SCHOOL DESEGREGATION POLICIES IN HUNGARY 2002-2010:

MECHANISMS AFFECTING IMPLEMENTATION

By

Eva Csiki

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of Public Policy

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in Public Policy

Supervisor: Professor Andrea Krizsán

Budapest, Hungary

2012

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I, the undersigned Éva Csiki hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis.

To the best of my knowledge this thesis contains no material previously published by any other person except where due acknowledgement has been made. This thesis contains no material which has been accepted as part of the requirements of any other academic degree or non-degree program, in English or in any other language.

This is a true copy of the thesis, including final revisions.

Date: 28th September 2012

Name (printed letters): Éva Csiki

Signature: ……

ABSTRACT

The segregation of Roma children in education is very common in the member states, despite the fact that the EU and national governments treat addressing this issue as a priority area. The purpose of this paper is to identify the reasons behind the lack of success in implementing school desegregation policies in Hungary. The paper gives a brief introduction to desegregation and integration theory, and draws on examples from US literature in order to identify the mechanisms that can impede the implementation of desegregation policies at various levels, in a top-down and a bottom-up approach (e.g. resistance from implementers, resistance from parents, residential segregation). Then, based on this framework, it examines how these mechanisms apply in the context of Roma school desegregation in Hungary between 2002 and 2010. The paper concludes that all the mechanisms are underpinned by racial prejudice, which is interwoven at all levels of the implementation process, and there is a need for the policy design to also address this issue in order to be successful.

Key words: Segregation, Desegregation policy, Implementation, Hungary, Racial Prejudice, Roma

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The segregation of Roma children in schools is a widely held practise in Central and Eastern Europe and the Roma are one of the most vulnerable groups in education. (Farkas 2007). In all European countries the Roma receive low quality education, and the segregation of Roma children is endemic. (REF 2007) Despite the efforts of the EU and national governments to address issues of school segregation in Europe, Roma children continue to be separated in schools. (Greenberg 2010) Although countries have action plans, the implementation does not work out for various reasons. (OSI 2007)

Europe's Roma population numbers around 10-12 million, or approximately 16% of the overall population of the EU. The expansion of the European Union has made the Roma into the EU's biggest minority. They are also the most economically and socially disadvantaged and marginalized group in the EU, facing prejudice, discrimination, social exclusion and segregation in every area of life (e.g. education, housing) and living in extreme poverty. The rate of unemployment among the Roma is 80-90%.[1] The situation of the Roma people is unique among other minorities as they have no kin state or unified language, and this – combined with extreme poverty – is what makes it different from any other ethnic minority. (Farkas 2007)

Hungary has made a strong commitment to combat school segregation, and was the first to show the need for desegregation efforts (to fight against inequalities in education) and follow through with measures and policies.[2] The policy and the incentives for providing equal opportunities are unique in the CEE (Szendrey 2010), and this is why I have chosen to examine the situation in Hungary.

Between 2002 and 2010 the Hungarian government focused on policies aimed at the integration and desegregation of Roma pupils in primary schools. In 2002 the financial and legal conditions for the 'per-capita allowance for integrated education' were put in place (Decree 57/2002 (XI.18) 2003/2004). The new integration program aimed to promote integrated and quality education for Roma and socially disadvantaged students in Hungary. (Kézdi and Surányi 2009) The success of this integration policy is a controversial issue in Hungary, the effects of the integration policy are not yet clear. According to many experts the

[1] Ibid.

[2] European parliament (2011) *Measures to promote the situation of Roma EU citizens in the European Union.* http://www2.lse.ac.uk/businessAndConsultancy/LSEConsulting/pdf/Roma.pdf

impact of these policies is hard to measure, and so far few results can be seen. (Szendrey 2010)

There is a limited body of research into the mechanisms underlying the success or failure of the policy's implementation. Research conducted by Surányi and Kézdi (2009) between 2005 and 2007 suggested that the integration program was regarded as a success and that it was of benefit to both Roma and non-Roma pupils. In 2006 Gábor Kézdi and Gábor Kertesi also pointed to the benefits of investing in education for Roma pupils. Greenberg (2010) did research the desegregation policies in Central and Eastern Europe, focusing mainly on Hungary and drawing parallels with the United States. Zolnay and Havas (2011) Neumann and Zolnay (2008) and Szendrey (2010) have also conducted research into the obstacles to the implementation of integration policies. Zolnay and Havas (2011) did not consider the integration policy a complete failure, but did conclude that the practical implementation of the policy was only partly successful. They point out that the segregation of Roma students has increased, and the government is powerless to act in "ghettoised" small regions. (Zolnay and Havas 2011) Zolnay (2005, 2008) also researched the impacts of the integration policy in various towns and the problems that arose in the course of its implementation. Based on surveys carried out in 2000 and 2004 and 2010 Havas (2010) regarded the integration policy as unsuccessful, as it made little impact on the distribution of socially disadvantaged children in public schools in Hungary. He added that funding resources had failed to be deployed where they were most needed (areas with a high proportion of Roma in the population), and also criticised the shortage of suitably qualified teachers (Szendrey 2010)

The current programs have been running for ten years now, but the possible causes of problems related to implementation of integration policies in Hungary are only just starting to come under discussion. This is why I have chosen to examine this issue. My argument is that racial prejudice has a great influence on the successful implementation of desegregation policies in Hungary, and is a common factor underlying – to a greater or lesser degree – all the mechanisms that impede the success of the implementation of desegregation policy in Hungary.

My question is: What are the mechanisms that impede the implementation of desegregation policies in Hungary? To answer it I will attempt to identify the various mechanisms that can influence the outcome of the implementation of desegregation policies at all the levels of implementation, on the basis of the 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' approach to implementation

theory. For this purpose I will draw on examples from US literature, because – as Jack Greenberg (2010) points out – both Afro-Americans in the US and Roma in Eastern Europe face discrimination, poverty, inadequate housing practices and health and segregated education. (Greenberg 2010) I will then use this framework to help understand how these mechanisms apply in the context of Roma school desegregation in Hungary between 2002 and 2010, making use of published literature as well as empirical data gathered in interviews with professionals involved in the policy implementation.

In the first chapter I will introduce the theory of implementation and attempt to identify the mechanisms that caused problems with the US desegregation policies at all levels of the implementation process, using the 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' approaches to implementation theory. In the second chapter I will introduce the Hungarian context and desegregation policies relating to Roma from 2002-2010. In the third chapter, based on the framework elaborated in the first chapter, I will attempt to analyse the mechanisms that led to problems with the implementation of policies aimed at the school desegregation of Roma in Hungary.

1 WHAT MECHANISMS CAN AFFECT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DESEGREGATION POLICIES?

Policies aimed at ending segregation in education are a difficult case for implementation because of the many different mechanisms that can influence of the outcome of the implementation measures. The purpose of this chapter is to identify the mechanisms that acted against success in the implementation of school desegregation policies in the US, in order to use these mechanisms (in the later chapters) as a framework for analysing the obstacles to the success of policies relating to the desegregation of Roma in schools in Hungary, using a top-down and bottom-up approach to implementation theory. First I will give a short overview of the literature on desegregation in the US and a brief history of desegregation in the US. Then I will outline the theory of implementation, giving examples – from the US literature – of mechanisms that can lead to shortcomings in the implementation.

1.1 Review of US literature on desegregation in education

The United States has a broad body of literature on desegregation policies. The most influential study on desegregation policy and research was carried out by James Coleman in 1966 under the title of Equality of Educational Opportunity – commonly known as the Coleman report. (Thomas and Brown 1982; Wells at al 2004; Robin and Bosco 1976) This study found that the academic achievement of black students "increased as the proportion of white students in their school increased". (Thomas Brown 1982: 155; Ascik 1984) When desegregation appeared in a large scale in the 1970s, researchers found that if desegregation begins at an early age it leads to achievement in learning. (McPherson 2010)

Other studies, such as Epps and Hare (1978) explored the connection between school desegregation and 'students' aspiration and self-esteem', while others – such as those by Farley (1975) Giles et al (1974) Coleman et al (1975) (Rossell 1975) – dealt with the relationship between desegregation and white flight. (Thomas and Brown 1982) There have been many attempts to analyze the reasons for failures in implementation. Wells at al (2004) examined the success or failure of school desegregation in the context of a larger society and there were scholars who argued that like Coleman that "school do not matter" and family background matters more, while in 1972 Moynihan and Jencks argued their work "Inequality" that desegregation is the question of equal distribution of income. (Wells at al 2004)

