ACCEPT PLURALISM

APPLYING TOLERANCE INDICATORS:

ROMA SCHOOL SEGREGATION

Jon Fox and Zsuzsanna Vidra, University of Bristol and Central European University

Table of Contents

ROMA SCHOOL SEGREGATION INDICATORS

INTRODUCTION

Segregation of Roma children in schools remains a major and pressing problem throughout all the countries we have studied: **Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Poland**, and **Romania**. The number of Roma in these countries range from the tens of thousands (Poland) to the hundreds of thousands (Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania, for example), though estimates are notoriously inaccurate.

What all of these Roma share in common is that their children are concentrated in Roma segregated schools. This segregation occurs at both the classroom level and more significantly at the school level. Pupils in majority Roma classrooms or schools typically receive substandard education, thus contributing to the perpetuation of their socio-economic disadvantages. Despite fluctuations in levels of segregation, including some isolated success stories (including the use of Roma cultural mediators in several of the countries we studied), segregation has not gone away.

The causes of segregation are complex and varied as we have discussed in our ACCEPT PLURALISM research reports. In some cases, school admission policies based on academic achievement have the effect of separating out Roma (underachieving) students into separate schools. In other cases, residential segregation is a primary determinant of school segregation, with the phenomenon of white flight exacerbating already segregationist tendencies at both residential and school levels. In still other cases, loose alliances of teachers, parents, and sometimes school administrators join forces with the academic interests of the children in mind to remove or segregate 'disruptive' Roma pupils from classrooms and schools. These and many other factors interact in ways that effectively keep Roma children segregated in schools across much of Europe.

This does not mean that the problem of school segregation has been ignored on a policy level: far from it.

Governments on both the left and right in the countries studied have often made desegregation efforts a priority, with numerous attempts to reverse the segregation trend. These efforts are mostly aimed at different forms of integration: getting and keeping Roma pupils in mixed classrooms and schools. The one thing these policies all share in common is that for the most part they have failed. In spite of their efforts (notable in some cases) the segregation problem persists; indeed, in some cases it has worsened, and policies aimed at desegregation have inadvertently contributed to increased segregation. Often, these policies lack the political clout necessary for their successful implementation.

The political cultures of the countries we have studied often display and even legitimate the sorts of anti-Roma attitudes that are more widespread in the general population. With the exception of a small and dedicated segment of policymakers committed to addressing the segregation problem, most politicians in these countries view the Roma question as a political liability.

The corresponding lack of political will means that policies heralded with much fanfare very often meet their demise just as quickly. The recent economic crisis has also meant that desegregation programmes are competing for diminishing resources from budget strapped governments.

What does all of this mean for questions of tolerance?

Intolerant attitudes and racism toward the Roma are pervasive throughout Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Poland, and Romania. The Roma are severely stigmatised in cultural terms and marginalised in socio-economic terms. Integration efforts moreover are aimed not in the first instance at accommodating and/or respecting cultural difference (though such efforts are present too in some cases), but rather primarily on questions of integration, often explicitly presented in socio-economic terms. Whilst such efforts are generally viewed as the most progressive (and most urgent) solution to the problem, they only indirectly address the question of tolerance.

We will therefore consider what implications integration efforts (and indeed their shortcomings and failures) have for the Roma question in the countries we have studied.

Integration efforts, however important and even urgent in their own right, may turn out nevertheless not to be the most effective strategy for overcoming problems of racism and nurturing a more positive acceptance of the Roma in the societies we have been studying.

A note on methods

This cluster report focuses on questions of school segregation for Roma. This does not mean that other immigrant and/or national minorities do not suffer from various forms of segregation; they do. We chose to focus narrowly on the question of Roma segregation, however, so that the results we present can be more meaningful.

This means we not only excluded other countries from our comparison (where different forms of segregation can be found), we also excluded minorities other than Roma from the countries that were included in the cluster sample. The reasons for this are the same: widening the analysis to include non-Roma minority would have made it difficult to apply the indicators. Established national minorities for instance in several of the countries we have studied enjoy much higher rates of participation and attainment in the educational institution in the countries we studied than do Roma. There are also often very different sets of policies that govern national minorities and Roma. Including them in our analysis would have made a difficult task more difficult: assigning composite scores based on an assessment of very different phenomena would seriously compromise the explanatory power of our indicators. We thus opted to preserve the singular focus on Roma educational segregation in the countries concerned.

Our tolerance indicators are meant to capture some of the similarities and differences that occur between and amongst the countries we examined. They are not, however, comparable in the strict sense of the word. The research design for the project on which our findings are based varied country by country and indeed case by case. The strength of that design is that our qualitative approach allowed us to generate rich and textured data on the cases we examined.

We endeavour to convey these varied contexts (albeit in cursory form) in our presentation of the indicators below. These variations in context (measured in terms of time frames, political cultures, historical specificities, and so forth), however, complicate direct comparison between our cases. To be sure, the focus of our research was never so narrow as to exclude the wider contexts in which specific processes and practices were examined.

So, whilst some insights into various convergences and divergences between our cases can be gleaned from this document, those variations should always be approached with a healthy and critical scepticism.

For more information about each national case study please refer to the individual reports listed in the Annex.

PART 1. THE INDICATORS

We have selected six indicators to assess policies and practices related to Roma segregation in schools:

2.1   Civic education – teaching about diversity

3.2   Desegregation

3.3   Financial investment

3.4   Recruitment of minority/immigrant teachers

3.5   Teacher training programmes

3.6   Promoting a culture of anti-racism and non-discrimination

Most of these indicators are designed to capture various structural dimensions of segregation (3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5).

'Desegregation' is the most relevant and significant of these indicators.

Whilst we do not offer any formal weighting for the different indictors, results assigned to the 'desegregation' indicator should be read as being of primary importance in this cluster.

The 'civic education' (2.1) and to a certain extent the 'anti-racism' (3.6) indicators in contrast speak to initiatives that concentrate on the content of the curriculum rather than the structural dimensions of segregation. In this regard they do not address the segregation issue directly. We have nevertheless included these two indicators to draw attention to these complementary efforts in dealing with larger problems of Roma inclusion in schools.

What the indicators can and cannot show

Country scores on individual indicators should be interpreted as very condensed statements on the situation in a particular country (for a given time period) on this aspect.

Scores represent contextual judgments by experts based on an interpretation of qualitative research and the available knowledge about the respective society in this respect. The 'scores' cannot be understood and should not be presented without the explanations provided by the researchers.

