ROMA POPULATION OF HUNGARY 1971–2003

Foreword

Three representative surveys of the Roma population in Hungary have been conducted over the past 35 years: in 1971, in late 1993, and in the first quarter of 2003. All three surveys covered the entire Roma population. The data collected thus relate to each of the three language groups (Hungarian, Romani and Beás),[1] to urban and rural inhabitants, and to lower and higher income groups. This publication draws together the findings of the three research projects. Data from the "Roma census" of January 31, 1893 are also employed.

The aim of the 1971 survey was to offer a comprehensive view of the social situation of Roma, including their linguistic and ethnic composition, settlement types, regional distribution, housing conditions, family size, the numbers of children and live births, education, the effects of industrialization in the 1950s and 1960s, employment, and income levels.

The survey of 1993 sought to reveal and quantify changes in the economic and social situation of Roma resulting from the political transition of 1989–90.

In the decade between 1993 and 2003, further changes took place in the economy, the labor market, income levels, and government policies. Thus, our objective in the survey of 2003 was to monitor the effects of the changes on the lives of Roma. The title given to our research and published findings was *The Roma Population in Hungary at the Beginning of the 21st Century*. An alternative title would have been *Changes in the Lives of Roma in the Past 33 Years*.

The 1971 survey was conducted by István Kemény, the 1993 survey by István Kemény, Gábor Havas and Gábor Kertesi, and the 2003 survey by István Kemény and Béla Janky. In 2003, the sam-

pling design was developed by István Kemény (with the assistance of Béla Janky, Gabriella Lengyel, Tibor Szûcs and Zita Szûcs.) The questionnaire used in 2003 was drawn up by István Kemény, while the fieldwork was carried out by Gabriella Lengyel and fellow researchers in Budapest and by Tibor Szûcs, Zita Szûcs and fellow researchers in other communities across the country. The surveys of 1971 and 1993 were launched under the auspices of the Institute of Sociology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The Minority Research Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences conducted the 2003 survey under the auspices of the National Research and Development Program. The title of the research project was *The Situation of the Roma Population in Hungary at the Beginning of the 21st Century (Segregation, Employment and Living Conditions, Education, and Self-Governance)*.

The first part of this chapter examines the demography of the Roma population. The second one discusses the language groups and ethnic data, while the third investigates settlement patterns and housing conditions. The fourth part looks at issues of education and the last one reviews labor market conditions and incomes.

I. Main Features of the Roma Population

The Representative Survey of 2003

In February and March 2003, we conducted a survey of the Roma population in Hungary. Previous representative surveys of the Roma population were undertaken in 1971 and in 1993.[2] Both of these earlier surveys were based on 2 percent representative samples of the Roma population. The estimated total Roma population was 320,000 in 1971 and 468,000 in 1993. We may state that the number of Roma was between 270,000 and 370,000 in 1971 and between 420,000 and 520,000 in 1993.

In 2003, we were limited to a 1 percent representative sample. The survey was therefore less accurate than in 1993. Another factor also restricted accuracy. In the 1993 survey, we used educational statistics from 1992 to determine how many Roma—very many, many, few, or none—were living in communities across the country and in electoral constituencies within cities.[3] In 2003, the most recent of such statistics were more than 10 years old. Thus, in order to determine how many Roma were living in the various communities across the country and in electoral constituencies within cities, we made use of data on Roma ethnicity recorded in the 2001 census. This procedure was clearly less accurate than the previous one based on educational statistics.

Our final sample comprised 5408 individuals in 1165 households. If the survey were to be regarded as fully accurate, this would mean a Roma population of 540,000 in Hungary in early 2003. Nevertheless, no survey can hope to reach all Roma families or ensure that all data are compiled and all questionnaires completed. Even in the 1993 survey, we assumed an error margin of 10 or 5 percent, adjusting the figures by 5 percent in some publications and 10 percent in others. Estimating that 10 percent of Roma households and individuals were ignored in the census and assuming, therefore, that the figure of 540,800 represents just 90 percent of

the real number of Roma, we may conclude that 600,000 Roma were living in Hungary in February/March 2003. If, however, we estimate that 5 percent of Roma households and individuals were left out of the census and assume, therefore, that the figure of 540,800 represents just 95 percent of the real number of Roma, then we may estimate the number of Roma living in the country at 570,000. Thus, we may say that in early 2003 there were between 520,000 and 650,000 people living in Roma households in Hungary.

The basic sampling unit of the survey is the household, that is, people living together in one dwelling. Not all people living in Roma households are Roma. In fact, non-Roma account for 5.9 percent of all adults recorded in 2003. In the 1993 survey, the non-Roma ratio was as much as 7 percent. The 2003 survey therefore shows a reduction in the ratio of mixed marriages over the 10-year period. In the 1993 survey, taking into account a moderate (5 percent) recording error, Gábor Kertesi and Gábor Kézdi estimated the number of non-Roma at 19,000. At present, non-Roma may account for 19,000–20,000 of the 570,000–600,000 people living in Roma households.

Who is Roma?

The 1971 survey classified as Roma all persons whom the surrounding non-Roma community considered to be Roma. The same principle was applied in the surveys of both 1993 and 2003.[4] This was the only way to ensure full consistency in the selection of a sample population. Official records relating to the places of residence and addresses of Roma do not exist, and thus the selected method is the only means of compiling a sample. Clearly, a sampling population cannot be compiled by classifying as Roma anybody who identifies his/herself as Roma. As with other categories of Roma, records of such people do not exist and are not permitted.

Which individuals are regarded by the surrounding community as Roma? An attempt to answer this question was made in the article *A cigány nemzetiségi adatokról* [On Roma Ethnic Data].[5] We here quote several paragraphs of the article:

> The surrounding community regards people with dark skins or Roma ancestry as Roma. Further, if somebody's parents are Roma, he or she is considered to be Roma. Generally speaking, people who are half-Roma are also regarded as Roma. The point is that Roma are defined on the basis of their descent. In this sense, a professional who is known by his/her colleagues to be the child of Roma parents is considered to be Roma even if he/she says otherwise or denies having a Roma background. Evidently, there are some people who are not known to be Roma and who are able to conceal their ethnic background. But they are the exceptions. There are, further, some pale-skinned Roma who are able, under exceptional circumstances, to keep secret their ethnicity. They, too, are the exceptions. In general, descent will be the deciding factor. In 1989, László Márton wrote the following in his book entitled *Kiválasztottak és elvegyülõk* [The Chosen Ones and the Mingled Ones]: "Evidently, Jewish descent is a reality;… the more it is a burden, the more it becomes reality; and while nobody is entitled to judge Jewish people for wanting to break free of a burden, it is worth their knowing (as Jews, in particular) that one cannot escape reality; and those that try to flee, find that their flight becomes a part of reality, the most destructive part." Obviously, the word Jew may be exchanged for the word Roma. Elsewhere in his book, Márton writes that "few are the people in whom an awareness of being Jewish is not activated by circumstances, in particular and oddly by the distorted fact that there are many people who conceal their Jewishness, or from whom it was concealed during childhood. And then, when such people become aware of their background, the feel-

> ing of being shut out becomes irrevocable and final." A person's Jewishness is limited to his or her descent—to cite Márton once again—and this applies both to Jews and to non-Jews, that is, to an awareness of being Jewish among Jews and to being aware that someone is Jewish among non-Jews. This is also true of Roma, for they themselves are aware of their Roma descent, while non-Roma make a mental note of their Roma descent and call them Roma on this basis.

The people included in the first two surveys and the 2003 survey were regarded as Roma by the surrounding community. And they also saw themselves as Roma.

The 1993 survey sample comprised 2222 households. The questionnaire was completed on a voluntary basis. Respondents were told that it was part of a survey of the Roma population; they were included in the sample as Roma and responded to the questions voluntarily. The survey failed in 405 of the 2222 households, but in only 21 cases was this due to the fact that the respondents did not consider themselves to be Roma. (Households that dropped out were replaced by supplementary addresses.) The 2003 survey sample comprised 1165 households. The survey failed in 105 households, but in only 19 cases was this due to the fact that the respondents did not consider themselves to be Roma.

Regional Distribution

The regional distribution of the Roma population underwent changes between 1993 and 2003—just as it did between 1971 and 1993. The number of Roma and the regional share of the total Roma population increased significantly in the Northern region (counties of Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén, Heves and Nógrád). The numbers of Roma increased but the regional shares declined in the Eastern region (counties of Szabolcs-Szatmár, Hajdú-Bihar and

Békés), in the Great Plain region (counties of Bács-Kiskun, Csongrád and Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok), in the Budapest agglomeration (Budapest, and the counties of Fejér, Pest and Komárom) and in Southern Transdanubia (counties of Baranya, Somogy, Tolna, Veszprém and Zala). But the number of Roma and the regional share also increased in Western Transdanubia (counties of Gyõr-Moson-Sopron and Vas).

Table 1:

Regional Distribution of the Roma Population in Hungary[6]

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Table 2:

Size of the Roma Population in the Various Regions

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

The tables show that although Roma live throughout the country, their distribution is not uniform. There are considerable differences in their share of the population by region and by county. In 1971 one in five Roma lived in the Northern region; by 2003 the ratio was almost one in three. The Roma share of the total regional

Table 3:
County Population Figures and Percentages in 2003

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

population is correspondingly high: Roma account for just over 13 per cent (almost 100,000) of Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén County's population of 745,000, for 16 per cent (52,000) of Heves County's population of 325,000, and for 14 per cent (31,000) of Nógrád County's population of 219,000.

Twenty-three per cent of Roma lived in the Eastern region in 1971, while one in five did so in 2003. The Roma share of the regional population is smaller than in the Northern region, but it is still greater than the national average: Roma account for 6.6 per cent (38,500) of Szabolcs County's population of 586,000, 5.7 per cent (31,300) of Hajdú County's population of 552,000, and 10.9 per cent (43,000) of Békés County's population of 396,000.

In the Great Plain region, the ratio is above average in just one county—Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok. It is far below average in Bács-Kiskun County and Csongrád County. The Roma share of the population is relatively low throughout the Budapest agglomeration: only in Fejér County does it reach 4 per cent, while in Budapest it is 3.5 per cent. The Roma ratio is significantly above average in two Transdanubian counties—Somogy and Baranya, and it ranges between 4 per cent and 5 per cent in three further counties—Tolna, Veszprém and Zala. The Roma share of the total population is small in the western part of the country: 2.7 per cent in Gyõr-Moson-Sopron County, and 1.8 per cent in Vas County.

It should be noted that the sample comprised just 1 percent of the Roma population. This limits the accuracy of both national and regional data. The sampling errors of county data are particularly grave.

Types of Settlement

Recent decades have also witnessed changes in the distribution of the Roma population by type of settlement. In 1971, 25,000 Roma—or just under 8 per cent of the total Roma population—lived in Budapest, the capital city. In 1993, 44,000 Roma lived in

Budapest—9.1 per cent of the total Roma population. In 2003, 60,000 Roma, 10.4 per cent of the total Roma population, lived in the city. The shift towards Hungary's provincial urban centers was even more pronounced. In 1971, 45,000 Roma, or 14 per cent of the total Roma population, lived in towns and cities outside Budapest. Between 1971 and 1993, the number of Roma living in such areas more than tripled—to 30.4 per cent of the Roma population. In 2003, 282,000 Roma, or 49.7 per cent of the total Roma population, lived in provincial urban areas.

Nevertheless, urbanization is only partly due to migration. Between 1971 and 1993—and again between 1993 and 2003—many rural communities were incorporated as towns. In this way, many Roma—and non-Roma—became urban-dwellers without ever migrating to urban areas. This process affected both Roma and non-Roma populations. Currently, 227,000 Roma, or 39.9 per cent of the total Roma population, still live in rural areas.

Table 4:
Population of Hungary by Type of Settlement, 1970

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Tota
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0

Source: Hungarian Central Statistical Office

Table 5:
Population of Hungary by Type of Settlement, 1993

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0

Source: Hungarian Central Statistical Office

Table 6:

Population of Hungary by Type of Settlement, 2003

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0

Source: Hungarian Central Statistical Office

Table 7:

Roma Population by Type of Settlement, 1971

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0

Table 8:

Roma Population by Type of Settlement, 1993

Composition of Class	Rural	Provincial Urban	Budapest	To
Only Roma children	1.9	3.6	7.7	3
Mostly Roma	6.0	10.4	14.2	9

Table 9:

Roma Population by Type of Settlement, 2003

Composition of Class	Rural	Provincial Urban	Budapest	To
Only Roma children	1.9	3.6	7.7	3
Mostly Roma children	6.0	10.4	14.2	9

Population Growth, Number of Births, and Age Distribution

In the 32-year period after 1971, Hungary's population grew in the first ten years and then declined. Hungary's total population figures are as follows: 10,352,000 in 1971; 10,709,000 in 1980; 10,375,000 in 1990; and 10,200,000 in 2001. Meanwhile the Roma population grew continuously from 3 per cent of the total in 1971, to 5 per cent in 1993, and to 6 per cent in 2003.

Among the Roma population, the number of live births per 1000 inhabitants was 32 in 1971 and 28.7 in 1993. In the 1993 survey report, we predicted a further decrease over the next 10–15–20 years. According to our survey, in 2002 the number of live births per 1000 Roma inhabitants was 25.3. It seems, therefore, that the number of births continued to fall after 1993. It should be noted, however, that our sample is not sufficiently large and that, owing to fluctuations in the number of births, conclusions should not be drawn from the data of a single year. For the various years, the number of live births in our sample was as follows:

Table 10:
The Number of Live Births for the Various Years in the 2003 Survey Sample

Composition of Class	Rural	Provincial Urban	Budapest	Total
Only Roma children	1.9	3.6	7.7	3.4
Mostly Roma children	6.0	10.4	14.2	9.1
Mixed	60.7	54.0	32.5	53.9
Mostly non-Roma	31.1	30.5	44.4	32.5

Despite striking fluctuations, these figures show that after 1993 the number of births initially increased, then stagnated (with an exceptional fall in 1996), and finally decreased steadily between 1997 and 2002. It is possible that preferential mortgages for married couples with children compensated for the long-term trend of a reduction in the number of births. When evaluating the figures, one should also bear in mind the steady increase in the total Roma population over the period. The figure of 137 in 2002 relates to a substantially larger population than does the figure of 142 in 1993.

During the 22-year period between 1971 and 1993, the number of live births per 1000 Roma inhabitants fell by about 10 per cent. According to our survey, this decrease continued after 1993. By 2003, the number of live births per 1000 Roma inhabitants was 15–20 per cent lower than in 1971. An even more substantial decrease in the number of births was registered among the population as a whole. In 1970, the number of live births in Hungary per 1000 population was 15. The rate fell to 11.3 in 1993, and it has been lower than 10 since 1997.

The number of live births in Hungary was 152,000 in 1970, 116,000 in 1993, and 97,000 in 2001. According to the 1993 survey, in that year 13,000 Roma children were born in Hungary, accounting for more than 11 per cent of total live births. Based on the 2003 survey, the number of Roma children born in 2002 may be estimated at 15,000—or more than 15 per cent of all children born in Hungary. In 1971, 6 per cent of children reaching compulsory school age were Roma. This figure rose to 11 per cent in 1999 and will reach 15 per cent in 2008–2009. Further increases are expected thereafter.

Birth rates are far higher among the Roma population, but so is mortality. The combination of higher birth rates and higher death rates means that the share of under-15-year-olds among the Roma population is more than double the national average: 16.8 per cent of Hungary's total population but 37 per cent of Roma are aged

under 15. On the other hand, among the general population the ratio of people aged over 60 is five times higher than among the Roma population: 20.2 per cent of Hungary's total population but just 3.9 per cent of Roma are aged over 60.

Table 11:
Age Distribution of People Living in Roma Households (percentage)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

If—of the two possible estimates—the figure of 570,000 is a more realistic estimate of the Roma population, then between 1993 and 2003 the Roma population grew by 10,000 per year, or by 100,000 over the 10-year period. If, however, 600,000 is a more realistic estimate, then the Roma population grew by 13,000 per year, or by 130,000 over the 10-year period. In comparison with the 1971 figures, the increase would be 250,000 (78 per cent) in the first case and 280,000 (87 per cent) in the second case.

The increase was even greater in comparison with 1893. According to our estimates, at that time 65,000 Roma lived in

regions that belong to Hungary today. Thus, between 1893 and 2003, the Roma population in Hungary grew ninefold.

Marital Status

Regarding legal marital status, there is no significant difference between Roma and non-Roma males. Twenty-one per cent of Roma males (aged 15 and over) marry before the age of 30. According to HCSO data for January 2003, the corresponding national ratio was 15 per cent. In all age groups, the ratio of single Roma males (those not legally married) was similar to the ratio of single males for the population as a whole. The number of divorced males among the Roma population is somewhat less than the national average, but this is due in part to a different age structure. Owing to the lower life expectancy of Roma, there are more widowers among the older age groups.

In many Roma communities, long-term relationships are regarded as proper marriages even when they are not officially recognized as such. Accordingly, we also collected data concerning persons living in such unions ("actually" married persons). Such data show that 36 per cent of males aged under 30 have married or lived in a union. Among Roma, the ratio of single males based on their actual marital status is significantly lower than the ratio of single males based on their legal marital status. Legally speaking, 46 per cent of Roma males are single, but in actual terms just 34 per cent are single.

In the survey sample of 2003, 72 per cent of females aged 15–29 were single. This closely mirrors the national figure of approximately 74 per cent. However, the married ratio among middle-aged Roma women is substantially lower than it is among non-Roma women. This discrepancy was absent among the male groups. As expected, there are more widows among Roma women aged 50–70 than there are among non-Roma women in the same age group. The discrepancy disappears among the oldest age groups.

Among women too, an examination of actual marital status gives a rather different picture. In terms of their actual marital status, barely more than half of Roma women aged 15–29 are single. In subsequent age groups, however, the share of married Roma women is close to the national average.

The data thus show that Roma are younger than average on their first marriage. On the other hand, the ratio of those who remain single is no lower than it is among other groups in society.

Table 12:

Percentage of Single Men and Women among the Roma Population and among the Population as a whole, by age Group (January 2003)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Source: *Statistical Yearbook* 2002, p. 48. Cf. *Cigányvizsgálat* [Survey of the Roma Population]. The figures in brackets are to be interpreted with caution due to the small number of cases.

Early marriage is often considered a feature of Roma culture. Another common preconception is that the traditions of Roma communities have been best preserved in rural areas.

Based on the 2003 survey data, at least one of these assumptions needs to be revised. For, in terms of their actual marital status, single people in their teens or twenties are almost as numerous in rural areas as in urban areas. Still, the number of persons subsequently remaining single is significantly higher in the provincial urban centers.

Table 13:
Percentage of Single Men and Women in the Various Age Groups by Type of Settlement (based on actual marital status)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

The figures in brackets are to be interpreted with caution due to the small number of cases.

Roma living in the western half of Hungary tend to get married later than do those living to the east of the River Danube. The share of early marriages among Roma is particularly high in the Northern region. Here, persons who are, or have been, married comprise more than half of the 15–29 age group ("actually" married rather than merely legally married). Among Roma living close

to the western border, this ratio is less than 20 per cent. The central region of the country also exhibits a high share of marriages before the age of 30. But here the divorce rate is also high—even among younger age groups.

A comparison of the various ethnolinguistic groups fails to offers a clear picture. Beás native speakers tend to marry early, whereas those with a Beás ethnic identity who are not native speakers of Beás tend to marry late. The situation is the exact reverse among Vlach Roma.

The Number of Children Born to Roma Women

Data on the fertility of Roma women collected during the census of 1990 were published by Árpád Mészáros and János Fóti.[7] The data relate to Romani native speakers (*cigány anyanyelvûek*) and to Roma with a Roma ethnic identity—rather than to the entire Roma population.

Table 14:
Number of Children Born Alive per 100 Married Women Aged 15 and over, 1990

Age Group	Married Women		Married Women in Hungary
	Romani Native Speakers	with a Roma Ethnic Identity	
15–24	174	175	91
25–34	207	306	176
35–49	428	429	190
50 and over	531	546	205
Combined	358	354	188

Source: Mészáros and Fóti[8]

The value of the data is severely limited because, as in the census, Mészáros and Fóti classified as single women those Roma

women who were living in unions considered by Roma communities—in line with their customs—to be marriages. Elsewhere in their article, they state that, in the 30–39 age group, 5.1 per cent of the general population, 18.6 per cent of Romani native speakers, and 25.9 per cent of people with a Roma ethnic identity were cohabiting. The figures of 358 children born to 100 married native-speaker women and of 354 children born to 100 women with a Roma ethnic identity resemble the national figure of 362 children born to 100 women recorded in the Hungarian census of 1920. As Janky has demonstrated, the age structure of the Roma population in 1990 resembles the age structure of the Hungarian population as a whole in 1920.[9]

By 2003 a significant change had taken place in the fertility of Roma women. The table below presents the number of children born to married women of various age groups who were Romani native speakers or of Roma ethnic identify.

Table 15:
Number of Children per 100 Married Women Aged 15 and over, 2003

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)

In 1990 the number of children indicated for Romani-speaking married women was 358. In 2003 the number of children indicated for Romani-speaking married women was 334, while for Beás-speaking married women it was 284. Taking the two groups together, the figure was 304—a 14 per cent decrease. The number of children indicated for married women with a Roma ethnic identity was

354 in 1990 and 321 in 2003—a 9 per cent decrease. One should note that more than 80 per cent of married Roma women are Hungarian native speakers (rather than Romani or Beás native speakers) and only a third of such women declared a Roma ethnic identity. Overall, the number of children born alive per 100 legally married Roma women was 305 in 2003. (The number of children born alive per 100 "actually" married Roma women was 284). The figures are significantly higher than the national figure of 188 for 100 married women, but they are also substantially lower than the rates in 1990. Thus, there was a clear decline in fertility—of an estimated 10–15 per cent—between 1990 and 2003.

As already noted, the number of children born alive per 100 women is lower among those who are "actually" married than it is among those who are legally married. But the difference is not particularly great. The following table demonstrates a similar situation among single women.

Table 16:

Number of Children Born Alive per 100 Women Aged over 14, among the Roma Population and the Total Population

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0

There are also differences between the various language groups, but they are not significant.

Table 17:
Number of Children Born Alive per 100 Women Aged over 14, by Native Language

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)

The differences between the various ethnic identity groups are somewhat greater, but they are not crucial.

Table 18:
Number of Children Born Alive per 100 Women Aged over 14, by Ethnic Identity (self-identification)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)

There are, however, important differences according to the level of education.

Table 19:
Number of Children Born Alive per 100 Women Aged over 14, by their Level of Education

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0

We have already met with the argument that education is the cause and the smaller number of children is the effect. The relationship is not so simple, however. It is perhaps more accurate to

say that girls—and their families—face a choice at the end of primary school: Is the girl to continue her education or is she to have a child? Various factors will influence their decision. One factor is the availability of funds necessary for completing school. It is usually the better-off girls that complete vocational or secondary education. A willingness to adapt, integrate or assimilate among Roma families also influences whether or not a girl will go on to complete her education.

For the population as a whole, 7.5 per cent of married women in Hungary have no children, one-quarter have one child, 48 per cent have two children, and one-fifth have three or more children. Among the Roma population, 6 per cent of married women have no children, 10 per cent have one child, 23 per cent have two children, and 60 per cent have three or more children. It would be a mistake, however, to project the current figures and percentages back into the past, believing that "it was always like this." In 2003, 33 per cent of Roma women had four or more children, but in 1920, nationally, the share of women with four or more children was 42 per cent. The following table serves to indicate the changes occurring between 1920 and 1990 (or 1993) and between 1990 and 2003.

Table 20:

Breakdown of Married Women by the Number of Children Born Alive—Census Data, and Data from the Surveys of 1993 and 2003

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Two other points should also be made. The estimated fertility rates for Roma in the early 1990s were similar to the national figures for 1921. For example, in 1921 the number of children born alive per 1000 women aged 15–49 was 117. This same index was 112 among Roma between 1990 and 1993, based on the 1993 Roma survey. In addition, the age distribution of the Roma population was relatively similar to that recorded for the total population in 1921. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to state that current birth trends among Hungary's Roma reflect the childbearing features of the country's population in the years following the First World War. Among Roma, both the first and the last child are (it would seem) born to mothers at a younger age than was customary among the general population even 80 years ago. At the same time, however, the percentage of mothers bearing five or more children was not as high among the Roma in the early 1990s as it was among the general population in the 1920s.

