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Introduction

Equality between women and men is an objective of the European Union (EU) since 1957. Yet, women throughout the European Union still face inequalities in many respects. Roma women face additional challenges as extreme poverty, exclusion and discrimination reinforce their disadvantages even further. In core areas of life, such as education, employment and health, Roma women continue to fare worse than Roma men and than women in the general population. In addition, many women in the EU, both Roma and non-Roma, shoulder a disproportionate part of the responsibilities involved in running a family. Roma women, especially those who marry and start a family at a very young age while living in severely deprived material and housing conditions, are even more disadvantaged and at risk of exclusion and marginalisation. Drawing on FRA’s own survey research in nine EU Member States, this report highlights the position of Roma women in education, employment and health, as well as the extent to which they experience hate-motivated discrimination, harassment and physical violence. It also highlights the dire consequences of early marriages which affect many Roma women.

Today, Article 23 of the EU’s Charter of Fundamental Rights requires that equality between men and women be ensured in all areas, including employment, work and pay. According to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the EU should act to ensure equal opportunities and equal treatment for men and women, and to empower women through positive action. The EU has therefore developed robust legislation to combat discrimination on grounds of sex and gender, which is complemented by legislation addressing different forms of violence that have a particular impact on women.

Over the past years, the EU has made efforts to reduce gender inequalities through political and legal initiatives, by mainstreaming gender issues in EU policies and through targeted measures. The Council of the EU, for example, sent a strong political signal by adopting a decision on signing the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, the Istanbul Convention, in May 2017. The outcome of these efforts is measured through the EU’s Gender Equality Index which monitors progress in six core domains of life: work, money, knowledge, time, power, health, and violence against women. Overall, the index shows that more than 9 in 10 Europeans believe that gender equality is important for a fair and democratic society. But, as the European Commission notes in its 2018 stocktaking report on equality between men and women in the EU, gender equality moves forward “at a snail’s pace and in some domains is even going backwards”.

In addition, the 2030 Agenda 2030 for sustainable development – the global strategy for sustainable growth – aims “to leave no one behind”. It includes a specific sustainable development goal (SDG 5) which calls on states “to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls”. The EU monitoring report on progress towards the SDGs is based on a range of EU SDG indicators. They are populated by data provided by Eurostat, as well as by FRA on violence against women, and the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE).

However, while providing a breakdown by gender, the data are not disaggregated by ethnic origin, despite the prohibition of discrimination based on race, colour or ethnic origin in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and the existence since 2000 of EU law protecting against discrimination on grounds of racial or ethnic origin. The Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC) requires under Article 13 that national equality bodies conduct surveys on discrimination. The surveys on minority ethnic groups, including migrants, conducted regularly by FRA – which can be disaggregated by gender – contribute in addressing this data gap. In this way, the data can assist policymakers at EU and national levels to develop evidence based, and therefore better targeted, policy responses to ensure the respect of fundamental rights and to improve the social inclusion of women and men belonging to marginalised minority ethnic groups.

---

1 See, European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE), Gender Equality Index 2017 – data for the domain “violence against women” is provided by FRA’s survey on Violence against Women.
5 Eurostat, EU SDG Indicator set 2019, final version of 08/01/2019.
The results of FRA’s work show that, while all women are affected by inequalities across the 12 areas identified in the Beijing Platform for Action, many of those belonging to minority groups, such as Roma, face additional challenges. For this reason, “awareness of the gender dimension” is one of the Common Basic Principles on Roma Inclusion guiding Roma integration strategies and measures.

This report examines data from FRA’s second European Minority and Discrimination Survey (EUMIDIS II) in nine EU-Member States to compare the situation of Roma women to that of Roma men and to that of women in the general population, where possible. The survey interviewed face-to-face about 8,000 Roma women and men in Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Greece, Hungary, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Spain. It collected data on their experiences of hate-motivated discrimination, harassment and physical violence, as well as on living conditions, employment, education, housing and health. The results provide evidence on how anti-Gypsyism affects the lives of Roma in the EU. This is the second time FRA reports on Roma women following its 2014 report, which examined gender differences in respect to their experiences of discrimination, harassment and hate crime, as well as on their living conditions.

The analysis confirms the findings of FRA’s 2013 survey on Roma in 11 EU Member States. It shows the extent of the impact of anti-Gypsyism:

- on core social indicators, all Roma, both women and men fare, on average, much worse than women and men in the general population;
- on a range of indicators, Roma women fare worse than Roma men.

This report presents the findings of FRA’s own survey research with Roma in nine EU Member States. It explores the data collected by FRA, building on earlier publications from FRA’s survey research, and addresses the following areas as regards the position of Roma women in the Member States where they were surveyed:

- education;
- early marriage and health;
- employment;
- discrimination, harassment and violence.

---

7 UN Women (2015).
8 The Council of Europe uses ‘Roma’ as an umbrella term. It refers to Roma, Sinti, Kale and related groups in Europe, including Travellers and the Eastern groups (Dom and Lom), and covers the wide diversity of the groups concerned, including persons who identify themselves as Gypsies. See, Council of Europe Descriptive Glossary of terms relating to Roma issues, 18 May 2012. For the purpose of the EU-MIDIS II survey, ‘Roma’ refers to autochthonous ‘Roma’ within selected EU Member States and does not focus on ‘Roma’ who have moved from one EU Member State to another.
10 The survey interviewed face to face about 8,000 Roma women and men in BG, CZ,EL, ES, HR, HU, PT, RO, SK. It collected data on their experiences of hate-motivated discrimination, harassment and physical violence, as well as on living conditions, employment, education, housing, health. The results provide evidence on how anti-Gypsyism affects the lives of Roma in the EU.
11 FRA (2014).
12 FRA (2013).
13 FRA (2016); FRA (2017).
The right to education is a fundamental human right, enshrined in Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) recognises a right to education and specific rights, as regards the primary, secondary and tertiary levels under Article 13. The EU Charter of Fundamental Rights recognises under Article 14 that everyone has the right to education and to have access to vocational and continuing training.

The right to equitable, quality education is crucial to finding stable and decently paid employment, but it also has an intrinsic value for personal development and social integration. It is therefore key for achieving progress in Roma inclusion for both women and men. The EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies recognises the need for equitable, quality education and places particular importance on promoting policy measures related to education, including early childhood and adult "second chance" education. The age profile of Roma respondents in FRA’s EU-MIDIS II survey shows that, on average, they are much younger than the general population when leaving school (Figure 1). This emphasises the need to tackle anti-Gypsyism in education and invest in improving their access to quality education, given their countries’ demographic balance. Comparing the proportion of the general population where on average every 7th person is below the age of 15 (last census of 2011) with Roma, as recorded in this survey, every fifth to every third Roma – depending on the Member State – is below the age of 15. The share of young Roma under the age of 15 is particularly high in Croatia (37.4 % of the Roma surveyed compared to 15.2 % for the general population), Greece (31.4 % compared to 14.5 %), Portugal (27 % compared to 14.9 %) and Slovakia (27.4 % compared to 15.32 %).

These young people should remain in education to attain the essential qualifications that will allow them to compete in the labour market on equal terms with their non-Roma peers. However, as FRA reported in 2016, the share of young Roma leaving school early with at most lower secondary education and not continuing education or engaging in training is unacceptably high overall (66 % for men and 71 % for women). The gender gap in the Roma population is pronounced in Bulgaria (77 % women compared to 57 % men) and Croatia (78 % women compared to 60 % men).

Given the importance of education and training for sustainable development, Europe’s 2020 Strategy aimed to reduce the share of early school leavers to less than 10 %. A number of Member States have achieved this target, which appears within reach for the general population in most Member States. However, the survey results show that for Roma this will not be possible without serious investment in targeted and gender-sensitive measures. Such measures should specifically target both the young Roma women who marry early and leave school and the young Roma men who go to work at an early age, many in low-skill jobs to provide income for their families with little opportunity for personal development. At the same time, authorities need to take measures to tackle anti-Gypsyism in education among the majority population, as this can be a formidable barrier to social inclusion measures for both women and men.

