



EUROPEAN CENTRE  
FOR  
MINORITY ISSUES

**TOWARD REGIONAL GUIDELINES  
FOR THE  
INTEGRATION OF ROMS**

Narrative Report

Submitted to the

Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency

February 2004

EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR MINORITY ISSUES (ECMI) Schiffbruecke 12 (Kompagnietor Building) D-24939  
Flensburg Germany  
☎ +49-(0)461-14 14 9-0 fax +49-(0)461-14 14 9-19 e-mail: [info@ecmi.de](mailto:info@ecmi.de) internet: <http://www.ecmi.de>

**ISBN 3-00-014076-X**

**ECMI Project Summary**  
**TOWARD REGIONAL GUIDELINES**  
**FOR THE**  
**INTEGRATION OF ROMS**

**AIMS**

The purpose of the needs assessment described herein is to lay the groundwork for a set of guidelines to increase the level of integration of Roms ('Gypsies') in the general population of the Republic of Macedonia.

**RELEVANCE**

Although improvement in Roms' administrative status since 1989 and the absence of policies drafted for the purpose of excluding Roms are useful in distinguishing Macedonia from numerous other post-Communist countries, the absence of a government strategy and expertise (let alone an office) aimed at improving the lot of what remains the most disadvantaged population in one of the poorest countries of a disadvantaged region points to tremendous room for improvement not only in Macedonia, but also further afield. Additionally, efforts to date by international actors have been sporadic, and no global needs assessment had been performed prior to the current project.

**METHOD**

Focusing on four core areas (education, health, civil rights, and employment), the Project Team began by procuring the most recent domestic and international statistical data available on the position of the Romani population in Macedonia. The results of a preliminary analysis of the data were discussed in thematically organized focus groups assembled in ECMI's six Regional NGO Resource Centres around the country. Drawing on the meetings of the initial focus groups conducted in each of the core areas, an additional focus group was held on the position of Romani women and girls.

**FINDINGS**

The findings of the focus groups in the four core areas demonstrate the centrality of education in accounting for Roms' comparative disadvantage in the domains of health, civil rights, and employment, with Roms' low level of educational attainment explicable in terms of language barriers, material conditions, family dynamics, and ethnic isolation. Whereas the disadvantage of Romani women relative to Romani men in education is to be attributed primarily to marriage of girls before completion of primary school, Romani women's comparative disadvantage in the other three core areas is largely explicable in terms of differences in level of educational attainment. Moreover, lack of education within the Romani population in general forms vicious circles with incomplete enjoyment of civil rights on the one hand and with high unemployment on the other: Whereas in the former case lack of knowledge about civil rights contributes to suspicion of ongoing violations of those rights and the perception that Roms are powerless to do anything about such violations such that becoming informed is futile, in the latter case the lack of occupational qualification resulting from a low level of educational attainment makes for unemployment and thus to material conditions not conducive to the completion of education.

**FOLLOW-ON**

While the current document contains brief outlines of specific follow-on measures drawn from the proceedings of the focus groups, such initiatives could be developed most sustainably by Romani working groups formed around the four core areas. Additionally, insofar as the design of the needs assessment and the issues covered by it are broadly applicable to Macedonia's neighbours, this project could be adapted for implementation in other countries in the region.

**TOWARD REGIONAL GUIDELINES  
FOR THE  
INTEGRATION OF ROMS**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background Note .....	4
III.	Core Areas .....	10
IV.	Method.....	15
V.	Coordinating Partners.....	21
VI.	Time Frame.....	24
VII.	Focus Groups .....	26
VIII.	Conclusion.....	55
	Project Team .....	58
	ECMI Profile.....	60
	Selected Bibliography .....	62
	Statistical Appendix .....	68
	<i>Graduated primary school students according to ethnic affiliation.....</i>	<i>68</i>
	<i>Graduated secondary school students according to ethnic affiliation.....</i>	<i>80</i>
	<i>Enrolled students at institutions of higher education.....</i>	<i>81</i>
	<i>Enrolled Romani students at institutions of higher education.....</i>	<i>86</i>
	<i>Graduated students at institutions of higher education.....</i>	<i>91</i>
	<i>Graduated Romani students at institutions of higher education.....</i>	<i>96</i>
	<i>Adult population by economic activity and ethnicity.....</i>	<i>101</i>
	<i>Adult population by economic activity and ethnicity - structure.....</i>	<i>102</i>

## I. INTRODUCTION

Since their arrival in Europe roughly one thousand years ago,<sup>1</sup> Roms ('Gypsies')<sup>2</sup> have almost always (if not invariably) lived worse off than the surrounding non-Romani population. While the situation of Roms in post-Communist Eastern Europe suggests broad continuity with the Roms' past, there is nonetheless considerable variation in the state of Romani political integration across the region, with the degree to which the Romani population is integrated in the Republic of Macedonia perhaps higher than the degree to which Roms have been integrated as a distinct group anywhere and at any time. Although improvement in Roms' administrative status since 1989 and the absence of policies drafted for the purpose of excluding Roms distinguish Macedonia from numerous other post-Communist countries, however, the fact that the post-Communist period has been characterized by a continuation of the overall practice of neglect characteristic of the Yugoslav regime leaves a considerable vacuum to be filled by actors outside government.

The current document is the result of an assessment of the needs of the Romani population in the Republic of Macedonia conducted between September and November 2003. Reflected in the evaluation in general and in this report in particular is the need to attend not only to the situation of the Romani population as a whole, but also to the position of Romani women relative both to Romani men and to the non-Romani population. Any follow-on measures generated on the basis of this evaluation should also take this need into account.

The needs assessment described herein was designed with the intention that the evaluation report could serve in turn as the foundation of a strategy aimed at increasing Roms' level of integration into the society of Macedonia as a whole by equipping them with the resources needed for playing an effective role in a democratic society based on the rule of law as well as for participating successfully in a competitive labour market. Although the present document deals only with the Republic of Macedonia, where much of the organizational infrastructure necessary for a comprehensive project aimed at addressing the needs of the Romani population is already in place, the issues identified are broadly applicable to other countries in the region. This being the case, similar needs assessments could be conducted elsewhere in the region, with follow-on activities designed accordingly. Listed in order based on the apparent potential for such activities to generate positive results, the candidates for

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the timing of the event which resulted in the genesis of the group now called Roms is the subject of some controversy, as is the nature of the event itself, there is general agreement among scholars that the Roms originated somewhere (or in multiple areas) in the region of present-day northwestern India and Pakistan (see, for example, Augustini ab Hortis 1995; Bernasovský and Bernasovská 1999; Courthiade 2001; Fraser 1995; Grellmann 1787; Hancock 1991; Horváthová 1964; Jurová 2000; Kenrick 1993; Mann 1990; 2000; Marushiakova and Popov 2001; Petrovski 2000; Sinclair 1909-1910).

<sup>2</sup> Whereas 'Rom' is neutral, 'Gypsy' often has a pejorative connotation. For this reason, the latter term is used only in presenting policies and statements the declared targets of which are "Gypsies". The use throughout this document of the English plural 'Roms' rather than the Romani plural 'Roma' constitutes acceptance of Victor Friedman's (1999: 319-320 fn \*\*) assertion that "'Roma' exoticizes and marginalizes rather than emphasizing the fact that the group in question is an ethnic group" like all others, the names for which end in '-s' in the English plural.

inclusion in a regional initiative designed to increase Romani integration into the societies in which they live might include:

- Serbia and Montenegro;
- Bosnia and Herzegovina; and
- Kosovo (contingent on return of a substantial proportion of the territory's Romani population from Serbia proper, Macedonia, and elsewhere); as well as
- Albania.

While recent years have seen a considerable increase in the number of studies of Romani populations in Central and Eastern Europe, no global needs assessment has been performed to date in Macedonia. Moreover, the quality of the studies conducted elsewhere in the region varies widely. Of these studies, perhaps the best is the 2002 UNDP publication, *The Roma in Central and Eastern Europe: Avoiding the Dependency Trap*. However, although the report contains some useful data covering Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, and Romania, the document is explicitly not designed to be a source of direct policy recommendations, and the claim that "Roma face challenges similar to other ethnic groups in CEE countries" (Ivanov et al. 2002: 79) neglects a wide range of policy-relevant differences between Roms and non-Roms in the region.

While the 2002 UNDP report *The Roma in Central and Eastern Europe: Avoiding the Dependency Trap* may be the best global needs assessment performed to date in the region, the study was neither the first nor the last of its kind. Among the UNDP publication's predecessors are two studies published in 2000: Dena Ringold's report for the World Bank, *Roma and the Transition in Central and Eastern Europe*, and the High Commissioner on National Minorities' *Report on the Situation of Roms and Sinti in the OSCE Area*.

One of the better policy documents based on English-language sources (a significant limitation given that much relevant material is not published in English), the World Bank report covers Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia. Field research for the report, however, was conducted only in Hungary and Romania. Additionally, like the UNDP report, the study does not include Macedonia.

Unlike the World Bank study, the *Report on the Situation of Roma and Sinti in the OSCE Area* contains discussion of Macedonia. Nonetheless, coverage is sparse, consisting on the one hand of a few brief descriptions of problems faced by Macedonia's Romani population and on the other hand of anecdotes from Macedonia to illustrate more general points being made about the OSCE area as a whole. Moreover, the *Report* explains that while visits were undertaken in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, France, Greece, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, and the United Kingdom, the time and resources necessary for visits to many countries with considerable Romani populations were lacking (Van der Stoel 2000: 11). Thus, what little information on Macedonia the document contains is based exclusively on documentary sources.

Insofar as it draws on the author's fieldwork in Macedonia, Ina Zoon's (2001) *On the Margins: Roma and Public Services in Romania, Bulgaria, and Macedonia* constitutes a significant improvement over its predecessors. Designated on its cover as

“A Call to Action to Improve Romani Access to Social Protection, Health Care, and Housing,” Zoon’s study contains competent discussion of many aspects of two of the core areas (i.e., health and employment) addressed in the current needs assessment. At the same time, the fact that *On the Margins* does not address issues of education – the area arguably most important for increasing Roms’ level of integration – and civil rights means that Zoon’s study cannot be considered comprehensive, as does the report’s tendency to focus on a single Romani settlement in Skopje. Finally, the recommendations presented at the end of the work are extremely general, applying broadly to all three countries covered by the study without taking national particularities into account.

The most recent multi-country report published on Roms is the 2003 World Bank publication *Roma in an Expanding Europe: Breaking the Poverty Cycle*. Prepared for the World Bank and the Open Society Institute’s summer 2003 conference on Roms, the report covers the Slovak Republic, Romania, Hungary, and Spain. As was true of the previous World Bank report, this one is based almost exclusively on English-language sources and does not cover Macedonia. Further, while the report is to be praised for its nuanced account of the multifaceted nature of poverty among Roms, the repeated appearance of variations on the thesis that “the histories of African and indigenous peoples in the Americas offer more parallels to that of Roma than other national minorities in Europe” (Ringold, Orenstein, and Wilkens 2003: 7) does not attend sufficiently to the particularities of Romani history and to their role in explaining the current state of affairs.

Beyond the multi-country studies reviewed above, UNICEF has commissioned three reports which focus on Roms in Macedonia. The first of these, *Situation Analysis of Roma Women and Children*, was published in 1999 on the basis of a survey conducted in 1996 (Aloui, Petroska-Beshka, and Najchevska 1999). Based on carefully designed field research conducted in nine municipalities located throughout the country, the report is of excellent quality and contains useful findings on the situation of Romani women and children. While the report accomplishes its task effectively, however, it cannot be considered a global needs assessment.

Research for the second and third UNICEF (Lakinska-Popovska 2001a; 2001b) reports was conducted in 1999 and 2000, resulting in the publications *Vulnerability of Roma Children in the Municipality of Shuto Orizari* and *Vulnerability of Roma Children in the Dispersed Roma Communities in Skopje*. Like the *Situation Analysis*, the two later reports are well researched and of excellent quality. Also like the *Situation Analysis*, neither is a global needs assessment, as both reports focus exclusively on parts of Skopje.

## **II. BACKGROUND NOTE**

### **ROMS IN MACEDONIA BEFORE 1945**

Owing to the fragmentary nature of available data, little is known about the exact timing of the arrival of Roms on the land that is now the Republic of Macedonia. Although scholarly estimates range from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century (see, for example, Kenrick 1993: 44; Mujić 1952-1953: 141; Petrović 1980: 55; Puxon 1974: 81; Stojanovski 1989: 130-131; Soulis 1961: 161; Zirojević 1981: 225), the wide variation in the estimates still leaves no room for assertions that Roms are recent arrivals in the Balkans. It is also clear that Roms have not been simply passing through the region for the last several centuries, as available evidence suggests that there were relatively few nomadic Roms in the Ottoman province within which Macedonia was located as early as the first quarter of the sixteenth century (Stojanovski 1989: 141; also see Mujić 1952-1953: 155-157). Further, coexistence between Roms and non-Roms in the region has generally been peaceful, with the persecution of Roms common in other parts of Europe rare in the Balkans. Thus, insofar as most of Macedonia's Romani population survived the Second World War, Roms on the territory at the time of Macedonia's entry into the People's Federal Republic of Yugoslavia constituted a population firmly embedded in the ethnic landscape.

### **YUGOSLAV AND MACEDONIAN EXCEPTIONALISM**

Following the pattern outlined in Stalin's writings and put into practice in much of Eastern Europe, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia distinguished among "nations" (or "peoples"), "nationalities" (or "national minorities"), and "ethnic groups" (cf. Stalin 1942a: 12, 65; 1942b: 117). The distinctions among groups corresponded to rights accorded the groups in question: Whereas nations (with the exception of Muslims) were entitled to their own republics and the elevation of their languages to official status at the federal level, nationalities were guaranteed linguistic and cultural rights in the republics of their residence (Kovačec 1991: 46). As an autochthonous population exhibiting "a historical mortgage of nomadism," on the other hand, Roms fell into the category "ethnic group", the realization of the rights of which was not generally regulated (Devetak 1988: 42, 58 fn 2; Kovačec 1991: 46-47; Škiljan 1988: 67; also see Reemstma 1995: 9).

Unique insofar as it never treated Roms as a problem, "Yugoslavia [was], arguably, the most progressive of states with regard to treatment of Gypsies" (Lockwood 1986: 63). In contradistinction to their counterparts elsewhere in Eastern Europe, Yugoslav authorities neither commissioned special studies nor designed special policies for Yugoslavia's Romani population. From the beginning of Communist rule, Yugoslavia was unique in not attempting to force permanent settlement on its Romani population (Fraser 1995: 282; Lockwood 1986: 63). The absence of a sedentarization policy allowed widespread migration of Roms into the more industrialized northern republics of Croatia and Slovenia (Fraser 1995: 282). Nonetheless, the largest concentrations of Roms in Yugoslavia remained in Serbia and Macedonia.

If Yugoslavia was the most progressive of the East European regimes where Roms were concerned, Macedonia was in some important respects a Yugoslavia within Yugoslavia. In particular, the construction and settlement of Šuto Orizari in the 1960s

can be viewed as the beginning of a gradual process of cultural emancipation.<sup>3</sup> Built after the earthquake of 1963 that destroyed most of Topaana, Skopje's medieval Romani quarter, on what had previously been grazing lands outside Skopje, Šuto Orizari began as a barrack-style settlement two kilometres from the older settlement. The first families moved into Šuto Orizari in March of 1964, with land and construction grants given to Roms who had lost their homes in Topaana as a result of the earthquake (Puxon 1976: 129). Over time, business and commercial installations were constructed, followed by paved streets, parks, and an influx of Romani families from elsewhere in Macedonia and from Serbia. As a result of administrative redistricting in 1996, Šuto Orizari became the world's first Romani-majority municipality.

Following the first use of the term 'Rom' in an official capacity in the census of 1971 came a series of "sporadic attempts" at developing Romani cultural rights which stretched into the 1980s (Friedman 1999: 327). Whereas publications in Romani began to appear in the 1970s, radio and television broadcasts in Romani began in the early 1980s. In education, the Romani language was first taught in state schools in 1983, first in Kosovo, and later in the West Macedonian city of Tetovo (Poulton 1991: 89; Silverman 1995: 45; cf. Poulton 1993: 42; Škiljan 1988: 111). As will become clearer from the discussion of demographic politics below, Yugoslav authorities' choice of largely Albanian-inhabited areas for the extension of cultural rights to Roms in the form of broadcast time and education in Romani was no coincidence.

#### **DEMOGRAPHIC POLITICS**

The Yugoslav regime's unusually progressive policy toward the Romani population seems to have stemmed at least in part from a desire to prevent Roms from identifying with other Muslim populations, particularly the Albanian population, which "asserts assimilatory pressures on smaller Muslim groups whose identities are in a state of flux" (Poulton 1998: 15; also see Ramet 1992: 196-197). Between the censuses of 1971 and 1981, the size of the Albanian population of Macedonia increased by 36% (Bubevski 1985). According to the Macedonian demographer Dušan Bubevski (1985: 540, 544), this change was primarily the result of natural population growth rather than of migration or of changes in ethnic affiliation. That Macedonian authorities viewed the growth of Albanian population as problematic is demonstrated by the Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts' 1985 publication of an edited volume entitled *Problems of Demographic Development in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia*; whereas one contributor to this volume calls for "a systematic and active population policy" to combat differences in natality among different nationalities and ethnic groups (Bogoev 1985: 13), another warns that "[d]ifferences in the rate of natality among distinct nations and nationalities on a territory, sooner or later, can lead [...] to differences in the numerical relations among these nations and nationalities," showing potential over the long term "to lead to a drastic change in the ethnic composition of the population in a specific place and on a specific territory" (Bubevski 1985: 549).

---

<sup>3</sup> For an alternative view, see the Macedonian sociologist Ilija Aceski's (1996) *Skopje: Vision and Reality*. According to Aceski, the process of urbanization which began in Skopje in the 1960s is inseparable from a process of ghettoization, with "the high degree of concentration of some ethnic groups in only some parts" of the city indicative of "a high degree of ethnic intolerance" (Aceski 1996: 61). At the same time, Aceski observes that surroundings are for Romani and Albanian populations often more important than living conditions (Aceski 1996: 47, 128, 228 fn 18).

“While many Roma have declared themselves to be Macedonians or Turks, the former Communist authorities in Macedonia alleged over a long period that the Roma, especially the Muslims who comprise the vast majority, were being subjected to Albanianisation – the Albanians being seen by many Macedonians as the main internal threat” (Poulton 1995: 141; also see Poulton 1998: 19). In the weeks preceding the censuses of 1971 and 1981, Albanians and Turks in Macedonia encouraged Roms to register as Albanians or Turks (respectively), while Macedonians and Serbs encouraged them to register as Roms “in order to reduce the nominal percentage of Albanians in the country” (Crowe 1996: 228; also see Kenrick 2001: 413; Reemstma 1995: 13).<sup>4</sup> Comparing the size of the Romani population in Macedonia according to the census of 1971 (24 500) with the corresponding figure from the 1981 census (43 125), a high rate of growth is apparent. Whereas the growth of the ethnic Albanian population in the same period was a function of natality, however, the increase in the official size of the Romani population was primarily the result of growth in Romani ethnic consciousness, with many of the Roms who had previously declared themselves Albanians or Turks responding favourably to the Yugoslavia-wide campaign particularly strong in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia for the affirmation of a Romani ethnic community through print media, radio, and especially television (Bubevski 1985: 540).<sup>5</sup>

Another relevant effort of Yugoslav authorities to reduce the official size of the ethnic Albanian population relates to the emergence of the census category “Egyptians.” First recognized as a distinct group in 1990 by the (then-)Yugoslav state in methodological materials to be used in the 1991 census, Egyptians appear in the results of the 1991 Macedonian census in the number of 3 307 persons (Risteski 1991: 10; also see Duijzings 1997: 201). Although some scholars (see, for example, Hadži-Ristikj 1996; Kuzman 1996; Risteski 1991; Zemon 1996) have attempted to trace the Egyptian populations of the former Yugoslavia to Egypt, more plausible than such accounts is the thesis that official recognition of an Egyptian identity in Kosovo and Macedonia is the product of demographic politics. As mentioned above, authorities in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia were concerned by the tendency of some Roms to declare themselves Albanian at the census, with the tendency most

---

<sup>4</sup> In similar fashion, during the 1991 census Macedonian authorities appealed to Roms to declare themselves as such rather than Turks, Albanians, or something else out of fear or pressure (Friedman 1999: 318 fn 2).

<sup>5</sup> The drop in the official size of Macedonia’s ethnic Turkish population from 108 552 in 1971 to 86 690 in 1981 seems to reflect changes in ethnic affiliation among persons who declared themselves Albanians, Roms, or Muslims in the later census (Poulton 1989: 28). If government efforts account for much of the growth in the official size of the Romani population between the 1971 and 1981 censuses, however, Roms were not the only population so treated. Concerned about the Albanianization of the Macedonian Muslim population through the penetration of Albanian hodzhaz, Macedonian authorities established an official organization for Macedonian Muslims in order to prevent their assimilation (Poulton 1989: 29; 1998: 15). In similar fashion, acting on a fear of infiltration by Kosovo Albanians in the aftermath of the riots of April 1981 in that province, Macedonian authorities in September of 1981 commissioned a study of Macedonian Muslims in Gostivar, opened a *medresse* (Islamic school) in Skopje, and began publication of a magazine for Macedonian Muslims (Popović 1989: 280). Consequently, whereas the 1971 census had reported a Macedonian Muslim population of 1 248, the 1981 census resulted in the considerably higher figure of 38 513, with the increase probably the result of changes in declarations by Macedonian Muslims who had previously declared themselves Albanians, Turks, or Macedonians (Bubevski 1985: 538; also see Poulton 1989: 28).

pronounced among Roms who speak Albanian as their first language. As ethnic Albanians lost power in Kosovo and Macedonia during the crackdowns of the 1980s, however, Albanian ethnicity ceased to provide a means of upward social mobility, such that ethnic Albanians were no longer able to secure ethnic loyalty from smaller ethnic groups, including persons who might otherwise be identified as Albanian-speaking Roms (Duijzings 1997: 213). The official recognition of autochthonous Egyptian populations in the former Yugoslavia thus served on the one hand the interest of authorities in reducing the official Albanian population as much as possible while on the other hand allowing the members of the group to dissociate themselves from the pariah identity of the “Gypsies” (Ašuri and Zemon 1996: 13; Duijzings 1997: 213-214; Marushiakova et al. 2001: 43; Willems 1997: 2).