Scores cannot be aggregated, scores on individual indicators may help to analyze the situation in countries in a comparative perspective, but from the fact that countries score higher or lower across a number of indicators we cannot infer that *ipso facto* a particular country as a whole is 'more or less tolerant'

Scores on individual indicators are not necessarily comparable, because different factors and reasons may have resulted in a particular score for a country (e.g. it may be that the score in one country only refers to a particular region). This means that scores cannot necessarily be compared and they can only be interpreted in a comparative way in relation to the explications and reasons provided.

For the Toolkit of the ACCEPT PLURALISM Tolerance Indicators please see here: www.accept-pluralism.eu

INDICATOR 2.1 CIVIC EDUCATION – TEACHING ABOUT DIVERSITY

LOW – non tolerance	There is no civic education course in lower high school (around the 11-15 age bracket) and/or civic education only includes teaching on the country's political system and institutions with no reference to the cultural, ethnic or religious diversity of the country.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Civic education courses include specific references to cultural, ethnic or religious diversity, however the courses are taught in an abstract or general way without presenting students with questions about particular examples pertaining to real situations that they may face in and out of school.
HIGH – acceptance	Civic education courses give significant priority to the value of cultural, ethnic and religious diversity and include experiential learning, including examples that are relevant to the contemporary reality and situations that children face in and out of school.

Teaching about diversity is important because it can foster both a greater awareness of and respect for cultural difference. Pupils lacking exposure to diversity or harbouring a fear of difference can be taught the importance of accommodating and appreciating cultural diversity. Diversity teaching thus has the potential to facilitate inter-cultural communication and mutual respect. This is particularly important in the Roma case where the stigmatisation of their culture remains a significant barrier to integration.

In all the countries we studied Roma difference was unambiguously perceived in negative terms. It was not that Roma difference was not recognised; it was that Roma difference was coded in racist terms. A robust curriculum that teaches cultural diversity offers an important opportunity to not only raise awareness of Roma cultural distinctiveness but in a way that presents Roma culture in a positive light.

All of the countries we studied did have some diversity teaching in the curriculum. (Poland had the least diversity teaching but it also had the lowest proportion of minorities.) Nevertheless, none of these countries receive high marks for their diversity teaching.

The reason for this is that any positive impact of diversity teaching was offset by a number of different factors (present in various combinations in our five cases):

1. The main educational priority in several countries was to promote national cohesion and to advance the educational interests of a national mainstream. Diversity teaching was not only not a priority; it was also in tension with the goals of advancing common national values.

2. Diversity teaching that did exist tended to emphasise the role and place of national (and sometimes immigrant) minorities in their countries; the Roma were given less attention.

3. There is no evidence from any of our countries to suggest that diversity curricula have changed pupil attitudes toward the Roma. To the contrary, high levels of intolerance and racism toward the Roma in all the countries examined would suggest such attitudes have not been fundamentally altered.

As a result, most of our countries receive scores of medium.

This acknowledges the presence of diversity teaching in these countries but cautions against over-optimism in assessing the potential of this teaching to alter negative attitudes toward the Roma. Genuine intercultural dialogue and mutual respect between Roma and majority populations remains allusive.

Table 1. Applying Indicator 2.1: Civic education – teaching about diversity to five European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Medium	There is no dedicated 'civic education' course in Bulgaria, but issues related to diversity are touched upon in various courses contained in the 'Social Sciences and Civic Education' curriculum. The State Education Requirements (in force since 2000) stipulate that pupils completing the 8th grade should be aware of ethnic, religious and linguistic diversity in Bulgaria, and that they should appreciate the importance of concepts like equality and tolerance. Pupils completing 12 years of schooling should be able to explain the role of language, religion and culture for the diversity of the country. These requirements must however be understood in terms of the larger goals of the curriculum: the formation and strengthening of Bulgarian national identity and the promotion of the principles and ideals of a Bulgarian nation (civically understood).
Greece	Medium	The Cross-Thematic Single Curriculum Framework (established in 2003) promotes the 'cultivation of a European conscience while preserving national identity and cultural self-knowledge.' It thus balances its diversity teaching against its cultivation of a Greek national identity. In the area of diversity, its objectives include the reinforcement of cultural and linguistic identity in the context of a multicultural society and raising awareness of human rights, world peace, and human dignity. In spite of these principles, actual course content focuses on the Greek political system and the EU; the diversity content is superficial and is not

		connected with discussions of racism, discrimination, and other diversity challenges.
Hungary	Medium	Textbook content is not tightly regulated in Hungary; there are dozens of textbooks for civic education available for use by schools. Final exam requirements reveal that students are expected to know about minority rights and ethnic and national diversity. Hungary's new national curriculum (in effect as of 2013) has already been criticised for its nationalist ideological bias. This suggests that the curriculum will not emphasise diversity teaching. Survey research in Hungary also shows Hungarian school children displaying High (and increasing) levels of prejudice.
Poland	Low	There are two school subjects in Lower High school (age 13-16), 'Knowledge and society' and 'History' in which some diversity issues are touched upon, but only briefly. These issues refer to Poland's minorities, but mostly in historical terms. As such they have little practical contemporary relevance. The Roma receive no mention in Poland's core curriculum. Schools with a large Roma presence do however sometimes make an effort to initiate their own diversity teaching.
Romania	Medium	Beginning in the late 1990s various NGOs in Romania introduced different forms of intercultural education. Since 2007 civic education courses became a part of the official curriculum and have been taught in Lower High school (age 11-15). This curriculum describes the cultural and ethnic diversity of Romania. The Roma are included in this curriculum (in segments authored by Roma intellectuals and activists), but they do not receive any special emphasis.

INDICATOR 3.2 DESEGREGATION

LOW – non tolerance	De facto or state-sponsored segregation in classrooms and/or schools against the wishes of the local minority. Minority children denied equal access to educational institutions that meet basic standards.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Various efforts made at desegregation, but with minimal impact on larger problem. Some minority children integrated into special schools targeted for desegregation policies, but most minority students remain in segregated classrooms/schools.
HIGH – acceptance	Sustained system-wide desegregation efforts to combat segregation in classroom and school. Has backing of state and local education officials. Significant inroads made toward desegregation.

Desegregation is our most important indicator in this cluster. It assesses both the various policies aimed at integrating Roma into mainstream schools and the effectiveness of those policies in achieving their intended results. Desegregation is viewed as the most obvious and most progressive remedy to the problem of segregation.

It has been embraced by governments on both the left and right and it has had the support of the EU. These efforts are sometimes pursued exclusively at the school level and in other cases as part of a wider policy of socio-economic integration.

