Poverty and Ethnicity in Six Post-Socialist Countries

Adrienne Czismady, Budapest

The transformation of Eastern European societies created laboratory conditions in the region. It became possible to carry out comparative studies, which had not been possible earlier. For instance, before the transformations it was difficult to answer the question whether the difference between Western societies and former socialist countries was mostly due to the different levels of economic development or to the different political systems. This made the comparative study of major social problems rather complicated. Poverty and ethnicity had and still have a very important place among these problems. This is the reason why a research group consisting of American and Eastern European sociologists, headed by Professor Iván Szelényi from Yale University, decided to study these problems. The present paper describes the first results of the activities of this research group.

Design and Organization of the Project

We attempted to answer our research questions with survey data and ethnographic case studies. With the support of the Ford Foundation, the research was conducted in six post-communist countries: Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Russia and Slovakia. These countries were selected based on theoretical considerations that had inspired our research. They can be considered as various ideal types of post-communist capitalisms. The countries also differ from each other concerning their ethnic composition.

The survey was conducted between autumn 1999 and spring 2000. In all countries the survey was conducted on the basis of a national representative sample. In Russia, we selected 2.500 individuals using the random method in parts of the country which are situated to the west from the Ural Mountains, while in all other countries the national random sample consisted of 1,000 individuals or households.[1] The randomly selected general population sample was supplemented with two randomly selected over-represented samples. Roma and extremely poor people were over-represented, because these two categories of population were important in verifying our theoretical hypotheses. Our survey was also supplemented with ethnographic studies. In all countries we selected two to three particularly poor settlements. The Ph.D. students of the national research groups prepared a sociography in these settlements. They made participating observations there. The reports on these sociographies can be found on the website of Yale University (*www.yale.edu/ccr/*).

After collecting the data and completing the sociography work, members of the national research groups spent one semester at Yale in order to analyse data jointly. This was made possible with the support of the Ford Foundation.

Between September 2000 and December 2001, three teams worked at Yale. Each team had between 6 to 8 members and American Ph.D. students studying at Yale also joined the analyses. In the fall semester of 2000, the main task was the comparison between countries. The team operating in the spring semester of 2001 compared ethnicity and poverty. The autumn semester of 2001 focused on feminisation of poverty in transition societies.

Theoretical Issues

In Eastern Europe both the extent of poverty and its nature are changing fast in the course of transition from state socialism to a market economy. Social scientists generally assumed that during socialism poverty was mainly determined by demographic factors. To simplify, families with many children as well as old and ailing people tended to be poor. According to certain observers, social position, ethnicity and gender are the main reasons for poverty in post-socialist times.

Furthermore, numerous researchers assert that some people might remain poor throughout their lives with the development of market economy in the region. Moreover, the poorest are segregated from the less poor in space more frequently than earlier. Therefore, in post-communism a new type of poverty can be observed. In other words, in the post communist period, a so-called underclass is developing. Especially, poverty and membership in ethnic groups are related and thus poverty concentrates in one or several ethnic groups of society. On the other hand, other researchers have found that not only certain ethnic groups are stricken more by poverty than the ethnic majority. There are a lot more women among the poor than men, i.e., poverty is feminising. The feminisation of poverty means that households, in which the head of the household is a woman, could become poor with higher probability than households with a man as the head of the household. Still another issue is that within poor households women bear the burden of poverty more than men. Finally, it seems that there are significant differences between countries concerning the extent, nature and dynamism of poverty in the post-socialist societies in Europe. Certain countries seem to follow neo-liberal reforms, as if they were on an evolutionary path towards a liberal market economy. Other countries were more careful in leaving behind the state socialist model and it seems that they are starting to develop a neo-patrimonial system of capitalism.

Social Determination of Poverty

Henryk Domański focused his analysis on the distribution of poverty within the social structure. To measure poverty he used the bottom fifty percent of mean family incomes

per capita as a poverty threshold. Following are some results of the regression analysis: Table 1.

