BUDAPESTI UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND ECONOMICS

Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences

Doctoral School in Philosophy and History of Science

THE PROCESS OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION

Case studies about one scientific and one rural community

Gábor Héra

Dissertation

Advisor

Dr. János Tanács

BME GTK Department of Philosophy and History of Science

2016

Table of contents

1. Introduction

The focus of my dissertation is the phenomenon of social exclusion. The term itself is widespread. Researchers, representatives of international organisations, human rights activists, policy makers, politicians, scientists and practitioners of specific fields build upon this concept while describing forms of inequalities and processes of exclusion in different societies. However, thorough investigation reveals that the concept is often used in different ways at different times and at different locations. In order to clarify this diversity of approaches and definitions in this area, I will shortly describe the routes and the core elements of the concept in the beginning of the dissertation.

As the following chapter will introduce, the definition and aspects of social exclusion provide an excellent framework for interpreting processes at the macro level and describing the situation of disadvantaged groups within the society, e.g. the Roma minority in Hungary. However, the dissertation underlines the importance of focusing even on the micro level, where groups are formed and group-members communicate and interact with each other in their everyday life. The aim of my dissertation is connected to this micro level as I would like to focus on the source of social exclusion and to identify some factors that tempt group-members to exclude 'others'. In order to achieve this aim, the situation of the Roma minority in Hungary and particularly in a Hungarian village will be described. The profound analysis that is based on an action research program will reveal exclusionary practices that are observable at the micro level. Several specific stories will provide support to my readers in understanding not only the everyday life and conflicts of the villagers but the manifestations of social exclusion and the motives behind rejection. At the end of this chapter, I will conclude that the conflicts between the local Roma and non-Roma are not (solely) interethnic. The real underlying reason for conflicts are the clashes of the powerful groups of interests in the village. Among other factors, this can also be a reason why exclusion towards the Roma, the most vulnerable and powerless group, emerges and intensifies. In addition, I will point at the local conflicts that were considered risky to unveil and to talk about and emphasise that lack of open communication often leads to stereotyping and thus can intensify social exclusion.

The following section will turn the attention of my readers to the way social exclusion emerges and causes clashes in the social scientist community in Hungary. The

prevailing norms of the community that were violated by a young researcher will be outlined. I will also provide an overview of a research report that led to an intense debate and introduce critics representing the "guards" of the established science and the defence of the "separatist" researchers. The consequences of the debate will be also elaborated. The story will reveal that opposition of different groups can lead to exclusion due to the phenomenon of in-group favouritism. In addition, I will point even at the role of the negative emotions that arose due to the intense debate resulting in stronger anti-outgroup reactions. Finally, it will be emphasised that exclusion can emerge, even as deviation is often interpreted as a violation that invites punishment; deviants are frequently isolated in order to clarify and strengthen the values of the in-group.

The case studies support to understand the importance of the micro level and to identify some important factors that contribute to the emergence of the social exclusion. In addition, the second case study even helps me to describe science as a practice that is not operated by objective, independent and neutral researcher but a social activity, a fully human enterprise that is organised by human actors who are influenced by norms, personal biases and emotional involvement.

At the end of the dissertation, I will identify some possible questions and directions with regard to further research work.

2. The concept of 'social exclusion'

The concept describes an old reality as '*social exclusion and excluded groups have been around for as long as men and women have lived in communities and have wished to give a meaning to community life*' (Estivill 2003, p. 12). Therefore, the historical roots of the term can be analysed by going back in time even as far as Aristotle. However, the present investigation will focus only on the past fifty years when a rapid spread of the concept has been observed.

As Silver (1994) underlined the term of 'exclusion' had been the subject of the public discourse in France during the 1960s and had become wide-spread only after the social and political crises in the 1980s when more and more types of social disadvantages had arisen and welfare states had seemed to be incapable of handling these problems. Silver followed the way the increasing numbers of social groups – handicapped, young people leaving school without the adequate skills to find a job, unemployed, victims of xenophobia, migrants, Muslims, residents of suburbs – had been identified as facing exclusion from the most of the society and the way the French state had reacted and aimed at strengthening the principles of social cohesion, sharing and integration. In one of his later publications, Silver referred to René Lenoir who had been the Secretary of State for Social Action in the French Gaullist government in 1974. Lenoir had considered further social groups as 'excluded', for example the '*mentally and physically handicapped, suicidal people, aged invalids, abused children, substance abusers, delinquents, single parents, multi-problem households, marginal, asocial persons, and other social "misfits"* (1995 p. 60). Silver even summarised the contemporary literature people may have been excluded from. This list is quite long; not only livelihood, secure, permanent employment, earnings, education but inter alia citizenship and legal equality, democratic participation, the nation or the dominant race, family and sociability, humanity, respect, fulfilment and understanding are also part of the enumeration (Silver 1995, p. 60). As it is clear to see, the literature of 'exclusion' was not for the abstemious; Shaaban even claimed that anyone could be a subject of social exclusion who diverged in any perceived way from the mean of the population. (2011, p. 120.)

This tendency was supported by the sudden and enthusiastic adaptation of the concept across Europe. The spread of the term is detectable by the way the focus of the anti-

poverty programs of the European Union shifted from 'poverty' to 'exclusion' between 1975 and 1994 (Room 1995, Silver 1995). Furthermore, the importance of social inclusion and of the fight against social exclusion were incorporated into the Maastrich Treaty and its Protocol, while the Structural Funds and the European Social Fund also emphasized the importance of combating social exclusion. In addition, numerous recommendations of the European Parliament, the Commission's Social Action Programmes, the so-called Green and White Papers included commitment to make social inclusion stronger and cease social exclusion. The term 'exclusion' is still a wide-spread concept nowadays – partly because the fight for social inclusion could only be evaluated by the measurement of social exclusion (Shaaban 2011). The acceptance and extensive application of the term within the EU is proved among many others by the work of the European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion (European Commission 2015a), the event of the European Year 2010 for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion (European Commission 2015b), the National Social Inclusion Strategies with their objective to fight against social exclusion and numerous reports (e.g. the Poverty and Social Exclusion Report (Eurobarometer 74.1, 2010), the European Social Statistics – Income, Poverty and Social Exclusion or the Poverty (European Commission 2002) and the Poverty and Exclusion in Rural Areas (European Commission 2008). In addition, several international organisations such as the United Nations, the World Bank, the UNESCO, the UNDP and the International Labour Organisation have also been increasing their use of the concept of exclusion (Estivill 2003).

Scholars have analysed the further spread of the discourse of 'exclusion' (and the difficulties of using this term in different societies) all over the world (Gore 1994, Sen 2000, Saith 2001, Behrman et al. 2002, Estiviil 2003, Gardener and Subrahmanian 2006). Within the framework of the current study, however, focus will solely be on the way the concept describes and explains marginalization of social groups in Europe, and more especially in Hungary.

As introduced earlier, 'social exclusion' was a political concept that had been introduced for political reasons in the 1960s. In 1997, Else Oyen pointed at the unfounded character of the term emphasising that new entrants of the field *pick up the concept and are now running all over the place arranging seminars and conferences to find a researchable content in an umbrella concept for which there is*

limited theoretical underpinning' (p. 63). Murard also described the concept as not *'rooted in the social sciences, but an empty box given by the French state to the social sciences in the late 1980s as a subject to study… The empty box has since been filled with a huge number of pages, treatises and pictures, in varying degrees academic, popular, original and valuable'* (2002, p. 41).

Despite the process of the 'filling' the concept is still contested, has multiple meanings and as Saraceno put it *'what social exclusion means is about far from being univocally achieved'* (2001, p.3). Atkinson and Hills also emphasised (while citing Weinberg and Ruano-Borbalan) that *'observers in fact only agree on a single point: the impossibility to define the status of the 'excluded' by a single and unique criterion. Reading numerous enquiries and reports on exclusion reveals a profound confusion amongst experts'* (1998, p. 13). Other scholars also pointed at the lack of an adequate definition and scientific conceptualization of the term – some of them emphasised that 'social exclusion' was often seen as a potential result of a number of risk factors without the result explicated by precise and accurate definition (Atkinson and Hills 1998, Jehoel-Gijsbers and Vrooman 2007, Levitas et al. 2007, Shaaban 2011). Yet others underlined that the picture was also blurred because the words changed their meanings when they crossed borders and thus created dissimilarities in interpretation (Estiviil 2003, Ferge 2002, de Haan 1999). The lack of an exact definition can be recognized even by the titles of scientific articles, such as the *'Social exclusion: a concept in need of definition?'* (Peace 2001) and *'The Problematic Nature of Exclusion'* (Sibley 1998).

All of these factors may result in the confusion that is verified by those long lists summarising the definitions of 'social exclusion'; Mathieson introduces altogether 13 definitions from the academic and further 5 descriptions from the governmental/intergovernmental field (Mathieson et al 2008, p. 86) while Levitas summarises altogether 12 explanations (Levitas et al 2007, p. 21) for the same term. Not only the academic but the political field has also not supported perspicacity; as I have already underlined the concept has been widely adopted across Europe and it has become one of the fundamental ideas of the European Union policies and social policy. However, the meanings of the term have been unstable and a consistent theoretical underpinning has been still lacking (Daly, 2006).

It should also be recalled that disturbance regarding the meaning of the concept is supported by scientific disciplines as well. Sociologists, cultural anthropologists, social

psychologists, psychologists, economists, political scientists, criminologists and lawyers have used the term frequently – even if they have referred to different phenomena sometimes. On the contrary, some of the disciplines have described the same phenomena while using not only (or not solely) the term of 'social exclusion'. For example, economists use the term of 'discrimination' while describing only one dimension of exclusion; the way specific social groups are blocked from the job market. Legal texts also refer to 'discrimination' while recognising forms of segregation, exclusion, harassment or victimisation violating the requirement of equal treatment. Social workers prefer the term 'deprivation' (and further, more complex forms of deprivations as 'social deprivation', 'relative deprivation' or 'multiple deprivation') while introducing the depth and characteristics of poverty, disadvantages, lack of resources and social exclusion. Experts of social policy also describe 'deprivation' – for example when they measure inequality by different statistical-based indices (as the Robin Hood, Theil, Atkinson index, the Gini Coefficient or several alternatives and variations). Several times sociologists use 'discrimination' and 'social exclusion' as synonyms while investigating the action or practice that differentiates on the basis of some ascribed or perceived characteristics of individuals or social groups. Social psychology and psychology give varied descriptions while defining the reactions of human beings on 'social exclusion'. However, a lot of studies about this issue build upon various terms, such as 'marginalisation', 'discrimination', 'rejection', 'oppression', 'bullying', 'abuse', 'ostracism' or 'ignorance'. All in all, I agree with Byrne who stated that

'Social exclusion' is not simply a term in social politics. It is also a central concern of social science. However, there is a problem. The academic debate on social exclusion provides an excellent illustration of the problems posed by the reification of disciplinary boundaries within the contemporary academy [...] There is a cross-discipline/-field debate and discussion about this topic, but it remains at best only partially coherent, primarily because there are fundamental dissonances in the way in which the processes of social change, which can be subsumed under the heading of "social exclusion", are conceptualized and, above all else, measured.' (2005, p. 3-4)

According to some scholars (Silver 1994, Beall 2002, Levitas 2005, Shaaban 2011) the concept allowed for different interpretations about the causes and solutions of inequality. Thereby, different political, ideological, historical roots created their own

distinct meanings and usages of the term (and thereby induced different policies and actions to address social exclusion). Here, I refer to Silver (1994) describing his threefold typology of the multiple meanings of 'exclusion'. According to Silver, the '*solidarity paradigm*' was born from the French Republican political ideology and thereby it underlines; the state has to repair the social bond broken down between the individual and the society. This approach supposes the existence of a '*core of shared values, a "moral community" around which social order is constructed, and processes of assimilation of individuals into this community, and their ability to express their membership through active participation are important*' (Silver 1995, p. 7) Solidarity is the keyword. Solidarity that implies political rights and duties of the citizens. This paradigm considers important to establish public institutions to hinder exclusion and support social integration.

On the contrary, the '*specialization paradigm*' rooted in the Anglo-American liberal thought looks at 'social exclusion' as the result of specialization; of social differentiation, the economic division of labour, and the separation of spheres '*thus exclusion results from an inadequate separation of social spheres, from the application of rules inappropriate to a given sphere, or from barriers to free movement and exchange between spheres*' (Silver 1995, p. 68). This approach points at the individual (and micro-sociological) causes of economic exclusion and reflex on the separated groups and discrimination that denies individuals full participation in social life. The paradigm finds the remedy somewhere else for marginalisation; '*group and market competition and the liberal State's protection of individual rights impede the operation of [...] exclusion*' (Silver 1994, pp. 542-543).

Finally, I should name the '*monopoly paradigm*' that was influenced by the European Left considering 'exclusion' as a result of the formation of group monopoly. According to this approach, 'exclusion' arises '*from the interplay of class, status, and political power and serves the interests of the included*' (Silver 1994, p. 543). Institutions and cultural distinctions create boundaries between groups and thereby keep away deprived social groups (and thereby make them outsiders and oppressed). Social democratic citizenship and active participation in the society are able to mitigate repression.

Levitas (2005) also identified three different approaches while describing discourses about 'social exclusion' in the United Kingdom. The *redistributionist discourse*

emphasises poverty as the prime cause of social exclusion. The *moral underclass discourse* focuses rather on the behaviour of the poor and less on the structure of the society. In addition, it supposes that welfare benefits are bad as they undermine people's ability and will to be self sufficient creating dependency. Finally, the *social integrationalist discourse* narrows the definition of 'exclusion' to participation in paid work. According to Levitas, this approach obscures the inequalities between paid workers, especially between men and women.

The different paradigms and discourses describe well the difficulties of finding one unified definition of 'social exclusion' – as they attribute the phenomenon to different causes and thereby create differences in emphasis and tone.[1] As de Haan put it: '*This emphasis on paradigms is helpful in stressing that social exclusion is (or should be) a theoretical concept, a lens through which people look at reality, and not reality itself. [...] Yet social exclusion remains a concept, and the discourse emphasises that it is a way of looking at society*' (1999, p. 5).

Notwithstanding all of these difficulties, some common grounds of the definitions can be identified and thereby core elements of 'social exclusion' can be specified. Thereby one can avoid the usage of a '*catch-all expression, a corner shop offering something of everything, a buzz word that can be used on any occasion, or as being like chewing gum in the sense that it can be stretched at will*' (Estivill 2003, p. 12).

Firstly, I would like to introduce the **multidimensional** aspect of the term. As Shaaban summarised, scholars identified several realms of everyday life – usually the economic, cultural, social and political dimensions – where inequalities arose (2011, p. 120). Thereby, the concept of 'social exclusion' encompasses not only lack of paid work or income poverty but – among many others – lack of access to education, information, childcare and health facilities, accessibility of public provisions, poor living conditions, etc. Similar distinction is made by Silver who argued that social exclusion '*is multidimensional in that it marries the material and non-material, economic and social dimensions of disadvantage*' (2006, p. 4). It is important to underline that social exclusion emerges at more than one dimension at the same time resulting inequality,

---

[1] Silver himself also emphasised that exclusion varied in meaning according to national and ideological context and '*empirical referents of the idea of exclusion are not always discussed in that terminology*' (Silver 1994, p. 539). Moreover, he also recognised that the concept was expressed in several ways (superfluity, irrelevance, marginality, foreignness, alterity, closure, disaffiliation, dispossession, deprivation and destitution) and underlined that the concept refer to more than one term.

negative consequences for quality of life, well-being and future life chances (Sen 2000, Miliband et al 2006, Levitas et al 2007, de Haan 2001). Estivill also emphasised that exclusion was caused by relatively distinct factors *'which together have an impact [...] on the living standards of individuals, groups and spaces'* (2003, p. 40).

Another important characteristic of social exclusion is the ***dynamical aspect*** – the phenomena underlying what is beyond the current status and the process through which people become excluded. This attribute refers to the *'changing and interactive nature of social exclusion along different dimensions and at different levels over time [...] The experience of social exclusion is unequally distributed across socio-economic and ethnic groups and that it is not a static state experienced by the same social groups at all times in all places'* (Mathieso et al 2008, p. 13). For example, stereotypes about the 'Roma people' and the consequences of their potential stigmatising probably differ in Canada (where the first Roma migrants have arrived just a few years ago) and in Hungary (where the Roma people live since the 13th century). At the same time, I can presuppose that Roma people's experience about their own social exclusion is different nowadays as it was during the socialism or even before. Exclusion happens in time and can change during centuries, decades or even years, during the lifetime of a single person. As it will be introduced later within the chapter, this happened in Hungary after the socialism when the state owned industrial companies, where most of the Roma had worked, disappeared.

The dynamical aspect warns of the importance of the process by which the exclusion from social relationships results in further deprivations and thereby further decreasing of the living opportunities (although, Saraceno (2001) suggested not to offer a view of the poor as mere victims of society launched in a hopeless downward path). De Haan underlined that '*the central definition of the notion of social exclusion [...] stresses the processes through which people are being deprived, taking the debate beyond descriptions of merely the situation in which people are*' (1999, p. 5). Estivill also gave a similar description while stating that social exclusion '*designates an accumulation of confluent processes which, through successive ruptures, have their origins in the heart of the economy, politics and society, and which distance and render inferior individuals, groups, communities and spaces in relation to centres of power, resources and the prevailing values*' (2003, p. 115). This approach supports the understanding of social exclusion as '*succession, and cumulation, of breaks and disadvantages in an individual's life*' (Saraceno 2001, p. 15).

Finally, I introduce the **relational** aspect of the concept emphasising the importance of social relationships and the need to the comparison with others. According to this perspective, an observer can not decide whether a person is socially excluded by looking at his/her circumstances itself in isolation – one has to take even the others into consideration. Sen cited from Adam Smith in order to explain the relational aspect:

'By necessaries I understand not only the commodities which are indispensably necessary for the support of life, but what ever the custom of the country renders it indecent for creditable people, even the lowest order, to be without.... Custom has rendered leather shoes a necessary of life in England. The poorest creditable person of either sex would be ashamed to appear in public without them' (Sen 2000, p.7)

Mathieson introduced another interpretation of the relational perspective on social exclusion as a product of power relationships within the society that were created historically '*that assign social identities and associated power and status to different individuals, groups, classes, and even States*' (2008, p. 14) From this perspective, exclusion is a weapon used by the ruling groups in order to maintain current power relationships.

In short, the concept of social exclusion is still contested and has multiple meanings. Partly, as the term was first introduced as a political concept without an adequate definition and conceptualization and, to some extent, as the different political, ideological, historical roots created their own distinct interpretations. However, some common grounds of the definitions can be identified and thereby core elements of 'social exclusion' can be specified; it obviously has multidimensional, dynamical and relational attributes. Hereinafter, I will refer to social exclusion as Levitas and his co-authors use the concept:

'Social exclusion is a complex and multidimensional process. It involves the lack or denial of resources, rights, goods and services, and the inability to participate in the normal relationships and activities, available to the majority of people in a society, whether in economic, social, cultural or political arenas. It affects both the quality of life of individuals and the equity and cohesion of society as a whole' (Levitas 2007, p. 25).

I consider this definition profound enough to describe a complex social phenomenon while at the same time emphasising the three aspects that were introduced in detail in this chapter.

3. Social exclusion of the Roma minority in Hungary

The process and the impacts of social exclusion and the characteristics of the excluded social groups are focal points of several scientific disciplines in Hungary. However, primarily social sciences, first of all sociology and social policy deal with these phenomena.[2]

While describing social exclusion, sociologists and experts of social policy – as well as scholars, politicians, media workers, policy makers etc. building upon the findings of social sciences – usually point at poverty and child poverty, unemployment, disabilities, homelessness, living in disadvantaged regions etc. However, the Roma as '*the poorest of the poor*' (National Social Inclusion Strategy 2010, p 6.), as the main

---

[2] Their openness towards these issues are confirmed by

1) forums and conferences; as the 'Multiple discrimination and intersectionality' conference at the Hungarian Academy of Science Institute of Sociology (szociologia.hu 2014), lectures at the latest conference of the Hungarian Sociological Association in 2014 (Kund et al. 2014) or the 'I speak out' forum (hilscher.hu 2011) organised by the Hilscher Rezso Association of Social Policy.