An important lesson of the 2003 survey was that the childbearing propensity of Roma continued to fall in the decade following the political changes of 1989-90. The reduction was not particularly significant, but the trend may be clearly demonstrated. In the late 1990s, Márta Gyenei reported that, in a village surveyed by her, the number of children had increased among poorer Roma and non-Roma families.[10] Gyenei considered the increase in the number of children to be a national phenomenon. She called it a demographic explosion that could be explained as the response of the poor to unemployment: poor people were having "strategic" children in order to gain family allowance and other social benefits. "One cannot escape the fact," she wrote in *Népszabadság* on 14 November 1998, "that more and more women are having children in order to help provide for their families. They call them strategic children, because they form part of a household strategy, whose goal is survival." At the same time, Gyenei also emphasized that "the system will only be profitable if the 'costs of having a child' are lower than

the amount that can be made from family allowance and other child benefits." Gyenei's data do indeed show an increase in the number of children among poor families living in the village surveyed by her and at the time of her survey. We think it quite possible that social benefits played a part in this, as well as the strategy supposed by Gyenei. In all likelihood, poorer Roma or non-Roma families in other villages pursued the same strategy too. Nevertheless, the data of the 1993 and 2003 surveys demonstrate that the factors reinforcing fertility weakened both between 1971 and 1993 and between 1993 and 2003.

Families do, of course, take family allowance into consideration when having children. Their calculations were clearly influenced by the rise in the level of family allowance—its highest level was in 1989 after two increases in 1988 and in 1989. But the decrease in its real value as of 1991 presumably had an effect, too. The extent of the rise and fall in the family allowance, measured in 1990 prices, was presented by András Gábos and István György Tóth in a study published in 2000.[11]

Table 21:
Family Allowance for Two Children, Measured in 1993 Prices (HUF)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Source: Gábos and Tóth[12]

We turn now to changes in the national live birth rates by age of mother. Between 1975 and 2001, the live birth rate per 1000 women in the 15–19 age group fell to less than a third of the previous rate. The reduction occurred in two stages. The rate fell from 72.1 to 39.5 between 1975 and 1990 and from 39.5 to 21.8 between 1990 and 2001. The change was just as rapid but far more significant in the 20–24 age group. The rate fell from 183.5 to 147 between 1975 and 1990 and from 147 to 65 between 1990 and 2001.

Studies conducted in the 1990s investigated the reduction in the number of children among women aged 20–24.[13,14] The researchers established that in Hungary the average age of a woman at the birth of her first child used to be 20–22 (e.g. in the 1970s). Giving birth at a young age was regarded as characteristic of the eastern type of childbearing behavior—as against the western type, where the average age of a woman at the birth of her first child was 25–29. They postulated that in Hungary the western type would replace the eastern type, that the average age of a woman at the birth of her first child would rise to 25–29, and that the average number of children would also increase.

So far, their expectations have been only partly fulfilled. Between 1975 and 1999, the live birth rate for women aged 25–29 fell from 133.8 to 90.7. It rose in 2000 to 94.6 but declined in 2001 to 92.7. However, live birth rates have risen slightly among the 30–34 and 35–39 age groups.

The table shows that the most typical age of Roma women at the birth of their first child is between 20–24 rather than between 15–19. A further observation is that the ratio of children born to women aged 15–19 has fallen substantially over the past ten years. Moreover, the average live birth rate has also fallen significantly.

Table 22:

Live Birth Rates per 1000 Women among the Roma Population and the Total Population by Age of Mother HCSO Data, and Data from the Surveys of 1993 and 2003

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

The autumn 2001 edition of *Századvég* included an article by Judit Durst on childbearing customs in a rural Roma community. Roma accounted for 75 per cent of the 560 inhabitants of the village surveyed. The average age at the birth of the first child was 20–21 for the 30 Roma women born between 1950 and 1969, while it was 16–17 for the 20 Roma women born between 1970 and 1989. Judit Durst wrote, "young girls today are becoming mothers in adolescence, three years earlier than the previous generation, on average at the age of 16." In the Roma community surveyed, the average age of giving birth for the first time had clearly shifted from the 20–24 age group to the 15–19 age group. It is likely that such a shift occurred in other rural Roma communities, too. Nationally, however, the reverse trend was true: the typical age for the first birth switched from the 15–19 age group to the 20–24 age group.

Size of Households. Number of Children per Household

In 2003, the average number of persons per Roma household was significantly higher than the national average. According to the 2001 data, the number of persons per 100 households was 257 in Hungary. Among Roma households, however, the figure was 464. The high number is linked to the financial position of Roma. Often several families share a household. Whereas nationally, according to the HSCO data for 2001, 26 per cent of households consist of a single person, among the Roma the figure was just 5 per cent. In 2001, nationally, 94 per cent of households consisted of a single person or family. But just 74 per cent of Roma households included in our sample fell into this category. The difference is still significant even accounting for any slight differences in the definition of household.

The above-average size of households also reflects a higher number of children. The number of persons per 100 households in the single-person/single-family category is 405, which is more than

1.5 times the national average for all types of household. We estimate that the number of children aged under 15 per 100 families (for the sake of comparability, we include single-person households as well as "families") is 43 nationally, but 126 among the Roma. The average size of a Roma family is 3.43 (including single-person "families").

The number of persons per household is no higher in rural areas than it is in the provincial urban centers or in Budapest. Slight regional differences are, however, apparent: households are smaller in the western part of the country than in the east. In Southern Transdanubia there are 421 persons per 100 households, whereas in the Eastern region (comprising the counties of Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg, Hajdú-Bihar, and Békés) the corresponding figure is 495. Thus, even in regions where smaller Roma households are typical, the average number of persons per household is significantly higher among the Roma population than it is among the non-Roma population. Differences based on the ethnic identity of household members are not particularly significant. The index is 494 in the case of households consisting mostly or exclusively of Roma, but 416 in the case of Beás households (this relatively low figure is an estimate based on just 43 households).

Married or cohabiting couples live in 56 per cent of the families registered in our survey. Excluding the single-person households or "families," this ratio is 67 per cent. According to the roughly comparable HCSO index for 2001, 84 per cent of families include married or cohabiting partners.

The ratio of cohabiting couples interests us primarily in terms of the children. If we only examine families with children aged under 15, then we arrive at similar percentages to the ones above. At least 68 per cent of Roma families raising children and forming part of our sample are two-parent families. Based on HCSO data for 2001, the corresponding national rate may be estimated at 83 per cent. Although the divorce rate among Roma is no higher than

Table 23:

The Number of Persons per Roma Household, the Number of Families per Household, and the Number of Children Aged under 15 per Family in the Various Regions of Hungary

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

the national average, it is likely that separation (or widowhood) affects a larger proportion of families with small children. Though Roma households tend to be large and on average consist of more families than do non-Roma households, the proportion of parents raising their children alone (lone parents) still does not seem to be particularly low even if we consider only those parents that are raising children aged under 15 in single-family households. We estimate that 12 per cent of Roma households (or perhaps somewhat fewer) consist of single-parent families with at least one child aged under 15. Based on various HCSO reports, the estimated national average is just a third of this rate. (If single-person households are ignored, the rate for Roma households rises to 13 per cent and the national average to 5 per cent.)

The comparability of the figures is doubtful in the case of this index. In the course of our survey, which concentrated on households and dwellings, there was no opportunity to map out the precise relationships within small families. We may have overestimated the number of single-parent families. Further, based on our data, the proportion of single-parent Roma families may in fact be close to the national average. However, in the light of the data, it is highly unlikely that in Roma households, more children than the national average are being raised in two-parent families or at least in one-parent families benefiting from the assistance of local relatives (if comparisons of the percentages of children raised in the various family types were possible, we might be able to refine the analysis, and Roma might be more favorably portrayed). When analyzing the structure of the Roma population, we continue to reckon on a 68–32 per cent division in respect of families raising children aged under 15.

One-parent families account for one in four rural families raising children aged under 15. The corresponding rate in the provincial urban centers is 37 per cent (and 35 per cent in Budapest). The small number of cases prevents analysis of regional differences, but

the ratio of one-parent families is probably below average in the Northern region but quite high in Transdanubia. On the other hand, among the various ethnolinguistic groups, there appear to be no essential differences.

II. Ethnolinguistic Data

Native Language

Roma in Hungary comprise three main linguistic groups. These are as follows: Hungarian Roma [*magyar cigányok*], who speak Hungarian, identify themselves as Hungarian or Musician Roma, and are sometimes called Romungro; Vlach Roma [*oláh cigányok*], who speak two languages, Hungarian and Romani (Lovari and Kalderash dialects), and who identify themselves as Roma or Rom; and Beás people [*beások*], who speak two languages, Hungarian and Beás (dialects based on an archaic form of Romanian), and who identify themselves as Beás.

In the following, linguistic changes are outlined based on data for the years 1893, 1971, 1993 and 2003.

On 31 January 1893, one-third of the 280,000 Roma living in the Kingdom of Hungary[15] were either immigrants who had entered the country after 1850 or the children of such immigrants. Hungarian was the native language of 38 per cent of the Roma population, while 30 per cent spoke Romani and 24 per cent Romanian (including the Beás dialects). The remainder spoke Slovak, Serbian, German, Ruthenian, Croatian or another language.

On territory that today belongs to Hungary, Hungarian was the native language of 79.5 per cent of the Roma, while 10 per cent spoke Romani and 4.5 per cent spoke Romanian. The remainder—6 per cent—spoke Serbian, Slovak, German, Ruthenian, Croatian or another language. Thus, there was a substantial difference between the country as a whole (now referred to as historical Hun-

gary) and the territory that now belongs to Hungary (present-day Hungary). And the difference was even greater between the territory of present-day Hungary and Transylvania. In Transylvania, in 1893, Romani was the native language of 42 per cent of the Roma, while 39 per cent spoke Romanian. On territory now belonging to Hungary, the Hungarian-speaking Roma tended to be the descendants of earlier immigrants, while the non-Hungarian speaking Roma population was made up of more recent immigrants. Thus, in Baranya County, where Vlach Roma and Beás had arrived from the south, Hungarian was the native language of just 53 per cent of the local Roma population. In Bács-Bodrog County, where Vlach Roma (23 per cent), Serbian Roma (39 per cent), and Beás (4 per cent) had arrived from the south, the Hungarian-speaking share of the Roma population was just 34 per cent.

By 1971, the breakdown based on native language was as follows: the share of Hungarian-speaking Roma had fallen from 79.5 per cent to 71 per cent; the share of Romani-speaking Roma had risen from 10 per cent to 21.2 per cent; and the share of Beás-speaking Roma had risen from 4.5 per cent to 7.6 per cent. In total, there were 320,000 Roma. Hungarian Roma numbered 224,000, Vlach Roma 61,000, and Beás 25,000. The Roma population was five times higher than before, the Hungarian Roma population four times higher, the Vlach Roma population nine times higher, and the Beás population eight times higher. Such large increases can only be explained by immigration. Most of the Beás living in Southern Transdanubia had immigrated from Croatia, but some of them had come from Romania. Most of them arrived in the country in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, but their immigration continued between the two world wars and immediately after the Second World War. It was during these same periods that most Vlach Roma arrived in the country across the southern border. In 1971 they accounted for one in five Roma living in Southern Transdanubia. Vlach Roma living in the counties of Bács, Csongrád and Szolnok

came from Serbia and from the Banat region of Romania. In 1971 they comprised 19 per cent of the three counties' Roma population. Vlach Roma living in the countries of Szabolcs, Szatmár, Bihar, Békés and Hajdú came from Transylvania and from Romania. Together with earlier arrivals, they comprised 22 per cent of the region's Roma population in 1971.

Before 1918, it was quite natural for Vlach Roma to move to areas that now comprise the counties of Borsod, Nógrád and Heves. And there were no real obstacles to such migration even between the two wars.

The Roma who were registered in 1893 as native speakers of Slovak, Ruthenian, Serbian or Croatian had either disappeared without trace or undergone language shift by 1971.

The period between 1971 and 1993 saw a large-scale language shift. The share of Vlach Roma (Romani-speaking Roma) fell from 21.2 per cent to 4.4 per cent and the share of Beás from 7.6 per cent to 5.5 per cent. Meanwhile, the Hungarian-speaking share of the total Roma population rose from 71 per cent to 89.5 per cent. In absolute terms, the Romani-speaking population fell to 21,000, while the number of Beás rose from 25,000 to 26,000. Most of the Roma that changed their native language continued to be bilingual. Thus, 53,000 Roma, or 11.3 per cent of the Roma population in Hungary, spoke Beás and Hungarian, and 52,000 Roma, or 11.1 per cent of the Roma population, spoke Romani and Hungarian. The percentage of bilingual Roma, as a proportion of the total Roma population, fell from 28.8 per cent to 22.4 per cent, but in absolute terms their number grew from 86,000 to 105,000.

The shift from Beás or Romani to Hungarian took place within a bilingual framework. In her description of this framework, Zita Réger has noted that one of the languages tends to be "the intimate, familial means of communication within a group" whereas the other is "used in education, in public offices, at places of work, and in contact with members of the other language community, and

even for intra-group communication when discussing matters of education, public offices, places of work, etc."

The elimination of isolated Roma settlements between 1965 and 1985 contributed to the language shift. In 1971, 75 per cent of Vlach Roma and 48 per cent of Beás lived in such settlements. By 1993 the corresponding ratios had fallen to 4.9 per cent and 1.1 per cent. While they were living in segregated, isolated settlements, Roma were in contact only with members of their own group. But once they moved away, they came into daily contact with non-Roma and began speaking Hungarian regularly.

Language shift was boosted by the fact that in 1971, 84 per cent of Beás men and 75 per cent of Vlach Roma men were required to use Hungarian at work. At the same time, 30 per cent of women—or 50 per cent of them by the end of the decade—found themselves in a similar situation. They had no option but to speak Hungarian with health visitors, physicians, chemists and lawyers. Moreover, Hungarian was needed for administrative matters and for communicating in shops or at the market. Nevertheless, kindergartens and schools had the greatest effect. With a couple of exceptions, teachers at kindergartens and primary and secondary schools did not speak a word of Romani or Beás.

School education tended to assimilate Roma not just in childhood but later on, too. As adults, Beás and Vlach Roma recalled how they had done badly at school because of their poor Hungarian. Many of them wished to spare their children the failure and humiliation. So they spoke Hungarian with them even at home, and in this way Hungarian became the children's native language.

Beás and Vlach Roma whose knowledge of Hungarian was poor suffered discrimination and failure in the workplace, in public offices and elsewhere. Moreover, in the 1970s and 1980s, it seemed that knowledge of Hungarian and assimilation into Hungarian society was a guarantee of employment, income and housing. Changing one's native language seemed a sensible strategy.

Even in 1971, many people were surprised to discover that Hungarian was the native language of 71 per cent of Roma in Hungary. (The figure was widely cited in the 1980s and 1990s, and the 71 per cent figure is still often heard.) But even more surprising was the rapid linguistic assimilation of the Beás and Vlach Roma between 1971 and 1993.

It should be noted, however, that linguistic assimilation in Hungary is not limited to Roma but is a general phenomenon. For instance, the number of Croatian native speakers fell from 59,786 in 1920, to 21,855 in 1970, and to 17,577 in 1990. Serbian native speakers numbered 17,131 in 1920, 7989 in 1970 and 2953 in 1990. Romanian native speakers numbered 23,760 in 1920, 12,624 in 1970 and 8730 in 1990. The number of Slovak native speakers was 21,176 in 1970 and 12,745 in 1990.

The percentage of Beás native speakers continued to fall between 1993 and 2003—from 5.5 per cent to 4.6 per cent. Among Romani native speakers, however, the language shift came to a halt. Indeed, the share of Romani native speakers rose from 4.4 per cent to 7.7 per cent. Thus, among the Roma population as a whole, the percentage of Hungarian native speakers fell from 89.5 per cent to 86.9 per cent. Some Vlach Roma have moved from language shift to a reversal of language shift. The number of Beás-speakers was unchanged, while the Vlach Roma population rose to 44–46,000.

Table 1:
Roma Population by Native Language in 1893, 1971, 1993 and 2003 (percentage)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)

Source of the 1893 data: Hungarian National Royal Statistical Office[16]

Obviously, people have changing attitudes towards what constitutes the native language. In this context we refer to Tove Skutnabb-Kangas's definitions of native language. We do so based on an article by Miklós Kontra published in the January 2003 issue of the Hungarian magazine *Kritika*:

1. background—the first language learnt as a child
2. identification/identity
   a) the language with which the speaker identifies;
   b) the language with which the speaker is identified
3. the best known language
4. the usual language

Skutnabb-Kangas draws several conclusions from these definitions:

1. A person may have more than one native language.
2. A person's native language may vary, depending on the various definitions.
3. A person may change his/her native language perhaps several times in the course of his/her life.
4. We may place definitions of native language in a hierarchical order based on society's awareness of human language rights.

In the population census of 2001, the Hungarian Central Statistical Office announced that questions 23–25 were to be answered voluntarily. Question 23.3 asked: What is your native language?

The native language must be indicated, without prejudice, as the language learnt by the subject in his/her childhood (usually first), which he/she uses with family members and which he/she identifies as his/her native language.

The native language of mute persons and of infants that cannot speak yet is the language normally spoken by their next of kin. Since members of the ethnic minority population learn and speak in childhood several languages to native level, three languages may

be indicated.

The drafters of the census forms were not aware that they had made three different definitions of native language. Nor, of course, did they inform the census-takers.

Both in the population censuses and in the surveys of 1971, 1993 and 2003, the native language identified by a respondent was recorded as his/her native language. In most, but not all, cases, this was the language first learnt as a child. The native language identified by respondents is what we know for sure. In a great majority of cases, it is the same language as the language first learnt as a child. But in an unknown number of cases, this is not the case. As Skutnabb-Kangas has written, a person may change his/her native language several times in the course of his/her life. We might also add that a person's native language is sometimes a matter of choice.

According to the 1971 national survey, 61,000 (or 21.2 per cent) of the 320,000 Roma were Romani native speakers, while 25,000 (or 7.6 per cent) were Beás native speakers.

The census of 1990 recorded 48,072 Romani native speakers. But Beás native speakers were included in this number. School statistics suggest a Roma population at the time of 445,000. If this estimate is correct, the figure of 48,072 represented 10.8 per cent of the total Roma population. Thus, between 1971 and 1990, the combined sum of Romani and Beás native speakers fell from 86,000 to 48,000 and their share of the Roma population from 28.8 per cent to 10.8 per cent.

In the 1993 national survey, 5.5 per cent of respondents identified themselves as Beás native speakers and 4.4 per cent as Romani native speakers. The sum of these two figures is 9.9 per cent, which is close to the figure of 10.8 per cent recorded in the census of 1990.

The census of 2001 recorded a combined sum of 48,685 Beás and Romani native speakers. We estimate that the Roma population was between 550,000 and 570,000 at the time of the census. Thus,

by 2001, the combined share of persons identifying Beás or Romani as their native language had fallen to 8.5–8.9 per cent. Data on the numbers of Romani native speakers and Beás native speakers and the numbers of those speaking the languages at home could have been noted in *Nemzetiségi kötõdés* [Ethnic Attachment], a volume published in 2002 on the basis of the 2001 census. Regrettably, however, the lengthy volume gave merely cumulative figures for Romani and Beás native speakers as well as for those speaking the languages at home.

The native language ratios demonstrate how the factors underlying language shift continued to exert an effect between 1993 and 2001. This is still the case today and it will remain so in the future.

At the same time, a reverse trend was set in motion by the Roma and Beás ethnic, linguistic and cultural movements, which provide social and economic opportunities to those joining them. The fact that assimilation no longer provided jobs, incomes and livelihoods also slowed down linguistic assimilation. It may have contributed to the renewed use of Romani by 23–24,000 people. A limited reversal of the language shift took place throughout the country, but it was particularly noticeable in urban areas—above all Budapest—and less so in rural areas. The proportion of Roma identifying Romani as their native language was 5.8 per cent in rural areas, 8.9 per cent in the provincial urban centers, and 9.6 per cent in Budapest.

Table 2:
Roma Population by Native Language and Type of Settlement in 2003 (percentage)

In 1971, Romani native speakers accounted for 21 per cent of

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)

the Roma population. In other words, Vlach Roma made up 21 per cent of Hungary's total Roma population. Also to be noted is that in the 1993 survey the ratio of those who spoke Romani in addition to Hungarian was 11 per cent. All this greatly facilitated a shift back to Romani as the native language.

The higher percentages recorded in urban areas and particularly in Budapest were due in part to migration. Romani native speakers tended to be more mobile and could migrate more easily to urban areas. They were attracted to urban areas and especially to Budapest, and they were more inclined to look for and find livelihoods there. We consider the effect of political action, movements and campaigns to have been equally or even more important. There is little doubt that the effect of such movements, campaigns and political struggles was greater in urban areas and particularly strong in Budapest.

The percentage of Beás native speakers is slightly higher in urban areas than it is in rural areas. And hardly any Beás appear to have moved to Budapest.

Language shift and its reversal are proceeding within a bilingual framework. Currently, 40–43,000 people—7.1 per cent of the Hungary's Roma population—speak Beás and Hungarian, while 97–102,000 people—17 per cent of the total Roma population—speak Romani and Hungarian. In the course of ten years, the number of bilingual Romani-Hungarian speakers—or those declaring knowledge of Romani—has almost doubled.

The percentages of Croatian, Romanian and Slovak native speakers among the population as a whole continued to decline between 1990 and 2001. Apart from the Vlach Roma, the Serbs were the only other linguistic group to reverse the language shift. But the reversal was a small one in absolute terms, with the number of Serbian native speakers increasing from 2953 to 3388.

Table 3:

Languages Spoken by Roma Population in 2003, by Age Group

Ethnic Identity

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Shifts may also be observed in terms of ethnic identity. A point worth underlining is that Roma who otherwise regard themselves as Roma may not always identify themselves as Roma at the time of a census. There are many who regard themselves as both Roma and Hungarian (or Hungarian and Roma). However, when asked to state their ethnic identity, they may choose to identify themselves as Hungarian (or Hungarian-Roma) rather than as Roma.

In the 1990 population census, 143,000 people identified themselves as Roma. Based on the school statistics from 1990, an estimate for the Roma population in that year is 440–450,000. That is to say, 32 per cent of all Roma identified themselves as Roma in the 1990 census.

In the 2001 population census, 190,000 people identified themselves as Roma. We already know that in the year of the census the Roma population in Hungary was probably about 550–570,000. If we accept the figure of 570,000, this would mean that 33 per cent of all Roma identified themselves as Roma. The ratio

rises to 34.5 per cent, based on a total Roma population figure of 550,000. While the number of those identifying themselves as Roma increased, their share of the total rose only slightly.

When collecting data as part of the 1993 survey, we asked all respondents aged over 14 to state their ethnicity. Of more than 5000 respondents, 56.2 per cent identified themselves as Hungarian, 22 per cent as Roma or Vlach Roma, 18.2 per cent as Hungarian Roma, and 0.7 per cent as Romanian or Beás.

Among the 18 per cent of respondents who stated, in the 1993 survey, that they were Hungarian Roma, there were some—in the census of 2001—who identified themselves as Roma and some who identified themselves as Hungarian. It would seem likely that just over half said they were Roma and just under half said they were Hungarian.

In the 2003 survey, we asked respondents once again to state their ethnic identity. The results in the sample of 5408 persons were as follows: 37.8 per cent Hungarian, 29.8 per cent Hungarian Roma, 26.8 per cent Roma, 4.5 per cent Beás, and 1.0 per cent other. The 37.8 per cent of respondents who stated they were Hungarian in the 2003 survey probably identified themselves as Hungarian in the 2001 census. Likewise, the 26.8 per cent who said they were Roma probably identified themselves as Roma in the census, too. But the 4.5 per cent who said they were Beás in 2003 seem also to have identified themselves as Roma in 2001. In fact, they had no choice, since the 2001 census did not distinguish between Roma and Beás ethnic identities or between Roma and Beás native speakers. Instead, Roma and Beás were placed in a single category. Most of the 29.8 per cent of respondents identifying themselves as Hungarian Roma in the 2003 survey declared themselves to be Hungarian in the census of 2001.

There is no recognizable shift between the two censuses, but one may identify a shift between the 1993 survey and the 2003 survey: One-third of the 56 per cent of Roma who stated they were

Hungarian in 1993 identified themselves as Hungarian Roma in 2003. Perhaps they felt themselves to be less Hungarian and more Roma than before. But the figures may indicate feelings of being less integrated and less part of Hungarian society and of being more segregated and discriminated against. Another small group who stated they were Hungarian in 1993 identified themselves as Roma (without the attribute "Hungarian") in 2003.

In the 1993 survey, among the Roma population, 60.18 per cent of Hungarian native speakers identified themselves as Hungarian, 18.76 per cent as Hungarian Roma, 18.46 per cent as Roma, and 0.22 per cent as Beás. Thus, 60.2 per cent of Romungro considered Hungarian native speakers of Roma ethnic descent to be Hungarian in terms of their ethnic identity. On the other hand, these same people acknowledged that they were Roma inasmuch as they responded to a questionnaire whose explicit objective was to survey the situation of Roma families. They saw themselves as Roma, but as Roma of Hungarian ethnic identity.

In 2003, the ratio of Roma holding such a position fell to 38.6 per cent. The share of those identifying themselves as Roma rose from 18.46 per cent to 25 per cent, while the share of those identifying themselves as Beás increased from 0.22 per cent to 4.5 per cent. These people are probably the offspring of those who in 1971 still identified themselves as Romani or Hungarian native speakers. The increase in the two ratios may be attributed both to the effect of the minority organizations and to the failure of policies of assimilation. Even more striking is the increase in the percentage of those identifying themselves as Hungarian Roma, from 18.76 per cent to 32 per cent.