Another line of the analysis was the effort to find evidence to prove the hypothesis that the underclass is constructed in the same way in Western and Eastern European countries. Poorly-educated are over-represented in the American and Western European underclass. Researchers have found that the basis of poverty there is the fact that individuals with a low level of education and training find it more difficult to get a stable job. Consequently, it is more probable that they would end up in the underclass or in unfavourable positions. (Ricketts/Sawhill 1988: 321, and Buckingham 1999: 57). Data in Table 1 show that low education plays a significant role in determining whether a household falls below the fifty-percent poverty line. The effect can be observed in all six countries. The risk to become poor among the highly educated is the lowest and increases with the decline of the level of education. With the exception of Poland and Russia where the curved line model applies, there is almost a straight-line connection between poverty and education.

According to Nicholas Lemann (1988: 81), the American underclass has become „a problem mainly for black people". Generally, in the Western societies the most important feature of the underclass is that ethnic minorities are overpresented in it. Indeed, belonging to an ethnic minority in Bulgaria, Hungary and Russia increases the chances of falling below the fifty-percent poverty line. However, in Poland and Slovakia one may observe the reverse effect. It can be assumed that in these countries the position of ethnic minorities is relatively better than that of the majority.

In Western societies there is a risk of becoming a member of the underclass primarily for residents living in the outskirts of towns. However, the poor in Eastern Europe live primarily in villages. The data of Table 1 indicate, with the exception of Hungary, that poverty is much more concentrated in rural areas than in city centres.

Poverty is determined most strongly by the position of the individual in the labour market. Table 1 shows that in all countries the probability of falling below the fifty-percent poverty line is the lowest among employees. The current status in the labour market of the interviewee was least important in Bulgaria, and most important in Hungary. The detrimental impact of long-term unemployment is less general in Eastern Europe. The data of Table 1 indicate that long-term unemployment increases the risks of poverty significantly only in Hungary.

In Bulgaria, Hungary and Poland there are no major differences between the poor and those, who belonged to labour related categories, such as intellectuals, workers, peasants and owners. Similar differences exist in Romania, Slovakia and Russia. On the basis of the results, it is not possible to give a final answer to the question as to what are the reasons for the development of the underclass. However, it is now clear in what directions the research should continue.

The Feminisation of Poverty

The fact that women are over-represented in the poor population has already been observed in developed and developing capitalist societies (Pearce 1978; Albelda and Tilly 1997). Éva Fodor wanted to demonstrate this phenomenon in relation to the countries of Eastern Europe, using the material of the research. She used four indicators to identify the poverty gap between sexes, which show: 1) the level of low nutrition, 2) possession of simple consumer articles, 3) the quality of housing, and 4) the subjective assessment of the interviewee about the financial position of his/her household. She also added the income-based poverty indicator to these four indicators (50% of median). On the basis of the analysis, Fodor found that while the adjusted per capita household income indicated a poverty gap between sexes only in Romania, other indicators complicated the picture. It showed feminisation of poverty in Bulgaria, Romania and Russia. Finally, she added a further complex absolute poverty indicator to the five indicators, which includes all indices with the exception of the housing index. As a result, it seems that Russian and Romanian women suffer from poverty most, followed by Bulgarian women. Certain signs indicate that a reverse poverty gap exists in Hungary and Poland.

The differences between countries are explained by wage discrimination on the labour market, quality and meaning of social rights as well as the situation of the economy. In countries where the wages of women are relatively high compared to men, or state benefits are generous and more people are saved from poverty, women are in a better situation both in an absolute sense and compared to men. It seems that this situation has occurred in countries where a market economy developed most rapidly and successfully. This might be a convincing relationship between the feminisation of poverty and economic development. The development of a market economy increased disparities between classes, however it contributed to the reduction of disparities between the sexes in East European poverty or in certain cases kept it at the same level. This holds true for the first ten years after the collapse of state socialism. According to optimists, women cannot afford to lose their advantages. According to pessimists, they cannot afford to keep them either.

How Do People Remember Socialism?