---

All children and young people regardless of their gender or ethnic origin have a right to quality education. While states have a duty to provide education equitably, poverty as well as prevailing social attitudes can affect choices about continuing education, especially after completing its compulsory component. For example, attitudes in Roma communities can also influence how long Roma girls and boys stay in education. The survey asked respondents if they believe that girls and boys should stay in school for the same length of time. The results show that the overwhelming majority of all Roma men (81%) and women (83%) surveyed, agree or strongly agree that “both girls and boys should stay in school for the same length of time”. The lowest levels of agreement are found in Greece among Roma men (72%), the country which also has the lowest levels of educational participation and attainment, Czechia among men (75%) and Slovakia among both men (74%) and women (75%). These findings can be taken into account when considering what measures would be effective and necessary to tackle early school leaving, which despite these prevailing attitudes are high, as the findings show (Figure 1).
In some European countries, several decades ago civil society organisations and state authorities started using members of their Roma communities as teaching assistants or mediators to improve the educational outcomes of Roma students.\textsuperscript{16} Recommendation No R (2000) 4 of the Council of Europe (CoE) Committee of Ministers on Roma education referred to the use of “mediators from the Roma/Gypsy community” to improve communication with parents and avoid conflicts at school\textsuperscript{17}. Ten years later, the "Strasbourg Declaration on Roma"\textsuperscript{18} stated that the use of school assistants and mediators can "ensure effective and equal access to the mainstream educational system, including pre-school education, for Roma children". Subsequently, the CoE Committee of Ministers adopted in 2012 a Recommendation\textsuperscript{19} on mediation as an effective tool for promoting respect for human rights and social inclusion of Roma "stressing the importance of respecting gender equality when having recourse to mediators and noting that the gender of mediators may be relevant to..."\textsuperscript{20}

---

\textsuperscript{17} Council of Europe (2000).  
\textsuperscript{18} Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers (2010).  
\textsuperscript{19} Council of Europe (2012).  
\textsuperscript{20} Council of Europe (2012).
the effectiveness of their work in some situations”. The CoE developed a range of important initiatives\textsuperscript{20} to develop mediation as “one of the measures used across Europe to tackle the inequalities Roma face in terms of access to employment, healthcare services and quality education.”\textsuperscript{21}

The EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies\textsuperscript{22} refers to the usefulness of Roma school mediators and the relevant Council Recommendation calls on Member States, where appropriate to local approaches to Roma integration, to “promote the training and employment of qualified mediators dedicated to Roma.”

Against this background, the survey asked respondents whether the children in their household are assisted by a Roma teaching assistant at school. The results show that while a significant proportion in Slovakia (49\%) and in Croatia (35\%) said that they benefit from such assistance, the overwhelming majority in the other countries surveyed did not receive this support. This could be either because they did not need it or request it, or it could be because Roma teaching assistants were not available. Given that the practice of training and employing Roma mediators/assistants has been positively assessed on numerous occasions, this evidence can be used by the EU and by Member States to consider concrete measures to improve availability and access to Roma mediators/assistants to improve the educational performance and attainment of Roma children.

Figure 3. Roma households with children in primary or lower secondary education supported by a Roma teaching assistant, by country (%)

![Figure 3](image)

Notes:  
\textsuperscript{a} Out of all Roma households with children in the age 6-15 who attend primary or lower secondary education (n=3,022); weighted results.  
\textsuperscript{b} Based on household questionnaire and respondent questionnaire asking “Are the children in your household assisted by a Roma teaching assistant at school?”  
\textsuperscript{c} Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016, Roma

\textsuperscript{20} For more information, see the Council of Europe’s webpage on ROMED.  
\textsuperscript{21} See the Council of Europe’s webpage on the ROMED1 Programme.  
\textsuperscript{22} European Commission (2011).
In this Chapter, the first section examines gender differences in literacy, namely the ability to speak, read and write the national language; the second, looks at educational attendance and attainment; the last two sections examine gender differences among those Roma who are most vulnerable to social exclusion and poverty, namely early school leavers and young people not in employment, education or training.

1.1. Proficiency in speaking, reading and writing

The overwhelming majority of the Roma surveyed, with small differences between gender (89% men and 88% women) and age, speak the language of their country well to excellent or as mother tongue. In four of the nine Member States surveyed, Bulgaria, Greece, Croatia and Slovakia, the majority of respondents speak Romani as their first main language at home, more men than women, except in Greece. Use of Romani at home by female respondents increase with their age only in Bulgaria and Romania. In Croatia, it is more younger

---

Notes:

a Out of all Roma respondents in the age 16+ (n=7,844), excluding those who declined to answer; weighted results.

b Survey question: “What language do you mainly speak at home?”

c Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

d Results for Hungary, Portugal and Spain are not included, because the proportion of those speaking Romani at home is very small.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016, Roma

---

See, FRA (2017), p. 94.
women who use Romani. At the same time, no large age differences are observed among Roma men in the countries surveyed. In these four countries, the results should be taken into account when designing educational measures targeting Roma, which could include mother tongue-based multilingual early childhood education, as recommended by UNESCO. UNESCO Director-General Irina Bokova has underlined the basic principle of children learning in a language they speak highlighting that “it is essential to encourage full respect for the use of mother language in teaching and learning, and to promote linguistic diversity. Inclusive language education policies will not only lead to higher learning achievement, but contribute to tolerance, social cohesion, and, ultimately, peace.”

Good reading and writing skills are essential for finding ‘decent work’, as required by SDG 8 “[…] full and productive employment and decent work for all.” This SDG is linked to the right to work, which is a fundamental human

---

**Figure 5:** Good to excellent reading and writing skills in the national language (self-assessment) (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>16-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- Out of all Roma respondents (n=7,844), excluding those who declined to answer; weighted results.
- Survey question: “Using this scale, how would you describe your proficiency in [SURVEY COUNTRY NATIONAL LANGUAGE 1] as regards…Speaking/Reading/Writing?” The analysis combines the answer categories “Good, Excellent, Mother tongue”.
- Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

**Source:** FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016, Roma

---

24 Mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTB-MLE) is education that begins in the language that the learner speaks most fluently, and then gradually introduces other languages. See the presentation by Wisbey, Matt (2017) from the Asia Multilingual Education Working Group on Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education – The Key to Unlocking SDG 4 – Quality Education For All.

The right, recognised in international human rights instruments, such as the ICESCR (Article 6). The right to work is also necessary for realising other human rights, and according to the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights it “forms an inseparable and inherent part of human dignity”. On average a majority of Roma, slightly more men (63%) than women (61%), assess their reading skills in the national language as good, excellent or at mother tongue level. However, when it comes to writing this proportion drops to around 56% for men and 55% for women with important differences across countries, and, in particular, across age groups which show an encouraging trend: an increasing proportion of young Roma between the ages 16 and 24, in particular women in most countries, is positively assessing their reading and writing skills in the respective national language.

Figure 6: Good to excellent reading and writing skills in the national language (self-assessment) (%)

Notes:

a Out of all Roma respondents (n=7,844), excluding those who declined to answer; weighted results.

b Survey question: “Using this scale, how would you describe your proficiency in [SURVEY COUNTRY NATIONAL LANGUAGE 1] as regards...Speaking/Reading/Writing?” The analysis combines the answer categories “Good, Excellent, Mother tongue”.

c Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016, Roma

More detailed country comparison reveals that across all age groups more men than women have good to excellent reading and writing skills in Bulgaria, Greece, Spain, Croatia and, particularly, in Portugal. However, in the younger age group 16-24 the situation is different. For instance, in Bulgaria or in Greece the proportion of young women aged between 16-24 with good or excellent writing skills is clearly higher than that of men (65% compared to 50% in Bulgaria, 55% compared to 45% in Greece). On the other hand, in two of the other Member States surveyed, young Roma women age 16-24 lag behind young Roma men in their self-assessment of their writing skills: in Portugal (49% compared to 65%) and Hungary (71% compared to 84%). Previous analysis by FRA\textsuperscript{27} shows that national language skills are a strong predictor of the quality of employment. These disaggregated results should therefore be taken into account by national policymakers to design more targeted, effective, gender-sensitive measures for each age group with a focus on improving reading and writing skills in the national language.

