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Objectives

- Propose a mechanism to allow Decade countries to track and report on the results of Roma inclusion policies in 2015 – measure changes in the lives of people
- Propose a measurement methodology and a set of indicators covering education, employment, health and housing
- Propose data collection mechanisms
- Propose first and second best options
A Unifying Framework: The First Best 1

- Three measured stages of the integration process
  - Opportunity to **access** a particular institution or service
  - Access provided, ability to realize a positive **result**
  - Realization provided, the chances to achieve **success**
A Unifying Framework: The First Best 1

- Integration: full participation in terms of social and economic life of the broader society
## A Unifying Framework: The First Best (Table)

Table 1: *Three-stage Integration*

| Stage         | Employment                  | Education                              | Health                               | Housing                                                          |
|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------|                                     |                                                                 |
| 1. Access     | Labor market participation  | Enrolment in pre-primary and primary education | Possession of health insurance      | Access to non-segregated and functioning housing market, e.g. possibility to obtain building permit, housing credit, or buy/own land |
| 2. Result     | Employment, Self-employment | Segregation (at classroom level, primary), primary education drop out rate, special school incidence | Vaccination rate, Registration with GP | Legal housing in a non-segregated area                           |
| 3. Success    | Hourly wage, Labor income, Occupational status | Attainment (tertiary, secondary or tertiary), educational achievement (external standards, screening, scores in such tests), length of stay in pre-preprimary | Infant mortality rate, Life expectancy | Housing of a good quality (inhabitants per room or m²), Homeownership |

**Overall indicator**  
The product of the success rates in each stage to obtain the overall success measure.
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- Overall success measured at the community level:
  - expected outcome (e.g. population average earnings)
  - absolute chance to achieve a "good outcome" (e.g. 5 EUR an hour)
  - absolute chance to achieve an outcome similar to the majority. (e.g. the median earnings of the majority)

- Ratio of minority and majority chances is our key value (under the last possibility no need)
The Data Issues 1

- General lack of data and severe measurement problems
  - No indicators of ethnicity or missing variables in the existing data
  - Where ethnicity indicated, extreme measurement error due to low self-identification.
  - Restrictions on data availability
  - Restrictive questionnaires: no room for complex ethnicities
  - Confusion: ethnicity, nationality, citizenship
  - Negative associations with Roma ethnicity
The Data Issues 2

- We suggest for the long run
  - Include ethnicity questions in the regularly collected data
  - Apply broad measures of ethnicity and ethno-cultural background in the questionnaires
  - Remove social and psychological barriers to self-identification
  - Remove excessive restrictions on data availability
The Data Issues 3

- We suggest for the medium run
  - Small-scale collection of dedicated data
    - dedicated mini-surveys,
    - Roma boosters or ethnicity supplements in existing surveys
    - community surveys providing aggregated data for well-defined Roma communities
    - custom surveys collecting data from social service recipients on voluntary basis

- Problems
  - costs (time and money), representativeness, and subjectivity
A Unifying Framework: Feasible Solutions?

- Can we apply the first best methodology using imperfect data?
- Use existing markers of ethnicity other than self identification?
  - Language or mother tongue? No.
  - Religion? No.
A Unifying Framework: A Feasible Second Best 1

- Geographical segregation may be the key
  - First best can be *approximated* using data without information on ethnicity, just location
  - In itself another integration measure that can be used

- Step 1 (Partition)
  - Define "segregated" and "integrated" neighborhoods by the share of Roma
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● Step 2 (Measurement)
  ● Measure the outcome variable in segregated and integrated neighborhoods
  ● Estimate the total numbers of Roma and non-Roma
  ● Estimate the shares of integrated Roma and non-Roma
  ● Estimate relative deprivation of Roma and non-Roma within segregated and integrated neighborhoods

● Step 3 (Calculation)
  ● A well defined formula
A Unifying Framework: Some Third Bests 1

- The second-best still not easy to do
- Third best alternatives based on the assumption that bad outcomes are correlated with ethnicity
- Alternatives (shares of the general population)
  - In poverty (e.g. below 1-2-3$/day)
  - In long term unemployment
  - Lacking education (or bad in PISA), health care, housing
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- Advantages:
  - Readily available data

- Problems:
  - Dependent on the share of Roma
  - Dependent on the non-Roma's outcomes in additive way
  - Not really integration measures: not benchmarked
  - Unclear policy makers' incentives
Conclusions

- We are facing a serious measurement challenge.
- There are solutions.
  - Long term: Improve standard data
  - Medium term: Collect own data
  - Short term: A feasible and valid second best solution that reduces the measurement problem, but does quite eliminate it
  - Immediate possibilities: Third best alternatives
Conclusions

- Indicators
  - Employment, education, health, housing plus locational (regional) segregation
  - Three stage integration
  - Core and auxiliary indicators

- Data issues
  - Different strategies for administrative and survey data, existing and proposed data, special attention to representativeness and the number of observations

- Subpopulations by gender, age, region
Conclusions: Table Guide

### Table 2: Good practice of integration measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Core indicator</th>
<th>Secondary indicator</th>
<th>Preferred data source</th>
<th>Alternative data source</th>
<th>Collection strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Target population</td>
<td>Core indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Primary working age, by gender</td>
<td>Employment rate</td>
<td>Self-employment rate</td>
<td>Labor force survey</td>
<td>Micro-census</td>
<td>If no ethnicity use segregation proxy measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Target population</td>
<td>Core indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>Primary working age</td>
<td>25-54 years of age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>