Attempts at desegregation often do not target the Roma by name but rather are aimed at the most marginalised segments of the population (which often included a high proportion of Roma). Desegregation is an important first step (but not the last one) in ensuring that Roma pupils are given the same educational opportunities as non-Roma pupils.

Here all countries received the same score: medium.

The justification for this scoring is also similar across all our cases. Whilst all countries receive high marks for their various progressive policies to tackle segregation, they all receive low marks for the ineffectualness of these policies. There is thus a significant and troubling divide between policy and practice in the area of desegregation.

We attribute these policy failures to a number of factors:

1. In many cases school segregation is a reflection of residential segregation: Roma pupils are segregated in Roma schools because the neighbourhoods/locales in which they live are also segregated. Attempts to address school segregation without also addressing other forms of segregation are thus prone to failure.

2. There is a lack of political will in these countries to see these policies through to fruition. Desegregation efforts find little political support beyond the narrow band of policymakers and activists who develop them. Political cultures which often turn a blind eye to racist attitudes toward the Roma discredit efforts aimed at genuine respect and integration.

3. Informal coalitions of concerned parents and teachers coordinate their activities to keep 'disruptive' Roma children (or just Roma children) outside of their classrooms. Whilst these parents and teachers express their concerns in terms of educational attainment, their efforts effectively undermine efforts at desegregation.

The result is that efforts aimed at desegregation have achieved at best only modest results. For the most part, the efforts and policies surveyed by us and presented in detail in the table below have been ineffectual or even counter-productive.

The countries we examined deserve recognition for developing both homegrown and EU sponsored policy initiatives to tackle the problem of segregation. But much more work is needed to see these policies through to fruition.

Table 2. Applying Indicator 3.2 Desegregation to five European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Medium	The National Education Act states that 'Restrictions or privileges based on race, nationality, sex, ethnic and social origin, religion and social status shall not be tolerated.' But whilst this law grants Roma (and indeed all) children equal access to educational institutions, demographic and other factors contribute to the *de facto* segregation of a large number of schools. These segregated schools typically exhibit much Lower levels of educational performance vis-à-vis other schools. Policy and legislative efforts in the domain of desegregation have been robust, particularly since the late 1990s. These policies are aimed at ensuring equal access to quality education, the integration of Roma children and in ethnically mixed schools, the promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination, and the cultivation a Roma cultural identity. In spite of these and other ambitious policies, however, most Roma students for now remain in segregated schools.

Greece	Medium	Segregation is officially forbidden but in practice it persists in many schools. Numerous efforts at desegregation have had only limited (localised) success or have simply been ineffective. The resistance of Greek majority parents and local authorities against desegregation has been registered in several places across Greece. Informal alliances of parents and teachers (sometimes in combination with local authorities) have coordinated their efforts in some cases to obstruct various efforts at desegregation (like bussing). Greece has been convicted by the European Court of Human Rights (2008, 2011) for violating the right to education and the non-prohibition of discrimination.
Hungary	Medium	The former socialist government (in coalition with the liberals) (2002-2010) made important efforts to desegregate the school system. Nevertheless, major structural problems including residential segregation, selectivity in the school system, and white-flight remained outside of the purview of these efforts. The current (centre right) government (2013) supports Roma integration in its rhetoric but it has introduced various policies that are inconsistent with desegregation. The explicit aim of the new (2013) education bill is to create 'a new national middle class'. Other policies have directly or indirectly contributed to increased segregation: Lowering the compulsory school age (increasing the dropout rate for Roma), promoting a centralised compulsory curriculum that makes it more difficult to make adjustments to meet the local needs of pupils, and the creation of a preparatory year for disadvantaged children that may trigger early selectivity.
Poland	Medium	Education in Poland is universal and standardised: all citizens have a duty to enrol their children in school. Formally, there is no segregation (ethnic-sensitive data cannot be collected by schools). In practice, however, Roma children often do not participate in the general obligation of school education. Efforts at desegregation have been ineffective.
Romania	Medium	Romania only began to come to grips with its Roma segregation problem in the early 2000s. By 2004 it began adopting legislation intended to combat Roma segregation in schools. Its efforts to date have not been applied for the most part in local schools. Since 2004, the segregation problem has been monitored but this has not had any direct effect on desegregating schools.

INDICATOR 3.3 FINANCIAL INVESTMENT

LOW – non tolerance	There is a systematic neglect of the needs of schools in socio-economically deprived areas, even where those schools are shown to be unable to meet basic standards of educational provision. Opportunities for socio-economic integration of minority/migrant children are minimal to non-existent.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Some targeted funding for schools in socio-economically deprived areas meeting minimum standards of provision. Increased opportunities for educational and socio-economic advancement for minority children (though still severely limited).
HIGH – acceptance	Robust investment strategy in schools in socio-economically deprived areas. Often combined with desegregation efforts in practice. Programmes targeting pupils in these schools to increase opportunities for educational and socio-economic advancement.

This indicator recognises the importance of financial investment in schools (particularly those serving socio-economically marginalised pupils) in addressing the ongoing problem of segregation. Without financial investment in the infrastructure of education progressive sounding desegregation efforts are doomed to failure.

Thus whilst some governments (for example, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania) have trumpeted their desegregation efforts with much fanfare, they haven't always coupled these efforts with financial support for socio-economically disadvantaged schools. This helps explain why the successes of desegregation have been spotty and limited to a handful of schools in all the countries we studied. Without robust investment in the schools in the most need desegregation efforts are bound to fail. With this indicator we thus consider the ways in which our different countries are investing in schools, and particularly those in disadvantaged areas.

The results are not good. Whilst three countries received a score of medium (Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania), two were scored low (Greece and Poland). Monies in ever constricted education budgets are being moved in many cases away from the areas of greatest need (defined in terms of socio-economic deprivation) and being channeled to other areas of the education budget or to entirely different budgets.

We note the following trends with respect to financial investment:

1. Financial investment in marginalised schools is not a priority. In Hungary, for instance, there is a new and explicit emphasis on the need for education to serve the interests of the middle class. Redirecting funds to disadvantaged schools is politically unpopular in this context.

2. The economic crisis has further tightened already tight education budgets in many of the countries we have examined. This has forced education ministries in all the countries we studied to prioritise their spending in ways that haven't always benefited socio-economically marginalised districts.

3. Hungary, Poland, and Romania have made use of EU funds to direct resources to socio-economically marginalised schools (often in coordination with efforts by local NGOs). This is a welcome development but it is not a system wide solution.

