

**A Comparative Study on the Situation of the Roma in
Romania and Spain: A focus on multicultural
education measures as a foundation for positive
societal integration**

Katelyn Julissa Hochler

Masters of Science in Global Studies

Supervisor: Karin Steen

21 May 2012



**LUND
UNIVERSITY**

Abstract:

This thesis addresses the complexities of the situation of the Roma in Romania and Spain and the challenges of including isolated groups in society. The main texts used for comparison come from the Council of Europe's expert bodies: the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), the Advisory Committee (ACFC) under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM), and the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages (ECRML), although other inter-governmental supplementary sources are also used in the text analysis. This thesis aims to compare and contrast education policies, developments, and initiatives specially for supporting the Roma, in the last decade, evaluating the barriers for Roma to access and integrate into the education system through an analysis of measures addressing school integration, education content, language, and cultural awareness. Also presented is a theoretical discussion of multicultural education coupled with a dissection of Roma culture and identity from a social constructivist lens, in order to best approach the inclusion of diverse cultural perspectives in the mainstream educational system. Lastly, this thesis argues that multicultural education is an important element in the process of socially including excluded groups in society, such as the Roma, which I word as positive societal integration. This thesis concludes that Roma poverty and exclusion is not an isolated phenomena, but instead, it is attached, dependant, and influenced by many other societal sectors, and therefore I argue that a multicultural approach, incorporated into education polices and programs, can shape actors' actions, attitudes, and perceptions, with the power to affect the overall situation of the Roma in Romania and Spain.

Key Words: *Roma, Social Identity Theory, Multiculturalism, Multicultural education, Intercultural Communication, Integration, The Council of Europe*

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	5
BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION	5
ROMA TERMINOLOGY	7
PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS	7
CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	9
METHODOLOGY	10
LIMITATION OF SCOPE	11
COPENHAGEN CRITERIA	13
CHAPTER THREE: COUNTRY PROFILES	13
(1) ROMANIA	14
(1A) GENERAL INFORMATION	14
(1B) SITUATION OF THE ROMA	14
(1C) EDUCATION IN ROMANIA	15
(2) SPAIN	15
(2A) GENERAL INFORMATION	15
(2B) SITUATION OF THE ROMA	16
(2C) EDUCATION IN SPAIN	16
OVERALL CONCLUSIONS OF COMPARISONS	17
CHAPTER FOUR: ROMA CULTURE	18
THE COMPLEXITY OF CULTURE AND IDENTITY	19
CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE IN-GROUP, OUT-GROUP	20
CHAPTER FIVE: THE ROMA AND EDUCATION	22
(1) SCHOOL INTEGRATION	23
(1A) ACADEMIC SUPPORT	25
(2) EDUCATION CONTENT	27
(3) LANGUAGE	29

(4) CULTURAL AWARENESS	33
(4A) TEACHER TRAINING	33
(4B) AWARENESS RAISING IN SCHOOLS	35
(4C) AWARENESS RAISING IN THE SOCIETY	36
CHAPTER SIX: MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION	38
INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION	41
THE POWER OF LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION	43
CONCLUSIONS	44
CHAPTER SEVEN: EDUCATION AND SOCIETAL INTEGRATION	44
DEFINITIONS OF INTEGRATION	46
HISTORIC PATTERNS OF INTEGRATION IN ROMANIA AND SPAIN	48
CONCLUSIONS	49
CHAPTER EIGHT: CHALLENGES TO EVALUATING THE SITUATION OF THE ROMA AND EDUCATION	51
(1) DOCUMENTATION AND DEMOGRAPHIC DATA COLLECTION	52
(2) FUNDING AND OVERSIGHT	54
(3) PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	56
(4) ROMA INVOLVEMENT	57
CHAPTER NINE: OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DISCUSSIONS	59
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	65
REFERENCES	67
APPENDIX A	72
(1) EUROPEAN COMMISSION AGAINST RACISM AND INTOLERANCE (ECRI)	72
(2) FRAMEWORK CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES (FCNM)	73
(3) EUROPEAN CHARTER FOR REGIONAL AND MINORITY LANGUAGES (ECRML)	73

Chapter One: Introduction

Background and Motivation:

The Roma people are considered an ethnic group, whose origins most likely trace back to the Indian Sub continent, but the exact location is unclear and widely debated, as they have historically traveled from one community to the next, picking up different cultural and linguistic traits (Acton & Marsh 2007). Although the term Roma seems to carry with it the notion of landless groups of travelers, the extent to which this holds true today is quite varied. For example, the majority of Roma in Central and Eastern Europe settled during the Austro-Hungarian (1867-1918) and Ottoman Empires (circa 1299-1915) and others, later, during post-World War Two socialism. In Western European countries, such as Spain, the Roma migrated through Northern Africa, as early as the 15th century (Ibid). Therefore, since the process of migration has been so varied and largely unrecorded, it is highly disputed holding with it many mainstream negative connotations, perhaps paying head to part of the reason the Roma has been such a historically isolated and targeted group. Regardless, throughout history, the Roma people have suffered repeated acts of persecution. For example, they were enslaved for more than five centuries, during the Byzantine Empire up until the Ottoman conquest, and this continued in areas of present day Romania until abolished in the 1840's (Achim 2004; Liégeois 2005). In addition, groups of Roma who came to Western Europe during the time of the Ottoman conquest, were mistaken for being Turkish spies and were subjected to ethnic cleansing and mass genocides (Achim 2004). In addition, in Spain, during the 17th Century, Sancho de Monaca, described the Roma as more useless than the moors and therefore they needed to be destroyed, so in 1749, the Spanish monarchy "rounded up" all able-bodied Roma and forced them into labor camps. Again during World War Two, known as the "forgotten holocaust" up to 500,000 Roma were executed, along with the Jews and other persecuted groups, in the Nazi concentration camps (BBC 2009). Even in more recent times, in communist Central/Eastern Europe, the Roma experienced severe cultural oppression and, in some cases, even forced sterilization (Achim 2004). Furthermore, I feel this repeated oppression and discrimination is particularly salient because even though the Roma tend to live in smaller communities, dispersed

throughout the European continent, they actually collectively make up the largest and oldest minority within Europe, an estimated 10-12 million (European Parliament 2011).

Currently these historic acts of racism and intolerance persist in the form of negative societal stereotypes, affecting the way the Roma are treated in public and/or social institutions, such as schools, which can in turn affect their ability to enter other institutions, such as the job market or property ownership (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Therefore, as Roma societal exclusion still exists, coupled with the fact that the Roma are the largest and oldest minority in Europe, it seems an obvious indicator that it needs to be addressed. Hence, I have chosen to focus on an education ideology apt for dealing with multicultural societies because I assume that education is not only a way to transform societal perceptions about groups of people, but also a way to actually breed physical progress and change (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Ergo, I argue that it has the potential to be a space for facilitating tolerance, open-mindedness, and communication between diverse people, as “education is one key factor for promoting intercultural relations and increasing a good understanding among all ethno-cultural groups” (COE 2011a, p. 70), as well as teaching actual professional skills, useful for successfully entering other sectors of the society (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Furthermore, the importance of education in developing the foundations for life-long learning, is noted by renowned bodies such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Council of Europe (COE) (COE 2011a; UNESCO 2006).

I chose to use Romania and Spain as case studies for this research, because not only do they have the largest Roma populations in the European Union (EU) and therefore the situation is particularly salient, but also they have the potential to provide a larger picture of the situation of Roma in Europe as a whole (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005), as Romania is an Eastern European country and a newer member of the EU, and Spain is a Western European country and an older member of the EU. Also, there is a strong correlation of Roma migration from Romania to Spain, so many of the Roma sub-groups are the same in both countries, perhaps making a comparative analysis regarding Roma culture, policy, and situation, slightly more addressable and measurable (Macías Leon 2007).

Roma Terminology:

Due to the complexities of the Roma situation as well as the distinct migration patterns and historical oppressions experienced throughout Europe, it's difficult to come to a common consensus of a term for the Roma, as there are many names tossed around in the public, private, and academic sphere. Jean-Pierre Liégeois's book, *Gypsies An Illustrated History*, displays that this need to identify the Roma using a common terminology is a non-Roma construction, as the Roma themselves have no term to define who they are (Liégeois 2005). The book includes various interviews with members of Roma communities across Europe, and has presented many different commonly used terms such as, "Gitan", "Sinti", "Traveller", "Bohemian", "Gypsy", etc. used synonymously, without the conception of one being better or more correct (Ibid). In fact, when Liégeois asked members of the Roma community what it meant to be a Roma, the answer culminated to a feeling or a way of living, and that there is no need to be "any more specific about it" (Liégeois 2005, p. 85). Regardless, even though there are many different conceptions and definitions of what being Roma is, and many terms to define this (Liégeois 2005), I chose to use the term "Roma" throughout this paper, solely due to the fact that the Council of Europe reports largely use that terminology, and they account for most of the empirical data gathered.

Purpose and Structure of the Thesis:

The historical, repeated offences of oppression, isolation, racism, and discrimination have made the Roma a target group in Europe and a concerned issue for human rights organizations as well as governments and policy reforms (COE 2012a; COE 2011abc; COE 2010ab; COE 2006b; COE 2003). Furthermore, Roma discrimination and racism has become an increasingly more important public topic, especially since 2010, when France deported thousands of Roma "back to" to Eastern Europe (Judah 2011), and recent plenary sessions held in the European Parliament, have also centered around the inclusion and integration of the Roma in Europe (European Parliament 2011). Due to this public popularity, protecting the Roma and promoting social inclusion and integration makes up many of the recommendations and projects within the

Council of Europe, which was founded in 1949 to monitor the human rights situation in its, currently 47 member countries, and to develop common democratic and human rights principles in Europe (COE 2012a). Therefore, using the Council of Europe's reports, this thesis compares and contrasts Romania and Spain's different education policies, procedures, and developments/reforms in the past decade or so, in regards to the Roma people. Then, through a social constructivist perspective, I attempt to examine the ways in which multicultural education can be beneficial for dealing with divided and diverse societies, as well as contribute to the positive societal integration of isolated groups, such as the Roma. In order to address the above, I briefly discuss Roma culture and identity formation, as well as intercultural communication and language as integral parts of understanding multicultural education, and how these can aid in the process of my conception of positive societal integration. Lastly, I present the barriers for divided societies to integrate diverse groups and the challenges for effectively evaluating the situation of the Roma and education as a whole, and conclude with my assumption that an emphasis on systemic educational developments can be vital in shaping the foundation for respectfully and beneficially including isolated groups, like the Roma.

Thus, in order to direct the focus of this thesis, my research questions are as followed:

- 1.) *What are the differences in the education system in Spain and Romania, as well as what are the noticeable education policy transitions or shifts in the past decade?*
- 2.) *What is multiculturalism and multicultural education? How can this be applied and/or beneficial to diverse and/or divided societies, and how has Romania and Spain used or incorporated these bodies of thought in their respective education program(s) directed towards the Roma?*
- 3.) *How and in which ways can multicultural education be applied, beneficial, or useful to societal integration? What are the challenges and/or problems of different conceptions of integration in divided societies and what type(s) is/are perhaps more useful in aiding positive societal integration in Romania and Spain?*

The first question is briefly introduced in the *Country Profiles* section and further developed in *The Roma and Education* and the *Challenges to Evaluating the Situation of the Roma and Education* sections. Whereas, the complexity of the second question is introduced in the *Roma*

Culture section, it is more theoretically examined in the *Multicultural Education* section, leading directly to the *Education and Societal Integration* section, which overlaps with the aims of the third question, and finishes in the *Overall Conclusions and Future Discussions* section.

Chapter Two: Theoretical Framework

Although the classical definition of a theory, which is very positivist in its nature, states that it is “a causal argument of universal, transhistorical validity and nomothetic quality, which can be tested through the falsification of a series of hypothesis” (King, Keohane, and Verba cited in Wiener & Diez 2009, p. 3), in this paper I am not testing the outcome of some scientific experiment. Instead, I am observing the possible outcomes and causations of people in societies, therefore it is useful to think of my choice of theory as more an “abstract reflection”, serving different purposes than the traditional definition (Ibid). Thus, I approach the empirical data presented in the Council of Europe's reports through a social constructivist lens, as the major focus will be the interaction of groups, Roma and non-Roma, and the development of education programs, which foster intercultural dialogue and interaction, all of which are derived from social relations.

Working definitions of social constructivism state that the world is social rather than material, and actors' interests and identities are constructed rather than given and normalized (Kratochvil & Tulmets 2010; Risse 2009; Rosamond 2009). Therefore, how groups identify themselves, under which terms and practices, as well as their represented needs in a given society, are “a consequence of relations” and these relations, understandings, and interactions with and within environments are not fixed. Instead “they are a result...[of] both their relations to their environment as well as their roles in their environment”, which are forever changing and developing (Rosamond 2000, p. 198). Although constructivists may differ in the fact that some are both constructivist in their epistemology (knowledge and truth) and their ontology (existence and being), others are more rational in their epistemology, saying that truth is reducible to facts and the environment has the ability to affect actors without actors mutually having the power to affect it (Kratochvil & Tulmets 2010, p. 20). I, and others, criticize this in that choosing to use a

constructivist lens makes it difficult to conceive truth as entirely separate from the social relations which create it, and thus I approach my analysis from this dual perspective, viewing not only ontology as a construction, but also conceptions of knowledge and truth (epistemology) as constructions (Kratochvil & Tulmets 2010).

Methodology:

This thesis is conducted in a Comparative Methods structure. Comparative research tends to examine differences and similarities in given cases, as well as attempts to explain and make sense of the diversity of these cases, where one must “unravel the different casual conditions”, which may be connected to the found differences and similarities (Ragin & Amoroso 2011, p. 139). This methodology is important because, according to Ragin and Amoroso, when comparing phenomena or issues researchers tend to look just for the similarities or come to general conclusions about why, without taking into consideration the complexity and diversity of the entire situation, and that is extremely important when looking at education policies for the Roma. Although comparative researchers tend to focus on causation, in order to find patterns and “combinations of characteristics” in each case, they also accept that the way these patterns are viewed are a result of the analytical lens (Ibid, p. 142-3). Therefore in the case of my research it is important to note that my conclusions on the situation of the Roma in Romania and Spain, as well as education measures that I declare as more apt to deal with multiculturalism and make positive change in the respective societies, are a combined result of my theoretical lens, social constructivism, as well as my personal perspective bias. Regardless, using such methods stimulates “rich dialogue between ideas and evidence” and allows “for the possibility that there may be several combinations of conditions that generate the same general outcome” (Ibid, p. 149). Since I assume my topic will have many differing perspectives and a variety of influences, using a methodology, which takes this complexity into account seems only appropriate.

The data gathering process, in this thesis, is carried out using text analysis as the main method, allowing me to make sense of information about humans and social relations (McKee 2003). It is an important method for seeking to understand different cultures' existences in various

situations, in this case Roma in Romania and Spain, whom are different from each other and different from my own cultural identifications (Ibid). Therefore, as text analysis takes into consideration that there are multiple ways to interpret reality, allowing one to see the “limitations and advantages of [his/her] sense-making practices” (Mckee 2003, p. 1), it allows me, the researcher to make meaning despite these diverse interpretations.

Limitation of Scope:

In order to address my aforementioned research questions, I will draw upon the Council of Europe's expert bodies: the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI); the Advisory Committee (ACFC) under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM); and the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages (ECRML), as well as related informative sources. Although I may rely on some, other academic and inter-governmental sources, I will mostly gather my data from the Council of Europe's expert bodies' reports, and supplementary sources will only be used to support that information. The analysis includes statistical, content-related, and linguistic data, in which I not only look at provided percentiles and program developments available in the reports, but I also offer a theoretical discussion of the connection of this information to the relations between education, multiculturalism, and integration.

