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Introduction: Lifelong Learning and the Roma Minority in Central and Eastern Europe

Katalin R. Forray and Andrea Óhidy

Abstract

This introduction from Katalin R. Forray and Andrea Óhidy provides a brief overview of the social and education situation of European Roma and also about the structure of this book.

Roma are here described as a ‘hidden minority’ (see the country study about Italy from Valeria Cavioni in the book *Lifelong Learning and the Roma Minority in Western and Southern Europe* (2019)), because – although they are the largest minority group living in Europe for more than a hundred years – we still know very little about them. Although most of the Roma people have been living for centuries in European countries, their situation is still different from the non-Roma population; they often suffered from poverty and exclusion. There is a host of Roma, especially in Southern and in Eastern Europe, who is considered to be the most disadvantaged group in European societies; that is, regarding their (1) health situation, (2) on the labour, (3) on the housing market and (4) also in education. Questions of education are the central elements of politics making the situation of Roma better. To fulfil these requirements, some European countries have taken determined steps. As Natascha Hofmann in the country study about Germany wrote in the book *Lifelong Learning and the Roma Minority in Western and Southern Europe* (2019), we are in the phase of the ‘dawn of learning’ because there are more and more policies and programmes to develop attainment and success of Roma in European education and lifelong learning. This book wants to change this and gives an overview about retrospective and prospective tendencies in the situation of European Roma in education and lifelong learning.

**Keywords:** Roma; Southern Europe; Eastern Europe; policy; lifelong learning; education
Access, attainment and success of Roma people in education and lifelong learning is one of the most urgent public policy issues in Europe. According to empirical data, Roma people are the most underrepresented group in schools and other educational institutions. The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) found, in its survey about the situation of Roma in 11 EU Member States (2014), that – although the situation has been improved for younger age groups – there are still considerable differences between Roma and non-Roma students at all levels of the education system (EU-FRA, 2014b). This book takes a look at the education situation of Roma across Central and Eastern Europe. In the following section, we provide a brief overview about their social and education situation.

**Roma: A ‘Hidden Minority’**

Although Roma people are the largest minority group living in Central and Eastern Europe for more than a hundred years, we still know very little about them. There is a general lack of information and knowledge about Roma in public awareness. Traditionally, there is repugnance against getting to know Roma people better, because they are often described stereotypically. Prejudice has accompanied the European Roma through their history since they arrived at the continent. Antiziganism can be seen as a part of European history (Agarin, 2014; Kóczé & Rövid, 2017; Selling, End, Kyuchukov, Laskar, & Templer, 2015; Tosi Cambini & Beluschi Fabeni, 2017), which is not very often reflected in public discussion or taught in schools. There are also a host of blind spots in scientific research regarding Roma, which precludes thorough discussion of their (education) situation. This book wants to change this and gives an overview about retrospective and prospective tendencies in the situation of Central and Eastern European Roma in education and lifelong learning.

According to current estimates, there are about 10–12 million Roma living in Europe, among them about 6–7 million in the European Union (EU) (European Commission, 2011). Almost 70% of the European Roma live in the middle and eastern parts of the continent as well as in the countries of the former Soviet Union. The most significant presence of Roma can be found, among others, in Bulgaria, Romania and Slovakia where they form about 9–11% of the whole population. Regarding the absolute numbers, Romania has the largest Roma population, estimated between 1.5 and 2 million people or more. Another 400,000 to one million Roma live in Bulgaria, Hungary and Slovakia, and there are more than 100,000 in the Czech Republic as well.

Despite the increasing public interest in statistical information on Roma, there are a number of reasons why it is impossible to collect and distribute exact data on this minority group: Firstly, in official statistics the category ‘ethnicity’ is mostly not recorded because in many European countries, ethnic registration is forbidden. Secondly, even if there are empirical data about them, it is often not clear about how is the identification with the category ‘Roma’ operationalised. Are we speaking about ‘nationality’, ‘ethnicity’ or ‘mother tongue’? Thirdly, a host of Roma attempt to conceal their membership to this minority because of the negative experiences they have had and the resulting stigmatisation and discrimination.
which they face. Hence, there are big differences regarding the number of Roma according to their internal terms and based on external designation.