Whereas 24 505 residents of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia declared themselves Gypsies (*Cigani*) in the last census in which the category “Gypsy” was used (i.e., 1971), ten years later 43 125 persons declared themselves Roms in the first census in which the term ‘Rom’ was used. By the 1991 census, the number of declared Roms had grown to 52 103, dropping to 43 707 in the census of 1994 (Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia 1997, Book I).<sup>6</sup> The census of 2002, on the other hand, gives a number of 53 879, such that Roms officially constitute 2.66% of the general population (State Statistical Office 2003: 19). Finally, Druker cites figures from various sources which place the Romani population of Macedonia between 110 000 and 260 000 (Druker 1997: 23; cf. Crowe 1996: 232; European Roma Rights Center 1998: 34; Liégeois and Gheorghe 1995: 7). Informed estimates from local Romani NGOs throughout Macedonia suggest that the actual size of the Romani population is in fact at the lower end of this scale.

#### **A LEGACY OF BENIGN NEGLECT?**

Although the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia treated its Romani population better than did other East European regimes, the standard set by the other regimes was so low that treatment of Roms in Yugoslavia is perhaps still “nothing to boast about.” (Silverman 1995: 45). Indeed, according to Lazhar Aloui, Violeta Petroska-Beshka, and Mirjana Najchevska (1999: 9), the Yugoslav regime’s overall neglect of the Romani population’s socio-economic position as well as its cultural and educational needs resulted in the “non-integration of the Roma population into society in terms of their equal participation in all social structures, participation at the different decision-making levels and in the government, cultural life and economy.”

The most disadvantaged population in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Roms have retained this position in the Republic of Macedonia. While the secession of Macedonia from Yugoslavia has brought some improvements in Roms’ legal status, the independent Republic of Macedonia has continued the Socialist Republic of Macedonia’s practice of not issuing policy aimed specifically at the Romani population. As significant as it is that Roms have been recognized in the 1991 and 2001 Constitutions of the Republic of Macedonia as a group equal in status to Albanians, Turks, and Vlachs (as well as to Bosniaks and Serbs in the Constitution of

---

<sup>6</sup> The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1997: 2) attributes this decrease to “the freedom of choice that the citizens of the Roma minority enjoy when declaring their national affiliation.” Given that Roms were also free to choose their national affiliation in prior censuses, however, it is more likely that the drop in the official Romani population from 1991 to 1994 stems primarily from the decision not to count citizens resident for more than a year outside the Republic of Macedonia in the latter.

2001), the absence of a government strategy and expertise (let alone an office) aimed at improving the lot of the most marginalized population in one of the poorest countries of a disadvantaged region points to tremendous room for improvement not only in Macedonia, but also elsewhere in the region. In similar fashion, while the fact that the Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia has always included at least one Romani MP representing a Romani political party is useful in distinguishing Macedonia from other post-Communist countries, this level of representation has proven insufficient to effect change which benefits the country's Romani population as a whole.

#### **ACTIVITIES OF OTHER DONORS**

Unlike the Macedonian government, which has generally neglected Roms while it has attended to the larger and more politically active ethnic Albanian population, a considerable number of international donors with a presence in Macedonia have provided support for projects aimed at Roms. The substantial funding involved notwithstanding, most of the initiatives enacted in the country to date have suffered from the absence of a global view of the conditions in which the Romani population lives. Compounding the effects of the lack of general guidelines, there has been little coordination among donors, leading to duplication of efforts in some areas and neglect of others. Moreover, implemented projects have in many cases been designed by NGOs with tenuous connections to their target group and which propose projects only in response to donor interest. Finally, the role of Roms in directing donor support has been minimal, with only the OSCE, the Swiss Embassy, and UNHCR employing one Rom each in Skopje. Overall, there has been much dabbling in issues affecting Macedonia's Romani population, but little sustained engagement, with international donor interest decreasing as the number of Romani refugees in Macedonia fell.

Among donors in Macedonia engaged in work with the Romani population, the two most active have been the Macedonian Center for International Cooperation (MCIC) and the Foundation "Open Society Institute Macedonia", with USAID in recent years also supporting an increasing number of projects aimed at Roms.

Initially concentrating on building the capacity of Romani NGOs, MCIC launched the programme "Applied Education for Young Roma" in 2001. Slated to run through 2004, the programme consists of four components:

- Consciousness-raising through financial support to selected Romani NGO projects;
- Training on vocational skills for Romani youth and on tolerance for educators;
- Lobbying of state and international organs to initiate policies directed at the promotion of education among Roms; and
- Providing information on the educational situation of the Romani population.

In addition to this programme, MCIC supports various programs involving Roms without targeting the Romani population as such. Among these are the citizens' advisement centres run by the Gostivar-based Romani NGO "*Mesečina*".

Since the mid 1990s, the Foundation "Open Society Institute Macedonia" (FOSIM) has granted financial support to projects carried out by Romani NGOs in the areas of primary and secondary education. Additionally, FOSIM has provided funding for mentorship and scholarship programs for secondary and university students. Among the most successful FOSIM-supported projects aimed at Roms in Macedonia is the

Centre for Social Initiatives “*Nadež*” (which has also been financed at various times by several other donors, including Caritas-Essen (Germany), the King Baudouin Foundation (Belgium), UNICEF, Forum Civil Peace Social Service (Germany), and SOS Kinderdorf International (Germany)). Located in Šuto Orizari, *Nadež* organizes educational activities for approximately 200 Romani children and youth. As a result of the shift in focus of George Soros’ funding activities to the former Soviet Union, however, FOSIM has been forced to downscale its Romani programmes, leaving vacant FOSIM’s role as a clearinghouse for projects targeting Roms.

Through its NGO partners, USAID has channelled considerable funds toward Romani projects. In terms of volume, the Community Self-Help Initiative (CSHI) and the Confidence-Building Initiative (CBI) stand out. Whereas the former has funded vocational training, infrastructure projects, and social and educational activities through local Romani NGOs with various levels of organizational capacity, the latter has supported mostly cultural celebrations, along with a handful of infrastructure projects. Through the Institute for Sustainable Communities, USAID also provides support to education projects in Prilep and Šuto Orizari. Additionally, USAID funds a Romani community centre in Skopje through FOSIM and the Skopje-based NGO “*Sončogledi*”. Finally, in the framework of a non-Romani-specific microfinance programme administered by the NGO “*Možnosti*”, USAID has provided credits to approximately 30 Romani-owned businesses in five municipalities.

The effectiveness of initiatives funded by other bilateral and multilateral donors varies widely. Among bilaterally funded initiatives, the relatively small-scale projects executed by the Konrad Adenauer Foundation (providing stipends for university students) and Kvinna till Kvinna (on reproductive health) stand out for the favourable results attained in their specific areas of concentration. Multilateral donors not mentioned above which have occasionally supported projects affecting Roms in Macedonia include the OSCE, UNHCR, and the Budapest-based European Roma Rights Center.

#### **LIKELY FUTURE INITIATIVES**

1. *USAID*. Beyond its activities discussed above, USAID is presently considering undertaking other, larger initiatives aimed at Macedonia’s Romani population. As of late 2003, the form and scope of these initiatives had not yet been defined.
2. *The World Bank*. The summer 2003 World Bank-Open Society Institute conference “Roma in an Expanding Europe: Challenges for the Future” marked the official launch of what George Soros and James D. Wolfensohn christened a “Decade of the Roma”. Given that the Decade is not slated to begin until 2005, however, it is still too early to know what kinds of measures will be implemented. Clear in any case is that any support provided through the World Bank will be channelled through the Macedonian government.
3. *The Project on Ethnic Relations*. In early 2004, the US-based NGO Project on Ethnic Relations will initiate a consultative process bringing together senior Romani leaders and members of the Macedonian government. The goal of this process is to produce a government strategy on Roms.

### III. CORE AREAS

Following on extensive background research and consultations with local stakeholders in the course of preparing the project, four core areas were chosen for the purposes of the needs assessment:

- Education;
- Health;
- Civil rights; and
- Employment.

While each of these areas constitutes a distinct set of needs requiring consideration in its own right, the core areas are listed in order of priority. Further, as will become apparent from the findings of the focus groups, deficiencies in the core area of highest priority – education – go far toward explaining Roms' comparative disadvantage in the other core areas, with low educational attainment linked to the poor health, high rates of abuse, and high unemployment in the Romani population. Finally, although the need for attention to the position of Romani women and girls is clear, the issues pertaining to the female Romani population in particular manifest themselves in the same core areas affecting the Romani population in general.

#### **CORE AREA 1: EDUCATION**

##### EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

As is true elsewhere in the region, Roms in Macedonia have the lowest primary school enrolment rates and the highest dropout rates. According to the most recent census data available, 24% of Roms older than fifteen are illiterate (compared to an overall illiteracy rate of 6% in the general population) (Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia 1997, Book VII).<sup>7</sup> The same census indicated illiteracy among Romani women to be considerably higher, at approximately 36%.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, according to this census 30% of Roms in Macedonia have not completed primary education, 33% have only primary education, and 9% have completed secondary education, with 0.35% having finished some form of post-secondary education.

In the 2001-2002 academic year, Romani children accounted for 1.7% of all children enrolled in primary school but approximately 3% of the total population in Macedonia between the ages of five and fourteen (i.e., the ages of primary school attendance), placing Romani attendance well below the state-wide average of 84% (World Bank 1999: 37). Reasons for low school attendance among Roms include not only the direct costs associated with sending children to school (e.g., books, supplies, transportation, and fees), but also the opportunity cost of so doing instead of sending the children to earn money through work (e.g., selling consumer goods) or begging.

The gap between the Romani population and the general population widens considerably at the level of secondary education: Comprising approximately 3% of children aged fifteen to nineteen (i.e., the ages of secondary school attendance), Roms

---

<sup>7</sup> With the exception of the size of the Romani population (presented on page 7 above), data of relevance for this report from the 2002 census is not expected to be released before June 2004. This being the case, the most recent available census data comes from 1994. Where no specific publication is cited, statistical data presented in this report was acquired directly from the State Statistical Office.

<sup>8</sup> A UNICEF survey conducted in 1996 found that 46% of adult female respondents were unable to read or write (Aloui, Petroska-Beshka, and Najchevska 1999: 21).

accounted for 0.6% of secondary school students in the 2001-2002 academic year, placing Romani secondary school attendance at less than a quarter of the state-wide average.

In the 2002-2003 academic year, Roms comprised 0.3% of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in the Republic of Macedonia. Stated in absolute numbers, there were 134 Romani students in that year. As low as this number is, it points to significant improvement over the last decade: whereas in the 1993-94 academic year there were nine self-identified Roms enrolled at universities in the Republic of Macedonia, by the 1998-99 academic year there were 24 Roms enrolled at Macedonian universities, with enrolment reaching 40 in the 2000-2001 academic year. Also worthy of note is that women account for over half (62%) of the Romani student population.

The educational disadvantage of the Romani population in Macedonia relative to the general population is summarized in the table below.

**Table 1. Educational attainment**

<b>Highest level of education completed</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>	<b>Higher</b>
Romani population	33.06%	9.24%	0.35%
General population	33.40%	32.32%	8.70%

*Source:* Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia (1997, Book VII)

#### ROMANI EDUCATORS

In the 2000-2001 academic year, Romani primary school teachers accounted for 0.1% of all primary school teachers in the country. In secondary education, a total of two teachers of Romani ethnicity were employed during the 1992-1993 year (Aloui, Petroska-Beshka, and Najchevska 1999: 15). Finally, of the 569 professors employed at state-sponsored institutions of higher education in Macedonia in the 1997-98 academic year, 528 were ethnic Macedonians, four were Vlachs, four Turks, three Albanians, and two were Roms (Najčevska 2001: 8 fn 11).

#### CORE AREA 2: HEALTH

Although the total fertility rate for Roms in Macedonia tends to be approximately twice as high as the total fertility rate for the general population, it is also the case that the infant mortality rate for Roms is twice the statistic for the general population (Aloui, Petroska-Beshka, and Najchevska 1999: 11; Kalibova 2000: 188; UNICEF 2001). Further, adult Roms in Macedonia have a considerably lower life expectancy than do non-Roms, with Roms' share of Macedonia's total population dropping off sharply after age 40. As will be discussed in greater detail in the findings of the focus groups on health, Roms' lower life expectancy stems from a combination of poor living conditions, lack of access to healthcare, and insufficient awareness of preventive healthcare practices.

In the course of their relatively short lives, Roms are disproportionately afflicted by infectious and chronic ailments. More specifically, whereas upper respiratory diseases

are most common among Roms under age fourteen (with diarrhoea a major problem for Romani infants), Romani adults suffer frequently from high blood pressure and various types of neuroses. Early pregnancies are also a major cause of health problems for both mother and child, with approximately one quarter of girls between the ages of fifteen and nineteen in Šuto Orizari giving birth (as compared with approximately ten percent within Macedonia's general population).

Compounding pre-existing problems, the introduction of a participation fee for medical care in the state health care system has resulted in a visible drop in the frequency with which Romani patients seek medical counsel. Moreover, the range of drugs available through local producers has decreased in recent years, leading to the replacement of locally produced pharmaceuticals with more expensive foreign-produced medication. This leads in turn to poor therapy compliance for economic reasons.

Roms' high fertility rate and short lifespan combine to make the Romani population younger than the general population of Macedonia. Otherwise stated, the proportion of children is higher and the proportion of older persons is lower among Roms than within the general population.

**Table 2. Age structure**

Age	General population			Roms		
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
0-4	7.8	8.1	7.6	11.1	11.1	11.0
5-9	8.4	8.6	8.2	11.3	11.4	11.3
10-14	8.6	8.8	8.4	11.6	11.8	11.3
15-19	8.4	8.5	8.2	11.0	11.6	10.4
20-24	7.9	8.0	7.7	8.8	9.2	8.3
25-29	7.8	7.9	7.7	7.9	7.8	7.9
30-34	7.6	7.7	7.5	7.6	7.7	7.5
35-39	7.5	7.7	7.3	7.3	7.1	7.5
40-44	7.1	7.1	7.0	6.1	5.9	6.2
45-49	5.7	5.5	5.8	4.2	4.0	4.5
50-54	5.1	5.0	5.2	3.5	3.2	3.8
55-59	4.9	4.8	5.1	3.4	3.4	3.5
60-64	4.6	4.4	4.8	2.7	2.5	2.9
65-69	3.5	3.2	3.7	1.7	1.7	1.8
70-74	2.6	2.4	2.9	0.9	0.8	1.0
75-79	1.1	1.0	1.2	0.4	0.3	0.4
80-84	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.2	0.1	0.3
85-89	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1
90-94	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia (1997, Book I)

### **CORE AREA 3: CIVIL RIGHTS**

Roms are disproportionately represented among stateless persons and persons with unknown citizenship resident in the Republic of Macedonia, with the Macedonian government in 1997 reporting the presence on Macedonian territory of 4 356 stateless Roms and 7 407 Roms with unknown citizenship (out of 18 851 stateless persons and 68 989 persons of unknown citizenship) (European Roma Rights Center 1998: 29). The problems with citizenship experienced by many Roms stem in large part from the 1992 citizenship law's requirements of a source of regular income, fifteen years of legal residence in Macedonia, fluency in the Macedonian language, and administrative fees of \$50 to \$250 (depending on when the application was submitted) (Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija 1992). Whereas the requirement of a permanent source of funds has proven problematic because of high rates of unemployment, the residence requirement of fifteen years has been an obstacle for the many Roms who had never registered as residents of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia when they moved from other republics of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (many well over fifteen years earlier). The language requirement, on the other hand, excluded some young Roms returned from the West European countries where they had grown up, such that they had relatively little exposure to Macedonian. Additionally, a lack of easily accessible information on the terms of the law effectively deprived many Roms of the opportunity to apply for citizenship in time to avoid paying the higher fee associated with naturalization.

Whereas ethnically motivated violence against Roms in Macedonia seems to be a rare occurrence,<sup>9</sup> the same cannot be said of police brutality. Although ethnically disaggregated statistical data on police brutality are not available in the Republic of Macedonia,<sup>10</sup> reports by human rights monitors suggest that police are likely to beat detainees of any ethnicity, and even more likely to beat members of minorities, including Roms (European Commission against Racism and Intolerance 1999: 13; European Roma Rights Center 1998: 47 fn 67; U.S. Department of State 1999; 2000). Here, it is important to note that the geographical distribution of police brutality against Roms appears to be quite uneven, being reported more frequently in Eastern Macedonia than in Western Macedonia. Also significant is that in disputes involving Roms and ethnic Macedonians, police tend to side with the latter. (Helsinkiški komitet na čovekovi prava na Republika Makedonija 1999; U.S. Department of State 2000). While attempts to pursue redress for police brutality in Macedonia have generally been unsuccessful (as well as rare), the fact that Romani citizens aware of their rights have proven that the justice system may be used against civilian state employees even for infractions not involving physical violence points to the utility of human rights education.

Domestic violence is a taboo subject among all ethnic groups in the Republic of Macedonia, and hard data on such violence are not available. Nonetheless, insofar as domestic violence occurs within the Romani population (as it does within other ethnic groups), increased attention to the dynamics of such violence is necessary.

---

<sup>9</sup> No statistical data on ethnically motivated violence in Macedonia are available.

<sup>10</sup> The Sector for Internal Control of the Ministry of the Interior keeps statistics on police brutality, but does not record victims' ethnicity. In similar fashion, the Office of the Ombudsman does not record the ethnicity of complainants.

#### **CORE AREA 4: EMPLOYMENT**

Whereas estimates from the national Employment Bureau and the Institute of Economics indicate an overall unemployment rate of over 40% in 2002 (Nanevska 2002), a government workforce survey from the previous year estimated the unemployment rate among Roms to be 71.8% (European Commission against Racism and Intolerance 2001: 13). Additionally, a UNICEF survey conducted in 1996 found that 97.7% of Romani women surveyed lacked regular or even temporary employment (Aloui, Petroska-Beshka, and Najchevska 1999: 29).

According to the Ministry of Finance, Roms accounted for 0.7% of the employed population in the Republic of Macedonia in the year 2000. Expressed in terms of unemployment, Roms comprised 3.7% of the total number of unemployed persons registered with the Employment Office of the Republic of Macedonia in the same year. Further, Roms' share among persons unemployed for four years or longer is 4.3%.

Although ethnically based discrimination against Roms on the employment market is not unheard of, Roms' comparative disadvantage seems to be related mostly to their low level of educational attainment. Whereas 6.1% of the unemployed population in the Republic of Macedonia in 2000 had not completed at least primary education, the proportion of unemployed Roms in Bitola who had not completed primary school, for example, was nearly 100%.<sup>11</sup> Also contributing to the current situation is Roms' socio-economic position under the previous regime, as a result of which they are poorly positioned to benefit from the systemic corruption that has characterized the post-Communist period in Macedonia.

As the findings of the focus groups demonstrate, if unemployment is often a result of low educational attainment, it is also a cause thereof insofar as it largely determines the material conditions within which Romani families live. At the same time, the material conditions which depend primarily on employment affect the health of the persons who live in those conditions. In this manner, unemployment, low educational attainment, and poor health form a vicious circle.

---

<sup>11</sup> Data provided by the Employment Bureau in Bitola. Similarly, Aloui, Petroska-Beshka, and Najchevska (1999: 13) report that 91.6% of Roms seeking employment in 1991 were unskilled or semi-skilled workers.

## IV. METHOD

### OVERALL PROJECT DESIGN

#### DATA COLLECTION

While the gathering of quality information constitutes a necessary prelude to designing a comprehensive programme to address the concrete needs of the Romani population, rarely do the “bare facts” speak for themselves. Moreover, access to statistical data on Roms is often problematic. Thus, in conducting the statistical groundwork for this needs assessment, the Project Team was able to procure recent, detailed statistical data for only two of the four core areas (i.e., education and employment), with the few available numbers on health and civil rights dating back to the mid 1990s.<sup>12</sup>

Taking the above limitations into account, the needs assessment was designed in such a way as to supplement analysis of available statistical data with intensive consultation with local activists and stakeholders in the four core areas of the study. More specifically, the needs assessment began with documentary research which was subsequently discussed in focus groups. Additionally, project design and implementation were discussed in bilateral meetings with state and local officials, members of the domestic academic community, and representatives of relevant NGOs.

For each of the designated core areas, the Project Team began by procuring the most recent domestic and international statistical data available on the position of the Romani population in Macedonia. These data in turn constituted the starting point for focus group discussions bringing together local citizens on the one hand with state employees and NGO activists with expertise and experience in a the specific core areas on the other. Here, it is important to note that these data served as *only* a starting point for discussions, as the quality of available data gathered by states in the region on Romani populations tends to be quite low, and the access of international organizations to Romani populations is often relatively limited.

