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POVERTY AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION OF INTERNALLY DISPLACED POPULATION IN SERBIA

Summary: In this paper we deal with poverty and social exclusion of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Serbia. This descriptive analysis is mostly based on LSMS conducted in 2007. Some indicators are derived from 2009 Survey on Social Inclusion, conducted by UNDP Serbia for Human Development Report. Several aspects of social inclusion are presented: access to basic personal documentation, their position at labor market, their financial poverty and material deprivation, as well as access to different social services (education, health care, employment assistance). In general, the analysis shows that IDPs have been well integrated regarding health care and education. There are still significant problems with housing conditions, and situation with employment and poverty is very bad. The worst situation is with Roma IDPs who face multidimensional exclusion and severe poverty.
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Introduction

In this paper we deal with poverty and social exclusion of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Serbia. According to UNHCR, the term IDP denominates persons who were forced to change place of residence, moving to another settlement in the same country of living. Such persons usually suffer hard consequences of forced migration affecting their living conditions, labor market status, self-confidence, economic position and social inclusion. In Serbia, waste majority of the group are persons who moved from Kosovo after NATO invasion in 1999. The number of IDPs did not significantly vary in the past few years, and the estimate is that it stands at about 205,000 persons. According to the latest large scale survey conducted among IDPs in Serbia, The Living Standard Measurement Survey (LSMS, 2007), Serbs make 78.5% of the group, Roma make 15.8%\(^1\), and the rest are Montenegrians, Bosniaks, Goranians and others (LSMS IDPs Report, 2008). From here on, these two groups are referred to as Roma IDPs and non-Roma IDPs (all other ethnic groups, mostly Serbs).

The majority of IDPs from Kosovo are located in Belgrade and bigger cities near Kosovo (Kraljevo, Niš, Leskovac, Kruševac). There is much fewer of them in northern province of Vojvodina, with the exception of Roma IDPs. The majority of IDPs came from urban areas in Kosovo, but a part of them got the opportunity to migrate from villages to towns when resettling, so the proportion of IDPs living in urban areas increased from 70.6% as it was before the displacement, to 83% as it is today (LSMS IDPs Report, 2008). This fact, as well as the fact that IDPs have a similar educational structure to the one of the domestic population has certain implications to their positioning in the labor market (LSMS IDPs Report, 2008). This shows that IDPs add pressure to those labor market segments that suffer from harshest forms of competitiveness in the first place. Consequently, these facts are affecting overall economic and

---

\(^1\) There are some estimates that Roma, Ashkalie and Egyptians make around 25% of IDPs in Serbia (IDPs In Serbia And Kosovo – Vulnerability And Need For Assistance, 2008)
social position of IDPs, especially of those accommodated in collective centers under very poor housing conditions. As of January 2009 it was estimated that some 4,580 IDPs were accommodated in 56 collective centers. These are mainly located in Southern and Central Serbia, which have the highest concentration of IDPs. Perceived as the most vulnerable group of IDPs, many face serious economical, psychological and social obstacles when trying to integrate into society.

Institutional response to IDPs’ social and economic position now and ten years ago is not the same. Forced migrations are usually followed by significant deterioration of basic living conditions of migrants which was the case with majority of IDPs. The initial shock produced by forced displacement required an urgent response and protection of people’s mere existence. The logical institutional response was to establish crisis teams and safety nets gathering all institutions, organizations, firms and individuals that could provide food, money, clothes, shelters, etc. Ten years later we still witness the most obvious consequence of this approach - the existence of collective centers. There is, however, large number of IDPs in private accommodation, much larger than in CCs, who suffer equally poor social and economic conditions and who receive much less institutional support than IDPs in CCs.

These circumstances continuously point to the need for different approach from institutions side. Nowadays we need to provide support for improvement of social inclusion of IDPs into local communities. This support should treat all aspects of their living that are being deteriorated. Generally, most of problems that IDPs face are related to poverty, housing and labor market position. Another important feature of their social and economic position is that many of them face multidimensional exclusion. These facts show that 10 years after displacement we need more carefully tailored measures and policies and active network of institutions in order to support IDPs and make them active members of society.

---

In next pages we intend to show which are the fields of highest social exclusion of IDPs in Serbia. We will present their access to basic personal documentation, their position at labor market, their financial poverty and material deprivation, as well as access to different social services (education, health care, employment assistance).