Since publication of the census data, which included ethnic data, many people have cited the finding that just 190,000 of the 600,000 Roma living in Hungary identified themselves as Roma. Nevertheless, our data demonstrate that although 60.2 per cent (1993 survey) and 38.6 per cent (2003 survey) of Hungarian-speak-

ing Roma identified themselves as Hungarian, nevertheless they still acknowledged that their background was Roma and that they belonged to the Roma community. They have no alternative, since the surrounding community pays close attention to their ethnic descent.

When Hungary's Minorities Act was being drafted, it was proposed that the Jewish community should be included as one of the country's national minorities. A majority of Jews in Hungary rejected this suggestion. In 1999, the Minority Studies Department of the Institute of Sociology, ELTE University, Budapest, carried out a survey of the Jewish population in Hungary.[17] One of the points on the questionnaire related to the Jewish identity of respondents. There were five possible responses, including, at one end of the spectrum, "I am a Jew living in Hungary." This response was chosen as first preference by 23 per cent of respondents and as second preference by 16 per cent of respondents. At the other end of the spectrum was the response "I am Hungarian." This was chosen by 13 per cent as first preference and by 10 per cent as second preference. A majority of respondents chose responses indicating dual identity. The response "I am a Hungarian of Jewish religion (descent)" was chosen by 30 per cent and 25 per cent, while the response "I am both Hungarian and Jewish" was chosen by 24 per cent in both categories.

The ancestors of Jewish people currently living in Hungary immigrated to the country in the 18th and 19th centuries. Prior to their arrival, Hungarian was naturally not their native language. Today, Hungarian is their native language, and when asked in the 2001 census to state their ethnic identity, a great majority of Jews identified themselves as Hungarian. The ancestors of Romungro migrated to Hungary in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. Today, Hungarian is their native language, and when asked in the 2001 census to state their ethnic identity, a majority of them identified themselves as Hungarian.

A dual identity is clearly visible among respondents identify-

ing themselves as Hungarian Roma. However, as we have already emphasized, we know that those identifying themselves as Hungarian also have a dual identity. And we can only guess the meaning of the choice of Hungarian Roma. Evidently, it could mean, "I am both Hungarian and Roma," but there may be another meaning, too. Use of the word Hungarian may be linked to the "Hungarian Musician Roma" identity of Romungro, to the envisaged place and prestige in Hungarian society of the Musician Roma, to the myth of an aristocracy within Roma society, and to an awareness of, and emphasis on, difference from Vlach Roma. Still, among those who used to see themselves as "pure" Hungarian but who now identify themselves as Hungarian Roma, perhaps we should look primarily to the bitter experiences of recent years, to discrimination and to segregation. For such people, Hungarian Roma form a separate ethnic entity, distinct from both the Roma ethnic group and the Hungarian ethnic group.

In the 1993 survey, 19 per cent of Beás native speakers identified themselves as Hungarian by ethnicity, 49 per cent as Roma, 8 per cent as Beás or Romanian, and 22 per cent as Hungarian Roma. In the 2003 survey, 39.8 per cent identified themselves as Hungarian, 32.8 per cent as Roma, 11.5 per cent as Beás or Romanian, and 15 per cent as Hungarian Roma. Thus, the trend exhibited by the group differed notably from that shown by Romungro. While many Romungro drew away from society, Beás people tended to choose the path to integration.

Among Vlach Roma too, one could observe an increased share of those identifying themselves as Hungarian and a decreased share of those identifying themselves as Roma. In the 1993 survey, 21 per cent identified themselves as Hungarian, 59.6 per cent as Roma, 2 per cent as Beás or Romanian, and 15 per cent as Hungarian Roma. In the 2003 survey, 29 per cent identified themselves as Hungarian, 42 per cent as Roma, 3 per cent as Beás and 17 per cent as Hungarian Roma.

Table 4:

Roma Population by Native Language and Ethnic Identity (Self-Identification) in 1993 (percentage)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Table 5:

Roma Population by Native Language and Ethnic Identity (Self-Identification) in 2003 (percentage)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Both surveys exhibited a positive correlation between the level of education and Hungarian ethnic identity. There are three obvious explanations for this. First, the assimilating effect of school education. Second, those who participate in education tend to be those wanting to fit in and assimilate—those who want to be Hungarians. Third, the link with the native language. Hungarian native speakers have a higher level of school education and are more likely anyway to identify themselves as Hungarian.

The relationship is reciprocal in terms of employment status, too. Among employed persons, the mere fact of having a job tends to indicate an acceptance of Hungarian ethnicity. This is related to the need for contact with colleagues at work (associated with the

fear of losing one's job) and the fact that integrated or assimilated people find it easier to keep their jobs or find employment. The favorable position enjoyed by Hungarian native speakers in the labor market has strengthened the link between Hungarian ethnic identity and employment prospects. The level of school education is a further influential factor, because people with a higher level of school education generally choose a Hungarian ethnic identity.

In 1993 there was also a correlation between participation in Roma organizations and ethnic self-identification (the 2003 survey did not ask about membership of such organizations.) One might think that active members of Roma organizations would be less likely than average to identify themselves as Hungarian and more likely than average to identify themselves as Roma. In fact, however, the situation is not so clear-cut. While members of Roma organizations were more likely than other Roma to identify themselves as Roma, the difference between the two groups was not all that great. If we subscribe to the argument that Roma are those people who identify themselves as such, then we must also accept that almost 50 per cent of members of the Roma organizations in Hungary are not Roma.

III. Settlements, Housing and Migration

Settlements and Housing

In 1971, two-thirds of Roma lived in isolated or segregated Roma settlements. The inhabitants of Roma settlements accounted for 30 per cent of Roma living in Budapest, 52 per cent of Roma living in provincial urban areas, and 68 per cent of Roma living in rural areas. Nationwide, 65 per cent of Hungarian-speaking Roma and 75 per cent of Beás or Romani-speaking Roma lived in Roma settlements. In Budapest, 22 per cent of Hungarian-speaking Roma and 52 per cent of Romani-speaking Roma lived in Roma settle-

ments. In provincial urban areas, 74 per cent of Hungarian-speaking Roma, 62 per cent of Romani-speaking Roma, and 87 per cent of Beás-speaking Roma lived in Roma settlements. In rural areas, 68 per cent of Hungarian-speaking Roma, 80 per cent of Romani-speaking Roma, and 45 per cent of Beás-speaking Roma lived in Roma settlements.

Some of the Roma settlements had arisen spontaneously, while others had been artificially created. The settlements of Hungarian-speaking Roma were usually to be found on the outskirts of larger settlements, while those of Romani or Beás-speaking Roma were often, but not always, situated at some distance (frequently 4–5 kms) from larger settlements. In the past, the settlements of Hungarian-speaking Roma were also located at some distance from larger settlements, but they have often been swallowed up by expanding villages. The inhabitants of Beás settlements on the outskirts of villages previously lived in isolated forest settlements, but they moved closer to villages in the years preceding the 1971 survey.

> We cite the following sentences from the 1971 survey report: In the settlements, Roma construct their own dwellings out of adobe or mud-and-wattle. They do not dig foundations or insulate walls. Floors are made of pounded earth, while doors and windows fit badly since they usually come from demolitions. The rooms are 9–12 square meters in size. Damp, rising from the floor or coming through the walls, permeates everything and rots clothing as well as the poor and inadequate furniture. It is very drafty due to poorly fitting doors and windows, but the windows are too small for proper ventilation. Gaps in the roof are common, so that the rain comes in. And even when there are no gaps, the roof still leaks. A fireplace is used for heating, but it only provides warmth until the fire goes out. Mould is common, the air is heavy and musty… The lack of clean drinking water and latrines, as well as the discarded rub-

> bish, result in high rates of infectious diseases such as dysentery, typhoid and hepatitis… In long-established settlements, dwellings are crowded together, because expansion beyond the settlement boundaries is impossible. This is also the primary obstacle to the construction of latrines. The area surrounding the settlement is full of discarded waste, rubbish, old belongings, and faeces… There is not enough space for a proper number of beds; people share beds or simply sleep on the floor. Overcrowding drives people mad, turning them against each other and making communal life difficult.

Official rehousing policies were crucial to the establishment of three types of new settlements. In the first type, Roma living in long-established settlements were rehoused in existing old buildings (farm granges, former worker hostels, abandoned distilleries, barns, etc.). Generally speaking, the authorities rehoused too many individuals in poorly maintained—often uninhabitable—non-residential buildings. The result was overcrowding, making communal life unbearable. Sanitary conditions were rarely better (if so, then only slightly) than they had been in the older settlements.

In the second type, Roma on the rehousing list were granted plots of land—where they could build their own shacks. And these were no better than the dwellings in the long-established settlements. Under the third type, Roma were rehoused in existing or newly built barrack-type settlements. Evidently, these too were no better than the older settlements.

Still, official rehousing policies were not the only explanation for new settlements. Sometimes they would arise when Roma built or purchased homes using their own resources. Prior to describing that process, we offer an overview of housing conditions in 1971.

There was no electricity supply in 44 per cent of Roma dwellings, including 39 per cent of Hungarian Roma dwellings, 48 per cent of Beás dwellings, 65 per cent of Vlach Roma dwellings,

21 per cent of dwellings in Budapest, 35 per cent of dwellings in provincial urban settlements, and 48 per cent of rural dwellings.

There was a supply of running water in 8 per cent of dwellings (55 per cent of dwellings in Budapest, 11 per cent of provincial urban dwellings, and 2 per cent of rural dwellings). A well was available on site in16 per cent of dwellings (15 per cent of dwellings in Budapest, 8 per cent of provincial urban dwellings, and 18 per cent of rural dwellings). A well was available at less than 100 meters in 37 per cent of dwellings and at more than 100 meters in 39 per cent of dwellings. In provincial urban areas, a well was available at less than 100 meters in 43 per cent of dwellings and at more than 100 meters in 37 per cent of dwellings. In rural areas, a well was available at less than 100 meters in 38 per cent of dwellings and at more than 100 meters in 42 per cent of dwellings.

The table below shows access to water among Roma households of the various language groups.

Table 1:

Access to Water among Roma Households in 1971, by Native Language

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

A relatively large percentage of dwellings had no access to clean water even beyond 100 meters or at an even greater distance. The inhabitants of such dwellings were forced to drink contaminated water. The proportion of such dwellings was 16 per cent for the whole country, 14 per cent among Hungarian-speaking Roma, 14 per cent among Beás, 21 per cent among Romani-speaking Roma,

and 37 per cent in the Eastern region.

Indoor flush toilets were available in 3 per cent of dwellings and outdoor flush toilets in 5 per cent of dwellings. A third of dwellings did not even have a latrine, and the ratio was 47 per cent among Romani-speaking Roma and 59 per cent in the Eastern region.

Two-thirds of Roma lived in adobe or mud-and-wattle huts, most of which lacked foundations. Such dwellings were most common in rural areas, but even in provincial urban areas most dwellings were built of adobe—as were more than a quarter of dwellings in Budapest.

Table 2:
Construction Type of Dwellings Inhabited by Roma Households in 1971, by Native Language and in the Various Types of Settlement
Budapest
Provincial Urban Areas

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Rural Areas

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Total

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

In 1971, 61 per cent of Roma households lived in earthen-floor dwellings and 14 per cent in stone-floor dwellings. The combined share of earthen and stone-floor dwellings was 68 per cent in provincial urban areas and 37 per cent in Budapest.

Table 3:

Floor Type of Dwellings Inhabited by Roma Households in 1971

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0

The number of persons per room (note that most rooms were no larger than 9–12 square meters) was greater than 2.5 in 69 per cent of Roma households and greater than 4.5 in 25 per cent of Roma households.

Radios were present in 35.5 per cent of Roma dwellings, and televisions in 24 per cent. When evaluating these two figures from 1971, one should consider that in 1969 there were, in Hungary as a whole, 115 radios and 75 televisions per 100 industrial worker households and 89 radios and 37 televisions per 100 agricultural worker households.

Washing machines and refrigerators were present in 4 per cent of Roma dwellings. In 1969, there were 76 washing machines and 37 refrigerators per 100 industrial worker households and 54 washing machines and 6 refrigerators per 100 agricultural worker households.

Our description of the situation in 1971 began by pointing out that two-thirds of Roma lived in Roma settlements. We should now point out that we did not classify isolated Roma dwellings lying outside villages and towns as Roma settlement dwellings. Nor did we classify groups of two or three Roma dwellings lying outside villages or towns as Roma settlements. Nevertheless, 76 per cent of Roma dwellings were situated outside villages and towns.

A policy of eradicating Roma settlements began in 1965. Home loans at reduced rates of interest represented its primary means. The Roma could use such loans to build dwellings that were smaller and of lower quality than the average family house. Such dwellings became known as houses of reduced value. Sometimes Roma used the loans to buy old peasant houses in villages with declining populations. The loan scheme initiated in 1965 was largely concluded by 1985. In 1964, prior to the advent of the scheme, 222,000 persons inhabited 49,000 Roma-settlement dwellings. By 1984, 42,000 persons were living in 6277 Roma-settlement dwellings.[18]

Table 4:
Roma Dwellings by Their Location in 1971

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

At the time of the 1993 survey, 13.7 per cent of Roma—just over 60,000 people—lived in Roma settlements. By that time, however, long-established Roma settlements were less common. Most of the settlements surveyed were of the newer type. They had been established particularly in the Northern region and especially in Borsod County.

In 1997 the government of Gyula Horn adopted a medium-term action plan for improving the situation of the Roma population. The plan foresaw the holding of a population census in the Roma settlements. It was several years before the census actually took place, and even then it was deficient and inaccurate. According to the census, approximately 100,000 people lived in Roma settlements.

The survey of 2003 showed that 6 per cent of Roma, or 30,000 people, lived in Roma settlements.

The eradication of Roma settlements reduced but did not put an end to the segregation of Roma. Four out of five Roma moved from areas outside towns and villages to areas inside towns and villages. Once there, however, they soon encountered new forms of segregation. They built "reduced-value" houses, crowded together in areas set aside for this purpose, thus reproducing the previous segregation. Old peasant houses could be bought only in villages where it was difficult to make a living, which meant that people soon moved on. Moreover, house purchases by Roma accelerated the departure of non-Roma. This process was most notable in small villages and hamlets. As early as 1991, Károly Kocsis and Zoltán Kovács found that the share of Roma inhabitants was over 8 per cent in 675 municipalities, over 25 per cent in 94 municipalities and over 50 per cent in 9 municipalities.[19] Since then, the number of settlements becoming Roma ghettos has risen substantially.

In 1987 Gábor Havas conducted research on villages that were becoming Roma ghettos in Baranya and Borsod counties.[20] According to data provided by the Roma Affairs Co-ordination

Committee of Baranya County, 15 per cent of the county population lived in villages of fewer than 1000 inhabitants that lacked a local council or co-operative centre. At the same time, 37 per cent of the county's Roma population resided in such villages. In the county as a whole, 148 villages fell in this category.

Roma comprised over 75 per cent of the population in three of the 148 villages. Their share was over 50 per cent in three further villages, more than one-third in ten further villages, more than 25 per cent in sixteen further villages, and more than 20 per cent in seventeen further villages. Thus, in Baranya County, there were in total 49 small villages that were becoming Roma ghettos. In this context, Havas identified a figure of 20 per cent as the critical level at which conflicts begin to multiply, the departure of non-Roma accelerates, and ghettoization becomes irreversible.

In 1984, Borsod County had 16 villages of less than 1000 inhabitants in which Roma comprised over 25 per cent of the population.

In 1991, Éva Fekete, a staff member of the Department for Northern Hungary, Center for Regional Research of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, carried out research in 76 settlements in Borsod County.[21] Roma comprised more than 10 per cent of the population in two-thirds of the 76 settlements, more than 20 per cent in half of them, and more than 50 per cent in nine of them.

The same process has also been underway in the larger villages, towns and cities. Roma move in as non-Roma move out. In other words, they move to the neglected and dilapidated areas of towns and villages. The arrival of Roma hastens the departure of non-Roma, leading to a further deterioration in the situation.

In the 1993 survey, we also attempted to record the ethnic composition of the immediate neighborhoods of respondents. Thirty per cent of respondents said that only/mainly Roma lived in the vicinity, 29 per cent that both Roma and non-Roma lived in the vicinity, 29 per cent that mainly non-Roma lived in the vicinity, 9

per cent that no Roma lived in the vicinity, and 3 per cent that it was difficult to say.

In the 2003 survey we recorded the Roma share of the population living in the vicinity of respondent families. We separated the category "only Roma" from the category "mainly Roma." The responses demonstrate escalating segregation. Twenty-five per cent of respondents said that only Roma families lived in the vicinity, while 31 per cent said that mainly Roma families lived in the vicinity (in 1993 these two categories together had amounted to 30 per cent). Twenty-two per cent of respondents said that both Roma and non-Roma families lived in the vicinity (compared with 29 per cent in 1993); 17 per cent said that mainly non-Roma lived in the vicinity (compared with 29 per cent in 1993); and 5 per cent said that no Roma lived in the vicinity (compared with 9 per cent in 1993).

In this field, there are great differences between the various types of settlement and between the various regions. In Budapest and in Pest County, 16 per cent of respondents said that only Roma families lived in the vicinity, 20 per cent that mainly Roma families lived in the vicinity, 29 per cent that both Roma and non-Roma families lived in the vicinity, 34 per cent that mainly non-Roma lived in the vicinity, and 1 per cent that no Roma lived in the vicinity. Even these figures indicate a significant level of segregation, and they are higher than in 1993.

A further indication of segregation is that 50 per cent of respondent families live in the inner zone of a settlement, 42 per cent on the outskirts, and 2 per cent at some distance from a settlement. Moreover, as we have already noted, 6 per cent live in segregated Roma settlements.

Based on these figures, we might think that 50 per cent of Roma live in segregation. However, almost a half of Roma living in the inner zones of settlements also live in segregation: 15 per cent of them live in neighborhoods inhabited only by Roma families and 29 per cent of them live in neighborhoods inhabited mainly by

Roma families. To sum up, of 1165 dwellings included in the survey, 483 (42 per cent) lie on the outskirts of a settlement, 23 (2 per cent) at some distance from a settlement, 73 (6 per cent) in segregated Roma settlements, and 254 (22 per cent) in the inner zone of a settlement but in a neighborhood inhabited exclusively or mainly by Roma. Thus, overall, 72 per cent of Roma families live in segregation.

As already noted, in 1971 two-thirds of Roma lived in Roma settlements in segregation. By the time of the 1993 survey, segregation had been greatly reduced. But in 2003, rates of segregation typical of 1971 were encountered once again. The form of segregation was different—because there were now far fewer Roma settlements—but the degree of segregation was the same.

It should be added that the rate of 72 per cent reflected the situation in the first quarter of 2003. Nevertheless, it was indicative of the gradual rise in segregation, and all indicators suggest the process will continue in the future.

In terms of the location and segregation of Roma dwellings, Budapest differs significantly from other urban areas and from rural communities.

Table 5:

A Distribution of Roma Households by Location of Dwelling, for the Various Types of Settlement in 2003 (percentage)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Table 6:
Residential Segregation of Roma Households by Type of Settlement in 2003 (percentage)

Composition of Class	Rural	Provincial Urban	Budapest	Total
Only Roma children	1.9	3.6	7.7	3.4
Mostly Roma children	6.0	10.4	14.2	9.1
Mixed	60.7	54.0	32.5	53.9
Mostly non-Roma children	31.1	30.5	44.4	32.5

We have already noted that, in 2003, 6 per cent of Roma, or 36,000 people, lived in Roma settlements. Dwellings in Roma settlements were recorded in the counties of Békés, Borsod, Csongrád, Heves, Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok and Nógrád. In Budapest, Roma live in the inner zone of the city. Here, people living in the vicinity are all or mainly Roma in the case of 30 per cent of dwellings; the population is mixed in the case of 30 per cent of dwellings; and most of the population is non-Roma in the case of 40 per cent of dwellings. In rural areas, 60 per cent of Roma live on the outskirts of—or at some distance from—a settlement. In such areas, people living in the vicinity are all or mainly Roma in the case of 57 per cent of dwellings. Such figures demonstrate the magnitude of regional differences.

Table 7:

A Distribution of Roma Households by Location of Dwelling, for the Various Regions in 2003 (percentage)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Table 8:

Residential Segregation of Roma Households by Region of Residence in 2003 (percentage)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Housing conditions underwent a fundamental change between 1971 and 1993. In 1971, two-thirds of Roma lived in huts or shacks, but the proportion was 6 per cent in 1993. Currently, 5 per cent of Roma dwell in huts or shacks.

In 1993, one in three Roma dwellings were one-room dwellings, 43 per cent had two rooms, and 24 per cent had three or more rooms. In the same year, one-room dwellings accounted for 16 per cent of the total housing stock in Hungary, 43 per cent of dwellings had two rooms, and 40 per cent had three or more rooms.

In 2003, 28 per cent of Roma dwellings had one room, 42 per cent had two rooms, and 30 per cent had three or more rooms. One-room dwellings accounted for 12 per cent of the total housing stock in Hungary, 41 per cent of dwellings had two rooms, and 47 per cent had three or more rooms.

In 1993, 80 per cent of Roma dwellings were in brick, concrete or stone buildings, while 20 per cent were in adobe or mud-and-wattle buildings. Dwellings in brick or concrete buildings accounted for 96 per cent of dwellings in Budapest, 78 per cent in Miskolc, 74 per cent in other urban areas, and 52.5 per cent in rural areas.

In 2003, 77 per cent of dwellings were in brick, concrete or stone buildings and 19 per cent in adobe or mud-and-wattle buildings. There is no data for 4 per cent of dwellings. Dwellings in brick or concrete buildings accounted for 98.3 per cent of dwellings in Budapest, 82.6 per cent in provincial urban areas, and 64.2 per cent in rural areas.

The share of dwellings with earthen floors was 10 per cent in 1993 and 4 per cent in 2003.

In both 1993 and 2003, the share of Roma homes supplied with electricity was 98 per cent. In 1993, the share of Roma homes with running water was 65 per cent (95 per cent in Budapest, 75 per cent in provincial urban areas, and 55 per cent in rural areas). Water was drawn from a well on site in 10 per cent of homes, from a well

at less than 100 meters in 20 per cent of homes, and from a well at more than 100 meters in 5 per cent of homes. The share of homes with a toilet was 49 per cent (61 per cent in urban areas and 41 per cent in rural areas). Forty-eight per cent of homes had a bathroom.

In 2003, the share of Roma homes with running water was 72 per cent (94 per cent in Budapest, 68 per cent in provincial urban areas, and 67 per cent in rural areas). Water was drawn from a well on site in 6 per cent of homes. The share of homes with an indoor toilet was 51 per cent (59 per cent in Budapest, 54 per cent in provincial urban areas, and 44 per cent in rural areas) while 7 per cent of homes had an outdoor toilet (33 per cent in Budapest, 5 per cent in provincial urban areas, and 3 per cent in rural areas). In 2003, the share of Roma homes with a bathroom was 57.6 per cent (66.7 per cent in Budapest, 57.4 per cent in provincial urban areas, and 55.5 per cent in rural areas).

Among the Roma population, there were 2.27 persons per room in 1993 and 2.4 persons per room in 2003. In the same year, the share of persons with 5 square meters of living space or less was 9.3 per cent, while 26.5 per cent had between 5.1 and 10 square meters, 44.4 per cent between 10.1 and 20 square meters, and 19.7 per cent more than 20 square meters.

To many people the increase in residential segregation between 1993 and 2003 may seem surprising; it certainly requires explanation. We have already noted that even before 1990, Roma were able to move to those settlements—or parts of settlements—which non-Roma were leaving due to worsening conditions. In a research paper, Gábor Havas discussed the causes and effects of migration trends in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s.[22] He examined the effects of government policies, such as the collectivization of agriculture and the merger of agricultural co-operatives, councils, schools and other public services. By the 1990s and 2000s, other factors had come into play: higher income and wealth differentials, and the efforts of better-off people to segregate or isolate

themselves. As they become richer and more capable of investment, households in the upper third of society move away to form new segregated residential areas, leaving their old residential areas empty. As a result of the economic crisis of the early 1990s, more than one million people lost their jobs, and they were still unemployed or inactive in 2003. Some jobless families moved to cheaper areas, to settlements and urban districts inhabited by poor people and by Roma.

At the time of the crisis, Hungary became divided geographically. Unemployment and the associated poverty were far less severe in the more developed central and north-western parts of the country than they were in the less developed northern, eastern, and south-western regions. The subsequent economic recovery, which began in 1997, eliminated unemployment and established relative prosperity in the central and western regions. But in the regions most affected by the crisis, unemployment, inactivity and poverty remained. The official jobless figures of 2002 serve, in part, to show the differences: 2.2 per cent in Budapest, 3.7 per cent in Pest County, 4.0 per cent in Gyõr-Moson-Sopron County, and 4.5 per cent in Vas County, but 16.7 per cent in Szabolcs-Szatmár County and 19.1 per cent in Borsod County. These figures offer only a partial indication, because differences between areas within regions were significantly greater. The more active move away from less favorable areas, leaving those who are not so mobile behind.