The purpose of holding the focus groups was to ensure that subsequent policy initiatives generated on the basis of the needs assessment would be designed around real stakeholder needs. To this end, the discussions were oriented toward identifying the most pressing needs as presented by different constituencies. In order to facilitate analysis of the proceedings of the focus groups to extract findings, the discussions were recorded, with transcripts generated from the sound recordings.

#### REPRESENTATIVENESS

With two focus groups each organized around the core areas of education, civil rights, and employment, the individual focus groups generally consisted of 10 to 15 persons. The exceptions to this generalization were two of the four focus groups on health, where the Project Team judged it important to meet separately with members of Romani communities on the one hand and with healthcare professionals serving those communities on the other. As a result, all four focus groups on health were smaller than the focus groups organized around the other three core areas.

---

<sup>12</sup> Further, since 2001 the Employment Office of the Republic of Macedonia no longer records ethnicity.

The reason for organizing more than a single focus group in each core area was to ensure the geographical representativeness of the stakeholder population participating in the needs assessment, thus ensuring that the results of the focus group meetings would be useful for the design of state-wide policy initiatives aimed at increasing Roms' level of integration in the Republic of Macedonia as a whole.



\*Focus group meeting sites are marked with a cross

- Skopje and Kumanovo were chosen as meeting sites for the focus groups on education on the basis of the characteristics of the educational opportunities available to Roms in the cities in question. At one extreme is Skopje, where four primary schools offer instruction in the Romani language. Kumanovo represents another extreme, as contention between ethnic Albanian and ethnic Macedonian communities has led to a particularly high degree of neglect of Roms' educational needs in that city.
- In similar fashion to the meeting sites for the focus groups on education, Skopje and Štip were chosen for the focus groups on health because the two cities present the ends of a continuum in attention to Roms' healthcare needs. Whereas domestic and international initiatives have focused on the Romani population of Skopje (and particularly on the municipality of Šuto Orizari), by virtue of its location in Eastern Macedonia the city of Štip as a whole has

received considerably less attention, with Roms in Štip and the surrounding region often left to their own devices.

- Tetovo and Štip represent extremes in the Republic of Macedonia in respect for Roms' civil rights on the part of state authorities. Whereas reports of police mistreatment of Roms are relatively unusual in Tetovo (a fact made more noteworthy by the fact that some of the heaviest fighting in the armed conflict of 2001 took place in and around this West Macedonian city), police beatings seem to occur with considerably greater frequency in Eastern Macedonia, where the population is more homogeneously ethnic Macedonian.
- In the West Macedonian city of Gostivar, Roms practice a wide range of occupations and there is a substantial Romani middle class residing in the city centre. In Bitola, on the other hand, few Roms have regular employment and much of the Romani population lives in extremely poor, unsanitary conditions. Approximating best- and worse-case scenarios from the standpoint of employment of the Romani population, Gostivar and Bitola were chosen as the sites for the focus groups on employment.
- Skopje was chosen as the meeting site for the focus group on Romani women and girls both for the capital's relatively central location and for the numerical concentration of Roms there. Participants were also invited from other regions of Macedonia.

In addition to taking regional variations into account, the selection of focus group participants was conducted in such a way as to ensure demographic representativeness, taking into account gender, age group, socio-economic status, and religion, as well as citizenship status. Demographic representativeness is particularly important given the broad range of variation within Macedonia's Romani population. Beyond the predictable variation in gender and age categories, the gamut of Romani existence in Macedonia runs from longstanding resident non-citizens living in tents (e.g., on the outskirts of Gostivar), through a substantial middle class (e.g., in the centre of Gostivar), to rich entrepreneurs (e.g., in Šuto Orizari).

In addition to the ten focus groups organized around the four core areas, a further focus group meeting was held to address the position of Romani women and girls. Drawing on the proceedings of the eight focus groups with Romani participants, the discussion on the female Romani population was held relatively late in project implementation in order to allow reflection on the findings of the meetings which preceded it. Additionally, women in various age categories comprised approximately half of the participants in the other focus groups.

#### **FOCUS GROUP METHODOLOGY**

Generally, focus groups are conducted as series of regional one-day conferences held in different locales and involving different constituencies. There are two basic types of focus groups: marketing and social-scientific. Whereas focus groups held for marketing purposes tend to involve presentations and demonstrations as well as

roundtable discussions, social-scientific focus groups may consist exclusively of roundtable discussions.

The purpose of the roundtable discussions which constitute the core of social-scientific focus groups is to identify the most pressing needs of the constituencies represented in the focus groups and to explore ways in which the identified needs can be met. Because the identification of needs depends on the quality of the information provided by focus group participants, it is crucial that participants express their thoughts freely. In other words, the immediate purpose of the focus group is served to the extent that it reveals what participants actually think, as opposed to what they think those conducting and/or sponsoring the research want them to think.

Beyond the rich qualitative data they generate, focus groups offer two significant advantages over other research methodologies for identifying the needs of marginalized populations.

- First, focus groups are intelligible to their participants, who need not have a background in research to know how to participate in a constructive dialogue.
- Second, by providing the security of a peer group, focus groups reduce the effects of power differentials between participants and researchers.

Moreover, while focus groups with marginalized populations require cultural sensitivity on the part of the researcher who moderates them, they do not require that the moderator be a member of the marginalized group: “The knee-jerk response of matching facilitators and participants on key dimensions of diversity such as race, age, and gender does not always produce [...] an increase in honest self-disclosure. Depending on facilitators’ and participants’ stages of racial identity development, facilitators of a different race from the focus group members might, paradoxically, be more successful than facilitators of the same race” (Dreachslin 1998: 816).

Basic components of focus groups include:

- *A small group of people.* Usually ranging in size from four to twelve participants, focus groups should be relatively small in order to ensure that participants can develop a rapport of trust with the moderator and with each other. Additionally, as group size increases so does the likelihood of “groupthink”, along with the risk that not all participants will have the opportunity to express their views. The number of participants in the focus groups conducted in the framework of this needs assessment ranged from five to fifteen.
- *A non-threatening environment.* Because the success of a focus group depends on the willingness of focus group participants to share their views, it is important that focus groups be conducted in a location which participants perceive as neutral. Serving local NGOs dedicated to interethnic tolerance and respect for differences ECMI’s six Regional NGO Resource Centres in Macedonia are widely recognized as appropriate locales for constructive dialogue.
- *A skilled moderator.* Providing a model of calm, neutral listening behaviour, the moderator guides the exchange of views without controlling it and ensures that all

participants have the opportunity to express their opinions. This is particularly important for focus groups with marginalized populations whose supposed needs may have been “assessed” so many times before by parties with their own agendas that members of the group have learned a standard answer to satisfy outsiders. With two years of experience conducting field research with Romani populations in Eastern Europe including one year in Macedonia, the moderator for the focus groups of this project enjoys a high level of credibility with key opinion makers in local Romani communities throughout the country.

- *An intensive and carefully structured discussion.* Although the discussion must be guided in such a way as to ensure the generation of data necessary for the needs assessment, the needs assessed must be those of the local population rather than those of other interested parties. For this reason, the Project Team prepared open-ended questions in advance of each focus group.

For each focus group, individual participants as well as a full roster of alternates were selected by ECMI’s local coordinating partners on the basis of criteria supplied by the Project Team. Letters of invitation to participate in focus groups were sent by the Project Team one to two weeks before the focus group, with reminders made by telephone one to two days before each meeting. At the focus groups, participants received refreshments, a meal, and compensation for travel costs and lost work time, as well as an explanation of the purpose of the focus group and of the presence of the sound recording equipment. Following each focus group, participants were sent a letter thanking them for their participation, with those indicating an interest also sent a copy of the transcript from the focus group in which they had participated.

Focus groups lasted approximately six hours each and were divided into three sessions separated by breaks. Whereas at most of the focus groups a lunch break was held between the second and third sessions, the schedule of the focus groups held on 28 October, 30 October, and 4 November was modified in order to accommodate participants fasting in observance of Ramadan.<sup>13</sup> At these focus groups, the timing of the meal was adjusted according to participants’ preferences.

Both the standard and modified schedules for individual focus groups are presented below.

- *Standard focus group schedule:*

10.00-10.30	Participant arrival and registration
10.30-11.45	Session 1
11.45-12.00	Refreshment break
12.00-13.30	Session 2
13.30-14.30	Lunch
14.30-15.45	Session 3
15.45-16.00	Distribution of per diem/travel reimbursement

---

<sup>13</sup> 91.6% of Roms in Macedonia declared themselves Muslims at the 1994 census (Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia 1997, Book I).

- *Ramadan focus group schedule:*

11.30-12.00 Participant arrival and registration  
12.00-13.15 Session 1  
13.15-13.30 Break  
13.30-15.00 Session 2  
15.00-15.30 Break  
15.30-16.45 Session 3  
16.45-17.00 Distribution of per diem/travel reimbursement  
17.00-18.00 *Iftar* (meal)

## V. COORDINATING PARTNERS

Consistent with ECMI's emphasis on ensuring that local stakeholders are actively involved in project design and implementation, activities undertaken in the framework of the needs assessment made extensive use of expertise from within Macedonia's Romani population. In particular, most coordinating partners were drawn from the umbrella group of Romani NGOs "RNGO 2002." Formed in mid 2002 as a spin-off network within the Sida-funded ECMI project "NGO Network for the Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the Republic of Macedonia," RNGO 2002 brings together some of Macedonia's most experienced Romani NGOs from throughout the country in a coordinating body designed to focus on the issues most affecting the Romani population. Within RNGO 2002, ECMI maintains contacts with the members most qualified in the four core areas of this needs assessment.

### MEMBERS OF RNGO 2002

1. *Association of Romani Women and Youth "Luludi"* (Skopje). Formed in 2001, this organization aims to improve the status of the Romani woman within the family and to raise the educational level of Romani youth. In addition to various educational projects, *Luludi* has initiated a campaign against domestic violence and launched a telephone hotline for victims of domestic violence.
  - Member of the ECMI NGO Network for the Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the Republic of Macedonia.
2. *Association of Romani Women "Otvoreni Vrati"* (Skopje). Seeking to liberate, organize, and educate Romani women, *Otvoreni Vrati* was formed in 2001. Operating without a budget, the organization's activities to date have been conducted in the municipality of Šuto Orizari.
3. *Association of Romani Women of Macedonia "Daja"* (Kumanovo). One of the Republic of Macedonia's oldest and most successful NGOs, *Daja* was founded in 1993. *Daja*'s projects have ranged from pre-school education to legal aid. In addition to its headquarters in Kumanovo, *Daja* operates a branch office in Bitola.
  - Member of the ECMI NGO Network for the Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the Republic of Macedonia.
4. *Association of Roms "Phurt"* (Delčevo). Established in 1996, *Phurt* is one of a small number of Romani NGOs active in Eastern Macedonia. While the organization focused in the first years of its existence on domestic violence and human rights education, it has recently expanded its portfolio to include a project on trafficking in human beings.
5. *Forum for Integration of the Roms* (Skopje). Forum for Integration of the Roms was founded in 1998 by a Romani doctor who also finances the organization's activities. Among those activities have been projects on diabetes, virginity, and training of nurse-assistants.
6. *Forum for Roms' Rights "Arka"* (Kumanovo). *Arka* was established in 1998 as a human rights monitoring organization. At present, the organization is active in the fields of legal aid and human rights education, as well as monitoring of police

procedures and court cases. With its main office in Kumanovo, *Arka* also operates branch offices in Kratovo and Kriva Palanka.

➤ Member of the ECMI NGO Network for the Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the Republic of Macedonia.

7. *Humanitarian Association of Roms of the Republic of Macedonia “Sonce”* (Tetovo). With an extremely broad project portfolio spanning the gamut from distribution of emergency aid among refugees to occupational education, *Sonce* in fact consists of three sectoral organizations: a humanitarian organization, a women’s organization, and a youth forum. *Sonce* was founded in 1997.

➤ Member of the ECMI NGO Network for the Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the Republic of Macedonia.

8. *Humanitarian and Charitable Association of Roms “Mesečina”* (Gostivar). Established in 1993 in response to the need to organize distribution of humanitarian aid to Romani refugees from Bosnia into Western Macedonia, *Mesečina* has gradually expanded the substantive and geographical scope of its activities. At present, the organization works in four sectors: education, socio-economic integration, human rights, and public policy. In addition to its headquarters in Gostivar, *Mesečina* operates branch offices in the West Macedonian towns of Debar, Kičevo, and Tetovo.

➤ Member of the ECMI NGO Network for the Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the Republic of Macedonia.

9. *Organization of Romani Youth “Anglunipe”* (Skopje). With programmatic goals relating to various issues in the field of education, this organization was founded in 1997. Among *Anglunipe’s* specific foci are preschool education and equalizing educational opportunities for Romani girls. Although the organization is based in Skopje, its membership base extends throughout the Republic of Macedonia.

➤ Member of the ECMI NGO Network for the Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the Republic of Macedonia.

10. *Romani Community Centre “Drom”* (Kumanovo). Established in 1997, *Drom* has been active in the fields of human rights and education. Recently, the organization has concentrated in particular on pre-school education, providing 108 local Romani children with instruction in preventive health practices and the Macedonian language in order to ease the children’s entry into the state school system.

➤ Member of the ECMI NGO Network for the Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the Republic of Macedonia.

11. *Romaversitas* (Skopje). *Romaversitas* was founded in 2001 with support from FOSIM and the Higher Education Support Program (also funded by George Soros). Open to all Romani students, the organization aims to increase academic achievement and to promote equal access to higher education. In the 2003-2004 academic year, *Romaversitas* provides stipends to 30 Romani university students.

#### **OTHER COORDINATING PARTNERS**

Beyond RNGO 2002, ECMI has also built a wide range of contacts with Romani and non-Romani experts through the NGO Network for the Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the Republic of Macedonia. Coordinating partners drawn from outside RNGO 2002 and but within the NGO Network include the following:

1. *Association for the Protection of Roms' Rights* (Štip). Founded in 1997, this organization aims its activities on reducing the incidence of police brutality in Eastern Macedonia. To this end, the Association for the Protection of Roms' Rights monitors and reports on cases of police brutality, also providing free legal aid and human rights education.
2. *Association of Romani Women "Esma"* (Skopje). The Association of Romani Women "*Esma*" was founded in the Skopje municipality of Šuto Orizari in 1995. *Esma* pursues its organizational goal of emancipating Romani women and their families through educational programs focusing on arithmetic, literacy, mental and physical health, and human rights.
3. *Felix Group* (Bitola). Although its membership consists primarily of ethnic Macedonians, the Felix Group serves the Romani population of Bitola through various kinds of educational activities aimed at Romani children and adults. Particularly noteworthy is the organization's day centre, where school-age children receive help with homework and a meal. The Felix Group was founded in 2000.
4. *Women's Association "Romani Asvin"* (Štip). Seeking to improve the economic, health, and social situation of the Romani population through activities promoting music, art, education, and sports among youth, *Romani Asvin* has also implemented a project on the rights and obligations of person who sell consumer goods without a license. The organization has existed since 1998.

## **VI. TIME FRAME**

The needs assessment was carried out in three phases, with the first phase beginning in September 2003 and the third phase concluding in November 2003.

In the project's first phase, the Project Team gathered the most recent data available on the situation of Roms in the four core areas to be addressed: education, health, civil rights, and employment. In addition to conducting an analysis of these data, the Project Team prepared summaries for presentation to the members of the focus groups held in each of the core areas. Also part of the first phase was the design of the focus groups which constitute the heart of the project's second phase. This phase spanned the month of September 2003.

The second phase of the needs assessment consisted primarily in meetings of the focus groups formed to address the four core areas. Each of the eight focus groups convened once in a six-hour meeting divided into three sessions to discuss the picture painted by the data gathered in the first phase as well as focus group participants' ideas and experiences for improving the situation in the core area in question. Following the eight focus groups organized around the four core areas, a ninth focus group on Romani women and girls was held, drawing on the proceedings of the previous focus groups. Additionally, two further focus groups on health were held in order to gather information from the experiences of healthcare professionals who work with Roms. As a result of the addition of these two focus groups, the second phase of the project ran into the second week of November 2003, rather than ending in October 2003, as had originally been envisaged.

The proceedings of the focus group meetings were compiled and analyzed in the third phase of the project, which ran throughout the month of November 2003. Also part of the third phase were the gathering of additional data from state organs and international organizations with a presence in Skopje. The concrete result of this phase is the current report.

A week-by-week schedule of the activities undertaken within the framework of the needs assessment is given in the table on the next page.

**PROJECT ACTIVITIES  
(SEPTEMBER – NOVEMBER 2003)**

<b>Dates (2003)</b>	<b>Project week</b>	<b>Activities</b>
1-5 September	1	<i>General project preparation</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of project design</li> <li>• Review of relevant literature</li> </ul>
8-12 September	2	<i>Statistical groundwork</i>
15-19 September	3	<i>Design and formation of focus groups</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of focus group methodology</li> <li>• Discussion of focus group composition</li> </ul>
22-26 September	4	<i>Logistical arrangements for focus groups</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacts with coordinating partners</li> <li>• Space reservations at Regional Resource Centres</li> </ul>
29 September – 3 October	5	<i>Focus groups on education</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 September: Skopje</li> <li>• 2 October: Kumanovo</li> </ul>
6-10 October	6	<i>Focus groups on health</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 October: Skopje</li> <li>• 9 October: Štip</li> </ul>
13-17 October	7	<i>Focus groups on civil rights</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14 October: Tetovo</li> <li>• 16 October: Štip</li> </ul>
20-24 October	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data entry</li> <li>• Planning of additional focus groups with healthcare professionals</li> </ul>
27-31 October	9	<i>Focus groups on employment</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 28 October: Gostivar</li> <li>• 30 October: Bitola</li> </ul>
3-7 November	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preliminary analysis of transcripts</li> <li>• 4 November: <i>Focus group on women and girls</i></li> </ul>
10-14 November	11	<i>Focus groups with healthcare professionals</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11 November: Skopje</li> <li>• 12 November: Štip</li> </ul>
17-21 November	12	<i>Analysis, compilation, and reporting of results</i>
24-28 November	13	

## **VII. FOCUS GROUPS**

### **CORE AREA 1: EDUCATION**

#### **FOCUS GROUP COMPOSITION**

The focus groups on education were held in the ECMI Regional NGO Resource Centres in Skopje and Kumanovo on 30 September and 2 October 2003, respectively.

The two focus groups differed slightly in terms of participant composition:

- Whereas the focus group on education held in Skopje had fourteen participants, the participation of the father of a secondary school pupil in the Kumanovo focus group brought the participant total to fifteen;
- Two primary school teachers (both Roms) participated in the focus group on education held in Skopje, while only one primary school teacher (an ethnic Macedonian) participated in the Kumanovo focus group; and
- No teachers of Romani ethnicity could be found to participate in the Kumanovo focus group. This fact is symptomatic of the more general trend described in the introduction to the project core areas.

Relevant demographic information concerning the participants in the two focus groups on education is given in the tables on the next two pages.

**Focus group on education  
Skopje, 30 September 2003**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>First language</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<b>Marital status</b>	<b>Educational level</b>	<b>Employment status</b>
<i>Anglunipe</i> representative	18	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Student
<i>Romaversitas</i> representative	36	m	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Higher	Employed
Mother of primary school pupil, literate		f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Divorced	Higher	Unemployed
Father of primary school pupil, literate	32	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	NGO sector
Mother of primary school pupil, illiterate	35	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Incomplete primary	Unemployed
Father of primary school pupil, illiterate	43	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Incomplete primary	Unemployed
Secondary school pupil, male	16	m	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Student
Secondary school pupil, female	16	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Student
University student, male	26	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Higher	Student
University student, female	25	f	Rom	Romani		Single	Higher	Student
Primary school teacher		m	Rom	Macedonian	Orthodox	Married	Higher	Employed
Primary school teacher	43	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Higher	Employed
Secondary school teacher	39	m	Macedonian	Macedonian	Orthodox	Married	Higher	Employed
Preschool instructor	39	f	Macedonian	Serbian		Married	Higher	Employed

*Note:* Blank cells in the table above indicate that the focus group participant declined to provide the requested information.

**Focus group on education  
Kumanovo, 2 October 2003**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>First language</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<b>Marital status</b>	<b>Educational level</b>	<b>Employment status</b>
<i>Daja</i> representative	45	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Divorced	Secondary	NGO sector
<i>Arka</i> representative	49	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	NGO sector
<i>Drom</i> representative	37	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	NGO sector
Mother of primary school pupil, literate	35	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Unemployed
Father of primary school pupil, literate	33	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Unemployed
Mother of primary school pupil, illiterate	37	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Incomplete primary	Unemployed
Father of primary school pupil, illiterate	30	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Incomplete primary	Unemployed
Secondary school pupil, male	15	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Student
Secondary school pupil, female	17	f	Rom	Macedonian	Romani	Single	Secondary	Student
Father of secondary school pupil	42	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Unemployed
University student, male	20	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	University	Student
University student, female	25	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	University	Student
Primary school teacher	29	f	Macedonian	Macedonian	Orthodox	Married	University	Employed
Secondary school teacher	40	m	Serb	Macedonian	Orthodox	Married	University	Employed
Preschool instructor	28	f	Serb	Macedonian	Orthodox	Married	University	Employed

*Note:* Blank cells in the table above indicate that the focus group participant declined to provide the requested information.

#### FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

The questions used to structure the two focus groups on education are reproduced in their English version in the table below.