Data and Methodology

In the past few years, in Serbia there have been a number of researches aiming to analyze the position and problems of IDP population (Cvejić, Babović, 2009; Center for Institutional Development – CIR-a: *Report from the Regional Workshop with IDPs*, 2009; Group 484: *Report from round tables on the employment issue of internally displaced persons from the territory of Kosovo and Metohija*, 2009; *LSMS IDPs Report*, 2008; *IDPs In Serbia And Kosovo – Vulnerability And Need For Assistance*, 2008; *Analysis of the position of IDPs from Kosovo – Law and Practice*, 2007; Group 484, 2008, UNHCR, Praxis, 2007). These researches usually tried to analyze the characteristics and problems of the entire socioeconomic position of IDPs in Serbia or in selected regions, as well as their exercising of various rights. In this paper we rely basically on LSMS data from 2007. In this survey data collection was conducted by The Republic Statistical Office of Serbia (RSO) in May and June 2007 on national sample of 5,558 households and 17,521 individuals and on sample of 1,962 IDP households and 8,441 individuals, including 259 Roma households and 1,331 Roma individuals (*LSMS IDPs Report*, 2008). Occasionally we will support conclusions with findings from other researches, most often from Survey on Social Inclusion, conducted by UNDP for Regional Human Development Report (referred to from here on as *HDR Survey 2010*), where national sample of 2,400 was boosted with 300 IDPs.
Access to Basic Documentation

After the first wave of displacement of Serbs from Kosovo, during the beginning of current decade, the lack of different documents was often mentioned in public, especially by different NGOs, as a major problem for the integration of IDPs in Serbian society. Until 2007, as registered in LSMS, the number of IDPs who faced this problem decreased. At that time 10.6% of LSMS respondents said they lacked some personal documents, 8.1% of non-Roma and 26.6% of Roma. The two groups differed in types of missing documents, too. Roma lacked basic documents that proved their personal identification and citizenship and documents which guaranteed their basic freedom and rights (birth certificate, citizenship certificate, personal ID, health care card), while non-Roma lacked documents which restricted their freedoms and rights only partially (employment service document, passport).

While the proportion of non-Roma facing different problems due to lack of basic personal documents is almost negligible, one could say that the problems that Roma IDPs are facing are the same ones faced by Roma in Serbia in general. Many of them are related to Roma cultural habits and their comprehension of integration, and not only to obstacles made by institutions in Serbia. In a way this is proved by the fact that 42.1% of Roma IDPs who lacked documentation did not even try to collect missing documents. Out of those Roma IDPs who tried to obtain missing documents, only 10% said they have not had problems in doing so. The major problem was lack of other relevant documents (2/3 of those who had problems). The most of assistance in obtaining missing documents Roma IDPs get from NGOs and very little from administration. This might be because Roma need more training in administrative procedures than non-Roma and NGOs are much more prone than state institutions to make step towards them and provide necessary assistance ‘in the field’.
Labor Market Position

The labor market position is one of the key aspects of social inclusion of IDPs. A stable and favourable labor market position is a precondition for satisfactory economic position and living standard. It is also a channel for the development of social capital (significant for many aspects of social life of individuals), channel for collecting market-related information, development of skills, and other human resources. According to findings on the position of IDPs on labor market, it seems that a major part of social exclusion, or crucial problems of social integration are concentrated in this dimension of their life.

Basic indicators of labor market position of IDPs obtained from LSMS data reveal unfavourable position of IDPs in labor market. When compared with the general population of Serbia, employment rates of non-Roma and Roma IDPs are significantly lower and unemployment rates much higher than in general population of Serbia, which indicates the presence of significant obstacles to that participation on the labor market.

>> Table 1. here<<

Data from table 1 indicates an extremely unfavourable position of Roma IDPs, and women from both IDP subsamples. Employment rate of non-Roma displaced women is much lower than employment rate of women in general population, while their unemployment rate is much higher. The problem of Roma women appears at the first place as very low entrance to labor market. Only 1/5 of working age Roma women attempts to be economically active. Furthermore, only 10% of active Roma women succeed in gaining employment. It is important to note that the position of women from IDP population in the labor market is a consequence of
a twofold marginalization: their chances are lower because they are women\(^3\), and because they belong to a socially marginalized group.