Increased investment in disadvantaged schools benefits all pupils in those schools, irrespective of their ethnicity. Without addressing these financial problems desegregation efforts aimed at the Roma stand little chance of succeeding.

Table 3. Applying Indicator 3.3 Financial investment to five European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Medium	There is some targeted funding for schools in socio-economically deprived areas. Most schools in Bulgaria are funded by municipalities, which receive subsidies from the state budget to cover costs. These subsidies are based on a number of criteria including the number of students and the population size (density) of the municipality (school district). Municipalities which are sparsely populated (where Roma are typically found) receive on average about 25% more in state subsidies than schools in Bulgaria's largest cities.
Greece	Low	Greek schools are funded through the central budget of the Ministry of Education according to number of children and special needs requirements of schools (eg, building maintenance). This budget is complemented by municipality funds to cover additional activities (eg, sports, minor maintenance issues, etc). The amount of local funds available for schools varies according to the finances of the various municipalities. In 2011, Zones of Educational Priority (that included areas with Roma) were identified and targeted for priority resources (prior to 2011 no special previsions were made for schools in socio-economically deprived areas). Cuts to the education budget however have meant that this policy has not been implemented.

Hungary	Medium	Hungary's new education law centralising the school system (2013) has the potential to have a positive impact on segregation in small villages (where segregation is most pronounced). Analysts however are predicting that spending cuts to education will make it unlikely that the necessary resources will reach these schools. The main thrust of the law is to support and advance the educational needs of the middle class. Channelling funds into poor and/or segregated schools is not a priority. Many schools for disadvantaged children that are run by civil organisations will see their financial support withdrawn and redirected to churches. Some churches run schools for poor Roma but most tend to provide education for better-off, middle class children.
Poland	Low	Public education in general suffers from chronic underfunding. There are thus insufficient funds to subsidise schools in disadvantaged areas. EU structural programmes provide some assistance in this area, but it is not enough.
Romania	Medium	Certain opportunities for the socio-economic integration of minority children have become available in recent years, but on the whole, the situation remains unsatisfactory. These initiatives have been directed at the most socio-economically marginalised pupils in Romania which in many cases includes Roma. They include subsides for school supplies, meals, and free transport. Other efforts supported with European funds and coordinated by local NGOs have also addressed the problem. Some have focused on slowing or reversing High dropout rates for Roma pupils.

INDICATOR 3.4 RECRUITMENT OF MINORITY/IMMIGRANT TEACHERS

LOW – non tolerance	Minority or immigrant teachers/staff are not hired.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Minority teachers/staff are incorporated but are not given any preference even in schools/areas where minorities are numerically predominant.
HIGH – acceptance	Statewide hiring practices that give preferential treatment to minority teachers/staff. Typically combined with changes to curriculum that place emphasis on minority culture. Increased opportunities for advancement for minority teachers/staff, also role models for minority children.

It's not just Roma pupils who are underrepresented in majority schools; it's Roma teachers as well. Indeed, there are few Roma teachers in majority schools, and few Roma teachers in schools where Roma are present. More Roma teachers in both schools are needed. They are needed in majority schools so that majority pupils are regularly exposed to Roma in positions of authority and respect. And they are needed in schools with a high Roma presence so that they can serve as role models to Roma pupils.

The only way to get Roma teachers into these positions is to first provide them the teacher training they require. Unfortunately, discrimination and a lack of qualified Roma candidates mean that in most cases additional steps need to be taken to correct for current imbalances not only in teacher training programmes but also in the educational institutions in which those Roma ultimately seek employment.

Getting more Roma into teaching positions will not directly address the problem of Roma segregation. But it will contribute to the development of an educational environment that is more tolerant and accommodating of diversity. This shift in attitudes can then help reverse some of the problems that are at the root of segregation.

We find much variation across our five cases on this indicator. Romania receives the highest marks. Romania has invested heavily in nurturing a core of qualified Roma teachers that can gradually begin to fill the ranks of Romania's schools (both majority schools and those with a high Roma presence). Greece also deserves special mention for its use of cultural mediators who not only reduce truancy and provide help in the classroom to teachers but more importantly act as ambassadors of Roma culture in ways that foster intercultural understanding and goodwill; it only receives a medium score, however, because of its limited use of mediators. Hungary in contrast receives a low score (with Bulgaria and Poland in the

middle). The reasons, however, are different. Whilst Hungary has simply missed out on training Roma teachers, Bulgaria's policy of non-discrimination means that ethnicity is not taken into account in hiring practices. This in turn means that Roma teachers have lost out.

Several problems cross all of our cases are noteworthy:

1. It is difficult to separate cause from effect in the recruitment of Roma teachers. The lack of qualified candidates contributes to the problem, but so too do hiring practices that do not favour those (few) Roma candidates.

2. Roma teacher training programmes remain piecemeal at best. Even those countries with offering the most training still only offer it to a limited segment of the Roma population. More widespread training is needed.

3. Focusing on teaching assistants and cultural mediators is welcome but it shouldn't be at the expense of programmes devised to integrate fully qualified Roma teachers into schools.

In this case we see plenty of positive examples that can and should be turned to as a basis for addressing this problem in other contexts.

Table 4. Applying Indicator 3.4 Recruitment of minority/immigrant teachers to five European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	**Medium**	Teachers of Roma or other minority origin are hired based on the same criteria and requirements as the majority teachers: Bulgaria's Personal Data Protection Act prohibits the collection of data on ethnic origin. There are thus no official data on the number of Roma teachers in Bulgaria; NGO estimates suggest their numbers are negligible. Since the early 2000s, however, several hundred Roma have been trained as teaching assistants to work as mediators between Roma pupils, their families, and the schools. After achieving some initially positive results, their role has been transformed into one of keeping discipline and their numbers have been significantly curtailed.
Greece	**Medium**	Minority teachers can be recruited in western Thrace, a region in the northeast of Greece with a sizeable Turkish minority. Some of these teachers are of Roma