1.2 A brief history of desegregation policies in the US

Although desegregation efforts in the US started in the 1930s, there were no significant policies to deal with the desegregation of US schools until the US Supreme Court landmark ruling in the case of Brown v. Board of Education in Topeka (1954). This decision resisted the notion of "separate but equal" and resulted in the making of court mandated desegregation plans. (Horsford and McKenzie 2008).[3] The Supreme Court ruling in the Brown case and the congressionally-mandated Coleman report were major events that encouraged desegregation efforts and supported desegregation policies. (Wells at al 2004)

The US government has implemented desegregation policies in three waves starting in 1965. The first wave was *the Freedom of choice plans* in the 1960s, which had the aim of desegregating schools in the south by expanding the scope of school districts to encompass black and white schools. It failed to achieve racial integration in the school environment because some local authorities simply allocated children of the same race to the same schools within the given district. (McPherson 2010) The second wave was mandatory student assignment, which involved the 'busing' of students, in 1971. It was implemented throughout the US (Rossell 1990). This, however, led to 'white flight' – white children being taken out of the integrated schools – and the closure of public schools, as private schools were established for white children in order to get around the legislation. (McPherson 2010) The third wave was the Magnet school scheme, which aimed "to offer students to access special curriculum and to create schools with diverse student body". (McPherson 2010: 474) Programs were either voluntary (based on incentives) or mandatory. The voluntary programs provided enhanced learning opportunities, but failed to address segregation as white parents tended to send their children to schools with a majority of white students. These efforts did not fully eliminate segregation, and did not achieve the desired results. There are still desegregation court cases to this day. (McPherson 2010)

The implementation of desegregation policies is a complex issue, because the outcome is affected by a great many mechanisms both from the top (government) and from the bottom (implementers: local self governments, schools and parents etc.). In the next part of this

[3] School Desegregation and Equal Educational Opportunity, The Leadership Conference http://www.civilrights.org/resources/civilrights101/desegregation.html

chapter I will introduce the theory of implementation, using concrete examples from US literature to describe mechanisms that may contribute to implementation failures.

1.3 The theory of implementation

Policy implementation is the key feature of the policy process. (Birkland 2001) Program implementation is the process that takes place following the agenda setting. (Mazmanian and Sabatier 1989) Mazmanian and Sabatier define implementation as follows:

> *"... the carrying out of a basic policy decision, usually incorporated in a statute but which can also take the form of important executive orders or court decisions. Ideally, that decision identifies the problem(s) to be addressed, stipulates the objective(s) to be pursued, and, in a variety of ways, "structures" the implementation process. The process normally runs through a number of stages beginning with passage of the basic statute, followed by the policy outputs (decisions) of the implementing agencies, the compliance of target groups with those decisions, the actual impacts - both intended and unintended - of those outputs, the perceived impacts of agency decisions, and, finally, important revisions (or attempted revisions) in the basic statute." (Mazmanian and Sabatier 1989: 20-21)*

Despite its being the most important feature of the policy process, there isn't a single general implementation theory. Nevertheless, implementation research dates back 40 years. The literature on implementation distinguishes between three different generations of researchers: the *Pioneers*, the *Model Builders* and the third group, which developed an approach known as *Quantitative Research Designs*. (Winter 2003)

Here we will use elements of the approach developed by the Model Builders, who were active in the 1980s. (Winter 2003) Their aim was to create systematic theories and theoretical models, which they could apply to many cases (in other words a framework for analyses) (Birkland 2001). They created three separate approaches to study the implementation process: namely the *top-down* and *bottom-up* approaches, which focused on either statutory measures imposed from above, or on the mechanisms in play at 'street level'. (Birkland 2001; Hill and Hupe 2002) However, until 1985 they either pursued one or the other, but not both at the same time. (Winter 2003) Elmore, in 1985, was the first scholar who recommended using

'*synthesis*' which is the third approach; that is, the combining of both approaches into one model. (Winter 2003) By this he suggests that policy makers will have a choice of policy instruments and tools to structure implementation, and he also realised that the motivation and needs of lower level implementers must be taken into account. (Birkland 2001)

Desegregation policies tend to be implemented in a top-down manner. However, many of the obstacles to successful implementation come from the bottom up. Therefore, synthesis is the ideal approach, so I will look at examples of mechanisms that can affect the implementation of desegregation of policies in both a top-down and a bottom-up approach, using examples from the US literature.

1.4 Mechanisms affecting the implementation of desegregation policies

1.4.1 Top-down mechanisms

From the ***top down*** perspective there is a single defined policy in the form of legislation. This approach focuses "on a specific political decision" (law) (Winter 2003: 152) and upper-level decision making, "on the background of its official purpose they followed the implementation down through the system. They would typically assume a control perspective on implementation, structuring the process from above in order to achieve the purpose of the legislation and to minimize the number of decision points that could be vetoed". (Winter 2003: 152) In the following I will attempt to identify the mechanisms that can impede the success of desegregation policies in a top-down manner, using examples from the literature on desegregation policies in the United States.

1.4.1.1 Political cycles

Political cycles can lead to changes in policy or the level of commitment to it. For example, in the US prior to the Nixon administration there was a very strong commitment from the federal government to integrate Afro-Americans into schools.[4] This was reflected in the fact that the proportion of children attending integrated schools increased from 1.2% to 32% between 1964 and 1968.[5] After coming to power, however, President Nixon attempted to bring a halt to busing and massive cut funding for desegregation programs.[6] Because of this political

[4] School Desegregation and Equal Educational Opportunity, The Leadership Conference http://www.civilrights.org/resources/civilrights101/desegregation.html
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.

resistance, judges became hostile to desegregation and wavered from the commitment to the Brown decision. (Greenberg 2010)

1.4.1.2 Factors related to policy design

One of the factors that affect implementation is policy design which typically consists of "goals, a mix of instruments for obtaining these goals, the designation of governmental and non-governmental entities charged with carrying out the goals, and an allocation of resources for the requisite task." (Winter 2003: 155) In the United States, problems with the policy design arose from the fact that "all desegregation cases were litigation initiated" (Greenberg 2010: 987), in response to court cases such as Brown v. Board of Education in Topeka (1954), Alexander v. Holmes Country Board of Education (1969), Swan v. Charlotte Mecklenburg Board of Education (1971) and Milliken v. Bradley (1974), all of which led to the introduction of key policies. (Greenberg 2010) However, the Supreme Court did not develop a desegregation plan and a timeline to accomplish school desegregation. (McPherson 2010) Implementers at local level were left to deal with the implementation, and this top-down enforcement of policies resulted in *tactical delays* by the implementers, (Greenberg 2010).

1.4.1.3 Lack of monitoring

Another essential factor for the successful implementation of desegregation policies is adequate monitoring. (Vedung 2006) According to Greenberg (2010) school desegregation policies in the US were often forced and presented an unrealistic challenge for implementers. For example, in 1955 the Brown decision ordered desegregation with "all deliberate speed", which prohibited any delay. This is why there was only time for the most basic administration, and no provision was made for monitoring the programs.

1.4.1.4 Lack of skilful implementers

In order to successfully put a policy into practice, skilled implementers are essential. (Mazmanian and Sabatier 1989) In the case of education-related desegregation policies, the most important implementers are the teachers. In many cases in the US, although integration took place and desegregation was possible, the schools themselves were unprepared to handle multicultural classrooms, and there was not much training for teachers in how to deal with multicultural classrooms. In the early 1970s the Emergency School Aid Act was passed by Congress, with aim – among others – of funding training for teachers to keep pace with the

spread of desegregation programs, especially in the south. This funding continued to be provided for almost ten years, until it was cut off by the Reagan administration in 1981. Since then no equivalent policy has taken its place. (Frankenberg and Siegel-Hawley 2008)

1.4.2 Bottom-up mechanisms

As we have seen, many of the problems with the implementation of desegregation policy result from the top-down manner of its implementation. However, to understand the mechanisms underlying these problems, we need to also apply the "bottom-up" approach. The 'bottom' of the implementation system is "where public policies are delivered to citizens or firms". (Winter 2003: 153) Birkland (2001) states that the bottom-up approach can view implementation as starting not from the topmost implementer but from the identification of the network of actors involved in the policy area. This network includes what Limpsky calls 'street level bureaucrats' (e.g. social workers, teachers, police officers, etc.). The bottom-up approach then focuses on the effect that these front-line officers have on the delivery of policies. (Winter 2003) I will now examine, in the case of desegregation policies, what mechanisms influence the success of desegregation policies at this level of implementation (the level of schools, teachers, parents, local authorities, etc.).