<b>Problems</b>	<b>Possible solutions</b>
What are the causes of low school enrolment rates among Roms? (Why do Romani parents not send their children to school?)	What can be done to encourage Romani parents to send their children to school?
Why do some Roms not finish primary school?	What can be done to ensure that all Roms complete primary education?
Why do so few Roms finish secondary school?	What can be done to encourage Roms to complete secondary education?
Why do such a small number of Roms complete higher education?	What can be done to increase the number of Roms who complete higher education?
Why do fewer Romani girls than Romani boys finish school? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do differences in education between Romani boys and Romani girls affect the girls' choices?</li> <li>• How do differences in education between Romani boys and Romani girls affect relations between Romani men and Romani women?</li> </ul>	What can be done to promote the education of Romani girls?

#### RELEVANT FINDINGS

Among the chief factors accounting for the low level of educational attainment of Macedonia's Romani population are:

1. *Language barriers.* Approximately 80% of the Romani population in Macedonia speaks Romani as its first language. Smaller proportions of the Romani population speak Macedonian, Albanian, and Turkish as a mother tongue. Here, it is important to note that the first language of Roms varies regionally: whereas an overwhelming majority of Roms in Skopje speak Romani as their first language, nearly all Roms in the West Macedonian towns of Gostivar and Kičevo, for example, are monolingual Macedonian speakers. In Eastern Macedonia, on the other hand, the mother tongue of much of the Romani population is Turkish.

For Romani children who reach primary school without fluency in the language of instruction, scholastic achievement is predictably inadequate. Because existing legislation requires parental permission for children to repeat a year of school, however, the children tend to reach the fifth year of primary school regardless of their performance. Among Romani children who remain to complete primary

school, many are channelled into educational institutions for children with special needs as a result of their linguistic disadvantage.<sup>14</sup>

2. *Material conditions.* Although primary and secondary education in state schools in Macedonia are nominally free, the direct costs associated with sending children to school (e.g., clothing, books, supplies, and transportation) combine with the opportunity cost of so doing instead of sending the children to earn money through work (e.g., selling consumer goods) or begging to discourage many Romani parents from complying with the Law on Primary Education (Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija 1995), which requires that all children complete primary education. Even for some Romani children who attend primary school, the fact that homework constitutes an integral part of primary education in Macedonia presents problems insofar as the children may nonetheless be engaged in income-generating activities necessary for physical survival and which therefore take precedence over homework; as one focus group participant put it, “it cannot be expected from a child when s/he returns home and has nothing to eat to think about school [...] when s/he is thinking about how to go and help [his/her] parents or to earn on his/her own so that s/he can eat.” Finally, even in Romani families with enough to eat, the number of persons living in a given structure is often such that no appropriate space remains for children to complete their assignments.
3. *Family dynamics.* Given the extremely low level of educational attainment of the Romani population as a whole, awareness of the importance of education in Romani families is often low. As a result, many Romani children simply cannot acquire basic intellectual skills from their primary role models. Moreover, in some Romani families any resources available for education are directed to male children at the expense of female children on the grounds that investments in daughters are lost at marriage, when the daughters move into the household of their husband’s family.<sup>15</sup> Perhaps the primary factor contributing to the discrepancy in educational attainment between Romani men and women, however, is the widespread practice of marrying girls off shortly after sexual maturation (i.e., menarche), usually resulting in the interruption of the bride’s education prior to completion of primary school.<sup>16</sup>
4. *Ghettoization/ethnic isolation.* The language barriers discussed above are particularly relevant to Romani children brought up in predominantly Romani neighbourhoods, where the children’s exposure to the Macedonian language is quite limited. Additionally, focus group participants from Skopje indicated that the quality of both the instruction and the physical premises in the two primary schools in Šuto Orizari (i.e., Brothers Ramiz and Hamid; 26 July) is lower than in

---

<sup>14</sup> Participants in the focus group on employment in Bitola reported that other Romani children are placed in institutions of special education by their parents for the material benefits (i.e., room and board) offered by such schools.

<sup>15</sup> By way of contrast, the focus groups also revealed a tendency among relatively well-off Romani families to place greater emphasis on educating girls on the grounds that whereas men can engage in hard physical labor, women are more employable for office work.

<sup>16</sup> The age at which Roms tend to marry is integrally tied to the emphasis placed on demonstrating female virginity at the time of the wedding, such that a sexually mature female virgin presents a liability for her family which is most simply resolved by ensuring that she marries as quickly as possible.

schools with a smaller proportion of Romani pupils, with a (Romani) teacher explaining that some teachers in these schools “feel degraded if they work in a Romani environment with Romani children.” Presumably, these conditions contribute to the fact that the West Macedonian city of Tetovo with its relatively small, largely physically integrated Romani population has more Romani university students than does Skopje.

Moreover, focus group participants from both Skopje and Kumanovo reported that Romani children in ethnically mixed schools are sometimes isolated from non-Romani children by teachers who place them in the last row of the classroom. Stereotypes of Roms in the non-Romani population also result in isolation within ethnically mixed schools as non-Romani children apply values learned from their parents and avoid mixing with their Romani classmates.

#### GENERAL GOALS FOR INCREASING ROMS’ EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

- Adequate linguistic preparation of Romani children
- Enforcement of existing legislation requiring completion of primary school
- Improvement in the material conditions of Romani families
- Fostering a culture of education
- Equalization of educational opportunities for boys and girls

#### SPECIFIC MEASURES

1. *Pre-school education.* Although surveys conducted on Roms in Macedonia indicate that most Romani parents want their children to study in Macedonian, for Roms who speak as a first language a language other than the one in which primary school instruction takes place measures should be taken to ensure that Romani children are adequately prepared in the language of instruction. Programs which make use of the Romani language to teach children Macedonian and to provide general preparation for entry into primary schools with a language of instruction other than Romani show considerable promise for preparing Romani children for primary school. While programs of this type exist already in Macedonia, they are too few to serve existing demand and are disproportionately concentrated in Skopje.
2. *After-school centres.* Given the material conditions of many Romani families, centres offering suitable workspace as well as assistance with assignments and a cooked meal outside of school hours could go far to ensuring the more Romani children complete primary education. Ideally, such centres would be staffed by Romani-speaking adults who could serve as accessible role models to the children. As is the case with pre-school education, after-school centres have generally been successful where implemented, but have rarely been implemented outside Skopje, where interest already exceeds capacity .
3. *Integration of Romani adults in the education process.*
  - **Education for parents.** At minimum, the parents of Romani children need to be informed that the completion of primary education is required by law for female as well as male children and that it is a condition for health insurance and unemployment benefits. Although some Romani NGOs have engaged in awareness campaigns aimed at Romani parents, coverage has been extremely uneven.
  - **Romani teaching assistants.** In the absence of a sufficient cadre of qualified Romani teachers, the presence of adult Roms in the first years of

primary education could ease the transition from a Romani-speaking environment to a Macedonian-speaking one. This approach has proven effective in the Czech and Slovak Republics, but has not been applied in Macedonia.

4. *Teacher education.* As indicated by the statistics relating to this core area, the number of Romani teachers in Macedonia is extremely small. Further, the level of awareness about Romani history and culture among non-Romani teachers tends to be low, with one (non-Romani) focus group participant who works as a teacher in a predominantly Romani environment, for example, unaware that a standard, codified Romani language exists. To date, there have been no educational materials on Roms designed for teachers in the Macedonian school system.

## **CORE AREA 2: HEALTH**

### **FOCUS GROUP COMPOSITION**

Whereas the proposal for this needs assessment foresaw holding two focus groups on health bringing together members of local Romani communities in a discussion with healthcare professionals, in the course of finalizing the composition of the focus groups on health it became apparent that the presence of (predominantly non-Romani) health professionals around the conference table risked placing the Romani participants in the awkward position of complaining about the very persons in whose hands their lives might at some point be placed. For this reason, the Project Team decided to hold separate focus groups with members of local Romani communities on the one hand and with healthcare professionals on the other.

As a result of this minor adjustment to the project design, a total of four focus groups were held on health. The first two – the participants in which were members of local Romani communities in Skopje and Štip – were held on 7 and 9 October 2003. Following preliminary analysis of the transcripts from the two focus groups with Romani participants, two additional focus groups with healthcare professionals were held in the same cities on 11 and 12 November 2003 (respectively).

In terms of participant composition, the size of the two focus groups on health with Romani participants was identical, with ten participants each. At the same time, the composition of these two focus differed insofar as the first included one mother with primary education or less and two mothers with secondary education while the second included two mothers with primary education or less and one mother with secondary education. Also worth noting is that in both of the focus groups on health with Romani participants it proved impossible to secure the participation of both a woman older than 65 and a man older than 55, as had been the original plan. These problems reflect both the age structure of the Romani population and the view dominant among the older generation of Roms that a woman should not leave the house unaccompanied.

Although the overall composition of the two focus groups on health with healthcare professionals was identical, an additional note on two of the participants of the Skopje focus group is in order. Whereas the paediatrician in this focus group is a neonatologist with a specialization in pulmonary diseases, the gynaecologist also owns a private pharmacy in Šuto Orizari.

If the two focus groups on health with Romani participants were exclusively Romani, the participants of the two focus groups on health with healthcare professionals were almost exclusively ethnic Macedonians. It should be noted, however, that the distinction between Roms and healthcare professionals is not absolute, as demonstrated by the facts that the representative of the NGO *Forum for Integration of the Roms* at the focus group on health with Romani participants in Skopje is a medical doctor and that the social worker participating in the focus group on health with healthcare professionals in Skopje is a Rom.

Descriptive rosters of the two focus groups on health with Romani participants and of the two focus groups on health with healthcare professionals are given in the tables on the next two pages.

**Focus group on health (Romani participants)**  
**Skopje, 7 October 2003**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>First language</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<b>Marital status</b>	<b>Educational level</b>	<b>Employment status</b>
<i>Daja</i> representative	45	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Divorced	Secondary	Employed
<i>Forum for Integration of the Roms</i> representative	46	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Higher	Employed
Mother, primary education or less	41	f	Rom	Romani		Married	Primary	Unemployed
Mother, secondary education	43	f	Rom	Romani			Secondary	Disabled
Mother, secondary education	39	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Unemployed
Father, primary education or less	31	m	Rom	Romani		Married	Primary	Unemployed
Father, secondary education	47	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Employed
Elderly woman	49	f	Rom	Romani		Married	Secondary	Pensioner
Elderly man	53	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Pensioner
Person without Macedonian citizenship	23	m	Rom	Romani		Single	Primary	Unemployed

**Focus group on health (Romani participants)**  
**Štip, 9 October 2003**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>First language</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<b>Marital status</b>	<b>Educational level</b>	<b>Employment status</b>
<i>Association of Romani Rights Protection</i> representative	21	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Single	Secondary	NGO sector
<i>Romani Asvin</i> representative	24	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Primary	Unemployed
Mother, primary education or less	23	f	Rom	Turkish	Muslim	Married	Primary	Unemployed
Mother, primary education or less	44	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Incomplete primary	Unemployed
Mother, secondary education	30	f	Rom	Turkish	Muslim	Married	Primary	Unemployed
Father, primary education or less	29	m	Rom	Turkish	Muslim	Married	Primary	Unemployed
Father, secondary education	25	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Unemployed
Elderly woman	67	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Widow	Primary	Pensioner
Elderly man	54	m	Rom	Turkish	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Pensioner
Person without Macedonian citizenship	46	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Incomplete primary	Unemployed

*Note:* Blank cells in the tables on this page indicate that the focus group participant declined to provide the requested information.

**Focus group on health (healthcare professionals)  
Skopje, 11 November 2003**

Description	Age	Sex	Ethnicity
Paediatrician	40	m	Macedonian
Gynaecologist	43	m	Macedonian
General practitioner	44	m	Macedonian
Nurse	22	f	Macedonian
Social worker	24	f	Rom

**Focus group on health (healthcare professionals)  
Štip, 12 November 2003**

Description	Age	Sex	Ethnicity
Paediatrician	54	f	Macedonian
Gynaecologist	40	f	Macedonian
General practitioner	41	f	Macedonian
Nurse	32	f	Macedonian
Social worker	49	f	Macedonian

**FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS**

The questions used to structure the focus groups on health with Romani participants are reproduced in their English version in the table below.

Problems	Possible solutions
<p>Why do Roms tend to have more children than non-Roms?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent do Romani couples engage in realistic family planning?</li> <li>How common is contraceptive use among Roms?</li> </ul>	<p>What can be done to ensure that modern contraceptive methods are known and available to those who want them?</p>
<p>Under what conditions do Romani women visit the gynaecologist?</p>	<p>What can be done to encourage regular gynaecological exams among Romani women?</p>
<p>What are the causes of the high infant morbidity and mortality rates among Roms?</p>	<p>What can be done to reduce the infant morbidity and mortality rates among Roms?</p>
<p>Why are so few Romani infants fed only on their mother's milk?</p>	<p>What can be done to encourage breastfeeding among Roms?</p>
<p>Why do so many Romani infants develop gastrointestinal ailments?</p>	<p>What can be done to improve basic hygiene?</p>
<p>Why is the Romani population generally less healthy than the non-Romani population?</p>	<p>What can be done to promote healthcare among the Romani population?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How can various institutions help?</li> <li>What should Roms themselves do?</li> </ul>

For the focus groups with healthcare professionals, the questions above were supplemented with the following:

- What is the vaccination rate among Romani children?
- To what extent do Romani parents possess necessary medical documents when they bring their children to the doctor?
- Which are the illnesses most frequent among the Romani population?
- What, if anything, should be done to improve relations between Roms and healthcare professionals?

Also discussed in the focus groups with healthcare professionals were allegations of discrimination and corruption which had surfaced in the course of the focus groups with Roms previously held in the same cities.

#### RELEVANT FINDINGS

The poor state of health of the Romani population in general can be traced to several factors, including:

1. *Education.* The effects of Roms' sporadic school attendance and low levels of educational attainment are both direct and indirect. Whereas missing vaccinations administered in primary schools constitutes a direct effect of sporadic school attendance, a direct result of failure to complete primary school is ineligibility for state-provided health insurance. Additionally, the low level of educational attainment of the Romani population in Macedonia means that many Roms lack sufficient awareness of preventive healthcare practices, as well as of the healthcare options available to them.
2. *Economic situation.* Because of the high rate of unemployment among Roms in Macedonia (the causes of which are addressed later in this report), it is likely that a majority of Romani families are recipients of social welfare payments. These payments are generally insufficient to provide for food and shelter, let alone medicine. This being the case, the introduction of a 20% participation rate on prescription drugs poses a significant barrier to therapy compliance within the Romani population.
3. *Material conditions.* As a direct result of the economic situation in which many Romani families find themselves, the housing in which they live is often too small for the number of people living in it, leading to inadequate hygienic conditions. Additionally, many Romani households in Eastern Macedonia in particular lack basic infrastructure such as plumbing and running water.<sup>17</sup> Aggravating the effects of inadequate housing are inadequate clothing (also a product of Roms' economic situation), poor nutrition (resulting from a combination of lack of education and lack of buying power), and intestinal parasites (which live on the nutrients ingested by the host organism at the host's expense).

---

<sup>17</sup> Although households without electricity are rare, illegal connections to electrical cables are relatively common. In addition to being punishable as theft, stolen electricity is problematic from an administrative perspective insofar as possession of an electrical meter constitutes a condition for receiving social welfare payments. Because such connections sometimes result in the electrocution of those who use them, they are also problematic from a public health standpoint.

4. *Administrative status.* Although a wide range of healthcare services are available free of charge, taking advantage of the offerings requires that persons be registered with the relevant authorities. As mentioned above in point 1, persons who do not complete primary education are not eligible for state-provided health insurance. The situation of persons without Macedonian citizenship is similar, regardless of their level of educational attainment.
5. *Procedural irregularities within the healthcare system.* While no precise indicators of the extent of corruption and discrimination within the Macedonian healthcare system are available, Roms seem to be affected negatively by both. In the case of corruption, the problem for Roms is that as a result of their economic situation they tend not to be in a position to make offers attractive enough to secure necessary services which might not otherwise be administered in a timely fashion. The focus groups also yielded numerous allegations of discrimination, particularly in Štip. Although these allegations could not be substantiated within the framework of this needs assessment, a belief on the part of Roms that they fall victim to discrimination in healthcare institutions presumably makes them less likely to seek healthcare and therefore requires attention.

In focus groups with Romani participants and with healthcare professionals alike, issues relating to reproductive health received particular attention. Prominent among these issues were:

1. *Contraceptive use.* The focus groups in Skopje and Štip revealed significant regional variations in contraceptive use among Roms. Whereas the responses of Romani participants and healthcare professionals in Skopje indicated widespread knowledge and use of contemporary birth control methods (especially birth control pills and intrauterine devices), healthcare workers in Štip reported that the local Romani population tends to engage in family planning only after conception, resulting in a large number of aborted pregnancies. These reports were supported by the tendency of participants of the focus group on health with Roms in the same city to refer to birth control methods only in general terms, with several participants ashamed to discuss contraception at all. Among Romani men, there is also a tendency to associate with promiscuity the use of contraceptives by women in general and their own wives in particular. While no statistical data are available on the use of contraceptive methods, condom use among Romani men appears to be rare.

Regional variations notwithstanding, a common finding of the focus groups on health is that Romani women tend to visit a gynaecologist on a regular basis. Here, however, it is important to note that this practice applies almost exclusively to married women, with considerable stigmatization attached to unmarried women seeking gynaecological counsel on the grounds that unmarried women should be virgins and that virgins should have no need for a gynaecologist.

2. *Natality.* Coinciding with the reported variations in contraceptive use, the birth-rate among Roms is apparently lower in Skopje than in Štip. On the whole, however, the reasons for the higher-than-average birth-rate of the Romani population of Macedonia in general seem to be consistent throughout the country. Chief among these reasons is the tendency of Roms to marry young, with many

Romani girls entering marriage months after the onset of menstruation. Moreover, by Romani tradition a woman who fails to give birth within a year after her wedding is returned to her parents. As a result, reproduction tends to begin earlier among Roms than among non-Roms in Macedonia. Also contributing to the relatively high birth-rate among Roms is a preference in many Romani families for male children, such that the total number of sons receives greater emphasis than does the total number of children.

3. *Infant mortality.* The discussions with healthcare professionals in Skopje and Štip suggest the leading cause of infant mortality among Roms in Macedonia to be home births. Whereas the 1990s saw a considerable reduction in such births, among Roms the problem remains more pronounced than among non-Roms as a result of inadequate access to healthcare facilities for reasons both administrative and financial. Also problematic is that children born at home are often not registered with the appropriate administrative organs, such that they do not receive services to newborns normally provided by the state. Finally, even for infants born in a hospital, the hygienic conditions within which many Romani families live pose a significant health risk.
4. *Breastfeeding.* Contrary to the expectations of the Project Team, the focus groups on health revealed that breastfeeding is in widespread use among Roms, with exceptions generally due to a physical problem on the part of the mother. The use of mother's milk as the primary form of sustenance for Romani children can be traced to a combination of cultural values and economic circumstance. With respect to the former, most of the female participants in the focus groups recognize breastfeeding as bringing health benefits to the child. As for the latter, the prevailing view among focus group participants is that breast milk is simply cheaper than any other form of nutrition. That these views are also put into practice receives support from the healthcare professionals' observations about the low rates of allergies and of breast and cervical cancers in the Romani population.
5. *Vaccination.* Healthcare professionals taking part in the focus groups in Skopje and Štip indicated that Romani children often do not receive a full cycle of standard vaccines. As discussed above in the section on general findings, one reason for this is sporadic school attendance among Romani children.<sup>18</sup> An additional reason for this trend is that many children of Romani parents now resident in Macedonia were born in Western Europe and have not been registered with the Macedonian health system since settling in Macedonia. Finally, healthcare professionals reported that state institutions sometimes fail to send vaccination reminders.

#### GENERAL GOALS FOR IMPROVING THE HEALTH OF THE ROMANI POPULATION

- Ensuring that all Romani children complete primary education
- Improvement in the material conditions of Romani families
- Resolution of the citizenship claims of all residents of the Republic of Macedonia

---

<sup>18</sup> Compounding the problem is the inflexibility of the vaccination system, with vaccines administered only on days for which a minimum number of children have pre-registered.

- Ensuring access to healthcare and medicines for economically disadvantaged persons
- Promotion of preventive healthcare practices
- Reproductive health education for men as well as for women
- Increased participation of Roms in delivering healthcare services

#### SPECIFIC MEASURES

1. *Mobile healthcare service.* Although state healthcare institutions administer programs designed to ensure that the families of newborn children receive home visits from healthcare professionals (i.e., *patronažna služba*), in practice the inhabitants of largely Romani neighbourhoods often do not receive this service. In addition to providing basic medical care and advice to persons lacking adequate access to medical institutions, a mobile healthcare service could provide help in registering unregistered children and adults in order to increase their access to the state healthcare system. On each mobile service team, the inclusion of at least one Rom with basic training in public health would be useful for overcoming linguistic and cultural barriers. Such teams might also benefit from the services of trained reproductive healthcare workers, which already exist in the NGO sector. Ideally, each mobile healthcare service unit would operate in tandem with the family counselling centres described below.
2. *Family counselling centres.* In discussions of possible solutions for the state of health of the Romani population, state-administered marriage advising offices (i.e., *bračni sovetovališta*) received frequent mention. Just as frequently, focus group participants lamented the inactivity of the existing institutions, also pointing to the need for health education to be made accessible to persons of all ages, regardless of marital status. Tapping this need, family counselling centres could provide informational material and instruction on preventive healthcare practices, with both material and instruction given in the language preferred by the local community. In this manner, the centres would include men as well as women in family planning (probably best accomplished in gender-specific courses) while promoting vaccination, healthy breastfeeding practices, mental health awareness, and regular physical examinations. Here as in the mobile healthcare service, the inclusion of Roms on the staff of family counselling centres would take advantage of the benefits of peer counselling, thus increasing the accessibility of the services provided.