		origin. This is a positive development but limited in its scope. Other programmes in mainstream Greek schools have introduced Cultural Mediators: young Roma women who act as mediators between teachers and Roma families. This programme has enjoyed success in keeping Roma children in schools and improving their performance. At present the programme operates, however, in only a very limited number of schools.
Hungary	Medium	A 2006 report found that less than 0.5% of teachers in schools with disadvantaged children were Roma. There has not been any specific programme to hire Roma teachers. (Hungary prohibits discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin in hiring practices.) Hungary has used some cultural mediators (in teaching assistant roles), but they have been connected to projects with limited funding (ie, they are not in permanent posts). As part of the education reform for 2013 (which include important funding cuts to the education system) a number of teachers will be made redundant. This makes it even less likely that Roma teachers will be recruited in the near future. Also, less than 1% of the Roma have the necessary credentials in Higher education that are required for teachers.
Poland	Medium	Roma teaching assistants have been used in some areas with high concentrations of Roma (this programme was introduced in the early 2000s). These Roma work as teacher assistants, who come from the local Roma community. But they are not independent teachers, rather serve as helpers. Attempts to introduce Roma teaching assistants to other regions with smaller concentrations of Roma have been unsuccessful (local officials argue that the programme is too expensive and not effective enough).
Romania	High	A number of affirmative action programmes that benefit Roma teachers are in effect in Romania. These programmes target Roma teachers in hiring practices, teacher training programmes, and opportunities for advancement. In addition, a Roma school mediator programme was introduced in the mid-1990s to facilitate Roma children's access to education. Somewhat later (1999), Roma education inspectors were appointed in each of Romania's counties. Other policies introduced as early as 1990 allocated Roma places in pedagogical schools (and later in universities) with the aim of providing the necessary training for future Roma teachers. At present, nearly 1,000 places are reserved for Roma candidates in different academic departments.

INDICATOR 3.5 TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMMES

LOW – non tolerance	Teachers are given no specific instruction in how to deal with minority children or recognise racist/prejudicial treatment of minority children. The result is racism, and prejudicial treatment from both majority children and teachers go unchecked.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Minimal provision of teacher training to combat racism in schools and the classroom. Programmes in place but lacking the strong support of the state and school administrators. Effects minimal.
HIGH – acceptance	All teachers are subject to training (retraining) in sensitivity to cultural difference. Measurable reduction in prejudicial and racist treatment in the classroom. Increased equality and respect for minority children.

Another important aspect of teacher training concerns the ways in which majority teachers are instructed in dealing with diversity and recognising racist/prejudicial treatment of Roma children. In most of the countries we examined this is not simply a case of instructing teachers on issues of diversity but overcoming deeply held prejudices and stereotypes they hold against the Roma. Unfortunately, teachers remain part of the problem in most of our cases. These teachers often complain that Roma pupils disrupt their teaching. Whilst they may frame their concerns in ways that are not prejudicial, they still lead to segregated outcomes: separating Roma into different classrooms (to address discipline issues). A robust diversity curriculum for teacher training therefore needs to be complemented by approaches that take into account teacher concerns with discipline issues related to Roma pupils.

We see mixed results in the countries we examined. Here again there is significant gap between policy and practice. Most countries (Hungary is a possible exception) have some diversity training for their teachers. But there is little evidence from any country that these policies are effective in either overcoming more deeply held prejudicial attitudes toward the Roma or fostering a more positive intercultural environment in schools.

We notice several developments across our cases that exacerbate these problems:

1. This is a not a priority area in teacher training. Even in countries where such training exists it is either not standardised or made a universal practice. Instead, it is often viewed as the remit of local NGOs who whilst well intentioned lack the resources to reach the numbers of teachers required for such training to be impactful.

2. Teacher training in diversity has to contend with deeply held anti-Roma attitudes. Teaching diversity is one thing; overcoming prejudice is completely different. There is little indication that the limited policies in place so far have had any effect on teacher attitudes toward the Roma.

3. Teaching diversity to teachers can and should be usefully combined with teaching diversity to pupils. We know of no country in the cases we examine where these approaches have been combined.

Significantly more effort is needed in this domain to counteract the role teachers currently play (in alliance with parents) in advocating that Roma pupils should be separated out so that they don't interfere with the teaching of majority children. Devoting resources to wide scale teacher training programmes could thus have an indirect impact on the segregation problem.

Table 5. Applying Indicator 3.5 Teacher training programmes to five European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Medium	The Ministry of Education has begun to prioritise training teachers to work in multicultural environments. Most of the programmes developed in this regard are being implemented by various NGOs with financial support coming from the EU. The latest of these initiatives is the Qualification of Pedagogic Specialists (2012) with the goal to train 4,500 teachers (roughly 10% of all teachers) to work in multicultural environments. Most of these teachers come from schools located in socio-economically deprived areas populated by minority communities.
Greece	Medium	Special programmes co-funded by the Greek state and the EU implemented in the mid-1990s have provided teacher training with the aim of helping immigrant and minority children. Some of these efforts have been directed at building trust between schools and Roma families. To date, however, these measures have only been implemented in those schools registered with these programmes; they have not been mainstreamed.
Hungary	Medium	Some civil society organisations offer tolerance courses for schools, but there is minimal uptake either because the teachers are prejudiced or intimidated by parents who are prejudiced. Hungary has also tapped into some EU funds to promote diversity training for teachers. Nevertheless there is no systematic study in Hungary on the extent to which teacher training courses address the specific problem of racism. In interviews published in various sources, however, teachers say that addressing the problems of prejudice has not been a part of their teacher training.

Poland	**Medium**	A number of initiatives aimed at improving sensitivity to issues of tolerance and multiculturalism have been introduced with financial support coming from the EU. These programmes have not, however, been implemented nationally; rather, they are taken up only at the initiative of local school administrators wishing to take part in them (typically in areas with Higher proportions of minority children in the schools).
Romania	**Medium**	Early teacher training courses (in place since the late 1990s) designed to instruct teachers on how to deal with minority children and recognise the racist/prejudicial treatment of minority children did not focus specifically on questions related to the Roma. In addition, not all teachers enrolled in these courses. In the meantime, other initiatives (some with the support of various NGOs and the EU) have focused more directly on aspects of teacher training focused specifically on the Roma and questions of interculturality. Some successful programmes introduced by NGOs have since been taken over (and funded) by the Ministry of Education. Hundreds of teachers receive training this way every year (which is still a small proportion of the overall number of teachers in Romania).

INDICATOR 3.6 PROMOTING A CULTURE OF ANTI-RACISM AND NON-DISCRIMINATION

LOW – non tolerance	Anti-discrimination regulations have not been put in place or those that have been adopted within the respective educational systems remain largely ineffectual in addressing differential treatment and discrimination on the basis of ethnicity or religion. State bodies make no systematic or serious effort to monitor the effects of racism.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Anti-discrimination regulations exist but are not strongly enforced and not properly monitored. Racism and open forms of discrimination are disavowed and there are some mechanisms in place to address and monitor visible acts.
HIGH – acceptance (effective application/enforcement and control of the anti-discrimination regulations in place)	Anti-discrimination regulations are enforced effectively and properly monitored. There is concern not just with acts of discrimination but also with the institutional culture of the educational system and how it impacts upon the prospects and well-being of minority children.