**Characteristics of IDPs Employment**

Employment in Serbia is still marked by high share of informal employment. According to data from national LSMS, share of informal employment\(^4\) in total employment (including employers, self-employed, salaried workers, farmers) was around 35% in 2007 and it was on the same level as in 2003. Share of informal employment among IDPs was much higher – 42%. Although informal work was dominant among self-employed in both IDP groups as well as in national sample, significant differences could be observed among salaried workers from three samples. Informal salaried work was significantly more present among non-Roma IDPs than in national sample, and again extremely more present among Roma IDPs than in two other samples.

>> Table 2 here<<

Employed non-Roma women work under formal labor contracts more often than non-Roma men (78% and 69%, respectively), while for Roma women there was no enough cases in the sample for statistically reliable conclusion.

\(^3\) A recent study “Position of Women on the Labor Market in Serbia” (Babovic, 2007) revealed significant gender inequalities in the labor market. The position of women is significantly worse than the position of men in all aspects: activity, employment, unemployment, chances for promotion, levels of salaries, etc.

\(^4\) As informally employed are considered all persons who were employed without formal labor contract, employed in unregistered enterprises or agricultural production households, as well as persons who lack insurance from employment (LSMS report, 2007).
A significant number of employed IDP fail to exercise their welfare rights in the work place. Among the non-Roma, 91% of self-employed and 31% of employed do not have either retirement or health insurance. Among Roma IDPs, all self-employed lack both health insurance and retirement insurance. At the same time, among employed Roma, only 15% have health insurance and 19% have retirement insurance. In the work place, non-Roma women exercise welfare rights in 10% more cases than non-Roma men, while Roma women lack both health and retirement insurance.

Furthermore, the majority of employed among non-Roma IDPs, and all Roma IDPs worked for the monthly salary that is below the average salary for Serbia in 2007. According to RSO data, average net monthly salary in July 2007 was around 350 EUR. The average monthly salary for non-Roma IDPs was around 250 EUR, and for Roma IDPs 150 EUR. Average monthly salary in national LSMS sample was also lower than from RSO data – around 270 EUR. However, significant difference between IDP and national sample can be observed in much higher shares of employed with above average salaries in general population and higher shares of salaries below average in IDP population, with particularly high share of persons with salary below minimum in Roma subsample.

>>Table 3 here<<

Women from both IDP subsamples are paid less than their male counterparts. Seventeen percent of non-Roma men and 30% of non-Roma women receive less than the minimum wage. Among employed male Roma, 48% receive a salary lower than the minimum, while this figure for female Roma is 60%.
Employment structure according to economic sector differs strongly between IDP and general population. Share of persons employed in agriculture is much lower in IDP sample than in national sample (3.8% and 23.6%, respectively), while share of persons employed in services is significantly higher among IDPs than in national sample (67.5% and 43.6%, respectively).

The structure of employed IDPs according to industrial sector differs between non-Roma and Roma significantly: Roma are concentrated in trade, repair services and restaurants, while non-Roma are distributed more in different branches of activities.

The employment structure according to occupation again reveals a more differentiated distribution of different occupations among non-Roma IDPs (although qualified workers have a major share), while among Roma over 3/4 of employed are unqualified workers.

>>Table 4. here<<

It is important to note that 17% of non-Roma work in occupations that are below their educational level. When the match between education and occupation is observed separately for categories with different education levels, it is obvious that most frequently persons with a university education work in occupations below their education – 27% of them.

There is a certain level of gender segregation according to occupation, as among non-Roma women professionals, technicians and clerks have a higher share than among men who are dominated by skilled workers. Again there are no significant differences between Roma men and women, as in both groups unskilled workers prevail.
Characteristics of IDPs Unemployment

Education structure of unemployed IDPs is unfavourable from the perspective of employment chances. Unemployed persons with primary and secondary school level have fewer chances for re-employment than persons with higher level of education.

Long-term unemployment is considered as one of the most important labor market indicators. It indicates share of persons that are unemployed longer than one year, with higher chances to lose important skills, resources and social contacts and diminish chances for re-employment. LSMS data for national sample indicate that long-term unemployment is highly present in national sample with 75% of unemployed that are looking for job longer than one year. In IDPs sample long-term unemployment has extremely high share of 91%.