\textbf{Figure 7: Children aged between 4 years and the (country-specific) starting age of compulsory education who participate in early childhood education (\%)}\textsuperscript{a,b,c,d}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure7.png}
\caption{Children aged between 4 years and the (country-specific) starting age of compulsory education who participate in early childhood education (\%).}
\end{figure}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Country & Roma girls & Roma boys & Roma - country total & General population (Eurostat 2014) \\
\hline
BG & 69 & 64 & 66 & 77 \\
CZ & 35 & 32 & 34 & 53 \\
EL & 27 & 29 & 28 & 36 \\
ES & 37 & 32 & 37 & 41 \\
HR & 26 & 31 & 28 & 26 \\
HU & 93 & 93 & 95 & 90 \\
PT & 42 & 41 & 42 & 40 \\
RO & 36 & 34 & 34 & 34 \\
SK & 51 & 51 & 53 & 53 \\
Total & 89 & 86 & 94 & 94 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textbf{Notes:}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Out of all persons aged between 4 years and the country-specific starting age of compulsory primary education in Roma households (n=1,776); weighted results.
\item Survey question answered by respondents for all children if they regularly attend public or private childcare (including nursery, preschool, etc.).
\item Different age groups for participation in early childhood education in countries: 4-6 years in Bulgaria and Croatia; 4-5 years in remaining countries.\textsuperscript{26} Age is calculated on annual basis, hence the figures do not consider earlier or delayed start in primary education of an individual child.
\item Eurostat: Education and Training 2020 target – educ_uoe_enra10 (downloaded 20/10/2016) using data from education facilities’ registers.
\end{enumerate}

\textbf{Source:} FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016, Roma; Eurostat 2014, General population

\textsuperscript{27} FRA (2018), p. 28-29.
\textsuperscript{28} European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2015).
1.2. Attendance and attainment in formal education

In the EU, in 2016 practically all (95.3%) children aged between 4 and the age of starting compulsory education attended early childhood education, according to Eurostat. The survey results do not show important gender differences in the participation of Roma girls and boys in early childhood education. They do, however, show a huge gap between Roma and the general population, as overall only around one in two Roma boys (53%) and girls (52%) attend a childcare facility regularly (including nurseries, preschools, etc.).

Figure 8: Compulsory-school-age (country specific) children currently in education (%)a,b

Notes: a Out of all persons of a country-specific compulsory schooling age in Roma households (n=7,364); weighted results.
b Different age groups for compulsory-schooling age in countries valid for school year 2015/2016: starting age in years – 7 (BG), 6 (CZ, ES, HR, PT, RO, SK) and 5 (EL, HU); ending age – 17 (PT), 16 (RO), 15 (BG, ES, HU, SK) and 14 (CZ, EL, HR) (Source: European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2015)). Age is calculated on annual basis, hence the figures do not consider earlier or delayed start in primary education of an individual child.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016, Roma

The Council Recommendation on effective Roma integration measures in the Member States of 9 and 10 December 201330 recommended that Member States increase Roma people’s access to, and quality of, early childhood education and care, including targeted support, as necessary. SDG 4 on education includes early childhood development and universal pre-primary education as one of its core targets: “By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and pre-primary education so that they are ready for primary education.” In this light, it is essential that Member States support the Commission’s proposal of 2018 for a Council Recommendation on High Quality Early Childhood Education and Care Systems, which refers specifically to gender equality, as well as to Roma highlighting that “early childhood education and care experiences are an opportunity to
prevent and mitigate disadvantage for children from disadvantaged Roma communities and those with migrant backgrounds.” The proposed recommendation would reinforce efforts to improve Roma people’s access to high quality and inclusive early childhood education and care making use of EU funding, particularly Erasmus+ programme and the European Structural and Investment Funds.

The EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies requires that all Roma children complete at least primary school. Eurostat data for the general population show that in 2013 in the EU, on average practically every child (98 %) aged 7 years attended primary education. When it comes to Roma, the results of this survey show that the goal of the EU Framework for Roma integration has not been achieved. The gap to the general population is pronounced in the nine countries, except in Hungary and in Spain. Between 73 % and 91 % of Roma children attend primary school at the age of seven, when they should be enrolled in primary school like all children across all countries surveyed. Overall, overall

Figure 9: Share of Roma who have not completed any level of formal education (ISCED 0), by gender and age groups (%)a,b,c

Notes:  
* Out of all persons in Roma households in the age of 16 and above (n=21,890); weighted results.  
* Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.  
* Education levels based on UNESCO’s 2011 International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED), developed to facilitate comparisons of education statistics and indicators across countries based on uniform, internationally-agreed definitions.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016, Roma

31 Eurostat: Pupils in early childhood and primary education level and age – as % of corresponding age population – educ_uoe_enpr07 (downloaded 20/10/2016).
the share of Roma girls attending primary school is slightly higher than that of Roma boys, but still below the share in the general population of 7-year old girls attending primary education in the countries surveyed. The results show that in all countries, except Greece (69 %) and Romania (77 %), more than 90 % of Roma children attend school during compulsory school age 32. However, as FRA reported in 2016, large shares of Roma children attend lower levels of education than appropriate for their age. 33

All EU countries have a duty to fulfil the right of the child to education, enshrined in Article 28 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and Articles 14 and 24 of the EU Charter for Fundamental Rights. The results presented here can be used by national policymakers to develop measures that enable all Roma to attend compulsory education and attain these qualifications, as a minimum. This would also support Member States’ efforts to reach SDG 4 on education, in particular target 4.5 which requires States “to eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations.” 34

Given the decisive role of inclusive early childhood education in improving educational outcomes, it is not surprising that on average 16 % of Roma women and 12 % of Roma men surveyed never attended formal education. Gender differences are more visible among the older generation (45+) and are highest in Greece, Portugal, Spain and Croatia. In particular, in Greece 88 % of the Roma women aged 45 years and older said that they never received any formal education. In Greece, the majority of all Roma respondents never received formal education. Whereas the gender gaps for those 16-24 disappear, over 40 % of this younger age group still has never attended school, despite the

---

**Figure 10: Share of Roma who completed upper secondary education or higher (ISCED 3+), by gender and age groups (%)**

![Graph showing the share of Roma who completed upper secondary education or higher (ISCED 3+), by gender and age groups (%)](image_url)

**Notes:**

- Out of all persons in Roma households in the age of 16 and above (n=21890); weighted results.
- Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
- Education levels based on UNESCO’s 2011 International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED), developed to facilitate comparisons of education statistics and indicators across countries based on uniform, internationally agreed definitions.
- Results for Greece and Portugal are not presented, disaggregated by age, because of the very small number of respondents who completed upper secondary education and above.

**Source:** FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016, Roma

---

33 Ibid.
34 UN, Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), Goal 4, target 4.5.
implementation of several major EU funded projects since 1996.\textsuperscript{35} Differences between women and men are pronounced in the older age groups, except in Slovakia.