As stated above, most of the empirical data gathered will be from the Council of Europe's expert bodies: ECRI, the ACFC under the FCNM, and ECRML, which all have slightly different human rights criteria, as well as country monitoring and reporting methods. The differences in reporting styles and process have profound effects on the type and perspective of information provided, because where ECRI uses a bottom-up approach, gathering most of its information from on-the-ground studies and interest group reports, it has no legally binding power over recommended changes. Differently, the ACFC gathers its information from state reports and is a ratified convention, so it can legally hold states accountable. The ECRML is also a legally binding charter and gathers its information from state reports, although it seems to incorporate more dialogue with NGOs, interest groups, and other non-state actors (COE 2012a; COE 2012b; COE

2012c; COE 2012d). Therefore when using, analyzing, and conceptualizing the data provided, it is important as a researcher and reader to be aware of these distinctive methodological approaches and the perspectives and interests attached to them. Regardless each body is responsible for observing the human rights situations in their voluntary member states, making recommendations for improvements or changes and engaging in dialogue with both state and non-state actors to gather diverse information around the major issues. Although an introduction and a discussion on the quality, mandate, and monitoring process of each included expert body, is useful to fully understand the data gathered, the scope of this thesis does not provide adequate space, so specific information, as well as their webpages, can be found in Appendix A.

Lastly, this thesis refers to education as everything from pre-school (before one enters the mainstream academic classes) to higher education (post-secondary), although the focus will be mostly on primary and secondary education, as these are noted for being the most influential in human development (UNESCO 2006), and hence I assume that they are also the most pertinent years for instilling the values of multiculturalism. Thus, the evaluation of education in Romania and Spain will be broken down into the following sub-categories: (1) *School Integration*, the ability of the Roma to attend evenly distributed schools, with representatives from both the Roma and Romanian/Spanish populations, and schools which have adequate and equal resources; (2) *Education Content*, a curriculum with a focus on a multi-representational way to perceive the Roma; (3) *Language*, the inclusion of both linguistic support, access to education in mother tongue, and effective development towards intercultural communication, not only within the classroom but also within the society; and (4) *Cultural Awareness* within both the school environment, in regards to teacher-staff training/cultural workshops and the presentation of different historical perspectives in schools, and the society, in regards to larger initiatives to raise societal awareness. These are important aspects to include, because a curriculum, which promotes an understanding and a celebration of difference coupled with an already diverse classroom, can help facilitate a non-discriminatory and open-minded environment. This exposure at a young age is also likely to affect the way children interact with others in the future. In addition, the way teachers teach, perceive, and interact with students, affects a student's success (Orenstein, Ringold, & Wilkens 2005). Lastly, other means of cultural awareness raising in schools further encourages a multiculturalist way of dealing with societal difference, and

therefore can ultimately affect positive Roma integration into the school system, and in turn the society (Orenstein, Ringold, & Wilkens 2005; UNESCO 2006; UNESCO 2005).

Copenhagen Criteria:

Furthermore, as both countries are part of the European Union (EU), Romania in 2007 and Spain in 1986, they must adhere to the principals of the Copenhagen Criteria, which were created during the EU's eastern bloc expansion, after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 (European Council 1993). The Criteria emphasizes human rights developments as requirements for succession: "Membership requires that the candidate country has achieved stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities..." (European Council 1993, §3). It is also important to note that the EU candidacy of Romania focused major attention on policies surrounding the Roma in the adoption of the necessary Copenhagen Criteria (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Regardless, based on the above criteria, both Romania and Spain have built institutions and legislative measures to address Roma issues, as part of completing these principals. Due to the fact that EU law upholds these countries to the above, I see it essential that the situation of the Roma in both Romania and Spain, and their ability to take part in an education system adhering to multicultural principals, respecting and protecting diverse cultural rights (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005), is evaluated and/or monitored by some sort of body, such as the Council of Europe, as well as addressed in discussions in the European Community.

Chapter Three: Country Profiles

This section will briefly discuss the overall situational differences between Romania and Spain, to gain a general understanding of the geo-political and social make up of both countries. The larger discussion of the situation of the Roma and the dissection of education, will be broken down in more detail in later sections.

(1) Romania:

(1a) General Information:

According to the World Bank, Romania has the largest Roma population in the EU, between one to two million, of an approximately 22 million Romanians in total (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005), and is also one of the poorer EU countries with a Gross Domestic Product (GPD) of an approximated 127 Billion € (World Bank 2012). But, the ACFC acknowledges that acquiring the exact number of Roma in Romania is difficult and contested (COE 2011a). Furthermore, the distribution statistics of Roma in the different Romanian counties are also quite difficult to attain, but the World Bank assumes that the majority live in the poorer agricultural areas (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005).

(1b) Situation of the Roma:

Although the historical situation of Roma in Romania is particularly depressing, including slavery for many years and in some cases genocide, during the socialist period Roma were able to access public services and maintain jobs, although through rather rigid assimilationist policies (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). After the end of socialism, the Roma experienced a rather steep decline of standard of living and now have poverty rates four to ten times higher than that of non-Roma Romanians. Nearly 70% of the Roma population lives on less than \$4.30 a day and are the most at-risk group for poverty, coupled with the lack of access to equal social services (Ibid). There are also cases of outward hostility or verbal violence toward the Roma, representing the fact that the larger society tends to view them negatively (COE 2011a). Although the Roma continue to face difficulties and discrimination, some measures have been taken by Romania, and the benefits of these programs are beginning to become visible in society, but on the whole they are limited (COE 2005).

(1c) Education in Romania:

The academic level of the Romanian Roma population 16 and over, shows that about 37% of Roma have no studies, about 27% have primary studies, and about 36% have secondary studies, but unfortunately there is a noticeable steep decline in Roma students continuing from primary to secondary education, shown by an approximate 67% of Roma entering primary education versus an approximate 37% continuing to secondary education (Fundación Secretariado Gitano 2009). Furthermore, major problems with Roma and education are associated with the fact that around 50% of Roma are illiterate, and this number is slightly higher for women, coupled with the above very high drop-out rates, increasing with age, likely correlated with the ability to work (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Also, school distribution is a problem and many Roma end up in poorer schools with fewer resources, or in handicapped schools (Ibid; COE 2011a). In addition, the promotion of diversity and intercultural dialogue in the classroom and initiatives to improve the way Roma are reflected in the public and in the mass media, are reoccurring recommendations, as well as full education in the Romani language coupled with language courses for the learning of the Romani language (COE 2011a). Although the expert bodies have noted an obvious push to ensure equal access to education, promote societal awareness of the Roma, as well as implement linguist rights of mother tongue instruction, these efforts are criticized for tending to take place under a low governmental budget and many efforts are completely dependent on less reliable and less stable funding from private donors (COE 2005).

(2) Spain:

(2a) General Information:

Spain has an estimated population of 46,157,822, by data published by the Spanish National Statistics Institute (INE) and a GDP of 111 Trillion € (World Bank 2012). The Spanish Roma

population is estimated at between 650,000-700,000 (ACFC 2010a; Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005), but the opinion report, issued by non-state bodies, stated that the Roma population could in fact be anywhere from 800,000-1 million (ACFC 2008). Nevertheless, the Autonomous Communities with the highest Roma populations are: Andalucía, with a population estimated at 270,000; followed Catalonia with 80,000; Madrid with 60,000; and Valencia estimated with 52,000 Roma (COE 2011c).

(2b) Situation of the Roma:

Spain's reactions to and relations with the Roma have been very diverse throughout the centuries, from outward acceptance in the 15th century to periods of expulsion, forced assimilation, and more recently, to legal incorporation although not removed from public suspicion and distance (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). During socialism in Romania, assimilation was systematic and rigid, but it did, in some ways, succeed to diminish ethnic divisions, whereas the policies in Spain were more diverse and open-ended, and ethnic differences have always been publically highlighted (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Regardless, similar to Romania, the majority of Roma in Spain live in poverty. Andalucía, the Autonomous Community with the largest Roma population, also ranks among the bottom of "the evolution of wealth and development" list (2011c). Also, similar to Romania, the Spanish public tends to view the Roma rather negatively (COE 2008a), and although Spain has been a part of the EU longer and therefore has had more experience incorporating and accessing EU institutions for Roma related anti-discrimination projects, they have not always been successful or categorized as positive (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005).

(2c) Education in Spain:

The academic level of the Spanish Roma population 16 and over, shows that about 67% of Roma have no studies, about 27% have primary studies, but only about 6% have secondary studies, therefore there is also a noticeable, very steep decline in Roma students continuing from primary

to secondary education, shown by the 94% of Spanish Roma entering primary education versus the 6% continuing to secondary education (Fundación Secretariado Gitano 2009). Like Romania, problematic education themes include illiteracy and school absenteeism shown by the fact that 54% of Roma children have irregular patterns of school attendance, which is part of a more general phenomenon of early school drop-out, affecting around 30% of all pupils (COE 2011c; COE 2008a). Furthermore, like Romania, Spain also faces school distribution problems, where ECRI has received consistent reports of “ghetto” schools filled with mostly immigrant and/or Roma children in certain parts of the country, and discriminatory practices in the admissions procedure, enabling publicly-funded private schools to pick and choose pupils (COE 2011b). Therefore ECRI recommends that “the authorities...review the admissions procedures to ensure that there is an even distribution of Spanish, immigrant and Roma pupils” (COE 2011b, p. 8). Spanish language support and Romani language education are also regular report recommendations (COE 2011c) as well as recommendations that all education levels (pre-school through higher education) be accessible in minority and regional languages, such as Romani, and that it should be the responsibility of the state to enforce this (COE 2008c). Lastly, in order to address the public opinion of the Roma and their notorious lack of success in the education system, there are recommendations to include Roma history, culture, traditions, language, and the contribution of the Roma people to the history of Spain, in the compulsory curriculum in order to increase intercultural understanding and tolerance and “to help Roma...feel valued in the education environment” (COE 2011b, §70). Although the Council of Europe reports have noted that the Roma are considerably better off than they were ten years ago, the recent increase in foreign pupils, unstable funding, and the decentralized implementation of programs and projects pose great challenges to the growth of Roma initiatives (COE 2011b; COE 2011c).

Overall Conclusion of Comparisons:

As obvious from the country profiles, Roma in both Romania and Spain face similar challenges in the education system, although external reasons or influences may vary due to historical, political, and social differences. Regardless, the Roma populations' education level is currently lower than any other social group of similar size (ECRML 2011c) and generally the Roma

population in Europe is very young, where about 27% of the Roma population is between the ages of 15 to 29 compared to about 19% in the rest of Europe, and about 36% of Roma are under 15, compared to about 16% in Europe (Fundación Secretariado Gitano 2009). This shows that a large majority of Roma in both Romania and Spain are affected, more severely than non-Roma, by education reforms and developments because the majority of them are within common education age ranges. Therefore the issues faced by the Roma, and the challenges within the education system should be readily addressed, as they hold much influence on the amount of Roma entering, and succeeded, in the education system. I argue that these issues also have profound effects on the amount of Roma in Romania and Spain integrating into the larger society as a whole.

Furthermore, when dissecting the differences between the two countries' approaches, methods, and acknowledged outcomes, it is also important to take into consideration possible motivations behind them, such as Romanian's more recent EU succession, and the fact that this process required large focus on, and attention to, the Roma situation (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Also, there may be reporting discrepancies in terms of how much information is available for each certain issue and development in both countries, due to the opinions and interests of both countries' governments and interest groups, published in the reports. In addition, there may be possible differences in countries' developments, based on governmental involvement, oversight, funding, and implementation methods.

Chapter Four: Roma Culture

Firstly, I want to acknowledge the fact that my understanding of Roma culture recognizes the fact that: “[w]e can have no direct knowledge of cultures other than our own. Our experience with and knowledge of other cultures is limited by the perceptual bias of our own culture.” (Jandt 2007, p. 7). In order to begin the dissection of Roma culture, which is deeply complex, I must break down conceptions of identity and culture from within the Roma communities as well as in the Romanian and Spanish societies. In this particular case, I think the effect of the outside

society on identity development within Roma communities is quite salient, but the reasons why and how these certain outside societal conceptions have been formed are not to be forgotten.

The Complexity of Culture and Identity

The meaning of culture is diverse and disputed, and it is often difficult to distinguish between terms such as culture, race, and ethnicity, as Brian Belton argues they have become socially constructed as interchangeable, throughout time and usage (Belton 2005). Largely understood culture is a historically created collective idea of meaning and significance, expressed through common norms, values, beliefs, symbols, and/or practices (Griswold 2008; Jandt 2007; Kymlicka 2008). Many times culture can represent “an exclusivity set in a common past that includes some and excludes others”, some sort of connecting factor that links and groups generations (Belton 2005, p. 49). Therefore, while culture tends to be subjected to more biological and lineage factors, identity is “created and maintained not only by tradition and hereditary, but also by social and ideological factors” (Belton 2005, p. 3). Widely defined, identity can be seen as the set of these common cultural values, goals, standards and rules (Risse 2009) and the structure used to define them (Kymlicka 2008).

Although essentialist views of identity state that identity resides within the nation-state, the study of multiculturalism and the Roma show that cultural identity cannot be “synonymous with countries” and does “not respect political boundaries...” (Jandt 2007, p. 6) as Roma have no physical kin state, yet a strongly defined collective identity (Belton 2005). Furthermore, the complexities and diversities within the Roma populations themselves further complicate this understanding. According to the ACFC, Romania has nearly thirty subgroups Roma (COE 2011a) and little is known about the complex hierarchy among Roma groups (Orenstein, Ringold, & Wilkens 2005). Furthermore, there are different combinations of Roma subgroups with distinctive languages (although they understand each other for the most part), religions, occupations, and levels of settlement (more or less nomadic) (Orenstein, Ringold, & Wilkens 2005). Many mainstream perspectives of the Roma identify them as nomads, and based on Belton's interviews with Roma, Roma themselves often identify with this nomadic or

“Traveller” lifestyle as well. But it is hard to know if this lifestyle choice is purely connected to the culture and identity of being Roma, or a product of their historical relations with their “host” countries and peoples, as it is quite obvious that Roma all over Europe face, and have faced, the same intolerant attitudes and difficulties to receive social services, find stable jobs, and live in permanent homes (Belton 2005).

Belton also describes cultural identity as the “dialectic between similarity and difference” (Belton 2005, p. 53). Based on detailed on the ground research, he concludes that the Roma identity is largely connected to a preserved bloodline and that they have maintained themselves as a “distinctive cultural group” (2005, p. 140). But, their identity is not exclusively classified by a “separate or complete cultural group”, and Belton is rather critical of the fact that the Roma identity can be only categorized as that of “ethnic homogeneity” due to the heterogeneity of the groups: “Travellers [Roma] should be understood as being a heterogeneous population, developing out of and reflecting the social and economic situation in which it exists [although] this proposal does not disqualify the hereditary or biological links” (Belton 2005, p. 145). What remains obvious is the fact that Roma can be collectivized in that they face similar social issues leading to intolerant stereotypes: “What unites this group is a common feeling of oppression and injustice.” (Ibid, p. 14-19). This is precisely why I think the in-group, out-group theory of social relations, further discussed below, which acknowledges a natural favoritism towards one group or another (Tajfel & Turner 1979), coupled with an acknowledgement of the above, relating to multiple social identities, where one can feel part of many identities without declaring one as dominant (Risse 2009), is so salient for attempting to understand the complexity of the of Roma.

Constructions of the In-group, Out-group:

The in-group, out-group dichotomy, I claim, is a powerful part of Roma identification, not only because it allows Roma to conceptualize what they are in relation to each other, but it also draws attention to the very strong influence of their idea of what they are not. The in-group and out-group thought has its roots in Social Identity Theory, coined by Henri Tajfel and John Turner, which states that people tend to identify positively with those within their social group (in-group)

and negatively with those who are not (out-group) (1979). These comparisons have the potential to fuel negative perceptions from the outside society as well as ignite pessimistic Roma views about non-Roma, both of which result in further Roma isolation.