2) institutions; as the 'Insitute for Minority Studies of the Hungarian Academy of Science', the 'Research Department for Social Integration and Social Policy' or the 'Section of Roma/Gypsy Researches' of the Hungarian Sociological Associaton.

3) sociology methods based research programs focusing on discrimination, prejudice and victims of social exclusion; as the projects supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office (e.g. the Multiple discrimination: Personal and Institutional Perceptions, Impacts, and Actions) or further investigations of the Institute for Sociology (e.g. the Roma media representation) (Országos Tudományos Kutatási Alapprogram, 2015).

4) publications; among many others the third thematical issue of the Review of Sociology in 2010 or many of the articles of the 'Esély' journal published by the Hilscher Rezso Association of Social Policy.

5) the explicit and hidden content of the textbooks; sources which give valuable information about the current paradigm (Kuhn 1996) as they are used as pedagogic instruments to educate new scientists and thereby can give insight into the norms, rules and framework of the 'normal science'. Here, I only refer to the 'Introduction in Sociology' written by Rudolf Andorka (Andorka 2006). The textbook is widely used at social science departments of various universities in Hungary. The author emphasised in the Introduction that '*originally, the commitment towards the poor, oppressed and disadvantaged people belong to sociology*' (Andorka 2006, p. 27). He even made his personal conviction explicit about inequalities that were harmful and abonimable. In addition, he considered it important to cite Raymond Aron's classification about the roles of sociologists who (as the 'people's doctor') investigated the '*problems of the poor, oppressed and vulnerable people*' (Andorka 2006, p. 41)

victims of social exclusion, is almost always on the agenda. Thereby, this chapter will also focus on the situation of the Roma people.

In the beginning of the chapter it should be underlined that Hungarian Roma are a rather heterogeneous population. It consists of groups such as the Vlach, the Boyas and the Romungro and also of several sub-groups (Szuhay 2002). In addition, Roma differ in terms of spoken language (Kemény 2002), integration into the job market, socio-economic status etc. Despite the fact that the majority of the society fails to agree on who is Roma and who is not (Csepeli and Simon 2004) this population is often considered as one homogeneous group. Within this study, I refer to 'Roma' as a single group – especially as available statistical data usually provides information only according to this homogenizing.

It should also be mentioned that the traditional Hungarian name for this ethnic group is 'Gypsy' but the politically correct one is Roma. (Although it is debated even by the Roma whether 'Gypsy' implies negative connotations.) However, partly because of the historical perspective of my investigation, I use both of the terms and consider them as synonyms.

3.1 Social exclusion at the macro level

The complexity of social exclusion would have been hidden if I used the term without revealing its aspects that have already been introduced in the previous chapter. Therefore, I will shed light on the multidimensional, dynamical and the relational attributes while describing the situation of the Roma people in Hungary. This description helps me to give not only theoretical but a practical description as well about the way social exclusion and its aspects operate.

The Roma in Hungary do not belong to the newly arrived migrants. We do not know exactly when they arrived from the Balkans fleeing from the conquering Turks. However, sources from the 13th-14th centuries have already mentioned the arrival and the presence of the Roma – at that time known as Egyptians – in Wallachia, Transylvania and later in Hungary (Dupcsik 2009). Roma came to Hungary first and later migrated to Western European countries (Shahar 2007).

Between the 15th and 17th centuries the Roma found their place in the Hungarian society; during the war against the Ottoman Empire, the lack of craftsmen and the military preparations gave them the opportunity to work. Roma were employed on the fortifications, construction works, in repair of arms, weapons production, but also in manufacture or as musicians (Kemény 2005). Some Gypsy groups were even granted privileges (Dupcsik 2009).

However, the economic, political and social transformations in Hungary after the beginning of the 18th century brought some changes into the relationship between the Roma and the most of the society. According to Nagy, this was the period when non-Roma identified the Roma with those things that they feared; as exclusion, poverty, homelessness, starvation, existential uncertainty (Nagy 2004). Kemény underlined that the „enlightened" absolutism characteristic of the era of Maria Theresia tried to *'regulate anything that was still unregulated'* (Kemény 2005, p. 15). The state prohibited the use of the name 'Gypsy' and required the terms 'new peasant' and 'new Hungarian'. Many other rules came to power about restrictions on marriage, travelling, begging, clothing, using the Romani language etc. Mezey considered these regulations as a rough attack against the lifestyle and social structure of the Gypsies. He underlined that *'the regulation resulted in an anti-Roma campaign. The justifications of the legal acts created the image of the „bad Gypsy". However, the drawing about the „good Gypsy" was not so successful. After a while, the prejudiced thinking became typical in the society'* (Mezey 2002, p. 87).

However, the following century brought positive changes into the life of the Roma again. As Kemény put it: *'at the time of the 1893 census, the situation of Roma was significantly better than it had been in earlier decades or centuries. Economic historians have calculated that Hungary's national income doubled or even tripled*

between 1867 and 1900. This growth had a tangible effect on Roma livelihoods.' (Kemény 2005, p. 41) That time, out of 174.000 Roma adults 143.000 were wage-earners, being active mainly in agriculture and in industry (primarily as blacksmiths), commerce, or working as musicians.

However, after World War I the situation of Roma became worse again in terms of employment and because of the political ideology and the growing discriminatory tendencies. During World War II, after the German occupation of Hungary, the deportation of the Roma population began. According to estimations, up to 1,500,000 Roma were persecuted because of their origins during the Nazi era in Europe (Hancock 2005, p. 392). As Bársony estimates, about 60,000-70,000 of them were Hungarian Roma, of whom 10,000-12,000 died (Bársony and Daróczi, 2007, p. 21).

Although after World War II, the new, democratic government declared the principle of equality and prohibited discrimination, in economic terms the position of the Gypsy population deteriorated. Land distribution began in 1945 – without Roma. In spite of the fact that many Roma made livelihoods from seasonal work in agriculture. Land distribution also eliminated the jobs that previously were available for Roma by medium and large landowners.

However, the next decades brought some positive changes as well. The ideology of communism and the necessity of labour force during the enforced industrialisation in socialist Hungary after World War II provided the opportunity to the Roma for social integration. This was due to the fact that the state-owned industrial companies needed semi- and unskilled workers in large numbers. The forced industrialization created full employment (mainly for Roma men) and increased the employment (Kocsis and Kocsis 1999). As the Roma could only partially fulfil the requirements of the labour market because of their educational, health and housing difficulties, nationwide campaigns began in Hungary in order to reduce these disadvantages. The programs focusing on the elimination of the Roma settlements set the objective of creating better housing conditions. The rate of the Roma pupils attending schools increased due to the extension of compulsory education on to the Roma children and the need for writing and reading appeared among the Roma. Because of the increase in industrial employment the number of the Roma with an income became higher by the early 1970s. Although, certain drawbacks of these programs can be identified, the living conditions of the Roma clearly improved during this period. As Kemény emphasised

while describing this period, it '*brought great changes to the lives of Roma families: full employment was almost achieved among adult Roma males. Roma families witnessed a dramatic improvement in terms of their livelihood, standard of living, job security, and general welfare.*' (Kemény 2005, p. 53)

The situation of the Roma since the 1990ies will be introduced later in detail – as here, at the end of this chapter, I would like to point at the dynamical aspect of the social exclusion. Information about the history of the Roma makes it clear: their relationships with the non-Roma and their positions within the society were continuously changing. Sometimes, as during the 'enlightened' absolutism or especially during World War II when the regime actually placed them outside the law, they were pushed out from participation and social interaction in the society. At other times, as between the 15th and 17th century, at the end of the 19th century or during the socialism, the relationship between the Roma and the most of the society was rather peaceful, Roma found their place in the job market and in the society. The keyword is 'changing'. Kemény also emphasised the importance of the alteration while comparing two different periods in the history of the Roma: '*As far as Hungary's current territory is concerned, mixed communities were more common than segregated communities at the time of the Roma census of 1893. I may therefore conclude that Roma were more likely to be living among non-Roma in 1893 than they were in either 1971 or 2003*' (Kemény 2005, p. 32). All in all, the historical description makes it clear: the level of inclusion/exclusion of the Roma minority in Hungary was not fixed, constant and rigid, it was not a static state but rather could be described as a continuously changing and interactive process.

3.1.2 Focus on the relational aspect – Roma after the collapse of the socialist regime

The situation of the Roma has been worsening dramatically since socialism collapsed. Among the Roma, semi- and unskilled work were dominant and these positions were the first to cease when the system changed after 1989; thereby, the employment rate of Roma has also dramatically declined. In the 1970s there was no relevant difference between the employment of the Roma and non-Roma. In 1989, the proportion of employment (Kertesi 2005, p. 59) was 67% that dropped to 31% in 1993 among the 15-49 year old Roma population. There has not been any increase in the employment rate

of Roma during the last 20 years. The data of the FRA Roma pilot survey confirm these results. The rate of paid employment (full time, part time, ad hoc and paid parental leave) of Roma aged 20 to 64 is significantly lower (reaches about 35%) compared to the non-Roma (near 50%) (Fundamental Rights Agency 2012, p. 16).

Similar tendencies can be recognized on the field of education. Social scientists observed that differences between Roma and non-Roma appeared already in early childhood. According to the national survey conducted in 2003, 88% of non-Roma children aged 3-5, while only 42% of Roma children attended kindergarten (Kemény et al 2004, pp. 83-84). The educational system neither here nor on higher levels was able to ensure equal chances for Roma children. In 2003, the number of segregated schools was 180, and the number of segregated classes mostly attended by Roma was 3,000 (Molnár and Dupcsik 2008, pp. 17-18). Among the Roma children the rate of dropouts, qualifying as so-called 'private students' or being labelled as mentally disabled and therefore sent to special schools or classes was much higher than the national average between 1993 and 2003 (Kemény et al 2004, pp. 82-90). Segregated classes and schools ensured weaker quality of education for the students, as they were being taught in buildings that were in terrible condition, they had very few and inappropriate tools for demonstration and only few of the classes were held by specialist teachers (Kurt Lewin Foundation 2010). The inequality between Roma and non-Roma will be even more visible if I take a look at universities: in 2003 40% of the youth population in the 20-24 age group attended college or university while this rate was only 1.2% among the Roma youth (Kemény et al 2004, p. 89).

On the one hand, the description about the situation of the Roma confirms the dynamical aspect of social exclusion. It sheds light on changes and introduces the way marginalisation has become more and more wide-spread after the collapse of the socialist regime. On the other hand, this portray points at the relational aspect of social exclusion as well, due to emphasising the differences between the Roma and the non-Roma. These differences have already been confirmed by several scholars and research programs. As the author of the study 'Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion' emphasised, '*multiple deprivations with serious danger of exclusion is much more characteristic of the Roma than the non-Roma population*' (Ferge et al. 2002, p. 58). A similar conclusion was made by Gábos and his colleagues about ten years later (Gábos et al. 2013). Ladányi and Szelényi (2002) also underlined that the rate of the

multiply excluded Roma was relatively high among their communities. According to the ENAR Shadow report about Hungary, the members of Roma communities had more chance to face social exclusion (European Network Against Racism 2011).

3.1.3 Focus on the multidimensional aspect – Roma after the collapse of socialist regime

Further research programs have described the poor housing conditions of Roma households. According to the survey in 2003 (Babusik 2004, pp. 30-39) 20% of the Roma live in social housing buildings originally not designed for living in, 67% in separate houses and 15% in traditional urban apartment buildings. The national researches conducted between 2003 and 2010 show that the infrastructure of Roma households is very poor (Marketing Centrum 2010, Letenyei and Varga 2011, Babusik 2007). In 2010, 61% of the Roma people reported problems with their apartments; most of them mentioned wet and cracking walls that were probably related to the poor state of the roof (Letenyei and Varga 2011). According to the FRA survey, around 45% of Roma lived in households that lacked at least one of the following basic housing amenities: indoor kitchen, indoor toilet, indoor shower or bath and electricity (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights 2012, p. 23).

Another dimension of deprivation is health and/or access to health services. As studies emphasized, Roma people with poor health conditions did not have access to quality, specialist medical care within the health care system. This statement was confirmed by an empirical study from 2003 conducted with the involvement of general practitioners and nurse practitioners, which was designed to explore the extent to which the principle of equal access to basic health care services prevails in the case of the Roma and people from socially and economically disadvantaged backgrounds. The results show that some general practitioners tend to refer patients from a socially peripheral background and poor, unemployed and Roma patients to less expensive treatments and examinations on a lower institutional level. The quality of the practitioners' communication with these clients falls below the average, while the number of conflicts with these patients reaches above the average and lacks solidarity. Another study enhances the same results: within the current health care system, Roma people with poor health conditions do not have access to quality, specialist medical care, and *the principle, according to which each citizen must be treated with the same quality,*

optimal care, regardless of social status or the ethnic background of the citizen, has failed' (Babusik 2004, p. 56).

Taking the findings of further research programs regarding negative attitudes towards the Roma into consideration I suppose that the exclusion of the members of the minority from social relationships and interactions is also wide-spread. Based on these findings I can state that nowadays, in Hungary – similarly to other Eastern-European countries – Roma belong to the most disadvantaged social group who suffer from the heaviest prejudice. According to a survey conducted in 2011 two-third of Hungarians would not let their kids play with Roma children (NOL 2011). In 2009, 58% of the population believed that the crime is in the blood of the Roma (Gimes et al. 2009, p. 25). In the same year the rate of those who agree with the statement 'there are respectable Roma but the majority of them are not respectable' was 82% (ibid) while 52% of the Hungarians supported to idea of creating specific rules in the criminal law solely for Roma perpetrators (Publicus Intézet, 2009). In 2011, 69% was the rate of the respondents of a survey who would have accepted Roma as colleagues at their workplace – but only 24% would have accepted them as partners (Csepeli et al. 2011). Negative attitudes towards Roma are obvious in everyday life; in the way ordinary people use language I often find hate speech elements. Media, national broadsheets, websites, tabloids (Bernáth and Messing 2011) and even documentary films (Strausz 2014) strengthen such stereotypes and contribute to racist prejudices of most of the society. Anti-Roma feelings are supported by radical movements and political parties (Gimes *et al.* 2008, Juhász 2010a, Juhász 2010b, Pytlas 2013). Lack of tolerance and the exclusion phenomenon – and even romaphobia (Ljujic et al. 2012) – were highlighted not only by research but also by the existence of hate crime incidents. Around 2009, a series of hate-murders resulted in the deaths of six Roma and multiple injuries (Human Rights First 2010).

The provided data approve the multidimensional aspect of social exclusion[3]; as the Roma people and especially the Roma young (Fremlove and Hera, 2014) have great

---

[3] Here, it is worth referring to the intersectionality as a concept originally used by post-colonial and Black feminists and as a major paradigm primarily in women, gender, ethnic and queer studies. The theory, that was coined originally by Crenshaw (1989) while introducing the drawbacks of the single axis framework of the antidiscrimination law, emphasises the complex factors (as race, class, gender, sexual orientation, religion etc.) and processes interacting with each other on multiple levels, influencing human lives and leading to discrimination, injustice and inequality (Berger and Guidroz, 2009). The concept of intersectionality is very close to the way social exclusion is defined in my dissertation; in both cases the dynamical, relational and primarily the multidimensional aspects are crucial.

chance to be cut off not only from the labour market but from the high quality education, the health care system and the appropriate housing conditions. Based on the findings of public opinion surveys I suppose that social participation of the Roma is also restricted, so several realms of everyday life of the Roma can be recognised where inequalities arose.

3.2 Social exclusion at the micro level

There is no doubt that social exclusion has its stems in the macro level (as the consequences of mass unemployment, mass migration etc.). However, I agree with Saraceno who underlined: the sources of social exclusion may be found at the micro level where researchers can find and analyse *'the particular experience of (sometimes self-) exclusion of individuals and groups'* (Saraceno 2001, p. 2). If one wants to reveal thoroughly the mechanism of social exclusion they will need to turn our attention to the micro level as well and reveal there *'the social processes that include some groups and exclude others'* (de Haan 1999, p. 16).

Thereby, within this chapter, a Hungarian village will be described where some groups of the local community discriminate and even oppress other groups. The analyses focusing on the micro level and introducing a case study will add some matchsticks to the puzzle that portrays the phenomenon of social exclusion.

It should be emphasised here, that instead of applying a top-down explanatory strategy (Kitcher, 1985) and working on theoretical explanation and derivation from concepts, this chapter uses a different way of 'reading' and realizes a bottom-up investigation (Salmon 1989, pp. 184-185). The case study that are deeply analysed by the methods of social sciences aims at revealing the underlying mechanism of exclusion and exclusionary practices. However, while interpreting the research findings, I take some of the theories and conclusions of the science studies and the social psychology into consideration and thereby 'stitch together' the theoretical explanation and the individual states and events.

The case study deals with an average Hungarian village, Kisvaros[4]. Within the frameworks of the ALTERNATIVE project[5], the colleagues of the Foresee Research Group implemented an action research program in this settlement. The research team[6] started to prepare the field work at the end of 2011 and were working there until May 2015. During these years we built upon good relationships and mutual trust with the community. On the one hand, trust-building was supported by the researchers while applying various research methods as interviews, focus groups and the participatory observations (Hera and Ligeti 2005). However, the role of the mediators[7] was even more crucial; they got in contact with the local residents, evolved personal relationships with them and thereby were often personally involved in the everyday life of the community.

Without trust researchers would have not been able to analyse the key issues of the action research: 1) the characteristics of the local groups 2) the conflicts and conflict management strategies – even the practice of social exclusion – of the observed community. The initiative was successful as at the end of the almost four-years-long field work clear picture emerged about groups of the village, reasons behind harms, disputes or misunderstandings and a general understanding of discontents. In addition, information about the way social exclusion works in the community became also available – the issue that will be introduced in detail in this chapter.

Qualitative methods have become wide-spread in the last few decades, mainly in the USA and in Europe (Thiollent 2011). In the opinion of representatives of this method, usage of qualitative methods can also support understanding, explanation and can also provide excellent tools for describing mainly smaller communities – such as Kisvaros. Partly, this was the reason why we, throughout our work applied tools of the qualitative method, such as interviews, participation and observation. Here, not only the methods themselves but also our approach should be defined here. The orientation of the research team was based on action research which is an umbrella term that represents several practices. In case of action research the researchers not only gain information from the field, they not only conduct studies on the target group. On the contrary, the researchers forms '*partnerships with community members to identify issues of local*

---

[4] Within this study, all of the names are fictive in order to protect confidentiality and anonymity.
[5] For more information about the project see: www.alternativeproject.eu
[6] Laszlo Balla, Gabriella Benedek, Gabor Hera, Szilvia Suki and Dora Szego.
[7] Borbála Fellegi, Eva Gyorfi and Erika Magyar.

importance, develop ways of studying them, collect and interpret data, and take action on the resulting knowledge'. (Smith et al. 2010, p. 408) One of the keywords here is action. Researchers are not only objective observers who do not influence the field and who are not influenced by the field or by their own prejudices, stereotypes and ideas. Rather, the aim of the researchers is '*to effect desired change as a path to generating knowledge and empowering stakeholders.*' (Huang 2010, p. 93) The researchers do not have to make a division between action and understanding.