Qualifications corresponding to upper secondary education and above are essential for decent work in the EU today. In 2017, on average the majority of Europeans (74.6 % women and 73.4 % men aged 15-64 years) had completed upper secondary, post-secondary, non-tertiary or tertiary education.\textsuperscript{36} In stark contrast, only 16 % of the Roma women surveyed and 22 % of men had achieved this. The share of both Roma men and women who have completed at least upper secondary education remains strikingly low for the 16-24 year old ones, while gender differences have declined, with 24 % of young Roma men and 21 % of young Roma women. Gender differences are more pronounced among the oldest generations. For the younger generation aged 16-24 years in all countries surveyed a similar share of women and men finished at least upper secondary education, except for Bulgaria, Croatia and Slovakia. Furthermore, as indicated in an earlier report by FRA, those Roma at risk of poverty after social transfers, living in rural areas, in overcrowded households, in ethnically segregated areas or in neighbourhoods where all residents are Roma, are also less likely to complete upper secondary education or higher.\textsuperscript{37} The overall low level of higher educational attainment among the younger generation shows the continuous need for gender-sensitive policy measures adapted to the needs of Roma who may have different demographic and socio-economic characteristics to improve their educational outcomes.

1.3. Not in education, employment or training

Leaving school early without adequate (post-secondary) education to secure decent work, especially in countries with unfavourable labour market conditions, can discourage young people from looking for any work. According to Eurofound\textsuperscript{38} “those with low levels of education are three times more likely to be not in employment, education or training (NEET) than those with tertiary education, and two times more likely than those with secondary education.” Eurostat data show that in 2015, 12 % of young people in the EU aged 15 to 24 were in a situation of NEET. A similar indicator used by FRA for Roma aged 16 to 24 years shows that the proportion of young Roma who are not employed, in education or training is dramatically higher (63 %).

Gender differences in NEET rates among the general population for the 15-24 age group in the EU-28\textsuperscript{39} are relatively small, but increase with age when women have children and leave school and the labour market. In the case of Roma, especially in those countries such as Bulgaria, Greece or Romania, where they tend to marry at much younger ages, significant gender differences can be observed.

On average, across all nine countries surveyed, 72 % of Roma women aged 16 to 24 years are neither working nor in education or training, compared with 55 % of young Roma men. The gender gap is the highest in Greece, where 81 % of Roma women are not employed, in education or training, compared to 38 % for men.

Previous analysis by FRA\textsuperscript{40} indicates that living in a household with young children under the age of 6 affects both Roma women and men: across all countries surveyed: Of those Roma aged 16-24 who lived in a household without a child under the age of 6, 25 % of women and 22 % of men were in education, while 14 % of women and 24 % of men were in employment. However, of those Roma aged 16-24 who lived in a household with children, under 6, attending childcare only 12 % of women and 13 % of men were in education. Notably is that the availability of childcare does not relate with a higher employment rate, as only 13 % of these women and 30 % of men were in employment. It is worth noting that the proportion of Roma women aged 16-24 in households with children, under 6, not attending childcare who are in education or in employment is particularly low (in both cases 5 %). Roma men aged 16-24 in households with children, under 6, not attending childcare are also affected, but differently: the share of those in education drops to 9 %, while the share of those in employment remains - relatively - high at 32 %. This is further evidence for the need of quality, inclusive early childhood education and care to make progress in Roma inclusion.

\textsuperscript{35} Evaluations of these projects (for example, Omas, Synergon, 2nd Evaluation Report of “School integration of Gypsy children”) identify as barriers to the effective implementation of Roma education programmes a lack of interministerial coordination, as well as the attitudes and culture of Roma parents.

\textsuperscript{36} Eurostat, Population by educational attainment level, sex and age (%) - main indicators, edat_lfs_e_03.

\textsuperscript{37} FRA (2018), p. 11.

\textsuperscript{38} European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (2012), p. 56.


\textsuperscript{40} FRA (2018), p. 19.
Many young NEETs, men and, particularly, women are married and have families. Member States need to take measures to avoid that these young NEETs become “long-term NEETs”. Such measures need to examine carefully how to combine social welfare support with opportunities for decent work to avoid phenomena of in-work poverty. In this regard, governments could consider adapting Youth Guarantee schemes to take into account the needs and demographic characteristics of their Roma populations in compliance with the Common Basic Principle on Roma Inclusion for “explicit, but not exclusive, targeting” of Roma in policy initiatives. The European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative provide EU funding for such initiatives and a range of promising practices are regularly published by the Commission, many of which can be adapted to the specific needs of Roma.

41 The Youth Guarantee is a commitment by all Member States to ensure that all young people under the age of 25 years receive a good quality offer of employment, continued education, apprenticeship, traineeship within a period of four months of becoming unemployed or leaving formal education. For more information, see the European Commission’s webpage on The Youth Guarantee.


43 For more information, see the European Commission’s webpage on Youth Guarantee – promising practices.
**Figure 12: Activity status of Roma aged 16-24, by socio-demographic characteristics (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMONG WOMEN</th>
<th>AMONG MEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No child under the age of 6</td>
<td>No child under the age of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child/children under the age of 6 that is/are in childcare</td>
<td>Child/children under the age of 6 that is/are in childcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child/children under the age of 6 that is/are not in childcare</td>
<td>Child/children under the age of 6 that is/are not in childcare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In education</th>
<th>Neither in work nor in education or training</th>
<th>In employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No child under the age of 6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child/children under the age of 6 that is/are in childcare</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child/children under the age of 6 that is/are not in childcare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No child under the age of 6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child/children under the age of 6 that is/are in childcare</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child/children under the age of 6 that is/are not in childcare</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- a Out of all those aged 16-24 years in Roma households (n = 5,632); weighted results.
- b Based on the household questionnaire and respondent questionnaire on self-declared current main activity. ‘In education’ encompasses those whose current main activity is education; ‘in employment’ encompasses those whose current main activity is paid work, self-employment, helping in the family business (unpaid) or military service or other community service.

**Source:** FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016
The first section of this report shows clearly that the gender gap in education at compulsory age has been closed, but opportunities for Roma girls and boys to stay in higher education remain low. The presence of small children in the household is closely related with even less opportunities for girls and boys to remain in education. The results also show that most young Roma leave school early without taking up further training or employment. The majority remain without a job, which is more profound among young Roma women. Whereas the presence of children seems to have little effect on further education or training for the 16-24-year old ones, it does relate to employment. This goes along with an on average very young age of marriage for Roma women and men, which might be a consequence of cultural traditions as well as lacking employment opportunities.

2.1. Early marriage

Early marriage is most common in developing countries and occurs more frequent in rural settings and among certain groups. The phenomenon is a global concern and estimates indicate that about 5 % of women, aged 20 to 24, have married before the age of 15 and 21 % before the age of 18. Poverty is considered a major factor underpinning early marriage, which is often part of an economic survival strategy, but nevertheless undermines the future prospects of young people, particularly women and girls.

Treaty monitoring bodies, such as the CEDAW and the CRC Committees, interpret marriage under the age of 18, e.g. child marriage, “as a form of forced marriage, as children – given their age – inherently lack the ability to give their full, free and informed consent to their marriage or its timing”. The UN General Assembly, in Resolution 69/156 of 18 December 2014 on child, early and forced marriage called on States to develop measures to tackle poverty and insecurity, root causes of such marriages, as well as deep-rooted gender inequalities, norms and stereotypes with the active engagement of all relevant stakeholders. In this light, the global Agenda 2030 included reference to child marriage in Sustainable Development Goal 5 on gender equality and women empowerment, under Target 5.3 “Eliminate all harmful practices, such as child, early and forced marriage and female genital mutilation”.

In Europe, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe defined in Resolution 1468 of 2005 on “Forced marriages and child marriages” the union of two persons at least one of whom is under 18 years of age as ‘child marriage’ and considers this as an infringement of child rights. Three years later, in 2008, the General Affairs Council of the EU approved guidelines on violence against women and combating all forms of discrimination against them, which consider early marriage as a form of violence against women occurring within the family.

---

44 See UNICEF’s global databases based on Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) and other nationally representative surveys. Estimates for 107 countries covering 78 % of the population of women aged 20 to 24.