In scientific research, the principle of self-designation is usually rejected as unreliable (Janka, Vincze, Ádány, & Sándor, 2018; Kemény, 1997). According to external designation, persons are defined as ‘Roma’ when their social environment recognises and handles them as Roma. János Ladányi differentiates between two main forms of external designation: in the first case, the researcher asks so-called experts (e.g. teachers, social workers or police people), who know the persons, which should be categorised very well, who are Roma in their opinion. The problem with this categorisation method is that it convolutes poverty with Roma ethnicity and with problematic behaviour (from the point of view of the major society). In the second case, people who conduct the survey determine who is defined as Roma. This method is considered to be very useful for research studies about assimilated Roma, but a disadvantage of this method is that the interviewees can meet the persons to be categorised only during the survey and, therefore, their attribution is based only on very limited information (Ladányi, 2009, p. 44ff).

In everyday understanding, the external description of ‘Roma’ is neither based on their ethnicity nor on their mother tongue, rather people are defined as ‘Roma’ who ‘live like the gypsies’ – in poverty, in bad living conditions, in segregation and unemployment. This means, on the one hand, that people who could be described as ‘Roma’ by the characteristic of their ethnicity, but do not live segregated, are not unemployed or poor, were not defined as ‘Roma’ from their social environment. On the other hand, people who are not Roma by the trait of ethnicity but live in poverty are considered as ‘Roma’ (Ladányi, 2009; Ligeti, 2002). The term ‘Roma’ is thus strongly associated with deprivation and burdened with strong prejudices. The Roma culture is often equated with poverty in everyday life (Farkas, 2002 in Szoboszlai, 2006). The current public discussion – both on national as well as on the international levels – mostly focusses on their difficult socio-economic situation. János Ladányi (2009), therefore, states that ‘being Roma is nothing else but ethicized poverty’ (p. 11).

Another problem is that the inner diversity of the Roma minority is seldom recognised in statistical and empirical data or in scientific studies. Roma in Europe are a very heterogeneous minority group regarding their cultural, linguistic and religious diversity or settlement forms. Roma communities – not having any mother country – have always lived scattered in countries with different historical

---

1The attitude of Roma organizations to official statistics is different: Some of them refuse any kind of data collection because they are concerned that such statistics could be the first step of government action against them. Others tend to accept the need of central registers if the data collection involves government guarantees against Roma discrimination and antiziganism. On the other hand, there are some Roma politicians who prefer setting up statistics which help to get real information about the situation of Roma and to create policy measures to deal with them (Forray, 2009).

2These problems are characteristic not only for data of the European Union but also for national and regional surveys and studies.
traditions and social-cultural background; thus, they can be found almost in every European country. As a result of this, the European Roma minority is especially colourful. Despite this diversity, there is a ‘Roma identity’, which is based on a Sanskrit rooted common language Romani/Chib (with a broad variety of dialects), on recognition of a common origin from India, on similar norms, values and traditions, but also on common historical and current experiences of stigmatisation, discrimination and exclusion. Roma have proclaimed themselves as a unified non-territorial transnational nation, which includes different subgroups. Although the Council of Europe recognises five main Roma groups (Council of Europe, 2012), these can be further divided into various subgroups whose exact number is uncertain. There are a host of different names (both internal and external) for them, which can diverge in different countries, like Roma, Romani people, Sinti, Gypsy, Kaale Roma/Kale/Kalo, Kelderash/Kaldashari, Polska Roma, Lovara, Manuš, Caminanti, Vlach/Vlah/Vlax, Vlachike or Walachian Roma, Boyasch, Romungro/Rumungro, Servike Roma, Ungrike Roma, Bergitka Roma, Carpathian Roma, Zigeuner, Tsigagnoi, Cigány, Zuže, Degeša, Bougiešti, Drizari, Kalaidzhii, Gradesh, Laho, Fichiri, Yerlii, Burgudzhii, Gitano, Turkish Roma and Horahane Roma. In this book, we use the term ‘Roma’ or ‘Roma people’ because the first World Romani Congress (1971) and the Council of Europe (2012) have a current consensus accepting and using this term, but the different country studies might use other terms, according to their national and/or regional traditions.

The Roma Minority in Selected Central and Eastern European Countries

This book discusses the education situation of Roma in eight Central and Eastern European countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Moldova, Poland, Romania and Slovakia. Seven of them are members of the EU; four members of the Schengen agreement. Most of the countries discussed here – Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Moldova, Slovakia and Poland – lay in Central and South Eastern Europe and share a common tradition through their long Soviet occupation in the twentieth century. After WWII, they became so-called satellite states, which meant that they were formally independent but stood under the control of the Soviet Union. The exception is Croatia, which – as a part of Yugoslavia – had a communist regime, but was not occupied. They