In case the ALTERNATIVE project, the research team prepared altogether around 80 interviews with local residents. In the beginning of the program, we used the snow-ball method in order to get in contact with interviewees and used a semi-structured interview guideline. That time, the date of the conversations were fixed in advance, were usually 1-1.5 hours long and were in most cases recorded and later transcribed. Later on, several spontaneous and not-structured interviews were also prepared in the field. Another information source was desk research. All kinds of information about Kisvaros was collected from libraries, internet, local residents, local newspapers and local government. Moreover, we were there on the field. Members of the Foresee Research Group took part in events, such as the Charity Ball of the Catholic Church, soccer games, Roma Day, graduation, consecration of a local monument etc. After participatory observation, our experiences were summarised in research diaries.

We did not only collect information but shared the gained knowledge and experience with the residents of Kisvaros. We organised three workshops where the findings of the action research program were introduced. Here, local residents asked questions, shared their feedbacks with the researchers and even criticized the process or conclusions of the research.

3.2.1 Background – description of the village

Until the 1950ies, the residents of the village were working primarily at the local manor or as independent peasants. Later on, the socialist government enforced a lot of villagers to join the local collective farm while other residents (about 50% of them in 1960) started to work in the industry. During the action research, a lot of interviewees looked back on this period with a certain nostalgia. This was the time when even the local Roma had jobs and did not have to worry about income and living. These changes

hit back in 1989 when – as in the whole country – industrial workers had to face unemployment. As an old resident of Kisvaros told us '*slump came in 1990. Before that year hundreds of people had got on the train and had gone to work. After 1990...empty trains...people were fired.*' These changes affected the Roma minority as well. 'O*pportunities have become unfavourable... Roma had been travelling to work as well. They had had beautiful, clean houses. They had been working together with the Hungarians*[8]*...there had been no problem at all. In the 1990s...that year was the beginning of the hard slump for them.*' Nowadays villagers work mainly at institutes of the local government (school, kindergarten, office etc.), or travel to Budapest to work, have a job in the surrounding villages or work at the few local companies.

The infrastructure of the village has been upgraded. In 2011, 95% of the houses had piped drinking water, 94%had piped gas supply, 99% were involved into waste collection and 83% were connected to the wastewater collection network (Központi Statisztikai Hiatal, 2012). The settlement has one kindergarten, one primary school with a gymnasium and one local library as well – the institutions which also have an important role in the life of the village. A family doctor and a paediatrician are also available.

The community is traditionally religious. In 1998, more than 80% of the local residents considered themselves as Catholics. Beyond religious services, the Catholic Church is active in secular activities, too. The settlement has a multicultural background as well, as not only Hungarians but members and posterity of the German, Slovakian and Roma minority live here. Today, the village has German and Roma Minority Governments. In 2001, about 4% of the people considered themselves Roma (Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, 2012). In the opinion of the leader of the Roma Minority Government, this percentage is more than 8% today. The reason of the difference between the two data is not immigration or an outstanding rate of birth. It lies in the fact that in case of an official census the Roma citizens usually do not declare their minority background.

Civil activity is strong and supported by the local government. The website of the village mentions altogether eighteen NGOs and bottom-up initiatives under the link

---

[8] 'Roma' vs. 'Hungarians' are often used terms in the narratives of everyday people both by Roma and non-Roma people, even though Roma people are also Hungarian citizens. The word „peasents" are also used for non-Roma people.

'communities'. For example, sport associations, a club for retired residents, a choir and music band can be found among the local initiatives. In 2013, the village gave the floor to altogether 34, in 2014 to 40 programs – many of them organised by the local NGOs. The local government has a newspaper as well. Apart from this medium the Catholic Church, one of the local NGOs and the Roma Minority Government publish local newspapers as well. These products of media are also the signs of an active civil society; the editors, journalists and other contributors working as volunteers, they all take part and shape the life of the community, they mediate between the local government and the residents.

Kisvaros is a small settlement where the number of the local inhabitants is around 2,800 nowadays.

3.2.2 Groups of the village under investigation

The efforts of the action research program were partly concentrated on describing the fragmented environment (Hydle and Seeberg 2013, p. 9). The researchers were able to describe this dynamical, relation-based context by the stories of the interviewees. Thanks to these stories the research team managed to categorise the kinds of groups which existed in Kisvaros. These groups could be named as 'ordering groups' with different cultures (Foss et al. 2012, p. 23) or with premises (ibid, p. 42). They could be defined as groups with different feelings, unmet needs, *'incompatible interests or goals or in competition for control over scare resources'*. (ibid, p. 34) These groups show the multiplicity of local subcultures (Kremmel and Pelikan 2013, p. 17). Anyhow, these groups supported the team of the researchers in identifying the power-relationships within the community. In the next chapter, I will name and describe these groups and will identify their members, values, norms and perspectives.

3.2.2.1 Roma and non-Roma

In the beginning of the story, it is important to emphasise that all of the groups and residents regard Kisvaros as a *'peaceful island'* where the relationship between the Roma and non-Roma inhabitants is calm. Although, there were smaller conflicts in the

past few years and sometimes tensions were also observable. However, *'compared the village with other settlements, the situation is fine'*, which is an important value in the opinion of our interviewees.

Despite the fact that the situation is generally peaceful, Roma interviewees sometimes reported exclusion and exclusionary practices. As I have already introduced (Hera 2013, Hera et al, 2015), some of them thought that the Roma lived at the edge of the community ('*I have the same, old rules; the Roma settle at the edge*'), the teachers did not pay enough attention to their children ('*The children have to sit at the desks at the back, there is not attention paid to them*') and their parents had less rights in the school ('*The gate is closed in the school. Roma parents would like to go in but they do not let them in. Hungarians would like to go and the door is open for them immediately*'.) They talked about prejudice ('*I do not like it when they say that Roma would not like to work. They would like to but they do not have a chance.'),* disadvantage at workplace ('*They could tell us...I will not resent. "Listen to me, you are gipsy and I will not hire you!'*) and negative attitudes towards them. If an interviewee reported physical violence he or she surely belonged to the Roma minority. Some of the Roma gave account even of life-threatening conflicts.

'*Next to the forest they cut a dry tree they thought they could take away. Somebody reported it and a man appeared with his two sons and with guns. This man was the schoolmate of the interviewee, he was an acquaintance. This man called somebody and told him "listen to me, here is a father and his son, bring the grasper, I have to bury them" and "I will shot the head of your father". Those, who did not have a gun came against us with axes, cudgels.*'

Fortunately, no physical harm was caused. The Roma were denounced because of stealing wood, the sentence was admonition. This was the official process. Non-officially the man who threatened the Roma '*was caught at the Day of the Village and got some biffs*'.

Despite of the violent conflicts and the feeling of being discriminated, the situation of the Roma is felt much better since 2002 when a mayor was elected who '*tried to support the disadvantaged people, 'eliminated the Roma settlement and made it clean', 'gave houses to the Roma', 'supported the Roma Self Government every time'.* According to our Roma interviewees the relationship with the local government was worse before that year. '*The struggle began when the old mayor was in power. "I have*

to civilize them." This was the idea.' The Roma Self Government was not acting as a partner to the local government in that period and clashes between Romas and non-Romas became more intensive in the village.

Not only the Roma but the non-Roma also had a point of view about the interethnic collisions in Kisvaros. Some of the non-Roma residents were less tolerant towards the Roma. They thought that a few decades ago there was no problem with Roma as '*they knew where to stay*'. Unfortunately, nowadays '*Roma can do what they want while Hungarians mustn't do anything.*' In their opinion the village always had problem with this minority whose members did not really want to change their life. This idea was fed by the ideology '*if you really want to do something, you can*'. According to this opinion Roma should have been active in order to improve their life-circumstances. All in all, these people had a perspective which emphasised the responsibility of the individual. On the contrary, some non-Roma residents accepted that solely Roma could not change their own life. These people explained the situation of the Roma with macro-sociological reasons. '*Under the period of socialism…a lot of gypsies were working in the collective farm. The system has changed…farms ceased…there is no work place since that time and they can not work.*' These villagers emphasised that if the Roma had work there would not be problem in the village. All in all, these people highlighted the responsibility of the whole society.

Some of the non-Roma residents warned of growing number of thefts, which in their opinion were committed by Roma. '*There is a lot of conflicts about 'collecting' firewood. While white people buy the wood Roma people steal the forest. I know somebody…they went to measure the forest…they realised that the trees could be cut so they hired people to work there. One month later…they arrived to the forest but it was not there. The gypsies stole it.*' On the other hand, some of the residents had explanation for crime. '*It is not an easy issue… Should they curdle? Moreover, they push the bike with firewood for two-three days…and the police bring them to the yard. If somebody steals the wood with a truck…I can understand if they catch you. However, it is a cruel situation if you can not heat.*'

On the one hand, according to some villagers Roma had undue benefits only because they were Roma. On the other hand, other residents pointed at the poor financial background of these families – the circumstance that may legitimate benefits. It was said that a few years ago when the Roma settlement was eliminated the debate became

stronger between the two sides. One of the groups gave voice that the Roma did not want to improve the settlement. '*There were really bad circumstances…but what did they do? They opened the door and spilled everything, the trash, the shitty diapers…at the front of their doors. And the yard… They shit there. Big shits. I asked them to clean the yard, not to shit there… I asked them to do something in order to achieve the common aim*'. In the opinion of other residents it was out of question that the Roma settlement should be ceased. These people did not understand the resistance of some of the villagers. '*They did not like it. I did not understand it…it was the shame of the village. Some of the local residents asked why do not I just leave them there, in the mood and grime?*'

3.2.2.2 Native villagers and newcomers

The local government has been aiming at welcoming new residents and to increase the population in Kisvaros for decades. This notion fitted into the demographic trends. In general, the population in villages have been declining in the past few decades in Hungary. The primary reason was the lack of workplaces; young people have been looking for jobs and they have had better chances to work in cities. However, the population of Budapest also dropped after 1990. In this case the motivation was different; more people decided to move out from the smoggy, busy city to green, to peaceful villages. Although, Kisvaros does not belong to the primary agglomeration but still, within one hour the capital can be reached – and it was enough motivation to change residence. The 'immigration' was fed from the countryside as well. If somebody wanted to live closer to the capital but still in a rural area – Kisvaros was a perfect decision. In order to support these changes the local government in Kisvaros established a housing estate in 2004. Welcoming new people became part of the official local policy – regardless of who was in power.

Due to these efforts, the population in Kisvaros has increased in the last twenty years. However, after a while conflicts appeared between the native villagers and the newcomers. According to some of our interviewees, some of the dissents were born because of different claims: '*The newcomers from the city disapprove of the local shop, because it is not a supermarket and they cannot buy everything here.*' Other disagreements were based on the different norms. For example, some of the newly arrived people did not pay attention to their gardens – what could be quite unusual for

rural people. '*The people who used to live in a city never run a garden, so it is weedy. The people in the village condemn this behaviour.*' The incomprehension could be mutual. One of our interviewees who arrived to the village a few years ago shared with us his opinion: '*Here is a freak that "oh, my god, the tree and leafs touch the house"… And it is the mania of the local residents that they rake the stupid shifting sand as flat as a pancake.*'

As an example, some of our interviewees pointed at different habits of greeting. People at the countryside greet each other from a distance. People coming from the cities only say hello when they are close. This could be the reason that some of the native villagers think of the newcomers as impolite. After a while, newcomers and native villagers faced each other not only along different norms and habits but also along particular cases – some of these cases will be introduced later in detail.

3.2.2.3 Leadership of the village

Since 1990, altogether three periods in the life of Kisvaros can be distinguished from the point of view of political power relationships:

- the regime that was in power between 1990 and 2002. In that case both the mayor and the village council belonged to the group of the native villagers. Moreover, they clearly belonged to the right which means, in case of Hungary, the ideology of conservatism, the value of tradition and the religion of the (Catholic) Christians. Hereinafter, this regime is called by us 'tradition-orientated group'.
- the period between 2002 and 2014 when the mayor was in power who identified himself as a liberal and a leftist person with sensitivity for equality. Moreover, the representatives of the village council this time were open to the newcomers and respected the mayor. This is the village council where even a Roma was among the members. Hereinafter, this regime is called by us 'progress-orientated group'.
- the third period, when members of the 'tradition-orientated group' returned to power in 2014 when they won the local election.

Both of the groups had clear ideas about the other group. In the beginning of the action research programme I recognised that members of the 'tradition-orientated group'

(who were in political opposition that time) criticised the mayor because of lack of investment in Kisvaros. According to these residents, while other village councils submitted several development applications and tried to find financial sources for developing infrastructure, the leader of Kisvaros did not pay enough attention to this issue. As a member of this group put it:

You cannot imagine how nothing happens in this village. We got used to the notion that every four years we stepped forward. We only had electricity in 1990. That time, we only had our naked bottom. Between 1990 and 1994 we built a gymnasium, a war memorial, a sewer, a treatment plant. In the next four years, we built piped drinking water. Stormrain water drainage. We made huge steps. However, since Tamas has been the mayor... (...) Almost nothing has happened here, in the village.

In addition, complaints were made about the mayor who favoured the newcomers and he would not have liked to cooperate with native villagers. Moreover, the Roma-friendly attitude of the mayor was also sometimes mentioned as a negative characteristic of him.

On the other hand, the members of the 'progress-orientated group' also criticised the 'others.' They claimed that spending money on infrastructure was not necessary as there were other important things to deal with in Kisvaros. In addition, they complained about the boastful behaviour of the 'tradition-orientated group' whose members did not show respect towards the local residents. In the second year of the action research program, elections were held at the local level in Hungary. The representatives of the 'progress-orientated group', who lost the competition in the village, drew up new critics towards the 'tradition-orientated group'. They pointed not primarily at the results of the contest but at the preceding electioneering while describing it as an unjust and incorrect campaign. Partly, these experiences explained why members of the losing side described the winners – the 'tradition-orientated group' – as dangerous and despicable people. According to the criticism, members of the rival team:

- wanted to exclude other groups of the village,
- were sly and arrogant,
- were unfair and won the election by fraud,
- were hypocrite and not honest,
- "are blinded by their own hatred".

3.2.3 Social exclusion of the local Roma

Within this chapter, I will point at the way local groups of the village under investigation exclude others. Focus will be on groups and group formations that entails boundary control. I agree with Silver who underlined that *'scholars of social exclusion should take group relations and collective processes seriously'* and *'research at the border is thus a useful site for examining exclusion processes'* (Silver 2006, pp. 15-17). In order to introduce the way social exclusion operates at the micro level and results in the exclusion of the Roma, altogether four case studies will be presented in the next chapter.

3.2.3.1 The case of the 'Civil Guard'

The research team recognised some conflicts because of the local 'Civil Guard' already at the end of 2012. As Tibor, the leader of the Local Minority Government[9] and at the same time a representative of the City Council shared with us, members of a local NGO initiated the establishment of a civil guard a few years ago. As our interviewee shared with us, members of that 'Civil Guard' were clearly against involving Roma residents into the work of the only grass-root organisation which dealt with local security. However, some members of that organisation invited Tibor to join the civil guard but *'no other Roma from the village were welcome. I resented that for the local Roma local security was as important as for the non-Roma. It would have been great if the village had believed that the local Roma had been also for the local security, tranquillity and peace.'* However, the conflict and harms, which arose due to the Roma's exclusion from the 'Civil Guard', were not discussed openly.

As the number of burglaries increased in the village at the end of 2013, Tibor was motivated to do something for the local security. He initiated the establishment of a new 'Civil Guard'. He was not alone in this attempt because Henrik, another local resident, also supported the initiative. They agreed to set up the new organisation in

---

[9] Act 1993/77. (Act on the rights of national and ethnic minorities) is the legal basis of the protection of minority rights in Hungary. The law offers a broad set of specific rights in the fields of education, culture, participation in public life, etc. The most important innovation of the law was the establishment of minority self-governments which are organisations that offer a form of cultural autonomy for minorities.

order to '*make the sense of security of the local residents in Kisvaros stronger*'. Tibor and Henrik informed the members of their informal network about their intention, they advertised the plan on Facebook and in one of the local newspapers. They planned to round up altogether 30-60 participants. Tibor tried to mobilise some Roma residents as well.

They invited those who would have taken part in the work of the new 'Civil guard' not for salary but as volunteers. In addition, they wanted to involve villagers who would have been able to support the work by covering the costs of the petrol. According to Tibor, lack of criminal record had been also a criterion. Henrik emphasised that they had mainly been interested in those applicants who had had driving licence and/or a car. As it can be seen, the organisers wanted to found a real grass-root organisation without any financial support from the local government or the government.

Signs of exclusion were not easy to detect in this case as only a very few of the local residents shared with us their doubts regarding the involvement of the Roma to the work of the 'Civil Guard'. One of the rare villagers was Henrik. According to him, the Roma's potential to join the 'Civil Guard' decreased the chance that non-Roma would also contribute. As he put it: '*It also exists...that...Tibor is a...you know his colour. I know a guy who will not join the initiative because Tibor is a Roma.*' Somebody else emphasised that Roma should have not been involved because '*if Roma go on patrol they will just check where to break in later on.*' This opinion originates in the idea of the local Roma being contributors to several burglaries. According to this opinion, Roma commit crime because they need money, they are lazy and just live on social benefits. Moreover, committing crime '*somehow it is a kind of code...it is in their blood*'. This is the reason why '*90% of the Roma are in prisons*'.

Finally, the grass-root movement itself was not successful; the organisers did not manage to involve enough volunteers. As there was no real reaction from the part of the villagers, Tibor and Henrik gave up organising the initiative.

Researchers of Foresee arrived at the village in January 2013. It was the same month when the conflict around the 'Butcher Festival'[10] emerged. As our interviewees and members of the Local Support Group informed us, visitors of the festival had to pay an entrance fee. Thereby, most Roma did not take part in the event which was set in the centre of the village, on the soccer field. Some of the Roma referred to the Butcher Festival as the '*festival of the rich people*'. Poor villagers – mainly Roma but non-Roma as well – were standing outside the fence and were listening to the show of a famous Hungarian music group, called 'Irigy Hónaljmirigy'. The situation must have been not only humiliating but grotesque as well, as the music group had released some anti-Roma productions earlier: they had a television programme in 2003, called 'Bazi nagy Roma lagzi' – which means: 'Big Fat Roma Wedding' in English. According to the National Radio and Television Authority, the program intensified racist attitudes and thus was liable to support hate speech. The channel was punished with a 30 minutes period of broadcasting ban.

After these antecedents some local actors fought for free entrance to the festival for all Kisvaros people in the name of (social) justice. These actors – the local government, the mayor and the leader of the Roma Self Government – wanted to ensure this opportunity mostly for those with poor living conditions. Thanks to this joint activity, entrance to the 'Butcher Festival' of 2014 was free for the villagers of Kisvaros. However, despite the success, signs of social exclusion emerged in this case as well.

The organiser opposed the idea of the free entrance because he wanted to avoid participation of poor villagers. According to him, there were economic reasons behind his argumentation because poor visitors '*will not buy anything and thus decrease our income*'. In addition, he wanted to avoid offences committed by those participants '*who are not able to behave*'. On the contrary, representatives of the city council and the mayor supposed that while the organiser spoke about disadvantaged people who might cause turmoil, he actually referred to the Roma.

---

[10] The so-called Butcher Festival where the purpose is to make a local tradition from an old-new Hungarian custom: killing a pig at the end of winter and making different types of food from it (pudding, sausage, aspic, fried blood, etc.). Making and tasting the food is usually managed within family circles, or in small neighborhood communities.

It is not known until today why the idea of the free entrance was opposed; due to the the poor residents (as the organiser emphasised) or due to the the Roma (as the city council supposed)? It should be mentioned here that during the action research an interview was conducted with the organiser of the festival. As it was possible to recognise, he was one of those few residents who openly talked about thefts which were presumably committed by the local Roma. Moreover, as he reported he once was a victim of a crime assumed to be perpetrated also by Roma. Unfortunately, his damage was restored neither by the police, nor the court, nor the local community – which intensified his negative attitudes. As he drew it up during that interview: '*the local government wants me to ensure tickets for free for the disadvantaged... In this case, I would not like to organise the festival. It is a huge investment and Roma are not able to behave. I do not want it to be free. I want all of the participants to have a good time.*' Taking his opinion into consideration, one can conclude that he really wanted to hinder the free entrance of the Roma residents.