The Roma themselves have no actual term to define them, in their languages, because, according to the Roma, there is no such internally defined group as: "Roma", "Gypsies", "Travellers", etc. Instead they define themselves by the "views and attitudes of others, and it is their relations with others that set the limits of the whole" (Liégeois 2005, p. 57). Although there are also many different Roma tribes, and differences within them, Piasere, a Roma, tends to see their solidarity as defined by "Manus" meaning that it is the family ties that are most important (Piasere cited in Liégeois 2005). Here the word family does not necessarily mean the nuclear family, in fact according to Karl Kaser, the traditional society in South East Europe, where many of the Roma from this analysis "originate", did not just include people related through marriage and child rearing, but instead had no distinct division where the idea of "family" ended and "kinship" began (Kaser 2008). Therefore this Roma excerpt describing family ties most likely means something beyond the conception of the nuclear family, and more along the lines of the idea of the preserved bloodline (Belton 2005), creating this in-group of those whom the Roma community loves/connects with, and this out-group of those whom the Roma community does not (Piasere cited in Liégeois 2005). Regardless the Roma can be seen as having some sort of identifiable in-group, based on both their geographical locations, characteristically living in isolated camps, as well as their relations, developed and defined through their conceptions of the family "manus" coupled with their opposition to the larger society: the out-group.

Another aspect that the in-group, out-group comparison theory addresses is the fact that inter-group conflict can be institutionalized, where the conception, attitudes, and actions towards unfavorable out-groups are normalized by institutional imposition (Tajfel & Turner 1979). Institutions not only play a large role in developing the rules and norms in the societal conception of values, but also in the creation of the rules and norms in societal policies (Hix 2005). I think this is pertinent, when looking at the Roma situation in both Romania and Spain, because the larger public generally tends to perceive them negatively and these perceptions are practiced institutionally, by prohibiting access to vital societal resources. Since the 14th and 15th

centuries, when the Roma entered various European societies, they have been popularly seen as “intruders, nomads lacking hearth or home amidst local communities rooted in fixed and familiar soil [arousing] mistrust, fear, and rejection” (Liégeois 2005, p. 34). These conceptions then tend to justify certain societal injustices, such as ignoring their barriers to access to social services.

Furthermore, although being part of a group offers protection, support, and acceptance if members uphold the values and norms of that group, these upheld norms are often coupled with understanding of what the group does not believe or practice, so it can also lead to intergroup conflict (Jandt 2007). Therefore, Belton acknowledges that there may be many socio-political benefits to forging Roma solidarity and cohesion (Belton 2005), because although the interviews by Belton and Liégeois show that Roma have a strong sense of a pure bloodline and family ties, the groups are notably dispersed, isolated, and have little or no contact with each other (Beissinger cited in Orenstein, Ringold, & Wilkens 2005). Perhaps some social capital among Roma, connecting the diverse groups, would allow for them to be more recognized in the public sphere, as well as allow for reform change to be more beneficial and broad reaching (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). But of course how and in which ways a heterogeneous culture is “standardized” or fused opens the door to many dangerous and problematic answers. Therefore, I think institutionalized, multicultural education could be beneficial in encouraging some sort of politically recognized group solidarity or common ground without discounting cultural differences, and also work to restructure and redevelop the negative stereotypes and associated actions, since the education system can be understood as one of the most important public or common spaces where this socialization and knowledge building has the ability to take place (Jean cited in Asencor 2007).

Chapter Five: The Roma and Education

Cultural identity, awareness, and co-mingling are social processes, just as the social relations in the education environment are, which can be interpreted as “an inner journey [continuously] maturing...the personality” (Jacques Delors cited in Asencor 2007), where “the central task of education is to implant a will and facility for learning; it should produce not learned but learning

people” (Eric Hoffer cited in Asencor 2007). In order to connect the developments, facilitating the above educational goals, to the major barriers facing Roma inclusion in education, in Romania and Spain, this section consists of the dissection of education through: (1) *School Integration*, (2) *Education Content*, (3) *Language*, and (4) *Cultural Awareness*. I have found these four education foci to be important, not only because they were repeated themes throughout the Council of Europe's expert bodies' reports, allowing education to be comparable for both Romania and Spain, but also the importance of these four foci is promoted by other known organizations, such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the World Bank (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005; UNESCO 2005).

(1) *School Integration*:

School Integration, in this section, consists of efforts made by Romania and Spain to ensure that Roma have equal opportunity to successfully attend the same schools as Romanian and Spanish students, shown through efforts to reduce the dropout rate and absenteeism. This is very important because UNESCO explicitly states in the Right to Education that “education must be inclusive and accessible to all...No provider of public education may discriminate on the grounds of gender, ethnicity, language, religion, opinion, disability, or social economic status” (UNESCO 2005, §7) and that “higher enrollment rates...bear evidence of quality and sustained commitment from governments...to ensure children's learning” (UNESCO 2005, §5).

In Romania, the Ministry of Education is the body largely responsible for making sure that Roma school segregation does not occur. It has implemented MECT Order no. July 1540/19, which bans school segregation and works to eliminate the barriers posed to integrating the school system (COE 2010b; COE 2011a). To further combat this, in 2007, Romania asked County School Inspectors (CSI), 35% of whom were of Roma decent, to identify actual cases of segregation in schools along with specific proposed desegregation plans. This has led to public publications including these segregation findings and desegregation plans (COE 2011a).

The Romanian Ministry is also responsible for ensuring that Roma children, if given the opportunity, actually attend desegregated schools, as absenteeism and high drop out rates are other major problems in regards to the Roma and education (COE 2011a). In order to combat this, the Ministry has worked to train and hire Roma in the school system, many as human resource counselors who are able to, not only provide the academic and emotional support needed to integrate and successfully complete school, but also to be positive Roma role models for Roma youth (Ibid). Since 2005, there have been between 420-510 school mediators for the Roma, trained and hired annually, 80% of which are of Roma decent. Furthermore, between 460-530 teachers for subjects such as Roma history, language, and culture have been trained and employed annually, 95% of which have been of Roma decent, as well as new specializations in universities for students studying to be educators, have resulted in 160 schoolmaster graduates (80% of them Roma) and 210 specialized personnel graduates (60% of them Roma), all providing more positive Roma role models in the education environment (Ibid). Also, the project "School a chance for everyone", with a value of around 2.5 million Euros, works to prevent early school leaving by providing second chances and academic support to struggling Roma students, and it is implemented in partnership with other NGOs (COE 2011a), showing attention and support to concerned Roma issues by bridging together the governmental system and the broader community. Since these developments, the school attendance of Roma in Romania has doubled between 1990-2009 (Ibid).

Similarly, in Spain, Roma tend to live in consolidated, and many times, isolated communities; therefore it is common that large groups of students attend the closest schools, creating a natural Roma overconcentration in certain schools and not in others (COE 2011c). These schools are often poorer with fewer resources and therefore are less equipped for supporting Roma students. Different from classroom demographic, class size can also vary from classroom, as well as school, which can have profound effects on the ability to effectively deliver special educational needs for Roma students. Regardless, the above have "consequences on the quality of education received as well as the integration possibilities of the children concerned" (COE 2011c, §64), so Roma school integration should be of top priority, considering the profound effects it has on students' educational success.

In order to address this, the Spanish Law on Education states explicitly that “[t]here will be an adequate, balanced distribution between the different schools of students who need specific educational support”. According to this law, the education administrations will also be responsible for regulating student admission to public and publicly-funded private schools, with the aim that all students, regardless of background or ethnicity will have “equal conditions of access” to quality education (COE 2011c, §62). On the other hand, in order to combat the phenomenon of students leaving or dropping out of school early, the Spanish Ministry of Education has 126 measures against early school leaving, in partnership with the Autonomous Communities, or Spanish counties. One program involves an agreement with employers that the Ministry will be responsible for financing four hours of the eight hour work day, when they hire a school drop-out aged 16, to be spent completing school studies and receiving the school-leaving certificate (COE 2011b, §66). Although this specific program involves a partnership with the Autonomous Communities, many statewide laws in Spain don’t, and the implementation of the law is entirely up to the Autonomous Communities. Therefore various Roma NGOs and other interest groups have stated that laws for Roma inclusion “should be monitored carefully to ensure that Roma children benefit from the increase in resources and attention to equality envisaged by the law” (COE 2008a, §129). Regardless, studies do suggest that school enrollment in Spain has improved in the past few years (COE 2011c).

Both Romania and Spain show signs of improvement, through noted, increased enrollment (COE 2001c; COE 2011a). But although Spain seems to have more comprehensive legislative measures addressing distribution and integration, Romania seems to be taking a direct inclusive approach, by hiring Roma in authority positions in schools. Thus, I think that both countries have more development to do, as both, a legal framework combined with actual Roma involved in causes for Roma, are necessary to tackle the social issues addressed by the expert bodies.

(1a) Academic Support:

In addition to the above initiatives, which work to both integrate and keep Roma in mainstream schools, ECRI urges that both Romania and Spain offer academic support incentives for Roma.

Therefore Roma children with limited resources can not only have the ability to attend school but also have the financial support, transportation, materials, and free healthy food necessary in order to do well in school (COE 2011b, §67). Similarly UNESCO's Right to Education agrees that these extra expenses for education are burdensome but that "with sufficient political will and allocation of funds, governments...can meet these costs" (UNESCO 2005, §1).

In Romania the Ministry of Education and Research, coupled with governmental support, provides a number of supports for Roma such as materials, language and culture books, transport, a free daily meal or snack, etc. (COE 2006b). Unfortunately the "Bread Roll and Milk" program, which also provides free meals at school, has trouble functioning because the participating pupils, who are mostly Roma, attend school just to eat and then don't go to classes (COE 2006b). But other socio-economic support incentives have been implemented (COE 2005), although less focused on the expert bodies' recommendations. In terms of monetary scholarships for school attendance, the Ministry of Education initiated between 117 to 220 grants annually between 2001-2005, covering the tuition fees of young Roma attending "Romanian for special purposes" at the University of Bucharest, in which they learn how to become teachers of the Romani language (COE 2010b). Also, the National Agency for the Roma funded 800 school scholarships for 12th and 13th graders and 2400 scholarships for high school students, in 2010, in addition to reserved seats for 2500-2600 Roma students to attend high school, as well as an available 555 seats for University (COE 2011a). So although incentives are provided with good intent, not all tend to be able to fully address Roma not attending school, and perhaps need to be accompanied by other measures.

Differently, although there have been explicit requests from Roma representatives, interest groups and organizations, as well as Council of Europe's expert bodies, for Spain to include extensive academic support incentives (COE 2011b; COE 2008a; Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005), the reports, do not show any developments of that matter (COE 2011b; COE 2008a). Furthermore, the ACFC reports showed that Spain's attention to Roma educational assistance included various cultural awareness initiatives, such as textbook content and teacher training, but nothing was mentioned about any type of financial support such as free food, transportation, school materials, etc. (COE 2010a). The only slightly relatable development is the

aforementioned 126 measures against early school leaving, but this only targets older students, so much of the Roma population is not considered or represented there. This is disconcerting considering there were such adamant requests for it from Roma representatives and associated organizations, because although quality educational content is important, it can only be of use to a diverse, integrated classroom. So if the Roma cannot afford to attend school in the first place, these measures have little meaning.

Overall, I think the major challenges in both countries with academic support incentives, are that they cannot be provided alone, and as much as they need to be considered a vital part of structural Roma inclusion in schools, they cannot be at the expense of other measures.

(2) Education Content:

Another important element in the evaluation of education is the actual content of the school curricula, in terms of how it represents the Roma and the actual compulsory subject(s) advocating for multicultural perspectives. Similarly, UNESCO recognizes that “a classroom is only a meaningful space if there are sufficient books of good quality...and a curriculum which addresses issues of relevance to the community” (UNESCO 2005, §6). Although this statement does not further describe “good quality” and “relevance to the community”, the Council of Europe’s report recommendations are rather explicit about what kinds of developments should be implemented, in Romania and Spain.

In Romania, the Ministry of Education is also responsible for overseeing the core school curricula, and since 1990 there have been efforts to include material aiming to prevent and combat Roma discrimination, such as the teaching of Roma history in schools and colleges as well as an increase in funds, specifically for related programs and involved educators (COE 2011a). Also, as of 2008, students can chose between two courses in public education highlighting diversity and the Roma in respectful ways: Intercultural Education, at the secondary level, and the History of National Minorities, at the high school level (COE 2011a). In addition, summer schools have been organized with similar anti-discrimination content, and have been noted for being well attended and for having constant funding, but no further detail was provided

(COE 2010b). Although there have been improvements and developments of the curricula and material, the ACFC and ECRI still disclose that more should be done (COE 2005; COE 2006b). The classes mentioned above should be compulsory for public/common classrooms and the textbooks, still in circulation, should be removed that contain stereotypes and prejudices about the Roma, for example depicting their arrival to Romania as “hordes of barbarian nomads who came from the East to spread terror” (COE 2006b, §81; COE 2005). In response, the Romanian authorities declare that proposed future developments do include implementations such as new, non-prejudice textbooks with Roma history and language, accompanied by CD's and other interactive learning forms with similar information, and those were later recognized in the ACFC and ECRML reports of 2011 and 2010 respectively (COE 2011a; COE 2010b). Since reports are issued in 4-5 year cycles, these developments, in direct response to the Council of Europe's expert bodies' recommendations, show not only that the suggestions were taken seriously, but also that proposed actions were carried out in a short amount of time.

Likewise, in Spain, the compulsory school curriculum has been noted to not address Roma history, culture, language, and/or their contribution to the history of Spain, which “does not help Roma children to feel valued in the education environment” (COE 2011b, §70). To combat this, the school curriculum now includes the compulsory subject “education for citizenship and human rights” for primary and secondary education (COE 2011b). Also between 2005-2009, the Institute for Roma Culture released a Roma culture exercise book, “rompien”, used in the third cycle of primary school and a CD called “MAJ KHETANE” (closer together), including information about Roma history, culture, humor through comics, language through conversation excerpts, and other activities, distributed through a collaboration of governmental, the Ministry of Education and the Education Commission, and non-governmental, the Roma Development Program, mandate (COE 2011c; COE 2011b). This collaboration is very positive, as it ensures statewide measures' abilities to be put into action, since non-governmental bodies have an easier time infiltrating locally and uniquely, in Spain, 55% of the school curriculum is designed solely by the Autonomous Communities, so although much funding comes from statewide measures, all of the implementation is done locally (COE 2008b).

In general, it is quite difficult to come to a concluded, comparative evaluation of anti-racist Roma inclusion in the education content due to the fact that the Council of Europe's expert bodies, as well as the Romanian and Spanish authorities, do not have a clear policy for how to approach this (COE 2011a; COE 2011b; COE 2011c; COE 2010a; COE 2010b). Although both countries have proposed actions, tolerantly including Roma history and culture in school curricula, it is tricky to accurately address such developments comparatively, since there is no official policy, rubric, or criteria for judging developments.

(3) Language:

Furthermore, language is included in the evaluation of education because in order to understand the full potential of cultural behavior and identity, we have to include an appreciation of language, words, speech and ways of expressing oneself (Parekh 2000). Language has been widely promoted as a means to include the Roma in the education system and the mainstream society, and the ECRML expert body focuses explicitly on it, understanding its value to and within culture. Therefore, not only is it important to include because of its ability to shape and maintain cultural identities, but also because it has real power dynamic roles ascribed to it, especially in the formation of collective group values, morals, and beliefs (Christiansen, Jorgensen & Wiener 1999). In fact, the spreading of a language can be considered an act of one culture's dominance and power over others, hence the reason why language development, reinforcement, and protection is part of human rights monitoring processes and included in this analysis. Although access to instruction in Romani mother tongue language is important, the expert bodies also recognize that this should not replace or overshadow language support for Roma pupils in Romanian and Spanish (COE 2012c; COE 2012d). So, as illiteracy is a major problem in the Roma populations in Romania and Spain, language support (both in Romani and host countries' languages) is vital for students' success in the classroom and school environment (COE 2011a; COE 2011c; COE 2010a). Therefore this section addresses the role language has in promoting and protecting cultural awareness, both in school and the community, and its essentiality for Roma success in the educational setting.

The Romani language is challenging to specify and consolidate because although it supposedly came to Europe as a uniform language, it has been divided into several different dialects, influenced by their host countries' languages (in this case Romanian and Spanish) and their largely unrecorded migration patterns (COE 2010b). Currently, it is estimated that there are between 13 and 30 different dialects and that 80% of the Roma in Europe speak one of them (Ibid), although they are, for the most part, understandable and communicable (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Whereas the majority of the Roma living in Romania tend to have a stronger connection to the "Vlach" Romani language, one of the major dialects, and many consistently speak it, the Roma in Spain have been noted to speak good Spanish and the Caló language, a hybrid dialect of Romani and Spanish, is less widely used (COE 2011c; COE 2008; Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005).