### **CORE AREA 3: CIVIL RIGHTS**

#### **FOCUS GROUP COMPOSITION**

Whereas the first of the two focus groups on civil rights was held in the ECMI Regional NGO Resource Centres in Tetovo on 14 October 2003, the second was held at the ECMI Regional NGO Resource Centre in Štip two days later. Other than the larger number of representatives of Romani NGOs among the participants of the focus group on civil rights held in Štip, the only notable difference in composition between the two focus groups is the participation of two relatively well-off young Romani men in the Tetovo meeting, as opposed to the one comparable participant of the focus group on civil rights held in Štip. As a result of these differences, the focus group on civil rights in Štip was slightly larger than the corresponding focus group in Tetovo, with thirteen and twelve participants (respectively).

Further details of the composition of the two focus groups on civil rights are given in the tables on the next two pages.

**Focus group on civil rights  
Tetovo, 14 October 2003**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>First language</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<b>Marital status</b>	<b>Educational level</b>	<b>Employment status</b>
Source representative	40	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Employed
Youth male, well-off*	21	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Higher	Student
Youth male, well-off	26	m	Rom	Turkish	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Employed
Adult male, well-off	45	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Employed
Youth female, well-off	14	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Primary	Student
Adult female, well-off	40	f	Rom	Turkish	Muslim	Married	Higher	Employed
Youth male, disadvantaged*	26	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Incomplete primary	Unemployed
Adult male, disadvantaged	40	m	Rom	Turkish	Muslim	Married	Primary	Unemployed
Youth female, disadvantaged	27	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Incomplete primary	Unemployed
Adult female, disadvantaged	58	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Widow	Incomplete primary	Unemployed
Person without Macedonian citizenship	37	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Incomplete primary	Unemployed
Police officer	40	m	Rom	Albanian	Muslim	Married	Higher	Employed

\*In the table above, the terms ‘well-off’ and ‘disadvantaged’ refer to socio-economic status relative to the Romani population.

*Note:* Blank cells in the table above indicate that the focus group participant declined to provide the requested information.

**Focus group on civil rights**  
**Štip, 16 October 2003**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>First language</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<b>Marital status</b>	<b>Educational level</b>	<b>Employment status</b>
<i>Phurt</i> representative	22	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Higher	Student
<i>Association of Romani Rights Protection</i> representative	21	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Single	Secondary	NGO sector
<i>Romani Asvin</i> representative	23	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Freelance musician
Youth male, well-off*	18	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Primary	Unemployed
Adult male, well-off	55	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Employed
Youth female, well-off	15	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Primary	Student
Adult female, well-off	28	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Primary	Employed
Youth male, disadvantaged*	22	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Unemployed
Adult male, disadvantaged	32	m	Rom	Romani			Primary	Unemployed
Youth female, disadvantaged	21	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Primary	Unemployed
Adult female, disadvantaged	53	m	Rom	Turkish	Muslim	Married	Primary	Unemployed
Person without Macedonian citizenship	47	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Married	Incomplete primary	Unemployed
Police officer	24	m	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Employed

\*In the table above, the terms ‘well-off’ and ‘disadvantaged’ refer to socio-economic status relative to the Romani population.

*Note:* Blank cells in the table above indicate that the focus group participant declined to provide the requested information.

#### FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

For the two focus groups on civil rights, the questions used to focus the discussion are given in the table below.

<b>Problems</b>	<b>Possible solutions</b>
Why are there so many stateless Roms?	What can be done to reduce the number of stateless Roms?
How widespread is ethnically motivated violence against Roms in Macedonia?	What can be done to reduce the frequency of ethnically motivated violence against Roms in Macedonia?
Why do few Roms bring cases of ethnically motivated violence to court?	What can be done to encourage victims of ethnically motivated violence to take legal action?
Under what circumstances do police beat Roms?	What can be done to prevent police from beating Roms?
Why do few Roms file formal complaints against the police officers who beat them?	What can be done to encourage victims of police brutality to pursue redress?
Why are attempts to pursue redress for police brutality often unsuccessful?	What can be done to increase the effectiveness of attempts to pursue redress for police brutality?
How widespread is domestic violence among Roms in Macedonia?	How can domestic violence be eliminated?

#### RELEVANT FINDINGS

Prominent among the reasons for which Roms in Macedonia do not enjoy all of the rights guaranteed them by existing legislation are:

1. *Lack of information.* On the whole, access to information on civil rights in Macedonia is problematic, and available information often exists only in a form suitable for use by persons who have completed more than primary education. Given the low level of educational attainment of the Romani population in Macedonia as a whole, many Roms are poorly informed about their civil rights. In some cases, this lack of information forms a vicious circle with suspicion that Roms' own rights are being violated; in the words of a participant at the focus group on civil rights in Tetovo, "Roms are not at all informed that they have rights and where they can demand those rights. They all think that the state is exploiting them, [that] it does not allow them to realize their rights, but when their rights are violated they don't know to whom to turn." Moreover, for persons without Macedonian citizenship, not only is it often unclear to whom to turn for assistance, but it is also not clear to which rights they can lay claim as non-citizens.
2. *Material conditions.* Notwithstanding significant regional differences in the frequency with which Roms are reportedly beaten by police, participants in both focus groups on civil rights reported that poorly dressed Roms are more likely to fall victim to police brutality. A Romani police officer at the focus group on civil rights in Štip explained this finding in terms of a tendency on the part of police officers to assume that persons living in poor material conditions are unlikely to

know their rights, broadening the scope of behaviour in which the police can engage without risking being reported.

3. *Lack of political organization.* Although the armed conflict of 2001 was primarily between ethnic Macedonian and ethnic Albanian belligerents, since the signing of the Framework Agreement political organization as a means of realizing rights has become an increasingly emotional topic of conversation among Roms in Macedonia as well. Noting the limits to what can be expected from a single parliamentary representative of a Romani political party, many focus group participants expressed disappointment in the performance of Romani political parties in the period following local and parliamentary elections. Further, participants in the focus group on civil rights in Štip reported that representatives of the two largest ethnic Macedonian parties (i.e., the Social Democratic Union of Macedonia and the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization – Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity) threatened to cut off electricity and water supplies to the city’s Romani quarter unless they received the electoral support of the neighbourhood’s inhabitants.
4. *Economic situation.* As a participant in the focus group on civil rights in Tetovo explained, the high rate of unemployment among Roms in Macedonia (analyzed in some detail in the next section of this report) means that “the Romani population is occupied with basic problems of existence due to which it cannot direct its activity to securing other rights.”

Whereas the reasons given above apply broadly to the incomplete enjoyment of rights by Macedonia’s Romani population, the fact that domestic violence by definition occurs within the family makes it qualitatively different from most other instances of the non-enjoyment of civil rights. This being the case, the factors contributing to domestic violence require separate attention, with the following particularly relevant:

1. *Education.* Statements of focus group participants supported the position that domestic violence occurs most frequently among persons with little formal education, with the educational process teaching that conflicts are best resolved through dialogue. This applies not only to men (whose main victims are usually their wives), but also to women (whose victims are most frequently their children).
2. *Economic dependence.* This factor applies primarily to women, who as a result of Roms’ patrilineal family structure depend on their husband and his family for housing, if not also for income. To the extent that the traditional solution of returning to her parents’ household is not available for lack of space (usually the case given the economic situation of most Romani families in Macedonia), women are left without a viable alternative to staying with the husbands who abuse them.
3. *Shame.* Insofar as many Roms consider that what goes on within the family should not leave the family, only rarely is domestic violence reported to the relevant authorities.

## GENERAL GOALS FOR INCREASING THE ENJOYMENT OF CIVIL RIGHTS AMONG ROMS

- Human rights education
- Improvement in the material conditions of Romani families
- Enforcement of existing legislation on police brutality and ethnically motivated violence
- Reduction of conditions for acquisition of Macedonian citizenship
- Introduction of legislation on domestic violence

## SPECIFIC MEASURES

1. *Family counselling centres.* Discussed above in the section on the focus groups on health, such centres would be modelled loosely on the existing but largely inactive state-administered marriage advising offices. In addition to providing informational material and instruction on preventive healthcare practices, the centres could offer information and training on human rights (including the rights of women both within and outside marriage) and basic conflict resolution. In this manner, family counselling centres would contribute simultaneously to raising the level of information among Roms about their civil rights and to reducing the incidence of domestic violence.
2. *Legal aid offices.* While the family counselling centres would serve to ensure that Roms are informed about their rights, the availability of free legal aid would give Roms a clear place to turn when their rights are violated. More specifically, the offices would provide assistance in understanding and meeting the conditions for citizenship, as well as in filing complaints in cases of apparent violations of civil rights. As in the family counselling centres, the presence of Romani employees in the legal aid offices would help to ensure that the services offered by the offices are accessible to those who need them.

## CORE AREA 4: EMPLOYMENT

### FOCUS GROUP COMPOSITION

The focus groups on employment were held in the ECMI Regional NGO Resource Centres in Gostivar and Bitola on 28 and 30 October 2003, respectively. Differences in composition between the two focus groups include the following:

- Whereas the focus group in Gostivar had ten participants, the number of participants in the Bitola focus group was thirteen;
- Due to the difficulty of locating employed Romani youth in Gostivar, the focus group in that city included two employed adult males and two employed adult females rather than the one employed youth male, one employed youth female, one employed adult male, and one employed adult female of the initial project design;
- Also deviating slightly from the initial project design, the focus group in Bitola included two employed youth females. The relative ease of locating two employed youth females in Bitola is the direct result of a training programme for hairdressers organized by the Bitola-based NGO Felix Group.

Detailed information concerning the composition of the two focus groups on employment is given in the tables which follow.

**Focus group on employment  
Gostivar, 28 October 2003**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>nicity</b>	<b>First language</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<b>Marital status</b>	<b>Educational level</b>	<b>Employment status</b>
Representative of Employment Office	39	m	Albanian	Albanian	Muslim	Married	Higher	Employed
<i>Mesečina</i> representative	25	m	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Secondary	NGO sector
Adult male, employed	36	m	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Employed
Adult male, employed	38	m	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Employed
Adult female, employed	32	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Employed
Adult female, employed	34	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Employed
Youth male, unemployed	23	m	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Unemployed
Adult male, unemployed	31	m	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Primary	Unemployed
Youth female, unemployed	21	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Unemployed
Adult female, unemployed	37	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Unemployed

*Note:* Blank cells in the table above indicate that the focus group participant declined to provide the requested information.

**Focus group on employment  
Bitola, 30 October 2003**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>First language</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<b>Marital status</b>	<b>Educational level</b>	<b>Employment status</b>
Representative of Employment Office	54	m	Macedonian	Macedonian	Orthodox	Married	Higher	Employed
<i>Bairska Svetlina</i> representative	28	m	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Employed
<i>Felix Group</i> representative	46	f	Macedonian	Macedonian	Orthodox	Married	High	Employed
<i>Daja</i> (Bitola chapter) representative	38	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Primary	Employed
Youth male, employed	24	m	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Primary	Employed
Adult male, employed	40	m	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Secondary	Employed
Youth female, employed	17	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim		Primary	Employed
Youth female, employed	17	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Single	Primary	Employed
Adult female, employed	52	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Incomplete primary	Employed
Youth male, unemployed	23	m	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Unemployed
Adult male, unemployed	46	m	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Primary	Unemployed
Youth female, unemployed	25	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Primary	Unemployed
Adult female, unemployed	34	f	Rom	Macedonian	Muslim	Married	Incomplete primary	Unemployed

*Note:* Blank cells in the table above indicate that the focus group participant declined to provide the requested information.

#### FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

The questions used to structure discussion in the two focus groups on employment are given in the table below.

<b>Problems</b>	<b>Possible solutions</b>
Why is unemployment among Roms so high?	What can be done to reduce unemployment among Roms in the short term? In the long term?
Why is unemployment among Romani women even higher than among Romani men?	What can be done to promote the employment of Romani women?
If there are more unemployed Roms than employed Roms, how do Roms manage to survive?	Which survival strategies have been most successful among unemployed Roms?
Why are so many Roms dependent on the social welfare system?	What can be done to reduce dependence on the social welfare system?

#### RELEVANT FINDINGS

As discussed in the introduction to this core area above, unemployment poses a serious problem for large segments of the general population of the Republic of Macedonia, affecting all ethnic groups in the country. Because unemployment among Roms is disproportionately high, however, the list below focuses on the causes of unemployment among Roms in particular.

1. *Education.* As the least educated ethnic group in the Republic of Macedonia, Roms constitute the group with the lowest level of occupational qualification. This being the case, Roms were among the first to lose work in the transforming post-socialist economy and are among those least likely to be hired as new positions open sporadically. As one focus group participant put it, “people with university education are waiting for work, and what should we do? What do we offer with a primary school education, or [for that matter] without it?” In similar fashion, the even higher unemployment rate among Romani women can be explained largely in terms of women’s lower level of educational attainment. Here, it should be noted that in the present conditions, lack of education and unemployment form a vicious circle; just as employment depends largely in education, the possibility of completing education is a function of a level of economic well-being which comes from income acquired through work.
2. *Grey economy.* In the absence of legal employment opportunities, many Roms engage in semi-legal economic activity in as a means of material subsistence. In particular, many Romani women are employed informally as domestic help in non-Romani households. Others survive from proceeds from the sale of consumer goods (often purchased in and smuggled from neighbouring countries) without a permit. Involvement in semi-legal economic activity of this kind means that official unemployment figures overestimate the proportion of the Romani population (as well as of the general population) without means of subsistence other than social welfare payments, which focus group participants invariably characterized as insufficient for survival. At the same time, the extent to which such activity offers a viable means of subsistence depends on the purchasing

power of the surrounding population. Thus, participants of the focus group in Gostivar, where much of the local (ethnic Albanian) population receives funds from family members working in Western Europe, had a considerably brighter view of participation in the grey economy than did participants of the focus group in Bitola, where relatively few families have members employed abroad.

3. *Lack of information.* Despite the existence of a state Employment Bureau in Macedonia's larger towns (including Bitola and Gostivar), both focus groups on employment revealed that participants were generally not aware of the local Bureau's offerings, which include job listings as well as (re-)qualification courses. The establishment of contacts between the Employment Bureau and representatives of local Romani NGOs at the focus group in Bitola quickly proved fruitful, with the former contacting the latter about 20 open positions a few weeks after the focus group.
4. *Procedural irregularities in hiring.* Among focus group participants in Bitola in particular, reports of hiring by political party affiliation were common. While a few of the participants had attempted to participate in this form of corruption themselves through Romani political parties, the attempts had proven unsuccessful. Also reported in Bitola was discrimination by ethnic Macedonian employers on the basis of surname (as the surnames of most Roms in Macedonia are recognizably Muslim), but the extent of this practice is not clear.

#### GENERAL GOALS FOR INCREASING EMPLOYMENT AMONG ROMS

- Raising the level of educational attainment of the Romani population
- Increasing the visibility of the activities of local Employment Bureaus
- Anti-discrimination legislation on employment practices

#### IMMEDIATE MEASURES

1. *Occupational training.* Although Employment Bureaus currently organize courses in which unemployed persons can acquire skills to make them more employable, the number of courses offered is insufficient to meet existing demand. Courses offered through NGOs (e.g., Felix Group in Bitola, Daja in Kumanovo) have also proven successful, but the scale on which the courses have been offered is such that the total numbers of persons involved in them are small, with the Workers' Universities (vocational training institutions) located throughout the country possessing significant capacity for administering such courses. Important to ensuring that those who enrol in courses can also complete them is the provision of financial support for the duration of enrolment. Subjects in which focus group participants expressed interest include: auto mechanics, ceramics, childcare, computers, construction, cosmetology, dactylography, electronics, hairdressing, languages, locksmithing, masonry, sewing/tailoring, and upholstery. Here, it is worth noting that with the exception of music, focus group participants do not view traditional Romani occupations (e.g., basket-weaving, blacksmithing) as economically viable and do not wish to be trained in them.
2. *Establishment of regular contacts between Romani NGOs and Employment Bureaus.* While the main focus of efforts to increase employment among the Romani population should be on education, the outcome of the focus group in Bitola demonstrates the utility of ensuring that Romani NGOs and Employment

Bureaus know of each other's activities. With the initial contact arranged by a third party, the NGOs and Employment Bureaus could coordinate at their first meeting to share information on a regular basis.

3. *Agencies for domestic help.* Insofar as participation in semi-legal economic activity constitutes one of few available means of subsistence for the Republic of Macedonia's most disadvantaged population, attempting to eliminate such activity does not constitute a viable option at this point. The organization of domestic help into local agencies, on the other hand, would serve the interests of both the providers and the users of the service; whereas the former would be assured of fair working conditions and reliable pay, the latter would be ensured dependable service at a price set in advance. The idea to establish agencies of this type comes from participants of the focus group in Gostivar and has not been implemented in Macedonia or elsewhere in the region.
4. *Small credits.* For Roms with marketable skills, education is sometimes less a problem than is start-up capital. A programme of micro-credits to carefully screened entrepreneurs could therefore provide the economic stimulation necessary to employ persons already employable. While various donors have implemented micro-credit schemes in Macedonia with various degrees of success, none have focused on Roms as a particularly disadvantaged group.

#### **THE FOCUS GROUP ON ROMANI WOMEN AND GIRLS**

##### **FOCUS GROUP COMPOSITION**

The focus group on women and girls was held at the ECMI Regional NGO Resource Centre in Skopje on 4 November 2003. To ensure geographical representativeness, participants in this focus group were drawn from throughout the Republic of Macedonia. Of the thirteen participants, six were Romani activists engaged in work on issues specifically affecting Romani women and girls. With the exception of one woman without Macedonian citizenship, the remainder of the participants were ethnic Macedonians in frequent professional contact with Romani women and girls. Additional details on the participants in the focus group on women and girls are given in the table on the next page.

**Focus group on women and girls  
Skopje, 4 November 2003**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>First language</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<b>Marital status</b>	<b>Educational level</b>	<b>Employment status</b>
Primary school teacher	42	f	Macedonian	Macedonian	Christian	Married	Higher	Employed
Secondary school teacher	50	f	Macedonian	Macedonian	Christian	Married	Higher	Employed
Gynaecologist	48	m	Macedonian	Macedonian	Orthodox	Married	Higher	Employed
Paediatrician		m	Macedonian	Macedonian	Orthodox	Married	Higher	Employed
General practitioner	40	f	Macedonian	Macedonian		Single	Higher	Employed
Representative of Employment Office		f	Macedonian	Macedonian			Higher	Employed
<i>Luludi</i> representative	42	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim		Secondary	Employed
<i>Otvoreni Vrat</i> representative	22	f	Rom	Romani		Single	Higher	Student
<i>Daja</i> representative	45	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Divorced	Secondary	Employed
<i>Esma</i> representative	24	f	Rom	Romani	Muslim	Single	Secondary	Employed
<i>Romani Asvin</i> representative	22	f	Rom	Turkish	Muslim	Single	Primary	Unemployed
Independent Romani activist	22	f	Rom	Macedonian	Atheist	Single	Higher	Unemployed
Woman without Macedonian citizenship	48	f	Rom	Serbian	Catholic	Married	Incomplete primary	Unemployed

*Note:* Blank cells in the table above indicate that the focus group participant declined to provide the requested information.

### FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

Because the issues pertaining to the female Romani population in particular manifest themselves in the same core areas affecting the Romani population in general, the questions used to focus discussion in the focus group on women and girls were drawn from the previous focus groups. These questions are compiled in the table below.

<b>Core area</b>	<b>Problems</b>	<b>Possible solutions</b>
<i>Education</i>	<p>Why do fewer Romani girls than Romani boys finish school?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do differences in education between Romani boys and Romani girls affect the girls' choices?</li> <li>• How do differences in education between Romani boys and Romani girls affect relations between Romani men and Romani women?</li> </ul>	<p>What can be done to promote the education of Romani girls?</p>
<i>Health</i>	<p>Why do Roms tend to have more children than non-Roms?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent do Romani couples engage in realistic family planning?</li> <li>• How common is contraceptive use among Roms?</li> </ul>	<p>What can be done to ensure that modern contraceptive methods are known and available to those who want them?</p>
	<p>Under what conditions do Romani women visit the gynaecologist?</p>	<p>What can be done to encourage regular gynaecological exams among Romani women?</p>
	<p>What are the causes of the high infant morbidity and mortality rates among Roms?</p>	<p>What can be done to reduce the infant morbidity and mortality rates among Roms?</p>
<i>Civil rights</i>	<p>How widespread is domestic violence among Roms in Macedonia?</p>	<p>How can domestic violence be eliminated?</p>
<i>Employment</i>	<p>Why is unemployment among Romani women even higher than among Romani men?</p>	<p>What can be done to promote the employment of Romani women?</p>

## RELEVANT FINDINGS

Findings related specifically to Romani women and girls constitute an integral part of the findings of the focus groups in the four core areas and for this reason have been presented with the findings of those focus groups. For the sake of completeness, however, these findings are reviewed in summary form below under the rubric of the core areas within which they are discussed in greater detail above.

