely in the current situation that this would happen first in settlements with a relatively high proportion of Romani residents.

The current trend shows that Romani of working age are increasingly dependent on state support, quasi job opportunities and quasi wages. Unfortunately, this also means that they can integrate into the evolving market economy mostly through social policy and employment transfers, and this also means the achievable limit of integration to them.

Though the employment policy plans of both the former and the present government have included the achievement of full employment - which is consistent with the objectives of the EU in this respect -, but this does not mean a considerable short-term increase. (Full employment relates to employees *capable of and willing to work*, that is, not the entire population of working age.) The probable script points towards the sustenance of present processes, that is, the number of the Romani population of working age will increase, but their proportion among those in employment will remain the same, or will only very slightly increase. The number and proportion of Romani among the registered unemployed and those not included in the record of employment statistics and not receiving benefits will increase.

The methodology of data collection

The ILO/UNDP data collection was implemented in the five countries studied using standardised questionnaires. The questionnaire had to explore the actual situation in the five countries on one hand, and it had to provide a basis for the comparison of the countries on the other. It had to provide information on Romani households in general, as well as the individual respondents.

The questionnaire contained one hundred questions. Half of the questions in the survey were targeted at individuals, while the rest were targeted at households.

The survey was based on stratified random sampling (the quotas were defined by regions or municipalities, depending on the country's public administrative system), involving adult Romani (aged 18 and older). The data of the last official census provided the basis for sampling, presuming that the data of the census reflect the structure of the Romani population correctly, with respect to their distribution according to the country/towns, age and sex.

The distribution of the number of respondents in a given area were defined as a function of the entire population; areas with a higher concentration of Romani population were given greater weight. As regards

the ethnic background, the study team followed the philosophy of the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (detailed in the Explanatory Report to the Convention, Council of Europe, 1995), which blends subjective identity with objective criteria rooted in culture.

With an eye to these common bases, sampling consisted of the following unified steps in each of the five countries:

1. Settlements and villages of overwhelmingly Roma population were selected, so that they reflect the full scale of economic environments.
2. The sample group was selected in accordance with the structure and territorial distribution of the Roma population. The exact composition of prospective respondents was defined for each sample group.
3. Local colleagues identified the persons to be interrogated in accordance with the composition of the group of respondents, assisted by representatives of social aid organisations.

Consultations were held with the NGOs of the five countries on the adequacy of the sampling procedure, so that the sampling would adequately reflect the distribution of the Roma population.

Data were obtained from personal interviews taken up at the residence of the respondents. Data collection took place in January 2002 in Hungary, involving 1000 respondents. In Hungary researchers decided to fill the full questionnaire only with persons who considered themselves Roma.

The most important data of the ILO/UNDP research relating to Hungary

Respondents by settlement types

	N	%
Budapest	57	5.7
Town	422	42.2
Village	521	52.1
Total	1000	100

Age of respondents

Age groups	N	%
15-19	17	1.7
20-24	73	7.3
25-29	139	13.9
30-34	151	15.1
35-39	150	15
40-44	141	14.1
45-49	113	11.3
50-54	89	8.9

55-59	48	4.8
60-64	37	3.7
65-69	20	2
Above 69	20	2
NR	2	0.2
Total	1000	100

Settlement part where the respondent lives

	N	%
Mainly inhabited by Romani	372	37.2
Mixed Romani and non-Romani population	532	53.2
Mainly non-Romani population	95	9.5
NR.	1	0.1
Total	1	0.1

Settlement part where the respondent lives

	N	%
Central part of the settlement	589	58.9
Non-central part of the settlement	280	28
Segregated part of the settlement	17	1.7
Gypsy settlement	114	11.4
Total	1000	100

Respondent s family status

	N	%
Married, cohabitation	775	77.5
Single	70	7
Divorced	93	9.3
Widow(er)	62	6.2
Total	1000	100

Data are not available on the total amount of income generated by the various types of potential sources of income in each household, but researchers approached this issue as one of the most intricate fields in general from another aspect. Examining the potential sources of income in a family, we found that the

most decisive factor is the role of social transfers. That is, a quarter of the respondents have a regular income from legal employment, whereas family allowance, social benefit, retirement pension and income from casual work are represented in a higher proportion of families as sources of income.

Did you receive one of the following types of income in the past month? (Number of persons answering "yes")

	N	%
Child support (incl. maternity leave)	724	72.4
Social benefit	401	40.1
Pension	373	37.3
Occasional job (without contract)	293	29.3
Unemployment benefit	148	14.8
Occasional job (with contract)	47	4.7
Regular wage job (without contract)	46	4.6
Self-employment	46	4.6
Remittances from people outside the household	43	4.3
Loan	36	3.6
Private maintenance	24	2.4
Occasional job (for food, etc.)	15	1.5
Investment	2	0.2

Did you receive one of the following types of income in the past month? (Number of persons answering "yes")

	Total (%)	Budapest (%)	Town (%)	Village (%)
Regular job (without contract)	4.6	12.3	4.3	4.0
Regular job (with contract)	4.7	10.5	4.7	4.0
Occasional job (without contract)	29.3	33.3	26.8	30.9
Self-employed	4.6	8.8	4.7	4.0
Occasional job (for food, etc.)	1.5	1.8	1.2	1.7
Unemployment benefit	14.8	21.1	12.6	15.9
Social benefit	40.1	33.3	38.9	41.8
Child care benefit (incl. maternity leave)	72.4	63.2	73.9	72.2
Pension	37.3	26.3	38.4	37.6
Investment	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2

Remittances from people outside the household	4.3	8.8	5.2	3.1
Private maintenance	2.4	1.8	3.8	1.3
Loan	3.6	7.0	3.1	3.6

Which of the following resources yielded most of the income in the household?