---

4The first World Romani Congress was organized in Orpington near London in 1971. It was attended by representatives from nine nations (Czechoslovakia, Finland, Norway, France, Great Britain, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Spain and Yugoslavia) and observers from Belgium, Canada, India and the United States. For further information see: https://www.revolvy.com/main/index.php?s=World+Romani+Congress
built so-called ‘socialist or communist societies’, a ‘dictatorship of the working class’ with common ownership, governed by a centralised single party apparatus and guided by Marxist–Leninist philosophy. After the Fall of the Iron Curtain, most of them have become members of the EU and also of the Schengen agreement. The Roma minority in these countries has lived there for centuries. Legally, they are usually full citizens, even if they are mostly marginalised. In the communist period, Roma were forced to integrate. Although this forced integration had its price – the assimilation of successful Roma – they could participate in the labour market and education. Therefore, Roma people are the greatest losers of the political and economic changes of the 1990s and now suffer more than before from multiple deprivations and social and geographical segregation, also in education and lifelong learning. Through the political liberalisation, especially the new freedom of speech and expression, nationalist and racist ideas – also antiziganism – have (re)emerged and are discussed publicly. János Ladányi describes this negative development in Hungary as ‘from concealed selection to open discrimination’ (Ladányi, 2009). In their study ‘Poverty, ethnicity and gender’, which was carried out in six post-communist states – Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Russia and Slovakia – in 1999 and 2000, János Ladányi and Iván Szélényi (2004) differentiate between two types of post-communistic states: neo-liberal and neo-patrimonialistic systems. They characterised neo-liberal states – such as the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland or Slovenia and the Baltic States – through their political and geographical closeness to the EU, and through the fast and shock-like liberalisation of their economic and political systems. However, they describe neo-patrimonialistic systems – such as Bulgaria, Romania, Ukraine, Russia, Belorussia and the states of Ex-Yugoslavia – as less liberal, rather authoritarian and paternalistic, where employers and employee have a patron-client relationship. According to their findings and based on the theory of Julius Wilson (1978, 1987), they formulated the hypothesis that in neo-liberal states an underclass-building process is characteristic – which means that only a part of the Roma minority is excluded – while in neo-patrimonial states an under caste building process – which means that the whole Roma minority is excluded – can be observed (Ladányi & Szélényi, 2004, p. 166). In 2000, as part of this survey, they made an international comparison of the connection between Roma ethnicity and poverty in Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary. Their interest was to describe the developments in the transitional period to market economy after the democratic systems change in the 1990s in post-communist states and in the consolidation period of capitalism structures in the 2000s.

According to their analysis in Hungary, the Roma ethnic minority broke apart along social class lines after the democratic system change. There is a process of underclass-building, which, for about 1/5 of the Hungarian Roma, means that their social position became significantly better. They practically become a part of the (lower) middle class. This social advancement also means that they come through an association process, so far, that their social environment does not define them as Roma anymore (Dupcsik, 2009; Ladányi, 2009). But for most of them, this process means that they became a part of the underclass, lost their function in society and suffer from permanently unemployment, poverty and
have no future vision. They live in social and regional segregation; that is why, Claus Offe (1994) calls them ‘the Unnecessary’. It is very likely that their children will live in the same situation. Ladányi and Szelényi (2004) also described this underclass-building process in Romania, but less pronounced than in Hungary (p. 156). According to Markéta Levínská, Dana Bittnerová and David Doubek, there are similar tendencies in the Czech Republic where around 245,000 Roma live (2016), which represents 2.3% of the overall population. Approximately, one half of the Roma are integrated into the Czech society while the other half faces risks of social exclusion (see page 70 in this book). According to Agnieszka Świętek and Wiktor Osuch, in Poland there is part of the Roma minority, which is entrepreneurial and effectively involved in legal economic activity but their majority, however, has difficulties on the job market (see page 139 in this book). In Bulgaria, Ladányi and Szelényi (2004) found rather a caste-like exclusion of Roma people because more or less the whole Roma minority is affected (p. 155). There is a strong ethnicity-based residential segregation, which we can describe as ghettoisation (Ladányi & Szelényi, 2004, p. 124). Milena Ivova Ilieva confirms these tendencies in her country study (see page 26 in this book).

There is a constant Roma migration from Southern and Eastern Europe to Western Europe because of their better living conditions, especially since the 1990s. After the Fall of the Iron Curtain, the Romanian Revolution and the disintegration of Yugoslavia, a host of Roma has moved from Romania, Bosnia and Kosovo, applying for asylum. After the Eastern enlargement of the EU (2004–2007), a host of Roma migrated from the new member states – for example, Romania and Bulgaria – to Western Europe, because the Schengen agreement allows them as EU citizens to live in all member states.