We were able to identify several further (hidden) factors that hindered the presence of Roma at the 'Butcher Festival':

- Financial background: Roma usually live in poor living conditions. Although, they did not have to pay for the entry ticket of the festival but high price of the food and products decreased the chance of visiting the event.
- Timing: Roma people usually run out of their savings in January when the festival was organised. As Endre, a member of the Roma community drew it up: '*January is one of the worst months. It is a poor month for the Roma. Christmas and New Year eat up all of our savings.*'
- Differences in status: visitors of the festival belonged primarily to the middle class. They arrived at the event in their own cars, they often wore branded and good-quality clothes and they had enough savings to buy food and products. According to some of our interviewees, Roma would not have enjoyed their time in such a group.
- Attitude: the well-known anti-Roma sentiments of the organisers probably also decreased the number of the Roma visitors. As one of our interviewees put it: '*One realises if he is not loved, respected and welcome. One does not visit places where this is the situation. And this was the situation at the festival.*'

- Lack of information: members of the Roma community probably were not informed about the opportunity of free entrance.

As it came to light, this information got stuck at Tibor, the leader of the Roma Self Government. He later revealed that he did not want to make propaganda for the festival within the Roma community because he had negative attitudes towards the organisers and the event. As he drew it up: *'I did not make propaganda. I even did not visit the festival. Because I do not like it when people create cliques. And those people who had fun there at the festival, they created a clique. While those who had not enough money were at the periphery. I do not like such behaviour.'* All in all, the representative of the Roma community created a clique himself by not informing the local Roma people who stayed away from the free event.

Information getting stuck had another reason as well; namely that Tibor had a kind of fear for the Roma. He was afraid of conflict between Roma and some of the organisers. As he put it: *'if you are full of passions or there is a friend of yours and you drink some shots of pálinka....you may leave your hindrance and become hot-headed'.*

As it is clear to see, exclusion occurred on several grounds at the same time; thereby the effects of these factors accumulated; financial background itself may not have hindered participation of the Roma but several factors jointly led to their non-attendance.

3.2.3.3. Soccer conflict

Men of the village are the members of the local soccer association from their childhood. As the leader of the local soccer association drew it up: *'Out of 10 only 2 did not play soccer as the member of our association. Everybody participated since the war.'* Soccer gives the chance to all of the people in Kisvaros to meet, to have common experience, to take part in an activity. Moreover, playing soccer is free – and almost the only opportunity to do some sports. Both Roma and non-Roma are welcome: *'Roma and Hungarians come to play soccer. It is very important that they know each other, they can see that the others do not eat human flesh, they are the same human being...This is very significant in order not to have struggles.'*

One of the local Roma residents was also an active soccer player. As he shared with us, he had started to play soccer in a new team, which had been set up by villagers outside the soccer association. '*After the matches I went out for a beer. And while I were drinking our beers I could have a talk about the problems of the village.*' More and more people – altogether 25 players – joined the initiative. After a while the group started to collect membership fee.

After these antecedents, it was a bolt from the blue when some of the players decided not to play with Roma. The decision was really a shock for the whole Roma community. Roma players and their relatives, cousins and friends felt humiliated because of the intention of exclusion. Until today, the teams of the Roma and the team of the non-Roma residents play football – separately.

3.2.3.4 The case of the Charity Distribution case[11]

Charity distribution runs in Kisvaros since 2010. So far, the community organised six charity events that were powered by the central office of Red Cross while local organising work was necessary as well. By one provision, the people who are eligible to receive the packages get some food (sugar, pasta, can-food). After several charity provision actions some local residents started to criticise the organisers regarding the distribution of the packages. Claims were expressed that the actions were unfair, as people who did not deserve support or aid could get the packages while the people in real need sank into oblivion.

We managed to get in contact with the two protagonists of the conflict. One of them, Edit, was an unemployed Roma woman who worked occasionally in the social work projects of the local government. She used to work in the Roma Self-Government back in the early '90s but she was still an opinion leader within the Roma community. The other actor, Ági was the main organiser of the charity action event. She was a district nurse in mother- and childcare who also knew mostly all of the families in the village, including the Roma community.

---

[11] I would especially like to thank my research colleagues László Balla and Dóra Szegő for following the conflict and providing detailed information about the case.

The mediators of the Foresee Research Group organised a Peace Circle (Fellegi and Szegő 2013) where both of the actors shared their standpoints about the conflict, discussed their possible misunderstandings, revealed their harms and looked for possible solutions. During the meeting, Edit placed herself on the side of the injured as she criticised the Charity Distribution from the following dimensions: the concept and criteria of eligibility, the way the packages were distributed and the information that was provided (advertising the action) as well. In her narrative, the organisers did not share the details (i.e. the place and the time) of the charity actions at all. In addition, the criteria of eligibility ('to be in need') was not realised, as too many well-off and even rich people and too few Roma families got packages.

Ági, the organiser worked voluntarily in the charity project. According to her, she received unfair critique on her job in many points. The category of 'to be in need' was not defined by herself in any measure or verifiable criteria but as she put it: '*I cannot control the criteria but I try to take social disadvantages into account.*' As Ági emphasised, a lot of Roma residents also got packages. In her point of view, the problem lied elsewhere: there was no exact calculation at the central Red Cross office, thereby the amounts of the packages between two charity actions were unbalanced; sometimes too many, sometimes too few packages arrived to the village. In the latter case, there was no way to distribute the packages in an optimal allocation.

In case of the charity distribution, it is difficult to decide whether exclusion really took place or not. However, I wanted to shortly expound the story as it clearly introduces the interpretation of Roma about their own (excluded) situation in the village. Edit often expressed the unequal and oppressed position of the Roma during the Peace Circle while claiming: '*Roma are now only on their own. They are afraid to tell their opinions, because they are afraid of atrocities they can get as answer*'. In addition, she pointed at discrimination as well. As she emphasised, non-Roma, rich people got packages while Roma living in poverty did not receive aid: '*while you hand out packages to 70-year old pensioners, who have got very expensive cars (...) but for me that 2kg of flour does really matter, and you give it to somebody who spends more on mineral water.*' Another Roma interviewee also came up with the same opinion while emphasising that '*opposing the original principles of this action, to support the poor, only the rich Hungarian pensioners can get the packages, who have got big cars... poor Roma only get a few, to keep their mouths shut.*' As it is clear to see, the Roma

placed themselves in the position of the oppressed and excluded group whose members live in poverty.[12]

3.2.4 Social exclusion of the 'others'

Here, it is important to underline that the local Roma and the local non-Roma were only two of the many groups in the village. And it is also worth to emphasise that all of the groups of the community used exclusionary practices and tended to reject members of the 'other group'. This chapter will introduce some specific cases which confirm my statement.

3.2.4.1 Native villagers vs. newcomers

As it has been already described, the local government aimed at welcoming new residents and to increase the population in Kisvaros for decades. However, after a while conflicts appeared between the native villagers and the newcomers. An important source of clash was burning leaves in the gardens. In the opinion of the native villagers burning things is necessary: '*Village. Here people are used to burning in the garden. They burn the weed. […] At spring and at fall in that bloody garden I have to somehow deal with leaves!*' On the other hand, smoke was almost unbearable for the neighbours, mainly for newcomers who were not used to it: '*They are burning all the time. Without any break. Pyromaniac people live here, everybody fires all of the shit. They are not able to understand how harmful it is.*'

---

[12] In order to avoid giving a simplistic picture, it should be shortly mentioned here that members of both of the groups constructed clear distinctions. According to the Roma, they were different in cultural specificities, they were excluded, oppressed and were the victims of discrimination. In addition, they often described the non-Roma as a homogeneous group (rich people who receive undue advantages) whose members were often "racist" and "haters". On the contrary, especially the less tolerant villagers the Roma as inactive, who – contrary to the non-Roma – did not want to work, '*take everything for granted*' and were responsible for their own poverty. As it is clear to see, these descriptions have some similarities: 1) The differences between the two groups were acknowledged by both of the groups. 2) Both of the parties gave simplistic descriptions about the other group and used stereotypes.

'Burning' became one of the central issues of the local public speeches. The opposition between the two groups turned into a heavy struggle four years ago. The story began in a hot, summer night. Peter, a newcomer, left the windows open in order to cool the house. When he woke up in the morning, his room was full of smoke as somebody was burning leaves in the neighbourhood. '*I was so angry that I thought I would explode. I went there and shouted at him. 'You motherfucker, I have to wake up at six to find my flat full of smoke!' I came back, logged in to Facebook and wrote a post "Smelly peasant, he is burning again".*' This was a turning point, as this comment appeared not only in interpersonal communication but in social media as well. Arguments and counterarguments followed the note of Peter who deleted his post three hours later and apologised for it – but it was too late. The news spread in Kisvaros: 'a newcomer called us smelly peasants'.

The reactions were quite strong and introduced various exclusionary practices. An unknown person printed leaflets and distributed them into the mailboxes during the night. The author warned villagers that the Peter who was working that time as the local postman and was a leader of a local NGO had negative opinion about the residents of Kisvaros. '*Folks, think about it, what kind of a man he is!*' – voiced the last sentence. Peter found himself to have even personal conflicts with local residents.

'*The local policeman stopped next to me with his car and got off. "Wait a minute, did you really say this?" I answered "Yes, I wrote it but I would like to tell you what happened." "No, no. I'll never talk to you" – this was his answer, he got in the car and drove away. After this...for months, until the next spring...if somebody glimpsed me in the village, they pointed the finger at me... I was afraid to go the other side of the village. There was somebody who came to my house and threatened me...that I should have not gone out at night, because I could have some troubles.*'

According to some of the villagers, the news about the Catholic Church were too dominant in the local newspaper. As one of our interviewees put it: '*It is a direct provocation on non-believers and it makes them nervous...why do you drop the cross into their mail-box? It makes them nervous, especially if they know that it is run by public money.*' On the contrary, some of the local residents supported the local newspaper and emphasised that '*I think this newspaper is good as it is. It informs us of what happened at the local government and in the village. I do not understand why we should change it.*'

Just before the beginning of the field work a debate arose about the editorial board of the local medium as some of the local residents would have liked to contribute to editing the journal. This intention was firstly refused by the editors. They even thought of resignation from their position as a protest. Later on, the editors decided to involve new members but only if the applicants would have university degree. As the potential contributors could not fulfil the requirements and as the conflict was going to remain, the city council agreed to appoint the same editors. The mayor warned that '*I only ask her to let in others who would like to work as well.*' All in all, the line up of the committee of the editors has not changed and their intention to exclude representatives of the 'others' were successful.

Despite all of this, the newcomers found the floor to communicate what was important for them in their own newly-established-newspaper, called 'Helyi Lap'. This newspaper was also free of charge and it was published almost every month. The publisher was the NGO that was founded by the newcomers. Of course, some of the representatives of the native villagers expressed negative opinion about the new medium:

'*The government has a newspaper. The Catholic Church has a newspaper. And there is...the other side...the strangers...although a lot of native villagers joined them. They write there...I can not say they stabbed us in the back...but what I read there hurts ...[...] They do not like the fact that the Church can publish a colourful newspaper. They publish their medium on an A4 size sheet of paper and drop it in everywhere.*'

After an intense electioneering, elections were held in 2014 in Kisvaros that was lost by Tamas. According to some of our interviewees, exclusionary practices clearly emerged during these months:

1. at the Harvest Festival, Tamas and his candidates offered tea and mulled wine for the visitors. Although, the local newspaper published photos and articles about all of the groups and organisations taking part in the festival, Tamas' team was somehow left out. According to Erzsi, the members of the editorial board of the journal were not independent. They were fans of the 'rivals'; some of them were even canditates at the election. All in all, not to write about Tamas' action was not an accidental but conscious decision.

2. according to a leaflet that was spread in the village by an unknown person, Tamas was not an independent candidate of the election but the supporter of the 'Democratic Coalition' political party ('Demokratikus Koalíció' in Hungarian) led by the former Prime Minister Ferenc Gyurcsány who is quite unpopular nowadays.

3. malicious gossips were spread in the village about Tamas' plan to make Roma families move into the village. According to some of the locals, opponents of Tamas set out to scatter the false news.

4. the next day after the election stickers with the numbers of the voters who elected Tamas (altogether 436 people) and the new mayor (a lot more, altogether 732 people), were sticked up everywhere in the village.

5. Only one member of the previous city council, Akos received enough votes to continue his work as a delegate. However, supporters of the new regime continuously provoked debates with Akos and made him angry and upset. Finally, he decided not to join the new city council being openly hostile towards him.

6. the previous mayor was the focal point of attacks after the lost election. Some members of the new city council even declared that '*they will only feel alright if Tamas goes to prison. [...] And they started to search for mistakes in the administration. Tamas was a little bit nervous that time. He even told me: if they really want to find something not signed or with wrong dates...they will*

find it.' Although, official proof that would have confirmed the guilt of the ex-mayor was finally not found but the new leader of the village pointed at some problems in the next issue of the local newspaper. She revealed the deficit in the budget of Kisvaros and declared: *'This is the current financial situation of the village. I had to write down all of this as I would like to avoid the impression that the outgoing mayor ensured all kinds of opportunities for us. The new city council will do its best in order to fulfil the obligations in time and the management of the village will not be endangered.'*

3.2.5 How the process of social exclusion was intensified?

This chapter will point at some of the circumstances that may have intensified the intension to exclude others. First of all, the role of the power relationships will be discussed. Later on, I will reveal the way the phenomenon of 'silence' influenced the life of the village.

It should be emphasised that many factors could be identified in the search for the sources of social exclusion. Some of them are listed here as (not exhaustive) examples: the historical antecedents of the dissents; the characteristics of the personal relationships; the fears, aims and interests of the participants who were involved in the conflicts; the local institutions, formal and informal organisations (as the school, the city council, the local NGOs, the church, the local enterprises, grass-root and bottom-up initiatives etc.) influencing the life of the village and the local power-relationships. However, it is important to point at the limitations of the research work that emerged because of the applied methodology. We did not have a previously established theory in our mind in the beginning of the action research program only an assumption: conflicts arise in all kinds of communities. We were solely interested in these conflicts, and what was also important, we were interested in the local residents' experiences and interpretations. All in all, we wanted to identify the local villagers' description about their own life. We asked them to name those who took part in the local conflicts, what the reason of these dissents was, how the participants treated each other, how the opposition was solved, how the participants managed to reach an agreement etc. As a result, some of local residents shared with us information about the antecedents of the local dissents – but some of them did not talk about this issue at all. Some of the local

residents revealed the way social exclusion emerged in the local school – but some of them did not even mention the topic. Some of them decided to talk about the clashes between the native villagers and the newcomers while others preferred to describe the Roma and non-Roma dissents. All in all, those issues came to the surface while talking about the local conflicts that were the most important and relevant for the participants themselves (and not for the researchers).

3.2.5.1 Power relationships

While analysing the results of the action research program one clear conclusion emerged: the targets of exclusion are not solely disadvantaged, vulnerable and marginalised groups, as the Roma people. Exclusion is not an ethno-specific phenomenon but rather a typical attribute of groups created by human beings. In case of the given village, newcomers and native villagers, supporters of the different regimes also take part in the game. And the list of the groups in Kisvaros – similarly to other communities – is quite long: there are active members of the Catholic Church and at the same time residents who regularly do not go to mass. There are poor and rich residents. There are people representing the ideology of liberalism while others stand up for conservativism or socialism. There are supporters of the right and at the same time fans of the left wing parties. Some of the people live at the upper side of Kisvaros, while others are inhabitants of the lower side. Although I do not discuss it but further groups existed in the village, divided by financial differences, different ideologies and kinships.[13] The village where the Foresee Research Group was working could be considered as a typical community where people live in an intercultural context, form groups and thereby boundaries, and feel inclined to exclude members of the other groups. All in all, the gap between the Roma and non-Roma is only one – and not even the widest – division within the community. Sometimes the tension is more intense

---

[13] One could observe the gaps between these groups even by focusing on the intensive spatial representation that functioned as a surface to acts of 'othering'. People considered each other and expressed separation and distance through actions related to the geographical space. Belonging to a social group or keeping distance from a social group determined for example the way people participated on a social event. The most expressive example to this phenomena was a concert organised as part of the Roma Day, where a countrywide famous Roma musician performed. According to the Roma people's interpretation some non-Roma villagers were equally keen on the musician, they visited the concert, but they did not come into the venue.

between those groups that own resources and mobilise their power in order to get in a better position.

Here, I would like to expand the definition of exclusion and distance it from the interethnic dimension. I argue that even conflicts that are easily labelled as 'interethnic' (as the primary stakeholders belong to specific ethnic groups and/or the issue is centred about ethnicity) could be reframed and introduced as the fight of powerful groups of interests who maintain the pretence and intentionally frame the dissent as one which arises between the Roma and the non-Roma. By stressing the (hidden) relationship between inter-ethnic conflict and power, I take the instrumentalist approach of the ethnic studies. According to this theory, inter-ethnic opposition often serves as a tool for mobilizing groups and launching collective actions in order to gain individual, political and economic ends (Fenton 2003, p. 76). The representatives of the instrumentalist lenses point at the aims and interests of community and political leaders that is hidden behind the scene of 'inter-ethnic conflicts'. In case of Kisvaros, the Soccer Conflict and the Butcher Festival should be cited once again as examples.

As it has been already introduced, native villagers, supporters of the 'tradition-orientated group' and Catholic residents could have problems with Tamas. As we highlighted: he identified himself as a liberal and a leftist person, he was an atheist and he was cooperating with the newcomers. I would like to reveal that the mayor not only represented a different ideology but he also challenged a lot of interests. He managed to build up a successful political ally – thanks to this work native villagers fell out of the formal leadership of Kisvaros for twelve years. He wanted to involve new members in the work of the local newspapers' committee – which was interpreted by some of the religious local residents as an intention to 'dismiss the believers'. He supported the newcomers in founding a new local NGO – and the organisation not only managed to involve a lot of residents into their work but they started publishing an alternative local newspaper regularly as well. In our opinion, the mayor offended interests and the actors who were attacked, reacted. And if anybody wanted to harm or attack the mayor, they could as well harm or attack his allies, as we explain in the following paragraphs.

Who were the allies of the mayor? For example Jozsef who was the leader of the soccer association. He was known as a "friend of the Roma", whose sport association was open

for Roma and non-Roma as well, whose Roma colleagues were the guards at soccer matches. He was not only supportive with the Roma but he was akin with the mayor – what may have been enough reason for attacking him: *'The leader of the local soccer association belongs to the team of the mayor. It is a common team. For native villagers they are the common enemy, they have to be removed and the other guys will run the sport and the local government.'* Somebody else pointed out that *'I am afraid the soccer conflict is not only racism but politics as well. Local politics. Here is the era of Tamas and Jozsef is his relative. They have family relationships. In my opinion, those who did not want to play with Roma saw an opportunity to attack the system.'*

Not only persons but groups belonged to the allies of Tamas – for example the Roma who were supported by him. According to our Roma interviewees the relationship with the local government had been quite bad before Lajos. *'When the old mayor was in power the struggle began. "We have to civilize them" This was the idea.'* The Roma Self Government had not been a partner in that period and clashes had been more intense in the village. Abusing Roma by the Home Guard and violation of human rights had been an everyday experience. As one of the ex-member of the Home Guard had shared with us: *"If we slapped somebody, we paid attention not to cause any visible physical harm. If we caught a Roma, we called the other home guards and, we slapped him and kicked his ass. And warned him that there will be no social aid if he will talk about it."* Circumstances at the Roma settlement had been terrible as the local government had not invested in infrastructure. As opposed to this, the new mayor, Lajos started a Roma settlement elimination program, invested in infrastructure and built upon the relationship with the Roma Self Government. When the research team prepared the first interviews in the village, the Roma inhabitants emphasised that *'the local mayor tries to support disadvantaged people*, *'he eliminated the Roma settlement and made it clean', 'he gave houses to the Roma', 'he supported the Roma Self Government every time'.* It is interesting to cite here the ideology of the mayor as well. In his opinion the majority of the society is responsible for the Roma integration. *'If we would like to accept them…not for one year, not only in the framework of a Roma integration campaign but for years…permanently…it will have an outcome. […] In the first 4-5 years there was no result. Seven years later it started to perform.*

Nowadays…there has been conflict one or maximum two times… Nowadays, it is not trendy to scold the Roma on the streets.'