One of Szelényi's aims was to reconstruct memories of socialism. In the personal interviews we asked several questions about the extent of poverty experienced by the interviewees in the various stages of their lives. Using such retrospective questions of the past, we asked the interviewees whether they remembered themselves as poor at the age of 14. The same questions were asked for 1988 and 2000. Naturally, on the basis of the answers given to the questions we cannot reconstruct the history of socia-

Table 1: Coefficients from logistic regression models predicting poverty in six countries[2]

Independent variables	Bulgaria	Hungary	Poland	Romania	Russia	Slovakia
Sex (1=men)	0,89	1,41	0,85	1,01	0,64*	0,85
Education						
College	0,43*	0,42**	0,22*	0,52*	0,78	0,46*
Some college	0,82	0,72	0,77	0,53*	0,96	0,83
Secondary	0,90	0,90	1,09	0,65**	1,15	0,51**
Basic vocational	1,28	1,44*	1,90**	1,19**	1,06	0,82
Primary	1,22	1,50**	1,71*	1,86**	1,48**	1,60*
Some primary	2,02**	1,71**	1,64	2,61**	0,74	3,94**
Place of residence						
Rural areas	1,10	1,10	2,07**	1,79**	1,91**	1,10
City with 10.000–99.000 inhabitants	0,97	1,13	1,06	1,27	1,08	0,92
City above 100.000 inhabitants	0,97	1,18	0,75	0,79	1,05	0,89
Capital city	0,97	0,67**	1,06	0,56**	0,47**	1,11
Employed	0,52**	0,11**	0,14**	0,10**	0,28**	0,29**
Retired	0,71	0,17**	0,25**	0,26**	0,24**	0,36*
Pensioner	1,23	0,41**	0,59	0,33**	0,38**	0,93
Housewife	1,23	1,42	2,74*	1,75**	3,21**	2,10
Permanently unemployed	0,84	1,53*	0,59	1,09	0,88	1,45
Father unemployed	2,24**	0,96	1,83*	1,51	1,89**	1,35
Divorced	0,93	0,27**	0,47**	0,84	0,45**	0,49
Membership in ethnic minority	3,99*	2,07**	0,08	1,21	1,82**	0,93
Transfers	2,05**	2,08**	2,21**	2,96**	3,64**	2,69**
Chi-square/df	301/22	909/22	395/22	1042/22	699/22	320/22

Source: Domañski, 2001. ** p< 0,01; * p<0,05.

lism: individuals still alive in the year 2000, who entered their 14th year of age in the fifties do not represent a sample of the population in the fifties or even a sample of those entering the 14th year of age at that point. However, their answers presented a very good overview about people's memory of socialism in the year 2000. Therefore, we did not wish to put together a history of socialism, but rather wanted to focus on the memory of the „survivors" of socialism. Despite these restrictions, the results are extremely interesting.

Iván Szelényi's main findings were:

(1) During socialism people experienced less relative deprivation and poverty. The sharp reduction of poverty occurs right after Stalinism, during the 1960s;

(2) People experienced continued decline of poverty and relative deprivation during the 1980s as the first market-oriented reforms were implemented in some of the countries. The decline in the experience of poverty in countries with market reforms is at least as pronounced as in countries that resisted reforms;

(3) During the post-Stalinist time people report a similar degree of poverty and relative deprivation in all countries. People in poorer countries experienced a sharper decline in poverty than those in well-to-do countries, thus it appears that cross-country differences narrowed somewhat during socialism.

During the post-communist epoch (in the year 2000) the countries we studied could be classified according to two categories. Some can be classified as a neo-patrimonial form of capitalism (Bulgaria, Romania, Russia) and others as neo-liberal regimes (Hungary, Poland and Slovakia). Szelényi found similar levels of poverty in the first group in 2000 (a third or a fifth of the respondents reported no experience with poverty at all) and in the second group, the proportion of respondents with similar answers was twice as large (between 60–75%).

Without exception, interviewees in all countries remembered that they had a better life in 1988 than in 2000. In addition, members of all countries in age-groups that had completed their 14th year before 1988, remembered that they were poorer at the age of 14 than in 1988. It was also remarkable that although remembering 1988, the interviewees reported on different standards of life: Hungarians remember less poverty than people living in the other countries; the Poles, Russians and Romanians depicted less rosy living conditions for 1988 than the Bulgarians or Slovaks did. In 1988 the differences between these countries were very small. According to the memories of our interviewees, in 1988 the former socialist countries were closer to each other concerning their standard of living than at the time when our interviewees were 14 years old. In summary, our interviewees experienced socialism

as a period during which the differences between countries did not disappear, but decreased.