Segregation was accentuated by the home loan system and house construction, where attention was always paid to the strict segregation of Roma. But an even greater effect was had by urban rehabilitation schemes, whose stated aim and much-repeated achievement was the *cleansing* of whole districts—the removal of Roma.[23] Local authorities reinforced segregation by preventing Roma from moving into homes near non-Roma. Indeed, during construction work, separate streets were assigned to Roma and to non-Roma. Such conduct has become more common and more

serious over the past 14 years, and the trend looks set to continue. The degree of segregation has not peaked; worse is to follow.

Migration[24]

In this chapter we address migration. In Hungarian statistical surveys, migration is defined as the movement (migration) of people across local administrative boundaries. In data published by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office, a distinction is also made between permanent and temporary migration. Permanent migration occurs when there is a change of permanent address. Temporary migration occurs when there is a change of temporary address. The 2003 survey did not investigate changes of address. However, on the 1993 survey questionnaire, we did record all changes of address. In addition to migration between settlements, we also considered changes of address within settlements if the new address was in a different part of a settlement. In the following, we disregard migration of people within settlements.

The 1993 survey variables relating to migration are only partially comparable with data provided by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office. In the former, we used a different method to distinguish permanent and temporary changes of address. The HCSO data were based on official forms for registering a permanent place of residence. While most people continue to register (even though they are no longer required to do so), some people clearly do not take the trouble. Indeed, some people even register a new permanent place of residence without ever actually moving there. The survey, on the other hand, registered cases of migration that were permanent in a substantial sense. In addition to cases of migration classified as permanent by the HCSO, the survey also contains data relating to cases of migration regarded as temporary by the HCSO. Nevertheless, when processing the 1993 data, we worked on the assumption that the survey migration data relate to cases of permanent migration.

A rougher but more reliable means of measuring migration is to compare the place of residence with the place of birth. Both the 1993 survey and the 2003 survey contain data in this regard. Such data may be compared with data from the 1996 micro-census and the 2001 population census. A relative certainty is that the sedentarization of Roma is not the product of recent decades. The 1893 census of the Roma population found that nine-tenths of the 257,000 Roma living in the Kingdom of Hungary in areas outside Budapest were completely settled. That finding is particularly noteworthy, given that the reason for the census was concern over what was regarded as the "problematic" nature of itinerant Roma. The findings showed that such "problematic" Roma were fewer than anticipated. In the course of the 100 years since the 1893 census, the nomadic groups have all but disappeared. Moreover, the findings of the 1993 survey disproved the existence of "semi-sedentarized groups of Roma."

Table 9:
Sedentary and Itinerant Roma in 1893, Based on the Census of the Roma Population*

	1971		1978		1987		
	%	N	%	N	%	N	
apest	90.0	na.	81.4	204	75.4	325	4
ern	74.8	na.	76.2	269	68.4	358	1
at Plain	81.8	na.	72.0	175	71.8	227	2
thern	90.8	na.	81.1	360	80.8	479	2
sdanubia	88.9	na.	77.2	377	73.9	540	3

*Source: Hungarian National Royal Statistical Office[25]

Based on data from the 1993 survey and the 1996 micro-census, and despite the limited comparability of data from these sources, we may conclude that in Hungary itinerancy is hardly more common among the Roma population than among the non-Roma population. The only significant differences relate to the rate

of permanent migration. But, based on sample data, the rate is unlikely to be more than double, say, the national average. An interesting difference may be observed if we examine the relative ratios of intra-county and inter-county migration, as part of total migration, during the period of Hungary's political transition. According to the retrospective data of the 1993 survey, between 1988 and 1993 roughly two-thirds of Roma migrants chose a new place of residence within their own county. Among the population as a whole, the corresponding ratio was approx. 55 per cent.

The 1993 survey and the 1996 micro-census show merely a small (but not negligible) difference between the Roma population and the population as a whole, in terms of the share of people residing at their birthplace. Once again, this contradicts those who claim that Roma are more inclined to migrate—especially since the difference observed contradicts their preconceptions about Roma itinerancy.

At the time of the 2003 survey, the number of Roma residing in places other than their birthplace was greater than the number of Roma residing at their birthplace. Still, the relative shift was not great and has, in fact, approached the national average in the past decade.

Table 10:
A Comparison of Birthplace with Current Place of Residence, for the Roma Population and the Population as a whole
Persons aged 15 and over (percentage)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Still, when evaluating the results, one should also take into account the lower average age of the Roma population. There may be more people among the Roma who have not *yet* moved away from their birthplace. For this reason, it is also worth examining the data by age group.

Table 11:
Percentage of Persons Currently Residing in their Birthplace, by Age Group

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

In the approximate age-group distribution available to us in 1993, the findings largely resemble those we made when examining the aggregated figures. There was no indication that Roma were more or less likely than the population as a whole to move away from their birthplace at some time in their lives. The difference registered for the total Roma population may be attributed to the effect of its composition—the differing age structures of the Roma and non-Roma populations. The 2003 data show a different picture. The percentages of those who have moved away from their birthplace are the same among both younger and older age groups. Among middle-aged and older age groups, one may assume that the share of those leaving their place of birth after many decades fell considerably. Changes in the labor market may have contributed to this development. Jobs in industry no longer tempted Roma to move away. Some Roma may, possibly, have moved back to their place of birth, although we have no data on the volumes involved. Also worth noting is the increase in spatial mobility among young peo-

ple, who were probably looking for jobs. In the under-40 age group, the share of those who had moved away from their birthplace was the same among those in work as it was among other groups. Among middle-aged groups, however, those still residing in their birthplace were less likely to be in employment. However, in this age group, data indicating a low rate of migration tend to suggest a reverse process: people commuting to work (mostly from rural areas) had been the first to lose their jobs, and they were now the ones who had greatest difficulty in finding work (in urban areas). Another possibility is that some people who were unable to find work had moved back to their birthplace. The higher propensity of young people to migrate may indicate a strategy for starting a family, which leads them to look for inexpensive housing in another settlement. Such housing is most likely to be found in settlements isolated from the labor market. Thus, in certain cases, migration can actually reduce the chances of finding employment in the future.

A comparison of the type of settlement of birthplace with the type of settlement of place of residence in 1993, demonstrates a reduction in the number of rural inhabitants. The share of people residing in rural areas in 1993 was 10 per cent lower than the share of those born in rural areas. Half of the missing number had been swallowed up by the provincial urban areas, and half by Budapest. This reflects Budapest's relatively higher rate of growth. Just 3 per cent of the 1993 sample were natives of Budapest, but 8 per cent lived there. The rural-urban migration flow does not indicate, however, that larger settlements were generally more attractive to Roma. If we ignore Budapest, from which just 10 per cent of natives moved away, population retention capacity was no greater in urban areas than in rural areas. In the samples comprising all respondents, there are significant numbers of people in their teens or twenties who have yet to move away from their birthplace. This may give a false impression of the retention capacity of the various

types of settlement. But emigration from rural areas is not much more striking even among people aged over 29.

In 2003 the share of people residing in rural areas was no lower than the share of those born in rural areas (according to their present classification). A higher share of people residing in rural areas have a birthplace in an urban area.

Table 12:
A Combined Distribution of Birthplace and Current Place of Residence by Type of Settlement. In 1993, for Roma aged 30 and over*

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

* Content of inner cells: upper figure = row percentage; lower figure = column percentage. Content of column aggregate cells: upper figure = row percentage; lower figure = sum of column elements. Content of row aggregate cells: upper figure = sum of row elements; lower figure = column percentage. Content of bottom right cell: upper figure = sum of row/column percentages; lower figure = total sample number.

An important finding of the 1993 survey was the low level of inter-regional migration in the 1970s and 1980s. Most migration by Roma took place within counties, affecting 2–3 per cent of the Roma population in any given year. Even so, there was a slow flow towards Budapest and the western parts of the country. The balance

of migration was probably negative in eastern Hungary and positive in the Budapest region and in Transdanubia. Levels of emigration were particularly high in the north-eastern region of eastern Hungary, but there were no signs of a large-scale population increase in western Hungary. The slight positive balance of migration in Transdanubia may have been the result of a small percentage of inter-regional migration. Most inter-regional migration took place between the eastern counties and the central region prior to the political changes of 1989-90. This explains why, despite the gradual population increase in western regions, in general people tended to migrate from Budapest to the east rather than to the west. The Roma share of the total population remained low in Transdanubia. In the 1970s and 1980s the most typical flow of inter-regional migration was from eastern Hungary to the Budapest region. But migration in the opposite direction was more than negligible. Indeed, rather uncertain—and perhaps distorting—data from the 1993 survey indicate that during the 20-year period preceding the political changes of 1989–90, the rate of emigration from the central region (including Budapest) to eastern Hungary was already greater than the rate of emigration from eastern Hungary to the central region. Still, it is also true that eastward migration from the Budapest region was directed mainly at the region between the Danube and Tisza, whereas migration towards the centre usually involved people from beyond the Tisza and from the north-east of the country.

If we compare the current region of residence of persons aged 15 and over in 1993 with the region of their birthplace, we draw the same conclusion as in the direct analysis of migration. The number of Roma residing in Budapest was greater than the number born there. But fewer were residing in the counties of Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg, Hajdú-Bihar and Békés in 1993 than had been born there, among those included in the sample. It is only when we examine data for people aged 30 and over that the above discrepancies

become relatively significant. By that time, the first instances of migration have taken place.

Nevertheless, owing to natural increase as well as the balance of migration, the regional distribution of the Roma population has altered significantly. This is due less to events in the two decades preceding the political changes of 1989–90 than to the substantial changes of the past decade. Recent years have seen a significant increase in the share of the Roma population living in the Northern region. At the same time, the share of the Roma population living in the Great Plain region has fallen steadily, and there has also been a reduction in Southern Transdanubia. Birth data indicate that regional differences in birth rates are responsible in part for these changes.

Table 13:

Percentage Distribution of Roma Population by Region of Residence Based on the Surveys of 1971, 1993 and 2003 (0– X years)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Different migration patterns may be observed among the various language groups. In the 1993 survey, differences were revealed in respect of native language and spoken language groups (although in the case of certain variables, the extent of deviation declined substantially when groups were defined on the basis of

spoken rather than native language). As far as migration is concerned, the age structure of the groups being compared is also relevant, since Roma whose native language is not Hungarian are older than average. Thus, using simpler regression models, we attempted to filter out the effects of disparate age structures. In terms of the number of places of residence, Beás deviated significantly from other groups in the Roma population in 1993. But the migration patterns of Romani native speakers were also slightly different from those of Hungarian native speakers. A model filtering out the effects of gender, marriage, age, language and regional variables verified this.

Table 14:

A Comparison of Birthplace with Current Place of Residence in 1993, by Native Language (percentage)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)

Table 15:

Comparison of County of Birth with Current County of Residence in 1993, by Native Language (percentage)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

The findings were similar when we compared birthplace and place of residence in 1993. Still, Beás native speakers in the 1993 sample were slightly more likely to be living in the county or region of their birthplace than were Hungarian native speakers. But this slight difference should be evaluated in the light of the fact that Beás native speakers are significantly less likely than Hungarian native speakers to be currently residing in their birthplace. As already noted, the 1993 data showed that, generally speaking, these findings also apply to native speakers undergoing language shift. Still, an importance difference may be observed. Namely, whereas native speakers of Romani (based on native language identified) also differ in terms of their migration patterns from Hungarian native speakers, they do not always do so, based on spoken language. The 1993 data led us to infer that differences would be found in the migration patterns of the various groups of Roma. In line with our expectations, in the period preceding the survey, Beás changed their place of residence somewhat more frequently than the other groups. However, their group was characterized by local migration. Migration was also more frequent among Romani speakers, but the difference was not as great.

The 2003 survey did not permit a thorough examination of the migration data. Nevertheless, based on a comparison of birthplace and current place or residence, we may infer significant changes. Beás native speakers no longer deviate so significantly from the average. The share of those residing in their birthplace resembles that for the Roma population as a whole. This does not necessarily indicate a decreasing propensity to migrate among Beás, since the number of people identifying themselves as Beás native speakers is declining and their average age is increasing. People losing their linguistic identity are necessarily more mobile. However, even when broken down according to spoken language, the data still exhibit the same trend. Moreover, the share of young Beás native speakers residing in their place of birth

is similar to the corresponding share among other Roma in their age group. And it is no longer true that Beás tend to favor intra-county migration. The 2003 data indicate an increased spatial mobility among Romani native speakers. Among this group, it is the middle-aged that are more likely than average to have moved away from their birthplace. Further analysis may clarify the processes underlying such findings. The share of inter-county migration is particularly high in this group. The migration of Romani-speaking families may possibly account—more so than other factors—for the Roma ghettoization of poorer villages and districts. Still, based on spoken language, we were unable to identify a significant difference between the migration rates of Vlach Roma and Hungarian Roma.

Table 16:

Comparison of Birthplace with Current Place of Residence in 2003, by Native Language (percentage)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0

Table 17:

Comparison of County of Birth with Current County of Residence in 2003, by Native Language (percentage)

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

It is worth devoting a few sentences to differences between the sexes. In the 1993 survey, we found that women were more likely to reside in a settlement that was not their birthplace than were men. Forty per cent of men, but 50 per cent of women did not live in their birthplace. The explanation for this lies not only in differences in the age-sex structure, but also in customs associated with marriage. Thus, the ratio of those who had moved away from their birthplace was ten per cent higher among women even in the 15–29 age group. Data from the 2003 survey show that, in this regard, differences between the sexes have declined over the past ten years. Fifty-three per cent of women and 49 per cent of men reside in a settlement that is not their birthplace. Among the younger age group, the difference was slight: 45 per cent of men and 47 per cent of women aged 15–29 no longer live in their birthplace. In this age group, the ratio of men living somewhere else was one and a half times higher in 2003 than it had been ten years earlier.

The findings of the 2003 survey indicate that the Roma population's propensity to migrate has increased over the past decade. Particularly among young people, the data show an increase in spatial mobility. Persons aged under 40 are about as likely to reside in their birthplace as the middle-aged or older age groups. A further important observation is that, as a share of the total, inter-county migration has increased in relation to local migration.

IV. Roma and Education

In the representative survey of 1971, we recorded the educational histories of 3510 adult respondents. We found that 70 per cent of Roma aged over 59 had never been to school. They were born in the late 19th century or first decade of the 20th century and were of school age prior to the First World War. At the time, 40 per cent of Hungarian Roma children and 10 per cent of Vlach Roma children, but no Beás children, went to school. The latter could not have gone

to school, because they lived in isolated forest settlements at some distance from villages, and they did not speak Hungarian. Many Vlach Roma were traveling Roma, the so-called tents-dwellers, while others were classified as "temporary residents and not permanently settled" or were sedentary but living a long way from a school. Most Hungarian Roma children also lived a long way from a school. Even among those who did go to school, attendance was irregular, and few children completed more than two or three years of education. Less than one-fifth of children completed four years.

In the early 20th century, education at school was still not universal in Hungarian society. In 1870, 50 per cent of children aged 6–12 attended school, and the figure increased to 81 per cent in 1890 and 85 per cent in 1913. Most children completed four years or less of education and then began work at the age of 10. Many villages had no school; if there was one, it usually consisted of just one classroom.[26]

Between the two world wars, the Hungarian authorities made great efforts to ensure that a broader section of the population attended school for at least four years. Such efforts accompanied the largely successful attempts to "settle" itinerant Roma. Even so, the 1971 survey revealed that 50 per cent of Roma in the 35–59 age group (those of compulsory school age during the interwar period) had never attended school. The school attendance rate increased among Vlach Roma from 40 per cent before the First World War to 60 per cent between the two world wars. The 10 per cent rate recorded among Vlach Roma and the 0 per cent rate recorded among Beás rose to 30 per cent. Most Beás attending school lived on the outskirts of villages, having abandoned the isolated forest settlements. Absenteeism was still common, and most Roma completed just two or three years of education. One-third of children completed four years of education. In the survey, 1 per cent of respondents aged 50–59 and 5 percent of respondents aged 35–49 had completed eight years of education. By 1930–31, the rate of

children not attending school had fallen to 8 per cent among the non-Roma population, and it subsequently declined even further.

Major changes took place in education after 1945. Enacted in 1940, primary education (grades 1–8) became universal and compulsory in August 1945. Successive governments worked hard to implement the program. The percentage of children not attending school declined from 37 per cent among those of compulsory school age between 1943 and 1948 to 27 per cent among those of compulsory school age between 1948 and 1953. It then fell to 13 per cent for the period 1953–1957 and to 9 per cent for the period 1957–1962.

The percentage of children attending school increased most rapidly—from 30 per cent in the interwar period to 90 per cent after 1957—among Beás. In the 1971 survey, we explained this principally in terms of changes in settlement patterns. Having abandoned their isolated forest settlements, Beás moved to the outskirts of villages and began to move into villages. By way of interaction, the position of Beás in the employment structure had changed. Mining and industry were thriving in Baranya County, providing Beás men with employment and granting them higher incomes than elsewhere.

Among Hungarian Roma, the percentage of children not attending school fell more rapidly than it did among Vlach Roma. Among the former, it declined from 40 per cent in the interwar period to 6 per cent after 1957, whereas among the latter it fell from 70 per cent to 17 per cent. Roma in the 30–34 age group in 1971 were born between 1937 and 1941, reaching compulsory school age between 1943 and 1948. In this age group, the percentage attending school rose to 63 per cent, while 48 per cent had four years of education and 11 per cent eight years of education.

Roma in the 25–29 age group in 1971 were born between 1942 and 1946, reaching compulsory school age between 1948 and 1953. In this age group, the percentage attending school rose to 73 per

cent (27 per cent still did not attend school), while 53 per cent had completed four years of education and 16 per cent eight years of education. Roma in the 20–24 age group in 1971 were born between 1947 and 1951, reaching compulsory school age between 1953 and 1958. In this age group the percentage attending school rose to 87 per cent, while 63 per cent had completed four years of education and 27 per cent eight years of education.

The 27 per cent rate was a major achievement in relation to the 5 per cent rate recorded before 1945. Even so, three-quarters of Roma children still completed four years or less of education. In the 1971 survey, we drew attention to the fact that the rapid educational advance of the non-Roma population between 1945 and 1971 had resulted in a widening of the educational gap between Roma and non-Roma. We wrote: "There is a danger that the difference in education levels will become an ethnic characteristic, contributing to the development of a colored minority."[27]

The following assessment was of even greater concern:

> Roma children with less than seven years of education are almost completely illiterate. Apart from signing their names, they cannot write at all. They can only read capital letters and their comprehension skills are poor. This makes it more difficult for them to take part in the social division of labor, or it limits them to jobs that do not require formal education. There is a rapid rise in the number of unskilled Roma workers … Another factor to consider is the restructuring of the country's economy and industry, which has already begun. Unskilled labor replicated itself in the 1950s, but not at the pace required by the increase in demand for unskilled labor. This meant that industrial expansion reached its own limits, forcing a change in direction. In the future, the demand for unskilled labor will decline or remain stationary rather than increase. Thus, one may foresee a surplus of Roma labor within a decade or two, and it will be impossible to find employment for this sur-

plus.[28]

Perhaps, there is no need to add that our prediction came true within two decades.

In the 1993 survey, 77.7 per cent of Roma in the 20–24 age group had completed eight years of education (grades 1–8). This was the achievement of the 22 years since 1971.

Although a favorable change, it proved insufficient. By 1993, even Roma with eight years of education faced long-term unemployment if they had no other school education.

As in the 1971 survey, in 1993 we traced the educational histories of adults in order to monitor changes in school attendance and levels of education. Roma in the 35–39 age group in 1993 were born between 1954 and 1958, reaching compulsory school age between 1960 and 1965. In this age group, 6 per cent had no school attendance, while 55 per cent had completed eight years of education. Roma in the 30–34 age group in 1993 were born between 1959 and 1963, reaching compulsory school age between 1965 and 1970. In this age group, 3 per cent had no school attendance, while 70 per cent had completed eight years of education. Roma in the 25–29 age group in 1993 were born between 1964 and 1968, reaching compulsory school age between 1970 and 1975. In this age group, 2.5 per cent had no school attendance, while 75 per cent had completed eight years of education. Roma in the 20–24 age group were born between 1969 and 1973, reaching compulsory school age between 1975 and 1979. In this age group, 1 per cent had no school attendance, while 77.7 per cent had completed eight grades of primary education. But eight grades did not always mean the normal eight years of education. On completion of primary education (grade 8), most Roma children were considerably older than the standard age of 14 or 15.

In the 1990s, among the general population, 81–82 per cent of

children completed primary education (grade 8) at the age of 14. The cumulative ratio increased to 90 per cent for children aged 15 and 96 per cent for children aged 16. Among Roma, however, just 31.3 per cent of students were aged 14 on completion of primary education (grade 8). The cumulative ratio increased to 43.6 per cent for children aged 15, 62.7 per cent for children aged 16, 64.4 per cent for children aged 17, and 77.7 per cent for children aged 18. The later a student completed his/her primary education, the less real knowledge lay behind the qualification.

An explanation for the delay was that Roma parents tend to enroll 7-year-olds rather than 6-year-olds at school. In 1993,

38.7 per cent of Roma 7-year-olds were enrolled in grade 2,
31.5 per cent of 8-year-olds in grade 3,
33 per cent of 9-year-olds in grade 4,
31.2 per cent of 10-year-olds in grade 5,
33 per cent of 11-year-olds in grade 6,
33 per cent of 12-year-olds in grade 7,
and 27.5 per cent of 13-year-olds in grade 8.

We also observed regional differences in school attendance and education levels in 1993. For instance, the proportion of Roma 25–29 year-olds with eight years of education was

75 per cent for the country as a whole,
84 per cent in the Budapest agglomeration,
74 per cent in the Northern region,
73 per cent in the Great Plain region,
72 per cent in the S. Transdanubia region,
and 70 per cent in the Eastern region.

There were also significant differences by type of settlement. The proportion with eight years of education was

84.5 per cent in Budapest,
76 per cent in provincial urban areas,

and 73 per cent in rural areas.

The greatest differences, however, were registered by native language.

The proportion of Roma 25–29 year-olds with eight years of education was

78 per cent among Hungarian native speakers,
58 per cent among Beás native speakers,
and 52 per cent among Romani native speakers.

In terms of education levels, the 2003 survey demonstrated a continuation of the figures recorded in 1993. In 2003, 79 per cent of 35–39 year-olds, 81 per cent of 30–34 year-olds, 80 per cent of 25–29 year-olds, and 82.5 per cent of 20–24 year-olds had completed primary education (grades 1–8). The 2003 survey revealed a lack of progress in the sense that Roma children continue to be older than average on completion of primary education. Eighty-four per cent of 15-year-olds, 48 per cent of 16-year-olds and 19 per cent of 17-year-olds were still at primary school. In February 2003, 64 per cent of 17-year-olds and 76 per cent of 18-year-olds had completed primary education (grades 1–8).

Even so, a significant change was observed among Beás native speakers. As already noted, in 1993, 42 per cent of Beás-speaking 25–29 year-olds had not completed primary school education. By 2003, however, this ratio had fallen to 22 per cent. Thus, in 2003, in the 25–29 age group,

19 per cent of Hungarian native speakers,
22 per cent of Beás native speakers,
and 34 per cent of Romani native speakers
had not completed primary school education.

In the 20–24 age group,

16 per cent of Hungarian native speakers,
15 per cent of Beás native speakers,
and 28 per cent of Romani native speakers
had not completed primary education.

For many years, young Roma coming out of primary school had little chance of going on to vocational secondary school or grammar school. They were limited to industrial trade schools, just one of the three possible options. But even at this type of school, participation rates were not very high. In 1993, 13 per cent of Roma aged 25–29 and 16 per cent of Roma aged 20–24 had completed industrial trade school, and many of them had qualifications in trades with poor employment opportunities.

Few Roma went on to vocational secondary school or grammar school, and of those who did, half dropped out. Just 1.5 per cent of each cohort completed secondary school education in the 1970s; 2 per cent in the 1980s.

The situation began to change at the time of the political transition of 1989–90. The survey of 1993 showed that 3 per cent of Roma who were aged 20–29 in that year had completed secondary education. This was somewhat more than the 2 per cent recorded in the 1980s.

The perspectives and ambitions of young Roma also changed. Fifty-one per cent of Roma students completing grade 8 of primary education in 1993 continued their education: 9.4 per cent at vocational primary school, 30 per cent at industrial trade school, 10 per cent at vocational secondary school, and 0.6 per cent at grammar school. In some cases, of course, to say that such children continued their education is inaccurate and misleading. The figures merely record enrolment in the various institutions, that is, how many children began to study there; and many of them soon dropped out. In the same year, 56 per cent of non-Roma began studying at vocational secondary school or at grammar school.

Thus, opportunities improved only for some, and the gap between most Roma young people and non-Roma young people grew.