Experiences of the Butcher Festival also confirmed the mayor's pro-Roma attitudes. The city council and the organiser negotiated the issue of the Butcher Festival on three occasions altogether in 2014. Together, the participants talked over issues such as program and the financial background of the festival, the financial support from the local government and the necessity of the entrance fee. The conversation focused primarily on the latter two topics. The mayor emphasised that if the local government had wanted to support the festival financially the organisers would have had to ensure free entrance for the local residents. The organiser opposed the idea because – as it has been already introduced – he wanted to avoid participation of poor villagers who '*will not buy anything and thus decrease our income*' and '*who are not able to behave*'. It was clear for the representatives of the city council that while the organiser spoke about disadvantaged people who might cause turmoil, he actually referred to the Roma. As the mayor drew it up: '*You may think that we will give the free entry tickets to the Roma but we will not. Not only Roma are disadvantaged in the village but a lot of other residents as well.'* He even mentioned that "*some of the organisers would not be satisfied if the Local Government gave free tickets to the disadvantaged residents. Supposedly, under the term of "disadvantaged" they meant "Roma" which is injurious and discriminative.'*

The mayor clearly expressed his discontent with the entrance fee and emphasised that '*I will not spew into my last ten years here, I will not consent.'* He did not understand what the (supposed) problems with the Roma were, as – according to the mayor – the village had previously not had any problems with the members of the minority, neither at the Roma Festival nor at other events. He voiced his incomprehension several times; '*altogether, 200 Roma people live here, in Kisvaros. If all of them visit the festival only about one-eighth of the visitors will be Romas. I do not understand the problem of the organiser at all.'* Probably, the mayor's commitment to the issue of Roma integration had a crucial role in the fact that an agreement was finally born and the main organiser of the festival guaranteed the free entrance for all of the residents of Kisvaros.

According to my opinion, if somebody wanted to harm or attack the mayor, they might as well have harmed or attacked his allies – and in case of Kisvaros the Roma clearly belonged to this alliance. If this really is the situation, the conflicts between Roma and non-Roma are not (solely) interethnic. The real underlying reason for conflicts is the clashes of the powerful groups of interests in the village. Among other factors, this could also be a reason why exclusion towards the Roma, the most vulnerable and powerless group, emerged and/or was deepened.

3.2.5.2 Silence

Kisvaros is quite a small settlement where people often meet on the street or at events of the village. The chance was there for all of the actors who were involved in the introduced strife to discuss the conflicts and to find out what happened, what the reason of the others reaction was, how the community should handle clashes and exclusion in the future. However, this happened only a very few times due to the practice of 'silence'. People from the different groups did not share openly their opinions with each other, their problems and their harms. Moreover, members of specific groups shared modified 'cover stories' with the others. The conflict that arose because of the exclusion of the Roma from the Civil Guard clearly shed light on this practice. As it has already been introduced, some non-Roma presupposed that Roma commit crime in the village. Despite these presuppositions, aversions against the participation of the Roma in the Civil Guard did not come to the surface. Only a very few people expressed openly their doubts against the involvement of them. Instead, silence prevailed, a very few of the locals revealed their real doubts and a kind of 'professional reasoning' emerged. According to some of the local residents no one could take part in the work of the 'Civil Guard' without experience and 'professional knowledge'. As Tibor, the leader of the Roma Minority Government emphasised, this opinion was only '*a communication bluff in order not to welcome everybody. They will tell you what 'professional' means and who is suitable for that work. [...] One does not have to attend the "University of Security"...*'

The sign of 'silence' will appear even if we turn our attention the way the pro-Roma residents talked about the issue of the local security. Tibor underlined that the Roma do not take part in burglaries at all. As he drew it up; '*I also feel as a piece of shit when*

there is a burglary in the village and we are blamed as burglars. I would like the local residents to recognise that Roma are for peace and tranquillity and they would like to do something for the security of Kisvaros. He even underlined that *'burglars usually come from the neighbouring villages. I am very angry because if there is an incident the communication will be about "the Roma who burgle" and not about "the burglar Roma who are not from our village".'* All in all, according to this interpretation, Roma do not take part in burglaries at all – especially not in their own village. I would like to focus on the way silence operated in this case as some of the local Roma committed crime indeed. This statement was confirmed by some of our Roma interviewees. According to these villagers, the criteria regarding the criminal record did not allow the Roma to join the 'Civil Guard' because *'several Roma used to be offenders'*. These residents also emphasised that Roma civil guards could catch those Roma criminals who were their relatives which may *'cause conflicts in your private life'*. However, the Roma and the pro-Roma local residents denied that Roma were involved in criminal activity (as they probably would not have liked to make the negative attitudes and the accusation of 'Gypsy crime' stronger).

As it is clear to see, nobody uttered explicitly why Roma should not have been involved in a local initiative that aimed at improving local security. In addition, none of the Roma initiated open discussion about the harms which arose due to the exclusion from the 'Civil Guard'. 'Silence' was so prevailing that issues regarding the local security were not discussed. The local residents did not talk about the way they – even Roma and non-Roma together – could decrease the burglaries and thefts in the village together. They did not have an open communication about the way the work of the current 'Civil Guard' could be improved together.

The same strategy evolved in case of the Soccer conflict as well. None of the soccer players – neither the non-Roma nor the Roma – have asked questions to each other in order to clarify the dissent. It is still an open question why some of the non-Roma wanted to play without the Roma. On the contrary, the Roma villagers' exasperation has not been resolved yet. In addition, the same strategy emerged when the organiser of the Butcher Festival emphasised problems with the poor visitors, who can not behave and who tend to decrease his income, and did not complain openly about the

Roma. All in all, he also avoided open communication, he did not reveal his opinion and did not utter explicitly his problems with the Roma.

In these cases, silence and group-boundaries were strongly connected to each other. Some of the non-Roma villagers had no doubts how to describe the Roma while a lot of Roma people in Kisvaros had clear ideas about the non-Roma. According to our experience, participants of these (and further) groups had vivid and intense discussions about the 'others'. However, hardly any of them share their opinions– and feelings, harms or criticism – with members of the 'other group'. Instead, most of them voiced their ideas, feelings, harms or criticism only within their own group. It is difficult to guess why the different group-members do not communicate with each other openly. Probably, lack of trust in each other and negative experiences about unsolved debates are among the main reasons. In addition, villagers may fear to reveal honestly their feelings as they do not want to become vulnerable. Moreover, they may interpret lack of communication towards the 'others' as manifestation of loyalty towards their own group. Although, the reasons are not certain the consequences are. Lack of open communication results in lack of information; which only decreases the chance of effective conflict management and makes stereotypes, assumptions and suspicions about the 'others' stronger. This is the way local groups become homogeneous entities which consist only of the same kind of people without any exceptions – the ideal way if somebody wants to make exclusion stronger.

3.3 Lesson learned

As Chapter 3 introduces, the definition and aspects of social exclusion provide an excellent framework for interpreting processes at the macro level and describing the situation of disadvantaged groups within the society, e.g. the Roma in Hungary. While talking about the situation of this minority, the multidimensional, dynamical and the relational attributes of the social exclusion can be clearly tracked.

However, if one is interested in the very specific process of social exclusion and would like to understand the way this practice emerges and is deepened, they have turn their attention to the micro level. Only the profound analyses of the level where groups are

formed and group-members interact with each other can give answers to the questions: what are the factors that support the emergence of social exclusion? What is the reason why exclusion evolves in certain circumstances while in other cases it does not prevail? Why some of the groups become more and more prone to exclude and tend to reject members of the other groups instead of acceptance? What are the components that enhance the sting of social exclusion?

All in all, I find it important to emphasise that while writing about social exclusion, one has to focus not only at the macro but even at the micro level and reveal the *'accumulation of confluent processes [...] which gradually distances and places persons, groups, communities and territories'* (Estiviil 2003, p. 19) and to understand the mechanism *'by which individuals and social groups belong to, or are detached from, relevant and meaningful social networks'* (Saraceno 2001, p. 4). If one would have liked to understand why and how people are being deprived, discriminated and excluded it would be necessary to gain knowledge about the micro level where groups are formed and group-members communicate and interact with each other in their everyday life.

4. Social exclusion within the scientific community

In a scientific community, there are always innovators, revolutionists and separatists who question established theories, introduce new techniques and apply new languages or approaches to previously examined and well-documented scientific problems. However, scholars calling into question or attempting to rephrase existing theories and norms often find themselves under attack by the "guards"; the representatives of the established science. These guards usually question the competency, knowledge and principles of the innovators. The case study presented in this chapter intends to demonstrate such an antagonism through an analysis of an intense debate. The story will reveal the way social exclusion emerges and causes clashes in the social scientist community in Hungary.

Firstly, the prevailing norms of the social scientists in Hungary that were violated by a young researcher, Ágnes Solt will be outlined. Then the chapter will provide an overview of the research report that led to an intense debate and introduce critics representing the "guards" and a defence of "separatist" researchers. Finally, it will elaborate on the consequences of the debate.

In the beginning of the chapter, it is important to give shortly information about the methodology of my investigation. In order to understand the participants' personal attitudes, motivations and interests, empirical fieldwork was conducted. I prepared seven semi-structured interviews between 2010 and 2012, participated in a roundtable discussion organised by the Institute of Sociology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, initiated informal personal discussions, organised a radio talk show program with participants involved in the debate, and used electronic sources, e-mails and published and non-published materials as well.

4.1 Background – the beginning of the debate

The root of the debate was a study written by Ágnes Solt about the living conditions of Roma communities in segregated settlements. The report, entitled "Life Beyond Hope", was ordered by a private foundation and published on 1 October 2009. The purpose of the research was to explore the living conditions of residents in segregated

neighbourhoods. In December 2009 the author presented her findings at a press conference, which generated waves of debate in the Hungarian media. Online and offline media, blogs and daily and weekly newspaper authors and radio broadcasters joined the debate by making, often explicitly, their personal opinion about the research project, the researcher herself and about the segregated areas, whose residents Solt identified primarily as Roma.

The "Taboo of the feral Roma" was one of the titles that appeared on an extreme-right blog in which the author of the study claimed that he jumped into the conversation only because of Solt's degradation to a "persona non grata"; however, he seized the opportunity by using only simplifying sentences and references to the article which depicted the Roma in a negative context. '*It* [Solt's study] *is a fiction or a horror indeed*', was the message of a well-known leftist daily newspaper (Ortutay, 2010) in reference to criticism coming from the Ombudsman for Minorities (Kállai, 2010). Shortly after this, the same NOL issue published articles from authors who found Solt's research exemplary and expressed opinions about the criticism, such as: '*those who would have responsibility in creating policies from the findings of science are looking for fabricated methodological deficiencies in their huffy vanity to disguise their impotence*' (Finszter and Korinek 2009, p. 1). In summarising the general expectations related to the various arguments, Lukács (2010, p. 77) commented that '*a professional scandal has evolved*', and the study generated intense debate both in the mass media and also in circles outside the public view. In order to understand the roots of the indignation and tensions, the content of Solt's study, which consists of 147 pages, is summarised hereinafter.

The first section explains the purpose of the research project and introduces the target group. Solt's intention was to explore the variance in societal norms and to analyse the mentality of residents in segregated settlements – almost all predominantly Roma. In general, she wanted to learn more about the daily life and living conditions of the Roma while focusing on how they perceive themselves and the majority society. In addition, she attempted to identify possible explanations for antisocial behaviour through variables such as poverty, Roma ethnic origin and prejudices towards the Roma.

According to Solt, this approach was meant to '*facilitate the social inclusion of the Roma*' (Solt 2009, p. 3) by introducing to the public the Roma's own perspective on how they experience the differences between minority and majority society. As Solt put

it, the research findings made '*it easier to understand the gap between the Roma and non-Roma in terms of communication and conflict resolution techniques and the reason why the Hungarian-Roma relationship has become so much more poisonous than economic and educational factors would suggest*' (ibid, p. 4). Thereby, the research findings can '*pave the way for a reconciliation and recognition of the rules of cohabitation between the parties*' (ibid, p. 3).

The text contains three hypotheses: 1) the mentality of the majority society and the Roma is different; 2) one of the reasons why previous social-political interventions were not successful is that they did not take into consideration the differences in mentalities; and 3) even within the Roma minority, I can observe prejudices against the majority society.

The research methodology was based on grounded theory, which means that the aim of scientific interest was to understand a "subjective reality" of the target group instead of looking for an "objective reality" (ibid, p. 8). As Solt underlined, her enquiry was an interactive process between the researcher and the research subjects. She gave a detailed description of the interview guidelines, her method of approaching interviewees and the interview arrangements. She visited 26 settlements, examined daily life in 14 places, conducted interviews with about 250 respondents, and recorded 74 conversations with a total of 117 people. The length of the interviews was between 23 and 30 minutes.

Solt made the whole data processing procedure transparent and easily accessible for the public. She labelled the interviews along dimensions such as "content", "circumstances", "style" and "dominant emotions" in order to support her content analysis. Due to the special characteristics of grounded theory, preliminary theories or preconceptions had no influence on her work. On the contrary, she identified salient issues through data processing as they emerged during the interviews. Both the structure of her study and the section headings followed this process and highlighted the topics that were important for the interviewees: *The rhythm of everyday life; Family; Solidarity and rivalry; Starvation and poverty; Jobs; Loan sharks;[14] Conflicts and taboos; The relationship between the Hungarians and the Roma;*

---

[14] A loan shark is a person who offers – illegally – loans at extremely high interest rates.

Communication and self-interest; Inspiring people and daily life; and *Narratives and emotions.*

The research summary concludes that the settlement members' belief that it is impossible to break out from extreme poverty was one of the dominant thoughts among them. However, one can find both individuals who fight against this attitude and believe in personal responsibility as a means of improving their lives, while there are those who criticise others in the settlement for not taking any action. But in general, the success and growth of individuals and families were not accepted and tolerated in the community. According to Solt, social control was very tight in the investigated communities, and its members did not allow their fellow residents to improve their lives which, as a consequence, hindered their mobility.

Solt claimed that the main communication strategy in the settlements involved the Roma emphasising their level of poverty and powerlessness. *'This communication entails serious barriers and obstructions for individuals to recognise opportunities and trust that they are able to create their own destiny and induce positive changes. The 'looking for support from the outside' communication results in an ignorance of one's own responsibility and leads people to a feeling of powerlessness.'* (ibid, p. 83)

The core issue of the current dissertation – the phenomenon of social exclusion – also was discussed in the report. On the one hand, the author observed exclusion that was expressed by the Roma towards other members of the Roma community who were trying to break out from poverty. On the other hand, exclusion emerged on the part of the Roma towards the non-Roma. Finally, the non-Roma were also described by Solt as using exclusionary practices towards the Roma. As the researcher underlined, members of Roma and non-Roma communities tended to avoid interactions with each other and that their relationship was tense and full of aversion, saying although it was stable, at least, on better days, it was hostile on worse ones.

Although the summary contains some controversial recommendations, it is the appendix that provoked most of the polemics. Titled "Field diary, photos, subjective remarks and experience in the field", it consists of 48 pages and begins with the author's warning of its subjective content. It shows that Solt intentionally ignored the

terminology of the scientific community and the requirements for objectivity and preferred to write about her own feelings and impressions.

The appendix repeatedly refers to differences between the Roma and Hungarians. According to Solt, the latter *'know how to behave and are able to manage expectations. In this respect, they differ greatly from those living in the settlements'* (ibid, p. 90). Interviews with Hungarians felt meaningful, with pleasant interviewees who appreciated being interviewed and did not expect any benefits from participating. Hungarians were depicted as victims of the Roma's antisocial behaviour, which included thievery, rowdiness, the spanking of children and intimidation.

The author's description of the Roma reflects negative sentiments and criticism. She believed that *'the main conflicts are among the Gypsies. They are results of loan sharking, jealousy and abusive behaviour'* (ibid, p. 95). The researcher writes residents of a segregated Vlach Roma settlement turned aggressively against her: *'A well-respected woman with a stentorian voice came out and forcefully warned us off with cursing. She set everyone against us. I was surrounded by local abusive young men. I was scared. It was the first time'* (ibid, p. 93). Later, Solt recalled that *'they were spitting after us, laughing at us and using dirty language. [...] They lacked any basic respect or kindness whatsoever'* (ibid, p. 124). Solt's experience with the people she came in contact with was that they were aggressive and *'their primary strategy was provocation, threats and physical aggression'* (ibid, p. 124). In reading the appendix, one can see Solt's disappointment in her clueless and desperate quest to understand the motivations for domestic violence and child abuse with apparent signs such as bleeding ears, broken noses and teeth, shiners and other injuries, and aggression among the Roma themselves and their behaviour towards domestic animals. Solt additionally listed characteristics of the communities such as the seclusion of strangers and taunting and member characteristics such as frustration and jealousy.

4.2 Groups in the scientific community under investigation

Before going into the details of the debate, it is essential to present the social science community itself. In this section the "elders" of the social scientists, whose research focus on the Roma minority is introduced, and the prevailing norms of the field are

outlined. It is indispensable to understand the background first as it provides insight into the participants' personal attitudes, motivations and arguments and, therefore, elucidates the intensity of the debate.

Csaba Dupcsik identified the streams of social sciences in Hungary with their "ideal types" (Weber 1968, p. 6) concerning the Roma. The main representative of the "critical theory", was István Kemény, who led an exploratory research program concerning the situation of the Roma in 1971. Kemény and his colleagues – mainly, Gábor Havas, Zsolt Csalog, Ottila Solt, Gabriella Lengyel, János Ladányi and Júlia Szalai – criticised the majority society for creating a disadvantaged status for the Roma. They described the relationship between the Roma minority and the non-Roma majority with terms such as oppression, discrimination and prejudice, thereby suggesting that the key to tackling the "Gypsy problem" could not be found without restructuring societal relations (Dupcsik 2009, p. 26).

Colleagues of Kemény expressed solidarity with the Gypsies. In particular, Csalog made his commitment to them often explicit. When recollecting his first memories about the Roma, he said in an interview: '*I was terribly upset when I saw how farmers treated them [...] Above all, my sense of justice was hurt [...] I literally had to close my eyes in order not to see how much they were duped*' (Daróczi 1997, pp. 36-37). Elsewhere, he talked about his relationship with the Roma by emphasising: '*I am a Gypsy. My work with them led to massive solidarity, a sense of common identity and a sense of kinship and love. It is good to spend time with them; it is enriching and helps me to grow. It became a reflex to stand up for them, for my kin*" (Csalog 1993, p. 41). Several of Csalog's further research reports exhibited and testified to the author's acceptance and sympathy towards the Roma (Csalog, 1976, 1979, 1991, 1995, 1996; Kovács, 1989).

Havas, expressing a similar opinion about the situation of the Hungarian Roma in terms of disadvantages for the minority group, believed one should not forget about the majority society as '*it maintains various mechanisms in order to keep the Roma, or those who are considered Roma by the society, poor*' (Pogonyi 2000, p. 8). Havas claims that the source of the Roma's marginalisation is rooted in ineffective social policy and a lack of long-term planning. Besides his scientific work, the sociologist took part in civil initiatives supporting the Roma. For example, he was an activist as part of

a grass-roots movement helping a village in the northeastern region of Hungary. The group's objective was to '*break up degenerate circles that derived from a total lack of hope*' (Havas 1998, p. 32). They helped in the establishment of a local Gypsy NGO, had a local school opened and, thanks to their work, enabled the launching of new local business ventures (Havas, 1998; Tót, 2000). In addition, Havas was also a member of "SZETA" – an organisation that will be introduced later on.