46 See European Institute’s for Gender Equality (EIGE) Glossary & Thesaurus on Child Marriage.

47 Council of Europe, Parliamentary Assembly (2005).

48 See Council’s of the European Union press release from the 2947th Council meeting, General Affairs and External Relations, 8 December 2008.
FRA published data in 2017 on the legal minimum age requirements for marriage in the EU. In most Member States, this coincides with the age of majority (18, except in Scotland, UK, where it is 16), as recommended by the Committee on the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Marriage before 18, however, is allowed with parental or judicial consent, except in Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and Poland (only for men). The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe noted in this regard in Resolution 1468 of 2005 that it is “appalled to find that some national legislation permits the marriage of minors, sometimes in a discriminatory fashion with gender-based differences”.

In the EU, early marriage practices in certain Roma communities have often served to fuel anti-Gypsyism. In public discourse, such marriages are often presented in a way that reinforces a negative image of Roma culture ignoring the structural marginalisation that gives rise to this phenomenon, as well as the “signs of Romani resistance to the practice”.

The persistence of official or unofficial early marriages in some Roma communities is related to the social exclusion and marginalisation they experience which is influenced by social, economic and political factors, including anti-Gypsyism. Civil society organisations, such as the European Roma Rights Centre, have expressed concern: “despite the continuation of this practice in some Romani communities and the very negative effect of child marriage on Romani girls and women the ERRC is unaware of any serious governmental response to issue.” In 2014, the European Roma and Travellers Forum and the Romani Women Informal Platform Phenjalipe stressed that “an adequate response has been lacking to effectively address the issue by state actors, while at the same time involving the affected communities and families themselves.”

In the absence of effective state action to ensure the equal treatment of Roma, early marriage becomes an element of their survival strategies in a hostile, stigmatising and excluding social environment, as family and kin become the only resource for finding work, accessing healthcare, mediating with state institutions, etc.
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The persistence of official or unofficial early marriages in some Roma communities is related to the social exclusion and marginalisation they experience which is influenced by social, economic and political factors, including anti-Gypsyism. Civil society organisations, such as the European Roma Rights Centre, have expressed concern: “despite the continuation of this practice in some Romani communities and the very negative effect of child marriage on Romani girls and women the ERRC is unaware of any serious governmental response to issue.” In 2014, the European Roma and Travellers Forum and the Romani Women Informal Platform Phenjalipe stressed that “an adequate response has been lacking to effectively address the issue by state actors, while at the same time involving the affected communities and families themselves.”
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According to Eurostat, in the EU the mean age at first marriage for women ranges from around 27 (e.g. in Bulgaria, Poland and Romania) to 33 or more years of age (e.g. in Spain and Sweden). For men, the corresponding figures are higher ranging from around 30 (e.g. in Bulgaria, Croatia, Lithuania and Poland) to peak at 36.5 in Sweden. The survey results show that on average many of the Roma women and men surveyed tend to marry at younger age, often below the age of 18. This contributes, among other factors, in undermining their chances to stay and continue education in order find decent work.
EU-MIDIS II results show that across all countries surveyed 29% of all Roma women and 12% of all Roma men surveyed had been first married before the age of 18, while 10% of Roma women and 2% of Roma men were married before the age of 15. In some countries, the share of women who married before the age of 18 is particularly high, for example in Greece (49%), Portugal (45%), Romania (39%), Bulgaria and Croatia (both, 37%) and Spain (36%). As noted above, UN Treaty monitoring bodies, such as the CEDAW and CRC Committees, as well as the Council of Europe, consider marriages under the age of 18, as forced marriages and a violation of the human rights of women and children. In the case of Roma women and girls, such marriages affect their ability to continue education to find decent work and contributes in perpetuating the cycle of poverty and social marginalisation.

Overall, however, there is a tendency for the rates of early marriage (before 18) to decline over time, as can be seen in Figure 14. However, an important share of women aged 16-24 years marry before they are 18, in Portugal (45%), Greece (42%), Romania (26%) and in Spain (22%).

These results call for policy measures that encourage Roma families and communities to support marriage that take place later in life allowing young people more time for education which states have a duty to provide equitably to everyone. Such measures, which could include positive action to overcome disadvantage, for example scholarship provisions, should ensure better educational and employment opportunities to empower Roma women within their own communities to reduce their vulnerability by increasing their options and social mobility. Roma women should be involved in a meaningful and effective way in the design, implementation of such measures within their communities. They should, in particular, be given a strong and prominent voice in communicating such measures to “transcend the obsession with ‘exotic’ oppression, which currently characterises public attention to Romani women’s woes”.

The measures proposed by the European Roma and Travellers Forum and the Roma Women Informal Platform ‘Phenjalipe’ to the Council of Europe Ad Hoc Committee of Experts on Roma issues (CAHROM) serve as a good example that should be followed-up.

2.2. Health

In international human rights law the right to health refers more specifically to the right to access services for attaining the highest standard of physical and mental health. The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights mentions health as part of the right to an adequate standard of living in Article 25. In 1966, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recognised the right to health as a human right. In recent years, the World Health Organisation (WHO), as well as the Human Rights Council and a range of Treaty monitoring bodies, including on CEDAW and the CRC, referred to the right to the highest attainable standard of health. In 2002, the UN established the mandate of Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.

The EU Charter of Fundamental Rights protects under Article 35 the right of access to preventive health care and the right to benefit from medical treatment under the conditions established by national laws and practices. The Charter further requires that the definition and implementation of all Union policies and activities ensure a high level of human health protection.

In the EU-28, according to Eurostat, 67.5 % of the general population aged 16 and over perceived their health as very good or good in 2016, while 23.7 % perceived it as fair and 8.8 % as bad or very bad with men rating overall their health better than women.

The survey asked Roma respondents if they had faced limitations in their daily activities because of long-term health problems. This would allow comparison with the indicator on ‘long-term activity limitations’ of the European Core Health Indicators. The results show that limitations due to health were more prevalent among Roma in Croatia, Czechia and Slovakia. In these countries, as well as in Bulgaria, the share of Roma facing

---

59 Ibid., p. 144.
62 See, also OHCHR and WHO (2008). Factsheet No. 31 on the right to health.
63 Eurostat: Share of persons aged 16 and over with very good or good self-perceived health, by sex, 2016 – hth_silc_10.
long-term activity limitations is higher than the share of the general population experiencing similar problems. Gender differences in this regard are pronounced in six of the nine countries surveyed, which is a pattern that can also be observed in the general population. The biggest difference between women and men’s experiences is in Spain, where 17% of Roma men say that they have been limited in their daily activities, while almost one in three women (30%) feel that health problems have limited their activities in some way. On the other hand, in Czechia, Greece and Hungary, there is little or no difference between Roma women and men.

Figure 15: Long-term activity limitations of women and men, Roma and general population (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Women (%)</th>
<th>Men (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (MS)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women | Men
--- | ---
BGCZELESHRHUPTROSKTotal
Roma /zero|/one|/six|/nine (MS)
General population (EU-SILC 2014)

Notes:
1. EU-MIDIS II results are based on all respondents (n=7,909), excluding those who declined to answer; weighted results. The same definition used as for the general population.
2. Eurostat rate 2014: [hlth_silc_06], downloaded 20/10/2016. In the Eurostat database, the result for activity limitations of men in Czechia has been flagged as having low reliability.
3. Includes respondents who say that, for the past six months, their everyday activities have been ‘severely limited’ or ‘limited but not severely’ due to a health problem.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016, Roma; Eurostat, EU-SILC 2014, General population
Member States have used for many years health mediation to improve the health status of Roma, in particular women, by facilitating communication between them and health-care staff. The survey asked respondents if they or anyone from their household used the assistance of a health mediator when going to a doctor. Overall, with small differences between the countries surveyed or gender, the overwhelming majority of Roma women and men did not use such assistance. This could mean that they did not consider their services necessary or that the number of Roma health mediators is too small to address the needs of Roma populations. It would be useful to conduct more in-depth research on its added value, especially as regards Roma women, to identify the level of investment that would be required to improve service uptake and quality of healthcare.
Employment

The right to work is recognised in international human rights instruments, in particular ICESCR (Article 6). It is an individual and a collective right encompassing all forms of work, independent work or wage-paid work. In General Comment 18, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights clarified that this right is not “an absolute and unconditional right to obtain employment”. However, work must be “decent work”, which means: it must respect the rights of “the human person as well as the rights of workers in terms of conditions of work, safety and remuneration”; provide “an income allowing workers to support themselves and their families”; and “respect the physical and mental integrity of the worker in the exercise of his/her employment.” Regarding gender, the Committee underlines the need for “a comprehensive system of protection to combat gender discrimination and to ensure equal opportunities and treatment between men and women in relation to their right to work by ensuring equal pay for work of equal value.” The Committee also draws attention to the “link between the fact that women often have less access to education than men and certain traditional cultures which compromise the opportunities for the employment and advancement of women.”