1.4.2.1 Resistance from implementers

It is clear from the examples below that one bottom-up mechanism that can lead to ineffective implementation of the desegregation policies is resistance by implementing agencies to the desegregation policies. For example, in the US after the Brown II decision (in which the federal government called for desegregation with "all deliberate speed") (Greenberg 2010), school boards and state legislatures, as well as other government institutions, refused to implement the desegregation policies.[7] (Horsford and McKenzie 2008) This resistance took the form of "interminable litigation, convoluted transfer procedures, threats of violence, and actual violence". (Greenberg 2010: 977) The Congressional Manifesto was not signed by all congressmen and senators (for example the chief justice and attorney generals), and the "state-founded sovereignty commission fought integration with a wide array of tactics such as newspaper advertisements in the north". (Greenberg 2010: 977) Many cases were more extreme: in Little Rock Central High school nine Afro-Americans students could not enter the

[7] *School Desegregation and Equal Educational Opportunity*, The Leadership Conference http://www.civilrights.org/resources/civilrights101/desegregation.html

school because the Arkansas governor Orval Faubus ordered armed troops to block the door of the school to stop them entering the school in 1957. In response President Eisenhower had to send in troops to protect the students.[8] The resistance led to failures of the implementation process in many cases. (Greenberg 2010)

1.4.2.2 Resistance from majority parents – white flight

The examples I have researched show that racial prejudice or concerns about the effect on the standards of education for their own children can cause the parents of children in the majority population to resist the implementation of desegregation policies. In the US the implementation of desegregation policies often led to extreme behaviour on the part of white parents, such as boycotts, petitions, riots and often withdrawal of children from the school concerned. (Gatlin at al 1978) The latter is often referred to as '*white flight*'.

According to Rossell, "Of all forms of white response to school desegregation, white flight is probably the most the important because it directly affects interracial exposure, the ultimate goal of any desegregation plan." (Rossell 1990) In many cases, white parents sent their children to private schools since the Brown decision only made desegregation compulsory in state-run schools. This legal loophole has led to an increase in the number of private schools in response to desegregation policies. (McPherson 2010) Both the Freedom of Choice Plans and Mandatory Student Assignment (busing) schemes resulted in white flight, which in turn led to the failure of the implementation. (Greenberg 2010; McPherson 2010; Rossell 1990)

1.4.2.3 Involvement of minority parents in the desegregation process

The extent to which the minority population is involved in the process is also an important factor in the success of desegregation policy. Within the black community in the US there were different opinions regarding school desegregation: some hoped that their children would be able to choose which school to go to, while others wanted "the same resources and educational opportunities [as the whites]." (Horsford at al 2008:444) However, for a long time Black parents had little power to influence desegregation plans, and until the civil rights Act 1964 African Americans rarely had any political powers, which also led to ineffective implementation as their views and needs could not be fully taken into account when designing the policy. (McPherson 2010)

[8] Ibid.

1.4.2.4 Residential segregation

Residential segregation means discriminatory housing practices where whites and non-whites live separately, and it is a factor that leads to a segregated learning environment and to segregated urban and suburban schools. (McPherson 2010) The failure in 1963-64 to fully implement desegregation policy was attributed to residential segregation (Greenberg 2010). The second wave of desegregation policies in the US attempted to solve the problems caused by residential segregation through the 'busing' of children from segregated neighbourhoods to "better schools". This policy was very unpopular (Robin and Bosco 1976) and met with government resistance when in 1972 Nixon asked Congress to ban the practice. (Greenberg 2010)

1.4.3 Racial prejudice

Greenberg's (2010) answer to the question of why it is such a difficult and lengthy process to integrate black students into white-only schools is simple: very deep and strong prejudice. This was the case when Autherine Lucy tried to enter the university under court order, and was prevented by racist mobs. (Greenberg 2010) Racial prejudice is an important factor influencing the success of desegregation policy implementation, as the following examples show. I have chosen to deal with it separately here because it can be present at any level of the implementation process.

In another case, in 1955 after the Brown II decision only a few schools were able to desegregate and only 1.2% of black students attended white schools as a result. There were many school districts where the leaders were prejudiced and therefore did not integrate the policy until compelled by law. (Greenberg 2010) Even later when desegregation policies were implemented in the southern states, according to McPherson (2010) racial prejudice continued against those African American students who were able to attend white schools under the free choice desegregation planes. They had a horrific experience during the integration process, as they were harassed by their white peers, felt isolated and were terrorised.

2 THE HUNGARIAN CONTEXT

In chapter two I will introduce the Hungarian context, giving a brief outline of the legislative framework, followed by a more detailed summary of the situation with regard to Roma education, past and current policies and the measures taken to implement them.

2.1 Legal framework

Hungary is embedded into an international statutory environment that prohibits segregation. The Framework Convention of 1995 and the Racial Equality Directive (RED) prohibits discrimination in education. The European Court of Human rights – as a result of the historic ruling in the famous desegregation court case of D.H. Ostrava v Czech Republic – has established a principle that states the special situation of Roma in Europe, and also defines Roma "as a specific type of disadvantaged and vulnerable minority who require special protection."[9] In Hungary, on 1 January 2004 the Anti-Discrimination Act was introduced, based on which the Ministry of Education amended the 1993 Public Education Act, supplementing it with – for example – the prohibition of discrimination (direct or indirect) and segregation.(REF 2007)

2.2 The Education of Roma in Hungary

There is a wide gap between the school performance of Roma and non-Roma. Official census data puts the size of Hungary's Roma population at 190,000 people (REF 2007), but the actual Roma population is estimated to be around 6% of the whole population, and Roma are estimated to make up 15% of the school-aged population. (Dupcsik-Molnár 2008) The majority of Roma live in the most economically disadvantaged, underdeveloped and poor settlements or outlying neighbourhoods, with unqualified teachers, inadequate teaching materials and resources, in temporary classrooms that are in very bad condition, with very bad educational services. (Havas et al. 2002; Kertesi and Kézdi 2002)

All available statistical data show (Havas et al. 2002; Kertesi and Kézdi 2002) that most Roma pupils are not succeeding in the current Hungarian Educational system. In primary and secondary education Roma children face high drop-out rates and low performance, class repetition, a high number of over-aged pupils, and low standards of teaching. (Havas et al. 2002; Kertesi and Kézdi: 2002). Data by Havas et al (2002) from 1994 shows that 76 % of

[9] *D.H. and Others v the Czech Republic* 14 June 2012 , European Roma Rights Center) http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=3559http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=3559

Roma in the 25-29 age group completed primary school, compared to only 30% of Roma aged 50-54. We can see this as a big improvement compared to a survey from 1971, when 87% finished primary school. However, this results from the fact that compulsory education was introduced in Hungary in 1968. (Szendrey 2010).

Despite this improvement, the gap between the Roma and non Roma school performance has nevertheless widened in the case of secondary and tertiary education. (Szendrey 2010, Havas and Zolnay 2011). For example, based on the results of successive surveys conducted by Havas 2000, 2004 and 2010, the number of students who did not continue studying at all fell from 8.2% to 5.5%, but while 71.8% of non-Roma children went on to a school that granted a certificate of secondary education, this figure was only 26.8% among the Roma. Of the Roma who continue education, 63% enrol in short-term vocational schools, as opposed to 32.9% in the case of non-Roma. (Szendrey 2010) This usually ends in the Roma being trained in vocational skills that are not competitive in the labour market. (REF 2007)

The overall proportion of Roma that complete and form of secondary education, including vocational schools, is under 25%. (REF 2007) The proportion of Roma students in higher education, meanwhile, has been measured at just 2%, (Kóczé: 2002) although Greenberg (2010) states that due to affirmative action this figure has since risen 3%. Hungary's drop out rate for Roma students is much higher than for the non-Roma. While in recent years primary schools have seen a fall in the drop-out rate, it has increased at vocational and secondary level, to 36% at 9^{th} grade and 29% at 10^{th} grade. In a comparison with other CEE countries this is a very high figure. (REF 2007)

2.3 Segregation of Roma children in education

The main obstacle to the school success of Roma children is their segregation within the Hungarian educational system. (Havas et al. 2002; Havas and Liskó 2005; Havas and Zolnay 2011) According to a PISA 2000 survey, among the OECD countries Hungary provides the fewest opportunities and the least equality in education to children from different socio-economic background and the education system is highly selective from an early age. Roma children are the most affected by this. (Dupcsik and Molnár 2008) The extent of segregation has increased since 2004. While in 2004 a total of 104 schools were found to have a majority (more than 50%) of Roma students, by 2010 this figure had risen to 140 (Havas Zolnay 2011).