A book entitled *Cigány gyerekek az általános iskolában* [Roma Children at Primary School] by Gábor Havas, István Kemény and Ilona Liskó contains data and analyses about students' study plans. According to a survey conducted by the authors in 1999–2000, 62 per cent of Roma students completing primary education in 1997 went on to industrial trade school and 13 per cent to secondary school (9.3 per cent to vocational secondary school and 3.7 to grammar school). In 1998, 58 per cent went to industrial trade school and 16 per cent to secondary school (12 per cent to vocational secondary school and 3.8 per cent to grammar school). In 1999, 57 per cent went to industrial trade school and 19 per cent to secondary school (15.4 per cent to vocational secondary school and 3.6 per cent to grammar school).[29]

One reason for the changes was that grammar school places increased by 40 per cent and vocational secondary school places by 70 per cent between 1985 and 1996. Admittance to such schools became easier. A second reason was the steady decline, after 1989, in the number of children completing primary education in Hungary. The total figure fell from 171,000 in 1989 to 114,000 in 1999. There were, therefore, fewer non-Roma students competing for places. A third reason was the introduction of normative funding in education. This motivated secondary schools to take on, and keep, as many students as possible. Children were in demand, and since there were not enough non-Roma children, Roma children were needed as well. The situation resembled the labor shortage of the 1960s and 1970s, when Roma workers were recruited for the mining, metallurgy and construction sectors—indeed, ultimately for almost every industrial sector. Now, half-empty schools were trying to fill up the schools with both non-Roma and Roma children.

Evidently, some grammar schools, and even some vocational secondary schools, could still pick and choose among applicants.

Nevertheless, the above conclusions are valid for secondary schools overall.

In the 2003 survey, we looked once again at further study intentions. We found that 26 per cent of Roma students completing primary education wanted to go on to industrial trade school and 24.5 per cent to secondary school (14 per cent to vocational secondary school and 10.5 per cent to grammar school). Five per cent did not want to continue their education and 46 per cent had not made any decision.

Thus, the number and proportion of young Roma continuing their education and enrolling at secondary schools has increased in recent years. The 2003 survey presented the first evidence of this process.

As we have seen, the proportion of Roma children with primary education admitted to secondary school was 13 per cent in 1997, 16 per cent in 1998, and 19 per cent in 1999. Of such students, those admitted in 1997 and 1998 should have completed their secondary education by the time of the 2003 survey.

We found that 10.2 per cent of 15–19 year-olds were studying at secondary school and 1.1 per cent had completed secondary education. Among 20–24 year-olds, 1.7 per cent were studying at secondary school and 5.1 per cent had completed secondary education. We do not known how many of the 10.2 per cent of 15–19 year-olds currently attending grammar school or vocational secondary school, will complete their secondary education. It is quite possible that the proportion completing their secondary education will fall to 5–6 per cent in this group too.

The drop-out rate has always been high among Roma students. Teachers of Roma students used to say that about a half of Roma children enrolled at secondary school would actually complete their secondary education. But Ilona Liskó showed that, in fact, almost two-thirds of Roma students drop out of secondary school in the initial two years.[30] At any rate, a 5 per cent rate is less than half the

13, 16 or 19 per cent rate. Does this mean that the "great breakthrough" is to result in a rate of five per cent? It seems more likely, however, that the share of Roma students completing secondary education will be 20 per cent or higher within several years.

This conclusion is based on our estimate that 15–20 per cent of Roma families have reliable incomes and live above the poverty level. For it costs money to complete secondary education. Only Roma families living above the poverty level are able to raise the necessary funds. And such families are generally willing to pay the extra cost, because they have learnt that it is impossible to find a job without secondary education.

As Gábor Havas has written, the first to recognize this fact were those who set out on the slow, but relatively secure, path to social integration during the more favorable period of the 1970s and 1980s. In other words, Roma who acquired a trade or even completed secondary education, those with proper living conditions, a stable income and life-style, and those who had managed to adapt after the political transition. It was such people who became the leaders of local minority self-governments and civil society organizations. Successful Roma business people should also be included among this group.

As we have seen, secondary education became both a possibility and a rational choice in the 1990s. It would not have been a rational choice in earlier periods of full employment and no fear of displacement. At that time, people with secondary education had no advantage in terms of wages. The costs of further study did not pay off. In the 1990s, however, people who only had primary education lost their jobs, and income differentials widened between people with secondary education and those without. Today 20 percent of Roma parents are in a position to send their children to secondary school. The others—four-fifths of Roma parents—are unable to do so. In the population as a whole, 70–80 per cent of parents send their children to secondary school. Regardless of government poli-

cy and action, it would seem unlikely that the ratio could be more than 70-80 per cent of Hungarian society—if defined in terms of those who successfully complete secondary education rather than those who merely enroll in secondary school. Evidently, the 20–30 per cent of the population without secondary education will be disadvantaged in the labor market. In fact, four in five young Roma face unemployment. Moreover, in 2002 almost one in five Roma children did not even complete primary education. Thus, the educational gap between Roma and non-Roma young people has not lessened.

We have already underlined how a lack of financial resources prevents four out of five Roma families from sending their children to secondary school and from helping them to complete secondary education. It is worth recalling that in 1993 and in early 2003, 60 per cent of married Roma women had three or more children. Furthermore, it is more difficult and costly to send children to secondary school in rural areas, particularly in villages with poor transport connections.

In addition to the financial difficulties, other factors, such as low kindergarten attendance rates, prevent Roma children from performing well at school. Data from the 1993 survey show that 40 per cent of Roma three-year-olds, 54 per cent of four-year-olds, and 72 per cent of five-year-olds were in pre-school education. It should be noted that such education is compulsory from the age of five—although this is merely a formal stipulation. Kindergartens and government authorities seem to be satisfied with the 72 per cent rate. In many communities, pre-school education amounted to just four hours of compulsory sessions weekly. Some Roma children were unable to attend kindergarten due to a lack of places. Many villages had no kindergarten, while in other villages Roma children were not admitted to kindergarten due to a lack of space. Financial concerns were another factor. Sándor Loss wrote: "One-third of parents said they were too poor to send their children to

proper kindergartens; the children did not have the right clothes or shoes."[31]

The situation was worse in 2003. In that year, just 41.5 per cent of Roma 3–5 year-olds attended kindergarten, while 58.5 per cent did not. When evaluating the data, one should note that kindergarten is officially compulsory for one-third of 3–5 year-olds (i.e. for 5-year-olds).

Generally speaking, children need to spend three years at kindergarten. In Hungary one of the most important activities at kindergarten is preparing children for school. Children can only cope with their first year at school if they have already attended three years of kindergarten. This is especially true for Roma children, most of whom do not have access to books, newspapers, magazines, pens and paper at home and whose families use a language that differs completely from the language at school. Many Roma 3–5 year-olds do not learn the words and customs that become familiar to other children at kindergarten. This makes it more likely that they will be assigned to the remedial class.[32] But even those Roma children who remain in the mainstream class find it more difficult to keep up. Meanwhile, skills and abilities learnt automatically by pre-school children are more difficult to catch up on later on, and this makes the situation even worse.

In this field, there are major differences by type of settlement. In Budapest, 44.2 per cent of Roma children do not attend kindergarten, but the corresponding ratio is 59.6 per cent in provincial urban areas and 61.4 per cent in rural areas.

Regional differences are even greater. The share of children not attending kindergarten is 44.6 per cent in the Budapest agglomeration, 56.4 per cent in the Great Plain region, 57.1 per cent in the Western region, 60.3 per cent in the S. Transdanubia region, 62.4 per cent in the Eastern region, and 62.7 per cent in the Northern region.

Another disadvantage is that most Roma children are at least seven years old, rather than six years old, at the start of primary

school. The 1993 survey showed that 38.7 per cent of Roma children were six years old on commencing grade 1. Even now, 38.7 of Roma children are six years old when they start school, while 52.6 per cent are seven years old, and 8.7 per cent are even older. This initial delay is made worse by subsequent failures and the need to repeat grades. According to parents and children, 18.4 per cent of children lose at least one school year and 10.7 per cent more than one school year.

As early as 1971, we concluded that segregation is one of the main obstacles to learning faced by Roma students. In an article[33] published in the January 2001 edition of the magazine *Beszélõ*, we wrote that the first Roma classes were introduced in schools around the time that Roma children who had not attended school before were being integrated into the education system. Ministerial instructions issued in 1962 stipulated the formation of Roma study groups. The number of Roma classes was 70 in 1962, 94 in 1963 and 181 in 1974.

Teaching conditions were poorer in such classes than in other classes. Teachers were less informed and the demands on students were less strenuous; it was easier to get good marks. The Roma classes were initially designed to be temporary, but they turned out to be permanent: children were never transferred from Roma classes to mixed classes.

Arguments against segregation finally persuaded the authorities to abandon their original position. A decree issued by the Council of Ministers in 1985 declared that "Roma classes should gradually be discontinued."

Thereafter, central government did not establish any Roma classes and gave no support to their establishment. Other factors, however, tended to increase the segregation of Roma students. Such a factor was selection between schools and selection between parallel classes within schools. This process began in the 1960s and is still underway today. The 1971 survey report established the following: "Selection occurs when a child is enrolled in grade 1—on

strict social lines, which may or may not be acknowledged. Where there are two parallel classes, Roma children and disadvantaged non-Roma students are put in Class B. And where there are three parallel classes, they are put in Class C… Where Roma children are sufficiently numerous, they will often be the only students in Class C. Elsewhere, they are grouped together with other socially disadvantaged children."[34]

Residential segregation, discussed in the chapter *Settlements and Housing*, accentuates the process of segregation in schools.

Residential segregation and selection/segregation between schools and within schools are topics addressed in the book—cited above—by Gábor Havas, István Kemény and Ilona Liskó. According to the authors:

- In the school year 1999/2000, Roma students accounted for more than 50 per cent of students in 1230 classes in schools in Hungary. Approx. 13,300 Roma children were studying in such classes;
- The share of Roma children was more than 75 per cent in as many as 740 classes. Approx. 10,300 Roma students were studying in such classes;
- Approx. 770 classes had only Roma students, and about 9000 children were studying in such classes;
- Thus, at least one-third of Roma primary school students (37,000 of 93,000) were studying in classes with a majority of Roma students.

In the 2003 survey, we asked respondent families about the composition of their children's classes at school. The responses were as follows: 3.4 per cent—only Roma children in the class; 9.1 per cent—mainly Roma children in the class; 53.9 per cent—the class is mixed; 32.5 per cent—mainly non-Roma in the class; 1.9 per cent—don't know.

Obviously, these responses reflected families' knowledge of class composition rather than the real circumstances. We estimated that there were 9000 Roma children attending all-Roma classes in

1999/2000. The responses in 2003 put the number at 5000. The "mainly Roma children" response roughly corresponds to a ratio of more than 75 percent: our estimate in 2000 was 10,300, and based on the responses in 2003 we may estimate the number of children attending such classes at 13,200. On the other hand, classes in which Roma account for 50–75 per cent of students were probably called "mixed" by families.

The table below shows great differences by type of settlement. In Budapest, 7.7 per cent of Roma children attend all-Roma classes, while 14.2 per cent attend classes where most students are Roma. The corresponding ratios are 3.6 per cent and 10.4 per cent in provincial urban areas and 1.9 per cent and 6.0 per cent in rural areas.

Table 1:

Roma Students by the Composition of their Classes at School. Percentage Distributions in the Various Types of Settlement

Another type of segregation is when Roma children are placed in special schools or remedial classes. As early as 1971, we concluded in our survey report that "remedial classes are to be found

Composition of Class	Rural	Provincial Urban	Budapest	Total
Only Roma children	1.9	3.6	7.7	3.4
Mostly Roma children	6.0	10.4	14.2	9.1
Mixed	60.7	54.0	32.5	53.9
Mostly non-Roma children	31.1	30.5	44.4	32.5
Don't know	0.4	1.5	1.2	1.0
Total	100	100	100	100

almost everywhere near larger Roma settlements" and that "in effect, these are used as Roma schools."

In the school year 1974/75, 7730 Roma children, or 12 per cent of Roma students, attended special schools or remedial classes. By the school year 1985/86, their number had risen to 15,640, or 18 per cent of Roma students.

During this period, primary schools assigned many Roma children to remedial classes even though the children were not mentally handicapped but simply lived in poor conditions and were slow to learn and badly behaved. Many people were critical of this practice. In the first half of the 1970s, Budapest council commissioned Endre Czeizel, assisted by 24 institutions, to examine the mental state of the 1364 children attending the city's 21 remedial schools or the three special schools for the mentally handicapped. The results of the inquiry were published in 1978.[35]

The most important finding was that while 49.3 per cent of students at remedial schools were indeed mentally handicapped, 50.7 per cent of them were normal. These figures were based on taking an IQ of 70 as the boundary between disability and normality, as recommended by the WHO. Still, the conductors of the inquiry did not propose the transfer of normal children to regular schools. Instead, in a "complex assessment procedure," they classified 62 per cent of the children as disabled, 31 per cent as retarded, and 7 per cent as average. Then they established whether or not individual children among the 7 per cent group of average students should have been placed in special remedial education.

In the 1970s and 1980s, István Kemény, Zita Réger, Ottilia Solt and many others criticized the practice of sending disadvantaged children with learning disabilities to remedial schools. The criticism led to the adoption of Act I of 1985 on Education, which declared leaving certificates issued by remedial schools to be the equivalent of those issued by primary schools, and which also tightened up the conditions for placing children in special remedial

schools.

In fact, leaving certificates issued by remedial schools became only nominally equivalent to those issued by regular primary schools: remedial school was still a dead-end for children. Nevertheless, stricter rules governing the placement of children in such schools and a change in the general atmosphere led to a persistent decline in the number of children classified as mentally handicapped and placed in remedial schools. According to the HCSO yearbooks, 39,572 children were attending remedial schools or classes in 1985. And the number fell to 36,516 in 1988 and to 33,595 in 1990. The trend continued after the political changes of 1989–90. In 1992, 32,437 children were attending special schools or remedial classes.

In an article entitled *Roma gyerekek és a speciális iskolák* [Roma Children and Special Schools], Katalin Pik analyzed data provided by the Ministry of Education.[36] According to the data, in total 39,395 students attended remedial schools in 1985/86 and 32,099 in 1992/93. Meanwhile, the number of Roma remedial students was 15,640 in 1985/86 and 13,602 in 1992/93. Ministry of Education data were also published in a chapter of *A cigány népesség Magyarországon* [The Roma Population in Hungary], a book by Gábor Kertesi and Gábor Kézdi. The data showed that there were 88,182 Roma primary school students in 1992/93, of whom 74,241 attended regular schools and 13,941 remedial schools. The percentage of Roma children attending remedial schools or classes had thus fallen to 15.8 per cent—from 18 per cent in 1985.

Kertesi and Kézdi also published related data from the 1993 survey. In the survey, students attending remedial schools or classes accounted for 11.6 per cent of total Roma students. Clearly, in this area, the educational statistics are more authoritative than data from the representative survey. In the survey, parents were asked to state whether their child attended special school or remedial class-

es. The term “special school” probably embarrassed some families, while other parents may not have been aware that their child was attending a remedial class at school.

Between 1985 and 1992, there was a gradual but steady reduction in the number of children classified as mentally handicapped and placed in remedial schools or classes. And, within this decline, there was also a steady reduction in the number of Roma students classified as mentally disabled and sent to remedial schools or classes. There was also a decline in the share of remedial Roma students as a percentage of total Roma students.

At the same time, however, as the following table shows, there was an actual increase in the share of remedial Roma students as a percentage of total remedial students. This was because the number of remedial Roma students fell more slowly than the total number of remedial students.

Table 2:

Roma Students in Remedial Education

Source: Pik[37]

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Since 1994 the number of children classified as mentally handicapped—and thus placed in remedial schools or classes—has been increasing. As a percentage, the increase is particularly steep in light of the steady decline in the total number of primary school students since 1989—from 1,183,573 in 1989 to 930,386 in 2002/2003. Meanwhile, the number of children classified as men-

tally handicapped has risen from 32,000 in 1992 to 37,026. Thus, as a percentage of total students, the share of mentally handicapped children increased from 3.1 per cent in 1992 to 4 per cent in 2003.

The cited book by Gábor Havas, István Kemény and Ilona Liskó provides estimates of the share of Roma children attending remedial schools or classes as a percentage of total Roma students. When making such estimates, we used the finding of the survey that 7 per cent of Roma children and 1 per cent of non-Roma children attended remedial schools or classes and that 84 per cent of remedial students were Roma. Overall, therefore, we estimated that between 18 and 22 per cent of all Roma students attended remedial schools or classes.

According to the 2003 survey, in the first quarter of 2003, there were 115,000 Roma primary school students aged 7–14 and 23,000 Roma primary school students aged 15–18. Thus, the total number of Roma primary school students was 138,000. Eleven thousand students, or 8 per cent of the total, attended special remedial schools (9000 in the 7–14 age group and 2000 in the 15–18 age group). And 9000 students, or 6.5 per cent of the total, attended remedial classes (approx. 7500 in the 7–14 age group and 1500 in the 15–18 age group). The combined sum of Roma students attending special schools or remedial classes was 20,000, or 14.5 per cent of the total.

At the same time, we were almost certain that the relative and absolute numbers of children at special schools or in remedial classes are even higher—for the same reasons as in 1993.

If the actual statistics in 2003 differ from the parental survey data to the same extent as they did in 1993, then we might well conclude that 19.7 per cent of Roma children have been classified as mentally handicapped and placed in special schools or remedial classes—where teaching stops at the level reached in grade 6 of regular schools and where some subjects are not taught at all. Although the leaving certificate issued in such schools or classes is the legal equivalent of the leaving certificate issued in regular

schools, nevertheless, in practice, children from remedial schools are unable to enroll in secondary schools.

It is possible, of course, that parental responses were closer to the truth in 2003 than in 1993. Even so, the share of Roma students attending remedial schools or classes must now be between 14.5 per cent and 19.7 per cent, and it is probably closer to 19.7 per cent. Moreover, 1.5 per cent of Roma children attend low-number classes and 1.7 per cent catch-up classes, that is, classes where fewer demands are made and where Roma children are segregated from non-Roma children.

Astonishing differences may be observed between rural and urban areas in terms of the placement of children in special schools. Special school pupils account for 6.2 per cent of total students in rural areas, 7.8 per cent in provincial urban areas, and 12.3 per cent in Budapest. Such differences demonstrate the arbitrary manner in which children are classified. It is surely unreasonable to believe that, based on any objective criteria, the share of mentally handicapped children in Budapest would be twice as high as it is in rural areas.

Regional differences are even greater and even more remarkable. In the Great Plain region, 3.9 per cent of children are sent to special schools, but this figure rises to 5.3 per cent in the Northern region, 7.8 per cent in the Eastern region, 9.2 per cent in the S. Transdanubia region, 10.8 per cent in the Budapest agglomeration, and 11.1 per cent in the Western region.

Differences between the types of settlement and between the regions are just as great in terms of the placement of children in remedial classes. The combined sum of students at special school or in remedial classes is 10.4 per cent in rural areas, 16.7 per cent in provincial urban areas, and 20.8 per cent in Budapest. In the regions, it is 6.0 per cent in the Great Plain region, 13.4 per cent in the Northern region, 14.5 per cent in the Eastern region, 15.0 per cent in the S. Transdanubia region, 18.6 per cent in the Western

region, and 19.2 per cent in the Budapest agglomeration.

The percentage of young Roma going on to college or university is far lower than the 5–6 per cent who successfully complete their secondary education. Just 1.2 per cent of 20–24 year-olds are studying in higher education. Thus, whereas 40 per cent of young people in the non-Roma population go to college or university, among young Roma the corresponding ratio is just one in a hundred. Kálmán Gábor published tables showing the ethnic composition of first-year college and university students in the academic year of 2001/2002.[38] The first question on the questionnaire was: Do you have any Bulgarian, Roma, Greek, Croatian, Polish, German, Armenian, Romanian, Ruthenian, Serbian, Slovak, Slovene, Ukrainian, Jewish or other ancestry? Among respondent full-time students, 2.8 per cent indicated Roma ancestry, 2.8 per cent Croatian ancestry, 4.7 per cent Polish ancestry, 18.8 per cent German ancestry, 3.4 per cent Romanian ancestry, 1.0 per cent Ruthenian ancestry, 3.9 per cent Serbian ancestry, 9.4 per cent Slovak ancestry, 5.6 per cent Jewish ancestry, 0.6 per cent Bulgarian ancestry, 0.7 per cent Greek ancestry, 0.8 per cent Armenian ancestry, 0.7 per cent Slovene ancestry, 0.9 per cent Ukrainian ancestry and 4.9 per cent some other ancestry. Based on these responses, however, it would clearly be wrong to conclude that 9.4 per cent of first-year students in 2001/2002 were Slovak, or that 4.7 per cent were Polish, 3.9 per cent Serbian, 18.8 per cent German, and 2.8 per cent Roma. Likewise, it is mistaken to state that 2.8 per cent of students were Roma. A person cannot be said to have a Roma background just because one of his/her eight, sixteen or even more ancestors is Roma.

To sum up the changes that have taken place during the past century in the relationship between Roma and education: Prior to 1945, Roma in Hungary had no school education. The musicians knew how to make music and the craftsmen knew their crafts, but they stayed away from school. The result of policies since 1945 is

that now, at the beginning of the 21st century, four out of five young Roma complete primary education (grades 1–8)—but often with several years delay and without proper knowledge levels. Indeed, even now, one in five Roma fails to complete primary education (grades 1–8). In the 1970s, 1.5 per cent of young Roma completed secondary education, and this ratio rose to 2 per cent in the 1980s, to 3 per cent in the 1990s, and to 5 per cent in the 2000s. Owing to a lack of infrastructure and proper funding, most Roma children of kindergarten age do not go to kindergarten. Roughly one-fifth of Roma children of school age attend special school or remedial classes. More than a half of students in such schools and classes are Roma. An additional one-third of Roma children are in classes where the majority of children are non-Roma but where funding and staffing conditions are below average. Little more than one per cent of Roma are studying in higher education—and we do not know how many of them will actually get a college or university degree.

One in five Roma children—those who fail to complete primary education—face long-term joblessness and privation. Unemployment and poverty are likely to be the fate of the sixty-seventy per cent of young Roma who successfully complete primary education but who are prevented from studying any further by the income and housing situation of their families. Both groups currently live and attend school in segregation, and segregation awaits them in the future. Roma will attain social equality when a decisive majority of young Roma complete secondary education and a significant proportion of them go on to graduate from college or university. At present, however, there is little chance of this.

V. Employment and Income

The Labor Market Situation of the Roma Population

Employment Trends Affecting Roma and Non-Roma

A period of forced industrialization began in Hungary in the late 1940s. The process continued in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, coming to an end only in the mid-1980s.[39] In the Budapest agglomeration, the Northern region, and large parts of Transdanubia, industrialization created full employment and even resulted in overemployment and labor shortages. In the Eastern region and in the Great Plain region, a level approaching full employment was reached. In the mining and metallurgy sectors, the recruitment of Roma workers began in the late 1940s. By the 1960s, Roma were being recruited throughout the country and for all sectors of the economy. Full employment and labor shortages made it imperative to recruit and employ Roma, many of whom took on unskilled jobs in industry.

The findings of our retrospective analysis of the 1993 data permit the following conclusions: The high employment rate in Hungary under state socialism resulted in job opportunities even for those who were later prevented from working by their lack of education or by the distance of their homes from potential places of work. In the mid-1980s and late 1980s, differences in employment levels between groups of various social backgrounds and living conditions, were usually not very significant. Differences between men and women are the exception, however. The female participation rate in the labor market was significantly lower than the male participation rate.

Data from the 1971 survey of the Roma population indicated that 85 per cent of Roma men of working age (aged 15–59) were active income earners (working people with a regular income). Seventy-five per cent were in permanent employment, while 10 per cent had temporary jobs or were self-employed. In the same year, 87.7 per cent of males in Hungary were active income earners. Thus, there was only a small difference between Roma and non-

Roma in terms of the male employment rate. Even so, in the population as a whole, more than half of inactive males were students, whereas the corresponding ratio was one in three among inactive Roma. In the general population, 8 per cent of men aged 15–59 were students and 4 per cent were on benefits; among Roma, 5 per cent were students and 14 per cent were on benefits.

Retrospective data from the 1993 survey indicated a slight reduction in Roma male employment by the late 1980s—with an increase in the number of students. In the 1980s, three-quarters of men of working age were in jobs.

The situation among women was different. In 1971, 64 per cent of all women and 30 per cent of Roma women were active income earners. The difference is primarily the result of a higher number of children in Roma families. The employment rate among Roma women increased in the 1970s: by the end of the decade, it reached 50 per cent and remained at that level until the end of the 1980s.

Employment peaked in Hungary in the mid-1980s. In 1985, there were 5,400,000 employed persons—5 million active income earners and 400,000 working pensioners. Recession struck in the second half of the 1980s, and after 1990 the country faced an unprecedented economic crisis. Examining the period in which jobs were lost, we see that Roma were displaced from their jobs more quickly than non-Roma.

