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**Our focus: selected countries and minorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Majorities</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>Romanian, Slovak, Serb, Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMANIA</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>Hungarian Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERBIA</td>
<td>Serb</td>
<td>Hungarian Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOVAKIA</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>Hungarian Roma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Background

Fertility of many European minorities persistently deviates from the one of the majority population

⇒ Large differences:
- Russians in Estonia (Katus et al. 2000)
- Romansch-speaking in Switzerland (Haug and Wanner 2000)
- Roma in Central and Eastern Europe (Kalibova 2000)
- Catholics in Northern Ireland (Compton 1998)

⇒ Small differences:
- Hungarians in Romania (Spéder 2010)
- Italian, French and German speaking population in Switzerland (Haug and Wanner 2000)
Questions

• Has the minority situation an individual effect on the fertility behaviour?

• Or the fertility differences are features of social, economic and institutional differences?

Theories of integration / assimilation:

(Esser 1990, 2001)

different degrees of assimilation in different areas of life

different fertility behaviour between majority - minorities
1. hypothesis: not the minority status per se but rather the social, demographic and economic characteristics of the minorities determine the fertility levels and differentials

„Social characteristics hypothesis”

(Sly 1970; Day 1984)

2. hypothesis: the minority group status has an independent role on the group’s fertility behaviour: membership in and identification with a minority group depresses fertility below majority levels

„Minority status hypothesis“:
   a) collective minority strategy ~ residential proximity
   b) individual minority strategy ~ upward mobility

(Goldscheider and Uhlenberg 1969, Ritchey 1975, Andorka 1978)

„Subculture hypothesis”

(Kennedy 1973, Day 1984)
Target group of analysis, samples and variables

SOURCE:
- 2011 national censuses from Hungary, Slovakia, Romania and Serbia

TARGET GROUP OF ANALYSIS:
- Selected countries: Hungary, Slovakia, Romania, Serbia
- Selected minorities: Hungarian, Romanian, Slovak, Serb, Roma
- Women aged 30-59

CENSUS VARIABLES:
- Sex, date of the birth (or age), completed education
- Different geographical locations
- Nationality / ethnic affiliation: self-declared; voluntary
- Children ever born

CALCULATED INDEXES:
- Fertility variables: average number of children, share of childless women, TFR 2010
Some general aspects of the target population
Total fertility rate in selected countries, 1975-2014

Source: Eurostat
The average number of liveborn children by women’s birth cohort in selected countries, 2011

Source: National Censuses 2011
The average number of liveborn children by women’s birth cohort and nationality in selected countries, 2011

![Chart showing average number of liveborn children by women’s birth cohort and nationality in selected countries, 2011.](chart.png)
The share of childless women by women’s birth cohort and nationality in selected countries, 2011

Source: National Censuses 2011
Social economic characteristics

Fertility of Roma minority and the majority population by completed education in Hungary, Slovakia and Serbia:

- Low education (Primary or below)
- Secondary – vocational, or apprenticeship
- Secondary – high school (liceum, gymnasium)
- Higher education (colleague, university diploma)
The average number of liveborn children by women’s birth cohort, nationality and completed education, Hungary 2011

Educational composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary or below</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>High school</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952-1956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-1961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Hungarian National Census 2011

- Hungarian
- Roma

Educational composition:
- Primary
- Vocational
- High school
- Diploma
The average number of liveborn children by women’s birth cohort, nationality and completed education, Slovakia 2011

Educational composition

Source: Slovakian National Census 2011, thanks for the data for Branislav Sprocha
The average number of liveborn children by women’s birth cohort, nationality and completed education, Serbia 2011

Educational composition

Serb

Roma

Sources: Serbian National Census 2011, thanks for the data for Igor Kiss
TFR 2010 by women’s nationality and completed education, Hungary 2011

Sources: Hungarian National Census 2011
Minority status hypothesis testing: collective vs. individual strategy

Geographical dispersion of Roma minority in Hungary and Slovakia; and Hungarian minority in Slovakia

1. Share of minority very high: 50%+
   (segregated residential areas ~ relative majority)

2. Share of minority: 19-49%

3. Share of minority: 4-18%

4. Share of minority very low: 0-3%
   (diaspora)
The average number of liveborn children by women’s birth cohort, nationality and geographical dispersion of Roma population, Hungary 2011

Share of Roma population in the block of residence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr of children</th>
<th>0-3%</th>
<th>4-18%</th>
<th>19-49%</th>
<th>50%+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952-1956</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-1961</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-1966</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1971</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1976</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-1981</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hungarian National Census 2011
The average number of liveborn children by women’s birth cohort, nationality and geographical dispersion of Roma population, Slovakia 2011

Share of Roma population in settlement of residence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr of children</th>
<th>0-3%</th>
<th>4-18%</th>
<th>19-49%</th>
<th>50%+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952-1956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-1961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Slovakian National Census 2011, thanks for the data for Branislav Sprocha
The average number of liveborn children by women’s birth cohort, nationality and geographical dispersion of Hungarian minority, Slovakia 2011

Share of Hungarian population in settlement of residence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr of children</th>
<th>0-3%</th>
<th>4-18%</th>
<th>19-49%</th>
<th>50%+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952-1956</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-1961</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-1966</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1971</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1976</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-1981</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Slovakian National Census 2011, thanks for the data for Branislav Sprocha
1. Well established minorities in national territories: no significant differences in fertility behaviour.

2. Roma minority have higher fertility compared to majority population (and to other minorities, as well).

3. The higher fertility of Roma minority could be assigned to compositional effect (~ low educated rural inhabitants).
### EDUCATIONAL Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a. Low educated Roma women have significantly more children on average than low educated majority women (cultural effect? structural effect?).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4b. Roma and majority women with high school education do not differ significantly in their fertility behaviour (structural integration; individual minority strategy; minority status hypothesis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY

| 5a. When the share of minority population is very low in the residential proximity, the fertility differences between minority and majority  
| :---:  
| - are the same (Roma) or  
| - lower (Hungarian)  
| *(individual strategies ~ upward mobility, minority status effect)*;  

| 5b. Segregation: the fertility differences between minority and majority are also small when the minority lives in a relative majority situation: the „majority” adapt their fertility behaviour to the behaviour of the minority *(adaptational effect)*.  

| 5c. Hungarians in Slovakia: largest difference in diaspora; smallest difference in segregation *(structural effect; individual strategies ~ upward mobility; minority status hypothesis)*.  

Thank you for the attention.
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