The majority of unemployed from both groups are registered at National Employment Service (NES): 78% of unemployed non-Roma and 72% of unemployed Roma. Only 15% of unemployed non-Roma and less than 3% of unemployed Roma from the sample are beneficiaries of unemployment compensation. All unemployed respondents, reported that they have been actively looking for a new job during last month. The main channels for the job search are: National Employment Service, direct approach to employers, social networks (family, friends, acquaintances), and newspaper advertisements. Both groups of unemployed rely mostly on NES, but there is a difference between non-Roma and Roma IDPs in the use of other channels. The first group relies much more on social networks and uses direct approaches to employers more as a strategy. Women from both ethnic groups prefer to look for a job through NES more than their male counterparts, and less through social networks or by directly approaching employers.

During the month in question, only less than 2% of non-Roma from the sample attended some kind of school or training programme, while no single Roma participated in an educational
programme. Furthermore, less than 3% of non-Roma and less than 2% of Roma from the sample received severance payment for job loss.

Education

Here we will deal with current education attendance of children from IDPs families at 3 levels: pre-school education, primary and secondary education and university education.

Pre-school education

Here we will differentiate between pre-school daily care and obligatory pre-school education for children aged 6 or 7.

Two major conclusions regarding pre-school day care are that attendance of children among IDPs is low, and that this is especially valid for Roma children. Attendance rate in national sample is 25.3%, among non-Roma IDPs 16% and among Roma IDPs 2%. If the children are attending pre-school daily care, it is the public one. In national sample 5% of children who attend pre-school daily care go to private kindergartens.

Obligatory pre-school education is not available to all IDP families. The attendance rate is low, since only 2/3 of internally displaced children attend a pre-school programme. There is no difference between non-Roma IDPs and domicile children (82% and 83.3%, respectively), but low participation of Roma in education already starts at this level, since there is only 28.8% of Roma children attending this form of education. All of the children who attend this form of education go to public institutions.
Primary and secondary education

In this paragraph, we will consider the attendance of IDPs children to different forms of primary and secondary education. These two levels of education were not separated in the LSMS questionnaire, but we differentiated between them based on the children’s age.

Attendance rates for non-Roma and Roma children who were internally displaced from Kosovo and for children from national sample are presented in the following table.

>> Table 5. here<<

There are 3 important conclusions based on the table 5. First, the attendance rate among non-Roma is far higher than among Roma, and not much different from national sample. Second, among Roma children the attendance rate is sharply decreasing at secondary education. In the 7 to 14 age-range (primary school age), 69.5% children from Roma IDPs families attend school. In the 15 to 19 age range, (secondary school age) the attendance rate is only 15.8%, and even those are mostly Roma children who are still in primary school (60%). Here we have to stress that, contrary to our expectations, there was no significant difference in attendance between girls and boys, either among Roma or non-Roma.
University education

To calculate the attendance rate for university education we will refer to all those who are between 19 and 25 years old and who have completed some 4 years secondary school. Of course, there are students in the sample who are older than 25, but even in the referrent category university attendance rate is 44.8% among non-Roma and 0 among Roma. In national sample this rate is 61%. We believe that higher rate of university attendance among domicile population, as compared to non-Roma IDPs, could be at least to some extent explained by higher costs related to university education as compared to primary and secondary.

Health Care

Our respondents were asked to give subjective estimate of general health condition of themselves and their family members. Here non-Roma and Roma differ only slightly: almost 2/3 of non-Roma and 3/4 of Roma IDPs are in good or very good health. Also, both groups of IDPs don’t differ much from domicile population in this sense. Long standing illness or health problem was reported by 24.8% of IDPs. Among Roma this percentage is 18.3, and among non-Roma 26%. These problems limit the everyday activities of both Roma and non-Roma IDPs in almost 2/3 of cases. This is a bit better situation than with domicile population where 32.2% respondents claim they suffer from long standing illness.

The reason for Roma respondents reporting fewer long standing health problems in their families could be both because they are younger in average and because they are far less educated and capable of recognizing different diseases. On the other hand, Roma IDPs get long standing diseases at much younger age than non-Roma. This is especially valid for chest and
breathing problems, stomach and digesting problems, diabetes and progressive diseases. Roma IDPs who suffer chronical deseases are in average 10 years younger than non-Roma IDPs.