Lengyel conducted several case studies about the Hungarian Roma. She researched a village close to the region of Karancs (Lengyel, 1982), musicians in Letenye (Lengyel, 2001) and the Gypsies of Tiszavasvári (Lengyel, 2004). She also emphasised the power of the majority society in influencing Roma communities.

Szalai addressed the vulnerability of the Roma and the prejudices towards them in an interview for the journal *Amaro Drom*. She also represented the ideas of critical theory by emphasising that

being part of a minority group […] in the case of the Roma means a terribly high rate of unemployment and having to face accusations of receiving social benefits […] It is all about sweeping the Roma out from everything that is good in Hungarian society […] I believe the real drama of the last decade – and I all are responsible for this – is that the negative connotation of 'being Gypsy' has been conserved for a long time. (Kende, 2000, p. 6)

Elsewhere, Szalai looked for those coercive factors in the structure and history of the society that resulted in disadvantages for and prejudices towards the Roma (Szalai, 1998; Szalai, 2000).

Ottilia Solt, who considered Kemény her mentor (Papp and Horváth, 1989), published several essays, articles and research papers about the poor and the Roma. She claimed that since the Gypsies did not benefit from land distribution in 1945, they '*were condemned to be penniless once again*' (ibid, p. 78). She stood up for integrated education (Solt, 1976), spoke about the disadvantages of dismantling Roma settlements (Papp and Horváth, 1989) and led familiarisation campaigns regarding the Gypsies' lives and their difficulties in terms of schooling in Budapest (Solt, 1975; Solt, 1979). She argued against the regulation-orientated approach, which embraced the simplifying term of "Gypsy crime" (Solt, 1991). In her writings, she advocated the

interests of the poor, the oppressed and the Gypsies and criticised the majority society, with its prejudiced institutions, for its unwillingness to explore and resolve various social problems.

Kemény and his colleagues established a movement called SZETA (Szegényeket Támogató Alap – "Fund for Support of the Poor") in 1979. According to Solt, this grass-roots organisation, which aimed at enhancing solidarity towards the Roma, attracted friends, colleagues, writers and others who were interested in social problems. Members of the organisation spread the information about the initiative and collected donations for families in need. Out of the eight founders, Gábor Havas, Gabriella Lengyel, Magda Matolay and Ottilia Solt belonged to the Kemény school. As Havas recalled: '*Ottilia Solt organised meetings in her flat […] and there she came up with the idea of establishing an organisation to support the poor. To do so two attitudes were strongly interlinked: on the one hand, her commitment towards the poor, including the Gypsies, and on the other, her oppositionist stance*' (Diósi 1999, p. 91).

As in the socialist era, talking about poverty was considered taboo, and authorities would have probably banned the organisation, so the founders decided to operate illegally. It is therefore interesting to examine the mechanisms of dictatorship in terms of further insights into the work of SZETA and evidence about the norms of critical theory as the organisation was monitored by the secret police force, the ÁVH (Államvédelmi Hatóság – "State Security Bureau"). In 2011, thanks to the generous support of a DAAD scholarship, I had the fortune to spend two months at the Research Centre for East European Studies of the Bremen University. There, I had the opportunity to familiarise myself with copies of files that were compiled by the ÁVH regarding the establishment and work of SZETA for records created between 1980 and 1984. In order to confirm the "Roma-supporting" attitude of critical theory, I will cite from some of these documents.

A quote from an ÁVH officer noted that the aim of SZETA was to '*support those who lived in extreme poverty, especially those who were poor beyond their own control and those with many children, in a way that diverged from the discriminatory practise of official social policy*'.[15] The secret police chased members of SZETA when

---

[15] Daily report, No: 11-20/129/1980.

they collected donations and solicited sponsors through the spreading of propaganda,[16] the organisation of concerts[17] (under the mask of 'events of the Hungarian Young Communist League'), auctions,[18] public readings,[19] cabarets,[20] photo exhibitions[21] and choir concerts,[22] the publishing of anthologies[23] and books,[24] the sending of fundraising letters[25] and the personal collection of donations[26]. As the ÁVH figured out later – and partly due to a program broadcasted by Radio Free Europe[27] – foreigners could also send money and clothes to SZETA.[28]

Officers of the secret police often noted that Gypsies also belonged to the target group of SZETA: '*The aim of the regular monthly meetings was to distribute money among people chosen by them […] 80-90 percent of the beneficiaries are from the countryside and the majority of them are of Gypsy origin*'.[29] According to another file, the organisers also aimed at '*dismantling Gypsy settlements and providing solutions to housing problems*'.[30] In 1981 the Council of Szabolcs-Szatmár County built four houses for Gypsy families, and SZETA decided to support their construction with used furniture. Besides the financial aid, the idea of legal support also arose due to the high rate of legal prosecution of the Gypsies.[31] SZETA also provided legal assistance in other cases for members of the initiative who organised spontaneous guerrilla-actions in support of the Roma people. According to an ÁVH report, '*they erected a Christmas tree on a playground in District XX – without any official permission – which attracted approximately thirty Gypsy children*'.[32] The Roma-supporting attitude becomes apparent in the following report as well:

---

[16] Daily report, No: 11-20/82/1980.
[17] Daily report, No: 11-20/101/1980.
[18] Daily report, No: 11-20/151/1980.
[19] Among others: Daily report, No: 11-20/170/1980, 11-20/192/1980, 11-20/172/1980, 11-20/178/1980.
[20] Daily report, No: 11-20/36/1981.
[21] Daily report, No: 11-20/76/1983.
[22] Daily report, No: 11-20/157/1980.
[23] Daily report, No: 11-20/22/1981.
[24] Daily report, No: 11-20/36/1981.
[25] Daily report, No: 11-20/101/1980.
[26] Daily report, No: 11-20/198/1980.
[27] Daily report, No: 11-20/148/1980.
[28] Daily report, No: 11-20/189/1980, 189, 11-20/22/1981.
[29] Daily report, No: 11-20/129/1980.
[30] Source: SZETA, 3-II-62/6/1981.
[31] Daily report, No: 11-20/50/1981.
[32] Daily report, No: 11-20/202/1981.

According to information received from Mr György G., who is currently under prosecution, 'Smartass' (the code name of Ottilia Solt) has received several letters, mainly from Gypsies from Szabolcs-Szatmár County, asking for donations of money and clothes. In the flat of Smartass about 500 pieces of clothes have been collected, which were to be arranged into 7-15 kilogram packages and delivered to the addresses of those who asked for help.[33]

Besides these acts of support, members of SZETA organised seminars and workshops on the situation of the Roma.

According to Dupcsik, critical theory became unequivocally dominant in Hungary in the beginning of the 1990s (Dupcsik 2009, p. 243). As he emphasised, representatives of this theory were widely accepted, well-known and active. As Dupcsik put it: '*the approach, which I call 'critical', has an overwhelming advantage (both qualitative and quantitative) compared to other research approaches of social-scientific quality that focus on our compatriots considered to be Gypsies*' (Dupcsik 2010b, p. 2). I agree with Dupcsik that institutions, members of the scientific community and professional journals today represent the values and perspectives of critical theory – and did so even throughout the course of the debate, which will be introduced soon. At the end of this section, it is important to repeat once more and highlight the central elements of critical theory:

1. Solidarity towards the Roma, and
2. an emphasis on the responsibility of the majority society in creating disadvantages for the minority.

According to Dupcsik, Solt's study deviated from the prevailing norms of critical theory and, as a consequence, led to an extension of it with the introduction of his "post-critical theory". As he pointed out, Solt's approach was one which was not only critical of the majority society and its prejudices, but also of critical theory itself: '*Post-critical theory takes a critical perspective of critical theory that creates taboos and masks and distorts reality as if everything was fine with the Roma by suggesting that their*

---

[33] Daily report, No: 11-20/17/1982.

problems derive exclusively from discriminative oppression from the non-Roma' (Dupcsik, personal communication, 19 August 2011).

Dupcsik identified three important characteristics of post-critical theory:

1) Criticism of critical theory.

2) An attempt to dissolve taboos. As Dupcsik explained, *'ironically enough, they wanted to experience a moment of "I speak out' again", a sentiment that had been so inspiring for advocates of critical theory in the 1970s'* (Dupcsik 2010b, p. 3). An employee of the aforementioned donor foundation also pointed out that '*Ágnes recognised a new wave. She was keen to speak the truth and to avoid being compromised. She believed that a lot of things were biased, and she wanted to avoid being biased'* (Anon., personal communication, 14 February 2012). Solt herself agreed with this opinion and claimed that she '*has analysed things in such a way that have not been stressed in Gpysy research in Hungary'* (personal communication, 16 February 2010).

3) A shift from the prevailing idea of Kemény, which explains the Roma's disadvantages based on the majority society's prejudice and discriminatory practices. In contrast, post-critical theory emphasises the Roma's own responsibility. Dupcsik pointed out that although the idea had already been present in the media, this was its first appearance in social sciences, and Solt's work was the first attempt at legitimising the ideas of post-critical theory.

4.3 Social exclusion of the deviant community member

As a result of the deviation of Solt's study from the mainstream and the prevalent norms of the scientific community, criticism arose. Hereinafter, I summarise the main points of Solt's opponents.

1. *Methodological concerns.* Critics made explicit remarks about their methodological concerns related to the sample collection, applied guidelines and methods, field work, interviews and their analysis, embeddedness of the research project in the literature and Solt's research work.

2. *Discrediting of the person.* Solt had to face attacks against her person through negative comments and attributes connected to her personality. It becomes clear that criticism was not focused exclusively on methodological concerns when we read commentaries claiming that she used statistical software in an "amateur manner", that the references attached to her footnotes were used as a kind of decoration, the research was bound to "methodological slovenliness", the researcher was considered to be "naïve" and "obtuse", the research was fundamentally "misguided", or the description of the applied methodology fit into "introductory handbooks" which cannot veil the fact that "the different techniques applied in the research confusingly interfere with each other".[34] The criticism, apart from including references to Solt's cognitive capacity, often used emotional and value-driven judgments and sometimes short-tempered barbs. Or, as Margitay claims, the critiques, irrespective of the methodology, were targeted at the personality of the researcher as well (Margitay 2007, p. 550). This rhetorical strategy – limiting the occurrence of rational debate – suggested that the researcher was incompetent and lacked the necessary qualifications in the domain.

3. *Breaking solidarity.* The third element of criticism claims that Solt broke some ethical norms of the scientific community such as the requirement of solidarity.

a) Solt's text intensified negative attitudes towards the Roma. According to Dupcsik, '*Solt's study draws an important line between the Hungarians and the Gypsies. [...] Such a marked and significant distinction used throughout the article can polarise the non-ethno-specific elements of the description and the analysis into two opposing segments*' (Dupcsik 2010a, p. 81). He pointed out that this polarisation has amplified negative images about the Roma. When Solt used language with negative connotations to portray the Roma such as "jealousy", "aggression" and "man is wolf to man", she was suggesting that the Roma are the "bad ones" while, on the contrary, the Hungarians are the "good ones".

Dupcsik also highlighted the fact that the negative impact of the study was amplified by an irresponsible media, which prefers simple messages to communicate '*clichés or popular fallacies supported by so-called scientific evidence*' (Kovács 2010, p. 3). This is especially true when a scientific research has the potential to justify negative

---

[34] The citations are from the academic debate. Members of the scientific community criticised Ágnes Solt using these words.

attitudes and, thus, reinforce existing prejudices against the Roma. As Kovács recalls, '*I could see that many snapped at the opportunity and were strengthened in their prejudice and limited experience: "Yes, the Roma of the settlements are like this, indeed*" (ibid).

b) Solt showed negative sentiments towards the Roma. As I have pointed out earlier, the appendix of her study contained the researcher's own personal remarks – including those that later became a target of criticism. According to some opponents, the appendix proved that Solt '*does not like the Roma*' (Dupcsik 2009, p. 1);

the report proved the author's incomprehension and indisposition towards the Roma. […] She […] provided valuable insights into mentality: her own mentality and not the Roma's. It would be more pertinent, thus, to title the study "An urban intellectual's first encounter with culture shock." It would be interesting to code and run through the same data analysis process to see how often she felt it necessary to express her indisposition, disgust and astonishment. (ibid, p. 2)

Later on, Dupcsik described Solt carrying out her work as if '*somebody, suffering from a serious case of claustrophobia, wanted to research the subculture of cavemen*' (ibid, p. 2). Another opponent claimed during a discussion held at the Institute of Sociology that '*Ágnes Solt treated the subjects of her interviews inhumanly, and she seemingly could not overcome the cultural differences that she felt between herself and her interviewees*' (Kovács 2010, p. 4). The same opponent pointed out the potential effects of the researcher's facial expressions full of disdain and horror when interacting with the Roma.

Ágnes Solt responded to the criticism repeatedly and in various ways. She had the opportunity to publish in scientific journals, to speak at the above-mentioned discussion held at the Institute of Sociology and also to express her opinion in various other forums accessible to the wider public such as radio shows, online portals and other media outlets. In this section I will summarise Solt's defence strategy and her responses to the main points of criticism.

1) *Methodological concerns.* Solt welcomed the criticism and partly accepted some elements of the critical remarks regarding the applied methodology. She promised to refine her phrasing and terminology and to correct the problematic parts. She wrote in

Esély: "I have learnt a lot from the criticism and attempted to build some of them into the study that I wrote on the basis of the research" (Solt 2010a, p. 83). She said during the discussion at the Institute of Sociology: '*I will be much more aware of the terminology and the phrasing which, I have to admit, were reasons for misunderstanding*' (personal communication, 16 February 2010).

2) *Discrediting of the person*. Solt made several attempts to reinforce her legitimacy by presenting herself as an experienced and well-prepared researcher. These attempts were reactions to the criticism which questioned her competencies and professional knowledge and, therefore, her legitimacy as a full-fledged member of the scientific community. At the non-public debate Solt referred to her competencies acquired from her numerous projects in the field. She gave detailed insights into her professional background in *Esély*:

Due to preconceptions regarding my personality, I have to make it clear that in the course of my practice in empirical research, I have worked in both the longitudinal and in-depth interview styles, of which I have carried out almost five-hundred [...] Besides the above-mentioned target groups, I recorded longitudinal interviews with at-risk youth, their families and professionals who work with them. After all these experiences, I began the research in question. During my professional praxis I gained competences in verbal and non-verbal communication, which facilitated the interaction with my interview subjects and, therefore, allowed me to obtain the specific information I needed. (Solt 2010a, p. 90)

3) *Breaking solidarity*. Solt accepted, effectively, that the study had adverse effects to the extent that it led to stronger anti-Roma sentiments in Hungarian society. At the debate held at the Institute of Sociology, Solt distanced herself from the media scandal which was generated by the study: '*I lost control over it. In retrospect, I very much regret that it became public because it seems that it did more harm than good for the participants*' (personal communication, 16 February 2010). All in all, Solt accepted these kinds of critiques.

Solt expressed explicit reactions to the critiques regarding her contravention of the scientific community's ethical norms. She felt obliged to emphasise that she did not have any negative thoughts towards the Roma, writing in the *Esély* article: '*I did not*

perceive the residents of segregated settlements as natives of a completely different culture. I did not visit them with preconceptions of their Roma identity and culture that would have forced me to face a group of mysterious people. The main difference between us was that they live in extreme poverty, are socially excluded, are rejected by the non-Roma and, thus, are immeasurably defenceless' (Solt 2010a, p. 84). She considered it important to emphasise her trust-based relationship with members of the target group:

The goal of repetitive sampling was to assess the hospitality of the interviewees – whether their approach is ambivalent, benevolent or hostile. If I had experienced ambivalent or hostile approaches on their part I could have concluded that previous visits had been unsuccessful because I hadn't established trust and authentic personal relationships which would have led to us being unaccepted, discredited and not trusted. […] Without exception, they welcome our returns benevolently, in a friendly way. (ibid, p. 86)

This approach was tentatively reaffirmed by a high-ranking employee at Solt's institution: '*Connecting Ágnes Solt with racist language is simply nonsense*' (Anon., personal communication, 16 February 2010). In general, these signals meant to contradict the criticisms concerning the author's presupposed prejudices towards the Roma. Solt made it clear that she did not have a negative attitude towards the Roma at all.

The overall goal of the scholar in carrying out a study is not only to share "objective" information with members of the scientific community, but also to persuade: they refer to other authorities (already established scholars) and theories and methods and use quantified datasets, and profit from their rhetorical skills by trying to obtain the appreciation of fellow scientists while mitigating their criticism (Schickore, 2008; Latour, 1987). Solt's study was not completely suitable for this task; it proved to be insufficient in terms of the applied research methodology. The author did not give evidence of her commitment to the group norms, and her study consisted of subjective value-judgments as well. Therefore, a modification of the study became necessary.

At first the controversial appendix was omitted; with this the length of the study decreased from 147 to 98 pages. However, it was apparently not enough to eliminate the researcher's norm-breaking comments. The modified study was published in

Szociológiai Szemle (Review of Sociology) in 2011, and I compared this new modified text with the original research report – the following paragraphs summarise the differences I observed.

Although the size of the original text was reduced by the author, the structure and the phrasing remained relatively unchanged. The same chapters followed in order, and the text remained basically the same as before. However, slight modifications could be seen in the first and the final part of the study:

1. In the original text Solt described residents of the segregated settlements as members of homogenous Roma communities: '*The residents of the segregated settlements, with respect to ethnic affiliation, are Roma*' (Solt 2009, p. 5). In the modified text, although only slight, a few shifts in phrasing can be observed: '*Before starting my empirical research, I had knowledge of two components of social exclusion: I knew that the majority of segregated residents are Hungarian, Vlach or Boyash Roma people, and that they consider themselves Roma*' (Solt 2010b, p. 100).

2. While the list of references attached to the original study consisted of only one page and only 18 references, the modified version was made up of three pages with 51 references. With the emphasising of references to other authorities, the text became more serious, more professional and more relevant to the international scientific literature (Latour 1987, p. 33-44) and, therefore, the statements seemed to be more valid and less assailable.

3. A small modification was made in that the name of the cultural anthropologist who contributed to the field work disappeared from the modified list of contributors.

4. The titles of some section headings were softened. "Cooperation and rivalry" was modified to "Community cooperation and level of solidarity", "Starvation and poverty" was changed to "Inheritance, reasons for and consequences of poverty" while "Loan sharking" disappeared and the text of the chapter was incorporated into "Livelihood opportunities".

5. The original text enquired as to the responsibility of the residents living in segregated areas in creating their own situation: Do the Roma want to be isolated? What are the underlying cognitive processes which lead the segregated residents to choose isolation?

What prevents them from assimilating to the norms of the majority society? What conflict resolution strategies do they lack that isolate them from the members of the majority society? Solt tried to answer these questions, and in doing so, implicitly suggested that the segregated residents should have been blamed for their own situation.

At the same time, in the foreword of the new text, she dwells on the importance of the external prejudice generated by the majority society: '*I was fully aware that these people, beyond their own misery, suffer from the majority society's antipathy, suspicion, or even disdain and hatred*' (Solt 2010b, p. 100).

6. In the concluding part of the original study, the author claimed that the examined community's strategy for survival itself explains the despairing mobility prospects. Contrary to this, the new study mentions that the strategy for survival did not originate in the target group's ethnic affiliation, but for other reasons: '*On the whole, after comparing the results of the present research with other quoted – both Hungarian and international – research results, I argue that the strategy for survival and the mentality of the socially stigmatised, extremely poor minority cannot be explained by Roma culture (or by any Roma subculture), and cannot even partially originate from it*' (Solt 2010b, p. 130). Thereby, Solt not only emphasised the responsibility of non-Roma society, but expressed her agreement with one of the theses of critical theory: that the Roma can be considered rather a stratum than an ethnic group.