Five different types of segregation have been identified in Hungary: segregation between schools, segregation within schools, segregation within one class, segregation in the form of special schools (placing Roma children into remedial schools), and individual segregation (excluding pupils from education by declaring that are being home-tutored). (Német: 2003) (Farkas 2007) (R.E.F. 2007) In segregated schools the numbers of Roma students are very high, and the quality of education is lower than average. (Szendrey 2010)

2.4 Policy responses to the problem

Segregation is the greatest obstacle to the success of Roma children in school, (Havas et al. 2002; Havas and Liskó 2005) and for the last ten years government policy has focused on the integration of Roma schoolchildren in primary education. (Radó 2001) Prior to the current policy, under the per-capita support system introduced in 1991 local governments had access to PHARE and state funding on a 'per ethnic-student grant basis'. Schools established 'special classes' under 'Roma minority education programs,' with two main aims: to reduce the disadvantages of Romany Pupils by establishing catch-up classes, and to teach them about their culture and language in the framework of Minority education. (Szendrey 2010) (REF 2007) The extra funding was generally misused, and the scheme led to a greater degree of segregation as the Roma students were forced into separate 'catch-up' classes. (Német 2003; REF 2007) In 2002, this scheme was replaced with a new integration policy that shifted the focus away from minority education, to integration. (Szendrey 2010) This policy is described in more detail below.

2.4.1 Integration policy 2002[10]

In 2002 Ministry of Education (OM) decree 27/2002 (XI/18), amending Ministry of Culture and Public Education (MKM) decree 11/1994 (VI.8), laid down the financial and legal background of the per capita allowance for integrated education. The program's aim is to create opportunities "for children with different social and cultural backgrounds to be taught together and receive the same level of education." (Szendrey 2010: 235)

Paragraphs 39/E and 39/D of MKM decree 11/1994 introduce the concepts of skills development (39/E) and integration training (39/D). Point one of paragraph 39/D states that: "... skills development training shall be held, in order to develop the student's individual

[10] The sources for this subsection (2.4.1) are Ministry of Education (OM) Decree 57/2002. (XI. 18.) Hungarian Gazette, issue 143/2002: www.magyarkozlony.hu/pdf/3382 and Ministry of Culture and Public Education (MKM) Decree 11/1994. (VI. 8.) http://jogszabalykereso.mhk.hu/cgi_bin/njt_doc.cgi?docid=20252.585277

ability and talent, facilitate his or improvement, and provide the student with equal opportunities for continued study."[11] According to paragraph 39/E integration training means that students who take part in skills development training must be taught together with those who do not, and that disadvantaged students cannot be segregated during integration training.

Point 4 of paragraph 39/E states that for students belonging to a national ethnic minority, teaching materials must be provided that ensure the assimilation of the Hungarian language and culture, and the rest of the students must be taught about the culture of the national ethnic minority living in the settlement. The third point of paragraph 39/D stipulates that students participating in the program must be taught together in the same class. The provision states that multiply disadvantaged children with may not be separated within a class or a school. The decree further establishes that the education and teaching of students who take part in the skills development training must take place in accordance with point j) of paragraph (1) of article 95 of the Public Education Act. The decree also requires that an individual development plan be drawn up on the child's development and progress, which must be evaluated by the pedagogue every three months, with the participation of the parent.

According to the fifth point of the decree students can take place in the training if, based on point 14 of paragraph (1) of article 121, they are classed as multiply disadvantaged. A child is classed as multiply disadvantaged if his/her parent acting as legal guardian has only a primary or lower level of education and is receiving regular child protection support in respect of him/her, or if the child has been taken into permanent foster care.

Strict conditions are set with regard to student numbers: Point 9 states that skills development training may not be launched if:

a) there is a difference of 25 percentage points or more between the proportion of Roma students at a school and at an affiliated institution of the same school in the same settlement (or district of Budapest);
b) there is a difference of 25 percentage points or more between the proportion of Roma students in different classes at the same school;
c) there is a difference of 25 percentage points or more between the proportion of Roma students at two different schools in the same settlement (or district of Budapest).

[11] Ministry of Education (OM) Decree 57/2002. (XI. 18.) Hungarian Gazette, issue 143/2002: www.magyarkozlony.hu/pdf/3382

Article 54 states that the integration training may be launched in the 2003/2004 teaching year on the basis of paragraphs 39/D and 39/E. the integration training could be started in years 1, 5 and 9. Today nursery schools and secondary school can also join the program. It is not obligatory for schools to join the program in order to implement the desegregation policy, but the institutions engaged in integration receive three times the normative funding. (Havas and Zolnay 2011).

2.4.1.1 National Educational Integration Network (NEIN)

Paragraph 39/D Point 8 states that the skills development training shall be resolved by the National Education Integration Network in accordance with point i) of paragraph 1 of article 95 of the Public Education Act. Its tasks are determined in article 105 of the Public Education Act as follows: To provide assistance and professional coordination to schools who implemented the integration program and offered a wide range of coordination and professional assistance. (Surányi and Kézdi 2009) The network also provides assistance in order "to support the drafting of the public education equal opportunities action plan of the local council action plan," as defined in article 105 of the Public Education Act.[12] The NEIN has recently been disbanded, and with effect from 16 August 2012 its tasks have been taken over by the Human Resource Management Support Agency (Emberi Erőforrás Támogatáskezelő).[13]

2.4.1.2 Integrated Educational System (IES)

In 2003 the Integrated Educational System (IES) was introduced as part of the integration policy. This is an educational system aimed at ensuring equal opportunities for multiply disadvantaged children in the context of Hungarian teaching practice.[14] Institutions that applied the IES were professionally supported by the National Educational Integration Network. The program has optional and compulsory elements, some of which are aimed at integration, for example through multicultural content, compulsory integration within schools, while others are intended to provide quality education for all children.[15] "The design is based on the premise that integrated education is an issue of school management and is inseparable from quality education for all children." (Surányi and Kézdi 2009: 5) The conditions for

[12] *Ministry of Education (OM) Decree 57/2002. (XI. 18.)* Hungarian Gazette, issue 143/2002: www.magyarkozlony.hu/pdf/3382
[13] Email from Tamás Gere, specialist at the National Educational Integration Network (NEIN)
[14] *National Social Inclusion Strategy Extreme Poverty, Child Poverty, the Roma* (2011-2020) Budapest, December 2011, Ministry of Public Administration and Justice, State Secretariat for Social Inclusion http://romagov.kormany.hu/download/5/58/20000/Strategy%20-%20HU%20-%20EN.PDF
[15] Ibid.

support and the basic guidelines for IPR are determined annually in a decree (in the 2011/2012 teaching year: Public Administration and Justice Ministry (KIM) decree 26/2011 (IX 14)). The program is implemented in accordance with article 95 of the Public Education Act. 26/2012 (V. 9.).[16] Today the IES has become the most popular element of the integration policy: a quarter of all primary schools apply the system, and nursery schools and secondary schools have also adopted the methodology-based program. Approximately 1,600 public education institutions, 300,000 multiply disadvantaged children and approximately 13,000 teachers are involved.[17]

2.4.2 Further amendments to the integration policy

The 12/2007 (III.14.) and 9/ 2008 (III.29) decrees of the ministry of education introduced an important amendment to the 'integration head quota/per capita funding' system.(REF 2007) Under the new system, to apply for the integrated education funds the local council have to meet certain conditions, such as the designation of school districts, ensuring the correct proportion of disadvantaged children horizontally and vertically, preparing action plans for equal opportunities in education. (Dupcsik and Molnár 2008; Szendrey 2010) Under an amendment to Article 66 of the Public Education Act, the Education Ministry has also adopted an "Equal opportunity-based supporting policy", under which Hungarian and EU support is only provided if the school maintainers (e.g. NGO, Church, local authority) can prove that it will not be used for segregation or to support discriminative educational practices. (Dupcsik and Molnár 2008; Szendrey 2010)

[16] Ministry of Public Administration and Judicial Affairs (KIM) Decree on Support for Equality in Education http://www.kozlonyok.hu/nkonline/MKPDF/hiteles/MK12055.pdf)

[17] *National Social Inclusion Strategy Extreme Poverty, Child Poverty, the Roma* (2011-2020) Budapest, December 2011, Ministry of Public Administration and Justice, State Secretariat for Social Inclusion http://romagov.kormany.hu/download/5/58/20000/Strategy%20-%20HU%20-%20EN.PDF

3 HOW DO THE MECHANISMS AFFECT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DESEGREGATION POLICIES IN HUNGARY?

In this chapter I will analyse how the mechanisms identified in the first chapter apply in the Hungarian context in relation to desegregation policies in Hungary, in both a top-down and in a bottom-up manner.