Gender differences are small concerning health status. There is a slightly higher number of non-Roma women who reported long-standing illness (28.8% as compared to 23.2% men). The difference is most apparent in rheumatic diseases and, surprisingly, in high blood pressure. The same is the case in national sample: more women reported long standing illness and the difference is the highest in coronary diseases. On the other side, it is important to stress that IDP men on average get ill earlier than women.

It seems that in 2007, the health care situation improved compared to 2002. Only 1.6% non-Roma persons and 16.1% Roma persons from our sample did not have health insurance. In 2002 these figures were 7.0% and 29.8%, respectively. There is less IDPs who don’t have health insurance than local inhabitants (6% in 2007 LSMS).

Non-Roma IDPs visit doctors more often than Roma IDPs. Both groups go most often to public ambulances. However, non-Roma visit private ambulances 3 times more frequently than Roma. The average number of visits for both groups is close to one per month. There is no difference between non-Roma IDPs and domicile population regarding this issue, except for visits to private ambulances where local population has double higher frequency.

It is interesting to note that non-Roma IDP women do not visit gynaecologists more often than Roma women, contrary to trend in domicile population where non-Roma women visit gynaecologists much more frequently than Roma women. Both groups visit gynaecologists rarely (less than 2%). The rate of domicile adult women in Serbia who visited gynaecologist during last month was 2.3%.
**Housing Status**

Housing is one of the most important components of economic position and is expected to be one of the most jeopardized dimensions of the IDPs’ living in Serbia. As much as 77% of IDPs households managed to provide either ownership over housing unit or free housing. However, they are still in much worse position than domicile population who own house or apartment in 90.4% of cases.

It is worth noticing, though, that 10.2% of IDP households live in objects that are not intended for housing, as compared to only 0.5% among domicile population. This percentage is much higher among Roma households (32% as compared to 6.9% non-Roma IDPs). Living in non-housing objects for Roma families is most frequent in Belgrade (60%, half of it in municipality of Zemun), and two municipalities close to border with Kosovo - Bujanovac (20%) and Kraljevo (10%). All of unconditional housing is in urban surrounding.

There is more indicators showing much worse housing condition for Roma IDPs. Non-Roma households have an average size of living space per head of household of 18.43 m² and this figure among Roma households is 8.14 m², which is far below standards of normal housing conditions (15 m²⁵). Average size of living space per head for domicile households is 30 m², which is much better than with IDPs. It is important to stress that this has not much to do with the fact that much more of domicile population lives in rural settlements, but with the fact that IDP families are larger (have more children).

Finally, housing conditions are quite good for non-Roma families, although primarily at a basic level (electricity, water, sewerage system, bathroom/toilette). However, Roma IDP families live

---

⁵ There are no new official standards about minimum squared meters per household member. However old standards from socialist period proclaimed (in urbanization plans and housing documents) as the minimum 15m² per household member. Distribution of housing space that drops below 8 m² per household member is considered as highly pathological regarding household interactions and health of individual members.
in poorly equipped housing objects and critically lack basic hygienic conditions. Consequently, Roma families complain about living conditions much more often than non-Roma families (83.4% compared to 42.8%). Each investigated component of living conditions is worse for Roma than for non-Roma.

The two groups of IDPs differ significantly in basic infrastructural expenditures. Summary monthly costs for telephone, mobile telephone, utilities (water, garbage disposal, central heating), electricity and gas had an average around 57 Euro among non-Roma households and around 32 Euro among Roma households. Also, Roma households have debts for paying bills more frequently and for longer period than non-Roma households. For example, the average number of unpaid monthly bills for electricity is 5 for non-Roma and 10 for Roma families. Summary monthly costs for telephone, mobile telephone, utilities (water, garbage disposal, central heating), electricity and gas had an average of around 66 Euro among domicile households in Serbia. The number of households who have debts for electricity is 5.4%, which is less than among IDPs. The rate of households who have subsidized price for electricity is 5%, like among IDPs.

**Poverty and Material Deprivation**

In LSMS poverty risk was estimated using absolute poverty line, defined on average monthly consumption per equivalent adult (modified OECD scale used). In 2007 this line was calculated in Serbia at around 111 Euro per equivalent adult (Living Standard Measurement Survey 2002-2007, 2008). This indicator showed that the poverty of IDPs was much higher than that of domicile population.