The teaching, speaking, and including of the Romani language in the Romanian school system, as well as in mass media, has been widely promoted since 1989 and taught in grades 1-12, in public schools, since 1992 (COE 2010b). Currently, the Romani language is studied in 41 of the 42 Romanian counties, having a total of 420-460 teachers of Roma decent. There have also been Romani language competitions organized with an annual participation of 74 students, as well as preparation summer camps, which have about 100-250 participants annually (Ibid). In addition, in 2004-2005 in Bucharest, the Romanian authorities offered free language courses and free language textbooks, but in general there is no further information available about the duration and amount of hours, the actual number of participants, or the exact locations of the above initiatives in Romania (COE 2006b). Furthermore, the ECRML has noted these educational language programs have been only spontaneously replicated, making their sustainability, reliability, and continuing existence questionable. On the other hand, in higher education, there have been extensive language developments. The University of Bucharest, has an Institute for the Romani language, which prepares teachers as well as language experts, which is beneficial since there have been complaints that minority languages are taught by unqualified staff, making it hard to motivate youth and have comprehensive, engaging programs (COE 2005), in addition University offers optional Romani courses for students of other faculties (COE 2006b). Although there are problematic challenges for the implementation and evaluation of language

initiatives, overall there seems to be a strong commitment by the Romanian authorities to address the importance of the protection and inclusion of the Romani language education.

Even though the Council of Europe notes that illiteracy is a pertinent issue for Roma in Romania, the reports tend to focus solely on developments around Romani language inclusion, and not Romanian language support, which may be hindering students success in the school system. Therefore, although the above developments do show much attention to the Romani language and Roma culture in the classroom, they need to be coupled with initiatives that also strengthen the Roma's Romanian language skills, as it is necessary for full participation and cooperation in the classroom (COE 2010b).

In Spain this situation largely differs. Caló, a Romani-Spanish hybrid, is recognized as the community's language, but isn't very widely spoken and/or used, more often only by Roma over 40 years. Instead, it is mostly shared in the private sphere with family and in celebrations and other social interactions with members of the Roma community (COE 2011c; COE 2008b). Regardless, the Spanish Organic Law on Education 2/2006, through the Ministry of Education, does protect and include the different Spanish languages, Romani included, within public education and reiterates that the state shall provide access to language-learning education as well as education in these languages (COE 2011c), adhering to the Spanish education aims of "linguistic and cultural plurality" (COE 2008b, §18). As the Spanish Autonomous Communities, have full implementation power for programs, stated earlier (COE 2011b; COE 2011c; COE 2010a) and although there can be associated problems, in terms of language programs, this can be very beneficial because Roma are concentrated mostly in Andalucía and Cataluña, so Romani language education can/should be more developed there. For example, in Cataluña, they implemented the 2005-2008 Integral Plan for the Roma People, working on Roma social cohesion and integration through the "recovery of the Romani language" and "awareness of the right to linguistic difference" as well as Romani language educator training. This led to the first standardized Romani course in 2008 called "Rromani Skòla", held in thirty-two, three-hour sessions and due to its success, it was offered again in 2009 (COE 2011c). Unfortunately, the Council of Europe's expert bodies have not recognized any similar programs in Andalucía, which has by far the largest Roma concentration and is probably the region that has the most

need due to its lower socio-economic standing (COE 2011b; COE 2011c). So although this regional autonomy can have benefits, like the Catalonian example, the fact that the Autonomous Communities vary largely in terms of wealth, certain regions, like Cataluña, have more money for implementing programs but others, like Andalucía, do not, unrepresentative of need (2011a). Therefore, the ACFC urges that there be more statewide regulation and execution of programs as well as collaboration with other Roma organizations to tackle this challenge (COE 2010a).

On the other hand, the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages acknowledges Spain's developments to ensure the protection of minority and regional languages, unfortunately without specific supporting data (2011c). So although it appears that the situation has improved and there might be smaller initiatives working to promote Romani language education throughout Spain, due to the research limitations, this is difficult to conclude.

Like Romania, the expert bodies' reports have also touched upon the fact that illiteracy is a pressing issue in Spain, and more efforts should be made to include Spanish-as-a-second-language support for classroom success (COE 2011b). Unfortunately, the reports also only focus on Romani language education and not Spanish language support, which is obviously needed based on the high illiteracy rates (COE 2011b).

Nevertheless, comparing the given initiatives and suggesting the most effective implementation of language developments for Roma in Romania and Spain, is very challenging. Roma in Romania tend to identify more strongly with the Romani language than Spanish Roma, so perhaps there is more need and demand in Romania for full Romani instruction, and instead more Romani language classes than actual full Romani education, in Spain. Also, as the Spanish Romani language, Caló, is a dialect different than the Romanian Romani language, the implementation of standardized Romani courses are perhaps less valued in Spain, and the World Bank suggests that standardization of the Romani language might facilitate widespread language education reform (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). But of course there are huge implications to how, and who overseas and realizes this process. Furthermore, the Roma in Spain have slightly different cultural values than the Roma in Romania, so language standardization may erase some dialectal words, which are important aspects of Spanish Roma cultural identity (Parekh 2000). Therefore, although both full Romani language instruction and

Romani language learning education are essential and promoted by the Council of Europe (COE 2012c; COE 2011b; COE 2011c), they must not discount the smaller linguistical and cultural diversions between the Roma in Romania and Spain, and they must not come at the cost of programs to lower illiteracy rates.

(4) Cultural Awareness:

Cultural awareness raising initiatives are some of the most essential components of inclusive education (Bernard 2012), and I find, also some of the most neglected from the mainstream conception and analysis of developments in education. Although such initiatives may not work directly on the content of education itself, they do affect the overall health (amount of violence and discrimination) of the learning environment and the ability of groups like the Roma to be respectfully included and succeed in the education system, as well as the society (Ibid). Therefore I have divided this section into: *(4a) Teacher Training; (4b) Awareness Raising in Schools; and (4c) Awareness Raising in the Society*. I have included these three aspects as UNESCO recognizes that teachers, students, parents, community members, health workers, and local governmental officials are all stakeholders in developing an education environment conducive for learning (Bernard 2012). Therefore, I assume, programs promoting cultural awareness in stakeholders coupled non-violent, positive interaction with Roma will have powerful outcomes on how Roma perform in the education system and further integrate into the society.

(4a) Teacher Training

As teachers are the guides of the classroom (Rosseau cited in Bernard 2012) and a classroom is only a meaningful space if there are adequately trained teachers (UNESCO 2005, §6), then if teachers discourage Roma students or express negative perceptions publically, most likely Roma students will feel unvalued, inferior, and unmotivated to continue with their education.

Therefore, the Romanian Department for Interethnic Relations has worked on initiatives to improve the capacity of teachers, including training for the usage of intercultural components in the classroom, to facilitate communication and understanding across cultures (COE 2011a; Jandt 2007). These training workshops include: education for democratic citizenship and intercultural dialogue as well as legislative and institutional frameworks promoting the idea of intercultural education in schools, coupled with an educational DVD for those teaching the History of National Minorities, which was created by teachers belonging to minority groups and relevant NGOs (COE 2011a). Thus teachers can learn, not only about communicating with students of diverse cultures, but also about how to foster this kind of dialogue among the students in the classroom. Although this information does not specify how many teachers regularly attend these training sessions, how often they are held, and/or how many trainings are erected, these measures show that Romania not only acknowledges the importance of teacher training, but also that education is a key factor for promoting intercultural relations and increasing good understandings among diverse ethno-cultural groups (COE 2011a).

Similarly, Spain also provides Roma culture and education teacher training, and the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Culture, rewards teachers for best practices. For example, teachers who focused on showing the positive influence and contributions of the Roma in Spain received public recognition, although the specificities of these rewards were not stated in the reports (COE 2011b). Also, like Romania, the fact that information about the regularity, quality of these trainings, and the numbers of teachers participating is not stated, is problematic and troublesome.

Albeit the unconcludable benefits of initiatives as well as the associated informational holes, the major concern I have with both the measures promoted by Romania and Spain, is that they are not compulsory. Teachers can voluntarily attend these optional training courses, and are perhaps, in some way rewarded for their efforts (COE 2011a; COE 2011b). Thus if major teacher-Roma student perception changes are to happen in the education system, it will likely happen slowly and probably first with teachers who already have a more open mind to begin with, since they will likely be the ones choosing to learn about communicating and including diverse cultures in the classroom.

(4b) Awareness Raising in Schools

Secondly, it is important to promote diversity within the schools, so that not only teachers or educators can appropriately deal with difference, but also so can school staff, administrators, and student peers, whom also have a major influence on the school environment (Bernard 2012).

For example, ECRI notes that there are regular instances of headmasters, teachers, and students' parents in the Romanian school system whom actively behave negatively towards Roma pupils, often ostracizing them in front of their peers (COE 2006b). Therefore much is needed to change those practices, not only because it discourages Roma students, but also because non-Roma students often look to authority figures for role model behavior and mimick their actions (Bernard 2012).

In Spain, there is also active discrimination noted. Roma representatives have said that there is pressure from both parents of other students, as well as peers not to attend school, and thus ECRI recommends that more efforts be done to change this (2011b). To further illustrate this issue, a recent survey stated that 25% of Spaniards would not like their children to be in the same class as Roma children (COE 2008a, §86), showing a quite present negative sentiment, likely affecting Roma students' comfort, and success, in schools.

Unfortunately the Council of Europe's reports did not go into depth about what kind of discrimination and violence happens in the classroom towards the Roma in Romania and Spain, but themes of racism and intolerance are actively noted, so even without statistical evidence, it seems an obvious human rights concern for the Council of Europe. Furthermore, although there have been noted campaigns, launching awareness in the larger Romanian and Spanish societies, the expert bodies' reports do not address any specific measures within schools, and thus more research and emphasis should be promoted there, as tolerance in education can affect the tolerance in other societal spheres (Bernard 2012).

(4c) Awareness Raising in the Society

Perhaps this section can be seen as even more important than the previous two foci because of the potential of tolerant ideas, encouraged in the wider society, to trickle down into other facets of societal systems, such as education (Bernard 2012; Orenstein, Ringold, & Wilkens 2005). This section is composed of measures in the larger society to support cultural consciousness about the Roma, many via media as it is considered a very powerful arena for spreading messages and arguably one of the most comprehensive areas for communicating about cultural differences and persuading mainstream negative perceptions (Griswold 2008). Media attention is also crucial for public cultural representation (Ibid). Therefore, how and in which ways the Roma are depicted in the media sphere, are considered and evaluated in both Romania and Spain.

ECRI has noted in past reports that the Romanian media tends to portray Roma in derogatory terms or through discriminatory/racist advertisements, articles, and programs. Several studies demonstrated that the Roma are talked about “chiefly in the context of criminal behavior” (COE 2006b, §110), perhaps affecting the fact that 78% of Romanians would not wish to have Roma as neighbors (COE 2006b). Therefore ECRI has requested that the Roma be represented in a “balanced” and “non-discriminatory” way, and there have been recent developments by the Romanian Television, mostly through the support of the “Pro Europa” Roma party, in producing a number of tolerant shows (COE 2006b, §109). In fact, since 2005, there have been over 180 related shows and 360 hours broadcasted as well as over 600 reports, 235 social surveys, 20 information and awareness raising campaigns, showing Roma where to access social services, produced. In addition, 150 interviews with experts dealing with the political, social, and cultural life of the Roma, as well as meetings with the Parliamentary Group of National Minorities about the social and economic situation of the Roma, have been produced and presented on the Romanian Television (COE 2011a, p. 60). Furthermore, the National Agency for the Roma implemented the campaign “DOSTA!/Enough!: Pass over prejudices, discover Roma”, from August 2008-August 2009, with the support of the Council of Europe, working to fight the prejudices and stereotypes of the Roma as well as bring together Roma and non-Roma. Not only was it the first such campaign about/for Roma at a European level, but also Romania was the

first EU country to implement it (COE 2011a, p. 29), which can be interpreted as great dedication in the public Romanian sphere to address pertinent issues and concerns of racism and intolerance towards Roma.

Similarly Spain has worked to promote a better public image of the Roma through media networks. There has been a Roma Documentation Centre created, compiling historical and cultural documentary material: bibliographies, films, photographs, recordings, etc. for public learning, use, and appreciation (COE 2011c). Also, the Roma Secretariat Foundation NGO, financed through the Spanish Ministry of Education, established the "Help us to destereotype the Roma community" slogan, which was broadcasted on TV, radio, the Internet, and other media sources as well as printed onto corporate and commercial products during 2007-2008. Later, these same messages were also solicited to public schools in assemblies and classrooms (COE 2010a). The fact that the work of the Roma Secretariat Foundation NGO went from the general public sphere, and later infiltrated the school sphere, shows the possibility of the spreading of these broader initiatives into more specific systems, such as education.

Although, the reports noted considerably less societal cultural awareness raising programs in Spain than in Romania, it cannot be merely considered as better or worse, due to the fact that Romania and Spain have very different socio-political climates, there was limited material about each initiative itself, and no specific information about the degree of public Roma racism and discrimination in both countries, before initiatives were made. Regardless, I argue that although awareness raising is not "directly" related to education in terms of content, books, and/or numerical statistics of attendance, performance, etc., it does work to influence and/or re-shape the societal perception of the Roma, which in turn affects how teachers, peers, administrators, and others involved in the education system, and the society, view the Roma. These perceptions shape the type of learning environment the Roma attending school, participate in and experience, likely also influencing their success rate (Bernard 2012) and therefore cultural awareness measures are essential in the dissection and discussion of good education. Also, as I argue below, incorporating education measures, which promote the inclusion of diverse cultures, as well as facilitate communication and relations between them, coined as multicultural education, can help isolated groups, such as the Roma, integrate into the society and become integral parts

of it without losing the essence of their own culture.

Chapter Six: Multicultural Education

As noted, accessible, quality education, adequately including multiple cultures, such as the Roma in Romania and Spain whom face very specific issues themselves, is very complex and multifaceted. In fact, according to the United Nations Development Program, “managing cultural diversity is one of the central challenges of our time” (Choudhry 2008). Therefore it is essential that an education model fit for dealing with diversity, which uses communication methods accessible between and within cultures, be involved in the educational system coupled with initiatives for broader societal awareness raising, to effectively “manage” difference conflicts. Therefore, I argue that multicultural education has the potential to fulfill the above model criteria and therefore is most suitable for the divided societies of Romania and Spain, in order to deal with conflicts among ethnic-social groups. In order to promote this, the next part of this paper addresses what multiculturalism is and what multicultural education looks like theoretically, and as concepts of multiculturalism are seen as “neither a political doctrine with a programmatic content nor a philosophical theory of man and the world but as a perspective on human life” (Parekh 2000, p. 336), this section is much less data concentrated but instead much more theory laden and idealistic.

In order to dissect multicultural education, one must first fully understand the meaning of multiculturalism, which is referred to as an understanding, acceptance, and network of constructive relations among people of many different cultures (Jandt 2007) seeking “to address the disadvantages of racialized groups by focusing on the needs of culture, stressing the validity of cultural diversity and instituting programs which will enable cultural difference to flourish and be endowed with a positive value” (Anthias 1997, p. 254). In order to encompass this, multicultural education exposes students, in the education system, to multiple perspectives of a prosperous and successful life as well as diverse cultures and languages, while at the same time developing critical and analytical skills with which to look at all situations (Parekh 2000). Therefore, multicultural education “is an education in freedom, both in the sense of freedom

from ethnocentric prejudices and biases and freedom to explore and learn from other cultures and perspectives” (Parekh 2000, p. 230). Based on the above descriptions, idyllically multicultural education is one in which all students are fully able to learn, and this learning is advanced by the possibility of really relating and communicating with diverse cultures, in ways in which both an understanding of their original culture is preserved and protected, but an open mind and willingness to learn about other cultures is also promoted and facilitated.