The EU Charter of Fundamental Rights recognises under Article 15 that everyone has the right to engage in work and to pursue a freely chosen or accepted occupation. In Article 23, the Charter requires that equality between women and men is ensured in all areas, including employment, work and pay. In Chapter IV, on solidarity, the Charter guarantees a number of related rights, for example on workers’ right to information and consultation, collective bargaining and action, etc.

The employment rate is a headline indicator for monitoring one of the targets of the Europe 2020 strategy, namely to raise the employment rate for women and men (aged 20-64) to 75 % by 2020. According to Eurostat, while this target was already reached in 2016 for men of working age (76.9 %), employment rates for women remain lower (65.3 %) with important differences between Member States. This chapter examines in the first section employment patterns with a particular focus on domestic work, and the second section looks at related attitudes of Roma men and women.

3.1. Employment and main activities

The survey results show that in comparison to the general population a much lower proportion of Roma men and women are in employment. This is particularly worrying given that EU law prohibits any discrimination on grounds of racial or ethnic origin in employment. When looking at the countries surveyed they reveal considerable differences in employment patterns of Roma women and men. Overall, while employment rates for both Roma women and men are far lower than those of the general population, more than twice as many Roma men are in employment than Roma women, 34 % and 16 % respectively. The largest gender gap is in Greece, where only 20 % of Roma women declare themselves as employed compared to 67 % for men (Table 1).

---


The analysis of the survey results on the basis of the category ‘paid work’, which includes those ‘employed’ and ‘self-employed’ which is a rough approximation of the employment rate definition used by Eurostat, shows that overall the share of those Roma surveyed who are in paid work (43%) is well below the average EU-28 employment rate (70% in 2015). There is also a substantial gender gap in all countries surveyed, highest in Greece (where only 22% of Roma women are in paid work compared with 82% of Roma men).

At the same time, more than a quarter (28%) of Roma women are engaged in domestic work compared to 6% for men. There are important country differences, which governments should take into account when designing gender specific Roma integration measures in employment. For instance, the majority of Roma women in Romania (59%), Greece (48%), Portugal (46%) and Croatia (34%) declare as their main activity ‘domestic work’. This could indicate that many of the Roma households surveyed are the type of single-earner household, which combined with dependants such as children or older relatives, have – according to Eurofound – one of the highest risk profiles for in-work poverty.

Notes:
- Out of all persons aged 20–64 years in Roma households (n=17,806); weighted results.
- Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
- Europe 2020 employment rate 2015: Eurostat t2020_10 (downloaded 13/09/2016). This is calculated by dividing the number of persons aged 20 to 64 in employment by the total population of the same age group. The indicator is based on the ILO concept, Labour Force Survey.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016, Roma; Eurostat 2015, General population
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Table 1: Current main activity in nine EU Member States, all persons in Roma households surveyed aged 16 years or over (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Not working due to illness or disability</th>
<th>Domestic work</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Other inactive (education, military service, other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (9 MS)</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
* Out of all persons aged 16 years or over in Roma households (n=22,097); weighted results.  
* Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016, Roma
This evidence could be used by Member States when designing employment policies for Roma integration to target women who can be instrumental in breaking the poverty cycle experienced by many Roma households, in particular those characterised by low work intensity, and those where unpaid domestic work, including care of children and relatives is carried out by women. FRA’s EU-MIDIS II report on Roma shows that 44% of Roma households surveyed were living, on average, in low-work-intensity households, in comparison, to 11% in the EU-28. It is also important that employment opportunities created by such policies provide decent, adequately remunerated jobs to avoid phenomena of in-work poverty. Moreover, it is essential that actions to improve the employment of Roma women, and men, specifically address anti-Gypsyism which can be a formidable barrier in implementing such actions effectively on the ground.

Figure 17: Women, 16 to 64 years, currently not active in the labour market, not looking for work because taking care of small children/elderly/sick relatives (%)a,b

Notes:  

a Roma female respondents aged 16-64 who were not employed at the time of the survey and who say that they do not look for a job because of care responsibilities (n=866); weighted results. EU-MIDIS survey interviewed respondents age 16 and above.

b General Population: Labour Force Survey 2016: Percentage of female inactive population, 15-64 years who are not seeking employment, for the main reason: looking after children or incapacitated adults. lfsa_igar (downloaded 22/01/2019). n.a.: Eurostat total across 9 MS is not available.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016, Roma; Eurostat 2016, General population

---

70 Work intensity is the ratio between the number of household members of working age -18 to 59 years, excluding persons aged 18 to 24 years in education - who are currently working and the total number of persons of working age in the household. Work intensity is defined as ‘low’ when it is below 20% of the household’s total potential.

71 Eurostat (2013). Individual employment, household employment and risk of poverty in the EU.

72 FRA (2017a), p. 22.

73 Eurostat defines the indicator ‘in-work poverty risk’, as “Individuals who are classified as ‘employed’ (distinguishing between ‘wage and salary employment plus self-employment’ and ‘wage and salary employment’ only) and who are at risk of poverty.” See, Eurostat (2010), In-work poverty in the EU.
It is mostly women who are engaged in unpaid, domestic work cooking, cleaning and caring for children, often also for older relatives, and can therefore find it challenging to find time to look for and engage in paid work. This affects all women. But comparing Roma women with women in the general population, twice or more Roma women are not working or looking for work because of family or care responsibilities – with the exception of Slovakia.

Research shows that affordable childcare is strongly linked to women’s employment by reducing care responsibilities at home. In 2002, the EU adopted the so-called ‘Barcelona targets’ for providing access to childcare for at least 90% of children between 3 and the mandatory school age, and at least 33% of children below 3 years of age. In 2018, the stock-taking report of the European Commission notes that most Member States did not reach these targets and concludes: “As caring responsibilities are the main reason for low female labour market participation, counting to 370 billion EUR a year of loss for Europe, the Barcelona objectives, adopted by the European Council in 2002, are still of crucial importance in 2018.” The Commission monitors progress through the ‘Social Scoreboard’, annexed to the European Pillar of Social Rights, specifically concerning the implementation of principle 11 on childcare. FRA’s surveys complement Eurostat data by providing data disaggregated by ethnic origin, including specifically on Roma, which assist the EU institutions and Member States to fulfil the relevant Council recommendations.

3.2. Attitudes on gender roles in employment

Women’s low employment rates could also be affected by traditional attitudes on gender roles. The survey asked respondents if they agree that ‘men should take as much responsibility as women for the home and children’. In every country, the majority of both Roma women and men agree, or strongly agree, with this statement. In some countries, the proportion of women who agree is higher than that of men. For instance, in Czechia there is a difference of 20 percentage points, in Greece and Romania 10. On the other hand, Spain is the only country where 7 percentage points more men than women agree to the statement. These results point to the need to design measures empowering Roma women and combating the traditional division of gender roles in the home and workplace. In this regard, Roma integration policies should include measures to improve access to quality early childhood education and care, as well as care services for older people to facilitate their right to live independently.