>> graph 1 here <<
In 2009 Survey on Social Inclusion, conducted by UNDP for Regional Human Development Report, a relative measure of poverty was used, defined as 60% of median monthly consumption per equivalent adult (here too the modified OECD scale was used). At-risk-of-poverty rate was estimated at 18% for general population in Serbia, 57.6% for IDPs and 82.8% for Roma. The relative measure in time of global crisis points to higher inequality between IDPs and domicile population than the one presented in the graph above.

In the same survey material deprivation was measured in the way similar to SILC methodology. Three dimensions of deprivation were identified: 1. economic (inability to realize specific needs: food, clothing, vacations, payment of utilities, etc.); 2. possession of durable goods; 3. housing (household furnishing and quality of the space); The three dimensions were included in the composite index of material deprivation. Considering the fact that the selection of specific indicators is contextual in order to make it indicative of the poverty and social exclusion in the given social environment, deprivation was estimated according to the extent of possession of specific goods (Mack & Lansley 1985). This means that the goods which became a part of the standard furnishings of most households (over 80%) were considered to be discriminating, i.e. it was assumed that the lack of such furnishings causes deprivation. Special care was also taken that other indicators of material deprivation were discriminating to social exclusion (below

---

6 Composite index comprises three individual indexes: 1. Index of deprivation in meeting needs which includes the following variables: 1) ability to buy food for three meals a day, 2) ability to regularly pay the bills, 3) ability to buy clothes and footwear when necessary, 4) ability to provide heating in cold weather, 5) ability to buy medicine when necessary, 6) ability to entertain friends including serving refreshments, 7) ability to travel for important family gatherings. Individuals who answered to 4 or more variables with “never” and “rarely” were identified as deprived; 2. Index of deprivation in household furnishing includes the following variables which register possession of the following household appliances: 1) TV sets, 2) mobile telephone, 3) washing machine, 4) refrigerator/freezer, 5) telephone, 6) radio set, 7) iron, 8) bed for each family member, 9) living room furniture, 10) vacuum cleaner. All who answered that they “do not own because they cannot afford” 5 or more appliances specified herein were deemed as deprived; 3. Index of deprivation in housing which includes the following variables: 1) up to 12 square meters of living space per member of household, 2) no running water, 3) not having indoor toilet and 4) not having electricity in the house. All who were registered with one of the specified conditions were deemed as deprived. Composite index was completed by identifying all who were registered with the value 1 in the composite index as moderately deprived, and all who were registered with the values 2 and 3 were recognized as significantly deprived.
adopted standards) and not the variations in the standard of living among rural population or compared to urban population.

From the graph below it is obvious that IDP families are in much worse position than general population of Serbia. They do much better than Roma families, though.

>> graph 2 here <<

Conclusions

Typical migrational destinations for IDPs in Serbia were urban centers, in which higher economic growth as well as developed administrative institutions gave more options for successful inclusion strategies. This fact is important, since many IDPs rely on state support, not only by receiving financial aid, but also by keeping their former jobs in administrative institutions and public enterprises whose centers have been moved mostly to southern Serbian cities.

The economic position of IDPs is very vulnerable. Most of them lost their property in Kosovo or were unable to use it freely. Here in Serbia some of them have managed to organize affordable housing, but many face increased costs for renting a living space. Their financial status is dominated by employment related income (including pensions) and support from the state. At the same time, many IDPs lost their jobs and faced risks of Serbian labor market. Unemployment, low wages, jobs below achieved skill and qualification, lack of options for additional work are some of them. A few have chosen low intensity agricultural production as an alternative survival strategy.
The weak economic position of IDPs negatively influences their social inclusion. Most IDPs are included in Serbian society through standard institutional ways: they receive financial aid for IDPs, they normally use public health care and public education or look for job through NES. However, it is private initiative and strategies based on options additional to public ones that lead to an improved quality of life today in Serbia. This is precisely where IDPs are weak: they mostly work for an employer, they rarely have additional jobs, their children do not get additional trainings in languages and skills, and they cannot afford private medical care. Therefore, IDPs, as a group, belong to the poorer and less integrated parts of Serbian society, to the part that struggles not to grow but to survive.