Looking at the differences between countries, Szelényi tried to analyse what happened in the first decade of post-communism considering the aspects under scrutiny. In 1993 he conducted a joint research with Donald Treiman, asking the same questions about living conditions in the same countries for 1993 and 1988. Therefore, we shall now have an opportunity to analyse whether the situation of our interviewees deteriorated or improved between 1993 and 2000. Data indicate that in 1993, compared to 1988, people believed that their living conditions deteriorated more or less similarly in all countries. However, in the year 2000 the trend changed. In countries that had completed a neo-liberal reform (i.e. Poland and Hungary), the proportion of those who believed that their position had deteriorated since 1988 had slightly declined, while in the neo-patrimonial systems interviewees reported further considerable deterioration in their living conditions. Comparing the year 2000 to 1993, fewer people who lived in neo-liberal regimes thought that they lived under worse conditions than in

1988. In neo-patrimonial systems the proportion of interviewees, who gave such an answer significantly increased compared to 1993. In other words, concerning the „social price" of transition, there were no major differences between the countries in 1993, whereas by the year 2000 a gap had opened between neo-liberal and neo-patrimonial capitalisms.

„Who Is Roma?"

The research acivities of János Ladányi, Iván Szelényi, György Csepeli und Dávid Simon focus on answering the question of „Who is Roma?" What is the number of Roma population in a given country, in a region of the world or in the entire world? To answer the question, the starting hypothesis of Ladányi/Szelényi is that all ethnic groups are a structure of the society. The borderline of all ethnic groups has faded. Who is „within" and who is „outside" this borderline greatly depends on who is doing the ethnic classification. György Csepeli and Dávid Simon found that the experience of being Roma is determined by the convergence of factors such as ancestry, mother tongue, neighborhood, and social bonds (Csepeli/Simon, 2001).

Table 2: Experience of poverty and experience of relative deprivation at age 14 by cohorts and by country (general population sample)

Country	Cohort[3]	Degree of poverty (in %)[4]			Altogether 100,0%	Extent of relative deprivation(in %)[5]			Altogether 100,0%
		Very poor	Poor	Not Poor	(N)	Below average	Average	Above average	(N)
Bulgaria	Pre-socialism	18,4	49,1	32,5	212	51,0	41,4	7,6	198
	Stalinism	11,7	48,0	40,2	179	44,9	48,3	6,8	183
	Socialism	3,1	18,1	78,8	590	19,4	58,9	21,7	576
	All %	8,0	30,3	61,8	981	30.8	53,2	16,0	952
Hungary	Pre-socialism	16,5	31,8	51,7	242	38,6	53,4	8,8	236
	Stalinism	16,3	34,1	49,6	123	42,2	53,7	4,1	115
	Socialism	3,4	15,5	81,1	567	16,1	74,5	9,4	565
	All %	8,5	22,2	69,3	932	25,2	66,4	8,4	922
Poland	Pre-socialism	35,4	27,8	36,7	158	48,1	44,2	7,7	154
	Stalinism	16,8	33,6	49,6	131	43,7	47,6	8,7	126
	Socialism	5,8	20,5	73,6	701	19,8	64,4	15,8	682
	All %	12,0	23,4	64,5	990	27,5	58,9	13,6	962
Romania	Pre-socialism	22,6	42,9	34.6	217	40,8	40,8	18,4	211
	Stalinism	13,4	45,9	40,7	172	44,6	42,3	13,1	168
	Socialism	6,2	29,2	64,5	660	21,1	57,9	21,0	653
	All %	10,8	34,8	54,4	1.049	29,0	51,8	19,2	1.032
Russia	Stalinism	33,0	45,6	21,4	927	58,9	34,7	6,4	900
	Socialism	3,8	39,7	56,5	1.441	19,2	65,2	15,6	1.409
	All	15,2	42,0	42,7	2.368	34,7	53,3	12,0	2.309
Slovakia	Pre-socialism	27,3	42,4	30,2	172	50,3	46,1	3,6	167
	Stalinism	11,8	40,9	47,2	127	35,9	58,6	5,5	128
	Socialism	2,7	24,6	72,7	692	15,1	76,0	8,9	662
	All %	8,2	29,8	62,1	991	24,1	68,4	7,5	957