But the ideas of multicultural education can be quite controversial worldwide, depending on one's view of the role of education. If it is only to “initiate pupils into the... ‘national culture’ or ‘creed’ [or] to cultivate in them a strong sense of ‘national identity’ [to] create a ‘cohesive nation’” (Parekh 2000, p. 224), as many believe, this can easily be at the expense of including and accepting other cultures lying outside this idea of “national identity”. Therefore multiculturalists critique that the dominant culture's view can, not only marginalize other or outside groups, but it also teaches students to look at the world from narrow perspectives, suppressing the potential of knowledge development, where instead of understanding circumstances from multiple perspectives, students judge others by their own standards (Ibid).

Differently, multicultural education can be seen as organizational cultures, or a system of organizations, operating within and across cultures, which “also produce[s] cultures of their own.” (Griswold 2008, p. 120). Although state-centric perspectives of education fear that “multiple cultures are always potentially cultures in conflict”, challenging the homogeneity of the national identity, the “[i]nternational flows of people, goods, images, and information mean that virtually every organization must contend with culture multiplicity” (Griswold 2008, pp. 138-9). So, although multicultural education, as an organization, has the potential to create conflict, it also has the ability to foster special communication between cultures, leading to strong hybrid or plural cultures. In fact, this mutually developed plural culture allows students with “well-developed intellectual, moral and other capacities and sensibilities”, fostered in the right educational system, to “feel at home in the rich and diverse human world” (Parekh 2000, p. 227).

Therefore, to effectively evaluate educational programs and/or developments for Roma in Romania and Spain, from a multiculturalist perspective, one must look for initiatives providing

the systematic structure and space for respectful, tolerant, and constant contact with the Roma, not only allowing the larger society to feel that the Roma are an integral part of it, but also for the Roma to feel like an integral part of the society. This section could dissect each, earlier presented development, for these characteristics, but that would be far beyond the scope of this thesis and I lack the sufficient research to do so. Therefore, as multicultural education can be seen as organizational cultures, I show Romania and Spain's main overall structural measures, which have the potential to create a framework for the development of individual multicultural programs.

In Romania, the Ministry of Education has pushed topics aiming to “prevent and combat discrimination” by emphasizing language, culture, and history of minority or underrepresented groups, such as the Roma, as essential incorporations in school curricula (COE 2011a, p. 70). Also, this curricula process was modeled after the ideas of intercultural dialogue, an essential component to multicultural education, further discussed below, where new and reformed curricula was discussed by textbook authors, school inspectors, teachers, and Roma NGOs and interest groups (COE 2011a). Diverging from education, on a more general level for multicultural societal reform and development, Romania showed the promotion of intercultural dialogue with its participation in the 2008 European Year for Intercultural Dialogue, an internationally sponsored and recognized event (COE 2011a).

More explicitly, in Spain, the Spanish Royal Decree 1513/2006 establishes the minimum learning requirements for primary education, by putting major attention to diversity in Article 13.1: “the educative intervention should contemplate as a principle the diversity of students, understood as the guarantee of the development of all of them as well as a personalized attention according to the necessities of each”. Furthermore, in Article 13.2, it recognizes that “learning difficulties are...both organizational and curricular...[signifying] as well to understand the features of current societies, their increasing pluralism and their evolving character...” one must comprehend “the contribution that different cultures have done to the evolution and progress of humanity...Definitely this competence means to show a global citizenship feeling compatible with local identity” (COE 2010a). This article also includes the recognition that diversity can

enrich cohabitation and show respect for the habits and ways of life of different people and groups (Ibid).

So, while Romania's developments positively include intercultural communication methods in school related programs as well as in the process of shaping these developments, Spain's Royal Decree seems to include more aspects of multiculturalism in its rubric for education. Although underdeveloped, Romania's participation in the 2008 Year for Intercultural Dialogue can be interpreted as a way to be involved internationally, perhaps putting pressure for further multicultural systematic change. Much more developed, Spain's Decree requires primary education, which is noted as being the most important level in shaping pupils' development (UNESCO 2006), to not only recognize and promote diversity, tolerance, and interaction, but also to acknowledge the linkages between respectful pupils' involvement and their success in the education system. But the most profound part of the Spanish Decree is the section addressing that the recognition of multiple cultures' contribution to society can provide a locally based feeling of global citizenship. I interpret this as incorporating what multicultural education refers to as producing new or hybrid cultures through educational interaction (Griswold 2008) and thus feeling part of the diverse world (Parekh 2000). Although these are just brief examples of structural efforts by Romania and Spain, all the earlier noted positive measures from *The Roma and Education* section can be interpreted as attempts to include the ideas of multicultural education because all of the foci (school integration, education content, language, and cultural awareness) need to be addressed when incorporating such bodies of thought.

Intercultural Communication:

In order for the philosophy of multiculturalism to be implemented in the school system, it is vital to include the methods of intercultural communication, as interaction between diverse cultures is one of the main goals and outcomes of multicultural education (Jandt 2007). Intercultural communication can be understood as a theory about the cultural understandings of communication, where the communication process itself is characterized as "face-to-face interactions among people of diverse cultures", acting as a force to either spread or stop

prejudices, racisms, and intolerance (Jandt 2007, p. 36). Also, good communicators generally have a strong sense of self, and it is an essential element for all communicators to have this, in order for intercultural communication to function. Therefore, education can be an important space for growing this sense of self, by showing the value of the Roma to/within the broader Romanian and Spanish societies, as well as instating it within individuals of the Roma community (Jandt 2007), hopefully allowing for communication that can bridge various groups.

Furthermore, intercultural communication can be viewed as the transformation of monocultural people into multicultural people (Jandt 2007) where “[i]ntercultural persons are extensions of cultural-selves whose qualities lie in their openness to cultural others, their willingness to negotiate differences, the ability to reach intercultural agreements, the ability to integrate diverse cultural elements, as well as the potential to achieve identity extension and mutual growth” (Dai 2009, p. 3). In order to effectively achieve this identity extension and growth, mentioned above, one must complete what Xiao-Dong Dai calls “cultural convergence” and “cultural differentiation”, which is the practice of trying to balance unity and diversity in a mutually productive way with openness to cultural others and a willingness to work with differences (Dai 2009). He continues that one must be willing to give up cultural stereotypes, prejudices, and ethnocentrism, and aim to connect and engage in dialogue with others on an “equal footing” in order to properly work with differences (Dai 2009). This can then enhance interactions between and within cultures, “playing an important part in transforming culturally autonomous selves into culturally interrelated selves” (Ibid, §12) and all the above represent, exactly, the cultural development process of becoming “internally plural” addressed in the dissection of multicultural education (Parekh 2000). Therefore, since the cultures represented in this paper (the Roma and the Romanian and Spanish societies) all have different systems of meaning and perspectives, they also have different visions of desirable, favorable, or acceptable ways of living (Parekh 2000). So, although cultures will be naturally judged, evaluated, and compared by others, it must be in a way that shared dialogue, and perspectives, between different cultures is mutually beneficial, accepting the other as an equal conversation partner.

Unfortunately there are many barriers to achieve the above. LaRay Barna presents the six barriers to intercultural communication: anxiety, assuming similarity instead of difference,

ethnocentrism, stereotypes and prejudice, nonverbal misinterpretations, and language. *Anxiety* is a result of the nervousness of not knowing how to react or communicate; *assuming similarity instead of difference* means that one can be caught unaware of differences and how actions could be interpreted differently in different contexts, although one can also assume things are more different than they really are and neglect ways to connect; *ethnocentrism* is where one culture is judged negatively based on another culture's standards; *stereotypes and prejudice* are where one assumes that the actions or general perceptions of groups of people actually represent those groups of people; *nonverbal misinterpretations* are the misunderstandings of non-verbal messages as holding other meanings; and *language*, is not only the type of language, but also how it is used as well as nonverbal language and their respective influential abilities (Jandt 2007). Although there are many obstacles to effectively communicating interculturally, many of which are present in Roma-Romanian and Roma-Spanish relations, I argue an education system working to foster a space for this type of interaction can eventually break down these barriers and lead to cultural awareness, acceptance, and tolerance in the society.

The Power of Language and Communication:

Since language plays such a vital and important role in communication and can create large barriers for the effective communication across different cultures, this section goes into further detail about its powerful nature. Language and discourse are not only essential in the meaning construction processes vital to understanding culture and identity, but they also play a central role in group formation, societal inclusion versus exclusion, power-relations within/between groups, as well as relations between groups and governments and policy makers (Christiansen, Jorgensen & Wiener 1999). Therefore, language not only provides for an environment of communication and cohesion or miscommunication and separation, but also has real decision-making properties (Stoker & Chhotray 2009). On another note, story-telling is a powerful force that not only has the ability to paint the image of culture, cultural relations, and group distinctions, but it also can create imagery around friend-enemy relations with the capacity to influence the formation of political strategies and reforms (Sorenson cited in Stoker & Chhotray 2009). Therefore language developments, including Romanian and Spanish language support as

well as Romani language classes and education, should be considered very important, due to the discussed potential power they hold in societal relations.

Conclusions:

Using a constructivist lens is imperative when evaluating and analyzing Romania and Spain's educational and larger societal policies, especially when relating them to the theories of multiculturalism and intercultural communication. According to constructivists, groups' identities, problems, conflicts, etc. are constantly in flux (Parekh 2000) developing and evolving through intercultural interaction and dialogue. Therefore reaching a final point of full multicultural education is never really possible and must always be further developed, since the involved cultures will continue to change and grow. In addition, as constructivists argue that political patterns are "a consequence of social human relations" and are not fixed, but instead a result of shared understandings among such social actors (Rosamond 2000, p. 198), if multicultural education's inclusion of diverse cultures is promoted, it has the potential to shape the social actors agreeing on these political shared understandings. This will then effect how policies for Roma are made, what is contextually encompassed within them, and who/what they will aid, change and/or target. Although, it might be useful to recognize progressive educational developments for the Roma in Romania and Spain, claiming that one country has completely reached the idealistic goals of multicultural education is completely impossible, as multiculturalism is just an ideological perspective without a programmatic content, characterized by sets of loose action guidelines (Parekh 2000).

Chapter Seven: Education and Societal Integration

Despite the ideological nature of multicultural education, the ideas are necessary when arguing that education can be a vital step in the respectful inclusion of diverse or excluded groups, such as the Roma, in Romania and Spain. To describe this process, I use the term integration despite my acknowledgment that it is heavily debated and can stir up negative connotations. But I

attempt to show a type of integration, approached from a constructivist perspective, that has the potential to include diverse groups in society, in a way that is both beneficial to these groups, as well as to the society as whole. In Romania and Spain, the Roma are minority groups who lay on the fringes of society and the political system, where the majority tend to see them as representing crime, poverty, and distrust and these perceptions are not without reason, because many Roma are involved in such acts (BBC 2009). The relations between Roma and the Romanian and Spanish societies represent that of “divided societies”, or ones that are not merely “ethnically, linguistically, religiously, or culturally diverse...Rather...that these differences are politically salient—that is, they are persistent markers of political identity and bases for political mobilization [wherein] political conflict is synonymous with conflict among ethnocultural groups” (Choudhry 2008, p. 5). Therefore educative measures should attempt to be done in ways, which discuss the interconnectedness of the various causes and outcomes in Roma perception, instead of exacerbating this inevitable conflict. The reality is that the majority of the Roma in Romania and Spain, live in poverty, but this poverty, resulting in isolation, is multifaceted and has interrelated causes (Orenstein, Ringold, & Wilkens 2005; COE 2011a; COE 2011c):

The causes tend to reinforce one another in a vicious cycle of poverty and exclusion and require a multifaceted approach. Roma often have poor labor market access because of low education levels, geographic isolation, and discrimination. Low education levels result from constraints on both the supply and demand side. Roma often face discrimination in school and feel that schools ignore their culture and language. In addition, Roma sometimes lack sufficient food or clothing to support school attendance. Thus, attitudes, experiences, and social conditions conspire to reduce Roma education levels and labor market performance. Because of these interconnected roots, one cannot adequately address Roma poverty by focusing on a single aspect. Rather, a comprehensive approach is needed (Orenstein, Ringold, & Wilkens 2005, p. 19).

So just as, the mentioned multiple causes affect the cycle of Roma poverty, in turn affecting their access to other societal sectors, I think it important to discuss how sectors, such as education, may play a vital role in alleviating the situational poverty, which prohibits Roma integration into the Romanian and Spanish societies.

Definitions of Integration:

According to John Macgarry, Brendan O'leary, and Richard Simeon, integration promotes a single public identity coterminous with the state's territory and equality of individual citizens before law and within public institutions. Here, the idea of equal state citizenship is usually against the recognition of smaller groups' identities within the public sphere; instead they see it as residing within the private sphere only (2008). These types of integrationists tend to favor assimilation as an end goal where they seek the erosion of private, cultural, and other differences among citizens in order to fuse this common public identity. Others favor acculturation (the adaption of one community into another), where they often lean towards the concept of voluntary, not forced, assimilation, where instead of eroding difference in the public sphere, it becomes "invisible" and the public is blind to it (Macgarry, O'leary & Simeon 2008). Generally, these types of integrationists reject the ideas that ethnic difference could translate, or be synonymous, with political differences and believe in the real possibility of a common public identity (Ibid). But it is precisely the above perspectives that I see as problematic, due to their propensity to only facilitate more conflict among groups through systematic separation or marginalization, from public oppression or blindness to their salient differences. Whereas separation or segregation is "maintaining one's original culture and not participating in the new culture" connoting the "judgment of superiority and inferiority, as well as prejudice and hatred between groups" (p. 309), marginalization is "not having...contact with the larger society". In the case of the Roma, both separation and marginalization are quite salient, therefore it is important to work towards a type of societal integration, which includes the Roma, but not at the expense of their cultural rights.

Therefore, although I acknowledge the multitude and complexity of the integration discussions, I hope to show a type of societal integration, which has positive benefits to marginalized groups as well as the cohesion of the broader society: "True integration is maintaining important parts of one's original culture as well as becoming an integral part of the new culture. Integration ensures the continuity of culture" (Jandt 2007, p. 310). Therefore, I argue that the above represents the type of integration useful for the situation of the Roma, and perhaps the sort the Council of Europe's expert bodies' recommendations aim for. Furthermore, accommodation,

part of this integration definition, advocates for equality within the institution and respect for differences, which are legally flexible, historic hybrids, or dual or multiple public identities, by promoting the maintenance of difference in both the public and private spheres (Macgarry, O'leary & Simeon 2008, p. 41). Similarly, multiculturalists agree with the idea of balanced representation and respect within and between all spheres, where structural general principals are present allowing groups to coexist (Jandt 2007; Parekh 2000). Therefore, the above represent the type of positive societal integration that I favor and that I use to approach the situation of Roma and integration in Romania and Spain with respect to education measures, due to its ability to spearhead the infiltration of tolerance and acceptance in all society's spheres.

In order to begin working towards my idea of positive societal integration, the protection of rights is important to note. In seeking the continuity and respect of different cultures as well as making sure that they have equality within societal institutions, a rights-based approach, which seeks to "elevate state protection for minority individuals and groups by providing basic civil and political rights...is believed to contribute to international peace" (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005, p. 18). Also, in order for a multicultural society to succeed, it requires: "a grounded structure of authority, a collectively acceptable state of constitutional right, [and] a just and impartial state..." (Parekh 2000, p. 236). But, in order for such rights to be protected, there is a need for public recognition of one's status, both legally and socially (Kymlicka 2008). So although discussions on the protection of minority rights coupled with the recognition of minority status are intrinsic parts of dissecting integration, especially when addressing the question if Roma policy should be pursued through coercive measures or with more individual respect for Roma rights (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005), it shall be left for future research, as I have neither the research nor the space enough to do it justice. Regardless, it is important to note that different societal groups' situations may be very different because they all have unique and special needs that cannot be treated the same way, so the classifications defining them should also be different, since one's "(minority) status" has consequences on how one's cultural rights are perceived and treated in the society and in policy (Kymlicka 2008).

Historic Patterns of Integration in Romania and Spain:

Before theoretically claiming that multicultural education can facilitate what I consider positive societal integration, it is important to touch upon the different historical Roma integration measures imposed by Romania and Spain, as this ultimately shapes its possibilities in the current situation.