3.1 Racial prejudice

Racial and ethnic discrimination is an extremely important mechanism when we look at the success of implementation of the integration policy. I deal with it separately here because it cannot be categorised as a purely top-down or bottom-up mechanism, but can be present at all levels of the implementation process. Roma everywhere in Europe face discrimination and prejudices in education as in all other areas of life. (OSI 2007) There is widespread negative prejudice and attitudes towards Roma in mainstream societies and also in relation to Roma education. (OSI 2007) In the European Court of Justice desegregation court case D.H. and others v. Czech Republic (which is often regarded as the European equivalent of the US case Brown v. Board of Education), the ECHR noted widespread discrimination against Roma in education. According to Dupcsik and Molnár (2008) there is strong prejudice towards Roma in Hungary, Szendrey (2010) found that, according to a public opinion survey conducted by Tarki, 25% of the Hungarian population would approve if Roma children attended segregated schools. This widespread racial prejudice is clearly a major potential source of resistance to the implementation of desegregation policies.

3.2 Top-down mechanisms

Top-down mechanisms relate to measures that are instituted from the top down, in the form of policies, statutes or decrees, by the government and upper-level decision makers. (Mazmanian and Sabatier 1989) The following top-down mechanisms have negatively influenced the success of the implementation of school desegregation policies in Hungary.

3.2.1 Political cycles

Changes in government can result in changes or even reversals of policies, and as we have seen from the US examples, this can have a profound effect on policy implementation. Hungary's past governments have developed many strategies for the development of Roma education, and since the 1989 regime change Roma education has been the priority in

education policy. However, in the 2010 general election the extreme right wing political party Jobbik won 47 seats (giving it a 12.18% minority) in parliament.[18] The fact that a political party with extreme right-wing views is now a part of the mainstream political apparatus suggests that there is a shift towards intolerance among both the political elite and among voters. In a related phenomenon, right-wing militia such as the Szebb Jövőért Egyesület (Association for a Brighter Future) regularly march through and occupy villages where Roma people live, intimidating the Gypsy populations and stirring up anti-Roma sentiment.[19] I suggest that this could have an effect on the level of political commitment to desegregation as a means of addressing the issue of Roma education.

The current government of Hungary, elected in 2010, in the process of rewriting the national curriculum, and these new changes might have a big influence on the integration policy and its implementation. The 'Equity' Association for Equitable Public Education[20] suggests that there are serious flaws in the planned amendment of the Act, such as placing disadvantage children in the same category as those with 'special needs'. Another deficiency is the omission of unequivocal fundamental principles – the terms 'equal opportunities' and 'equality of opportunity' are not mentioned in the consultation draft, and nor is the integration of needy children or Roma[21]. The minimum school-leaving age may also be lowered from 18 to 16 years, in which case schools will be under no obligation to admit students over this age. (Zolnay and Havas 2011) These developments are potentially unfavourable in terms of the implementation of desegregation policies, as they represent a step backwards from the current policy launched in 2002.

3.2.2 Mechanisms related to policy design

As we have observed in the case of the US, another mechanism that affects the implementation of the desegregation policy in Hungary in a top-down manner is the design of the policy itself. The following mechanisms related to policy design can all affect the success of implementation.

[18] *Parliamentary Elections* National Election Office website http://www.valasztas.hu/hu/ovi/455/455_0.html
[19] European Roma Rights Center, *Attacks against Roma in Hungary:* January 2008-July 2012 last updated: 30 July 2011. http://www.errc.org/cms/upload/file/attacks-list-in-hungary.pdf
[20] Equity – Association for Equitable Public Education, *Az új közoktatási törvény tervezetének 2010. december 3-án közzétett vitaanyagához* (Consultation draft of the new Public Education Act, published on 3 December 2010) http://equity.org.hu/index1.html
[21] Ibid

3.2.2.1 Problems defining the target group

It appears that potential problems may stem from a failure to properly define the target group. According to a study by the Open Society Institute (2007), in Central Europe, the Roma are not even specifically mentioned in the policy. In Hungary the current integration program focuses on social disadvantages rather than ethnicity. Therefore this integration policy uses the definition of 'multiply disadvantaged children' general rather than specifically targeting the Roma. (Zolnay and Havas 2011) Consequently, the "ethnic aspect of the segregation is outside the scope of the policy". (Szendrey 2010: 326) Szendrey (2010) raises the question of whether desegregation measures should focus on the ethnic aspect as well as (or instead of) the social aspect, as Roma children are clearly not only discriminated against on the basis of their social circumstances, but also because of their ethnicity. This is an important factor, as racial prejudice may be an important aspect of many of the bottom-up mechanisms that we will examine (e.g. resistance from implementers, white flight, etc.), and therefore the imprecise definition of the target groups could lead to a failure to identify all of the causal links between the policy and its objectives.

3.2.2.2 Conflicting data

A related issue is that of contradictory data relating to the number of disadvantaged children. Szendrey (2010) argues that the definition of multiply disadvantaged children is the source of many problems when it comes to implementing and evaluating the policy, because of the large difference between the number of disadvantaged children actually in the school system, and the numbers recorded as such by the local authority. As a reason for this, she cites the fact that for a child to qualify as multiply disadvantaged, the parent has to make a voluntary written declaration on his or her level of education, and not all parents are aware of the benefits of making such a declaration. This means that in some cases children could be unfairly excluded from the program.

3.2.2.3 Problems defining the target areas

Another problematic aspect of the policy design relates to the definition of the target areas. By only providing support to schools and towns that have already succeeded in desegregating their schools, it fails to reach the most deprived areas (segregated Roma settlements, deprived micro-regions such as Borsod and Szabolcs Counties) due to existing residential segregation and the fact that Roma populations may represent a majority at local level. In areas such as this – precisely where the need for desegregation is the greatest – the schools are incapable of

fulfilling the statutory requirements to receive support. (Zolnay Havas 2011) This is a problem because it prevents the programs from reaching the areas where the need is greatest.

3.2.3 Shortage of 'skilful implementers'

In order to effectively implement desegregation policies, what Mazmanian Sabatier (1989) refers to as "skilful implementers" are needed. In the case of desegregation in schools, the most important front-line implementers are teachers and, where provided, mentors.

3.2.3.1 Teachers

Eighty percent or more of the pupils are Roma, one or more teachers typically have had no pedagogical training at all. (Kertesi and Kézdi 2005) According to Ágnes Boreczky, a professor at the Faculty of Education and Psychology at ELTE University, Budapest, teachers are not trained to teach in heterogeneous classes, and cannot effectively deal with the children's special needs, or are unwilling to because dof their racial prejudices. Boreczky goes on to say that general teacher training today in Hungary does not deal systematically with matters connected to the teaching of children with special requirements, and that "modern multicultural concepts and multicultural classroom practices have not become an integral part of teacher training or in-service teacher training up to the present", and she adds that "multiculturalism has not been integrated into the canon of pedagogy".[22]

Since 2003, teachers taking part in the Integrated Education System have had to attend courses in new teaching methods, which goes some way to addressing the problem. (Dupcsik-Molnár 2008) In the course of the integration process much emphasis is placed on the "intent to revise the content and methodology of teaching work". (Havas and Zolnay 2011: 18) An important consideration, however, is that it is not compulsory for schools to join the program in the first place, so – as a consequence of the policy design – there is no obligation for all teachers to learn the new methods. (Greenberg 2010) This shortage of skilful implementers means that Hungary does not have the capacity to implement the policies effectively.

3.2.3.2 Mentors

Closing down the Roma-only schools is not enough, since a carefully researched strategy and pedagogical program are needed in order to manage the problems related to integration.

[22] Interview by the author with Ágnes Boreczky, professor at the Faculty of Education and Psychology at ELTE University, Budapest (15 January 2010).

(Zolnay and Havas 2011) When school districts are redrawn or Roma-only schools are closed, children from a 'ghetto' school may suddenly find themselves attending 'elite' schools, and they need help in overcoming the difficulties associated with the integration. (Neumann and Zolnay 2008) As we have seen in the previous chapter, the current policy does not mention the use of mentors.

For example, in Nyíregyháza after they closed down the Roma-only schools and integrated children into mainstream school, the Roma children were often victimised and subjected to racist bullying by the majority students. (Zolnay 2005) Mentors were provided, but were unable to provide the necessary support; the implementation process stalled and the children were unable to fit in and left the school. Neither the children nor the teachers were prepared to deal with the ethnic tensions between the old and new students. (Zolnay 2005) In Szeged, on the other hand, with the support of mentors provided by the Roma Education Fund (REF), the children were successfully assimilated. (Zolnay and Havas 2011) The success of the latter case, where proper mentoring support was provided, shows that there could be a need for this type of support, and for the standards of such mentoring to also be determined in the policy.