By 1993, the number of employed persons in Hungary fell to 3.8 million: since 1985, 1,600,000 people had lost their jobs. Many people had themselves pensioned off. Between 1989 and 1993 the number of pensioners rose by 400,000. Among Roma the flight into retirement began even earlier. The number of Roma pensioners rose from 16,000 in 1985 to 47,000 in 1993. By 1993, 700,000 people were officially unemployed in Hungary. The remainder—half a million people—were inactive persons, that is, they were unemployed people classified as inactive. By 1993, alongside the

increase in the unemployment rate, cultural and demographic differences between people in work and people out of work had also increased—among both Roma and non-Roma. People with poor education were the first to lose their jobs. Compared to college and university graduates, people with secondary education were 2.5 times as likely to become unemployed, while those with primary education (grade 8) were five times as likely. Regional differences were also significant. The unemployment rate was 6.6 per cent in Budapest, but it was 20.2 per cent in Borsod County, 20.6 per cent in Szabolcs-Szatmár County, and 21.3 per cent in Nógrád County.

The rate of job losses was even higher among Roma. The number of Roma in work was 125,000 in 1985, 109,000 in 1989, and 56,000 in late 1993. Between 1985 and 1993, 69,000 Roma lost their jobs. Nationwide 30 per cent of jobs were lost, but the ratio was 55 per cent among Roma.

Low levels of education were the primary factor: 43 per cent of Roma aged over 20 had less than eight years (grades) of primary education, while 41 per cent had no more than eight years (grades) of primary education. Among the non-Roma population, the corresponding ratios were 19 per cent and 25 per cent.

The second factor was the regional distribution of Roma. Very few Roma lived in the counties of Fejér, Komárom-Esztergom, Vas and Veszprém, and their number was particularly low in Gyõr-Moson-Sopron County. It was precisely in these countries that the unemployment rate was the lowest. In contrast, the number and share of Roma was already the highest in Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén County. Borsod was followed by Szabolcs County and then by the counties of Nógrád, Heves, Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok, and Hajdú and by Baranya and Somogy in Transdanubia.

The third factor was that during the earlier period of full employment, Roma had found work in sectors that subsequently collapsed during the crisis. For instance, the jobless rate in the con-

struction industry was twice the national average—and in 1971, 26 per cent of Roma had been working in construction. They must have numbered about 25,000: Roma accounted for 10 per cent of workers in the construction sector.

However, even in combination, these three factors do not fully explain the level of Roma unemployment in 1993 or, for that matter, in 2003. The fourth reason is discrimination. But it is difficult to measure its effect.

As far as differences within the Roma population are concerned, in addition to the principal causes mentioned above, other factors also influenced job retention or job loss. For example, the position of the home within a settlement had once been of negligible significance, but by the 1990s it became more significant. At both points in time, it had little effect on a person's chances of finding a job. The data available are not so unequivocal in respect of the importance of ethnolinguistic factors within the Roma community. On the one hand, both before and after the political changes of 1989–90, people who identified themselves in surveys as Hungarian were more likely to be in work than were Romani native speakers (although this is not true for Beás). On the other hand, it seems that the difference is largely the result of other factors acting in combination, such as differences in the regional, educational and residential breakdown of the various ethnolinguistic groups.

We have already noted how the unemployment figures rose to 700,000 in 1993. The figure of 0.7 million is for February 1993. By late 1993 the number of registered jobless had fallen to 640,000. This was not a real decrease, but merely a fall in the number of registered unemployed. Some jobless people who were not entitled to benefits, did not bother to register.

At the end of 1993, 57,000 Roma were registered as unemployed. This represented 9 per cent of unemployed persons in Hungary. Unemployed Roma men accounted for 37,000 of the 57,000,

or 9.6 per cent of the 386,000 unemployed males in Hungary. At the same time, there were 20,000 unemployed Roma women—8 per cent of the 254,000 unemployed females in the country.

A method of calculating the unemployment rate is to compare the number of registered unemployed with the size of the economically active population, that is, the sum of employed and unemployed persons. At the end of 1993, this rate was 13 per among the general population and 50 per cent among the Roma population. The rates were lower in Budapest and higher in rural areas. The highest rates were recorded in the Northern and Eastern regions: 17 per cent among the general population and 59 per cent among Roma.

Another way of calculating unemployment rates is based on the ILO definition. This definition counts as unemployed those people who have not done an hour of paid work in the week before the survey, who have actively sought a job in the last four weeks, and who are available to start work in the next two weeks. Unemployment rates based on the ILO definition can be calculated based on the HCSO labor survey conducted at the end of 1993. The unemployment rate of the non-Roma population was 11 per cent—or 13 per cent, including inactive unemployed persons, that is, those who want to work but have no hope of finding work. Meanwhile, the unemployment rate of the Roma population was 38 per cent—or 48 per cent, including the inactive unemployed.

The number of people in work continued to decline between 1993 and 1997. The real unemployment rate therefore grew. Between 1997 and 2001, however, the number of people in work increased—but only slightly. In 2001, the number of active income earners was no higher than it had been in 1993. In other words, the real unemployment rate had not fallen.

A decline was, however, observed in the number of registered unemployed. It fell from 700,000 to 364,000. The registered unemployment rate in 2001 was 9.8 per cent. The real number of jobless people was significantly higher; it stood at 364,000. Thus, the real

rate of unemployment was 9.8 per cent. As already noted, jobless people who are not entitled to benefits often do not bother to register as unemployed. Many people fail to register because they have given hope of finding a job through the labor office.

The number of unemployed fell even further, according to data provided by the HSCO's quarterly labor surveys. The surveys showed a fall in the number of jobless to 233,000 in 2001—an unemployment rate of 5.7 per cent.

The contradiction between the two rows of data provided by the survey was evident: while the number of people in work was the same in 2001 as it had been in 1993, the number of jobless had fallen to less than half. Hidden unemployment is the explanation for this contradiction.

In 1998, R. István Gábor published a paper in *Közgazdasági Szemle* on workers who had lost hope. The study referred to the Keynesian belief that unemployment deters people from seeking work. Hidden unemployment arises, increasing during an economic recession or crisis. For shorter or longer periods, the "hidden" unemployed give up looking for work. They return to the labor market after the economic upturn.

A publication entitled *2001. Foglalkoztatási helyzetkép* [The Employment Situation in 2001] indicated the extent of hidden unemployment. Based on a survey of the labor force, it showed that, when respondents were asked to classify themselves, "413,000 saw themselves as unemployed." If we accept this figure, then the number of unemployed in 2001 rises from 233,000 to 646,000, and the unemployment rate increases to over 10 per cent.

According to the 2001 census data (which were published in 2002), the number of people in work in 2001 was 3.69 million, that is, 170,000 fewer than in the labor force survey. The number of jobless, however, was 426,000, that is, 183,000 more than in the labor force survey. It should be noted that the census also adhered to the ILO definition of unemployment. Based on these data, the unem-

ployment rate in 2001 was 10.1 per cent rather than 5.7 per cent.

According to a survey conducted by the Employment Office and the Autonómia Foundation in 2001, the findings of which were published in 2003, Roma unemployment did not decline between 1993 and 2001. The staff of Hungary's 171 labor offices were asked in the survey to indicate the percentage of Roma among people receiving unemployment benefit or participating in employment programs. Respondents could select between five domains: Roma represent less than 10 per cent, 10–25 per cent, 26–50 per cent, 51–75 per cent ,76–100 per cent of such people. Based on a mean value of 16 per cent, the number of registered unemployed Roma was 56,000. This was clearly an approximate figure. As noted, the 1993 survey indicated 57,000 registered unemployed Roma. Thus, according to the Autonómia Foundation survey of 2001, the number of registered unemployed Roma was roughly the same as it had been in 1993.[40]

In 1993, the 57,000 registered unemployed Roma represented 9 per cent of the 640,000 jobless persons in Hungary. In 2001, the estimated 56,000 Roma unemployed represented 15 per cent of the 364,000 jobless persons in Hungary.

Different figures were obtained in the nationwide survey of 2003. At the time of the survey, 21 per cent of Roma in the 15–74 age group were in work—compared with 22 per cent in 1993. Twenty-eight per cent of males were in work, compared with 28.5 per cent in 1993. Fifteen per cent of females were in work—the same rate as in 1993.

Pensioners accounted for 17 per cent, while women on maternity or child care benefit (GYES, GYED, etc.) comprised 30 per cent. Notably, almost 3 per cent of men in the sample were on child care benefit. At the same time, 11 per cent of Roma aged 15 and over were students. Unemployment benefit, supplementary income support or other regular benefit payments were the primary source of income for 17 per cent of Roma. And this was true for 13 per

cent of Roma women and 22 per cent of Roma men. The proportion of students increased significantly over the decade. Currently, 60 per cent of Roma 15–19 year-olds are students. At the same time, however, fewer than half of non-students are working: 23 per cent of the age cohort are dependent non-students living at home, 4 per cent are on benefits, and just 7 per cent have some kind of work.

Changes in the Employment Rate among the Various Roma Groups between 1971 and 2003

As noted above, in 1971, 85 per cent of men of working age were actually working, according to data from the survey conducted in that year. Seventy-five per cent of them were in permanent employment, while an additional 10 per cent had temporary jobs or were self-employed. The 85 per cent rate was almost as high as the corresponding rate for the population as a whole. Until the late 1980s, a slight drop in employment may be observed—with a corresponding increase in the number of students (by 1993, 5.5 per cent were studying).[41] In the 1980s, three-quarters of Roma men of working age were in jobs. This ratio fell sharply to 28 per cent in 1993. The situation for Roma women was somewhat different. In 1971 less than a third of Roma women of working age were in jobs. This proportion was significantly lower than the national figure of 70 per cent. The primary reason for this was that Roma women tended to have more children. By the second half of the 1970s, the female employment rate had increased significantly among Roma. The rates were more or less stable during the 1980s. By then, roughly every second Roma woman of working age had a job. The decline in female employment following the political changes of 1989–90 resembled in magnitude the fall in male employment. The female employment rate fell to a third of the previous level.

Table 1:

Male and Female Employment Rates
As a Percentage of Roma of Working Age
Source of 1978 and 1987 data is the 1993 survey of the Roma population

Examining the national data on employment, we see that the male employment rate among Roma was just a few percentage

	1971		1978		1987		1993		2003	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Men	85.2	na.	77.3	1421	74.4	1966	28.8	2456	28.0	1616
Women	30.3	na.	47.0	1454	49.3	1922	16.3	2386	15.1	1718
Total	na.	na.	62.0	2875	62.0	3888	22.6	4842	21.4	3334

points lower than the national rate until the late 1980s. The discrepancy between the Roma female employment rate and the national rate fell gradually prior to the political changes of 1989–90. Whereas in the early 1970s the employment rate was twice as high among non-Roma women, by 1987 it was just 1.5 times as high. In the 1990s, however, enormous differences appeared. The divergence between the male employment rates of the Roma population and non-Roma population grew rapidly, and even among women the difference was greater than in 1971.

Examining the nominal figures rather than percentages, we observe an increase in the number of Roma in work. The number of employed Roma persons has actually risen during the past decade from 57,000 to 80,000. This includes an increase in the number of Roma men in jobs from 37,000 to 50,000 as well as an increase in the number of women from 20,000 to 30,000. At the same time, the number of registered unemployed has gone up from 57,000 to 90,000. Based on these figures, the registered unemployment rate is 52 per cent. The unemployment rate falls to 40 per cent if the unemployed are defined as those who actively sought work in the four weeks prior to the survey.

Differences between the Regions
and between the Various Types of Settlement

Significant differences may be observed between the various regions and types of settlement in respect of employment. As early as 1993 the chances of Roma men finding work were largely determined by where they lived. In the eastern parts of the country, the proportion of Roma men in work was half the level in Budapest or in Transdanubia. The findings showed that in the Eastern region less than one-fifth of men of working age were in jobs, whereas the corresponding ratio was greater than 40 per cent in the Budapest agglomeration. Such regional differences in the chances of finding a job were greater among the Roma population than they were among the non-Roma population. In 2003 the most favorable data were recorded in the Budapest region. In this central part of the country, 43 per cent of Roma men and women had some kind of work, and the ratio was 49 per cent in Budapest. Sixty-four per cent of Roma men in Budapest were employed, self-employed or casually employed, which is a high rate even in relation to the activity rates for the general population. Still, in Transdanubia just 28 per cent of Roma had jobs. And in eastern parts of the country, the ratio fell to 14 per cent of the population aged 15 and over. In such areas, less than 10 per cent of Roma women were in work. Outside Budapest, male activity rates were everywhere higher than female activity rates, but nowhere did they approach the 64 per cent rate observed among Roma men in Budapest.

Differences may also be observed within the eastern and western parts of the country. We investigated such differences in the earlier surveys, too. In 1971 roughly similar male employment rates were recorded in the northern, central and western parts of the country. A clear exception was the Eastern region, comprising the counties of Hajdú, Szabolcs and Békés, where the employment rate was 15 per cent lower than elsewhere. The rate was slightly lower in the Great Plain region as well. In the following two decades,

Transdanubia registered the largest decline in the employment rate, while the smallest increase in the share of unemployed persons was observed in the Eastern region. Even in the late 1980s, the lowest male employment rates were recorded in the three eastern counties, but the difference was no longer significant. By that time, the employment rate in the Northern region was roughly 5–6 percentage points higher than it was in the Budapest agglomeration or in Transdanubia. The regional structure of labor force participation changed radically after the political changes of 1989–90. In the Northern region, there was a 60 percentage point difference between the 1987 employment rate and the rate recorded in 1993. In 1993 the chances of finding work were largely determined among Roma men by where they were living. In eastern parts of the country, the proportion in work was less than half what it was in Budapest and the western counties. In the east the share of those in work fell to a quarter of its previous level, but in the Budapest region every second job was kept. In Transdanubia too, the fall in the share of those in work was less severe than it was in the Great Plain region, the Eastern region and the Northern Region. Thus, by the early 1990s, in Transdanubia and central parts of the country roughly 40 per cent of Roma men were in work, whereas in eastern and northern parts as well as the Great Plain region roughly one in five Roma men were working. The chances of finding work in the various regions have continued to change in the past decade. While conditions have improved in the Budapest agglomeration, they have tended to deteriorate in Transdanubia, where currently about 30 per cent of Roma men are in work. In the Great Plain region and the Northern region there has been no real change, while in the three eastern counties the situation has deteriorated further. In this latter region, just 14 per cent of Roma men have jobs. This is a lower rate than the nationwide employment rate for Roma women.

Regional variations in the female employment rate took a different course both prior to and after the political changes of 1989–90. In 1971 the employment rate among Roma women living in the

Table 2:

Regional Male Employment Rates
As a Percentage of Roma of Working Age

	1971		1978		1987		1993		2003	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Budapest	90.0	na.	81.4	204	75.4	325	40.5	420	57.7	274
Eastern	74.8	na.	76.2	269	68.4	358	18.4	479	14.2	323
Great Plain	81.8	na.	72.0	175	71.8	227	23.7	300	23.8	172
Northern	90.8	na.	81.1	360	80.8	479	22.9	607	19.7	498
Transdanubia	88.9	na.	77.2	377	73.9	540	36.6	650	31.5	349
Total	85.2	na.	78.0	1385	74.6	1929	28.8	2456	28.0	1616

Budapest differed greatly from the rate elsewhere in the country. The female employment rate was particularly low in the Eastern region. By the 1980s, the difference between Budapest and the other regions was relatively slight, although the Eastern region was slow to catch, in comparison with other regions. Regional differences hardly altered in the 1990s. The female employment rate in 2003 was 16–22 per cent in four regions of Hungary (Northern, Great Plain, Budapest, Transdanubia) and less than 10 per cent in the three eastern counties. Employment opportunities in 2003 were most favorable—for women too—in the Budapest agglomeration (with an employment rate of 36 per cent), and the employment rate was higher than 20 per cent in two northwestern counties. In other parts of Transdanubia (excluding Fejér County), the Great Plain region and the Northern region, the female employment rate fell slightly to 10–14 per cent. In the Eastern region the rate in 2003 was just 6 per cent.

In 1971 the male employment rate was 5–6 per cent higher in Budapest than it was in provincial urban areas. And the Budapest rate was several additional percentage points higher than the rate in rural areas. By the 1980s, the rural areas had caught up with provincial urban areas, but Budapest still had an advantage. After the political changes of 1989-90, the gap between Budapest and the provincial urban areas widened. Both in rural areas and in provincial urban areas, the employment rate fell to a third of its previous level, while in Budapest it was half the previous rate.

During the past decade, Budapest has offered new employment opportunities to Roma too. Conditions in the provincial urban areas have not changed, while a further deterioration in the labor market situation has been observed in rural areas. In Budapest the proportion of men in work has risen by a factor of 1.5 to reach 64 per cent. Even so, the rate is still significantly lower than it was prior to the political changes of 1989–90. Meanwhile, in rural areas just 20 per cent of Roma men are working, compared with a rate of

27 per cent ten years ago.

Differences in employment linked with the type of settlement have taken a divergent course among women. Thirty-two years ago, Roma women's chances of finding employment in Budapest were quite different from elsewhere. This difference gradually declined and even disappeared by the late 1980s. After the political changes of 1989–90, more jobs were kept in Budapest than elsewhere, but the difference was not as great as it was among men. Still, during the past ten years, a gap has appeared between the female employment rate in Budapest and the rate elsewhere. Whereas Budapest has shown an improvement, provincial urban areas have tended to stagnate, while employment opportunities in rural areas have worsened. Even so, women in Budapest are still less likely to be working now than they were prior to the political changes (37 per cent compared with the previous rate of 55–61 per cent), but unlike men, their employment rate is now just as high as it used to be in provincial urban areas in the 1970s and 1980s.

Differences Based on Native Language

The male employment rate among Beás native speakers was similar to or slightly higher than it was among Hungarian native speakers throughout the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. The employment rate among Romani native speakers was somewhat lower than average. On the other hand, female employment rates were similar among both Beás native speakers and Romani native speakers prior to the political changes of 1989-90. In the early 1990s, however, the chances of finding work declined more rapidly among Romani native speakers, so that they fell well below the levels of employment displayed by other groups.

If we group respondents according to their spoken language, a slightly different picture emerges (the situation in 1978 is examined for the 1970s, rather than conditions in 1971). In 1978, among the

male group, there is still no sign of Romani speakers falling behind. Among women, however, in all three surveyed years, the employment rate was lower among Romani speakers than it was among Beás speakers. Meanwhile, the rate among Beás speakers is lower than it is among Roma who only speak Hungarian. Among Beás native speakers the rate of employment was still higher in 2003 than it was among Hungarian native speakers. The most recent data indicate that the male employment rate is higher among Romani native speakers than it is among Hungarian native speakers. Rates of casual employment and self-employment are high among Romani native speakers, whereas Beás are more likely to be in paid employment. Indeed, while 27 per cent of Beás native speakers are in paid employment, the corresponding ratio is just 20 per cent among Romani native speakers and 17 per cent among Hungarian native speakers. The surprising result in the case of the Beás is related to the fact that they leave school earlier. Just 4 per cent of Beás are students, whereas the ratio is 12 per cent among Hungarian native speakers. In the case of Romani native speakers, the over-representation of Budapest may lie behind the figures.

Education and its Effect on Employment Rates

In 1978, men with primary education (grade 8) and those with secondary or higher education exhibited similar employment rates. Among men with primary education below grade 8, the rate was 6–8 percentage points lower. By 1987 greater differences had emerged between men with primary education (or higher) and those without completed primary education. In this latter poorly educated group, the employment rate fell significantly, whereas among other groups it hardly changed. After the political changes of 1989–90, a significant difference in the employment rate could be observed between those with primary education (grade 8) and those with secondary or higher education. While 35 per cent of the

former group were in work, the proportion was 48 per cent among the latter group. Meanwhile, the most poorly educated group fell even further behind—just one in six were working in 1993. The level of education continued to be an influential factor in 2003. Whereas more than 50 per cent of men with secondary education—but no longer studying—had some kind of work, just 28 per cent of men with primary education (grade 8) or less were in work.

Table 3:

Male Employment Rates by Level of School Education As a Percentage of 19–59 year-olds

Differences in the employment rate related to the level of school education were as great among women in 1978 as they were among men in 1993. In 1987, the employment rate of the more edu-

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)

cated women was lower than it had been in 1978. There was little change in 1993 and the differences were still present in 2003. Thus, among women, the employment rate of those with primary education differs from the employment rate of those with secondary or higher education to a greater extent than it does among the male population.

Differences between Age Groups

In 1978, 85–90 per cent of 24–40 year-olds were employed. Four-

fifths of 20–25 year-olds and 40–60 year-olds had jobs. By 1987, employment among persons aged under 40 had declined to a degree, but the reduction was most significant among older age groups. Less than half of those aged over 55 were in work. Many of the cohort differences emerging in the late 1980s had disappeared by 1993. In the 20–55 age group, differences became negligible. In the two outer marginal cohorts, however, employment levels continued to be below average. In 1978, among women, the highest employment rate was observed in a narrower age group. Around 55 per cent of women aged 30–40 were employed, while in other age groups (aged over 20) the female employment rate was 45–50 per cent. There was little structural change in 1987, but the proportion of women in work increased in all age groups. The situation among women changed in the 1990s. In contrast to the male employment rate, the decline in the female employment rate was smaller among the over-40s than among younger age groups.

Table 4:

Female Employment by Age Group
As a Percentage of the Cohort

It is worth examining in detail the most recent data from 2003. Most individuals in the 15–19 age group (approx. 60 per cent of both males and females) are still students. Most non-students are still dependents. Indeed, 21 per cent of males and 23 per cent of females in the age group are dependents, while just 9 per cent of males and 3 per cent of females have jobs. Maternity or child care

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

benefits are received by one in ten women aged 15–19. This is more than negligible, but indicates nevertheless that most Roma women have their first child in their twenties. To put it another way, most Roma women that have left school but not found jobs, do not have children in their teens. In their early twenties, however, childbearing increases rapidly among Roma women—just as it used to among the population as a whole until the late 1980s. Almost a half (47 per cent) of women aged 20–24 receive maternity or child care benefits (GYES, GYED, etc.). The proportion of women receiving such benefits is even higher among the 25–29 age group and the 30–34 age group. The unfavorable labor market situation of Roma may explain why a small but significant proportion of Roma men (3 per cent of those in their twenties) are also on child care benefit. Still, from their early twenties, a relatively high number of men are in work. As many men are working in the 25–29 age group as in the older age groups up to the age of 45 years. The employment rate then gradually decreases in the older age groups. Among women, the highest employment rate is initially observed at a slightly higher age—in the 30–34 age group. On the other hand, women in their forties still have a relatively good chance of finding work. Thus, in the 45–59 age group, women are just as likely as men to have work. Indeed, in our sample, in the 45–49 age group, more women than men had permanent jobs (although a greater proportion of men had casual work). Many Roma in work take advantage of early retirement. At the same time, significant numbers of 55–59 year-olds are unable to stabilize their situation by taking early retirement. For one in five Roma in this age group, benefits or the support of family members represent the primary source of income. The above reveals significant differences in male and female employment rates stemming primarily from the family strategies and opportunities of 20–35 year-olds.

Segregation and Employment

In 1978, Roma men living outside towns and villages were slight-

ly less likely—by a few percentage points—than other Roma men to be working. By 1987 this small difference had disappeared. After the political changes of 1989-90, however, the gap between the two groups widened once more. One third of Roma men living in towns or villages had work, while just 18 per cent of those living in isolated Roma settlements did so. The female employment rate was already lower in isolated Roma settlements than elsewhere in 1978 and 1987. And the gap widened in the 1990s. Another observation is that Roma who live in greater relative segregation are less likely to find work than those who live in areas inhabited mainly by non-Roma. The employment rate rises as the degree of segregation declines. In this regard, a similar trend may be observed among both male and female employment rates (even so, in our sample, the highest employment rate was recorded where there were some other Roma families living in the vicinity).

The Relative Importance of the Variables

The above review does not tell us whether or not the various factors can explain, in themselves, why the various Roma groups have different chances of finding work. Thus, for 1987 and 1993, we established a regression model to explain employment prospects.

The findings showed that even in 1987, all other things being equal, work was more difficult to find in the Eastern region than elsewhere. The better prospects of Roma living in Budapest could be observed. By 1993, the effect of the regions had become more potent. The Eastern region and the Budapest region were still powerful determinants, while the chances of finding a job had increased to well above the average in Transdanubia. The impact of the school education level on the employment rate was significant in both years. The differences between those with or without primary education (grade 8) were considerable even in the 1980s. The advantage enjoyed by those with a higher level of education became significant in 1993, but it was already more than negligible

even earlier on. The middle-aged were at a considerable advantage in both years. The number of children in a household appeared to have a negative effect on the female employment rate in the 1980s and on both female and male employment rates later on. An important change was that in the 1990s differences between the sexes occurred only as a function of the number of children in the household. Thus, in families where children had left home or were still to be born, men and women of the same level of education, age, etc. were equally likely to find a job. As the number of children rose, the likelihood of working declined more rapidly among women than among men. In 1987, Roma living in towns or villages found it no easier—*ceteris paribus*—to find work than Roma living in isolated Roma settlements. By 1993, however, the situation had changed. The advantage enjoyed by Roma living in towns and villages was significant in that year.