Prejudicial attitudes and racism underlie nearly all forms of segregation. Roma are segregated into separate schools because of the belief that they perform below the level of majority children.

This belief, however, confuses cause with effect: Roma perform below the level of majority children because they are segregated into separate schools (with inadequate resources and cultures of underperformance). This is why it is imperative to complement desegregation efforts with a robust campaign of anti-racism and non-discrimination.

Part of this can be embedded in cultural diversity curricula and teacher training programmes. But as the problem is more widespread the solution also needs to be more widespread. This entails not only a shift in pedagogical approaches to the Roma but in political cultures that too often condone racist and discriminatory attitudes.

Here, as in the other indicator reports, the scores received by most countries reflect a balancing between policies of anti-discrimination and practices of continued racism (Greece is an exception where the educational system does not provide formal protections against discrimination). Whilst some efforts have

been made in various ways at promoting a culture of anti-racism, an overriding culture of racism toward the Roma still persists in these countries.

We posit several reasons for this:

1. Racist attitudes are often dismissed or undervalued as non-racist. Popular beliefs in the countries we examined portray attitudes toward the Roma not as racist but as an accurate reflection of simply the way the Roma are. Calls to abandon political correctness in the name of frank dialogue on these important questions opens the door further to the legitimation of racist attitudes.

2. Efforts at promoting a culture of anti-racism have been piecemeal, uncoordinated, and ultimately ineffectual. Sustained public campaigns of anti-racism are needed to challenge prevailing attitudes.

3. Initiatives to change attitudes lack political clout. Mainstream politicians often silently condone or sometimes explicitly embrace the sorts of views that are responsible for legitimating and perpetuating a culture of racism and discrimination.

The countries we have examined (except Greece) afford protections against discrimination in educational institutions. This is an important first step. But it is not enough. These legislative efforts need to be complemented by robust anti-racist campaigns to change people's attitudes.

Table 6. Applying Indicator 3.6 Promoting a culture of anti-racism and non-discrimination to five European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Medium	The Protection against Discrimination Act (2004) outlaws discrimination in the education system. At the same time the law permits positive discrimination, with the goal of promoting tolerance and non-discrimination. These measures thus provide explicitly for education promoting the language and culture of minorities, training of minority teachers, and the supply of new textbooks intended to overcome problems of racism and prejudice. This Act and its provisions have been tested and upheld in the courts. In addition, several projects have recently been developed and implemented to promote anti-discrimination and tolerance.
Greece	Low	The Greek educational system does not have any anti-discrimination provisions. No monitoring mechanisms are in place to record instances of racism, xenophobia, intolerance, or discrimination. Greece has not ratified the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education. In 2005, Greece did adopt more general anti-discrimination legislation (extending to education as well), but the law has not been actively implemented.

Hungary	Medium	There are anti-discrimination laws in Hungary but they are not applied to the schools or the matter of school segregation. There is a civil rights group that has initiated lawsuits against local governments with segregated schools. Research shows that teachers have prejudices (which is unsurprising given that such prejudices are common in the wider population as well). Part of the problem is that a reluctance on the part of public officials (in government and school administration) to acknowledge prejudicial and/or racist attitudes toward the Roma. This culture of denying racism undermines policy initiatives
Poland	Medium	There are some general anti-discrimination laws in Poland (new legislation on hate speech is currently being prepared), but these laws are not consistently or effectively enforced by the courts. Public debate on these and related issues is increasingly influenced by the radical right which has been growing in strength. Tolerance toward intolerant and/or racist behaviour or language in schools ultimately comes down to the priorities and culture of individual school administrators and teachers. The headmaster's attention (or inattention) to these issues can shape the everyday practices in a given school.
Romania	Medium	There are effective anti-discrimination regulations in Romania. In 2000, the National Council for Combating Discrimination (NCCD) was established to provide oversight on various discrimination cases. The NCCD also organises teacher training for issues related to non-discrimination.

Table 7. Comparative country overview

	2.1 Civic education	3.2 Desegregation	3.3 Financial investment	3.4 Minority teachers	3.5 Teacher training	3.6 Anti-racism
Bulgaria	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Greece	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium	Low
Hungary	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Poland	Low	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium
Romania	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	Medium

PART 2. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Our analysis confirms that Roma segregation remains a significant problem in the countries we have studied. Diversity sensitive policies across the region have on the whole failed to achieve their objective of desegregation.

Overall scores averaging 'medium' belie a disturbing disjuncture between policy and practice: whilst some policies deserve and receive high marks, these marks are almost always offset by the failures to successfully implement them in practice. The problem is thus not that school segregation is not recognised as a problem. In all the countries we examined and across the mainstream political spectrum we see successive coalitions of governments, NGOs, and other actors joining forces to formulate wide ranging policies to tackle the problem of segregation. These policies deserve recognition. But it must also be recognised that these policies have all failed.

This should thus serve as a stark reminder to policymakers and politicians alike that much more work is needed if desegregation results are to be achieved and maintained in these countries.

Both segregation and (failed) desegregation efforts exhibit strikingly similar forms across all the countries studied: there is little variation in the scores we have signed (and there is also a remarkable similarity in the justifications for those scores).

This is even more striking given that the five countries have very different histories, political cultures, and demographic profiles. Greece, for example, did not experience a half century of state socialism as did the other countries; Hungary and Poland have historically been better off in economic terms than their Bulgarian and Romanian neighbours; and while Bulgaria and Romania have sizeable minority populations, Greece, Hungary and Poland are more ethnically homogenous. Yet the ways in which segregation occurs, the policy responses to that segregation, and the reasons for the failures of those policies all remain remarkably similar across all the countries we studied.

In this section we will consider some of the causes of segregation before offering some reasons for why policy has been ineffectual in reversing these segregation trends. We will then briefly discuss the implications of our findings for questions of tolerance. Finally, we will consider some modest policy recommendations that might help begin reverse these trends.

The causes of segregation

There are multiple factors that contribute to the emergence and perpetuation of school segregation. We briefly consider three such factors here:

1.   Residential segregation

Residential segregation is both cause and effect of school segregation, but mostly cause. Geographic concentrations of Roma in particular neighbourhoods and/or locales translate quickly and effectively into school segregation. Both residential and school segregation are exacerbated by the phenomenon of 'white flight': when the proportion of Roma is perceived by some members of the majority to be intolerably high, this results in their departure; this in turn disrupts that balance further, thus encouraging more and more majority members to follow suit. The result is that residential areas and schools with only a small number of Roma can quickly become majority or exclusively Roma.