Source: Szelényi, 2001

Table 3: Experience of poverty and experience of relative deprivation 1988 and 2000 (general population sample)

Country	Years	Experience of poverty in 1988 and 2000			Altogether 100.0%	Experience of relative deprivation in 1988 and 2000			Altogether 100.0%
		Very poor in %	Poor in %	Not poor in %	(N)	Below average income in %	Average income in %	Above average income in %	(N)
Bulgaria	1988	1,7	13,0	85,4	909	16,0	56,7	27,3	894
	2000	15,9	50,3	33,8	1006	80,3	16,1	3,6	995
Hungary	1988	2,1	9,5	88,4	912	15,1	73,8	11,1	897
	2000	5,8	21,4	72,8	934	42,6	51,3	6,1	933
Poland	1988	2,5	17,3	80,2	828	15,0	67,6	17,4	814
	2000	5,1	23,9	70,9	994	42,6	48,3	9,1	976
Romania	1988	5,2	25,3	69,5	866	16,1	58,4	25,4	849
	2000	15,8	45,4	38,8	1.051	68,5	27,1	4,4	1.047
Russia	1988	2,0	25,1	72,9	2,371	12,9	69,8	17,3	2.329
	2000	7,1	68,4	24,5	2,375	73,5	24,2	2,3	2.358
Slovakia	1988	1,0	14,1	84,9	830	8,6	83,2	8,2	821
	2000	4,7	25,2	70,1	1.001	42,6	50,2	7,2	990

Source: Szelényi, 2001

The survey gave an ideal opportunity for empirical analysis of this question. During the survey, we asked all interviewees to which ethnic group they belonged on the basis of their origin (self-identification) and we also asked the interviewers whether the families, where they just finished an interview, were considered Roma or not (classification by interviewers, which was done twice during the survey, once during the screening questions, and once during the repeated interview).

With regard to the analysis of the two classifications by interviewers, the results indicated significant differences between the three countries concerning the consistency of classification. Table 5 shows that ethnic borders varied in strength in the various countries. The borderline separating Roma people from non-Roma individuals is much stronger in Bulgaria than in Hungary and Romania. While in Bulgaria the interviewers are very certain that their judgment is correct, in Hungary and Romania they are more uncertain about it. When Csepeli and Simon

Table 4: Economic policies, economic growth and social indicators[6]

Country	A	B	C[8]	Survey data from 1993 and 2000[7]		
				D	E	F
Hungary	10.0	99	57	43	62	57
Poland	8.0	122	59	43	63	59
Bulgaria	5.0	67	68	80	69	84
Russia	2.0	57	60	74	65	79
Romania	6.0	70	–	69	–	76

A – Cumulative liberalization 1989–1999; **B** – Real GDP in 1999 (1988=100); **C** % of population reporting poverty[8] in 1993; **D** – % of population reporting poverty in 2000; **E** – % of population reporting deteriorated living conditions in 1993; **F** – % of population reporting deteriorated living conditions in 2000.

Source: Szelényi, 2001

Table 5: Ethnic classification of respondents who were reported to be Roma during the screening interviews after completion of the (%)

Ethnic classification of respondens	Bulgaria	Hungary	Romania
2nd interviewer certain	87,2	48,5	37,5
2nd interviewer not certain	6,5	16,3	34,2
Non-gypsy by the 2nd interviewer	6,3	35,2	28,3
Gypsy by the 1st interviewer	100,0	100,0	100,0
N	524	481	368

Source: Ladányi/Szelényi, 2001

examined the factors that contributed to ethnic categorization by the interviewers, there were differences between both the three countries and two situations (screener and survey[9]). They investigated the discrepant cases when the first interviewer perceived the respondent as Roma and the second interviewer failed to do so. Analysis of these differences can help to understand the peculiarity of the construction of ethnicity of the second interviewer. In Bulgaria, because of the low degree of discrepancy (6 %), this analysis does not yield any data of interest. In Romania, the attrition rates of color of skin and way of life were relatively higher than in Hungary. In the case of language, the tendency was just the opposite. Family name continued to be unnoticed.