Based on regression analysis, we may attribute the differences in employment rates among the three major language groups to residential, educational and other factors. At the same time, we should not ignore the importance of a person's native language in determining his or her level of school education. Hungarian non-native speakers do less well at school.

Based on the sample, non-Roma living in Roma households have a somewhat better chance than others of finding work, but the difference falls within the statistical margins of error. The age structure and higher level of school education of non-Roma included in our sample may have contributed to their higher rate of employment.

The Changes of the Transition Years

In the following, based on retrospective data from 1993, we examine how the labor market transition resulted in many Roma losing

their jobs. The data under examination demonstrate that the loss of jobs among Roma began in the 1980s. Initially, however, this did not mean long-term unemployment for everyone. At first, many people left and then returned to the labor market.

Employment Rates

The previous chapter showed that in 1987 three out of four men aged 15–60 and about half of women aged 15–55 were in work. The female employment rate fell by 2 percentage points and then 4 percentage points per year in the late 1980s and by 6–9 percentage points per year in the 1990s. Male employment exhibited an even sharper decline. The male employment rate fell by 3–5 percentage points per year until 1990 and then by 10–11 percentage points in both 1991 and 1992.

The first table on the next page demonstrates that the major change came in the 1990s. But it also shows how Roma were more quickly affected than non-Roma by the decline in employment.

A more nuanced picture is obtained if we count military conscripts and people on child care benefits as employed persons. As far as the majority of such people are concerned, this is evidently an unrealistic proposition. Nevertheless, the procedure does have its advantages—and not just in terms of achieving compatibility with official statistics (which often do make the same assumption). Being unemployed is not the same—in terms of livelihood or social esteem—as being a soldier or caring for one's children.

The male employment rates are not all that different from the previous data. Evidently, only for a small group of men and only for a short period does conscription substitute for employment or unemployment. The situation is quite different in the case of recip-

Table 5:

Annual Employment Rates
As a Percentage of Roma of Working Age

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Table 6:

Annual Employment Rates, Counting Conscripts
and Recipients of Child Care Benefits as Employed Persons
As a Percentage of Roma of Working Age

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0

ients of child care benefits. In the 1990s, an increasing proportion of jobless women with small children chose this status—probably because it offered better conditions than (official) unemployment.

Duration of Unemployment

Seven out of ten unemployed men in 1993 had lost their jobs in the 1990s. Among women, the ratio was just over 50 per cent. For both men and women, the first perceptible increase in the job displacement rate came in 1989. It should be remember, however, that—like recipients of child care benefits—people taking retirement added to the mass of people losing their jobs. Thus, we also examined why respondents left work. We separated family, health and demographic factors linked to individuals from job losses caused (initiated) by employers. In the 1993 sample, most people losing their jobs in the 1980s had become inactive by becoming pensioners or recipients of child care benefits. In contrast, most people losing their jobs in the 1990s had been displaced by their employers. The change is easier to perceive if we focus exclusively on those who left their jobs for reasons other than pensions or child care benefits. In this group, five out of six men and three out of four women lost their jobs in the 1990s. This group exhibits a smaller difference between men and women in terms of the duration of unemployment.

People Entering and Leaving Work in the Various Years

Despite the rapid increase in the number of unemployed and inactive persons, some people were still entering or returning to

employment. In what follows, we examine the number of people entering and leaving jobs in the various years.

In 1987/1988 about the same number of Roma men entered (or re-entered) work as left work. By the 1990s, the number of those leaving their jobs for various reasons had risen considerably, but at the same time the number of entrants also grew slightly, rather than decline. Similar trends can be observed among women, too. However, in 1991 and in 1992, they do not exhibit the moderate increase in entrants. The fact that absolute numbers were not in decline does not mean a change in relative numbers. Examining the percentage of unemployed people of working age who found work in the various years, we naturally discover a reduction in the 1990s compared with the 1980s. In the late 1980s, one in ten unemployed men re-entered (entered) work each year, while 7–9 per cent of women did so. In the 1990s, the re-entry rate among women fell to just half its previous level. The 6–7 per cent entry rates observed among men are also well below the previous constant rate of around 10 per cent.

Table 7:

The Number of Persons in the Sample Entering or Leaving Work in the Various Years

If we look at under-25s, we see the same trends among both men and women. Thus, in the early 1990s, just as many young people, but a smaller proportion of them, found work as in the mid-1980s and late 1980s. This surprising result may be due to the fact

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Table 8:

New Entrants as a Percentage of Total Entrants

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

that some young people were displaced but then quickly found new jobs—possibly, once again, short-term employment. Thus, in the 1990s, a growing army of re-entrants could supplement a declining number of new entrants.

This supposition is confirmed by data for the final two years. Whereas until 1991 new entrants accounted for at least 50 per cent of total entrants, in 1992 and 1993 their ratio fell significantly.

Examining the proportion of young new entrants in relation to their unemployed counterparts, we observe a significant decline in the early the 1990s. Until the late 1980s, one in seven unemployed 15–19 year-olds entered their first job each year, but the rate fell to just 7–10 per cent in the 1990s.

The above train of thought is underlined by data for new and re-entrants in the period under investigation who lose their jobs. Just one in six women entering employment in 1989 was working in 1993. But even among women who entered employment in 1991, less than 50 per cent were working in 1993. Among men, the percentage in work in 1993 was somewhat higher.

Table 9:

The Percentage of Entrants in the Various Years Who were Working in 1993

People Becoming Unemployed

In the next section, we use various factors to analyze the distribution of persons becoming unemployed in the various years. Once

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

again, our point of departure is people becoming unemployed permanently (that is, those who were still unemployed at the time of the survey) in each of the various years. Generally speaking, we take all such respondents into account. However, for the purposes of analysis, in a couple of the tables we separate those who voluntarily left work from those who were forced into unemployment.[42]

Table 10:

Unemployed Men by Age Group and the Years in which they Became Unemployed, as a Percentage of Men Who were Unemployed in 1993 and Who Lost their Jobs in the Given Year

We did not assume in advance a difference between the various age groups in terms of the time of period over which jobs were lost. The initial data suggest, however, that such an assumption would have been correct. In the 1990s, men aged under 40 became

	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	Altogether
15–29	27.3	38.6	44.6	40.6	47.4	43.3	50.0	44.5
30–39	36.4	28.1	23.2	32.1	30.6	33.6	29.3	30.6
40–59	36.4	33.3	32.1	27.3	22.0	23.1	20.7	24.9
Cases N	44	57	112	187	232	268	270	1170

slightly more common among people losing their jobs. There may be simple reasons for this, linked with the retrospective analysis rather than of any particular substance. Still, the extent of the differences argues against this. The wave of job redundancies affected young people more than older people. Among women, the proportion of under-30-year-olds leaving work is fairly stable throughout the period under investigation. The increasing share of young people observed among the male group relates only to those aged between 30 and 40. The difference between men and women is perhaps due to women going on child care. To find out whether young people really did leave their jobs later on, we need a more precise mode of analysis.

To us an apparently reasonable supposition was that Roma lost their jobs more quickly in rural areas than in urban areas. We could explain this, so we thought, primarily by a fall in the number of commuters. But, here too, the data do not fully support our preconceptions. Among men, the ratios based on type of settlement do not vary excessively. In rural areas there was a relatively larger number of people losing their jobs in 1990–91, whereas in urban areas the share of people leaving employment was greater in 1992–93. Among women, the share of rural inhabitants among those losing their jobs was relatively high in 1989, but otherwise the ratios were relatively constant.

Among men, the years of greatest displacement in the construction industry, i.e. 1987 and 1989–1991, are particularly important. In the services sector the proportion was higher a little later on, in 1992–93 (but by then a higher share of people were working in the sector). With respect to women, special mention should be made of light manufacturing industry. In this sector, the share of worker displacement was slightly higher in 1988, but there were no other exceptional years in the subsequent period. The proportion of service sector workers among women losing their jobs (as well as women in jobs) was slightly higher in the 1990s than in the late 1980s.

We have already noted the presence of commuters. We concluded that people commuting to their places of work lost their jobs sooner than others did. The data show that, generally speaking, commuters did lose their jobs sooner than those who lived where they worked. Until 1991, people living where they work accounted for 40 per cent of worker displacement. The ratio then increased by a factor of 1.5 and was still at that level in 1993. In fact, the number of weekly or monthly commuters was not particularly high, and so they were not a large share of those losing their jobs. Their share was 10–15 per cent until 1991 and then fell to below 10 per cent.

Table 11:

A Distribution of Unemployed Men according to how they Got to Work in the Year in which they Became Unemployed As a Percentage of Men Losing their Jobs in that Year

In this field, the trends are less acute among women. There are, nevertheless, indications that commuters tended to be displaced sooner. As in other areas, among women the changes may be felt earlier. Until 1989, one in two women leaving employment had

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

been working locally. In the 1990s, the proportion fell to 40 per cent.

Neither among men nor among women is it possible to identify a relationship between the time of displacement and the native language of people losing their jobs. Even as far as Roma settlement dwellers are concerned, there is no clear trend—although there are large fluctuations between the various years. In some years, they represent a large proportion, but in others just a small proportion of the total. Perhaps such fluctuations are linked to the sample peculiarities mentioned in the introduction. Respondents from Roma settlements come from a limited number of such settlements. It is therefore possible that a large number of people living in one settlement were working at the same place of work.

We assumed that people with a better school education were able to keep their jobs for longer periods than were those without skills. Perhaps this supposition requires no particular justification. Unskilled workers tended to lose their jobs sooner than others. To a lesser degree, this was also true of Roma with primary or vocational education but no secondary education. In this instance, too, the tendency was stronger among men than among women.

Table 12:
A Distribution of Unemployed Men by Level of Education and the Year in which they Lost their Jobs As a Percentage of Men Aged >20 Losing their Jobs in that Year

A further supposition was that non-Roma living in Roma households are better able to cope in the labor market. One explanation for this would be their higher than average level of education. The sample includes few non-Roma, so it is difficult to draw

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

conclusions. Minor changes are, nevertheless, perceptible. In the 1980s, non-Roma accounted for 2–3 per cent of men losing their jobs. This ratio increased to 5–10 in the 1990s. Among women, however, there is no apparent trend.

People Entering Work

We have already noted how in the 1990s the share of new entrants, as a percentage of total entrants, declined due to changes in the labor market. Not surprisingly, we observe a reduction in the share of people aged under 30 among entrants. The decline is, however, smaller than that observed among new entrants. And among women, the relative cohort shares exhibited an even smaller change.

In the late 1980s, three-quarters of men entering work lived in villages or towns (rather than in Roma settlements). By 1992–93 their share had risen to 85 per cent. The political changes in 1989–90 brought no change to the situation among women. Rough-

ly four-fifths of entrants lived in villages or towns. This ratio mirrors the residential distribution of adult Roma women in Hungary. Forty-three per cent of men entering work in 1987–88 did so where they lived. By the 1990s this ratio had risen by an additional 15 percent. Among women, there was no change in this respect during the period under investigation. The share of non-Hungarian native speakers among entrants declined perceptibly both among women and men. In the late 1980s, the share of Beás-speaking or Romani-speaking Roma entering work corresponded with their share of the population, but after the political changes their chances of finding work declined by almost a half. The fact that they lived in villages and that only a very few of them were living in Budapest is a possible explanation.

In the late 1980s, one-quarter of men entering work had not completed primary education (grade 8). The ratio declined to 12 per cent in the 1990s. The percentage of entrants or re-entrants with vocational qualifications increased from 21 per cent to 30 per cent. The changes were just as spectacular among women. In 1988 and 1989, 6 per cent of entrants had a level of school education that was higher than primary. By 1992–93 the proportion had risen to 17 per cent. The share of non-Roma household members among entrants did not change perceptibly at the time of political transition.

Significant changes may be observed in terms of the capacity of the various sectors to provide jobs. In 1988–89, one in five men took on work in the services sector, and the rate increased to 45 per cent in 1990–91. In the subsequent two years, more than a half of men entering employment took on work in the sector. At the same time, the share of men working in agriculture and construction fell to half the previous level. In the late 1980s, agriculture provided work to 28 per cent of men entering employment. In the 1990s, this ratio fell to just 16 per cent and then 13 per cent. During the period under analysis, the construction industry's share of total entrants fell from 22 per cent to 11 per cent. The changes were somewhat

less significant among women. The proportion of women taking up working in services increased from one-third to 50 per cent. The proportions of other sectors fell across the board by 6–7 per cent at the time of the political changes of 1989–90.

An important lesson of the analysis is that the loss of employment in 1989–90 did not mean, for Roma, permanent exclusion from the labor market. In the early 1990s, just as many people entered work as before. It was, of course, increasingly difficult to find work, and the average age of new entrants to the labor force shifted upwards. A further observation is that most people entering work during the transition lost their jobs within 2–3 years. In other words, the chances of Roma finding stable employment during the years of political change were quite minimal. This has already been pointed out by Béla Janky in an article published in 1998 and entitled *Cigányok munkaerõpiaci helyzete a hetvenes, nyolcvanas és a kilencvenes években* [The Labor Market Situation of Roma in the 1980s and 1990s], as well as by Gábor Kertesi in a study entitled *A cigány foglalkoztatás leépülése és szerkezeti átalakulása 1984 és 1994 között* [The Decline and Restructuring of Roma Employment between 1984 and 1994].

As far as worker displacement is concerned, there are no truly significant differences between the various groups. Perhaps one conclusion is that those with the lowest level of school education began to lose their jobs in larger numbers than other groups prior to the all-embracing changes of the 1990s.

Worker Stratification
An Analysis of Data from 1993

Temporary employment has already been mentioned elsewhere in this report. The number of temporary employees has changed sig-

nificantly since the 1970s. In 1978, the number of Roma men and women working at the end of the year was about the same as at any time during the year. However, in 1987, there was a 4–5 per cent discrepancy between the figures for the end of the year and those for during the year. Still, by that time, employment levels had declined significantly among Roma. The difference thus says little about the number of temporary workers. The same is true for the considerable differences observed in 1993.

Table 13:
Percentage of Men and Women Employed at some Time during the Year—As a Percentage of People of Working Age

Examining the relative numbers of people who were working during a given year but who were unemployed both at the end of the preceding year and at the end of the given year, we observe the greatest changes among the male population. In both 1978 and 1987, less than 1 per cent of Roma men of working age were work-

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)

ing during the year but not at the beginning or end of the year. In 1993, however, 4 per cent worked during the year but not at the beginning or end of the year. As early as 1978, more than 1 per cent of women worked only at some time during the year. The proportion increased to 3 per cent in 1987 and remained at that level even in the 1990s.

An alternative method of taking stock of temporary workers is to examine how many people work less than 12 months of a given year. For men and women, the proportion of employees working less than 12 months is relatively constant throughout the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. The rate fluctuates between 13 and 17 per cent.

The proportion of employees working less than 6 months fluctuates to a greater degree. There is a perceivable increase—from 4.3 per cent in 1987 to 7.9 per cent in 1993—in the proportion of men working just a few months. The percentages given in the previous paragraph thus seem to underestimate the proportion of temporary workers. On the other hand, the results outlined here may show more temporary workers than the actual number.

Table 14:
Male Employees by the Number of Months Spent in Work
A Percentage Distribution for Various Years

The 2003 Data

In 2003, 71 per cent of Roma in some kind of work had regular income opportunities throughout the year. According to the data,

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)

the work of an additional 19 per cent provided occupation for several weeks or months per year. Ten per cent of respondents with some kind of work were in casual employment. Commuters account for 35 per cent of workers, with 30 per cent commuting daily. Based on the statements of respondents, 77.5 per cent are working legally and the rest illegally.

Currently, few Roma have employment and even fewer have stable full-time jobs. And most Roma in work find employment in the lower segment of the labor market. Seventy per cent of employed Roma work as laborers or unskilled workers. Skilled workers and trained blue-collar workers account for 22 per cent.

Just 8 per cent of employed Roma work in white-collar positions or as members of one of the uniformed services.

Based on the above data, we constructed a composite factor to identify the labor market status of respondents by way of the regularity and amount of work and the legal status of any such work. We distinguished between three categories. In the first group, we placed those people who have regular work and a declared employment occupying them for 40 hours per week. In the 15–74 age group, sixteen per cent of men and 10 per cent of women fell in this category. In the second group we placed those people who have some kind of work, but whose work is "atypical" in some way or other. Thus, this category comprised people with constant employment whose work was part-time or full-time but seasonal, as well as people working eight hours per day throughout the year but whose employment was not officially declared and who were therefore not protected by labor legislation. Fourteen per cent of Roma men of working age and 6 per cent of Roma women have such employment. In the third group, we placed inactive or unemployed persons who have no paid work. It is apparent that, when grouped in this way, the proportion of people in work slightly exceeds the figure previously given. The reason for this is that we have placed among the employed group those people whose main source of livelihood is some benefit or allowance or family member's income but who still perform some kind of casual paid work.

The data further refine our knowledge of people's livelihoods, for they demonstrate not only that few Roma are in work but also that just 60 per cent of those in work have full-time jobs. The rest have employment providing them with irregular, low or illegal income. Moreover, it is quite possible that the number in undeclared jobs is somewhat higher than our figure, which is based on the statements of respondents.

Compared with rural areas, provincial urban areas provide men with more casual employment opportunities, whereas women

are more likely to be in legal employment. Budapest has more to offer in both categories of employment. In most parts of the country, men in full-time jobs are roughly equal in number to those doing some kind of atypical work. Exceptions are the Western region and the S. Transdanubia region, where most people in work are in full-time legal employment. Although the percentage of Roma men in full-time employment is lower in the western counties than in the Budapest agglomeration (22 per cent versus 30 per cent), nevertheless the significant difference is linked with other employment opportunities: in the Budapest region, an additional 30 per cent of men are in some kind of atypical employment, whereas in the three western counties this ratio is just 7 per cent. The tendency is even more apparent among Roma women. Indeed, if we limit ourselves to legal employment, the female employment rate in the western border counties is almost as high as the rate in the Budapest area (18 per cent versus 21 per cent). Even so, whereas in the Budapest agglomeration an additional 17 per cent of women have some kind of less regular paid work, the corresponding ratio is just 3 per cent in the Western region. There is a relationship between the regularity of employment and the quality of work. The level of education is closely connected to the proportion of people in regular full-time work. Atypical employment is far more common among the poorly educated.

As part of the 2003 survey, we examined the earnings of employed persons. Most of the data concern workers in full-time employment. The responses indicate that full-time workers earn, on average, HUF 61,000 net per month. Among full-time male workers, the average figure is HUF 66,000, while women take home, on average, HUF 51,000. The average figure is HUF 44,000 in the three eastern border counties but HUF 67,000 in the Budapest agglomeration. In Budapest, employees working at least 40 hours per week earn on average HUF 78,000 per month. Remarkably, in the Northern region (the counties of Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén,

Heves and Nógrád), Roma in full-time employment earn, on average, HUF 64,000. On the other hand, fewer people have work in that region. The average earnings of full-time workers in provincial urban areas (HUF 55,000) are significantly lower than the average for Budapest. In rural areas, average earnings (almost HUF 59,000) are slightly higher than in provincial urban areas.

We have already noted that people with a higher level of school education have a better chance of finding work. Still, the survey data show that differences in earnings linked with the level of school education are relatively slight. People in full-time employment with secondary or higher education take home, on average, HUF 66,000, while people with primary education (grade 8) or less earn HUF 60,000 (the differences are insignificant). Wage differentials are not particularly great in terms of the type of work. Laborers earn almost as much as trained blue-collar workers or white-collar workers (once again, there is no significant difference between the various categories). Even so, the sample data suggest that weekly commuters to distant workplaces (5 per cent of Roma in full time employment) earn more. Their average wage is HUF 86,000.

Differences between groups based on ethnic identity or native language require further analysis. Whereas the best education and employment data are recorded among Hungarian Roma, workers' earnings show a different pattern. The earnings of employed Beás are particularly deviant, and this is not clearly attributable to the regional distribution of the various native-language and ethnic groups.

Incomes

The 2003 survey also inquired into respondents' incomes. Obviously, a questionnaire-based survey is only capable of producing approximate income data. Still, according to our estimates, in

February 2003 the average monthly per capita income in Roma households was HUF 20,900, while the median income was HUF 16,800. This includes all monetary income, such as pensions and benefits. On average, employment income accounts for less than half of total monetary income. We estimate average employment income per household member to be HUF 8,800. The remaining HUF 12,100 comes from pensions, child care support and various other benefits.

Table 15:
Roma Households by Average Monthly per Capita Income (in HUF) in 2003

Significant income differences lie behind the averages cited. Indeed, in 56 per cent of households, there was nobody, at the time of the survey, with an income from employment (in such households, it is possible that all members of the family are involved in some joint income-producing activity, such as foraging). In 12

Income Category (HUF)	No. of Cases (Valid Responses)	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
0–14 999	477	41.5	41.5
15 000–19 999	232	20.2	61.7
20 000–29 999	225	19.6	81.2
30 000– X	216	18.8	100.0
Total	1150	100.0	

per cent of households, less than half of adult household members have employment income. The share is 50–50 in 18.5 per cent of households, more than half in 5.3 per cent of households, and all members in 8.1 per cent of households. The 56 per cent figure for households without workers is particularly high, given that pensioner households are so rare among the Roma population.

In households with no income earners, the average per capita income is HUF 14,900 (the median value is HUF 12,800). In the 8 per cent of households where all members are income earners, the

average per capita income is almost HUF 40,000 (the median value is HUF 36,000). As the share of income earners in a household increases, so both the relative and the absolute value of pensions and benefits decreases. Where all adult household members are working, pensions and benefits are worth just HUF 6500 per capita.

Table 16:
Estimated Average Monthly per Capita Income (HUF) for Various Types of Roma Household in 2003

* A household may still have employment income even when none of its members have earnings. Casual work jointly performed by family members (e.g. collecting medicinal plants) may result in income at household level rather than at individual level. A separate section in the questionnaire addressed such collective sources of income.

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

The average monthly per capita income for the population as a whole was about HUF 40,000 in 2001 and HUF 60,000 in the autumn of 2003. The average monthly per capita income in Roma households in January-February 2003 was therefore just over one-half of the 2001 figure and just over one-third of the autumn 2003 figure.[43]

In 2003, for the country as a whole, monthly per capita income in the lower decile stood at HUF 19,173. Even this low level of income was not reached in as many as 56 per cent of Roma households. In the second decile, monthly per capita income was HUF 29,585 in 2003. An additional 12 per cent of Roma households

failed to reach this level, while 18.5 per cent of households were at this level. In the third decile, monthly per capita income was HUF 36,548 in 2003. This amount exceeded the monthly per capita income of an additional 23 per cent of Roma households. In such households, most or all adults have employment income. In the fourth decile, monthly per capita income was HUF 42,175 in 2003. Even those Roma households in which all adult members have employment, income did not reach this level.

A more realistic picture of the situation of households may be gained by examining income per unit of consumption rather than income per capita. Given the large number of children, this is especially true for Roma households. To calculate income per unit of consumption, we used the OECD2 equivalence scale. Thus, the first adult in a household received an equivalence value of 1, each further adult received an equivalence value of 0.7, and each child received an equivalence value of 0.3.[44]

Table 17:

Roma Households by Average Monthly Income per Unit of Consumption (HUF) in 2003

Eighteen per cent of Roma households just about make ends meet, but they are incapable of saving or investing. Eighty-two per cent of Roma households have incomes below the HCSO's subsistence level, thus satisfying only some of the basic needs. Fifty-six per cent of Roma households are in the lower income decile; peo-

on	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
n	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
bia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Table 18:

Estimated Average Monthly Income per Unit of Consumption (HUF) for Various Types of Roma Household in 2003

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

ple in such households live in abject poverty and are unable to feed themselves properly.[45]

Regional differences in income only partly reflect the differing levels of economic development of the regions. Although households with no income earners account for 73 per cent of households in the eastern counties (Szabolcs, Hajdú, Békés) but less than 57 per cent in Transdanubia, nevertheless average household income per capita is only 22 per cent higher in the latter region than in former region. (Incomes in the Great Plain region and the Northern region are higher than in the eastern counties but lower than in Transdanubia.) Likewise, although employment income per capita is 2.9 times higher in Transdanubia than in the Eastern region, the high proportion and compensating effect of transfer income (pensions and benefits) reduces the difference between the two regions. The same relationship may be observed if we compare rural and urban populations. There is hardly any difference, on average, between incomes in rural households and incomes in provincial urban households, despite the fact that employment income per capita is about 40 per cent higher in the urban areas.