	Total (%)	Budapest (%)	Town (%)	Village (%)
Regular job (with contract)	24.2	29.8	27.0	21.3
Child care benefit (incl. maternity leave)	24.1	10.5	22.7	26.7
Pension	21.9	8.8	23.9	21.7
Occasional job (without contract)	10	17.5	9.2	9.8
Social benefit	8.7	8.8	6.4	10.6
Self-employed	3.9	7.0	3.8	3.6
Unemployment benefit	2.8	3.5	2.6	2.9
Regular job (without contract)	2.1	7.0	1.9	1.7
Other	1.2	1.8	1.7	0.8
Occasional job (with contract)	0.8	1.8	0.5	1.0
Remittances from people outside the household	0.2	3.5	0	0
Private maintenance	0.1	0	0.2	0
Total	100	100	100	100

Another possible approach examines the expenditure of the households. This has shown that the average expenditure in a Romani household has been 282 - in January 2002, which is nearly 70 thousand HUF at the rate of that date. The largest item of expenditure was foods, respondents spent nearly 50% of their expenditure on this item.

How much was the expenditure of the household in the previous month? (in €)

	Total	By type of settlement			By ages		
		Budapest	V1ros	Falu	15-29	30-49	>=50
	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €
Total expenditures	282,7	398,4	294,8	262,4	267,7	309,7	224,4
Food	48,1%	40,9%	49,3%	47,8%	47,0%	49,4%	45,9%
Costs of housing	17,1%	13,2%	18,7%	16,1%	15,9%	16,5%	20,9%
Petrol	11,3%	8,1%	10,7%	12,3%	10,9%	11,2%	12,4%

Clothing	6,8%	7,9%	6,1%	7,1%	7,6%	7,0%	4,8%
Cigarette, tobacco	6,5%	5,2%	6,4%	6,8%	6,8%	6,1%	7,7%
Investment (TV, washingmachine, car, etc.)	1,1%	0,0%	0,8%	1,5%	1,8%	1,1%	0,1%
Alcohol	0,9%	0,9%	1,0%	0,8%	0,7%	0,9%	1,0%

	Total	By educational attainment			
		below the 8-grade general school	8-grade general school	Unfinished secondary school	Vocational secondary school and higher
	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €
Total expenditures	282,7	239,7	287,1	327,1	411,2
Food	48,1%	51,7%	48,1%	44,6%	41,3%
Costs of housing	17,1%	15,5%	17,2%	19,1%	17,5%
Petrol	11,3%	12,4%	11,3%	10,5%	6,6%
Clothing	6,8%	6,1%	6,9%	6,9%	9,0%
Cigarette, tobacco	6,5%	7,7%	6,0%	6,4%	4,5%
Investment (TV, washingmachine, car, etc.)	1,1%	0,5%	1,1%	0,7%	4,8%
Alcohol	0,9%	0,8%	0,9%	0,8%	1,5%

Household expenditures per person (/month)

	Total	By type of settlement			By ages		
		Budapest	Town	Village	15-29	30-49	>=50
	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €
Total expenditure/capita	70,2	109,2	73,1	64,3	63,5	69,3	79,9
Food	47,6%	39,5%	49,2%	47,0%	47,4%	48,6%	45,2%
Clothing	6,1%	7,4%	5,5%	6,4%	7,4%	6,8%	3,3%
Costs of housing	18,0%	13,8%	19,8%	16,9%	16,7%	17,1%	21,0%
Alcohol	1,0%	1,1%	1,0%	0,9%	0,7%	1,1%	1,1%
Cigarette, tobacco	6,8%	5,3%	6,7%	7,1%	7,0%	6,4%	7,7%

Energy (heating, cooking)	11,8%	8,2%	10,9%	13,1%	10,8%	11,1%	14,1%
Investment (TV, washing mashine, car, etc.)	1,0%	0,0%	0,7%	1,6%	1,5%	1,3%	0,1%

Household expenditures per person (€/month)

	Total	By educational attainment			
		below the 8-grade general school	8-grade general school	Unfinished secondary school	Vocational secondary school and higher
	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €	Mean in €
Total expenditure/capital	70,2	62,2	68,2	84,8	98,9
Food	47,6%	50,2%	47,6%	45,0%	41,2%
Clothing	6,1%	4,8%	6,5%	6,4%	8,7%
Costs of housing	18,0%	16,2%	18,4%	19,5%	18,5%
Alcohol	1,0%	0,8%	1,0%	1,0%	1,5%
Cigarette, tobacco	6,8%	7,7%	6,6%	6,8%	4,0%
Energy (heating, cooking)	11,8%	14,2%	11,1%	11,1%	6,6%
Investment (TV, washing mashine, car, etc.)	1,0%	0,4%	1,0%	0,8%	5,5%