In Romania the ethnical borderline seems ever more flexible than the one in Hungary. It is further strengthened by the review of the self-identification of interviewees. Of the people assumed to be Roma by the interviewers during the screening survey, 73,3% in Bulgaria, 36,8% in Hungary, and only 30,7 in Romania consider themselves Roma individuals. Therefore, the definition of Roma ethnicity significantly differs in countries, and it also depends on who is doing the classification. In Bulgaria, there is quite a high degree of agreement within the society as to who are Roma, and only the Muslim Gypsies intend to somewhat differentiate this uniform judgement of the society. On the other hand, in Hungary and Romania the majority of those

who are considered Roma by their environment in the society do not accept this judgement in a survey, and do not consider themselves Roma either.

The fact that the ethnic borderlines are laid down so clearly in Bulgaria is due to segregation and use of ethnic language, according to Ladányi and Szelény. There is a considerable overlap between those considering themselves Roma and those living under ethnically segregated conditions. In general, those, whose mother tongue is Gypsy consider themselves Roma.

As it was stated by Ladányi and Szelényi, there are significant differences between the analysed countries in ethnic classification systems. The Bulgarian ethnic classification system is more stable and ethnic borderlines are more rigid than in the other two countries. At least with regard to the rigidity of ethnic borderlines, the Bulgarian system is more similar to the one known from the United States, while the Romanian and Hungarian systems remind more of the Brazilian one. This is even more remarkable because in this case it involves Roma classification, while in the American and Brazilian cases it is classification of black people. The current research does not support the earlier assumption, according to which and as a result of anthropological reasons, the classification system of black persons is much more rigid than that of Roma people. However, the fact that in ethnic classification anthropological, biological or

Table 6: Residential segregation of the neighborhood by countries in Roma over-sample (%)

Residential segregation	Bulgaria	Hungary	Romania
Gypsy settlement	56,2	11,6	10,9
Majority of the population is Roma	21,0	22,5	17,1
Majority of the population is non-Roma poor	11,7	26,0	27,4
No concentration of either poor or Roma	11,1	39,9	44,6
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0
N	524	481	368

Source: Ladányi/Szelényi, 2001

genetic factors have relatively little significance is mainly determined by social mechanisms.

The discourse in Hungary (both of society and experts) is relating the Roma to the issue of poverty. So, it is important to examine how society constructs the image of the poor and of Roma people. Csepeli and Simon used three models to explain the difference between being poor and being Roma. „Inconsistent ethnic categorization certainly is a function of the perceived ethnic character of the neighborhood. In the case of consistent outgroup categorization which does not correspond with the ingroup perspective the people believed to be Roma are not only living in Roma neighborhood but are subject of several social disadvantages such as low income, overcrowdedness and material deprivation. These people who deny to be Roma are not only perceived to be Roma but they tend to be more poor than the non-Roma poor. The stigma of poverty, however, was proved to be related most in the case of those who were willing to identify themselves as Roma.“ (Csepeli and Simon 2001)

The other very important theoretical issue is the underclass question. Iván Szelényi stated it in the following way: „Post-communism generated a qualitatively different experience in the life of Roma. Gypsies of course were always poor, but they may now have constituted an „underclass“ with the fall of communism. To formulate this theoretically: during pre-socialist times Gypsies constituted a pariah caste, or an under-caste. They were discriminated against, they were poor, but they lived in quite traditional communities and performed socio-economic functions, which were not well rewarded, but were seen as necessary. Socialism – to put it as simply as one can – proletarianized this pariah caste, included them into society, but slotted them into the very bottom of the social hierarchy. Discrimination persisted (though given the official anti-racism of the communist regimes was suppressed into a collective sub-conscious) and Gypsies had to perform the physically most demanding, dirty, unskilled manual tasks. They were, however, an integral part of society. During post-communist transformation the bottom fell out below the Roma. They are not in society any more. The ethnic majority sees the Roma as a nuisance, as a group, which could be disposed of. They are not simply poor. Society sees them as ‘useless’ – for the first time they constitute an underclass.“ (Szelényi, 2001: 60.)