3.2.4 Lack of evaluation, monitoring and enforcement

It is essential to evaluate and systematically monitor the implementation of the policy. (Vendung 2006) Without this, it is impossible to determine whether funds were used appropriately and judge whether any improvements or changes are needed. Several studies have pointed out that one of the weakest points of the implementation of Hungary's desegregation policy is the lack of effective monitoring and evaluation. (OSI 2007; Greenberg 2010) This clearly leaves scope for schools to claim support for Roma desegregation without any guarantee that the funds will actually be used for this purpose, so the system relies too much on the assumption that implementers are sympathetic to the objectives of desegregation.

3.2.4.1 External evaluation

There is virtually no external evaluation of the policy's implementation. (Szendrey 2010) (The only major systematic study was carried out by Kézdi and Surányi, in 2009, into the Integrated Education Program.) Schools and affiliated institutions that apply for the integration support only have to perform a self evaluation (as opposed to being assessed externally) each year, and although external consultants assist the schools with the self evaluation, they do not inspect their work. Szendrey notes that "if an institution wanted to

conceal the fact that it had requested integration support but its class organisational policy breached the ISP rules or even the Public Education Act ... the consultant would have no authority to investigate further."[23]

3.2.4.2 Monitoring and enforcement

Since 2007 the Education Authority has had the authority to perform follow-up monitoring of schools that apply for integration support. (Greenberg 2010) However, the Authority does not have sufficient resources and capacity to ensure effective control, and the monitoring system is ineffective. Although recently increased, fines remain low and are rarely imposed. Even when fines are imposed, they have little effect.[24]

3.2.5 Decentralised education system

The decentralised nature of the Hungarian education system means limits the role of central government. (Németh: 2003). Many studies (Greenberg 2010; Szendrey 2010; Neumann Zolnay 2008) identify, as a potential obstacle to implementation, the many conflicts of interest between the central government and the local authorities that maintain the schools. The local authorities do not always feel that it is in their best interests to accept and implement the equal opportunity policy, (Neumann and Zolnay 2008) and because they do not answer directly to the central government, this is a major factor preventing central policy maters from implementing their objectives. (Németh 2003) A good example of this occurred in the town of Jászladány, where the local council allowed a foundation to rent a building in the local school, for the purpose of opening a private school, essentially in order to avoid implementing the desegregation policy. This illustrates of how much scope the local authorities have to segregate children and refuse implementation of desegregation policies, as well as how little power the central government has to prevent them from doing this. (Dupcsik and Molnár 2008)

3.3 Bottom-up mechanisms

Bottom-up mechanisms originate at the lower levels of implementation, and relate to actions by implementers (local authorities, school administrations, teachers, etc.) as well as the target groups themselves. (Winter 2003) The following bottom-up mechanisms have negatively influenced the success of the implementation of school desegregation policies in Hungary.

[23] Email from Orsolya Szendrey, independent expert and consultant to the Roma Education Fund, to author (11 September, 2012).
[24] Ibid

3.3.1 Resistance from implementers

As the following examples show, in order for a policy to be successfully implemented the local councils, school administrators and teachers have to be committed to the integration policy, since its implementation is not compulsory by law. Another problem illustrated below is that in Hungary local authorities and school administrations often refuse to comply with the court decisions in segregation cases. Legal regulations are not complied with, and the incentives and the penalties for the violation of anti-discrimination laws are not always enough to overcome the resistance.

3.3.1.1 Local authorities

Local authorities (as the school maintainers) often do not apply for integration support because they do not want to implement the policy in spite of the massive funding opportunities it represents. (Zolnay and Havas 2011) This could be due to pressure from parents (voters) and the fear of white flight, or to prejudice towards Roma among the town's leadership itself. For example, the town of Kaposvár refuses to integrate despite a court ruling ordering the desegregation of its schools. (Zolnay and Havas 2011)

Tamás Gere described the situation as follows:

> *"I think primarily the acceptance of the integration program depends on the school maintainers. I have often observed that even where an institution is open to introducing the program, the maintainer does not support the idea. They may even try to prevent the school from applying for the support (the maintainer is the party that submits the application and signs the agreement; the funds are received and passed on by the maintainer etc.). The reasons for this can arise from the personality or value judgement of the mayor or council (there have been examples of this), but since the mayor is elected every four years, the resistance can also be traced back to opposition from parents."*[25]

Resistance from the local authorities can be so strong that legal consequences do not act as a deterrent. A landmark case in Hungary was Chance for Children Foundation (CFCF) v Town of Hajdúhadház, in which the Supreme Court found that in Hajdúhadház the Roma students were separated unlawfully. (Greenberg 2010) Despite this ruling the school did not stop

[25] Email from Tamás Gere, specialist at the National Educational Integration Network (NEIN)

student segregation. Moreover, when CFCF started to negotiate a desegregation plan many non-Roma students moved to schools in other towns. (Greenberg 2010)

3.3.1.2 School administrations

In other cases the local council has attempted to implement the policy but failed due to resistance from the schools. In Nyíregyháza an attempt was made in the 1990s, just after the regime change, to desegregate the town's segregated schools. One class was moved to another school, but resistance from the receiving school was so high that no more attempts were made until the Chance for Children Foundation (CFCF) sued them successfully and the closure of the segregated school was ordered. (Kerülő 2009) However, in September 2012 at the request of the city council, the Greek Catholic church of Hajdúdorog took over the maintenance rights of the school and reopened is as a segregated school, resulting in a failure to implement the integration program.[26]

3.3.1.3 Teachers

Teachers obviously have a key role in the success of Roma education. Zolnay and Havas (2011) found an increase in open anti-Roma feeling among pedagogues and school principals, and also found that many (for example the principal of the school in Hajdúhadház) blamed the "inappropriate lifestyle and attitude" of Roma families for their lack of school success. (Havas and Zolnay 2011:19) Moreover Dupcsik and Molnár (2010) cite an ombudsman survey, which found that one out of seven students in teacher training collages is racist and only 39% have no prejudices against Roma. Greenberg (2010) also finds evidence of problems with the attitudes of teachers towards integration. In an interview-based survey he found that – with some exceptions – overall, most teachers and other school staff are unsupportive of the integration program. Moreover, the methodological knowledge of teachers in integrated classes was said to be very poor, and many teachers under-motivated, (Németh and Papp 2006) while Greenberg concludes that the teachers are generally unreceptive to the extra skills prescribed under the new Integrated Education System. (Greenberg 2010) Dupcsik and Molnár (2008) refer to a study by Liskó in 2007, which assessed the impacts of in-service training provided to teachers as a part of the integration programme. She reached the conclusion that while the teachers considered the training useful, it had little effect on their views about segregation and the causes of low school performance. Overall, they had no belief in the usefulness of integration. (Dupcsik and Molnar 2008) Since the teachers are the

[26] Interview conducted by the author with Zsuzsa Nánási, head of the Hajdúhadház Family Welfare Service (18 May 2012)

front-line implementers of the policy, their support is essential for its success. In Hungary, this support is clearly missing.

3.3.2 Resistance from non-Roma parents

Neumann and Zolnay (2008) propose that parents exert the greatest influence on the composition of school classes, by putting pressure on decision makers. When a town decides to implement the integration policy and to desegregate its schools by ensuring the right proportion of students horizontally and vertically in the settlements' schools, these efforts are often disrupted by massive resistance from non-Roma parents. (Zolnay-Neumann 2008) Behind the decisions of local authorities and schools lie "the unrelenting enforcement of the interests of elite groups." (Zolnay 2005: 68) Havas meanwhile proposes that "if local authorities anywhere were to upset the accepted ratios, the parents would immediately redress the balance: the better-situated non-Roma families would immediately enrol their children in other schools, until the segregation of Roma and non-Roma children – in the extent considered desirable by the local elite groups – was restored." (Havas 2005:68) All this implies – as we have also observed in certain cases among the teachers and local authorities – that racial prejudice is an important factor underlying this mechanism too.

For example, when the town of Mohács made a commitment to integration and re-drew the school district boundaries, distributing disadvantaged children evenly across schools and classes, it was met with stiff opposition from the parents, who protested through every available channel and exploited legal loopholes to stop their children being put in the same class or school as Roma children, for example by registering themselves as resident in another district. (Neumann and Zolnay 2008) A similar situation arose in Nyíregyháza around the same time.