Romania historically enslaved the Roma for at least a couple hundred years, from the 13th or 14th centuries until it was abolished in the 1840's and 1850's (Achim 2004), so although they weren't integrated necessarily, they were forcibly part of the society. Then, during socialism (1947-1989), Roma were rigidly assimilated and stripped of their cultural identity, but Roma were employed and had access to social services just as everyone else, so although there was still public discrimination, and very little cultural rights, they at least had a more equal standard of living (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Although during socialism, Roma were generally integrated in societal institutions, the fall of the regime, which had tried to unite all Romanians under the name of the nation-state, led to difficulties in continuing to access social services coupled with increased public awareness of ethnic or racial differences. Therefore Roma are currently living in greater poverty and isolation than before (Ibid). But despite still obvious racial tensions, since Romania's succession to the EU and their attention to the protection of human rights, Romania's policies have been acknowledged for attempting to manage a climate of "tolerance and understanding" in which "the various ethnic, linguistic and religious groups co-exist in harmony" (ACFC 2005, §54).

In comparison, Spain was noted for largely trying to incorporate the Roma into the larger society, while promoting the preservation of their culture publically, during their first recorded arrivals in the 15-century (Acton & Marsh 2007). Although following that, the Roma experienced a period of banishment and expulsion from 1499-1633, then forced assimilation and legal incorporation, post 1633, where the public has always been aware of Roma differences, whether reactions to it be negative or positive (Liégeois 2005; Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Currently, Spain has incorporated more multicultural strategies for Roma inclusion in the society as the post-1978 policies worked to assist "the development of the Gypsy people and the

recognition of the fact that Gypsies have their own culture” (Gamella cited in Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005).

Regardless it is important to note that historic differences in Romania and Spain have salient outcomes, and addressing and implementing policies for the social, political, and economic inclusion of Roma needs to take these distinctions into consideration. Whereas in Romania, public Roma culture and difference has been suppressed, either through slavery or socialist assimilation, it has always been present in Spain, regardless of respectful or intolerant treatment. Also, the fact that Roma in socialist Romania were used to the state providing jobs and social services, perhaps makes them expect more from the state now, as they have experienced a steep decline in standard of living post-socialism (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). In contrast the Spanish Roma, who have been used to the long-term phenomena of exclusion from social services, the labor market, and other economic opportunities, save for the first period of arrival (Acton & Marsh 2007), perhaps have different assumptions from the state. Regardless, since Roma culture and difference has been treated differently in Romania and Spain historically, coupled with the fact that their ability to access social services largely differs, positive societal Roma integration in Romania and Spain will be influenced by these factors.

Conclusions:

As Romania and Spain are divided societies, there is a need for action to be taken to tackle the situation of isolated groups, such as the Roma, which can have many distinctive approaches with diverse predicted outcomes. Alan Pattern presents four plausible outcomes of dealing with this kind of difference: (1) *disestablishment*, where all citizens have basic liberal rights and entitlements by creating a “fair and level playing field” through “refusal of recognition condemning policies that encourage or discourage particular forms of cultural life” (Pattern 2008, p. 95). For example, the use of certain languages would not be prohibited in the public sphere, but would also not be acknowledged; (2) *nation building*, where states encourage citizens to converge on certain forms of culture and identity because a common framework of belonging can secure social and political equality, usually using language as a forefront for this; (3) *equality*

of status, which extends the same public treatment to majority and minority groups, ignoring the fact that certain groups require special treatment to have equal opportunities and succeed in the system; and lastly, (4) *cultural preservation*, which states that “a group whose culture enjoys equal public status with that of the majority’s may still have difficulty flourishing, or even surviving” and for this reason the state should prop up vulnerable cultures and identities by giving them the resources they need to survive (Pattern 2008, p. 102). The first three outcomes have already been stated as contributing to the problematic definitions, and aims, of integration by either erasing difference (acculturation), oppressing difference (assimilation) (Macgarry, O’leary & Simeon 2008), or disregarding the fact that groups like the Roma, with complex causes contributing to their situation, need unique state support. Therefore, according to the provided definitions of my idea of positive societal integration, I assume the fourth outcome, cultural preservation, is the most appropriate for dealing with Roma diversity in Romania and Spain.

Furthermore, the inclusion of integration in the study or analysis of education is important because education can influence which types of Pattern’s societal difference integration patterns are realized. In addition, education has a huge role in building or destroying the road out of poverty (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005), either allowing for groups’ societal inclusion or exclusion, and according to constructivists, the type of inclusion/exclusion methods used and promoted by the wider society, are not stripped of the values, norms, and rules learned through interaction in institutions, such as education (Christiansen, Jorgensen & Wiener 1999; Hix 2005). Also, since the type of integration I argue for, critiques the state-centric idea of “national” identity, and instead promotes plurality in the public sphere (Jandt 2007; Parekh 2000), “in order to facilitate the emergence of a multiculturally constituted common culture”, necessary for positive societal integration to succeed, “both private and public realms need to encourage intercultural interaction...multicultural education, and a plural and inclusive view of national identity” (Parekh 2000, p. 222; p. 236). This is where the education sphere, one that promotes the values of multiculturalism, can bridge people, institutions, and policies, if we are to acknowledge education from a perspective that includes a deeper analysis than just classroom content, but instead see it as a place where intercultural dialogue between students, peers, administrators, teachers, and parents takes place, developing a societal co-existence and sense of

belonging. Therefore, perhaps integrating the Roma, fully in the education system, can really help to facilitate societal integration into the Romanian and Spanish societies in a beneficial and positive way, to both the Roma and the wider societies.

Chapter Eight: Challenges to Evaluating the Situation of the Roma and Education

In this section, I acknowledge the various challenges I face to effectively evaluating the situation of the Roma, in Romania and Spain, due to my previous knowledge and experience, the methodology, and sources used. I anticipate that a major critique of this research topic and execution is that fact I, personally, have never been deeply in contact or communication with the Roma from either Romania or Spain, nor have I really spent adequate time in either country in general, nor their heavily populated Roma areas. Therefore my perspective, analysis, and conclusions come from a purely theoretical background, where the majority of empirical data gathered is from the Council of Europe's expert bodies' reports, and do not mean to disregard or discredit people who have personal experience and expertise on the Roma in Europe and/or education policies in Romania and Spain. But, just as I acknowledge, and apply, the constructivist perspective that people are never fully stripped of their pre-conceived perceptions (Jandt 2007), I also perceive that, although my conclusions may be in many ways influenced, premature, or flawed, someone with a "deeper level" of experience in the area runs the same risk of their conceptions being just as manipulated, skewed, and/or one sided in their evaluations as well.

Also, I chose to use only the Council of Europe's expert bodies' reports to evaluate education policies, due to the fact that they have recently focused more heavily on Roma issues, but I acknowledge that these reports perhaps only present part of the picture and there are a variety of other sources reporting on similar issues. Although the Council of Europe's expert bodies' methods for data collection, and diversity of information, represented in the publishing of response and opinion reports from member states, as well as other interest groups, supposedly including both information gathered from governmental as well as non-governmental

organizations/bodies, me, the public reader and user, is very removed from the entire process itself. I do not physically see the data collection process or the raw material used to draw their final conclusions, nor do I take part in the numerous meetings between all interested participants deciding what responses and conclusions, to publish.

With that said, there are also a number of identifiable issues to understanding the situation of the Roma and education developments, addressed within the Council of Europe reports themselves, which I have consolidated into four categories, useful for gaining a broader picture of the areas, which could be further researched and developed: *(1) Documentation and Demographic Data Collection; (2) Funding and Oversight; (3) Project Implementation; and (4) Roma involvement.*

(1) Documentation and Demographic Data Collection:

Firstly, a major barrier to fully grasping the situation of the Roma and education policies is the fact that accurate demographic, census data as well as data on reported racism or intolerance, is so hard to acquire. This makes it extremely hard to have actual numerical percentages in terms of Roma school attendance/drop-out, cases of mistreatment within the school system, and the actual usage and effect of developed programs, as well as it hinders Roma's access to social services, including education support (COE 2011a; COE 2011b; COE 2011c; COE 2005).

Therefore the lack of documentation, and hence lack of access to social services, not only challenges the Roma's access to education and integration into schools, which have the possible services necessary for success, but also, as noted earlier, Roma societal integration as a whole (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005; COE 2011a; COE 2011b; COE 2011c). In Romania's capital, Bucharest, at least 20,000 Roma don't have proper identity papers, and a survey of 8,000 Roma in Bucharest showed that 25% of them do not have identity cards and about 50% did not have birth certificates (COE 2006b). This creates a problematic cycle because children who come from parents without identity papers also do not receive birth certificates. Without proper papers, not only can it be difficult to enroll in school or other social benefit programs, but also buying property is prevented, forcing Roma to be homeless or "nomadic" aiding the negative societal perceptions around the Roma in the first place, and perpetuating the cycle of poverty

(Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005; COE 2006b). In order to approach this issue, the Romanian authorities have issued temporary identity cards to those who do not have all the necessary documents, issued for a maximum of one year (COE 2006a). Also, on a county level, there are counselors working with the Roma, informing them about the necessary documents needed for identity cards as well as helping them get them (Ibid). In Spain, there are also many cases of Roma being undocumented and illegal, mostly newer arrivals from Eastern Europe, although the number is unknown, and no statistics were provided in the Council of Europe's reports (Open Society Institute 2002). So although various official bodies are aware of this phenomenon in Spain, it is hard to gauge the severity of it without statistical data.

Another barrier to obtaining this type of data is the voluntary nature of census and/or other demographic identification methods, which also affects the ability to know the actual number of Roma in both countries (2011a; COE 2011b; COE 2011c). This not only gives a picture of the need or demand for Roma initiatives, but it also shapes how dire the situation of the Roma publically appears to be. Since there is still no real practice for ethnic data collection in Romania (COE 2006b), the ACFC urges that it take place with the "full respect for the anonymity and dignity of the persons questioned and in compliance with the principle of unreserved consent" and that each person should have "the right to have [his/her] own opinion, without any constraint" on government-type, demographic information collection forms (COE 2011a, p. 21). Although the nature of data collection in Romania is voluntary, the March 2002 census, added questions allowing one to express ethnic origin, mother tongue, and religion, worded with terms discussed in advance with the Council of National Minorities (ACFC 2005). In fact, due to these developments in Romania between 2002-2005 the number of people identifying as Roma increased by about 140,000 (COE 2005). This is significant not only because it shows Romania's public attention to acknowledge difference, a historically oppressed societal factor, but also because it was done through collaboration with organizations representing different minority groups, and it actually achieved results.

Likewise, in Spain, the Spanish constitution actually states that it is unconstitutional to force people to identify their religion, ethnicity, and/or ideology (COE 2003) and that the Roma specifically can only be studied on a "strictly voluntary basis" (COE 2010a, p. 3). Therefore, if

this type of identification is voluntary, people might not share this information with the public, due to reasons ranging from living far from areas conducting such surveys or research, or fearing the reaction of the public and those controlling their ability to access social services. Also if they are undocumented, they are already officially not counted or included in such statistical data collection in the first place. Thus, the lack of updated demographic and linguistic studies makes it quite difficult to fully evaluate the reality of the situation of the Roma and education using the available statistics, and therefore can only be concluded based on general, not numerical, terms (COE 2011c).

(2) Funding and Oversight:

Secondly, having regular and substantial funding, coupled with external bodies who regulate and monitor the situation of programs and developments is absolutely essential to the existence, salience, and success of them (Orenstein, Ringold, & Wilkens 2005). Diversity of oversight in regulatory bodies is especially important, when making sure that all interested parties' concerns and needs are taken into consideration (Ibid). Therefore, although there have been some improvements, the unreliable nature of funding and oversight for Roma programs, stated in the various reports, creates limitations to understanding the full potential of them on the situation of Roma.

Positively, according to the ACFC, there has been a huge increase in funds for cultural projects and awareness raising initiatives in Romania, many associated with the Roma. For example, the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage allocated 352,100 € in 2005, which increased to 669,221 € in 2008 (COE 2011a), and the Pro Europa Roma party received allocations from the Council of National Minorities, which increased from about 7 million € in 2005 to about 16 million € in 2007 (Ibid). In addition, each year separate funding issued for diversity and intercultural communication projects, totaled about 574,000 € in 2006 (COE 2006a). Of all projects funded in Romania, the local authorities were responsible for 57% and the non-governmental organizations 23% of them (COE 2011a). But, regardless of the highlighted, increased funding, and about 60% state support, there is continued criticism of the limited state

resources allocated for implementation as well as poor coordination, communication, and monitoring of involved and interested persons (COE 2005; COE 2006b). Also, often funders have the tendency to treat all Roma the same, not taking into consideration that their situation may vary and that ones living under the poverty line, may need immediate and emergency support (COE 2006b). Furthermore, from the available data one cannot get the full picture of how many of these cultural projects (and subsequent funds) are for education and the Roma specifically, causing barriers to effectively evaluate the above information.

In comparison, in 2006 Spain's 108 public-sector related projects, in which education resides, were given a total of 6,533,623 €, in 2007 the 109 projects were given a total of 6,615,902 €, and in 2008 the 110 projects were given a total of 6,800,054 € (COE 2010a). About half the total funds came from the Spanish authorities, and the other half through local corporations and the Autonomous Communities, Spanish counties, themselves. Although there has been an increase of projects and a noted increase in support (Ibid), there are other externalities to be taken into consideration, such as the fact that the amount of projects specifically for the Roma, education, and funds allotted are not available from the statistics. Also according to the ACFC, in 2008 in Spain, there were almost double the amount of social integration projects, including education, as well as a noted, almost 35 times, more users than labor market integration projects, but the government subsidy for social integration projects was only double that of labor market integration projects (2010a). This shows that although there is definitely a demand for social projects like education, the amount of funds is rather limited compared to labor market projects, likely affecting the programs' abilities to be successful. Of course certain programs may be more expensive than others, but it is still disconcerting that the funds could properly cover the diversity of projects within the social integration section as well as satisfy all the users.

In general, this information may present that Romania receives far more funds from their authorities than Spain, but the fact that Romania houses the largest Roma population within the EU, at least double the amount of Spain, should be considered. Also, although it is possible to see the total funds allocated, the distribution of these funds to specifically education and the Roma, for both countries, is not shown, therefore the importance of the numbers is hard to judge. In addition, the increased support in both countries, does not consider the increase in the Roma

population in Spain, migrating from Eastern Europe to Western Europe, especially in more recent times (COE 2010b), as well as inflation, raised prices of goods and services, changing and varying needs of the Roma population, as well as the actual execution and project results. Regardless of the amount of funds allocated in Romania and Spain and the lack of fund transparencies, it is apparent that both Romania and Spain receive about the same amount of support from the authorities, about 50%, which shows a steady state attention and dedication to projects related to the Roma and education. Although this support is comparable, it leaves the researcher to wonder if more state support is needed to fully address the intrinsic and deeply rooted social issues related to the Roma and education.

(3) Program Implementation:

Also there are large differences in program implementation methods between Romania and Spain, where Romania's efforts are much more statewide than Spain, likely related to Romania's communist past. Although the Romanian counties have some autonomy, it is not comparable to that of Spain, in which each of the Autonomous Communities have complete implementation power of programs and projects, and considerable social funds outside that of the state budget (COE 2008c). Even though the Spanish Autonomous Communities' autonomy can be a positive thing, as each area faces its own distinct problems, it can also lack coordination and communication with the state and between other Autonomous Communities, where the possible collaboration or transparency might help programs or projects have more impact on a larger scale. It also presents a challenge for evaluating the situation of education and Roma, in Spain as a whole, since all of the education measures developed and implemented are area specific.

Furthermore, due to the fact that Romania and Spain have been part of the EU for different amounts of time, the types of projects in line with EU human rights criteria differ slightly (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Since Spain has been a member of the EU longer it has had more experience accessing EU institutions for Roma project developments and policies, than more recent members of the EU, like Romania (Ibid). Therefore, the addressing of human rights with regard to the Roma situation must also be understood with new EU members' compliance

for EU membership. For example, the candidacy of Romania focused major attention on the Roma in the adoption and monitoring of the Copenhagen Criteria, in order for them to become a part of the EU (Ibid). Therefore, although it may seem that Romania has built more, recent institutions and legislative mechanisms to address Roma issues than Spain, who has been addressing Roma human rights since post-1978 (Ibid), the possible incentives behind this must be taken into consideration. Furthermore, whereas it may be easier to begin newer human rights initiatives, it is much harder to sustain them, therefore the real result of the programs developed in Romania may take some years to actually be able to evaluate and compare to those of Spain.