1. *Education.* Romani women's lower level of educational attainment with respect to Romani men seems to be attributable primarily to marriage of Romani girls before they complete primary school. Also problematic is that some Romani families emphasize male education at the expense of female education on the grounds that girls leave the parental household once married.
2. *Health.* While most Romani women undergo regular gynaecological examinations, they tend to do so only once married. Contraceptive use, on the other hand, varies regionally, and appears much higher in Skopje than in Eastern Macedonia. Roms' relatively high birth-rate, however, seems to have less to do with access to contraception than with the age at which childbearing begins and with a widespread preference for male children. The main causes of infant mortality are home births and the hygienic conditions in many Romani households. On the positive side, Romani mothers tend to make use of breastfeeding as the primary form of nutrition for their children.
3. *Civil rights.* Domestic violence perpetrated both on and by women tends to occur in families the members of which have little formal education in an attempt to resolve conflicts physically rather than through dialogue. For women abused by their husbands, economic dependence often means that there is no obvious alternative to living with domestic violence. Shame also plays a role, with cases of domestic violence not generally reported.
4. *Employment.* The disproportionate presence of women among the unemployed Romani population is explicable largely in terms of Romani women's lower level of educational attainment with respect to their male counterparts. In the absence of legal employment opportunities, many Romani women participate in Macedonia's large grey economy through informal employment as domestic help and selling consumer goods without a permit.

## GENERAL GOALS FOR RAISING THE STATUS OF ROMANI WOMEN AND GIRLS

- Equalization of educational opportunities for boys and girls
- Reproductive health education
- Human rights education
- Introduction of legislation on domestic violence

## SPECIFIC MEASURES

As is the case with the findings of the focus groups, immediate measures to raise the status of Romani women and girls are best viewed in the context of measures to be undertaken in the four core areas. A brief review of the specific relevance to Romani women and girls of measures discussed in the respective sections on the other focus groups is given below.

1. *Education.* The parents of Romani girls must be informed that the completion of primary education is required by law for female as well as male children and that it is a condition for health insurance and unemployment benefits.
2. *Health.* Family counselling centres could offer informational material and peer counselling on preventive healthcare practices, including but not limited to family planning and healthy breastfeeding practices.
3. *Civil rights.* Toward the elimination of domestic violence in Romani households, the family counselling centres mentioned above could also provide information and training on the rights of women, as well as on conflict resolution. Additionally, legal aid offices could provide assistance in reporting cases of domestic violence.
4. *Employment.* Insofar as domestic help in non-Romani households is primarily the domain of Romani women, the organization of domestic help into local agencies would contribute to improving Romani women's economic status.

## VIII. CONCLUSION

### REVIEW

Consisting in an assessment of the needs of the Romani population in the Republic of Macedonia, this project has attempted to fill a gap left by both the Macedonian government and by the efforts of international organizations with a presence in Macedonia. The assessment has been undertaken in the belief that while the degree to which the Romani population is integrated in Macedonia may be higher than the degree to which Roms have been integrated as a distinct group anywhere and at any time, the general neglect of the Romani population in the post-Communist period (as well as in the Communist period) leaves a considerable vacuum to be filled by non-governmental actors.

The findings of the focus groups in the four core areas demonstrate the centrality of education in accounting for Roms' comparative disadvantage in the domains of health, civil rights, and employment. Whereas Roms' low level of educational attainment is explicable in terms of a combination of language barriers, material conditions, family dynamics, and ethnic isolation, the relationships between education and the other three core areas can be summarized as follows:

- *Health.* Whereas sporadic school attendance means that many Romani children miss necessary vaccinations, many adult Roms are not eligible for health insurance provided by the state. More broadly, the low level of educational attainment of the Romani population accounts for the low level of awareness of preventive healthcare practices.
- *Civil rights.* Because information on civil rights in Macedonia tends to be available only in a form intelligible to persons who have completed more than primary education, the low level of educational attainment of the Romani population constitutes a principal factor in Roms' lack of knowledge about their civil rights. Further, insofar as the educational process teaches that conflicts are best resolved through dialogue, lack of education among the Romani population contributes to the incidence of domestic violence.
- *Employment.* As the group with the lowest level of educational attainment in the Republic of Macedonia, Roms are also the group with the lowest level of occupational qualification. As such, Roms were among the first to lose work with the collapse of the socialist economy and are unlikely to be employed as new positions open in the increasingly market-driven economy.

The disadvantage of Romani women relative to Romani men in all three core areas is largely explicable in terms of differences in level of educational attainment, with this difference due in large part to marriage of Romani girls before completion of primary school. Moreover, lack of education within the Romani population in general forms vicious circles with incomplete enjoyment of civil rights on the one hand and with high unemployment on the other: Whereas in the former case lack of knowledge about civil rights contributes to suspicion of ongoing violations of those rights and the perception that Roms are powerless to do anything about such violations such that becoming informed is futile, in the latter case the lack of occupational qualification

resulting from a low level of educational attainment makes for unemployment and thus leads to material conditions not conducive to the completion of education.

In light of the role played by Roms' low level of educational attainment in explaining their marginalization, measures designed to increase Roms' integration into the society of the Republic of Macedonia should emphasize education in both the long term and the short term. The general goals and specific measures outlined in the sections of this report on the focus groups reflect these priorities.

To the extent that it has been successful, the current document will serve as the foundation for a strategy aimed at increasing Roms' level of integration into the society of the Republic of Macedonia. Additionally, insofar as the design of the needs assessment and the issues covered by it are broadly applicable to Macedonia's neighbours, this project could be adapted for implementation in other countries in the region.

#### **FOLLOW-ON**

A key element in the development of ECMI projects is the early involvement of the local communities who constitute the beneficiaries of the projects, such that stakeholders also play a central role in project implementation. This is also a core component in ECMI's sustainability strategy for its projects. Often, ECMI reduces its role to that of facilitator at the earliest possible moment, to establish a genuine sense of what is sometimes referred to as "local ownership". In addition to facilitating dialogue, ECMI makes available international expertise, advises on policy initiatives and offers capacity enhancement through training and other measures.

Before embarking on any follow-on initiative based on the current needs assessment, the soundness of the analysis and the appropriateness of the solutions outlined herein should be discussed with local stakeholders. This could be accomplished most effectively in a meeting bringing together approximately 50 local leaders with experience in working with Romani communities. While most of those in attendance at the meeting will have participated in the focus groups which constitute the core of the needs assessment, also invited will be stakeholders without previous involvement in the project. Through this meeting, ECMI will seek critical stakeholder feedback on the findings of the needs assessment and on possible follow-on measures.

Vital to ensuring that the findings of the evaluation will be put to use in concrete project initiatives addressing the real needs of the Romani population is raising the levels of information and synchronization among international donors with a presence in Macedonia. Insofar as international donor initiatives to date have often suffered from a combination of a lack of a global view of the conditions in which the Romani population lives and a lack of coordination with other donors, the current document offers the basis for a reversal of these trends. With this in mind, the evaluation report should be distributed to international donors in Macedonia in advance of a forum for discussion of the findings and of possible follow-on measures. Ideally, the international donors' forum would be held after the meeting with local stakeholders in order to maximize stakeholder input prior to any decisions on funding.

Rather than developing and implementing any of the specific measures sketched briefly above on the basis of a decision made at the level of the international donor

community, follow-on initiatives could be generated by Romani working groups formed around the four core areas (i.e., education, health, civil rights, and employment). By meeting on a regular basis to develop project initiatives in their respective areas of expertise, the working groups would ensure that local stakeholders are actively involved in designing and implementing the programming that affects them.

In addition to enabling timely implementation of pilot projects, small funding facilities assigned to the working groups would allow them to undertake additional research and consultation for the design of initiatives building on the findings of the needs assessment. Consistent with its role as facilitator, ECMI would offer the working groups expert consultation in project design and implementation while ensuring a consistent standard of quality control. Additionally, ECMI would lobby actively in seeking external donor support for the expansion and/or replication of projects which have proven successful in their pilot phase.

The availability of additional funding would allow the working groups to take part in training activities of relevance to their work and thus to develop their sectoral expertise. In the medium term, the working groups' participation in capacity-building events would contribute to the groups' professionalization and, in so doing, to the sustainability of the follow-on. In this manner, the follow-on would make a significant contribution to increasing Roms' level of integration into the society of Macedonia as a whole by promoting the growth of an indigenous Romani expert community.

## PROJECT TEAM

This needs assessment was designed and implemented as a collaborative effort between ECMI's headquarters in Flensburg, Germany, and its Regional Office in Skopje, which has been in operation since early 2001.

ECMI Flensburg boasts an international team of researchers and conflict management experts backed up by an administrative infrastructure with experience in organizing international conferences, meetings and training seminars. Amongst its Flensburg-based staff, this project was administered by:

- *Project leader*

**Eben Friedman** (USA), Research Associate. After spending two years conducting fieldwork in Macedonia and Slovakia, he completed his PhD in political science at the University of California, San Diego in September of 2002. The title of his dissertation was "Explaining the Political Integration of Minorities: Roms as a Hard Case." He also holds an MA in political science from the Johns Hopkins University.

- *Project supervisor*

**Marc Weller** (Germany), Director of ECMI and Assistant Director of Studies in the Centre of International Studies at the University of Cambridge as well as a Fellow of the Lauterpacht Research Centre for International Law. He is a widely acclaimed expert on Balkan affairs and has published extensively on issues pertaining to the former Yugoslavia, most recently, *The Yugoslav Crisis in International Law: General Issues*, Cambridge University Press, 1997 (with David Bethlehem) and *The Crisis in Kosovo 1989-1999*, Documents & Analysis Publishing, 1999. He has acted as consultant on a number of conflict management issues, including Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. He is Council for Bosnia-Herzegovina in the International Court of Justice and was legal advisor at the Rambouillet Conference on Kosovo.

In Macedonia, ECMI has operated a Regional Office since early 2001. The Regional Office Team, which took an active role at all phases of the project, is led by:

- *Project advisor*

**Sunoor Verma** (India), Regional Representative. A cardiac surgeon by training, Dr. Verma is also an expert on project management, proposal writing, fundraising, negotiation, and organizational sustainability. After serving as medical advisor to the UN High Commissioner on Refugees (UNHCR) Humanitarian Evacuation Program during the 1999 Kosovo refugee crisis, he worked as a project management consultant to the Center for Refugees and Forced Migration Studies in Skopje. Since joining ECMI in January 2001, he has led the formation of the ECMI NGO Network for the Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the Republic of Macedonia and the development of the Network into a resource for other national and regional initiatives.

For the purposes of the needs assessment, two local Research Assistants were employed on a temporary basis to provide support in implementing the project.

- *Research assistant*

**Gjulten Dalipovska**, third-year law student at the University of Saints Cyril and Methodius in Skopje. Since she began university, she has also worked in various

Romani NGOs in Skopje, as well as in then Open Society Institute – Macedonia’s Women’s Program. Ms. Dalipovska also serves as coordinator of a group of young Romani women conducting a critical examination of the role of female virginity in contemporary Romani life. Her last engagement before joining the ECMI Project Team was as an intern in the Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia.

- *Research assistant*

**Robert Rustem**, final-year student at the Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy in Skopje. Active in the NGO sector in Macedonia since his secondary school career, he now works as a trainer for the Nansen Dialogue Centre in Skopje, as well as for the Council of Europe. Additionally, since October 2003 Mr. Rustem has hosted a weekly broadcast on Macedonian state television concerning ongoing projects in the NGO sector. He also serves as a consultant to the Association of Romani Women and Youth “*Luludi*”.

Within the Regional Office Team in Skopje, this project also drew on the skills, local contacts, and experience of two Programme Managers, a Finance Manager, and an Office Manager/Project Management Assistant. Further afield in Macedonia, the project made use of the administrative and logistical support provided by the Technical Assistants in each of the Regional NGO Resource Centres.

## **ECMI PROFILE**

**The European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI)** conducts practice-oriented research, provides information and documentation, and offers advisory services concerning minority-majority relations in Europe. It serves European governments and regional intergovernmental organizations as well as non-dominant groups in the European area. The Centre also supports the academic community, the media and the general public through the timely provision of information and analysis. The early monitoring, study and resolution of ethnic tension and potential conflict in all regions of Europe - East and West - provides one of the major focal points for the activities of the Centre. The Centre organizes its activities around three principal themes. It is concerned with the evaluation and further development of universal, regional, bilateral and national standards that may assist in consolidating democratic governance on the basis of ethnic diversity and human rights. In this context, ECMI is also particularly interested in the emerging convergence of standards between EU member states and applicant states.

A second area of interest relates to implementation procedures and mechanisms for such standards and the study of their effectiveness. At times, ECMI may also be invited to consider implementation issues and majority-minority relations in particular states in cooperation with the government of that state and local groups.

The third strand of ECMI's activities concerns constructive conflict-management. ECMI is at present developing its capacity to assist international peace-support efforts in addressing conflicts with an ethnopolitical dimension in the wider Europe. ECMI also maintains links to several regions of tension in Europe and engages local protagonists in dialogue, either in the region or in a neutral environment. In so doing, the Centre can draw upon the successful history of managing minority issues in the German-Danish border area, being based in Flensburg, Germany, at the very heart of that region.

ECMI was founded in 1996 by the governments of Denmark, Germany and Schleswig-Holstein. It is a non-partisan and interdisciplinary institution which can draw upon an international core staff of the highest calibre, supplemented by a number of Visiting Fellows and Visiting Research Associates from all over Europe and beyond. The Centre also maintains active relations with other institutions involved in conflict resolution and interethnic relations and engages in collaborative projects with them. While its core funding is provided by its governmental sponsors, the Centre actively pursues project-based funding to support its rapidly expanding activities. ECMI is governed by a Board of nine members: three from Denmark, three from Germany, and one representative each from the OSCE, the Council of Europe and the European Union. The working language of ECMI is English.

ECMI occupies a historic building in the centre of Flensburg where it also holds meetings and conferences. The building also houses its specialized library and provides the hub for ECMI's ambitious publishing projects and Internet information programme. These activities are supported by a dedicated IT and library team.

ECMI will be delighted to supply any further information that may be required.

Eben Friedman, PhD  
ECMI Research Associate  
Tel: +49 (0) 461 14149 62  
Fax: +49 (0) 461 14149 69  
E-mail: [friedman@ecmi.de](mailto:friedman@ecmi.de)

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aceski, Ilija. 1996. *Skopje: Vizija i realnost*. Skopje: Filozofski fakultet.
- Aloui, Lazhar, Violeta Petroska-Beshka, and Mirjana Najchevska. 1999. *Situation Analysis of Roma Women and Children*. Skopje: UNICEF.
- Ašuri, Robertina, and Rubin Zemon. 1996. Kratok osvrt za istorijata na dviženjeto na Egipkjanite na Balkanot i vo Makedonija. *Zbornik na trudovi za etnogenezata na Egipkjanite vo Makedonija*. Ed. Rubin Zemon. Skopje: Logos - T.
- Augustini ab Hortis, Samuel. 1995. *Cigáni v Uhorsku*. Bratislava: Štúdio dd.
- Bernasovský, Ivan, and Jarmila Bernasovská. 1999. *Anthropology of Romanies (Gypsies): Auxological and Anthropogenetical Study*. Brno: NAUMA/Universitas Masarykiana.
- Bubevski, Dušan. 1985. Nekoi aspekti na nacionalniot sostav na naselenieto vo SR Makedonija vo periodot 1948-1981 godina. *Problemi na demografskiot razvoj vo SR Makedonija*. Ed. Ksente Bogoev. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite.
- Courthiade, Marcel. May 2001. O pôvode rómskeho národa - skutočnosť a legendy. *Sam adaj - Sme tu*, pp. 4-5.
- Cox, T., and R. L. Beale. 1997. *Developing Competency to Manage Diversity*. San Francisco : Berrett-Koehler.
- Crowe, David M. 1996. *A History of the Gypsies of Eastern Europe and Russia*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.
- Devetak, Silvo. 1988. *The Equality of Nations and Nationalities in Yugoslavia: Successes and Dilemmas*. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller.
- Dreachslin, J. L. 1998. Conductive Effective Focus Groups in the Context of Diversity: Theoretical Underpinnings and Practical Implications. *Qualitative Health Research* 8, no. 6: 813-20.
- Druker, Jeremy. 1997. Present but Unaccounted for: How Many Roma Live in Central and Eastern Europe? It Depends on Whom You Ask. *Transitions* 4, no. 4: 22-23.
- Duijzings, Ger. 1997. The Making of Egyptians in Kosovo and Macedonia. *The Politics of Ethnic Consciousness*. Ed. Cora Govers and Hans Vermeulen. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- European Commission against Racism and Intolerance. 1999. *Izveštaj za Republika Makedonija*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. *Second Report on "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

- European Roma Rights Center. 1998. *A Pleasant Fiction: The Human Rights Situation of Roma in Macedonia*. Budapest: European Roma Rights Center.
- Fraser, Angus. 1995. *The Gypsies*. Second ed. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1999. The Romani Language in the Republic of Macedonia: Status, Usage, and Sociolinguistic Perspectives. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 46: 317-39.
- Grellmann, Heinrich Moritz Gottlieb. 1787. *Historischer Versuch über die Zigeuner betreffend die Lebensart und Verfassung, Sitten und Schicksale dieses Volks seit seiner Erscheinung in Europa, und dessen Ursprung*. Second ed. Göttingen: Johann Christian Dieterich.
- Hadži-Ristikj, Miodrag. 1996. Prašanjeto na etnogenezata na Egipkjanite vo Makedonija. *Zbornik na trudovi za etnogenezata na Egipkjanite vo Makedonija*. Ed. Rubin Zemon. Skopje: Logos - T.
- Hancock, Ian. 1991. The East European Roots of Romani Nationalism. Ed. David Crowe and John Kolsti. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.
- Helsinški komitet na čovekovi prava na Republika Makedonija. 1999. *Izveštaj za registrirani kršenja na čovekovite prava vo oktombri, noemvri i dekembri 1999 godina*. Skopje: Helsinški komitet za čovekovi prava na Republika Makedonija.
- Horváthová, Emília. 1964. *Cigáni na Slovensku: Historicko-etnografický náčrt*. Bratislava: Vydateľstvo Slovenskej Akadémie Vied.
- Ivanov, Andrey, Anna Csongor, Dimitrina Petrova, Dirk Westhoff, Nikolay Kirilov, Rebecca Jean Emigh, Rumyan Sechkov, and Sarah Takach. 2002. *The Roma in Central and Eastern Europe: Avoiding the Dependency Trap*. Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme.
- Jurová, Anna. 2000. K otázkam pôvodu a pomenovania Rómov. *Človek a spoločnosť* 3, no. 3.
- Kalibova, Kveta. 2000. The Demographic Characteristics of Roma/Gypsies in Selected Countries in Central and Eastern Europe. *The Demographic Characteristics of National Minorities in Certain European States*. Ed. Werner Haug, Paul Compton, and Youssef Courbage. Vol. 2. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Kenrick, Donald. 1993. *Gypsies: From India to the Mediterranean*. Toulouse: Gypsy Research Center/CRDP Midi Pyrénées.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. Former Yugoslavia: A Patchwork of Destinies. *Between Past and Future: The Roma of Central and Eastern Europe*. Ed. Will Guy. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.

- Kovačec, August. 1991. Languages of National Minorities and Ethnic Groups in Yugoslavia. *Language Planning in Yugoslavia*. Ed. Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, Inc.
- Kuzman, Pasko. 1996. Arheološki tragi za Egipkjanite vo jugozapadna Makedonija. *Zbornik na trudovi za etnogenezata na Egipkjanite vo Makedonija*. Ed. Rubin Zemon. Skopje: Logos - T.
- Lakinska-Popovska, Divna. 2001a. *Vulnerability of Roma Children in the Dispersed Roma Communities in Skopje*. Skopje: UNICEF.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001b. *Vulnerability of Roma Children in the Municipality of Shuto Orizari*. Skopje: UNICEF.
- Liégeois, Jean-Pierre, and Nicolae Gheorghe. 1995. *Roma/Gypsies: A European Minority*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- Lockwood, William G. 1986. East European Gypsies in Western Europe: The Social and Cultural Adaptation of the Xoraxane. *Nomadic Peoples*, no. 21/22: 63-70.
- Mann, Arne B. 1990. Odkiaľ prišli Rómovia? *Historická revue*, no. 3: 7-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. *Rómsky dejepis: Doplnkový učebný text pre vyučovanie dejepisu*. Bratislava: Kalligram.
- Mariampolski, H. 1989. Focus Groups on Sensitive Topics: How to Get Subjects to Open Up and Feel Good about Telling the Truth. *Applied Marketing Research* 29, no. 1: 6-11.
- Marushiakova, Elena, Herbert Heuss, Ivan Boev, Jan Rychlik, Nadege Ragaru, Rubin Zemon, Vesselin Popov, and Victor Friedman. 2001. *Identity Formation among Minorities in the Balkans: The Cases of Roms, Egyptians and Ashkali in Kosovo*. Sofia: Minority Studies Society *Studii Romani*.
- Marushiakova, Elena, and Vesselin Popov. 2001. *Gypsies in the Ottoman Empire: A contribution to the history of the Balkans*. Ed. Donald Kenrick. Paris and Hatfield: Centre de recherches tsiganes and University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Macedonia. 1997. *Situation of Roma in the Republic of Macedonia*. Skopje: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Macedonia.
- Morgan, D. L., Ed. 1993. *Successful Focus Groups: Advancing the State of the Art*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Mujić, Muhamed A. 1952-1953. Položaj Cigana u jugoslovenskim zemljama pod osmanskom vlašću. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 3-4: 137-93.
- Najčevska, Mirjana. 2001. Nesigurnost koja proizleguva od nesrednite etnički odnosi. Skopje: Institut za sociološki i političko-pravni istraživanja.