---

74 European Commission (2018b).
The survey also asked respondents if they agree that “having a job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person”. Overall, more women (76%) than men (70%) agreed, or strongly agreed, to this statement. The proportion of men who agree, or strongly agree, to this is higher in Spain, Portugal and Bulgaria, and lower in Romania, Greece and Czechia. The most pronounced difference in the attitudes of women and men on this issue can be found in Greece (18 percentage points more women agree, or strongly agree, than men), in Romania (14 percentage points more women agree, or strongly agree, than men) and in Czechia (11 percentage points more women agree, or strongly agree, than men). In Bulgaria, Hungary, Slovakia and Spain a similar share of Roma women and men disagree, or strongly disagree, that a job is the best way for a women to be independent.

Notes:
a Out of all respondents (n=7,775); weighted results.
b Based on respondent questionnaire: “For each of the following statements I read out, can you tell me how much you agree or disagree with each? Men should take as much responsibility as women for the home and children.” “Agree” combines answer categories “strongly agree” and “agree”, “Disagree” combines answer categories “strongly disagree” and “disagree”.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016
Employment

Policy and decision makers should consider these results when engaging with Roma civil society to develop awareness raising and other measures to promote gender equality. Attitudes that favour traditional, segregated gender roles are reinforced by the lack of institutional support, particularly in the form of free and inclusive quality early childhood education and care. Where such support is available to the general population, authorities need to take measures to tackle any anti-Gypsy attitudes that can actively exclude or discourage Roma parents from placing their children there. Roma, women and men, should also be empowered to access measures improving work-life balance and their potential for personal development, such as second chance education for adult learners or initiatives for improving the employability and entrepreneurship potential of women. The European Commission should also consider how Roma can benefit from its initiatives to address women’s underrepresentation in the labour market, such as the ‘New Start for working parents’ which addresses work-life balance challenges faced by working parents and carers, as one of the deliverables of the European Pillar for Social Rights.\(^76\)

---

\(^76\) On 24 January 2019, the European Parliament and the Council reached a provisional agreement on the European Commission’s proposal for a new Directive on work-life balance for parents and carers which has to be formally adopted by both the European Parliament and the Council. See, the European Commission’s press release on the work-life balance.
Discrimination, harassment and violence due to ethnic origin

4.1. Discrimination

FRA has often underlined that anti-Gypsyism in the form of discrimination experienced by Roma women and men, because of their ethnic origin, is a fundamental barrier to Roma inclusion efforts. The results of the EU-MIDIS II survey show that in the five years before the survey, overall 41% of Roma men and 38% of Roma women said that they have experienced discrimination because of their ethnic origin, or skin colour, when looking for work. This is illegal and a violation of their fundamental right to equal treatment guaranteed by the EU’s own Charter of Fundamental Rights. More women than men said that they had experienced discrimination in Czechia, Spain and Portugal. In Greece, the share of men (70%) reporting such incidents far exceeds that of women (55%), while in Hungary 36% of Roma men have felt discriminated against when looking for work in the five years before the survey, compared with 28% of Roma women.

Roma men and women also reported experiencing discrimination in settings other than work in the five years before the survey. For example, when in contact with public services (27%); using public transport (23%); in a shop or trying to enter a shop (22%); and, when trying to enter a night club, a bar, a restaurant or hotel (20%).

However, the results show, as in all FRA surveys, that incidents remain in most cases unreported and therefore invisible to authorities. Women respondents mentioned a range of reasons for not reporting discrimination incidents. As regards the incidents that occurred when they were looking for work, the reasons selected most often were because “nothing would happen or change” by reporting it (47%), because they simply did not know how or where to report or what their rights are (26%) and “it happens all the time” (25%).

---
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Figure 20: Roma who felt discriminated against when looking for work in the five years before the survey (%)^abc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
^ Out of Roma respondents who had looked for work in the five years before the survey (n=3,987); weighted results.
^ Question: “When looking for work in the past 5 years in [COUNTRY], have you ever felt discriminated against for any of the following reasons? Skin colour/Ethnic or immigrant background/Religion or religious beliefs”
^ Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016
Table 2: Three most often cited reasons for not reporting the incident – feeling discriminated against when looking for work in the five years before the survey (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing would happen or change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know where/how to report, or what my rights are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It happens all the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
"Out of Roma respondents who had felt discriminated against when looking for work in the five years before the survey and who did not report the most recent incident anywhere (n=1,356); weighted results.

"Question: "Why did you not report the incident or make a complaint?"

"Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

These results show that the relevant state authorities, including the competent Equality Bodies, are failing to inform Roma communities of their rights and to empower and assist them, as it is their duty for every citizen, in exercising these rights. It is disappointing that the robust anti-discrimination legislation, established many years ago (2000) and applicable throughout the EU, is not being implemented in a way that serves Roma citizens’ needs. On average, the survey finds that only slightly more than one in three Roma women (34 %) and men (38 %) are aware of the existence of such anti-discrimination legislation in their country. Gender differences are more pronounced in Greece (9 percentage point difference), as well as in Bulgaria and Romania (8 percentage point difference, respectively).

This evidence shows why it is necessary that competent authorities, national governments as well as local authorities, Equality Bodies and civil society reach out to Roma women and men to inform them of their rights and assist them in accessing legal remedy to exercise these rights. FRA has repeatedly called for such measures which could go a long way towards building trust in public services, especially law enforcement and criminal justice, which is key to Roma integration.
Harassment, as defined in Article 2 of the EU’s Racial Equality Directive, is the unwanted conduct related to racial or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of violating the dignity of a person and of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment.

Almost every third Roma survey respondent believed that they had experienced, at least once, some form of harassment which they felt was due to their ethnic origin in the year before the survey; 31% of men and 29% of women. The share of men and women who experienced harassment varies by country.

The analysis collapses the following harassment experiences asked by the survey: offensive or threatening comments made in person, such as insults or name calling; personal threats of violence; offensive gestures or inappropriate staring; receiving offensive or threatening email or text messages; people posting offensive comments about the respondent on the internet.
4.3. Violence

Violence motivated by racism is a hate crime. Such crimes harm individual victims, as well as their entire community and society. They strike at the heart of the EU’s commitment to democracy and fundamental rights. The survey shows that in most countries the majority of Roma respondents, men and women, did not experience any violence in the five years preceding the survey. The highest rate of those who did experience such violence is in Slovakia (19 % men, 13 % women). Other instances of higher victimisation rates can be found among Roma men in Czechia (16 %), Croatia (16 %) and Greece (14 %). In most countries analysed, the rate of violence motivated by racism is higher for men compared with women, although – apart from the findings listed above – the number of cases available for analysis is low and limits comparisons.
Overall, 74% of Roma women who experienced such an incident did not report this to the authorities, compared with 67% of Roma men. Small number of cases available for analysis at the country level hinders disaggregating these results further. Reluctance to report a criminal offence to the police, as FRA has often highlighted in its reports on hate crime, means that such crimes will not be investigated or prosecuted which reinforces the perpetrators’ sense of impunity, while victims do not benefit from the legal protection and psycho-social support they are entitled to by the EU’s Victims’ Rights Directive. As FRA has pointed out in the past, while some victims of hate-motivated incidents may find other ways of coping – such as relying on assistance from family and friends – those who might have chosen to seek legal redress if they had access to information about their rights and support mechanisms cannot do so if they do not report such crimes. The unwillingness of victims to report crimes to the police and criminal justice institutions is a measure of their institutional effectiveness. FRA’s surveys consistently show that as regards hate crime affecting migrants, Muslims, Jews, LGBTI people, as well as gender based violence, the issue of low reporting rates across the EU must urgently be addressed to make these crimes more visible and hold perpetrators to account. Rulings by the European Court of Human Rights, such as ECtHR, *Balazs v. Hungary*, No. 15529/12, 14 March 2016, cited in FRA’s report on hate crime recording and data collection practice across the EU*oblige* countries to ‘unmask’ the bias motivation behind criminal offences which can lead to increased penalties, as well as more and more and diverse services available for victims.