(4) Roma Involvement:

Lastly, a common critique from the Council of Europe expert bodies, as well as supplementary sources, is the lack of Roma involvement in initiatives, which work to support them (COE 2011a; COE 2011b; COE 2011c; COE 2010b). The World Bank states that emphasis on Roma inclusion in the society should be through various incentives, rather than forced compliance, which is seen as too assimilationist (Christiansen, Jorgensen & Wiener 1999; Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Instead, this should be done through an inclusive approach aiming to expand and promote Roma involvement and participation, while at the same time maintaining their cultural and social autonomy, where Roma are responsible for the implementation of the programs, which support them, not just present or affected by them (Ibid). Also, since multiculturalism and the type of societal integration I argue for, rely so heavily on intercultural communication to succeed, there should be increasing partnerships between non-Roma and Roma in order to facilitate inclusion and address the possible mistrusts and miscommunications that limit the progress of community development as a whole (Ibid).

In Romania, the ACFC has recognized more recent involvement and consultation of representatives from national minority groups, especially in the writing and conducting of census documents (COE 2006b). This allows groups, like the Roma, to be involved in the creation of documents, which identify them, allowing for more accurate numerical representations and perhaps bringing actual policy change and development, which affects their situation. Romania

has also been noted previously, to include Roma in inspecting the situations in schools, as well as in the hiring bodies of teachers, counselors, and in Roma related organizations (COE 2011a; COE 2010b). Also, this not only helps to give the wider society and public a more accurate picture of the issues and concerns faced by the Roma community, hopefully leading to further support and policy, but also the involvement of the Roma provides an insider perspective, so that societal issues can be presented from the Roma, hopefully leading to more societal tolerance.

In Spain, ECRI warns that although much has been done for the Roma, they are skeptical about how much has been done by the Roma (COE 2011b). For example, in 2008 there were a total of 574 employed workers related to social Roma projects, of which 135 were Roma and a total number of 127 volunteers, 45 of which were Roma (COE 2010a), meaning that of the very few people working with Roma and other social projects, even fewer were actually of Roma descent. Therefore in the proposed initiatives it seems that Roma themselves do not have much decision making or implementation power, which is an important part of making sure they feel valued in the policy and project execution process, as well as ensuring that their actual needs are supported (Orenstein, Ringold, & Wilkens 2005). Also, as there are notably few Roma in leading political or institutional positions, and a lack of Roma as public role models, with strong educational and professional backgrounds, many Roma “remain skeptical about the benefits of education” and integration into other mainstream societal institutions (COE 2011b, §126). Perhaps then, integrating Roma into the education system can allow them to become leaders for/in their societies, hopefully feeding into the development of programs for the Roma, led by educated and competent members of the Roma community. This might change the general Roma skepticism about education and allow for Roma to feel more valued in the education environment, as well as influence, positively, the societal perception about Roma.

It appears, from the given information, as well as previous information, in *The Roma and Education* section, that Romania has more Roma participation in initiatives for them, than Spain. I am not sure if this has to do with the fact that the Roma population is much larger in Romania or that they have been part of institutions historically, or for other reasons entirely since both countries face their respective issues and development foci, as well as different socio-economic and political situations of the Roma.

Chapter Nine: Overall Conclusions and Future Discussions

Although I have addressed the various barriers and limitations to my analysis, there can still be a number of overall general conclusions drawn about the situation of the Roma and education in Romania and Spain, as well as the benefits of multicultural education and how it can influence or aid in positive societal integration, based on my research.

As addressing Roma poverty is a multifaceted problem, related to a complex mix of historic, economic, and social factors, designing and implementing programs to address the exclusion of Roma requires unique attention to issues of diversity, culture, and identity. Ergo, my findings relating to the first two research questions showed that although there are many identifiable similarities to the situation of the Roma and education in Romania and Spain, in terms of identifiable societal patterns, such as isolation, exclusion, and poverty, as well as general problems within education, there are also a number of noticeable, and in some cases, surprising differences. The major diversion between Romania and Spain in regards to the situation of Roma and education, has to do with making a concluded understanding from either a *policy perspective* or a *multiculturalist perspective*. As Romania is considerably poorer than Spain, noted from the differences in their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (World Bank 2012), I would have expected that the situation of Roma overall, as well as in education, would be worse but in fact although health, employment, and poverty levels are about the same in both countries, the situation of education, shown by academic level, is quite different. There is a significantly higher drop-out rate for Spanish Roma between primary and secondary school, and Romanian Roma are about six times more likely to complete secondary education or beyond (Fundación Secretariado Gitano 2009). Also there is a significantly higher percentage of the Spanish Roma population with no studies, almost double that of Romanian Roma (Ibid). Furthermore, although research shows that academic support through financial incentives, allowing even the poorest Roma to attend school with necessary nutrition and materials, is highly demanded and important (COE 2011b; COE 2008a; Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005), only Romania has made steps to include these. Therefore from a *policy perspective* it seems that the situation of Roma and

education in Romania is far better off, as much more attend and succeed in the system and there are comprehensive plans to aid this. But this doesn't take into account the quality of the education, and its attention to diversity, the *multiculturalist perspective*, which relates to the second research question. Whereas Romania is noted to still have overtly racist textbooks in circulation, Spain seems to have a slightly more comprehensive idea of multiculturalism. Spain's Royal Decree, which established the minimum requirements for primary education, is composed of detailed ways to promote attention to diversity and the contribution of diverse cultures to the Spanish society, and their teacher training objectives are also similarly developed (COE 2010a). Differently Romania tends to focus on intercultural communication, but is much less specific about the benefits of including and protecting diverse cultures in societal institutions. So although Romania may have more Roma in, and completing school, perhaps the programs and classes are not as developed, in terms of following multicultural educational standards, as Spain, therefore understanding the situation of multicultural education policies for the Roma's academic success is difficult, due to the two countries divergence from a *policy and a multiculturalist perspective*.

These disparities perhaps originate from the difference in socio-political history and make-up. Post-communist countries of Eastern Europe, such as Romania, have had more experience relying on a strong state with more reliable access to social institutions, accounting for more Roma attending and completing school, versus Spanish Roma, who have been used to historical exclusion from social institutions perhaps see no need to infiltrate them (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). Also, post-communist countries tend to have more trouble acknowledging difference in the public sphere because of the old fear that these groups would gain too much power and over-throw the state or side with enemies of the state (Bertelsmann Stiftung 2009), versus Spain, who has always made ethnic divisions clear, whether they be negatively or positively promoted (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005), perhaps explaining the different levels of attentiveness to diversity inclusion. In Romania's defense, reforms for EU succession focused on the implementation of anti-discrimination legislation to raise public awareness of difference and tolerance of the Roma (COE 2005) as well as their breadth of developments in terms of awareness raising through media. Also, Romania's efforts to include the Roma in various initiatives as well as in role model positions in education are very commendable, and

from the information, Spain has yet to address this. Regardless, the above findings hopefully allow one to begin to understand the situation of the Roma and education on a European scale, painting a picture of different situational challenges and advantages in Eastern and Western European countries.

Although the claim that multicultural education can be the beginnings of a foundation for positive societal integration, the third research question, can be criticized as lacking the adequate research and proof of its possible potential, I think the ideals of multicultural education could do no more wrong than the injustices already present in Romania and Spain's socially exclusive societies. Furthermore, organizations such as the World Bank, UNESCO, and the Council of Europe have highlighted the benefits of education in improving the situation of the Roma, and although they do not always use the term "multicultural education", they actively express the need for an educational institution which allows groups to maintain their cultural wealth, as well as become an integral part of the larger society (Orenstein, Ringold, & Wilken 2005; UNESCO 2005; COE 2012a). Previously addressed, education also has the power to highlight what's important in society, a social process which allows for members of the society to make sense of problems, issues, and possible solutions through imagery and story telling (Christiansen, Jorgensen & Wiener 1999; Stoker & Chhotray 2009). Ergo, in order to create social change, whether it be in the shape of policies or other reforms, it is essential that the problem or conflict is presented in a way that is of relevance to the society as "[s]ocial movements require motivating people to recognize that a problem exists, to accept the possibility of its being solved, and to regard a certain line of action as being likely to produce this result" (Griswold 2008, p. 111). Therefore, I venture to argue that, education can produce the environment and tools necessary for social change and aid in the positive societal integration of the Roma. For example, if this social framing persuades countries' authorities to work on some of the societal barriers Roma face, it might actually change, not only their situation, but also, in turn, the mainstream societal perception of Roma. Although education itself cannot protect the Roma's cultural and identity rights, on a legal scale, it can on a social scale, where people learn about others through interactions in environments, fostering intercultural sharing and development, and since people are the players in the government and policy game, shaping the players, through education, will inevitably, shape the game.

To further obscure the complexities of Roma inclusion, the various Roma groups in Romania and Spain, and around Europe as a whole, have very little contact with each other, keeping them isolated from each other and hindering the social capital possibilities of collaboration and communication (Orenstein, Ringold & Wilkens 2005). The World Bank has hinted at the fact that some form of communication standardization, perhaps through language instruction, might address this issue (Ibid), but there are many problematic concerns with the actual implementation of this, especially if one recognizes language's role in culture creation and preservation and the power it holds societally (Stoker & Chhotray 2009). Therefore the Roma "face a fundamental dilemma: to remain a Gypsy in the face of the new policy of assimilation, they must organize; but organizing to deal with non-Gypsies means learning to use their tools (such as association with presidents, treasures, secretaries, and so on), which in turn means accepting values and ways of doing things that modify life-styles" (Liégeois 2005, p. 167). But, as stated earlier, the Roma do account for the largest minority in Europe, so they have major potential to fight injustices, such as the ones presented in education, if they band together and elevate their social capital potential. However the process of achieving this balance, has skeptics wondering if there can be any "middle way between the policies of rejection and assimilation" since there seems to be no "happy medium between the myth of the handsome Gypsy and then ominous nomad" (Liégeois 2005, p. 164). Also, as earlier discussed, Roma identity seems to be most understandable through the opposition of polar spheres, where Roma perceive what they are, by what they are not (Tajfel & Turner 1979). Therefore the polarization between complete assimilation or complete rejection seems to fit quite well with these cultural polarities, and perhaps the undertaking of this balanced "happy medium" of autonomy and integration can be achieved through cultural awareness development through multicultural education ideals, not only in the mainstream societies of Romania and Spain, but also within the Roma communities themselves.

Dealing with multiculturalism is not easy. Conflict is a central characteristic of divided societies, such as Romania and Spain (Choudhry 2008; Parekh 2000; Griswold 2008), naturally allowing cultures to accept and realize a range of other cultures and neglect, marginalize and suppress others (Parekh 2000). Therefore, the heart of conflict is rooted in culture and cultural differences, because the perception and interpretation of the world can be so different depending

on different cultural identifiers (Huntington cited in Griswold 2008). In addition, as social constructivism states that these world perceptions are subject to constant change through social relations, the differences between groups will also manifest endlessly (Griswold 2008) and thus difference will always be a present characteristic in the society. Therefore, in order for a society to direct itself towards multiculturalism's ideals, the recognition of cultural differences and identities needs to be approached in a way, which acknowledges this evolution (Griswold 2008). Achieving this is difficult, and challenges many state-centric, traditional concerns of recognizing societal difference. Based on a state-centric perspective, the supporting of difference in the public sphere confronts the survival of the nation-state through its homogeneity and cohesion through likeness (Parekh 2000). But this view of similarity and likeness within the nation-state also opens the possibility of the state to become an instrument of injustice and oppression (Parekh 2000). Therefore in order peacefully deal with multi-ethnic societies, I argue their different histories and contexts need to be acknowledged, ideally through a more adequate legal framework, one that moves beyond the simplistic idea that what is useful for one group may be applicable to another, and instead suggests that communities and groups have claims to different rights and therefore need separate legal provisions and unique supports (Ibid; Pattern 2008).

Regardless, not only have I found that education development and reform evaluation is complex and complicated, but also that coupled with an attempted analysis of the Roma and societal inclusion and integration, which is deeply rooted in historical, socio-economic, and political circumstances, adds another hazy barrier to adequately understanding. Perhaps, trying to fully answer my thesis research questions was "biting off more than I could chew", to use the common American saying, trying to address a situation with so many complex cultural, historical, and political influences, without any personal expertise or experience in the given areas. The sections dissecting Roma culture and identity, the evaluation of the included projects, as well as the connection between multicultural education and integration and the discussion to whether that is really desirable, require further research and could be more developed, in order to fully grasp the entire situational picture. With that said, my thesis is meant to represent the beginnings of a space to continue dialogue on an up and coming European topic. On the other hand, these topics are neither entirely new nor un-researched and renowned organizations have brought to the public attention, the same concerns regarding social exclusion, respect for cultural differences, and lack

of access to resources, like education, so I am not entirely alone in my connections and conclusions. Therefore, education highlighting Roma issues in a non-discriminatory, way coupled with solution seeking lead by, or including, Roma participants, to combat such barriers, giving young minds the ability to look at social circumstances in a multicultural perspective, can only be beneficial for both the actual economic situation of the Roma as well as their socio-political integration: "Education is a proven way out of economic despair, and there is a close correlation between low levels of education and poverty...Through education, individuals contribute to alleviating poverty, liberating both the mind and the hands to a life of dignity" (UNESCO 2005, §3). Hence, education can work to change the systemic influences making negative societal perceptions a reality.

Of course, education alone cannot solve the complexity of all noted societal issues, but its density and multifacetedness makes it able to affect and infiltrate various parts of the society at once, therefore I consider it essential to develop, and include, the ideas of multicultural education and intercultural communication, which at least have the potential to positively influence the societal integration of socially excluded groups, in this case the Roma in Romania and Spain. In fact, according to Haas, cited in Rosamond, knowledge construction is where true societal progress can be achieved (2000). Albeit the fact that Roma inclusion and education are becoming major topics in the European Community's recent debates, discussions, and publications, there is still much needed developed research around these topics, especially in terms of understanding Roma culture and identity and the benefits of education, as mainstream perspectives still seem to largely oversee this (European Parliament 2011). Furthermore, as Roma are Europe's largest and most historical minority, discussions and developments around their inclusion as a vital, recognized, and respected group, should be regarded as important and essential when addressing the human rights criteria for countries within the European Union and Europe as a whole.

Executive Summary:

The Roma are a heterogeneous group whose origins most likely trace back to the Indian Sub continent, and they make-up Europe's largest and most historical minority, an estimated 12 million. Regardless, throughout history the Roma have suffered persecution, banishment, and isolation, and tend to be widely perceived negatively, as impoverished landless travelers, taking part in various crimes, and being an overall menace to society. Romania and Spain house the largest Roma populations in the European Union (EU), and these Roma tend to live in isolated, poor areas lacking access to social services and other benefits, such as quality, sustained education. The fact that few Roma in Romania and Spain complete even secondary education, perpetuates the cycle of poverty, and also prohibits their abilities to enter other societal sectors such as employment, fueling these negative societal stereotypes.

Therefore, this thesis is meant to compare and contrast the situation of the Roma in Romania and Spain, as well as the education policies specifically for the Roma, in the last decade or so, according to the Council of Europe's expert bodies: the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), the Advisory Committee (ACFC) under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM), and the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages (ECRML), in order to grasp an overall understanding of how Roma fare in both countries' societies and educational institutions. This thesis touches upon other external, and internal factors affecting Roma group formation, actions, and wider perceptions, both inside and outside the Roma communities in Romania and Spain, from a social constructivist perspective.