**Disadvantages and Multiple Deprivations**

Roma in Europe are not only the biggest minority, but also the most disadvantaged (European Commission, 2004; EU-FRA, 2012, 2014a). Although most of the Roma people have been living for centuries in European countries, their situation is still different from the non-Roma population; they often suffered from poverty and exclusion. There is a host of Roma, especially in Southern and in Eastern Europe, who are considered as the most disadvantaged group in European societies, that is, regarding their (1) health situation, (2) on the labour market, (3) on the housing market and (4) also in education:

1. According to research findings on national and international levels, the European Roma minority usually has a less healthy lifestyle and its health situation is much worse than of the non-Roma population. Roma people regularly suffer from higher rates of chronic diseases and infant mortality and have lower life expectancies than the rest of European societies. For example, in Moldova life expectancy at birth for Roma people is estimated to be 65.3 years, which is nearly three years shorter than for the population in general (see page 121 in this book). In the Czech Republic, Roma have a higher premature mortality rate in comparison to the majority society by about 10–15 years on
the average (see page 75 in this book). In Bulgaria, in a survey 60.5% of the Roma-respondents had no health insurance at all (see page 27 in this book).

(2) There is also a significant gap in employment opportunities on the labour market between Roma and non-Roma: Rastislav Rosinský stated – citing Jurášková (2004) – that in Slovakia the most important reasons for the low employment rate among Roma are: (1) low educational and qualification levels, (2) the presence of hidden discrimination against the Roma ethnic group by the majority or employers, (3) the negative influence of low status of housing and living conditions on the health status and on their reproduction of labour force and (4) the loss of work habits resulting from permanently high long-term unemployment rates and the related devastation of human capital (see page 186 in this book). These tendencies are also characteristic for most of the Roma (not only) in Central and Eastern Europe. It is, therefore, no wonder that Roma often do not reveal their ethnic affiliation to facilitate social mobility and participation and prevent institutional discrimination (Jonuz, 2009, p. 290; Strauß, 2011).

(3) Disadvantageous housing conditions – dwelling status and available infrastructure – represent a major problem for most of the Roma people in Central and Eastern Europe. Not only substandard living conditions, but also residential segregation and barriers to the subsidised and free housing market are characteristic for them. In Moldova, a host of Roma households do not have a secure dwelling; a representative survey from 2007 showed that about one third of the Roma population lives in houses which are in very poor conditions or even in ruins (30%) in comparison to only 7% of the non-Roma households. An average member of the surveyed Roma households benefits from 18 m\(^2\) of living area in comparison with 24 m\(^2\) for a non-Roma (see page 117 in this book). Added to these problems is also segregation in the housing of Roma, which is related to their special difficulties in finding housing. On the one hand, they often do not have formal employment, personal savings or a chance to take out a mortgage, which are requirements for obtaining social housing. On the other hand, there is discrimination against them regarding the access to the free housing market. Markéta Levínská, Dana Bittnerová and David Doubek report that in the Czech Republic, due to the absence of housing policies at the national and municipal levels, housing has become one of the areas of the ‘poverty business’. It means that a host of landlords and house owners misuse the social system and claim large sums for housing supplements to which people in need are legally entitled to. As a result, there is an increasingly spatial segregation of Roma people, who are often pushed into ghettos where they live not only in residential buildings, but also in overpriced lodging houses (see page 74 in this book). There are also segregated settlements in Hungary, where the traditional segregation of Roma during the era of communism – when the low-comfort houses were built next to each other in the villages – was strengthened through new governmental policies, leading to new segregated settlements on the peripheries or segregated streets inside of the villages. Julianna Boros and Eszter Gergye report that very often, if Roma wants to buy a house in the neighbourhoods
The disadvantaged social situation of the European Roma minority is considered to come from their low level of participation and success in education and lifelong learning (EU-FRA, 2014b). This impedes not only their chances for employment and income prospects, but also for getting better housing conditions and having a good health status. These problems in turn have a negative impact on their access to, and attainment and success in, education. Therefore, it is no wonder that the Framework of the European Commission for National Roma Integration Strategies emphasised the necessity of policy measures in these areas.

**Lifelong Learning for Roma in Europe**

Questions of education are the central elements of politics making the situation of Roma better. To fulfil these requirements, some European countries have taken determined steps. There are more and more policies and programmes to develop attainment and success of Roma in European education and lifelong learning.