Households in Budapest and the surrounding area are the exception when it comes to the relationship described above. In this central region of the country, both the proportion of households with income earners and the level of household income exceed the proportions and levels of income observed elsewhere. In Budapest, just 17 per cent of households do not have any income earners, while in 30 per cent of households all adult members have employment income. Average income per capita in the region is HUF 32,900—90 per cent higher than the average income recorded in the three eastern counties that comprise the poorest region. In terms of employment income, the difference is far greater (by a factor of almost 6.5). Still, transfer income (pensions and benefits) is no higher in Budapest than elsewhere.

Table 21:

Table 19:

Estimated Average Monthly per Capita Income (HUF) of Roma Households in Various Regions in 2003

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Table 20:

Average Monthly per Capita Income Categories (HUF)
Percentage Distributions for the Various Regions in 2003

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Estimated Average Monthly per Capita Income (HUF) in Rural Areas, Provincial Urban Areas, and Budapest in 2003

The average values for total households differ slightly from the values given in *Table 16* because the use of different variables results in different households being left out of the total.

Table 22:

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
pest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
rn	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
t Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
hern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
sdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
ern*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Average Monthly per Capita Income Categories (HUF) Percentage Distributions for the Various Types of Settlement in 2003

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

On average, child care benefits account for about 25 per cent of the total income and 45 per cent of the transfer income (pensions and benefits) of Roma households. The sum of child care benefits

Table 23:

Estimated Average Monthly Income per Unit of Consumption (HUF) in Rural Areas, Provincial Urban Areas, and Budapest in 2003

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

The average values for total households differ slightly from the values given in *Table 16* because the use of different variables results in different households being left out of the total.

per household member is greater where there are several children in the family—although the increment is minimal from the fourth child onwards. (Examining the sum of child care benefits per child, we find no significant increment even for the first three children—and the sum of child care benefits per child decreases from the fourth child onwards.) The slight increase mentioned is reflected in part in the sum of transfer income. That is to say, transfer income is greater in households with many children than in households with few children; but the difference is slight. (The highest level of transfer income was measured in households with no children, because they tended to include elderly people on pensions). Still, employment income per household member is much lower in households with many children. Thus per capita income in such households is somewhat lower than in households with fewer children. (Per capita income in households with two children is 36 per cent higher than in households with five or more children.) The incomes of households with few or many children still differ slightly even if we attempt to calculate the various indices of income per unit of consumption.

The differences noted do not mean, however, that families with many children are worse off in the labor market. The proportion of active adults is somewhat lower among families with many children, but there is no negative effect on earnings per adult. Indeed, the more children there are in a family, the higher the average earnings of non-student family members aged over 15 tend to be. In part, this is due to the fact that many adolescents do not find jobs. Some households with few children are, in reality, families with adolescent children who have left school but do not yet have earnings.

Household income does not vary significantly among the various ethnic groups. Among Roma households in Transdanubia, it is possible to show that households dominated by persons identifying

themselves as Hungarian are somewhat better off than average. But no such difference may be observed in eastern parts of the country. On the other hand, by focusing on employment income, we may perceive differences between the various ethnic groups—even in the east. But in Budapest and the surrounding area there is still no acute difference. Likewise, per capita income is only slightly above average in households with some non-Roma members.

In rural areas, families living in integrated areas are no better off than are those living in segregated areas. In provincial urban areas, a correlation between segregation and income status may be observed in some regions but is absent elsewhere. The relationship is particularly manifest in urban areas in Transdanubia; but in Budapest too, the better off are less likely to live in segregated residential areas. In Budapest, per capita income in Roma households living in non-Roma neighborhoods is 40 per cent higher than per capita income in Roma households living in Roma neighborhoods. (Moreover, average employment income in households in integrated areas is 72 per cent higher than in households in segregated areas.)

The analysis data do not disprove the supposition that ghettos of poorer Roma may develop in larger urban settlements, which better-off Roma try then to leave. Even so, our findings indicate that as far as Roma in Hungary are concerned, acute boundaries tend to be drawn *between* settlements and regions rather than within them. Thus, employment income among Roma households living in segregated areas of Budapest is 2.5 times higher than employment income among rural Roma households living in predominantly non-Roma areas. Moreover, while potential earnings vary greatly between regions, transfer income is shared almost equally among the various groups of Roma and constitutes an important source of income in most households.

Having surveyed monetary income, we now look briefly at household farming, which serves as an additional source of food for families. Household farming is a particularly significant activity in

light of the low levels of income described above. Almost a third of households grow vegetables or keep livestock—almost always for their own use and in small volumes. In 1–2 per cent of households, household farming is able to provide perceptible (additional) income.

In response to our questioning, 20–22 per cent of households said that they grew potatoes, onions, beans, tomatoes or paprika. However, for none of these crops were more than 5 per cent of households able to meet the entire family needs from household farming. Fifteen per cent of households kept pigs, usually slaughtering one or two per year. One per cent of households had sold a fattened pig in the previous 12 months. Cattle are less typically kept: just 0.5 per cent of households keep cows. On the other hand, chickens are kept by 13 per cent of households. Poultry numbers reach a hundred in 2 per cent of households. Little more than 1 per cent of households keep horses. This piece of data corresponds with previous observations and symbolizes the changes in the livelihoods of all Roma. Out of 1165 households included in our survey, just one household had sold a horse in the previous 12 months.

Nine per cent of families grow vegetables but keep no livestock, while 7 per cent keep livestock but grow no vegetables. Fifteen per cent of households are active in both areas. Some kind of household farming is practiced by 57 per cent of households. Worth noting is that, even in provincial urban areas, 16 per cent of families practice household farming.

Table 24:

Roma Households by Type of Household Farming
Percentage Distributions for the Various Types of Settlement

in 2003

Household farming is strongly related to local conditions. A comparison is worthwhile only among rural populations. Even so, as we focus on rural households, we struggle to identify the factors

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)

rendering household farming more or less likely. The most significant differences are between regions. In Central and Southern Transdanubia, 64 per cent of families living in rural areas practice household farming. In the Northern region, comprising the counties of Nógrád, Heves, and Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén, the ratio is 60 per cent. But in the villages of the counties of Pest, Fejér and Komárom-Esztergom, just 36 per cent of households practice household farming. In the Great Plain region, just under half of rural families grow vegetables or keep livestock. Breaking down the data to the level of individual villages within the sample, we find that household farming is almost completely absent in some rural communities. Even so, it is difficult to find a village where household farming is almost universal. Thus, unfavorable local conditions may put people off household farming, but favorable conditions do not automatically mean that all families have the resources necessary for household farming.

Table 25:
Roma Households in Rural Areas by Types of Household Farming.

Percentage Distributions for the Various Regions in 2003 (N=466)

* The distribution contains data for just five households.

Region	None	Grow Vegetables	Keep Livestock	Both	Total
Budapest agglom.	64.1	0.0	23.1	12.8	100.0
Eastern	45.4	18.5	9.3	26.9	100.0
Great Plain	52.5	5.0	22.5	20.0	100.0
Northern	39.5	16.4	10.7	33.3	100.0
Transdanubia	36.1	18.6	6.2	39.2	100.0
Western*	(0.0)	(100.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	42.9	15.9	11.4	29.8	100.0

Larger households, sometimes consisting of several families, are more likely to practice household farming, although, by itself, the number of children is not an influencing factor. At the same time, it cannot be said that families with limited monetary income are more likely to be active in household farming or, for that matter, that those with the proper resources are more likely to be involved. Nor can we demonstrate that an increase in the number of employed persons in a family leads to a corresponding decrease in the family's involvement in household farming (or vice versa). Nevertheless, indicators relating to residential area, and thus to the financial circumstances of families, do help to predict the probability of household farming. Households living in the inner zones of settlements or in dwellings with modern amenities are more likely to practice household farming. Indeed, household farming is practiced by 65 per cent of people living in dwellings with flush toilets but by only 42 per cent of people living in other dwellings. Similar differences may be observed by employing other indicators, such as the presence of a kitchen, a bathroom or running water. Presumably, therefore, household farming is influenced by the disposable financial resources of households. It would seem that regional and local conditions, acting in combination with household resources,

determine whether or not people take up household farming. The role of necessity or subsistence is less evident.

Notes

1. More information on the three ethnolinguistic groups is given at the beginning of the second part of this chapter.
2. For the background to the 1971 survey, see István Kemény, *Az alacsony jövedelmû népesség életkörülményei Magyarországon* [The Living Conditions of Low-Income Population Groups in Hungary] (Budapest, 1972). For analysis of the 1971 survey, see István Kemény, ed., *Beszámoló a magyarországi cigányok helyzetével foglalkozó, 1971-ben végzett kutatásról* [Report on the 1971 Survey of the Situation of the Roma Population in Hungary] (Budapest, 1976), as well as István Kemény, "A magyarországi cigány lakosság" [The Roma Population in Hungary], *Valóság*, January 1974, and István Kemény, "A budapesti cigányokról" [Roma in Budapest], *Budapest*, 1975, no. 5. For the 1993 survey, see—*inter alia*—Gábor Havas and István Kemény, "A magyarországi romákról" [Roma in Hungary] *Szociológiai Szemle*, 1995, no. 3, pp. 3–20; István Kemény, "A romák és az iskola" [Roma and School Education] *Educati*o, Spring 1996; István Kemény, "A magyarországi roma (cigány) népességrõl" [Roma in Hungary] *Magyar Tudomány*, 1997, no. 6, pp. 641–655; István Kemény, "A magyarországi cigányság szerkezete a nyelvi változások tükrében" [The Structure of Roma Society in Hungary as Reflected in Linguistic Changes] *Régió*, 1999, no. 1; István Kemény, "Tennivalók a cigányok/romák ügyében" [Measures Needed to Assist Roma], in István Kemény, ed., A *cigányok Magyarországon* [Roma in Hungary] (Budapest, 1999), pp. 229–256; Gábor Kertesi, "Cigány gyerekek az iskolában, cigány felnõttek a munkaerõpiacon" [Roma Children at School and Roma Adults in the Labor Market] *Közgazdasági Szemle*, 1995, no. 42, pp. 30–65; Gábor Kertesi, "Cigány foglalkoztatás és munkanélküliség a rendszerváltás elõtt és után" [Roma Employment and Unemployment before and after the Political Changes of 1989–90] *Esély*, 1995, no. 4, pp. 19–63; Gábor Kertesi, "Megalázottak és megszomorítottak. Cigány emberek beszámolói az õket ért sérelmekrõl és megaláztatásokról az 1993/94. évi országosan reprezentatív cigányvizsgálat megkérdezettjei közül" [They Humiliated and Depressed Us. Reports of Roma People Participating in the 1993/94 National Representative Survey of the Roma Population on Bad Treatment and Humiliation] *Esély*, 1996, no. 3; Gábor Kertesi, "A cigány foglalkoztatás leépülése és szerkezeti átalakulása 1984 és 1994 között" [The Decline in and Restructuring of Roma

Employment between 1984 and 1994] *Közgazdasági Szemle*, 2000, no. 47, pp. 406–443; and Béla Janky, "Lakóhely-változtatások a cigányok körében" [Changes in Place of Residence among Roma], in István Kemény, ed., *A cigányok Magyarországon. Magyarország az ezredfordulón* [Roma in Hungary. Hungary at the Turn of the Century] (Budapest, 1999), pp.175–203. For the 2003 survey, see István Kemény and Béla Janky, "A cigány nemzetiségi adatokról" [Ethnic Data on Roma], *Kisebbségkutatás*, 2003, no. 2, pp. 309–315; István Kemény and Béla Janky, "A 2003. évi cigány felmérésrõl—Népesedési, nyelv-használati és nemzetiségi adatok" [The Survey of the Roma Population of 2003—Demographic, Linguistic and Ethnic Data] *Beszélõ*, 2003, October, pp. 64–76; István Kemény and Béla Janky, "A cigányok foglalkoztatottságáról és jövedelmi viszonyairól" [The Employment and Incomes of Roma] *Esély*, 2003, no. 6, pp. 58–73; István Kemény and Béla Janky, "Települési és lakásviszonyok" [Settlement Patterns and Housing] *Beszélõ*, April 2004, pp. 96–111, 190. The three representative surveys of the Roma population in Hungary are the source of data for 1971, 1993 and 2003. In recent years, in addition to research led by Kemény, a national survey was conducted by Ladányi and Szelényi in 2002, which also permits thorough analysis of the living conditions of Roma in Hungary. See János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi, "Cigányok és szegények Magyarországon, Romániában és Bulgáriában" [Roma and Poor People in Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria] *Szociológiai Szemle*, 2002, no. 4, pp. 72–94.

3. For issues of sampling and estimating numbers, see Gábor Kertesi and Gábor Kézdi, *A cigány népesség Magyarországon* [The Roma Population in Hungary] (Budapest, 1998); Gábor Kertesi and Gábor Kézdi, "A cigány népesség lélekszáma Magyarországon a kilencvenes évek elején" [The Size of the Roma Population in Hungary in the Early 1990s], in István Kemény, ed., *A cigányok Magyarországon* (Budapest, 1999), pp. 45–72; and Gábor Kertesi, "Két cigányvizsgálat (Kritikai elemzés)" [Two Surveys of the Roma Population (Critical Analysis)] *Szociológiai Szemle*, 1996, no. 1.
4. For the debate concerning the procedure, see Gábor Havas, István Kemény and Gábor Kertesi, "A relatív cigány a klasszifikációs küzdõtéren" [The Relative Roma in the Classification Battlefield] *Kritika*, March 1998, p. 189; Gábor Kertesi, "Az empirikus cigánykutatások lehetõségérõl" [Potential Methods of Empirical

Research on Roma] *Replika*, 1998, p. 29; János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi, "Ki a cigány?" [Who is Roma?] *Kritika*, December 1997; János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi, "Az etnikai besorolás objektivitásáról" [The Objectivity of Ethnic Classification] *Kritika*, March 1998; János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi, "Még egyszer az etnikai besorolás objektivitásáról" [The Objectivity of Ethnic Classfication Revisited] *Replika*, 1998, p. 30. For problems associated with ethnic classification, see also István Kemény and Béla Janky, "A cigány nemzetiségi adatokról" [Ethnic Data on Roma] *Kisebbségkutatás*, 2003, no. 2, pp. 309–315, and János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi, "A roma etnicitás társadalmi konstrukciója Bulgáriában, Magyarországon és Romániában a piaci átmenet korában" [The Social Construction of Roma Ethnicity in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania during the Era of Market Transition] *Szociológiai Szemle*, 2001, no. 4, pp. 85–95.

János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi, "Van-e értelme az underclass kategória használatának?" [Is It Worth Using the Category of Underclass?] *Beszélõ*, November 2001, pp. 94–98.

5. István Kemény and Béla Janky, "A cigány nemzetiségi adatokról" [Ethnic Data on Roma] *Kisebbségkutatás*, 2003, no. 2, pp. 309–315.
6. Tables without indication of source are based on the data of the three representative surveys of the Roma population.
7. Árpád Mészáros and János Fóti, "A cigány népesség jellemzõi Magyarországon" [Features of the Roma Population in Hungary] *Statisztikai Szemle*, 74 (11): 908–929.
8. *Ibid*.
9. Béla Janky, "A cigány nõk helyzete" [The Situation of Roma Women], in Tiborné Pongrácz and István György Tóth (eds.), *A nõk helyzete* [The Situation of Women] (Budapest, 1999), pp. 217–238.
10. Márta Gyenei, "A 'stratégiai gyerek'" [The 'Strategic Child']. *Népszabadság*, 14 November 1998.
11. András Gábos and István György Tóth, *A gyermekvállalás támogatásának gazdasági motívumai és hatásai* [The Economic Motives for, and Consequences of, Financial Support for Childbearing] (Budapest, 2000).
12. *Ibid*.
13. László Hablicsek, *Demográfiai forgatókönyvek, 1997–2050* [Demographic Scenarios, 1997–2050] (Budapest, 1998).

14. Ferenc Kamarás, "Termékenység, népesség-redukció" [Fertility and Population Decline], in Tamás Kolosi, István György Tóth and György Vukovich, eds., *Társadalmi riport 2000* [Social Report] (Budapest, 2000), pp. 409–432.
15. The present territory of Hungary is smaller than the former territory of the Kingdom of Hungary.
16. " A Magyarországon 1893. január 31-én végrehajtott cigányösszeírás eredményei" [Results of the Roma Census in Hungary of 31 January 1893] *Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények*, new series, vol. IX, 1985.
17. András Kovács, ed., *Zsidók a mai Magyarországon* [Jews in Present-Day Hungary] (Budapest, 2002).
18. For a description of the policy of eradicating Roma settlements, see Katalin Berey, " A szociális követelményeknek meg nem felelõ telepek felszámolása" [The Eradication of Isolated Settlements not Fulfilling Social Requirements], in Katalin Berey and Ágota Horváth, *Esély nélkül* (Budapest, 1990).
19. Károly Kocsis and Zoltán Kovács, *A magyarországi cigány népesség társadalomföldrajza* [Social Geography of Roma Population in Hungary] (Budapest, 1991).
20. See Gábor Havas, " A kistelepülések és a cigányok" [Small Villages and Roma], in Kemény, ed., *A cigányok Magyarországon. Magyarország az ezredfordulón*, pp. 163–204.
21. Éva Fekete, "Cigányok a Cserháton" [Roma in the Cserhát Region], in *Észak- és kelet-magyarországi földrajzi évkönyv* [Geographical Yearbook of Northern and Eastern Hungary] (Miskolc, 1994).
22. Gábor Havas, " A kistelepülések és a cigányok" [Small Villages and Roma], in Kemény, ed., *A cigányok Magyarországon. Magyarország az ezredfordulón*, pp. 163–204.
23. For analyses of the situation in Budapest, see János Ladányi, "A lakásrendszer változásai és a cigány népesség térbeni elhelyezkedésének alakulása Budapesten" [Changes in the Housing System and the Spatial Distribution of the Roma Population in Budapest] *Valóság*, 1989, no. 8, pp. 73–89; and János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi, "Szuburbanizáció és gettósodás" [Suburbanisation and Ghettoisation] *Kritika*, July 1997.
24. The processing of the 1993 data in this chapter is based on analysis presented in Béla Janky, "Lakóhely-változtatások a cigányok körében" [Changes in Place of Residence among Roma], in Kemény,

ed., *A cigányok Magyarországon. Magyarország az ezredfordulón*, pp.175–203.

25. "A Magyarországon 1893. január 31-én végrehajtott cigányösszeírás eredményei" [Results of the Roma Census in Hungary of 31 January 1893] *Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények*, new series, vol. IX, 1985, p. 21.
26. Cf. Ignác Romsics, *Magyarország története a XX. században* [Hungarian History in the Twentieth Century] (Budapest, 1999), pp. 39–40.
27. István Kemény, ed., *Beszámoló a magyarországi cigányok helyzetével foglalkozó, 1971-ben végzett kutatásról* [Report on the 1971 Survey of the Situation of the Roma Population in Hungary] (Budapest, 1976), p. 45.
28. *Ibid*., p. 40.
29. Gábor Havas, István Kemény and Ilona Liskó, *Cigány gyerekek az általános iskolában* [Roma Children in Primary Education] (Budapest, 2002), p. 181.
30. Ilona Liskó, *Cigány tanulók a középfokú iskolákban* [Roma Students in Secondary Education] (Budapest, 2002), p. 37.
31. Sándor Loss, "Egy csapásra" [All at Once] *Beszélõ*, January 2001, p. 74.
32. See István Kemény, "A nyelvcserérõl és a roma/cigány gyerekek nyelvi hátrányairól az iskolában" [Language Shift and the Linguistic Disadvantages of Roma Schoolchildren], in Ágota Horváth, Edit Landau and Júlia Szalai, eds., *Cigánynak születni* [Born to Be Roma] (Budapest, 2000), pp. 313–330.
33. István Kemény, "A cigányok és az iskola" [Roma and Education] *Beszél*õ, January 2001.
34. Kemény, ed., *Beszámoló a magyarországi cigányok helyzetével foglalkozó, 1971-ben végzett kutatásról*, p. 42.
35. Endre Czeizel, Ágnes Lányiné Engelmayer and Csaba Rátay, eds, Az *értelmi fogyatékosság kóreredete a Budapest-vizsgálat tükrében* [Causes of Learning Disabilities as Reflected in the Budapest Inquiry] (Budapest, 1978).
36. Katalin Pik, "Roma gyerekek és a speciális iskolák" [Roma Children and Special Schools] *Educatio*, 1999, no. 2.
37. *Ibid*.
38. Kálmán Gábor, *Az elsõ éves hallgatók szociológiai vizsgálata. Táblázatok* [Sociological Study of First-Year Students. Tables]

(Budapest, 2002).

39. For an overview, see István Kemény and Béla Janky, "A cigányok foglalkoztatottságáról és jövedelmi viszonyairól" [The Employment and Incomes of Roma] *Esély*, 2003, no. 6, pp. 58–73. Based on data from the 1993 survey, a detailed analysis of changes in the labor market affecting Roma and associated with Hungary's political transition is presented in Gábor Kertesi, "A cigány foglalkoztatás leépülése és szerkezeti átalakulása 1984 és 1994 között" [The Decline in, and Restructuring of, Roma Employment between 1984 and 1994] *Közgazdasági Szemle*, 2000, no. 47, pp. 406–443.
A survey of conditions after the political changes was also conducted by Kertesi in 1994 based on HCSO data. See Gábor Kertesi, "Cigányok a munkaerõpiacon" [Roma in the Labor Market] *Közgazdasági Szemle*, 1994, no. 41, pp. 991–1023. Cf. Gábor Kertesi, "Ingázás a falusi Magyarországon" [Commuting in Rural Hungary] *Közgazdasági Szemle*, 2000, no. 47, pp. 775–798. For an analysis of the processes underway in the 1990s, see also Isván Kemény, ed., *Romák/cigányok és a láthatatlan gazdaság* [Roma and the Invisible Economy] (Budapest, 2000); István Kemény, "Foglalkoztatás, munka, munkanélküliség" [Employment, Work and Unemployment], in Ernõ Kállai and Erika Törzsök, eds., *Cigánynak lenni Magyarországon* [To Be Roma in Hungary] (Budapest, 2000), pp. 25–31; István Kemény, "A teljes foglalkoztatottságtól a munkanélküliségig és a láthatatlan gazdaságig" [From Full Employment to Unemployment, and to the Invisible Economy] *Kisebbségkutatás*, 2000, no. 4, pp. 599–608; István Kemény and Béla Janky, "A cigány nemzetiségi adatokról" [Ethnic Data on Roma] *Kisebbségkutatás*, 2003, no. 2, pp. 309–315; István Kemény and Béla Janky, "A 2003. évi cigány felmérésrõl—Népesedési, nyelvhasználati és nemzetiségi adatok" [The Survey of the Roma Population of 2003—Demographic, Linguistic and Ethnic Data] *Beszélõ*, 2003, October, pp. 64–76. Additional data may be found in Béla Janky, *Cigányok munkaerõpiaci helyzete a hetvenes, nyolc-vanas és a kilencvenes években* [The Employment Situation of Roma in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s] (Unpublished, 1998).

40. Concerning the survey, see János Köllõ, "A roma munkanélküliség és a munkanélküli segélyrendszer 2000. évi reformja" [Roma Unemployment and the Reform of the Unemployment Benefit System in 2000], in Anna Csongor and György Róbert Lukács, eds., *Roma munkaerõpiaci programok* [Roma Labor Market Programs]

(Budapest, 2003), pp. 29–44; and György Róbert Lukács, ed., "Roma munkaerõpiaci programok" [Roma Labor Market Programs], in Csongor and Lukács, eds., *Roma munkaerõpiaci programok*, pp. 45–88.

41. The retrospective analyses were possible due to the employment history section in the 1993 survey.
42. Unfortunately, conclusions based on the statistics are tentative in the case of several variables, due to low cell frequencies. Definitive opinions may only be given where there are strong trends. As well as low case numbers, another factor renders the results uncertain. Due to the means of sampling, many respondents may have worked at the same place. A major decision on redundancies may have affected many respondents of similar status at the same time. Thus, in some cases, we may have recorded 'exceptional' years that may be explained by local rather than national factors.
43. For the latest national estimates, see Péter Szivós and István György Tóth, eds., *Stabilizálódó társadalomszerkezet* [Stabilising Social Structures] (Budapest, 2004).
44. See Ödön Éltetõ and Éva Havasi, "Az elemzési egység és az ekvivalenciaskála megválasztásának hatása a jövedelmi egyenlõtlenségre és szegénységre" [The Analysis Unit and the Effect of the Choice of Equivalence Scale on Income Inequalities and Poverty] *Szociológiai Szemle,* 2002, no 4, pp. 157–170. A different scale for calculating equivalence values and consumption units was used in Zsolt Spéder, ed., *Demográfiai folyamatok és társadalmi környezet. Gyorsjelentés* [Demographic Trends and Social Milieu. An Express Report] (Budapest, 2002) and in Balázs Kapitány and Zsolt Spéder, *Szegénység és depriváció* [Poverty and Deprivation] (Budapest, 2004).
45. Slightly different results are presented in János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi, "Cigányok és szegények Magyarországon, Romániában és Bulgáriában" [Roma and Poor People in Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria] *Szociológiai Szemle*, 2002, no. 4, pp. 72–94.