- Nanevska, Branka. 10 January 2002. Ball Extravaganza, Soup Kitchens and Garbage Containers. *AIM Skopje*, available online at [www.aimpress.org](http://www.aimpress.org).
- Petrović, Đurđica. 1976. Društveni položaj Cigana u nekim jugoslovenskim zemljama u XV i XVI veku. *Jugoslovenski istorijski časopis* 1-2: 45-66.
- Petrovski, Trajko. 2000. Romite vo Vizantija. *Puls* 10, no. 472: 64-65.
- Popović, Alexandre. 1989. Islamische Bewegungen in Jugoslawien. *Die Muslime in der Sowjetunion und in Jugoslawien*. Ed. Andreas Kappeler, Gerhard Simon, and Georg Brunner. Köln: Markus Verlag.
- Popovski, Vlado, and Mitko Panov. 1998. *Opštini vo Republika Makedonija spored novata podelba vo 1996 godina*. Skopje: Misl.
- Poulton, Hugh. 1989. *Minorities in the Balkans*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. *The Balkans: Minorities and States in Conflict*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. The Roma in Macedonia: A Balkan Success Story? *RFE/RL Research Report* 2, no. 19: 42-45.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. *Who are the Macedonians?* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. *Minorities in Southeast Europe: Inclusion and Exclusion*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- Puxon, Grattan. 1976. Roma in Macedonia. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 1: 128-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980. Tito and the Future of Roma. *Roma* 5: 5-7.
- Ramet, Sabrina P. 1992. *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia, 1962-1991*. Second ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Reemstma, Katrin. 1995. *Roma in Mazedonien*. Göttingen: Gesellschaft für bedrohte Völker.
- Ringold, Dena. 2000. *Roma and the Transition in Central and Eastern Europe: Trends and Challenges*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Ringold, Dena, Mitchell A. Orenstein, and Erika Wilkens. 2003. *Roma in an Expanding Europe: Breaking the Poverty Cycle*. World Bank.
- Risteski, Stojan. 1991. *Narodni prikazni, predanija i običaji kai Egipkjanite/Egjupcite vo Makedonija*. Ohrid: Nikola Kosteski.
- Silverman, Carol. 1995. Roma of Shuto Orizari, Macedonia: Class, Politics, and Community. *East European Communities: The Struggle for Balance in Turbulent Times*. Ed. David A. Kideckel. Boulder: Westview Press.

- Sinclair, Albert Thomas. 1909-1910. The Word 'Rom'. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 3: 33-42.
- Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija. 1992. Zakon za državljanstvo na Republika Makedonija. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 67.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. Zakon za osnovnoto obrazovanie. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 44.
- Soulis, George C. 1961. The Gypsies in the Byzantine Empire and the Balkans in the Late Middle Ages. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, no. 15: 142-65.
- Stalin, Joseph. 1942a. Marxism and the National Question. *Joseph Stalin: Marxism and the National Question, Selected Writings and Speeches*. New York: International Publishers.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1942b. New Features of the National Question. *Marxism and the National Question, Selected Writings and Speeches*. New York: International Publishers.
- State Statistical Office. 2003. *Census of Population, Households and Dwellings in the Republic of Macedonia, 2002*, no. 2.1.3.30. Available online at [www.stat.gov.mk](http://www.stat.gov.mk).
- Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia. 1997. *The 1994 Census of Population, Households, Dwellings and Agricultural Holdings in the Republic of Macedonia*. Skopje: Statistical Office of Macedonia.
- Stojanovski, Aleksandar. 1989. *Makedonija vo turskoto srednovekovie (od krajot na XIV - početokot na XVIII vek)*. Skopje: Kultura.
- Škiljan, Dubravko. 1988. *Jezična politika*. Zagreb: Naprijed.
- U.S. Department of State. 1999. *The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1998*. Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Washington, DC. Available online at [www.state.gov](http://www.state.gov).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. *1999 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*. Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Washington, DC. Available online at [www.state.gov](http://www.state.gov).
- UNICEF. 2001. *Situation Analysis of Children and Families*. Skopje: UNICEF.
- Van der Stoep, Max. 2000. *Report on the Situation of Roma and Sinti in the OSCE Area*. The Hague: Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.
- Willems, Wim. 1997. *In Search of the True Gypsy: From Enlightenment to Final Solution*. Trans. Don Bloch. London: Frank Cass.
- World Bank. 1999. *Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Focusing on the Poor*. Vol. I (Main Report). Washington, DC: The World Bank.

- Zemon, Rubin. 1996. Etnodemografski karakteristiki na Egipkjanite vo Makedonija. *Zbornik na trudovi za etnogenezata na Egipkjanite vo Makedonija*. Ed. Rubin Zemon. Skopje: Logos - T.
- Zirojević, Olga. 1981. Romi na području današnje Jugoslavije u vreme turske vladavine. *Glasnik Etnografskog muzeja u Beogradu* 25: 225-45.
- Zoon, Ina. 2001. *On the Margins: Roma and Public Services in Romania, Bulgaria, and Macedonia*. New York: Open Society Institute.

## STATISTICAL APPENDIX

### Graduated students according to ethnic affiliation, sex and municipalities (regular primary and lower secondary schools)

	Вкупно Total	Македонци Macedonians	Албанци Albanians	Турци Turks	Роми Roms
1998/1999					
2000/2001					
2001/2002					
<b>Република</b>					
<b>Македонија</b>					
Republic of Macedonia					
	30389	19849	8212	979	372
	30252	19106	8386	1098	518
	31090	19453	8716	1194	598
<b>Гази Баба</b>					
Gazi Baba					
	905	683	169	6	9
	937	695	190	10	9
	1036	745	231	2	21
<b>Ѓорче Петров</b>					
Gjorče Petrov					
	479	421	24	3	12
	494	427	25	4	11
	521	438	28	5	16
<b>Карпош</b>					
Karpoš					
	913	840	43	3	3
	889	802	51	4	8
	924	830	53	2	9
<b>Кисела Вода</b>					
Kisela Voda					
	1818	1712	7	17	20
	1698	1607	4	5	21
	1634	1518	3	17	35
<b>Центар</b>					
Centar					
	1365	726	434	139	8
	1426	704	454	169	26
	1484	684	493	230	15
<b>Чаир</b>					
Čair					
	875	519	265	11	25
	919	518	327	4	30
	869	452	326	7	33
<b>Шуто Оризари</b>					
Šuto Orizari					
	240	10	100	-	126
	321	2	108	-	208
	315	-	117	4	192

**Арачиново**

Aračinovo

187	14	173	-	-
201	6	195	-	-
152	-	152	-	-

**Бач**

Bač

6	6	-	-	-
7	7	-	-	-
6	6	-	-	-

**Белчишта**

Belčišta

27	26	-	-	-
23	21	-	-	-
24	24	-	-	-

**Берово**

Berovo

206	202	-	-	-
170	163	-	1	6
216	206	-	-	10

**Бистрица**

Bistrica

75	57	18	-	-
71	52	19	-	-
69	49	20	-	-

**Битола**

Bitola

1293	1221	40	26	2
1247	1148	46	32	12
1195	1117	36	24	12

**Блатец**

Blatec

35	35	-	-	-
25	25	-	-	-
28	-	-	-	-

**Богданци**

Bogdanci

149	130	-	2	1
154	142	-	-	-
139	132	-	-	-

**Боговиње**

Bogovinje

302	-	302	-	-
292	-	292	-	-
292	-	292	-	-

**Богомила**

Bogomila

16	15	1	-	-
9	8	1	-	-
11	11	-	-	-

**Босилово**

Bosilovo

124	123	-	1	-
128	126	-	2	-
134	133	-	1	-

**Брвеница**

Brvenica

233	93	140	-	-
253	86	167	-	-
260	116	144	-	-

**Валандово**

Valandovo

192	167	-	19	-
186	146	-	29	-
205	161	-	26	-

**Василево**

Vasilevo

128	127	-	1	-
124	122	-	2	-
134	131	-	3	-

**Вевчани**

Vevčani

36	36	-	-	-
36	36	-	-	-
31	31	-	-	-

**Велес**

Veles

879	737	90	6	3
809	695	48	13	-
846	698	56	14	4

**Велешта**

Velešta

128	-	128	-	-
111	-	111	-	-
139	-	139	-	-

**Виница**

Vinica

255	246	-	1	6
240	229	-	6	2
271	259	-	2	9

**Витолиште**

Vitolište

1	1	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-

**Вранешница**

Vranešnica

10	10	-	-	-
5	5	-	-	-
2	2	-	-	-

**Врапчиште**

Vrapčište

127	23	49	55	-
163	19	67	77	-
143	23	57	63	-

**Вратница**

Vratnica

14	14	-	-	-
30	30	-	-	-
21	21	-	-	-

<b>Вруток</b> Vrutok	64	8	56	-	-
	59	3	56	-	-
	66	2	64	-	-
<b>Гевгелија</b> Gevgelija	318	318	-	-	-
	271	271	-	-	-
	270	265	-	-	-
<b>Гостивар</b> Gostivar	910	252	505	127	16
	929	258	502	135	22
	989	264	510	164	38
<b>Градско</b> Gradsko	54	74	2	2	-
	55	38	2	3	-
	51	41	-	2	-
<b>Дебар</b> Debar	238	7	218	12	16
	346	12	210	29	24
	359	15	216	13	-
<b>Дологожди</b> Dologozdi	140	-	139	-	1
	153	-	153	-	-
	139	-	137	-	2
<b>Делчево</b> Delcevo	265	252	-	2	9
	254	248	-	-	6
	296	280	-	1	15
<b>Демир Капија</b> Demir Karija	50	37	-	8	-
	51	46	-	2	-
	56	47	-	6	-
<b>Демир Хисар</b> Demir Hisar	100	94	6	-	-
	89	84	5	-	-
	87	85	2	-	-
<b>Добрушево</b> Dobruševo	43	42	-	1	-
	38	35	-	3	-
	39	35	-	4	-
<b>Долна Бањица</b> Dolna Banjica	3	-	3	-	-
	9	-	9	-	-
	9	-	9	-	-

<b>Долнени</b>					
Dolneni	163	60	21	41	-
	147	48	24	31	-
	165	44	33	41	-
<b>Другово</b>					
Drugovo	22	18	-	3	-
	33	30	2	-	-
	38	28	1	8	-
<b>Желино</b>					
Želino	433	-	438	-	-
	409	-	409	-	-
	454	-	454	-	-
<b>Житоше</b>					
Žitoše	77	-	44	-	-
	61	-	39	-	-
	60	-	49	-	-
<b>Зајас</b>					
Zajac	142	-	142	-	-
	145	-	145	-	-
	151	-	151	-	-
<b>Зелениково</b>					
Zelenikovo	69	32	31	-	1
	91	45	42	-	1
	83	41	37	-	-
<b>Злетово</b>					
Zletovo	35	35	-	-	-
	36	36	-	-	-
	33	33	-	-	-
<b>Зрновци</b>					
Zrnovci	63	63	-	-	-
	43	43	-	-	-
	33	33	-	-	-
<b>Извор</b>					
Izvor	15	15	-	-	-
	11	11	-	-	-
	11	11	-	-	-
<b>Илинден</b>					
Ilinden	216	201	3	-	-
	179	156	7	-	3
	207	178	13	-	5
<b>Јегуновце</b>					
Jegunovce	125	75	48	-	1
	130	77	51	-	2
	115	51	63	-	-

**Кавадарци**

Kavadarci

624	621	-	-	1
583	571	-	3	5
556	540	-	3	10

**Камењане**

Kamenjane

219	-	199	20	-
243	-	223	20	-
248	-	220	28	-

**Карбинци**

Karbinci

57	56	-	1	-
53	48	-	4	1
61	55	-	4	-

**Кичево**

Kičevo

458	299	105	39	8
478	281	117	54	20
453	287	95	43	22

**Клечевце**

Klečevce

7	7	-	-	-
10	10	-	-	-
7	7	-	-	-

**Кондово**

Kondovo

206	-	206	-	-
231	-	231	-	-
201	-	201	-	-

**Конопиште**

Konopište

-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-

**Конче**

Konče

23	27	-	7	-
44	37	-	7	-
40	32	-	8	-

**Косел**

Kosel

16	16	-	-	-
20	20	-	-	-
20	20	-	-	-

**Кочани**

Kočani

460	445	-	5	9
433	422	-	-	4
567	551	-	6	10

**Кратово**

Kratovo

162	161	-	-	-
146	145	-	-	1
153	152	-	-	1

**Крива Паланка**

Kriva Palanka

326	325	-	-	1
330	322	-	-	8
327	316	-	-	10

**Кривогаштани**

Krivogaštani

65	65	-	-	-
83	83	-	-	-
76	76	-	-	-

**Крушево**

Kruševo

97	93	-	-	-
93	86	1	-	-
98	88	-	-	-

**Куклиш**

Kukliš

70	70	-	-	-
50	50	-	-	-
63	63	-	-	-

**Кукуречани**

Kukurečani

43	42	1	-	-
35	35	-	-	-
49	47	1	-	1

**Куманово**

Kumanovo

1563	90	455	2	24
1547	928	466	6	18
1658	1011	494	4	30

**Лабуништа**

Labuništa

197	196	1	-	-
183	183	-	-	-
195	195	-	-	-

**Липково**

Lipkovo

389	-	384	-	-
433	-	433	-	-
440	-	440	-	-

**Лозово**

Lozovo

52	48	1	2	-
49	44	-	5	-
-	-	-	-	-

**Луково**

Lukovo

22	22	-	-	-
14	14	-	-	-
27	27	-	-	-

**Маврови Анови**

Mavrovi Anovi

19	9	4	-	-
15	5	6	-	-
12	7	3	-	-

**Македонска****Каменица**

Makedonska Kamenica

121	119	-	-	-
107	107	-	-	-
152	151	-	-	-

**Македонски Брод**

Makedonski Brod

91	91	-	-	-
95	95	-	-	-
96	96	-	-	-

**Мешеишта**

Mešeišta

46	46	-	-	-
39	39	-	-	-
35	35	-	-	-

**Миравци**

Miravci

34	34	-	-	-
31	31	-	-	-
28	28	-	-	-

**Могила**

Mogila

59	59	-	-	-
47	47	-	-	-
67	67	-	-	-

**Муртино**

Murtino

105	103	-	-	-
100	99	-	1	-
88	86	-	-	-

**Неготино**

Negotino

307	294	-	2	2
285	264	-	8	3
300	269	-	6	8

**Неготино Полошко**

Negotino Pološko

330	-	330	-	-
342	-	342	-	-
347	-	347	-	-

**Новаци**

Novaci

32	32	-	-	-
40	40	-	-	-
30	30	-	-	-

**Ново Село**

Novo Selo

169	168	-	-	-
152	152	-	-	-
176	176	-	-	-

**Облешево**

Obleševo

7	7	-	-	-
55	55	-	-	-
66	66	-	-	-

<b>Оризари</b> Orizari	53	53	-	-	-
	73	73	-	-	-
	62	62	-	-	-
<b>Осломеј</b> Oslomej	126	-	126	-	-
	121	-	121	-	-
	116	-	116	-	-
<b>Охрид</b> Ohrid	844	715	50	39	3
	800	678	58	25	10
	821	693	38	40	1
<b>Петреовец</b> Petreovec	112	71	14	-	1
	138	58	40	1	2
	140	72	31	1	-
<b>Пехчево</b> Pehčevo	71	58	-	9	4
	72	63	-	6	3
	67	57	-	5	5
<b>Пласница</b> Plasnica	84	-	-	84	-
	114	-	-	114	-
	129	22	-	107	-
<b>Подареш</b> Podareš	42	41	-	1	-
	56	56	-	-	-
	50	50	-	-	-
<b>Прилеп</b> Prilep	1011	997	-	-	12
	1035	1017	-	-	15
	1043	1023	-	1	19
<b>Пробиштип</b> Probištip	231	228	-	-	2
	219	219	-	-	-
	220	220	-	-	-
<b>Радовиш</b> Radoviš	342	333	-	-	9
	403	371	-	32	-
	393	361	-	32	-
<b>Ранковце</b> Rankovce	63	63	-	-	-
	60	29	-	-	-
	69	69	-	-	-

<b>Ресен</b> Resen	246	192	24	22	4
	262	187	28	41	2
	271	206	24	39	1
<b>Росоман</b> Rosoman	55	52	-	-	-
	58	52	-	-	-
	58	50	-	-	-
<b>Ростуша</b> Rostuša	187	27	18	41	-
	187	37	20	10	-
	226	49	19	36	-
<b>Самоков</b> Samokov	16	16	-	-	-
	21	21	-	-	-
	18	18	-	-	-
<b>Сарај</b> Saraj	415	11	385	-	1
	478	10	444	-	3
	408	11	373	-	3
<b>Свети Николе</b> Sveti Nikole	251	251	-	-	-
	271	270	-	1	-
	300	299	-	1	-
<b>Сопиште</b> Sopište	98	40	46	-	-
	102	50	45	-	-
	92	50	42	-	-
<b>Сопотница</b> Sopotnica	21	21	-	-	-
	18	18	-	-	-
	18	18	-	-	-
<b>Србиново</b> Srbinovo	58	-	58	-	-
	50	-	50	-	-
	70	-	70	-	-
<b>Стар Дојран</b> Star Dojran	59	50	-	8	-
	50	38	2	5	-
	58	40	-	9	1
<b>Старавина</b> Staravina					
<b>Старо Нагоричане</b> Staro Nagoričane	52	47	-	-	-
	54	49	-	-	-
	33	31	-	-	-

<b>Струга</b> Struga	642	398	206	12	3
	662	376	224	14	4
	680	390	255	9	6
<b>Струмица</b> Strumica	730	728	-	2	-
	713	705	-	7	-
	727	710	-	15	-
<b>Студеничани</b> Studeničani	273	-	175	40	-
	247	-	184	1	-
	298	29	221	3	2
<b>Теарце</b> Tearce	408	30	370	7	1
	442	52	387	3	-
	452	17	422	12	1
<b>Тетово</b> Tetovo	1208	365	771	31	23
	1229	351	803	44	12
	1292	320	897	33	29
<b>Тополчани</b> Topolčani	30	20	-	9	-
	29	14	-	14	-
	34	24	-	9	-
<b>Цапари</b> Cepari	18	10	8	-	-
	21	13	8	-	-
	15	9	6	-	-
<b>Центар Жупа</b> Centar Župa	123	43	9	71	-
	135	5	9	85	-
	118	29	17	72	-
<b>Чашка</b> Čaška	30	17	-	11	-
	26	17	-	9	-
	44	30	2	11	-
<b>Чегране</b> Čergane	206	-	206	-	-
	192	-	192	-	-
	206	-	206	-	-
<b>Чешиново</b> Češinovo	54	54	-	-	-
	55	55	-	-	-
	49	49	-	-	-

**Чучер Сандево**  
Čučer Sandevo

119	40	56	-	-
104	67	21	-	-
92	59	17	-	-

**Цепчиште**  
Džerčište

136	-	136	-	-
143	-	143	-	-
129	-	129	-	-

**Шипковица**  
Šipkovica

139	-	139	-	-
26	-	26	-	-
144	-	144	-	-

**Штип**  
Štip

723	663	1	17	9
707	643	-	17	17
675	615	-	11	8

- Извор на информации: 2.4.08,2.4.2.07,2.4.3.07 Статистички преглед – ДЗС
- Source of information: 2.4.08,2.4.2.07,2.4.3.07 Statistical review – State Statistical Office

**Full – time graduated students in regular upper secondary schools, according to ethnic affiliation**

	<b>Вкупно</b> Total	<b>Македонци</b> Macedonians	<b>Албанци</b> Albanians	<b>Турци</b> Turks	<b>Роми</b> Roms	
<b>1997/98</b>						
	84059	67510	12024	1362	351	Total
%	100.0	80.3	14.3	1.6	0.4	%
<b>1998/99</b>						
	87420	69183	13648	1378	450	Total
%	100.0	79.1	15.6	1.6	0.5	%
Со 3-годишно образование	4169	3343	497	85	58	3-year course
Со 4-годишно образование	15083	1221	2169	185	35	4-year course
<b>1999/00</b>						
	89775	69844	14823	1545	447	Total
%	100.0	77.8	16.5	1.7	0.5	%
<b>2000/01</b>						
	90990	69991	15718	1665	499	Total
%	100.0	77.0	17.3	1.8	0.5	%
Со 3-годишно образование	3501	2721	460	73	59	3-year course
Со 4-годишно образование	17624	13771	2875	314	75	4-year course
<b>2001/02</b>						
	92068	69783	16691	1785	596	Total
%	100.0	75.8	18.1	1.9	0.6	%
Со 3-годишно образование	2946	2271	370	70	62	3-year course
Со 4-годишно образование	18295	14309	3017	330	55	4-year course

- Извор на информации: 2.4.08,2.4.2.07,2.4.3.07 Статистички преглед – ДЗС
- Source of information: 2.4.08,2.4.2.07,2.4.3.07 Statistical review – State Statistical Office