The dissection of education is broken down into an understanding of the barriers faced for Roma to integrate into evenly distributed public schools, with adequate resources, as well as their access to academic support, allowing Roma without financial means, to attend school. This is followed by developed classroom content, which includes diverse perspectives and presents the Roma in non-discriminatory ways, as many older textbooks still have outwardly racist comments about the Roma. Next, I continue with language education, both in Romani mother tongue, allowing Roma culture and identity to be present in the education/public sphere, making Roma feel as valued members of the academic society, as well as language support for the Romanian and Spanish languages, so that Roma students are able to succeed in the mainstream classrooms. Lastly, I present cultural awareness measures, which take into consideration the necessity for teachers to be adequately trained in diversity management, as well as discusses the importance of broader cultural awareness raising methods in schools and in the wider society, as I assume that such progress in the society, will shape similar change in the education system, and visa versa.

Furthermore, I present these foci as important elements of multicultural education, which works to address the varying needs of diverse students in the education system, so that all cultures, perspectives, and attitudes are represented in various ways, allowing for cultures to maintain their uniqueness, but also find ways of communicating and relating with others, through what is called intercultural communication. In order to understand the challenges of incorporating diverse societal cultures in institutions, like education, I open with a discussion on Roma culture and identity, trying to scrape the surface in understanding how this group is classified, within

their group, as well as outside their group. Thus, I present the case that multicultural education can be an effective first step to dealing with the characteristic Roma exclusion from society, and other social benefits, and to positively socially integrating the Roma into the Romanian and Spanish societies. Although I am not unaware of the various challenges to understanding Roma culture, evaluating their situation, education policies, and theories of multiculturalism and integration, I do acknowledge the linkages between Roma poverty, exclusion from social services, and exclusion from the mainstream society. Ergo, I suggest that Roma research and discussion move beyond the statistics to an understanding of possible other external and internal influences, affecting their circumstantial societal actions and perceptions, and that society push to incorporate multicultural methods in education systems. The assumption, and hope, is that these ideals will shape and develop the future environments of diverse societies, where difference is recognized in the public and private sphere, and where cultural autonomy is maintained, but groups are also integral, integrated parts of society.

This thesis introduces the differences between the situation of Roma in Romania and Spain, associated education policies for Roma, as well as presents the major differences in the socio-political and economic landscapes of both countries. So, by including case study examples from Eastern and Western Europe, as well as newer and older members of the European Union (EU), one can gain a broader picture of the Roma in Europe as whole. The reader should acquire a perspective on the differences in Romania and Spain's attempts to deal with difference, publically accept or suppress diversity, as well as policies not only aimed at incorporating the Roma students in the education system, but also including Roma culture and identity in the education core, presenting students with multicultural perspectives. From there, the reader will gain an understating, not only of the multifacetedness of the Roma themselves, but also of education and its various influences from/on other societal sectors, as well as its potential to include diverse groups, such as the Roma, and work to alleviate the poverty which inevitably excludes them.

References:

Anthias, F 1997, 'Anti-racism, Multiculturalism and Struggles for a Multicultural Democracy' in *European Citizenship and Social Exclusion*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, England.

BBC 2009, 'Roma Holocaust Victims Speak Out', *BBC* 23 January 2009, viewed March, 2012, <<http://news.bbc.co.uk>>.

Belton, B 2005, *Gypsy and Traveler Ethnicity The Social Generation of an Ethnic Phenomenon*, Routledge, Oxford.

Bernard, J 2012, 'A place to learn: Lessons from research on learning environments', UNESCO Institute for Statistics, Montreal, Canada.

Bertelsmann Stiftung 2009, *BTI 2010 Romania Country Report*. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann Stiftung, Romania.

Chhotray, V and Stoker, G 2009, *Governance Theory and Practice A Cross-Disciplinary Approach*, Palgrave Macmillan, USA.

Choudhry, S 2008, 'Bridging comparative constitutional law: Constitutional design in divided societies' in Choudhry, S (Ed.), *Constitutional design for divided societies: Integration of Accommodation?*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Christiansen, T and Jorgensen, K E, and Wiener, A 1999, 'The Social Construction of Europe', *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 528-44.

Council of Europe (COE) 2012a, Who We Are Council of Europe in Brief, Council of Europe, viewed February, 2012, <<http://www.coe.int/aboutCoe/index.asp?page=quisommesnous&l=en>>.

Council of Europe (COE) 2012b, The Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention For the Protection of National Minorities, viewed February, 2012, <http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/2_Monitoring/ACFC_Intro_en.asp>.

Council of Europe (COE) 2012c, The European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages About the Charter, viewed February, 2012, <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/minlang/aboutcharter/default_en.asp>.

Council of Europe (COE) 2012d, Council of Europe Committee of Ministers Resolution Res(2002)8 on the statute of the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance, viewed March 2012 <http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/ecri/about/ECRI_statute_en.asp>.

Council of Europe (COE) 2011a, *Third report submitted by Romania Pursuant to Article 25, Paragraph 2 of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities*, Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2011b, *ECRI Reports on Spain (fourth monitoring cycle)*, European

Commission against Racism and Intolerance, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2011c, *Third periodical report presented to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe in accordance with Article 15 of the Charter SPAIN*, The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2010a, *Third report submitted by Spain pursuant to Article 25, Paragraph 2, of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities*, Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2010b, *Initial periodical report presented to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe in accordance with Article 15 of the Charter Romania*, European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2008a, *Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities Second Opinion on Spain*, Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2008b, *Application of the Charter in Spain 2nd monitoring cycle*, The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2008c, *Recommendation RecChL (2008)5 of the Committee of Ministers on the application of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages by Spain*, The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2007, *Resolution CM/ResCMN(2007)8 on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities by Romania*, Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2006a, *Comments of the government of Romania on the second opinion of the Advisory Committee on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities in Romania*, Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2006b, *Third Report on Romania*, European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2006c, *Third Report on Spain*, European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2005, *Second Opinion on Romania*, Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2004, *Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities Comments of the government of Spain on the opinion of the Advisory Committee on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities in Spain*, Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 2003, *ECRI report on Spain (second monitoring cycle)*, European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe (COE) 1995, *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and explanatory report*, Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Strasbourg.

Dai, Xiao-Dong 2009, 'Intercultural personhood and identity negotiation', *The Free Library*, 01 April 2009, viewed 13 March 2012 <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Intercultural_personhood_and_identity_negotiation.-a0215410902>.

European Council in Copenhagen 1993, Conclusions of the Presidency, European Council, viewed February, 2012, <<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=DOC/93/3&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>>.

European Parliament 2011, *Roma: binding EU standards to integrate Europe's largest minority*, European Parliament News, Brussels.

Fundación Secretariado Gitano (Ed.) 2009, *Health and the Roma Community, analysis of the situation in Europe, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Greece, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain*, EFXINI POLI Local Authorities for Social, Cultural, Tourist, Environmental and Agricultural Development, Greece.

Griswold, W 2008, *Cultures and Societies in a Changing World Third Edition*, Pine Forge Press SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Hix, S 2005, *The Political System of the European Union*, PALGRAVE, Hampshire and New York.

Jandt, F E 2007, *Intercultural Communication*, Sage Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, California.

Judah, B 2011, 'Invisible Roma', *Moment*, July/August, p. 41-49.

Kaser, K 2008, *Patriarchy after Patriarchy (Studies on South East Europe)*, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, Berlin and Wien.

Kratochvil, P and Tulmets, E 2010, *Constructivism and Rationalism in EU External Relations: The Case of the European Neighborhood Policy*, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft Mbh & Co KG, Baden, Germany.

Kymlicka, W 2008, 'The Internationalization of Minority Rights' in Choudhry, S (Ed.), *Constitutional design for divided societies: Integration of Accommodation?*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Liégeois, J 2005, *Gypsies An Illustrated History*, Saqi Books, West Grove, London.

Macgarry, J, O'leary, B and Simeon, R 2008, 'Integration or accommodation? The Enduring debate in conflict regulation' in Choudhry, S (Ed.), *Constitutional design for divided societies: Integration of Accommodation?*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Macias Leon, A 2007, *International migrations of Roma population from Romania within the context of enlargement of the E.U.*, PhD thesis, Universidad Pública de Navarra, Spain.

McKee, A, 2003, 'What is textual analysis?' in: McKee, A (ed.), *Textual Analysis*, SAGE Publications, London.

Open Society Institute 2002, The Situation of Roma in Spain, Open Society Institute Monitoring the EU Accession Process: Minority Protection, viewed May, 2012,
<<http://www.romadecade.org/files/downloads/General%20Resources/EUMAP%20Roma%20in%20Spain%202002.pdf>>

Orenstein, D, Ringold, D and Wilkens, E 2005, *Roma in an Expanding Europe Breaking the Poverty Cycle*, The World Bank, Washington DC.

Parekh, B 2000, *Rethinking Multiculturalism Culture Diversity and Political Theory*, First United Kingdom publication Macmillan Press Ltd, Great Britain.

Pattern, A 2008, 'Beyond the dichotomy of universalism and differences: Four responses to cultural diversity' in Choudhry, S (Ed.), *Constitutional design for divided societies: Integration of Accommodation?*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Pildes, R H 2008, 'Ethnic Identity and Democratic Institutions: A dynamic perspective' in Choudhry, S (Ed.), *Constitutional design for divided societies: Integration of Accommodation?*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ragin, C C and Amoroso L M 2011, *Constructing Social Research*, Pine Forge Press, Thousand Oaks, California.

Risse, T 2009, 'Social Constructivism and European Integration' in Wiener, A and Diez, T (Eds.), *European Integration Theory*, PALGRAVE, Hampshire and New York.

Rosamond, B 2000, 'Europe and the World: Contemporary International Theory and European Integration' in Rosamond, B, *Theories of European Integration*, PALGRAVE, Hampshire and New York.

Tajfel, H and Turner, J C 1979, 'An integrative theory of intergroup conflict' in Austin, W G and Worchel S (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, Brooks/Cole, Monterey, California.

UNESCO 2006, *EFA Global Monitoring Report: Strong foundations, early childhood care and education*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Place de Fontenoy, France.

UNESCO 2005, *UNESCO and the Right to Education*, United National Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Place de Fontenoy, France.

van Berkel R 1997, 'Urban Integration and Citizenship. Local Policies and the Promotion of Participation' in Roche, M and van Berkel R (Eds.), *European Citizenship and Social Exclusion*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, England.

World Bank 2012, GDP (current US\$), World Bank national accounts data, and OECD National Accounts data files, viewed May, 2012,
<<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD>>.

Appendix A: [Information about the Council of Europe's expert bodies used]

(1) European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI):

The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), was adopted in October 1993 and works to generally “combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance in greater Europe from the perspective of the protection of human rights” (COE 2012a). It monitors its member states by evaluating the situation and effectiveness of their legislations and policies, formulates recommendations, and proposes steps for further action (Ibid).

ECRI uses a “country-to-country” approach analyzing the situation and degrees of racism and intolerance in each of the signed 47 Council of Europe member countries on “equal footing” with an understanding of possible outside factors and the “cultural uniqueness” that each country possesses. Therefore, recommendations can respect the individuality of a given country, as an independent entity, and take into consideration their particular interests and given challenges (COE 2012a).

A country's situation is monitored and evaluated through best practices, based on ECRI's recommendations, where they are judged on their acceptance and compliance of ECRI's Twelve General Policy Recommendations (GPRs). A country is seen as taking ECRI's suggestions seriously if noted issues/problems are acknowledged by states (acceptance) and measures are put into action with effective implementation and evaluation (compliance) (COE 2012a). The GPRs holding importance to this research are: ECRI General Policy Recommendation N°3: Combating racism and intolerance against Roma/Gypsies; ECRI General Policy Recommendation N°10: Combating racism and racial discrimination in and through school education; and ECRI General Policy Recommendation N°13: Combating anti-Gypsyism and discrimination against Roma.

ECRI has released three reports (beginning in 1999-2006) for Romania and four reports (beginning in 1999-2011) for Spain, which are generally published around every 4 years (COE 2012a). ECRI's reports are compiled from information provided mostly by non-state actors (i.e.: Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), interest groups, private organizations, etc.) and on the ground reports, although there is room for state bodies to issue responses, which are published in the report Annexes. Since ECRI's recommendations for action are only in the form of best practices, they have no legally binding power (COE 2012d).

More information about the ECRI can be found at:

http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/ecri/default_en.asp

(2) Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM):

Likewise, the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM), adopted in 1994 and put into action February 1995, aims “to specify the legal principles which states undertake to respect [and] ensure the protection of national minorities” (COE 1995). Although all 47 Council of Europe’s member states have signed, Luxembourg, Belgium, Iceland, and Greece have not ratified and therefore are not held liable for reporting recommendations or legal responsibilities. Both Romania and Spain have signed and ratified, and are therefore held to these legal responsibilities based on the FCNM’s recommendations.

The Advisory Committee (ACFC) under the FCNM is responsible for providing a detailed analysis, on the practices and situations of minority legislation, by adopting country-specific opinion reports. These reports are created to help influence the Committee of Ministers’ decisions in resolution solutions, and in the past have been noted to do so (COE 1995). Also, because the FCNM works with, and influences, the Committee of Ministers, a juridical body, it is the first legally binding Council of Europe expert body (Ibid).

Reports are generally released on a five-year cycle, and there are three noted reporting cycles for Romania (beginning in 1999-2011), but only the Third State Report is available, whereas the Opinion, Comments, and Resolution reports are not yet published, and I have used the Opinion, Comments, and Resolution reports from the second reporting cycle in this thesis. There are also three reporting cycles for Spain (beginning in 2000-2010), but, like Romania, only the Third State Report is available and therefore I have also used information from the second reporting cycle.

The Advisory Committee for the Framework Convention (ACFC) gathers its reporting information for the FCNM, through solely state reports, although there is room for dialogue from non-state actors, published in the opinion and comment reports, and are considered before actual law-binding resolutions by the Committee of Ministers, are formed (COE 2012b).

More information about the FCNM and the ACFC can be found at:

http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/default_en.asp

(3) European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages (ECRML):

The European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages (ECRML), which was drafted in 1992 but entered into force in August 1998, has been signed at ratified by only 25 of the 47 Council of Europe’s member states, and signed, but not yet ratified, by an addition 8 members. It was signed in 2001 by Spain, but while Romania began the ratification process in 2002 it wasn’t until 2007 that it was actually finalized (COE 2012c). The ECRML considers it Europe’s duty to protect its diverse heritage, and one way this is accomplished is through the protection of language. The ECRML “covers regional and minority languages, non-territorial languages and less widely used official languages”, however it does not state that the development of the above should in any way compete or obstruct the learning of member countries’ official languages

(Ibid). The charter defines *regional or minority languages* as “languages traditionally used within a given territory of a state by nationals of that state who form a group numerically smaller than the rest of the state’s population; they are different from the official language(s) of that state, and they include neither dialects of the official language(s) of the state nor the languages of migrants”. Differently, *non-territorial* languages are ones “used by nationals of the state which differ from the language(s) used by the rest of the state’s population but which, although traditionally used within the state’s territory, cannot be identified with a particular area thereof” (Ibid).

The ECRML evaluates the situation of language through states’ application of policies, legislation, and practice, which adhere to the ECRML’s Eight Fundamental Principals: (1) The recognition of regional or minority languages as an expression of cultural wealth; (2) The respect for the geographical area of each regional or minority language; (3) The need for resolute action to promote such languages; (4) The facilitation and/or encouragement of the use of such languages, in speech and writing, in public and private life; (5) The provision of appropriate forms and means for the teaching and study of such languages at all appropriate stages; (6) The promotion of relevant transnational exchanges; (7) The prohibition of all forms of unjustified distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference relating to the use of a regional or minority language and intended to discourage or endanger its maintenance or development; and (8) The promotion by states of mutual understanding between all the country’s linguistic groups (COE 2012c).

The ECRML monitors the above situation in three-year cycles, and has issued one report for Romania (in 2010) and the Committee of Experts’ evaluation report as well as the Committee of Ministers’ recommendation report are not yet available. Differently, there are three reporting cycles conducted for Spain (beginning in 2002-2010), but the third Committee of Experts’ evaluation report and the Committee of Ministers’ recommendation report are also not available (COE 2012c).

Like the FCNM, ECRML also gathers its information from mostly state reports, and has some legally binding properties, but the examination of the state report may include on-site visits, as well as supplementary information from non-state actors.

More information about the ECRML can be found at:

http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/minlang/default_en.asp