Decade Working Group on Indicators

A Progress Report

Martin Kahanec

Decade of Roma Inclusion

XIII. International Steering Committee Meeting

Budapest, February 26, 2008

DECADE OF
ROMA
INCLUSION
2005-2015

Background

- Decade is a commitment framework which implies monitoring and progress reporting

- DecadeWatch looked at inputs, due to lack of outcome data on Roma

- Unless this lack is addressed, Governments will not be able to report on progress in 2015, unable to prove or disprove the successes

Objective

- Propose a mechanism to allow Decade countries to track and report on the results of Roma inclusion policies in 2015 – measure changes in the lives of people

- Propose a set of indicators covering education, employment, health and housing

- Propose data collection mechanisms

- First best and second best options

The Technical Working Group

- Formed by the Hungarian Presidency
- Experts on data and monitoring
  - Andor Urmos (Hungary)
  - Mihai Surdu (REF)
  - Csilla Kaposvári (OSI Health Program)
  - Andrey Ivanov (UNDP)
  - Gabi Hrabanova (DecadeWatch)
  - Christian Bodewig (World Bank)
  - Martin Kahanec (IZA Bonn and technical advisor to the group)

A Unifying Framework: Indicators 1

- Integration: full participation in terms of social and economic life of the broader society
- Indicator criteria:
  - measure relevant domains of the integration progress
  - general enough to capture the most relevant aspects of integration
  - feasibility and applicability given the available data or data that can be collected in the given frame.

A Unifying Framework: Indicators 2

- indicators actually or potentially affected by the efforts of the national governments, non-governmental organizations, and other actors
- Besides measuring absolute outcomes, the indicators should measure integration progress in relative terms vis-à-vis the majority population
- flexible to enable applicability in the various integration contexts across the Decade countries and,
- at the same time, international comparability

A Unifying Framework:
The First Best 1

- Three measured stages of the integration process
  - Opportunity to access a particular institution or service
  - Access provided, ability to realize a positive outcome
  - Realization provided, the chances to obtain service of good quality
- Segregation, segmentation, discrimination

A Unifying Framework:
The First Best 2

- Overall success measured at the community level:
    - expected outcome (e.g. population average earnings)
    - absolute chance to achieve a "good outcome" (e.g. 5 EUR an hour)
    - absolute chance to achieve an outcome similar to the majority. (e.g. the median earnings of the majority).
- Ratio of minority and majority chances is our key value.

A Unifying Framework: The First Best (Table)

Integration Stage	Employment	Education	Health	Housing
1. Access	LM participation	Means to attend school	Posession of health insurance, access to GPs and emergency care	Access to non-segregated housing, e.g. possibility to obtain building permit, housing credit, or buy/own land
2. Some outcome	Employment, Self-employment	Enrolment and drop-out rates	Utilization rates of medical services, screening	Legal housing in a non-segregated area
3. Good outcome	Wage, Occupational status, Promotion	Grades, PISA scores, Enrolment in adequate-quality schools (no diversion to special schools)	Vaccination, mortality and morbidity rates	Housing of good quality, Homeownership
Overall indicator	By stage using population rates. The product of the success rates in each stage to obtain the overall success measure			

A Unifying Framework: The Data Issues 1

- General lack of data
  - No indicators of ethnicity or other missing variables in the existing data
  - Where ethnicity indicated, extreme measurement error due to low self-identification.
- We suggest for the long run
  - Data collection needs to include broad measures of ethnicity, including questions on ethno-cultural background
  - Increase the awareness of the Roma of their ethnicity
  - Remove excessive restrictions on data availability

A Unifying Framework: The Data Issues 2

- We suggest for the medium run
  - Small-scale collection of dedicated data
    - dedicated mini-surveys
    - Roma boosters or ethnicity supplements in existing surveys
    - community surveys providing aggregated data for well defined Roma communities
    - custom surveys collecting data form social service recipients on voluntary basis
  - Problems
    - costs (time and money), representativeness, and subjectivity

A Unifying Framework: The Feasible Solution 1

- Can we use the first best methodology using imperfect data?

- Use existing markers of ethnicity other than self identification?

  - Language or mother tongue?

  - Religion?

  - Might help, but not very promising, same data issues as for self-identified ethnicity.

- Use measures of extreme deprivation (e.g. long term unemployment)? No, serious mis-measurement.

A Unifying Framework: The Feasible Solution 2

- Suggestion: Use geographical segregation.
  - Step 1: Define "segregated" and "integrated" neighborhoods.
    - Need a criterion. Suggestion: percent Roma population
  - Step 2:
    - measure the outcome variable of interest in segregated and integrated neighborhoods.
    - estimate the number of Roma and non-Roma in the population
    - estimate the shares of integrated Roma and non-Roma
    - estimate relative deprivation of Roma and non-Roma within segregated and integrated neighborhoods.

A Unifying Framework:
The Feasible Solution 3

- Step 3: Using these values calculate the integration measure for Roma and non-Roma and their ratio:

$$\sigma \equiv p_R / p_N = \frac{N}{R} \frac{\left(R^s p^s + R^i p^i \right)}{\left(N^s p^s + N^i p^i \right)}$$

A Unifying Framework: The Feasible Solution 4

- The most sensitive step: calculate integration within neighborhoods.
  - Option 1: Assume Roma/non-Roma equality within neighborhoods
    - pros: transparent, easy to administer
    - cons: mismeasurement (in time and across countries), some issues with policy makers incentives
  - Option 2: Estimate it
    - pros: exact measurement, perfect integration incentives.
    - cons: more difficult to administer, estimates hard to verify

Summary

- We are facing a serious measurement challenge.

- There are solutions.

  - Long term: Improve standard data

  - Medium term: Collect own data

  - Short term: A feasible and valid second best solution that reduces the measurement problem, but does not quite eliminate it