## Enrolled students at higher schools and faculties in the Republic of Macedonia

	Вкупно Total	Македонци Macedonians	Албанци Albanians	Турци Turks	Роми Roms
1999/2000					
2000/2001					
2001/2002					
2002/2003					
<b>Факултет</b>					
<b>Faculty</b>					
<b>Скопје</b>					
<b>Skopje</b>					
Природно-матем. Natural Sciences and Mathematics	2887	2604	144	31	3
	535	461	37	9	1
	3126	2831	139	29	4
	2850	2598	117	31	3
Архитектонски Architecture	677	595	40	6	1
	133	117	8	2	-
	787	696	39	10	-
	842	746	44	11	-
Градежен Civil Engineerin	1119	983	64	4	-
	202	172	12	2	-
	1160	1020	68	9	1
	1123	1000	56	5	1
Машински Mechanical engineering	1673	1562	16	7	2
	327	307	2	-	-
	1729	1624	17	5	3
	1505	1410	13	7	-
Електро-технички Electrical engineering	2229	2090	28	9	2
	451	412	10	5	2
	2388	2241	27	9	3
	2365	2239	18	9	3
Технолошко-метал. Technological – metallurgic	1026	963	10	3	1
	356	337	2	-	1
	1217	1145	8	2	3
	934	883	3	2	1
Медицински Medical Science	1770	1448	177	31	6
	210	163	24	4	2
	1556	1291	139	30	7
	1404	1116	123	26	9
Фармацевски Pharmacy	426	370	22	7	-
	92	75	4	1	1

	542	476	36	5	-
	493	434	26	8	2
	Вкупно Total	Македонци Macedonians	Албанци Albanians	Турци Turks	Роми Roms
1999/2000					
2000/2001					
2001/2002					
2002/2003					
Стоматолошки Dentistry	690	563	79	22	1
	175	128	17	3	-
	800	677	69	18	3
	858	736	73	18	1
Ветеринарен Veterinary Medicine	378	345	6	1	1
	52	41	1	-	3
	321	303	4	1	2
	367	331	7	-	2
Земјоделски Agriculture	1639	1548	8	3	1
	365	342	3	1	-
	1650	1565	4	3	-
	1458	1386	2	4	-
Шумарски Forestry	538	515	4	3	-
	201	173	6	3	-
	581	547	2	4	-
	649	620	2	3	1
Економски Economics	4359	3933	198	43	10
	1023	835	104	18	8
	5094	4556	253	63	14
	5389	4843	244	70	12
Правен Law	2002	1756	127	23	11
	660	549	44	8	5
	3333	2900	184	46	21
	3747	3283	207	48	27
Новинарство Journalism	208	181	10	2	1
	49	45	-	1	1
	302	260	8	3	3
	314	284	3	3	1
Ликовна уметн. Fine Arts	174	151	10	1	1
	50	48	1	-	-
	181	165	5	-	2
	188	178	5	-	1

	Вкупно Total	Македонци Macedonians	Албанци Albanians	Турци Turks	Роми Roms
1999/2000					
2000/2001					
2001/2002					
2002/2003					
Драмска уметн. Drama Arts					
	82	60	12	8	-
	11	10	-	1	-
	78	61	7	8	1
	91	73	8	8	1
Музичка уметн. Music Arts					
	257	234	5	5	5
	64	54	6	-	2
	347	316	12	5	4
	321	293	13	5	3
Теолошки Theology					
	288	286	-	-	-
	42	38	-	-	-
	209	204	-	-	-
	195	194	-	-	-
Физичка култура Physical Education					
	486	438	20	4	1
	182	160	6	4	-
	688	612	23	9	-
	699	644	21	6	1
Филозофски Philosophy					
	1983	1777	79	17	5
	757	692	20	10	1
	2859	2585	96	26	11
	3235	2928	111	30	21
Филолошки Philology					
	2978	2404	346	74	7
	742	589	67	26	5
	3199	2630	313	100	17
	3226	2636	308	110	17
Педагошки Pedagogy					
	564	325	161	19	6
	2053	1311	551	63	10
	2557	1647	674	69	15

	Вкупно Total	Македонци Macedonians	Албанци Albanians	Турци Turks	Роми Roms
1999/2000					
2000/2001					
2001/2002					
2002/2003					
<b>Битола</b>					
<b>Bitola</b>					
Технички Technical engineering					
	1556	1476	29	8	1
	512	470	16	2	-
	2144	2062	16	13	5
	2262	2185	16	16	1
За биотехн. Науки Biotechnical science					
	203	192	2	-	-
	202	187	5	1	-
	376	372	1	-	-
	590	571	5	3	-
За учители и воспитувачи Educators and TeacherS					
	854	821	2	14	-
	232	3	5	1	-
	1138	1054	16	22	2
Педагошки Pedagogy					
	1226	752	402	40	1
<b>Штип</b>					
<b>Stip</b>					
Педагошки Pedagogy					
	533	519	-	4	2
	221	199	7	2	3
	780	726	1	3	1
	735	686	4	5	5
Рударско-Геолош. Mining and Geology					
	350	342	1	1	-
	141	141	-	-	-
	439	435	-	-	1
	357	353	1	-	-

	Вкупно Total	Македонци Macedonians	Албанци Albanians	Турци Turks	Роми Roms
1999/2000					
2000/2001					
2001/2002					
2002/2003					
<b>Прилеп</b>					
<b>Prilep</b>					
Економски Economics	1198	1127	41	4	3
	462	419	22	4	2
	1666	1628	4	7	2
	1662	1608	6	7	2
<b>Охрид</b>					
<b>Ohrid</b>					
за туризам и угостителство Tourism and Catering	1703	1509	105	19	4
	513	444	24	17	4
	2434	2171	126	39	3
	2517	2227	115	38	4
<b>Виши Школи Higher Schools</b>					
<b>Битола</b>					
<b>Bitola</b>					
Виша Медицинска Higher medical school	477	407	37	12	1
	91	69	8	2	-
	649	582	23	12	3
	890	787	25	22	2
Виша Земјоделска Higher agricultural school	445	434	4	2	-
	5	5	-	-	-
	470	459	1	2	-
Педагошка Академија Pedagogy academy					

- Извор на информации: Завод за статистика на Република Македонија
- Source of information: Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia

## Enrolled Romani students at higher schools and faculties in the Republic of Macedonia

	Вкупно Total	Машки Male	Женски Female
1999/2000			
2000/2001			
2001/2002			
2002/2003			
<b>Факултет</b>			
<b>Faculty</b>			
<b>Скопје</b>			
<b>Skopje</b>			
Природно-матем. Natural Sciences and Mathematics	3	2	1
	1		
	4	2	2
	3	1	2
Архитектонски Architecture	1	1	-
	-		
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Градежен Civil Engineerin	-	-	-
	-		
	1	1	-
	1	1	-
Машински Mechanical engineering	2	1	1
	-		
	3	2	1
	-	-	-
Електро-технички Electrical engineering	2	2	-
	2		
	3	3	-
	3	3	-
Технолошко-метал. Technological – metallurgic	1	1	-
	1		
	3	3	-
	1	1	-
Медицински Medical Science	6	3	3
	2		
	7	3	4
	9	4	5
Фармацевски Pharmacy			

	-	-	-
	1		
	-	-	-
	2	1	1
	Вкупно Total	Машки Male	Женски Female
1999/2000			
2000/2001			
2001/2002			
2002/2003			
Стоматолошки Dentistry	1	-	1
	-		
	3	1	2
	1	-	1
Ветеринарен Veterinary Medicine	1	1	-
	3		
	2	1	1
	2	1	1
Земјоделски Agriculture	1	1	-
	-		
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Шумарски Forestry	-	-	-
	-		
	-	-	-
	1	1	-
Економски Economics	10	4	6
	8		
	14	3	11
	12	2	10
Правен Law	11	4	7
	5	2	3
	21	12	9
Новинарство Journalism	1	-	1
	1		
	3	1	2
	1	-	1
Ликовна уметн. Fine Arts	1	1	-
	-		
	2	2	-
	1	1	-

	Вкупно Total	Машки Male	Женски Female
1999/2000			
2000/2001			
2001/2002			
2002/2003			
Драмска уметн. Drama Arts			
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	1	-	1
	1	-	1
Музичка уметн. Music Arts			
	5	4	1
	-	-	-
	4	4	-
	3	3	-
Теолошки Theology			
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Физичка култура Physical Education			
	1	1	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	1	1	-
Филозофски Philosophy			
	5	-	5
	1	-	-
	11	4	7
	21	9	12
Филолошки Philology			
	7	2	5
	5	-	-
	17	7	10
	17	5	12
Педагошки Pedagogy			
	1	-	1
	6	-	-
	10	1	9
	15	2	13

	Вкупно Total	Машки Male	Женски Female
1999/2000			
2000/2001			
2001/2002			
2002/2003			
<b>Битола</b>			
<b>Bitola</b>			
Технички Technical engineering	1	1	-
	-	-	-
	5	4	1
	1	-	1
За биотехн. Науки Biotechnical science	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
За учители и воспитувачи Educators and TeacherS	-	-	-
	1	-	-
	2	-	2
	-	-	-
Педагошки Pedagogy	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
<b>Штип</b>			
<b>Stip</b>			
Педагошки Pedagogy	2	2	-
	3	-	-
	1	-	1
	5	-	5
Рударско-Геолош. Mining and Geology	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	1	1	-
	-	-	-

	Вкупно Total	Машки Male	Женски Female
1999/2000			
2000/2001			
2000/2002			
2002/2003			
<b>Прилеп</b>			
<b>Prilep</b>			
Економски Economics	3	3	-
	2	-	-
	2	1	1
	2	1	1
<b>Охрид</b>			
<b>Ohrid</b>			
за туризам и угостителство Tourism and Catering	4	2	2
	4	-	-
	3	1	2
	4	2	2
<b>Виши Школи</b>			
<b>Higher Schools</b>			
<b>Битола</b>			
<b>Bitola</b>			
Виша Медицинска Higher medical school	1	1	-
	-	-	-
	3	1	2
	2	-	2
Виша Земјоделска Higher agricultural school	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Педагошка Академија Pedagogy academy	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-

- Извор на информации – Завод за статистика на Република Македонија
- Source of information: Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia

## Graduated students at higher schools and faculties in the Republic of Macedonia

	Вкупно Total	Македонци Macedonians	Албанци Albanians	Турци Turks	Роми Roms
1999					
2000					
2001					
2002					
<b>Факултет</b>					
<b>Faculty</b>					
<b>Скопје</b>					
<b>Skopje</b>					
Природно-матем. Natural Sciences and Mathematics	205	180	5	2	3
	248	230	6	2	1
	236	216	7	3	-
	246	229	1	1	-
Архитектонски Architecture	61	55	1	-	-
	38	33	2	-	-
	42	32	2	-	-
	48	43	1	1	-
Градежен Civil Engineerin	33	29	1	1	1
	26	23	-	-	-
	23	17	2	-	-
	33	24	5	2	-
Машински Mechanical engineering	155	138	2	-	-
	166	152	-	1	-
	60	59	1	-	-
	120	110	3	1	-
Електро-технички Electrical engineering	222	206	6	1	-
	234	227	1	1	-
	191	175	2	4	1
	199	187	1	2	-
Технолошко-метал. Technological – metallurgic	131	122	2	-	1
	118	110	4	-	-
	74	68	1	-	-
	59	55	-	-	-
Медицински Medical Science	146	134	3	-	-
	161	145	9	2	-
	118	105	6	2	-
	105	94	6	1	-
Фармацевски Pharmacy	72	68	2	-	-
	82	74	1	2	-

	55	42	3	-	-
	83	74	2	1	-
	Вкупно Total	Македонци Macedonians	Албанци Albanians	Турци Turks	Роми Roms
1999					
2000					
2001					
2002					
Стоматолошки Dentistry					
	74	65	5	-	-
	80	68	7	1	-
	122	107	10	2	-
	99	81	10	2	-
Ветеринарен Veterinary Medicine					
	26	26	-	-	-
	36	35	-	-	-
	23	22	-	-	-
	20	19	-	-	-
Земјоделски Agriculture					
	106	102	1	-	-
	69	69	-	-	-
	79	75	1	2	-
	95	90	1	1	-
Шумарски Forestry					
	36	34	-	1	1
	37	36	-	-	-
	30	30	-	-	-
	32	30	-	-	-
Економски Economics					
	362	337	2	4	5
	396	373	4	-	1
	354	327	5	2	-
	471	442	10	2	1
Правен Law					
	238	229	3	1	-
	152	137	8	-	-
	195	174	5	3	-
	203	188	6	1	1
Новинарство Journalism					
	21	20	-	-	-
	5	5	-	-	-
	6	6	-	-	-
Ликовна уметн. Fine Arts					
	37	34	1	-	-
	46	42	-	1	-
	34	33	1	-	-
	29	26	2	-	-

	Вкупно Total	Македонци Macedonians	Албанци Albanians	Турци Turks	Роми Roms
1999					
2000					
2001					
2002					
Драмска уметн. Drama Arts					
	19	15	2	-	-
	20	17	2	-	-
	11	10	-	1	-
	25	19	3	1	-
Музичка уметн. Music Arts					
	66	59	1	1	-
	62	53	1	2	-
	60	51	-	-	2
	56	51	1	1	1
Теолошки Theology					
	12	10	-	-	-
	23	23	-	-	-
	15	15	-	-	-
	18	17	-	-	-
Физичка култура Physical Education					
	54	51	2	-	-
	67	61	1	-	-
	73	67	3	1	-
	92	72	10	-	1
Филозофски Philosophy					
	312	286	12	-	1
	306	291	3	3	-
	308	284	5	3	-
	277	237	18	2	1
Филолошки Philology					
	323	250	41	8	3
	228	187	23	7	1
	142	114	9	3	1
	186	158	16	4	-
Педагошки Pedagogy					
	206	149	47	5	-
	212	97	105	4	-
	286	190	77	8	-
	220	149	60	1	-

	Вкупно Total	Македонци Macedonians	Албанци Albanians	Турци Turks	Роми Roms
1999					
2000					
2001					
2002					
<b>Битола</b>					
<b>Bitola</b>					
Технички Technical engineering	46	46	-	-	-
	50	50	-	-	-
	60	59	1	-	-
	39	37	-	-	-
За биотехн. Науки Biotechnical science					
За учители и воспитувачи Educators and TeacherS	141	140	-	1	-
	149	141	1	2	1
Педагошки Pedagogy	81	77	-	-	-
	157	150	1	3	-
<b>Штип</b>					
<b>Stip</b>					
Педагошки Pedagogy	63	62	-	-	-
	72	72	-	-	-
	132	129	-	1	-
	113	111	-	-	-
Рударско-Геолош. Mining and Geology	20	20	-	-	-
	31	31	-	-	-
	19	19	-	-	-
	14	13	-	-	-

	Вкупно Total	Македонци Macedonians	Албанци Albanians	Турци Turks	Роми Roms
1999					
2000					
2000					
2002					
<b>Прилеп</b>					
<b>Prilep</b>					
Економски Economics					
	110	107	-	-	-
	93	92	1	-	-
	129	123	2	1	-
	131	128	2	-	-
<b>Охрид</b>					
<b>Ohrid</b>					
за туризам и угостителство Tourism and Catering					
	52	48	1	-	-
	108	99	4	1	2
	51	50	-	1	-
	100	90	6	1	1
<b>Виши Школи</b>					
<b>Higher Schools</b>					
<b>Битола</b>					
<b>Bitola</b>					
Виша Медицинска Higher medical school					
	50	47	1	-	-
	63	60	-	-	-
	64	57	3	-	-
	96	89	1	1	-
Виша Земјоделска Higher agricultural school					
	67	63	2	-	-
	65	65	-	-	-
	60	59	-	-	-
Педагошка Академија Pedagogy academy					
	23	23	-	-	-

- Извор на информации: Завод за статистика на Република Македонија
- Source of information: Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia

## Graduated Romani students at higher schools and faculties in the Republic of Macedonia

	Вкупно Total	Машки Male	Женски Female
1999			
2000			
2001			
2002			
<b>Факултет</b>			
<b>Faculty</b>			
<b>Скопје</b>			
<b>Skopje</b>			
Природно-матем. Natural Sciences and Mathematics	3	1	2
	1	-	1
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Архитектонски Architecture	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Градежен Civil Engineerin	1	1	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Машински Mechanical engineering	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Електро-технички Electrical engineering	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	1	1	-
	-	-	-
Технолошко-метал. Technological – metallurgic	1	-	1
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Медицински Medical Science	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Фармацевски	-	-	-

	Вкупно Total	Машки Male	Женски Female
Pharmacy	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
1999			
2000			
2001			
2002			
Стоматолошки Dentistry	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Ветеринарен Veterinary Medicine	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Земјоделски Agriculture	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Шумарски Forestry	1	1	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Економски Economics	5	3	2
	1	-	1
	-	-	-
	1	-	1
Правен Law	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	1	1	-
Новинарство Journalism	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Ликовна уметн. Fine Arts	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-

	Вкупно Total	Машки Male	Женски Female
1999			
2000			
2001			
2002			
Драмска уметн. Drama Arts	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Музичка уметн. Music Arts	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	2	1	1
	1	1	-
Теолошки Theology	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Физичка култура Physical Education	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	1	1	-
Филозофски Philosophy	1	-	1
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	1	-	1
Филолошки Philology	3	-	3
	1	-	1
	1	-	1
	-	-	-
Педагошки Pedagogy	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-

	Вкупно Total	Машки Male	Женски Female
1999			
2000			
2001			
2002			
<b>Битола</b>			
<b>Битола</b>			
Технички Technical engineering	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
За биотехн. Науки Biotechnical science	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
За учители и воспитувачи Educators and TeacherS	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	1	-	1
	-	-	-
Педагошки Pedagogy	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
<b>Штип</b>			
<b>Штип</b>			
Педагошки Pedagogy	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Рударско-Геолош. Mining and Geology	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-

	Вкупно Total	Машки Male	Женски Female
1999			
2000			
2000			
2002			
<b>Прилеп</b>			
<b>Prilep</b>			
Економски Economics	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
<b>Охрид</b>			
<b>Ohrid</b>			
за туризам и угостителство Tourism and Catering	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	1	1	-
<b>Виши Школи Higher Schools</b>			
<b>Битола</b>			
<b>Bitola</b>			
Виша Медицинска Higher medical school	1	-	1
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	1	1	-
Виша Земјоделска Higher agricultural school	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Педагошка Академија Pedagogy academy	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	-

- Извор на информации: Завод за статистика на Република Македонија
- Source of information: Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia

**Population over 15 years of age by economic activity, gender and ethnic affiliation in the Republic of Macedonia**

Националност  Ethnic Affiliation		Вкупно население			Работна сила									Неактивно население		
					Вкупно			Вработени			Невработени					
		Вкупно	Мажи	Жени	вкупно	Мажи	Жени	Вкупно	Мажи	Жени	Вкупно	Мажи	Жени	Вк.	М	Ж
		Total population			Labor Force									Inactive population		
Total	Men	Women	Total			Employed persons			Unemployed persons			Total	M	F		
Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	M	F		
Вкупно	Total	<b>1534256</b>	<b>758922</b>	<b>775334</b>	<b>811557</b>	<b>488544</b>	<b>323014</b>	<b>549846</b>	<b>339550</b>	<b>210297</b>	<b>261711</b>	<b>148994</b>	<b>112717</b>	<b>722699</b>	<b>270378</b>	<b>452320</b>
Македонци	Macedonian	1096582	541726	554855	639364	355630	283734	459200	266737	192463	180164	88893	91271	457217	186097	271120
Албанци	Albanian	290293	143402	146892	105928	89401	16527	53866	47642	6224	52062	41759	10303	184365	54001	130364
Власи	Vlach	3695	2001	1694	2289	1655	634	1555	1219	336	734	436	298	1406	346	1060
Роми	Roma	27590	14259	13331	13365	8543	4821	3589	2635	953	9776	5908	3868	14225	5716	8509
Турци	Turkish	43261	21629	21632	20308	14080	6227	12474	8299	4175	7834	5781	2052	22953	7548	15405
Срби	Serbian	23373	12016	11357	11693	6959	4734	7416	4622	2794	4277	2337	1940	11680	5057	6622
Не се изјасниле	Ethnically undeclared	156	-	156	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	156	-	156
Други	Other	49307	23889	25418	18611	12276	6335	11747	8396	3351	6844	3880	2984	30696	11613	19083

- Извор на информации: Државен завод за статистика, април 2000 год.
- Source of information: Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia, April 2000

**Population over 15 years of age by economic activity, gender and ethnic affiliation in the Republic of Macedonia,  
(Structure by Ethnic Affiliation in %)**

Националност Ethnic Affiliation		Вкупно население			Работна сила									Неактивно население			
					Вкупно			Вработени			Невработени						
		Вкупно	Мажи	Жени	вкупно	Мажи	Жени	Вкупно	Мажи	Жени	Вкупно	Мажи	Жени	Вк.	М	Ж	
		Total population			Labor Force									Inactive population			
Total	Men	Women	Total			Employed persons			Unemployed persons			Inactive population					
			Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	M	F			
Вкупно	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Македонци	Macedonian	71.5	71.4	71.6	78.8	72.8	87.8	83.5	78.6	91.5	68.8	59.7	81.0	63.3	68.8	59.9	
Албанци	Albanian	18.9	18.9	18.9	13.1	18.3	5.1	9.8	14.0	3.0	19.9	28.0	9.1	25.5	20.0	28.8	
Власи	Vlach	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	
Роми	Roma	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.5	0.7	0.8	0.5	3.7	4.0	3.4	2.0	2.1	1.9	
Турци	Turkish	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.9	1.9	2.3	2.4	2.0	3.0	3.9	1.8	3.2	2.8	3.4	
Срби	Serbian	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.9	1.5	
Не се изјасниле	Ethnically undeclared	0.0	-	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	0.0	
Други	Other	3.2	3.1	3.3	2.3	2.5	2.0	2.1	2.5	1.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	4.2	4.3	4.2	

- Извор на информации: Државен завод за статистика, април 2000 год.
- Source of information: Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia, April 2000