3.3.2.1 White flight

White flight is a mechanism whereby, in response to an increase in the proportion of Roma children in the schools, non-Roma parents move their children to other schools, other school districts or to schools established by churches or foundations, which can be more selective about which students they admit. (Szendrey 2010; Havas and Zolnay 2011) One of the reasons for this is racial prejudice. (Dupcsik- Molnár 2008) For example, in Hajdúhadház Zsuzsa Nánási[27], head of the local family welfare service, reports that there were two schools

[27] Interview conducted by the author with Zsuzsa Nánási, head of the Hajdúhadház Family Welfare Service (18 May 2012)

in the town attended exclusively by Roma. When the local council ordered the desegregation of the schools in the town, the non-Roma children left these schools – some to schools in other towns, and others to a school set up by the local church for the purpose of "rescuing" non-Roma kids from the integrated public schools. Because church and NGO-run schools in Hungary are entitled to the same government subsidy as ordinary state schools, it was very easy to establish another school and solve the "problem" in this way.[28]

In other cases the mere possibility of white flight has prevented school maintainers from applying for integration support in the first place, making it one of the underlying causes of resistance from local authorities. In these cases – because it is not obligatory to implement the desegregation policy – the integration process cannot even get started. In an interview Mrs Erdőháti[29], IES consultant and equal opportunities specialist, commented that there are small towns in Hajdú-Bihar that do not want to implement the integration policy because of the fear of white flight, as the non-Roma parents do not want their children to attend school together with Roma children.[30]

As long as non-Roma parents react to integration by taking their children out of the schools, the integration policy cannot be implemented and no matter how hard the other actors or the government try, the implementation will be doomed to failure (e.g. Hajdúhadház). In order to stop white flight, in 2006 the government amended the Public Education Act Article 66 order to abolish the freedom of choice of school, but parents have found ways around the new regulations (e.g. by registering an address in a different district). (Szendrey 2010)

3.3.3 Low level of involvement of Roma parents

Few Roma families are able to provide the financial resources for learning, since the majority of them live in poverty. (Liskó 2002) In most cases there is no supportive environment, and usually children have no examples of how to study. Due their own lack of education parents are unable to help them with their study at home, and the schools usually have no understanding of the children's culture. (Forray 1997) Another problem arises from the relationship between the parents and the school (Liskó 2002; REF 2007) and the fact that the parents do not actively maintain contact. (Forray 1997) The integration policy 2003 targeted this problem, stipulating that the parents of children who take part in the integration program

[28] Ibid.
[29] Interview conducted by the author with Mrs Erdőháti, IES consultant, director of Oktador Bt., Hajdúszoboszló (19 May 2012)
[30] Ibid.

must meet with their form teacher every three months to discuss the child's progress. According to Alíz Török, a senior school teacher who has been involved with the integration program since it started, maintaining contact with the parents is problematic.[31]

3.3.4 Residential segregation

One of the key causes of segregated schooling is where the minority lives in a segregated environment. (Molnár and Dupcsik 2008) The majority of Hungary's Roma population – approximately 600,000 people – live in a segregated environment. This has proven to be a major obstacle to the implementation of school desegregation policies in Hungary. Havas concludes that significant results cannot be expected in places where poor people, mostly Roma, live in great numbers (Szendrey 2010: 258). In areas such as this it is very difficult to implement the integration policy, because owing to the high proportion of Roma children – and the conditions of the integration program – these schools are not eligible to apply for the integration support. (Szendrey 2010; Havas and Zolnay 2011)

In an attempt to solve this problem, in 2007 "local governments were ordered to redraw the boundaries of school districts in a way that diminishes the effects of residential segregation" (Molnár and Dupcsik 2008: 25) According to the new law, equal opportunities criteria had to be taken into consideration (Zolnay and Havas 2011), and the new school districts had to be drawn and the children horizontally and vertically distributed in and among schools so as to ensure that in neighbouring schools the numbers of disadvantaged children should not exceed a certain level. The new act states that disadvantaged and Roma children must be given preference in school admissions, while in the case of oversubscription the others should be selected by a drawing of lots. (Neumann and Zolnay 2008)

This was attempted in Nyíregyháza in 2007, when in response to external pressure the 100% Roma-attended school located in Huszár út was closed, and the decision was taken to integrate the children into other schools. The solution applied was to bus the children to the schools. (Zolnay and Havas 2011) However, this was later stopped and attendance by the children dropped off because they could not reach the school from the segregated environment. The implementation failed, and the school in Huszár út was later re-opened as a church-run (segregated) school.[32]

[31] Interview with Alíz Török, senior schoolteacher, 18th September 2012
[32] Interview conducted by the author with Zsuzsa Nánási, head of the Hajdúhadház Family Welfare Service (6 Sept 2012)

3.4 Summary

In this chapter I have identified mechanisms that influence the success of the implementation of school desegregation policies in Hungary. Some of these mechanisms act in a top-down, and others in a bottom-up manner. The table below give an overview of the top-down and bottom-up mechanisms.

Mechanisms influencing the outcome of the implementation of desegregation policy

Top-down ⇩	
Racial prejudice	
Political cycles	
Policy design • Problems defining the target group • Conflicting data • Problems defining the target areas	**Resistance from implementers** • Local authorities • School administrations • Teachers
Shortage of skilful implementers • Teachers • Mentors	**Resistance from non-Roma parents** • White flight
Lack of evaluation and monitoring • External evaluation • Monitoring and enforcement	**Low level of involvement of Roma parents**
Decentralised education system	**Residential segregation**
Racial prejudice	
	⇧ **Bottom-up**

A common characteristic of all the mechanisms I have examined in this section is that racial prejudice towards Roma is interwoven at all levels of the implementation process. In Hungary, in terms of the mechanisms I have examined in this paper, the racial prejudice is most direct and visible in the bottom-up mechanisms (white flight, resistance from implementers etc.). In a top-down approach this aspect may be present in a more indirect

form. or example, although the policy itself may not be racist, the shift to the right in the parliament (e.g. the entry of extreme right-wing party Jobbik to mainstream politics) – and the absence of attitude-shaping measures – can lend legitimacy to racial intolerance, which in turn strengthens resistance to desegregation policies overall.

CONCLUSION

My aim was to reveal the mechanisms that contributed to the failure of desegregation policies in Hungary, based on the implementation theory and taking the US examples as a framework. The purpose of the framework is to identify the relevant top-down and bottom-up mechanisms and apply them in the Hungarian context in order to understand why the desegregation policies were not fully implemented at the various levels of implementation.

I argued that racial prejudice has a great influence on the success of the implementation of desegregation policies. In my study I identified a number of mechanisms that negatively impact the implementation of desegregation policies at various levels of the implementation process, but all of these are underpinned – to a greater or lesser degree – by a common factor that cannot be categorised as top-down or bottom-up: racial prejudice, which is interwoven at virtually all the levels of the implementation process.

One of the criteria for a successful policy, according to Sabatier, is an adequate causal theory. "An adequate causal theory requires (a) that the principal causal linkages between governmental intervention and the attainment of program objectives be understood; and (b) that the officials responsible for implementing the program have jurisdiction over a sufficient number of the critical linkages to actually attain the objectives". (Mazmanian Sabatier 1989: 26) The existing policy does not address possibly the most important causal linkage – that of racial prejudice. It does not take into account the resistance to the top-down policies resulting from racial prejudice, and the means it employs (incentives, sanctions) are not always sufficient to counteract the effect of these attitudes.

In order to successfully address the mechanisms identified herein there is a need for the desegregation policy to also address the issue of racial prejudice, both at the level of policy-making and implementation. However, this goes beyond statutory measures, as it involves changing people's attitudes, which is a difficult and time-consuming process. There is a need for additional research into the extent and causes of racial prejudice, in order to determine how desegregation policies could address this important issue in future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Ascik, R. Thomas. 1984. "An investigation of school desegregation and its effects on black student achievement" American Education, Vol 20, N 10, Dec 1984, p 15-19

Birkland, A. Thomas. 2001. An Introduction to the Policy Process: theories, concepts, and models of public policy making, M.E.Sharpe, New York

European Parliament. 2011. Measures to promote the situation of Roma EU citizens in the European Union.
http://www2.lse.ac.uk/businessAndConsultancy/LSEConsulting/pdf/Roma.pdf last issued 25 Sept 2012

European Commission. 2011. An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020, Brussels, 5.4.2011
http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/discrimination/docs/com_2011_173_en.pdf last issued 25 Sept 2012

European Roma Rights Center. 2011. Attacks against Roma in Hungary: January 2008-July 2012. **http://www.errc.org/cms/upload/file/attacks-list-in-hungary.pdf** last updated: 30 July 2011

European Roma Rights Center. 2012. D.H. and Others v the Czech Republic http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=3559) last issued 14 June 2012

Equity - Association for Equitable Public Education. 2010. Az új közoktatási törvény tervezetének 2010. december 3-án közzétett vitaanyagához (Consultation draft of the new Public Education Act, published on 3 December 2010) **http://equity.org.hu/index1.html** last issued 25 Sept 2012

Farkas, Lilla. 2007. Segregation of Roma Children in Education. Addressing structural discrimination through the Race Equality Directive. European Commission. DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities.