Roma IDPs are in much worse position than non-Roma IDPs in each of the above-mentioned dimensions. Many of them still lack basic personal documents. They almost exclusively work in the informal sector at unskilled jobs. Roma families have many inactive members and are heavily dependent on cash transfers. Roma IDPs are more than 8 times poorer than non-Roma IDPs and only modestly compensated through budget transfers. Their children easily quit schools and are subject to social exclusion from an early age.

An obvious gender inequality also exists in two vital pillars of social inclusion: educational achievement and position in the labor market. However, it seems that the situation is improving with younger generations, as there is no significant difference in educational enrolment. Here, the difference between Roma and non-Roma children is the most striking, not between the genders.

When compared to national sample, IDPs again show differentiated picture: non-Roma IDPs share many of the characteristics of local population, while Roma IDPs suffer much worse living conditions and lower chances for improvement. However, even non-Roma IDPs lag behind local population in some important aspects of life. They share similar migration patterns, health status and health behaviour. They are even a bit better educated in average, mostly with
higher share of those with secondary education. However, even many of non-Roma IDPs lack good housing, they are much often unemployed and dependent on social transfers, their children don’t get university education and extracurricular training as often as local children do. This makes them as a group poorer than local population and less capable to define successful coping strategy and provide for good living standard.

Some eight years after displacement from Kosovo, IDPs were still struggling to improve their social and economic position in Serbian society. This was as much due to the mere fact of displacement as to the economic and institutional weakness of Serbia in its period of transition.

The first response to the wave of internally displaced persons from Kosovo in 1999 was formation of safety nets. Today, instead of talking about safety nets, we need to talk about active institutions. Relying mostly on primary networks (family, friends), which was the prevailing societal form for most of IDPs in first years of displacement, brings to formation of cohesive social groups, but might lead to their segregation and isolation. On the other hand, capacity to rely on network of institutions and organizations improves chances of each individual to get included in wider community. This is why special attention should be paid to this kind of networks. In the case of IDPs in Serbia this is even more important since research data showed that they don’t rely much on either type of networks. Such inactivity could be explained by two factors: one is post-traumatic stress that usually affects forced migrants and the other one is national government’s policy based on IDPs financial allowance and incentives to return to Kosovo, which keeps IDPs in awaiting position and makes obstacles for their faster integration into local community. It seems that today both of the factors, the first one more than the other, are weakening. This puts more emphasis on need for activation of IDPs and brings even more under the focus the role of local institutions and organizations since the most of supportive social services are being delivered locally. The role of local administration in improving social inclusion of IDPs is very important since local circumstances differ significantly in Serbia, as well as the number of IDPs. The design of support networks should be
strongly influenced by local administration knowledge and capacities. On the other hand, this means that under the same laws, strategies and action plans social inclusion of IDPs may be unequally successful in different municipalities, depending on efficiency and flexibility of support networks.
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Table 1: Basic indicators on labor market position – general population and IDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Serbia general population</th>
<th>Non-Roma IDPs</th>
<th>Roma IDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>gender</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity rate</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rate</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2: Legal labor status at present job, self employed and salaried workers, non-Roma, Roma IDPs, and national sample in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal status</th>
<th>Non-Roma</th>
<th>Roma</th>
<th>Total IDPs</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>Salaried worker</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>Salaried worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal contract, licence</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3: Monthly salary from main job, non-Roma, Roma, and national sample in %

Data on labor market indicators from LSMS 2007 are slightly different from LFS data as employment rate for working age population of Serbia is 55.3% and unemployment rate 13.9%. Partly, that difference is explained by seasonal effects (LSMS report. 2007).
### Category according to level of monthly salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Roma</th>
<th>Roma</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below minimum salary</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above minimum, but below average salary</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average salary</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average salary</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4: Structure according to occupation, non-Roma and Roma IDPs, in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Non-Roma</th>
<th>Roma</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politicians, managers, entrepreneurs</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly qualified and qualified workers in manufacturing and services</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in agriculture</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-qualified workers</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5: Primary and secondary education attendance of children, non-Roma and Roma IDPs and Serbia, in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Non-Roma</th>
<th>Roma</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not attending</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years vocational school</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years vocational school</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General high school</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special school for mentally handicapped</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 1 Poverty risk for IDPs and domicile population, 2002 and 2007, in %


Graph 2. Material deprivation, general population, IDPs and Roma, 2009

Source: *Survey on Social Inclusion, UNDP HDR*