The chapter summarised the main critics towards Solt's study and the way the author responded. The dissertation even introduced the way she modified her research report. We have good reason to think that the modification happened due to pressure from the scientific community. The researcher amended the description of the methodological background, corrected and reflected on possible mistakes and, in doing so, improved the quality of the article. In addition, she put more emphasis on the responsibility of the majority society and on the fact that one cannot explain the Roma's situation by claiming that it is entirely a result of their own doing. She emphasised that the ethnic affiliation of the Roma cannot explain their segregated status. Accordingly, she aligned her approach with the norms of critical theory.

4.4 How the process of social exclusion was intensified?

The case study presented Ágnes Solt's research report, which triggered norm-protective mechanisms in the scientific community and generated intense criticism against the author. One of the manifestations of this mechanism was apparent in how members of the Hungarian social science community put significant pressure on Solt, who recalled after the debate: '*I have survived a paradigm shift. It was fierce. I have never felt this before. I felt that they wanted to destroy me. It was a brutal feeling. They want to destroy me and they can destroy me. Professionally, humanly, in any way*' (personal communication, 13 March 2010).

A participant in the discussion at the Sociology Institute highlighted the practice of exclusion: '*There are men of knowledge and men of science who undoubtedly own science, who handle scientific questions mono-disciplinarily and who are on the correct side. I mean on the correct side of the barricades. And they shout 'Enemy!' if someone articulates opinions opposite to theirs*' (Anon., personal communication, 16 February 2010).

Other exclusionary practices emerged when the dynamic realignment feature of the scientific field activated. As Solt recalled, with the intensification and spreading of critical voices, the number of her supporters steadily decreased. A good example of this was when Solt's anthropologist associate at the Institute of Sociology requested her name be omitted from further references because she could not take responsibility for the contents of the study. To my enquiries on the background of this retreat, Solt answered: '*The associate asked me to remove her name from everywhere. She retreated because she is writing her thesis with X, and X is her director of studies and is completely fed up with her, so she could be flunked and, therefore, does not want to be involved*' (personal communication, 13 March 2010). According to Solt, another important supporter also disappeared when the debate intensified. As she put it:

He considered my research report fine and told the editors of the Review of Sociology to order a copy. This was before noon. His opinion changed suddenly by the afternoon. He wrote an email and emphasised that my study did not fit the requirements, neither of anthropology, nor sociology or social psychology. And its effects are terrible. So it was completely the opposite of what he had told me in the morning. (personal communication, 13 March 2010)

Hierarchy in the scientific community, dependency and patron-client relationships led to the galvanisation of lobbying-type activity against the researchers and their proponents who contested normal science. Being afraid of reprisals from the dominant and pro-normal science representatives of the field, Solt reported that it is difficult to stand up publicly to their agenda: '*As the outcry of the opponents intensified, an increasing number of people who had assured me of personal support indicated that they could not risk siding with me anymore. They expressed their agreement and what they thought of me, but feared to speak about it publicly*' (personal communication, 13 March 2010).

It should be underlined, that previous articles had already showed Roma in segregated settlements in a negative context. For example, Ottilia Solt had written wrote about the consequences of eliminating the Roma settlements in 1985. The places where the Roma had been moved to:

became littered with all kinds of garbage imaginable. All of the barracks have their own prostitutes with the potential to destroy the marriages of neighbouring families and to attract police attention. [...] They have their insane and criminals as well. Males of the families moving into the barracks are becoming criminals or alcoholics within a few months. Women are impatient; they beat up and yank their children around. Hate and murderous passion are widespread; adults and children and women and men equally live a life of physical aggression. Knives, bricks, axes and fistfights are usual elements of police arrests there, which average two a day. Every second Gypsy is in jail or has just been released from or is about to go to prison. [...] Being envious of their luckier fellows, they are regular guests at the mayor's office, demanding things resentfully, threatening suicide and the massacre of their families, and quarrelling with and spying on their peers, in addition to fighting with their peers about whether the latter's lives are easier than theirs and then trying to resolve any 'injustices' by making these peers' lives miserable. (Diósi 2002, pp. 89-90)

Decades later (in 2002), Dóra Pálos summarised her experiences and feelings about a Gypsy community living in a village in Romania. As the author put it in the book (which came into existence thanks to the cooperation of the Institute for Minority Studies of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Cultural Anthropology Department of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Eötvös Lóránd University): '*I visited them. They were*

drinking there. Something was repulsive for me. […] I was really afraid'. A bit later she revealed: *'I could not stand it. I felt disgusted. I found the people around me dumb, devoid of sense or any sign of thought. They cared only for themselves while their children were expelled to the streets, covered with mud, exposed to flies and fungal disease. […] It was like a nightmare! […] "Quickly! Leave this place!" I said to myself'* (Pálos, 2006, p. 93). Other studies (eg Bakó, 2006; Horváth, 2002; Stewart, 1994; Durst, 2001) were also able to strengthen the prevailing negative attitudes by describing the Roma's prejudices towards the non-Roma, the envy and aggressiveness prevailing in their communities, the young age at which Roma women give birth to children and the irresponsible way Roma spend welfare money.

In taking these aforementioned facts into consideration, questions may arise: What are the origins of 'indignation' and of the vigorous attention surrounding the study? What is the reason that Solt's study become the focal point of intense criticism? Why did Solt declare that *'The unusual attention covering my study and also the tensions that are being targeted at me are remarkable'* (Solt 2010a, p. 83). How can it be explained that, at the debate organised at the Sociology Institute, Solt was *'stewed in hot oil'*, *'quartered'*, *'put to the sword'*, *'crucified'* and *'spit upon'* (Anonymous citations from the participants of the debate held on 16 February 2000 at the Institute of Sociology). Why did Solt become the target of the exclusionary practices arising in the scientific community? In the next chapter, I will search for answers and point at specific circumstances that intensified social exclusion. It is important to underline that my explanation points only at some of the causes while several further potential reasons probably remain hidden.

4.4.1 Groups of interests and the social identity theory

While analysing the case study of Solt, one can identify fractions: the group of the 'critical-theory' and the representatives of the 'post-critical theory'. The difference between these theories seems to be one of the principal reasons behind the exclusionary practices that arose after the publication of the study. I agree with Bourdieu, who once claimed that a scientific community should be perceived as a social arena in which tensions are internally structured. The structure of the academic field is determined by agents (researchers, groups and laboratories) and, more precisely, by

the structure and quantity of capital available for actors. This approach describes a scientific community as a dynamical structure, as opposed to a static one in which power allocations are constantly changing. The more scientific capital a person owns, the more power she or he owns within the field. Conflicts in a scientific community are the result of struggles between the powerful (who have accumulated capital) and the relatively weak (who lack capital):

The former are able, often effortlessly, to impose the representation of science most favourable to their interests, that is to say, the 'correct', legitimate way to play according to the rules of the game. [...] Their interests are bound up with the established state of the field and they are the natural defenders of 'normal science' of the day. They enjoy decisive advantages in the competition, one reason being that they constitute an obligatory reference point for their competitors (Bourdieu 2004, p. 35).

In brief, those who attempt to introduce new approaches which contrast with prevailing norms might face resistance from those who represent the mainstream. In this regard, Solt was the one introducing a new approach and, therefore, had to face resistance from the powerful advocates of critical theory.

The science of social psychology also deals in detail with situations where different fractions stand in opposition to each other. As Tajfel emphasised in his social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979), the best way of increasing the self-image is favouring members of the in-group over the out-group. In-group favouritism often results in outgroup negativity and discrimination against the others. While listing the groups in case of the Solt-debate, not only the fractions of the 'critical-theory' and the 'post-critical theory' but additional groups – institutions and disciplines – could be named. Although Solt was a graduate student of Eötvös Loránd University of Science (ELTE), she carried out her divisive researches as an employee of the National Institute of Criminology (OKRI). One of the opponents raised his voice against the negative activity of the institute, claiming that it has, by publishing the study, reinforced the majority society's negative attitudes toward the Roma. '*I think the other problem is the institutional stance, which no one has counted with. Solt went public not only as a sociologist. Her work has been presented by OKRI* at *a press conference. Since 2008, the new turning point in the discourse of the "gypsy crime", OKRI has enjoyed relative*

media popularity. The public expect data and information. The press conference was a sort of institutional stance and therefore people could believe that mainstream criminology's findings coincide with what ordinary people think.' On the contrary, an institutional employee representing the OKRI at a private debate emphasised that '*it might have affected the debate that in the demarcated field of Roma research a new branch of science has appeared. A new professional, namely the criminologist, was to deliver a different perspective. [...] And I have to point out that it had happened before when the criminologist and the sociologist met, in the 1960's, when deviancy, in quotation marks, has attracted the attention of the sociologists.*' All in all, monopolization of professional authority was realized and one of the groups of interests in the field aimed at the exclusion of the outsiders while defining them '*with labels such as "pseudo," "deviant," or "amateur"* (Gieryn 1983, p. 792). The intensity of the exclusionary practices may also have been reinforced not only by the conflict of interests between two streams of social sciences in Hungary but by the opposition between two institutions or more accurately between two branches of science.

4.4.2 The role of the emotions in the debate

One can recognise two kinds of criticism in case of the Solt debate. In the first place, criticism originated in publicly available sources, which were accessible to the wider professional audience. Such sources were the study itself, the articles which had been published in reference to the study, the exchange of letters between Ágnes Solt and her critic, Csaba Dubcsik which was published in the journal of social sciences "Esély". The second stream of criticism contains much more diverse but publicly not available "proofs" – emails, non-published critiques and fragments of articles. I analysed two main sources from the second stream, such as an unpublished article and the private debate of the Hungarian Sociological Association held on 16 February 2010. The following tables summarise these kinds of criticism.

	Criticism regarding **methodology**
1	There may have been systematic distortion that resulted from poor sampling design as the extrovert residents of the settlements under investigation were probably more prone to communicate with the researcher.
2	The opinions of the interviewees were influenced and distorted because of the different ethnical background, as the Roma people were probably less open towards the non-Roma researcher.
3	It is not possible to follow the way the theory of the researcher changed in the mirror of the empirical experiences.
4	There is no historical perspective in Solt's study. She writes about characteristics of 'mentality' of the people under investigation. It is a mistake as these characteristics are probably the results of social processes of the past.
5	Solt does not ensure anonymity for her interviewees.
6	Researchers mustn't give presents during the field work.
7	Solt's sampling was not based on an up-to-date data base (from 1990).
8	The researcher was not able to bridge the cultural gap that appeared between her and members of the target group.
9	As the researcher had not enough time to spend in the field, she was probably able to talk only with a specific sub-group (the most disadvantaged one who stayed at home during working hours as well).
10	The interview guideline (and therefore the study itself) did not fit the professional standards due to the preconceptions and prejudices of the researcher.
	Criticism regarding **ethics**
1	Solt gave a negative description about the Roma.
2	She had negative sentiments towards the Roma.
3	The researcher violated human dignity of the interviewees.
4	The research report increased prejudices towards the Roma.

The picture becomes even more complex if we compare two versions of an article. Although, the first version of it was not published but as a manuscript was available for a small professional informal network. Later on, the author re-wrote this article and published it in the journal of the 'Esély'. As both of the sources are accessible for the author of the current study, it is an interesting experiment to compare them.

	Criticism that was **not available** to outsiders – the unpublished article	Criticism that was **available** to outsiders – the published article
	Criticism regarding **methodology**	
1	Solt did not spend enough time in the field thereby it was not possible to resolve the disinclination between the Roma and the researcher.	Solt did not spend enough time in the field thereby it was not possible to resolve the disinclination between the Roma and the researcher.
2	Conducting structured interviews was not an appropriate method (as it was not possible to conduct 45 minutes long interviews and as she should have combined interviews with participatory observation).	Conducting structured interviews was not an appropriate method (as it was not possible to conduct 45 minutes long interviews and as she should have combined interviews with participatory observation).
3	Solt did not study the relevant professional literature.	Solt did not study the relevant professional literature.
4	Sampling method was not appropriate (as Solt did not use an up-to-data database).	Sampling method was not appropriate (as Solt did not use an up-to-data database).
5	Solt did not have well-based information about the Roma themselves.	Solt did not have well-based information about the Roma themselves.
6	Some conversation (from the non-Roma interviews) were incorporated into the research report without any reflection from the researcher.	Some conversation (from the non-Roma interviews) were incorporated into the research report without any reflection from the researcher.
7	The negative attitudes of Solt were probably recognised by the Roma interviewees therefore their answers were influenced.	-
8	Solt did not aim at understanding the 'subject' of her investigation – what is a basic requirement towards a professional social scientist.	-
9	Solt's knowledge was limited about the way Grounded Theory should have been applied.	-
10	The applied concepts and terms are not well-defined.	-
11	Solt did not take the characteristics and determinants of the context (the society) into consideration.	-
12	-	There is no information (e.g. length, information) about the interviews that were conducted with non-Roma.
13	-	It is not clear how many Roma people gave interview more than once.
14		There is no historical perspective in Solt's study. She writes about characteristics of 'mentality' of the people under investigation. It is a mistake as

		these characteristics are probably the results of social processes of the past.
15	-	The interview guideline (and therefore the study itself) did not fit the professional standards due to the preconceptions and prejudices of the researcher.
16	-	Sometimes, Solt comes to unfounded conclusions (e.g. describing the fertility of Roma women without statistical evidences).
17	-	The number of the categories that was created by Solt was too small.
18	-	The database that was created by Solt did not provide the opportunity to draw conclusions about the Roma settlements nationwide.
19	-	During the content analysis Solt created categories but these units incorporated primarily negative characteristics.
20	-	Solt was not reflexive: the messages of the interviewees may have primarily aimed at influencing the research (and not mainly at giving information).
21	-	Solt did not clarify that some characteristics of the target group are Roma-specific and/or it is also the trait of the non-Roma society.
	Criticism regarding **ethics**	
1	Solt had negative sentiments towards the Roma.	-
2	Solt was not able to set apart her negative sentiments towards the Roma during the field work.	-
3	Solt gave negative descriptions about the Roma in her study.	Solt gave negative descriptions about the Roma in her study.
4	The putative differences between the Roma and the non-Roma are reinforced due to the study.	The putative differences between the Roma and the non-Roma are reinforced due to the study.

As it is clear to see, the first version of the criticism focused primarily on methodology. Altogether, 11 mistakes were identified by the author who – similarly to the opponents of the private debate of the Hungarian Sociological Association – pointed at the deficiencies of the research methodology, sampling, field work etc. The manuscript enumerated some violations of the ethical norms as well. It pointed at the negative stereotypes of Solt, the way the research report increased prejudices towards the Roma and the fact that the researcher violated the human dignity of the interviewees.

However, if we take the second (re-written) version of the article into consideration, we can conclude that more emphasis was put on the methodological concerns while the violation of the ethical rules stayed in the background. The published version pointed at altogether 16 types of methodological mistakes and only at 2 problems regarding the ethical issues.

It is an interesting investigation to analyse even the two different texts from the point of view of emotions. The author of the unpublished article described Solt as 'naïve' who was filled not only with incomprehension but even indisposition, disgust and astonishment towards the Roma. As the reviewer underlined, Solt had been annoyed as she had not been able to create proper interview situations. She organised her findings in a 'very strange table', her knowledge about the content of the professional literature was 'scary' as 'it is somewhere close to zero'. The degree of her ignorance was described as 'surreal'. As it clear to see, the author used rough language – and thereby made his attitude towards the debate clear and more identifiable. He attacked the character or motivations of Solt and this way tried to destroy the credibility of her position and argument. All in all, the clear case of (an abusive type of) ad hominem argument could be observed. As Walton emphasised, this kind of personal attack did not make real contribution to the advancement of the discussion and '*may even pose a serious obstacle in this regard*' and even '*it has the effect of turning a reasoned critical discussion of an issue into a personal quarrel*' (1998, p. XII. and 4.) Elsewhere, Walton pointed at the consequences of using an ad hominem argument emphasising that '*once a certain level of derogatory language has been used to classify one's opponents in the argument, a kind of poisoning the well takes effect*' (1992, p. 210) as participants of the debate were more and more bound to find prejudicial terms while describing each other. Tension, quarrel, prejudicial terms and derogatory language obviously result in intense conflict and opposition while dialogue gets more and more personal. Social psychologists also proved that negative emotions trigger anti-outgroup reactions as they made creating stereotypes easier (Mackie and Hamilton, 1993), exacerbated and encouraged conflicts (Forsyth, 2010) and provoked aggression and retaliation (Meier et al, 2008).

One could argue that in case of the Solt debate, the style of the published text was completely different. Most of the emotions disappeared and the author removed his negative comments and attributes connected to Solt's personality. The two changes –

more methodological criticism and less emotions – made those '*aspects of style that focus attention away from people and toward things*' (Gross – Harmonn – Reidy 2002, p. 228) stronger and thereby tried to convince the readers that '*reason has subjugated the passions*' (Gross 2006, p. 29). All in all, some of the real concerns with regard to the study – and to the author herself – were gone. As a counterargument, I would like to emphasise that the non-published text (and thereby the hostile attitude towards the research report and its author) was well-known for the members of the professional network and even for Ágnes Solt. All in all, the well had been already poisoned when the re-written text was published. Moreover, due to the modification even the problem of the 'unstated premises' (Govier 2010, p. 41) evolved as the premises of the arguments of the actor – i.e. Solt is incompetent – were not explicitly uncovered, the participants of the dispute did not properly reveal and interpret their arguments. All in all, unexpressed premises that were taken for granted by the author but the audience was not able to recognise, also hindered the solution of the debate.

4.4.3 Deviation

One can find an additional potential explanation from the field of the social psychology that explains why social exclusion emerged and was deepened in the Solt case. As the discipline underlines, people express more negative attitudes about a negative member of their own group than a negative member of the outgroup. Here, it is important to emphasise one more time that Solt was a member of her own scientific community; criticism arose from inside the group, which might have made the debate even more intense.

As Hogg and his co-authors underlined:

Members can intentionally betray a group by practising treachery or acting as a stalking horse for a despised outgroup. They can also intentionally try to destroy the group by introducing schism […] or acting as revisionists. These behaviours are often viewed as a profound betrayal of loyalty and group trust. Since loyalty and a sense that you can trust your fellow members to act in the group's best interests lie at the core of group life […] betrayal of these expectations is a cardinal violation that invites severe punishment by the group. (2004, p. 193)

Abrams described this process similarly while drawing a picture of the exclusion of deviants from the group: *'Traitors are rarely tolerated for long, and vengeance is often brutal. […] We propose that people use judgments and evaluations of individual group members to sustain the prescriptive norms of their ingroup […] By isolating antinorm deviants from the ingroup, the norms of the group are both clarified and strengthened'* (Abrams et al. 2004, pp. 161-162).

Sociology of scientific knowledge also has analysed the phenomenon of social exclusion in scientific communities. Hardwig emphasised that an indispensable characteristic of a scientific community is trust (1991, p. 693). In order to fulfil the increasingly work-intensive requirements of data collection and analysis and to obtain the necessary pool of information, specialisation and teamwork is becoming crucial for scientists. As a consequence, there is a decreasing number of scientists who possess comprehensive knowledge of the theoretical backgrounds of other approaches and the technical and methodological apparatus leading to new scientific achievements. Under these circumstances the importance of trust is rapidly growing. If scientists do not have necessary information about other scientists, but trust them – that is, they accept their epistemological character in terms of, for example, competency, scrupulousness and ability to self-assess (Hardwig 1991, p. 700) – they can accept their scientific results as well.