2.   Selective school systems

School systems that reward academic achievement in their admissions policies effectively sift Roma children out into schools with lower rates of educational attainment. The result is that Roma pupils are concentrated in the same (underperforming) schools even in areas where they may be otherwise (residentially, locally) integrated. Added to this is the practice of separating out children with 'special needs'. In many cases this leads to the creation of de facto Roma classrooms in otherwise (integrated) majority schools.

3.   Teacher-parent coalitions

Teachers often complain that Roma pupils disrupt their teaching. Parents in turn are concerned that the presence of Roma in the classroom (believed by the parents as well to be disruptive) jeopardises the overall potential for the educational attainment of their children. Loose coalitions of teachers and parents thus form (sometimes in direct opposition to integration efforts) to keep Roma children in separate classrooms.

These are only a few of the reasons that contribute to segregation and that we uncovered in our research for ACCEPT PLURALISM. A brief overview of these multiple and diverse causes should serve to show that the remedies to segregation must also be multiple and diverse.

Tackling school segregation in ways that does not attend to these multiple causes (sometimes occurring well outside the confines of schools) will have little chance of success.

Reasons for policy failure

Whilst some of our cases receive relatively high marks for policies designed to tackle different facets of school segregation, none of these cases achieved their intended results. Initiatives that have been in some cases well designed to integrate Roma into national education systems have so far failed to achieve their objectives. Why is this? What accounts for the failures of these policies?

Here we draw attention to four interrelated factors that have contributed to policy failures:

1.   Insufficient political will

New and impressive sounding policies to tackle various facets of the segregation problem have been heralded by governments on both the left and right across the countries we sampled. But despite the fanfare surrounding these policies, none have achieved lasting success. Politicians and policymakers agree that schools need to be desegregated. But whilst there is consensus on this there are unfortunately few politicians willing to champion or even openly support the measures required to accomplish this desegregation. Politicians frequently lack the political will to effectively promote desegregation efforts. The 'Roma question', as it is often referred to, is viewed by mainstream politicians as a political liability. In electoral politics, there is little incentive to champion the Roma cause. In this context policies that are legislated (and many are not) still face an uphill battle to be successfully implemented. As a result, these policies are undermined through a combination of indifference, neglect, muted opposition, or even outright sabotage.

2.   Nationalism

In all the countries we surveyed nationalism remained a dominant belief system and ideology that informed and undergirded policy in varied domains. Policies aimed at the Roma were thus not a priority; moreover, they were in a certain sense in tension with policies informed by national (or nationalist) priorities. Furthermore, in some of the countries we examined, mainstream politicians can be seen increasingly pandering to the even more brazen nationalist rhetoric of the radical right, thus tilting the scales further in the direction of nationalism.

3.   Misguided policies

Not all policies aimed at desegregation have adequately and appropriately focused on the Roma. Other policies lack effective enforcement mechanisms. Some countries take the easy way out by

formulating cultural diversity policies that are aimed first and foremost at national minorities other than the Roma. This one-size-fits-all approach to cultural diversity does not take account of the specificities of Roma exclusion in these countries. Dedicated policies are needed to address these issues specific to the Roma in ways that attend not only to their cultural distinctiveness but their socio-economic marginalisation as well.

4. Racism

Pervading all of these reasons for policy failures is racism. In all of the countries we examined, the Roma were viewed as racially inferior by people and politicians alike. Racism circulates in various guises, often muted or even explicitly denied, but always informing and reinforcing the logic of continued segregation. Racism does not only undermine efforts aimed at integration; it simultaneously provides a convenient explanation for the failures of integration: the Roma, it is said, simply do not want to integrate, or are incapable of integrating. The failures of integration thus rest on the shoulders of the Roma. This in turn relieves the majority of the responsibility for fixing the problem. There is thus an expectation that the Roma should integrate, but racism makes that integration logically impossible.

Individually and collectively these factors point to serious deficiencies with the political cultures of the countries we examined that contribute to the ineffectualness of desegregation efforts. These are fundamental problems that require fundamental changes. Without them, even well intentioned and well-designed policies will continue to fail.

Implications for tolerance

What does all this say about tolerance? What are the implications of these findings for how the Roma are – or are not – tolerated? In our project we distinguish between three different conceptual responses to questions of public diversity:

1. Non-toleration

Individuals, groups and practices who seek or for whom/which claims of toleration are being made but to whom/which toleration is not granted, and the reasons given in favour of or against toleration.

2.   Toleration

Individuals, groups and practices who seek or for whom/which claims of toleration are being made and to whom/which toleration is granted, and the reasons given in favour of or against toleration.

3.   Recognition, respect as equal and admission as normal

Individuals, groups and practices who seek or for whom/which it is claimed that toleration is not enough and other normative concepts, namely those that focus on majority-minority relations and the reform of institutions and citizenship, are or should be more relevant. They also include claims and processes towards the reconsideration of difference as a 'normal' feature of social life. Such concepts include equality, respect, recognition, accommodation and so on, and the reasons given in favour of or against these propositions.

Non-toleration thus refers to people and practices that we do not accept. We may choose to justify this non-toleration with reference to 'our values' or non-toleration may manifest itself simply as racism; in any case, non-toleration entails an explicit rejection of people and/or practices that are deemed offensive. Toleration, in contrast, denotes acceptance – but nothing more. That is, we accept various people and practices, but we do not make any effort to accommodate them; instead, we simply refrain from rejecting them (non-toleration).

Toleration is often popularly thought of as a good thing, and indeed, it is better than non-toleration. But toleration is only the minimum threshold of acceptance: we tolerate that which we do not like, but we offer nothing more than toleration.

Only recognition, our third category, takes us further.   Recognition involves the accommodation of difference in ways that provides a space (institutional or otherwise) for that difference.

It is of course always difficult to make a messy empirical reality fit neatly into an abstracted and distilled conceptual framework. Indeed, a good deal of variation can be seen from our analysis of the five countries we examined (an analysis which itself has the effect of generalising and flattening differences). These differences range from a number of policies designed to endorse and embrace Roma cultural distinctiveness in ways that could easily be graded as 'recognition' to widespread racist practices that can only be classified as 'non-toleration'.

Nevertheless, here again, the similarities between our cases are at least as striking as the differences. Whilst most policies would be graded between 'toleration' and 'recognition', practices lie closer to 'toleration' and 'non-toleration'. Hence the high proportion of middle 'toleration' scores reflecting this balancing between progressive policies and racist realities.