Forray R., Katalin. 1997. Az iskola és a cigány család ellentétei, Kritika. (Conflicts between the school and the Gypsy family, Critique) 1997/7

Frankenberg, Erica and Genevieve Siegel-Hawley. 2008. Are teachers prepared for racially changing schools? The Civil Rights Project. http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/are-teachers-prepared-for-racially-changing-schools/frankenberg-are-teachers-prepared-racially.pdf last issued 27 Sept 2012

Gatlin, S. Douglas, Giles, W. Micheal and Cataldo, F. Everett.1978. Policy support within a Target Group: The case of School Desegregation. The American Science Review, Vol. 72, No.3 (Sept. 1978), pp.985-995, American Political Science Association

Greenberg, Jack .2010. Report on Roma Education Today: From Slavery to Segregation and Beyond, Columbia Law Review, May 2010, Volume 110, No. 4

Havas, Gábor and Ilona Liskó: Szegregáció a roma tanulók általános iskolai oktatásában (Segregation in the primary school education of Roma pupils) Felsőoktatási Kutatóintezét, Budapest 2005.

Havas, Gábor, Kemény, István and Ilona Liskó: 2002, Cigány gyerekek az általános iskolában. (Romani Children in the Primary Schools) Oktatáskutató Intézet (Educational Research Institute). Budapest, Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó, pp. 167

Havas, Gábor and János Zolnay. 2011. Sziszifusz számvetése (Sisyphus' Reckoning), Beszélő journal, year 16, issue 6

Hill, Michael and Peter Hupe. 2002. Implementing Public Policy governance and theory in practice, Sage

Horsford, Sonya Douglass, and McKenzie, Kathryn Bell. 2008. 'Sometimes I Feel like the Problems Started with Desegregation': Exploring Black superintendent perspectives on desegregation policy, Routledge, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education Vol.21, No.5) September-October 2008, p 443-455

Kertesi, Gábor and Gábor Kézdi. 2002. Segregation in the Primary School System in Hungary, Causes and Consequences, Budapest

Kézdi, Gábor and Eva Surányi .2009. A successful School Integration Program, An evaluation of the Hungarian National Goverment's school integration program 2005-2007, Roma Educational Fund, Budapest, 2009 Working paper number No 2

Kézdi Gábor. 2009. Általános iskolai szegregáció Magyarországon az ezredforduló után (Primary school segregation in Hungary after the turn of the millenium) Közgazdasági Szemle, 2009, 56, 959-1000. Co-author: Kertesi, Gábor

Kerülő, Judit. 2009. Az integráció és a szegregáció kérdése egy iskolabezárás kapcsán Oktatáskutató és fejlesztő intézet (The question of integration and segregation in relation to a school closure - Education Research and Development Institute) **http://www.ofi.hu/tudastar/kerulo-judit-integracio 2009 Szeptember 30**

Kóczé, Angéla. 2001. Roma Youth Participation in Higher Education, Policy paper, Open Society Institute,

Liskó, Ilona. 2001. A cigány tanulók iskolai esélyei (The opportunities of Gypsy learners in education), 2001 /1 Mérlegen, 1990-2002

Liskó, Ilona. 2002. Cigány tanulók a középfokú iskolákban (Gypsy children in secondary schools). Új Pedagógiai Szemle (Journal of New Pedagogy) 6, no. 11.

Mazmanian, A. Danial and A.Paul Sabatier. 1989. Implementation and Public policy, University Press of America

Molnar, Emilia and Csaba, Dupcsik. 2008. 'Country Report on Education: Hungary.' EDUMIGROM Background Papers, Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies, http://www.edumigrom.eu/sites/default/files/field_attachment/page/node-1817/edumigrombackgroundpaperhungaryeducation.pdf last issued 26 Sept. 2012

Ministry of Education (OM) Decree 57/2002. (XI. 18.) Hungarian Gazette, issue 143/2002: www.magyarkozlony.hu/pdf/3382

Ministry of Culture and Public Education (MKM) Decree 11/1994. (VI. 8.) **http://jogszabalykereso.mhk.hu/cgi_bin/njt_doc.cgi?docid=20252.585277**

McPherson, Ezella. 2010. Moving From Separate, to Equal, to Equitable Schooling: Revisiting School Desegregation Policies, Urban Education, Sage Publications

National Social Inclusion Strategy Extreme Poverty, Child Poverty, the Roma – (2011-2020) December 2011, Ministry of Public Administration and Justice, State Secretariat for Social Inclusion Budapest, **http://romagov.kormany.hu/download/5/58/20000/Strategy%20-%20HU%20-%20EN.PDF** last issued 26 Sept. 2012

Neumann, Eszter and János Zolnay. 2008. Esélyegyenlőség, szegregáció és oktatáspolitikai stratégiák Kaposváron, Pécsen és Mohácson (Equal opportunities, segregation and education policy strategies in Kaposvár, Pécs and Mohács) Európai Összehasonlító Kisebbségkutatások Közalapítvány, Műhelytanulmány 38

Németh, Szilvia. (2003) Roma hallgatók a felsőoktásban, Integration contra segregation, Magyar Roma Oktatáspolitikai Tanulmány, (Hungarian Roma Educational Policy), OKI, 2003

Németh, Szilvia and Attila.Papp Z. 2006. 'És mi adjuk az integráció vezérfonalát' ('And we provide the guidelines of integration'). In Németh, Szilvia (ed.) Integráció a gyakorlatban. A roma tanulók együttnevelésének iskolai modelljei (Integration in practise. Models of the integrated education of Roma students). Budapest: Országos Közoktatási Intézet.

OSI EUMAP. 2007. Equal Access to Quality Education for Roma. Vol.2. (editors: P.Farrar, Katy Negrin, Open Society Institute, Budapest

Parliamentary Elections .2010. National Election Office website http://www.valasztas.hu/hu/ovi/455/455_0.html last issued 20 Sept 2012

Radó, Péter.(2001) Bevezetés az oktatáspolitikai elemzésbe: Romák és az iskola (Introduction to education-policy analysis: Roma and school) 2001/12 sz p 65

Robin, S.Stanley and J James Bosco. 1976. Coleman's desegregation research and policy recommendations, The School Review, Vol. 84. No.3 Is School Desegregation Still a Good Idea? (May 1976) pp.352-363, The University Chicago Press

Rossell H, Christine.1990. The carrot or the stick for school desegregation policy, Temple University Press, Philadelphia

Roma Education Fund (2007) Country Assessment and the Roma Education Fund's Strategic Direction: Advancing Education of Roma in Hungary, Budapest, 2007 available at: http://www.romaeducationfund.hu/sites/default/files/publications/hungary_assessment_english.pdf last issued: 23 Sept 2012

School Desegregation and Equal Educational Opportunity, The Leadership Conference **http://www.civilrights.org/resources/civilrights101/desegregation.html** last issued 27 Sept 2012

Szendrey, Orsolya .2012. Roma School Desegregation Policies in Hungary, in Iulius Rostás (ed.) Ten years after. The Roma Education Fund and Central European University

Thomas, E. Gail and Frank Brown. 1982. What does educational research tell us about school Desegregation Effects? Journal of Black Studies, Vol.13, No 2 School desegregation (Dec., 1982), pp.155-174, published by Sage publications, Inc.

Vedung Evert. 2006. Evaluation research in B.G. Peters & J.Pierre (eds) Handbook of Public Administration, Sage

Zolnay, Janos. 2005. Oktatáspolitika és etnikai szegregáció Miskolc és Nyíregyháza általános iskoláiban (Education policy and ethnic segregation in the primary schools of Miskolc and Nyíregyháza), Európai Összehasonlító Kisebbségkutatások Közalapítvány, Műhelytanulmány 16

Wells, Amy Stuart, Holme, Jennifer Jell, Revilla, Anita Tijerina and Awo Korantemaa Atanda. 2004. How Society Failed School Desegregation Policy: Looking Past the Schools to Understand Them? American Educational Journal Research Association

Winter C. Soren. 2003. "Implementation Perspectives: Status and Reconsideration," in B.G. Peters & J. Pierre (eds) Handbook of Public Administration, Sage