Adrienne Czismady ist Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin an der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

References

Albelda, Randy and Tilly, Chris 1997. Glass Ceiling and Bottomless Pits: Women's Work, Women's Poverty. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Buckingham, Alan 1999. Is there an underclass in Britain? British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 50: 49–75.

Csepeli, György 2001. Social Psychological Roots of Discrimination against the Roma minority in Eastern Europe. Paper presented at the joint meeting of the Law and Society Association and Research Committee on Sociology of Law held in Budapest, July 4–7, 2001.

Csepeli, György and Simon, Dávid 2001: Discrimination against and its consequences on the Roma minority in Eastern and Central Europe.

Csismady, Adrienne 2002. Central Issues in Hungarian Poverty Research. International Social Science Council – CROP Newsletter. Vol. 9, 4.

Domañski, Henryk 2001: Social Determinants of Poverty in Post-Communist Societies. Review of Sociology Vol. 7, 2, 37–60.

Fodor, Éva 2001: The Feminization of Poverty in Six Post-State Socialist Societies. Review of Sociol. Vol. 7, 2, 91–107.

Ladányi, János and Szelényi, Iván 2001: The Social Construction of Roma Ethnicity in Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary During Market Transition. Review of Sociology Vol. 7,2, 79–89.

Lemann, Nicholas 1988. A culture of poverty created the black underclass. In Bender, D.-B. Leone (eds.): In Poverty: Opposing Viewpoints. St. Paul: Greenhaven, 80–85.

Pearce, Diane 1978. The feminization of poverty: women's work, and welfare. Urban and Social Change Review, 11, 28–36.

Ricketts, Erol and Sawhill, Isabell 1988: Defining and measuring underclass. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 7, 316–325.

Szelényi, Iván 2001: Poverty under post-communist capitalism – the effects of class and ethnicity in a cross-national comparison. Paper presented at the conference „Unity and Diversity", Bruges, October 29–30, 2001.

[1] The detailed description of sampling is included in Review of Sociology 7 (2001), 2.

[2] The logistic regression model in multiplicative form was fitted using the binary response coded poverty. The odds ratios (eb) represent the multiplicative effect of a one-unit change in the predictor variables on the odds of being in poverty: odds=1 indicate a lack of any effect, with values higher than 1 indicating a positive effect, and values below 1 indicating a negative effect on the predictor variables of poverty.

[3] Cohorts were coded the following way. Those who turned 14 in 1948 or before are coded „pre-socialism", those who were young adults between 1949–58 were coded „Stalinism", others who turned 14 before 1988 were coded „socialism".

[4] „Degree of poverty" variable is coded the following way. Those who reported „hunger" are coded as „very poor"; those who reported poverty at least in one or a maximum of three of the other variables (other than hunger) were coded as „poor", those who reported poverty in none of the four dimensions were coded „non poor."

[5] Extent of relative deprivation is coded the following way. „Far below average" and „below average" income was coded as „below average." „Far above average" and „above average" income was coded as „above average."

[6] Transition Report 2000, European Bank of Reconstruction and Development, p. 21 and p. 65.

[7] Data from: Szelényi, Iván and Treiman, Donald J. 1993. Social Stratification in Eastern Europe After 1989, in: Transformation Processes in Eastern Europe (Proceedings of a Workshop held at the Durch National Science Foundation, 3–4 Dec. 1992). The Hague; Emigh, Rebecca and Szelényi, Iván (ed.) 2001. Poverty, Ethnicity and Gender in Eastern Europe during Market Transition, Westport, CT.

[8] We only have one measure of „poverty" which was asked in identical ways in 1993 and 2000. We asked people whether their family earned average, above average or below average incomes. In this instance we regard families, who reported earning below average income as „poor", in the sense that they experience „relative deprivation".

[9] Of course, the interviewers in the two situations were different; they not necessarily met the same respondent but they did visit the same household.