Even if desegregation efforts were successful, how likely would they be to foster increased tolerance and acceptance of the Roma?

Desegregation is recognised as the most progressive and most imperative solution to the problem of Roma segregation. But would it achieve greater tolerance of the Roma? Would it lead to their increased recognition and accommodation?

Conceptually, desegregation sits somewhat uncomfortably with the principles of recognition. This is because desegregation is ultimately premised upon principles of integration: the elimination of differences. Recognition, in contrast, demands the acceptance of that difference. Desegregation policies are aimed at integrating marginalised Roma populations into the fold of the majority society; the differences that separate them are meant to be reduced or even eliminated. Desegregation in this sense is a strategy aimed at achieving toleration, but not more.

Integration is intended to attenuate the detrimental effects of racism so that the majority society can tolerate (but not necessarily recognise or respect) the Roma.

PART 3. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Tolerance would be a desirable outcome in practice. But can we do more? Is there any hope for a future where Roma cultural distinctiveness is not derided, not even just tolerated, but respected, recognised, and accommodated?

As part of our project we have formulated policy recommendations that attempt to address this balance between tolerance and recognition. We fully recognise and appreciate the urgency of efforts aimed desegregation. This is a structural dilemma that requires a structural solution, and a solution which may at best only achieve a mark of tolerance.

At the same time we offer other remedies that, in conjunction with these structural approaches, might ultimately contribute to the recalibration of Roma cultural distinctiveness as a positive value. We posit three possible solutions:

1.   Cultural mediators

We recommend the recruitment of young women from the Roma community to accompany children to school and bring them back to the camp, village, or neighbourhood where they live. Their role is to (a) win the trust of the parents (who are often reluctant to send kids to school especially if the school is far away from the locality where they live); (b) accompany children and facilitate their integration in the classroom; (c) help teachers understand the specific Roma cultural and educational needs; and (d) work intimately and meaningfully with the children.

2.   Intercultural education

We also recommend an intercultural educational approach: adopting a curriculum of intercultural education in schools with a sizeable Roma presence. Intercultural education is supported by UNESCO. Integration through intercultural education is not a one way street to assimilation for the Roma; instead it is a two way street where different and equal cultures meet with mutual responsibility for integration. Intercultural education is also very resource intensive. It requires curriculum development, extensive training for majority teachers, hiring of and training for Roma teachers, and the development and dissemination of teaching materials across a range of subjects. The payoff, however, can be substantial: over time, a sustained and dedicated curriculum of intercultural education will produce concrete results. Programmes of intercultural education have enjoyed modest success (though on a small scale) in Greece and Hungary.

3. Bussing

Lastly, we recommend the limited and considered use of 'bussing'. This requires the provision dedicated forms of transport (buses or vehicles of similar function) to take Roma children to and from majority schools on a regular basis. Used effectively, bussing cannot only facilitate integration; it can also reduce absenteeism. Bussing serves two purposes. First, it can provide transport for Roma children who would otherwise not be able to go to school. Second, used in conjunction with other instruments (see above) it can help redress segregated imbalances in schools. Bussing is controversial and with good reason: it has a history of fuelling tensions with the majority population and alienating the minority population. Bussing should thus be used mainly to provide transport for Roma children in need of transport over reasonable distances. It can serve as a first step to address the problem of absenteeism. If it is to be used to redress segregated imbalances, it must first win the support of the majority community and the Roma.

Our European Policy Brief, **'Education on the edge: Roma segregation in the schools of five EU member states',** contains a fuller discussion of these recommendations.

As our current report clearly demonstrates, however, good policy measures are not enough. Indeed we have already seen these and other measures in varying degrees and combinations already in the region.

We cannot therefore be complacent with good policy. Nor can we be complacent with policies that focus narrowly on desegregation. What's needed is a fundamental culture shift: racism against the Roma needs to be confronted and eliminated both in popular attitudes and political discourse.

Without this culture shift, future policies will continue to fail.

FURTHER READINGS AND COUNTRY REPORTS

Education on the edge: Roma segregation in the schools of five EU member states
By Jon Fox, University of Bristol (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/22239

ACCEPT PLURALISM Tolerance Indicators Toolkit
By Anna Triandafyllidou, European University Institute (2013)
Download your copy from: http://www.accept-pluralism.eu/Research/ProjectReports/ToleranceIndicatorsToolkit/ToleranceIndicators.aspx

Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Discourses in Bulgaria
By Marko Hajdinjak and Maya Kosseva with Antonina Zhelyazkova, IMIR (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23257

Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Discourses and Practices in Greece
By Anna Triandafyllidou and Hara Kouki, European University Institute (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23261

Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Concepts and Practices in Hungary
By Zsuzsanna Vidra, Jon Fox, Anikó Horváth, Central European University and University of Bristol (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23402

Tolerance of Cultural Diversity in Poland and Its Limitations
by Michał Buchowski and Katarzyna Chlewińska, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/24381

Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Discourses in Romania
By Sinziana-Elena Poiana, Ioana Lupea, Irina-Madalina Doroftei and Alina Mungiu-Pippidi, SAR (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/24380

About ACCEPT PLURALISM – project identity

Acronym	**ACCEPT PLURALISM**
Title	**Tolerance, Pluralism and Social Cohesion: Responding to the Challenges of the 21st Century in Europe**

Short Description

ACCEPT PLURALISM questions how much cultural diversity can be accommodated within liberal and secular democracies in Europe. The notions of tolerance, acceptance, respect and recognition are central to the project. ACCEPT PLURALISM looks at both native and immigrant minority groups.

Through comparative, theoretical and empirical analysis the project studies individuals, groups or practices for whom tolerance is sought but which we should not tolerate; of which we disapprove but which should be tolerated; and for which we ask to go beyond tolerance and achieve respect and recognition.

In particular, we investigate when, what and who is being not tolerated / tolerated / respected in 15 European countries; why this is happening in each case; the reasons that different social actors put forward for not tolerating / tolerating / respecting specific minority groups/individuals and specific practices. The project analyses practices, policies and institutions, and produces key messages for policy makers with a view to making European societies more respectful towards diversity.

Website	**www.accept-pluralism.eu**
Duration	March 2010-May 2013 (39 months)
Funding Scheme	Small and medium-scale collaborative project
EU contribution	2,600,230 Euro
Consortium	17 partners (15 countries)
Coordinator	European University Institute
	Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies
Person Responsible	Prof. Anna Triandafyllidou
EC officer	Ms. Louisa Anastopoulou, Project Officer,
	Directorate General for Research and Innovation, European Commission