The idea of lifelong learning has become the most important educational paradigm of our times and also an umbrella term for educational political reform ambitions in the EU over the last decades. Since, at the very latest, the proclamation of the European Year of Lifelong Learning in 1996, lifelong learning has been considered the only possible answer to the political and economic changes in modern times in Europe. According to the interpretation of different organisations of the EU, lifelong learning shall be the precondition for the sensitive, peaceful and democratic solution to the difficulties arising from political, social and economic changes. As an educational policy concept, lifelong learning, through the extension of the socially mandatory learning period throughout one’s whole life, aims at changes in the individuals’ subjective biographies, on the one side, and at political and structural changes in the whole society, on the other (Óhidy, 2008). For individual learners, lifelong learning is a cognitive process which starts in early childhood, ends in late old age, and includes formal or school education, non-formal learning (in self-organized, non-formal organizations, which do not award degrees) and informal learning, such as learning in one’s family, at one’s workplace, or in the wider social environment. (Harangi, 2003, p. 225)

According to the European Report on Quality Indicators of Lifelong Learning, it ‘comprises the continuous directed formal and informal activities whose aim is the development of knowledge and skills’ (Setényi, 2004, p. 21). Our focus in this book is mainly, but not exclusively, on formal education in the regular education system in each country.

According to research findings, for example, from the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, the access, attainment and success levels of European
Roma people in education and lifelong learning are significantly lower than those of the non-Roma population (EU-FRA, 2012, 2014b). To change this situation in 2005, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Romania, Serbia and the Slovak Republic declared the Decade of Roma Inclusion (2005–2015) and George Soros and the World Bank funded the Roma Education Fund to contribute to closing the gap in educational outcomes between Roma and non-Roma, including through desegregation of educational systems in Central and Eastern Europe, especially the countries that have formally joined the Decade of Roma Inclusion. (Surdu & Friedmann, 2013, p. 36)

Twelve countries – Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia and Spain – took part in the Decade of Roma, while Slovenia, the USA, Norway and Moldova participated with an observer status. The policy measures were focussed on the following priority areas: health, education, employment and housing. In 2010, the European Commission’s Roma Task Force emphasised the need for more and more effective measures for Roma inclusion. Therefore, in 2011, the EU decided to work out a specific strategy to improve Roma inclusion and asked its member states to develop national programmes for it. The EU Framework raised Roma inclusion to the EU level for the first time and linked it with the Europe 2020 strategy for ‘smart, sustainable and inclusive growth’ (European Commission, 2010). The following goals were formulated regarding access to education, employment, healthcare, housing and essential services:

- Ensuring that all Roma children complete at least primary school.
- Cutting the employment gap between Roma and the rest of the population.
- Reducing the gap in health status between the Roma and the rest of the population.
- Closing the gap between the share of Roma with access to housing and public utilities (such as water, electricity and gas) and that of the rest of the population (European Commission, 2014).

A public consultation on the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020 has found out that since 2011 there has been no major change regarding the situation of Roma in employment, healthcare, housing and discrimination, but there has been improvement in the education situation. This book shows these developments in selected Central and Eastern European countries.

The Structure of the Book

In this section, we provide an overview of the individual chapters, highlighting common themes and structural similarities. The first group of chapters focusses on the most important policy measures for increasing attainment and success in education and lifelong learning for Roma in Europe. This introduction from
Katalin R. Forray and Andrea Óhidy provide a brief overview about the social and education situation of Roma in Central and Eastern Europe and also about the structure of this book. Natascha Hofmann discusses the policy measures for improving the (education) situation of Roma in Europe.

The second group of chapters discusses the education situation of Roma in eight Central and Eastern European countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Moldova, Poland, Romania and Slovakia, which are presented in alphabetical order. The country studies have a common structure according to the following guidelines:

1. Describing of the situation of the Roma minority in the selected country:
   a. Number, groups, names and legal status.
   b. Social situation.
   c. Culture and language/s.
2. Roma in the education system:
   a. The education system of the selected country.
   b. Educational attainment of the Roma:
      ● in elementary schools;
      ● in secondary schools;
      ● at colleges and universities; and
      ● in adult education.
3. Policies and support programmes for Roma education in the selected country.
4. Presentation of a/an (own) study about a successful programme.

The country studies express the opinion of the authors which are not necessarily in accordance with those of the editorial team and the publisher.

In the concluding chapter, we return to the central theme of the book with regard to similarities and differences of education and lifelong learning for Roma in different national contexts and within the wider European context. These themes are considered in relation to the issues addressed in the country studies, including the social economic challenges, the policies and programmes to change the current situation for the better, and the problems and challenges in research and practice, towards Roma inclusion. Evidence from the country studies is used to explore the similarities in the challenges to increase the participation and success of Roma people across (Central and Eastern) Europe.
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