---
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Concluding remarks

The analysis of the survey results shows that despite efforts by the EU and its Member States to reduce gender inequalities among citizens of Roma origin, important gender differences persist. While all women are affected by inequalities in the twelve areas identified in the Beijing Platform for Action, Roma women face additional challenges. For this reason, Roma integration strategies and measures, including the EU’s own framework for Roma inclusion after 2020 should include specific reference to the EU Common Basic Principle on Roma Inclusion: “awareness of the gender dimension”. This cross-cutting principle applies to all areas of life, as well as in the fight against anti-Gypsyism, which is a formidable barrier to social inclusion for both women and men.

The report highlights a range of areas where Roma women are disadvantaged both in comparison to Roma men and the general population. In particular, the analysis highlights the dire consequences of persisting practices in some EU countries of early, in particular under-age, marriages which affect many Roma women. Roma women who marry and start a family at a very young age, while living in severely deprived material and housing conditions, are even more disadvantaged and at higher risk of exclusion and marginalisation. This phenomenon is a serious violation of their fundamental rights and needs to be tackled urgently through specific, gender-sensitive measures. Such measures need to be designed and implemented together with Roma women and men concerned to avoid stigmatisation. They must take into account that inadequate access to or trust in available state provisions for social support can be a powerful driver for early marriages.

Member States can also use the data analysed here to assess the impact of measures they have taken. For example, many Roma inclusion actions provide mediation in health or education. The results show that only a small proportion of Roma benefit from these actions. This could mean that funding for such initiatives needs to better match the number of potential Roma beneficiaries or/and that the efficiency of these actions needs to be reviewed.

The results in education and employment show that the EU and its Member States are far from reaching the goals set by the EU Roma inclusion framework, especially for specific, critical indicators, such as the share of early school leavers and the proportion of young people not in employment, education or training. A serious investment in targeted and gender-sensitive measures is therefore required. This should include and specifically target measures on those Roma women who marry early and leave school and those young Roma men who go to work at an early age, many in low-skill jobs to provide income for their families with little opportunity for personal development.

In parallel, bold trust-building measures are required to improve participation in education, particularly in early childhood education and care. In some Member States, this will involve actions to tackle anti-Gypsyism in school and pre-school settings. In others, where most Roma speak Romani as their first main language at home, measures, such as mother tongue-based multilingual early childhood education which UNESCO recommends, could attract more Roma to education and contribute to improving respect for diversity and social cohesion.

A more ambitious framework for Roma inclusion post 2020 is needed to achieve the aim of Agenda 2030 “to leave no one behind” and its specific sustainable development goal No. 5 that calls on states “to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls”. Across the EU, there is a need for more evidence-based, better targeted, well-resourced and gender-sensitive actions to match by deeds the ambitious statement of the first EU Framework on Roma inclusion: “to make a tangible difference to Roma people’s lives”.
ANNEX - The survey in a nutshell

The full technical report and questionnaire for the EU-MIDIS II survey is available online.81

Selection criteria

EU-MIDIS II respondents were screened for eligibility by self-identification. When carrying out the interviews for the Roma sample, after contacting a household and introducing the survey, the interviewer asked a screening question (‘Is there anyone aged 16 or over living in this household who is Roma?’) to determine whether there were eligible Roma persons in the household to take part in the survey. In some countries, the term ‘Roma’ was replaced with a show card listing all relevant terms commonly used for different Roma groups. The survey interviewed one person per Roma household who were also asked a number of questions about each household member.

The EU-MIDIS II survey collected data on 7,947 Roma households – 33,785 household members. The results in this document depending on the analysis (respondent-level versus household-level) are based either on the experiences of 7,947 respondents (one per household) or 33,785 persons – all individuals living in Roma households.

Data collection

The fieldwork was conducted by Ipsos MORI, a large international survey company based in the United Kingdom, under the supervision of FRA according to strict quality control procedures participating in interviewer training sessions and observing data collection activities.

Main interview mode was Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) – face-to-face interviews administered by interviewers using a computerised questionnaire. The English master version of the questionnaire was translated into the nine official languages of the countries in which Roma were surveyed. The median length of the interviews with Roma respondents was 43 minutes.

Sampling

The EU-MIDIS II survey set out to achieve a probability sample of Roma in each of the nine EU Member States. In all countries, Roma households were selected through random route sampling techniques. In the absence of lists of individuals or addresses, the interviewers followed pre-defined instructions within randomly selected areas to contact every nth household. This involved a multi-stage clustered sampling approach, where – as a first step – data concerning the population size was gathered at the lowest possible territorial level (for example, data from censuses or other sources). This information served for the preparation of the sampling frame – a list of areas to be sampled, also known as the Primary Sampling Units (PSUs). In the nine countries where Roma were surveyed, administrative units with Roma population density below a certain country-specific threshold were excluded from the sampling frame. This led to a slight decrease in the coverage of all Roma living in the nine EU Member States covered, resulting in a coverage ranging between 60 % and 80 % in the countries where Roma were surveyed.

Weighting

When analysing the survey results, the data were weighted to reflect the selection and response probabilities of each household and individual based on the multi-stage sampling design. This was also needed to correct the results for unequal selection probabilities, which were used to increase the efficiency of the data collection (higher density areas were oversampled in some countries). The weights also account for the differences in the (estimated) size of the Roma population in each of the countries. As the sample sizes are not proportional to the size of the Roma population in each of the countries, countries with bigger Roma populations receive higher weights, accordingly. This allows for calculation of aggregate statistics when combining different countries.

Roma sample sizes

The target sample sizes for each of the nine EU Member States in which Roma were interviewed are based on the estimated number of Roma living in each country. In total 7,947 interviews with Roma respondents were carried out across the nine EU Member States, ranging from 508 interviews in Greece to 1,408 in Romania, as shown in Table 3. Altogether 35,400 addresses were contacted to obtain the sample of 7,947 interviews, including invalid and ineligible addresses.
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Table 3: Number of Roma individuals and households interviewed in EU-MIDIS II by gender and EU Member State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU Member State</th>
<th>Households/selected respondents</th>
<th>Individuals in Roma households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechia</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (9 MS)</td>
<td>3,591</td>
<td>4,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Getting in touch with the EU

In person
All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct information centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you at: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

On the phone or by email
Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union. You can contact this service:
– by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls),
– at the following standard number: +32 22999696 or
– by email via: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

Finding information about the EU

Online
Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website at: https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en

EU publications
You can download or order free and priced EU publications at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publications. Multiple copies of free publications may be obtained by contacting Europe Direct or your local information centre (see https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en).

EU law and related documents
For access to legal information from the EU, including all EU law since 1952 in all the official language versions, go to EUR-Lex at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu

Open data from the EU
The EU Open Data Portal (http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en) provides access to datasets from the EU. Data can be downloaded and reused for free, both for commercial and non-commercial purposes.
Despite efforts by the European Union (EU) and its Member States to reduce gender inequalities among citizens of Roma origin, important gender differences persist. While all women are affected by inequalities in a range of areas, Roma women face additional challenges as extreme poverty, exclusion and discrimination reinforce their disadvantages even further. In core areas of life, such as education, employment and health, Roma women fare worse than Roma men and than women in the general population. In addition, Roma women, especially those who marry and start a family at a very young age while living in severely deprived material and housing conditions, are even more disadvantaged and at risk of exclusion and marginalisation.

Drawing on FRA’s own survey research in nine EU Member States – Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Greece, Hungary, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Spain – this report highlights the position of Roma women in education, employment and health, as well as the extent to which they experience hate-motivated discrimination, harassment and physical violence. It also highlights the dire consequences of early marriages which affect many Roma women.