However, trust emerges only under specific conditions. Scientists are trusted only if they share norms which enhance coherence and group identity. Members of the community accept norms and the set of rules of the group by expressing 'joint commitments' (Gilbert 1994, pp. 246-248). University enrolment examinations and the subsequent series of exams, the process of graduation, the application procedure for PhD programs, the process involved in achieving a PhD and publishing represent the milestones of a suitable control mechanism in which researchers can display their personal credo and demonstrate their acceptance of group norms or, as Bourdieu said, their habitus (Bourdieu 2004, p. 38). Scientists who refuse to accept these norms might lose the community's confidence and, therefore, be disqualified from the scientific community (Schmitt, 1994).

Margaret Gilbert described in detail how scientific communities reacted when a member formulated ideas contrary to group norms by introducing the concept of

'shocked surprise' (Gilbert 1994, pp. 236-241.). She emphasised the emerging astonishment and disbelief on the part of the community that accompany rebellious ideas. In my opinion, the source of the strong criticism towards Ágnes Solt and the highly emotional response was a sign of shock because the group's own member broke the norms of the scientific community. '*It is clear that she came from the same place and raised the same questions, but in many aspects it seems obviously dangerous what she represents*' (Anon., personal communication, 14 February 2012) was a statement which came from a meeting at the Institute of Sociology. As another participant of the meeting explained: '*It was not only about her conclusions and the applied methodology, but mainly about the Roma. There is prudence. [...] There seems to be cliques finding out an approach, a politically correct spiel. And there is Ágnes, who is not interested in it*' (Anon., personal communication, 14 February 2012). Lukács commented: '*A peculiar, strange debate arose [...] regarding critics of Ágnes Solt not accepting different findings from their own, although they have no right to 'monopolise' the researches on the Gypsies*' (2010, p. 77). Another interviewee emphasised that '*an easily identifiable intellectual community came into being over the last twenty years through whom people became accustomed to finding negative talk about socially excluded groups, including the Roma, intolerable. For members of this community it is simply unacceptable*' (Anon., personal communication, 16 February 2010). Solt was a member of this community; however, her approach proved to contradict the prevailing norms, and she had to bear the brunt of the attack from her own scientific community. By refusing these ruling norms and not accepting the 'correct', legitimate way to play, she generated resistance inside the social science community to which she belonged.

5. To embedded into the society

The previous chapters described the groups under investigation and the way social exclusion emerged and was intensified. The two fields at the micro level – the residents of a Hungarian village and the social scientists – clearly differ, they can be described with distinct norms, values and rules. However, this chapter reveals a social factor that had probably an impact on both of the communities under investigation as it probably made the conflicts between the groups stronger and thereby intensified the degree of social exclusion. I consider it important to shed light on this factors as it can deepen our knowledge about the phenomenon of social exclusion.

In the beginning of the chapter it is important to cite Kerezsi who already emphasised: in East-Europe *'members of the ethnic minorities are commonly considered as "criminal", "thief" which opinion suggests that they are associated the traditional – typically not serious, the so-called 'livelihood crime'[35]* (2011, p. 24). Findings of nation-wide representative surveys that have already been introduced in the previous chapters confirm this statement. Further research programs have revealed that negative attitudes towards the Roma have been expressed even by the police (Bólyai 1997, Tarján 1999, Csepeli at el 1997, Geskó 2000, Hera 2015, Hera and Arnold 2014, Krémer and Valcsicsák 2001, 2005a and 2005b, Fridrik 2007, Kádár *et al.* 2008, Fleck *et al.* 2012). Probably, this attitude also contribute to discriminatory behavior of the police officers (Roma Sajtóközpont 2014, Kőszeg and Králik 2008, Pap and Simonovits 2006, Tóth and Kádár 2011).

However, not only the findings of research programs but the field of politics should also be named here. The negative attitudes towards the Roma have been strengthened by Jobbik, a legally functioning extreme right party, founded in 2003. During the 2009 European parliamentary elections, 15 percent of the voters supported the party. Three of their representatives were elected to the European Parliament. A year later, it won 12 percent of the votes during national parliamentary elections, sending 47 representatives to the Hungarian Parliament. In the local elections, 337 Jobbik delegates gained seats in local, county and state councils – including 3 mayors. As researchers emphasised, there was a high proportion of first-time voters who support

---

[35] 'Livelihood crime' is a frequent term which is used not only by (extreme) right wing politicians but ordinary people as well. It describes petty thieving as a profession and presupposes that Roma do not have a job as they would not like to work.

Jobbik, reflecting their popularity among the younger generations as well (Kiss and Szeger and Hera 2013, Hera and Szeger 2015). By today, Jobbik has become the second strongest party in Hungary (Ipsos, 2015).

The party readily emphasises the danger of 'Gypsy crime'[36] (Gimes et al. 2008), takes an openly discriminative attitude against the Roma and draws attention to the damage which, in their opinion, the Roma cause in the majority of the society. Not only the party itself but the Jobbik supported Hungarian National Guard (and later on the New Hungarian National Guard) paramilitary association have also been very anti-Roma and advocated against "Roma crime". Intimidating illegal marches have taken place primarily in villages in the countryside, where there has been friction between Roma and non-Roma residents. It is also important to mention one more time, that a series of violent attacks also took place, targeting Roma families, between 2008 and 2009. These attacks led to the death of six people and to multiple injuries (Human Right First 2010).

The strength of the anti-Roma sentiments in the Hungarian society probably had an impact on the way groups of Kisvaros and the social scientists community intended to exclude each other:

---

[36] The issue of 'gypsy crime' is a 'patchy area'. Scholars and researchers face difficulties in Hungary when they try to confirm or deny this idea. The Act on 'Protection of Personal Data and the Publicity of Data of Public Interest' (Act LXIII of 1992) considers ethnic origin sensitive information thereby signed consent form would be required if anybody collected, recorded, organised or stored data concerning people with Roma origin. This legalisation resulted in lack of crime statistics with special regard to the Roma. In the last thirty years, only three researcher programs analysed this issue. At the end of the 80ies, Tauber elaborated the statistics of the police and the prosecution concerning Roma. He declared that criminal activities of the Gypsies is higher than of the majority of the society – at least in case of specific types of crimes (as crime against property) and within specific groups (as juvenile offenders) (Tauber and Balogh, 1988). About ten years later, Huszár pointed out that '*Roma people […] are unprecedentedly overrepresented among the population who are in prison.*' (Huszár 1999, p. 131). In 2000, Póczik conducted a survey in the prison of Vác where high number of the population (41.5%) belonged to the Roma minority (Póczik 2000, p. 426).

Taking these descriptive statistics into consideration one may conclude that Roma are significantly overrepresented in prisons and have more conflicts with the police. However, it is almost important to refer to scholars who emphasise that crime is a social problem, closely related to other social conditions, for which not only one individual but the whole society is responsible. Researchers proved that being influenced by social deprivation and discrimination can lead to criminal offences. Hough underlined that '*The idea that high levels of income inequality fuel crime is almost a criminological truism, with a long sociological pedigree in strain theory.*' (Hough and Sato 2011, p. 12). In Hungary, Kerezsi also emphasised that '*by comparing geographical distribution of registered crime rate to the division of GDP rate per capita, those areas have higher registered property crime rate, which have higher GDP rate, too. Nevertheless the number of registered offenders is much higher and concentrated in the economically deprived areas*' (2004, p. 107). Tauber, one of the Hungarian researchers who focused on the issue of 'Roma crime', also pointed at how the social status and disadvantages increased criminal activities of specific groups (Mohácsi 1987).

1) In the village, Roma people often referred to the danger of the extreme-right wing. Somebody recalled the fearful period when the shocking series of Roma killings happened in Hungary: *'During those years the Roma were afraid. They were suspicious. They considered all of the unknown cars that arrived at the village as a potential source of danger.'* Somebody else emphasised that *'we are surrounded by supporters of the Jobbik and the Hungarian Guard. Both of the neighbouring villages are full of these kinds of residents. Roma mustn't live in those villages.'* Yet another Roma complained about the growing party while emphasising that *'racism used to be vehement in the country but nowadays it has reached even our village as well. There are Jobbik sympathizers all around us.'*

As some of the local residents declared, the idea of the exclusion of the Roma from the soccer team originated from the local Jobbik supporters. One of our Roma interviewees emphasised that *'it had not been a problem to play together. Roma and non-Roma had played together. It had been a peaceful co-existence. And a few years ago…radicalism appeared in our village. And some of those people did not want the Roma to be there on the soccer field. They did not want to play together with us. And they were the supporters of the Jobbik.'* According to our observation, the very same people aimed at the exclusion of the Roma from the Butcher Festival and the Civil Guard as well.

2) While introducing the Solt case, I have already pointed out that the participants of the debate repeatedly posed the question: what are the origins of "indignation" and of the accentuated attention surrounding the study? *'The eminent and unusual attention covering my study and also the tensions that target me are remarkable.'* – wrote Ágnes Solt in Esély (2010a, p. 83). In the course of the search for reasons, I would like to draw the role of the extreme right wing and party of Jobbik. *'The study of Ágnes Solt was published at a moment when hostile public perceptions toward the Roma became increasingly dominant. The text functioned as a commentary. Many interpreted her findings as something which was finally uttered and which had been muttered in the deep for long'* – gave one of the participants an alternative explanation at the debate chaired by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

It should be mentioned that the study was published right after a series of murders against the Roma. The electoral success of the Jobbik, the recruitment of paramilitary organisations against the Roma, and majority society's hostile attitudes toward the Roma were all determinants of the Hungarian social landscape. Therefore, I claim that

not only arguments and methodological deficiencies of the study account for the intensity of the debate. Ágnes Solt broke the norms of the scientific community not only and exclusively by the setting of the sampling or the guidelines, and by the way of analysing the interviews. Additionally, not only by her putative negative attitudes toward the Roma, but also by the timing of publication she did reinforce society's hostile attitudes. This argument can be confirmed by the fact that the study had been available for the scientific community for two months before it was publicly introduced in December 2009 at the press conference.

"-Ágnes Solt: The first appearance of the study was not at the press conference. It was completed two months earlier. I sent the paper to at least fifteen acclaimed scientists asking for their personal comments. And one month before the press conference I summarised my results at the annual sociological conference as well. I had only fifteen minutes. But I announced the completion of the study and I asked the audience, the illustrious members of the profession who work in the same area for their opinion and finally I indicated that I would make the paper available, which would be published soon.

-Broadcaster2: So, what were the reactions?

-Ágnes Solt: Nothing. Absolutely nothing, no one said a word." (Quoted from a discussion on radiocafé FM 98.6)

The press conference, the collateral media attention, the media consumers and the reactions of the media were necessary conditions, which put the study at the centre of scientific attention. In other words, these conditions and the negative climate towards the Roma, reinforced by wresting the text for self-justification, triggered a norm-protective mechanism in the scientific community and intense attacks against the author.

6. Summary

After introducing the findings of my empirical field works and summarising the experiences of the analysis of the professional literature

1. I point at the reasons for the diversity of terminologies and approaches of social exclusion and emphasise that a) the term was first introduced as a political concept without an adequate definition and conceptualization and b) different political, ideological, historical roots that created their own distinct interpretations also caused disturbance regarding the meaning of the concept.

2. I reveal the core elements of the term under investigation as the

    a) multidimensional aspect, emphasising that social exclusion emerges at more than one dimension at the same time resulting in inequality, negative consequences on quality of life, well-being and future life chances.

    b) dynamical aspect, warning about the importance of the process by which the exclusion from social relationships results in further deprivations and thereby further decreasing of the living opportunities.

    c) relational aspect, introducing the importance of social relationships and the need to the comparison with others.

3. I give evidences of the various forms of social exclusion affecting the Roma people in Hungary (Hera 2015, Hera - Szeger 2015, Fremlova - Georgescu - Hera - Marin - Miletic 2014, Kiss - Szeger - Hera 2013). However, by describing the everyday life of a Hungarian village in details and a debate in the community of the social scientists, I even point at the importance of analysing the norms, values and aims of the various groups at the micro level and of understanding the circumstances that amplify the tension between these groups of interests and make the intension of exclusion stronger.

4. I come to the conclusion that

    a) in-group favouritism,

    b) negative emotions that arise due to the intense debate,

    c) deviation from the group norms,

    d) clashes of the powerful groups of interests (that hide behind the scene of 'interethnic conflicts') (Hera 2013) and

    e) the lack of open communication which creates stereotypes

have the capacity to intensify the process of social exclusion.

Finally, my dissertation introduces science as a practice that is not organised by objective, independent and neutral researchers but a social activity that is operated by human actors who are influenced by norms, personal biases and emotional involvement (Hera, in press).

Hopefully, my dissertation does not only confirm some previously established theories but expands the scope of professional literature and contributes to the knowledge about social exclusion. In addition, the findings of my research work may even be able to support professionals – e.g. policy makers, community activists, social workers and mediators – who aim to drive back rejection, oppression and discrimination and intend to work for an inclusive society. Moreover, I believe that the study can join the efforts of the representatives of science studies and refine the widely accepted image about science.

At the end of the dissertation, I consider it important to identify some possible directions in regard to further research work:

1. instrumental framework: I believe that phenomenon of social exclusion could be understand by the way individuals describe and interpret their experiences. It makes sense to pay attention to the very subjective personal stories that contain emotions, fears and wishes while analysing the phenomenon of oppression, discrimination and rejection. However, one must not forget the 'instrumental tools' that support the 'social animals' to cope with specific problems of their life, to satisfy their needs and thereby to achieve their aims. These institutions, organisations and further entities with specific sets of rules and norms should also be the focal point of future research work, especially because these 'devices' can not only generate, support and foster but even hinder, repress or transfer the process of social exclusion.

2. boundary work: in my dissertation, similarities between science and non-science are detected. Both of the communities are described as entities that operate in accordance with the theories and empirical experiences of social psychology. In addition, it has become obvious that not only members of disadvantaged social groups can be the victims of social exclusion. Even a member of a scientific community analysing the oppression and discrimination in the society could also be

rejected by their own group-members. Despite these similarities, it is worth emphasising that the two fields clearly differ. One can argue that it is the same process of social exclusion which appears in both communities under investigation. Further research may be necessary in order to confirm this presumption.[37]

3. taboos affecting scientists: It seems worthwhile to move away from the concept of identity as a monolithic and non-contradictory phenomenon. The idea about identity allows that identities are never unified and singular but multiple and constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions (Pali 2013). Scientists also have multiple identities as they are not only representatives of their specific disciplines. They are citizens, residents of their neighbourhood, supporters of political parties and representatives of their own values and norms. It could be an important question how these multiple identities influence the way scientists choose themes, subjects for their investigations, methods and come to conclusions. Can the 'non-scientist identity' be blamed for analysing a great spectrum of phenomena while there is a few of them which do not get into focal point? How are the decisions about the objects of their exploration made?

4. scientists affecting taboos: scientists also take part actively in the game. The decision itself about the focal points of their research influence the context. The findings of their explorations also have clear messages that could have a great impact on citizens, politicians, institutions, sponsors, decision makers and various further actors. Questions arise such as: how are scientists able to influence their context? What are their tools that make them powerful and legitimate actors in the field? What kind of taboos are destroyed by scientists and which prohibited research areas and objects are resistant? What are the reasons behind this kind of opposition?

These issues are parts of our everyday life, they do not belong solely to the inquiry of the science studies. It is worth considering the Jensen-hypothesis that came to

---

[37] In my case, such a parallel could not be drawn especially due to the applied research methodology. In one case, there was an almost three-years-long presence in a village based on various types of interviews (e.g. life-way interview; structured-, semi-structured and unstructured interview; spontaneous interview) and participatory observation. In the other case, an approximately one-year-long research program that was supported by a limited number of semi-structured interviews was implemented.

conclusions regarding the causes of race-based differences in intelligence in 1967 (Jensen). When the paper was published, protest against the author started whose further reprints of works were even denied by the publisher. Despite the fact that the article was written fifty years ago, the debate has been going on until today while a wide range of various actors have explicated their arguments and counterarguments (Alderfer 2003, Rushton and Jensen 2005, Fox 2012) in the US where the issue of political correctness is a hot potato, especially nowadays (Green 2015, Gibson 2016, Schilling 2015). If we turn our attention to Hungary, further debates confirm that science focusing on taboos could be the subject of huge social controversies. In 2012, Endre Czeizel was in the focal point of the criticism that arose due to the argument of the geneticist about the consequences of the specific culture of the Roma that was said to be permissive regarding incest. In 2015, a huge attention was paid to the issue of migration in Hungary. On the one hand, the government expressed their doubts regarding the possibility of successful integration and even built a barrier in order to ensure border security preventing migrants from entering illegally. On the other hand, according to the Migration Working Group of the Hungarian Academy of Science migration was not a threat but an opportunity and recommended the improvement of the social system that supports the immigrants. All in all, scientists pointed at the long-term opportunities and positive effects for the Hungarian labour-market opened up by migration. And the list is quite long. In Hungary, scientists and non-scientists sometimes argue about other sensitive issues, as the 'Roma criminality', the role of Hungary in WWII and the Holocaust, the alcoholism and drug addiction of pregnant women and nursing mothers, the domestic violence and the potential causes of homosexuality. Science is almost always involved in these debates; scientists often share their ideas and evidence-based recommendations while non-scientists frequently refer to various research results as proofs of their arguments. Thereby, it is extremely important to understand the interrelationship between science and society and to recognise the way scientists influence society while at the same time society influences science. I hope that this dissertation is one step on the road of successfully understanding this process.

7. Bibliography

Abrams, D. and Marques, J. and Bown, N. and Dougill, M. (2002) Anti-Norm and Pro-Norm Deviance in the Bank and on the Campus: Two Experiments on Subjective Group Dynamical. *Group Processes and Integroup Relations*. 5 (2), 163-182.

Alderfer, C. P. (2003) The science and nonscience of psychologists' responses to The Bell Curve. *Professional psychology, research and practice*. (34), 287–293.

Andorka, R. (2006) *Bevezetés a szociológiába.* Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

Atkinson, A. B. and Hills, J. (eds) (1998) *Exclusion, Employment and Opportunity*. London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion.

Babusik, F. (2007) The Roma in Hungary – structural trap and exclusion. *Esély, (1), 3-23. Retrieved from:* http://www.esely.org/kiadvanyok/2007_1/babusik.pdf

Babusik, F. (2004) *Poverty trap.* Budapest: Delphoi Consulting. Retrieved from: http://www.delphoi.hu/download-pdf/roma-szoc-eu.pdf

Bakó, B. (2006) 'Cigány módra - magyar módra'. Együttélési viszonyok egy mikroközösség sztereotípiatörténetein át. In: Bakó, B. and Papp, R. and Szarka, L. (eds) *Mindennapi előítéletek: társadalmi távolságok és etnikai sztereotípiák.* Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 36-64.

Bársony, J. and Daróczi, Á. (eds). (2007) *Pharrajimos The Fate of the Roma During the Holocaust.* New York: The International Debate Education Association.

Beall, J. (2002) Globalization and social exclusion in cities: framing the debate with lessons from Africa and Asia. *Environment & Urbanization* 14(1), 41-51.

Behrman, J. R. and Gaviria, A. and Székely, M. (2002) *Social Exclusion in Latin America: Introduction and Overview.* Washington: Inter-America Development Bank. Retrieved from: http://www.iadb.org/res/publications/pubfiles/pubR-445.pdf

Berger, M.T. and Guidroz, K. (2009) *The intersectional approach. Transforming the academy through race, class and gender.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Bernáth, G. and Messing V. (2011) *Szélre tolva. Kutatási zárójelentés a roma közösségek többségi médiaképéről, 2011.* Retrieved from: www.romapage.hu/dl309.

Bólyai, J. (1997) A rendőrség és a cigányság viszonya Magyarországon, *Belülgyi Szemle.* 45 (6), 12–35.

Bourdieu, P. (2004) *Science of Science and Reflexivity,* trans. Richard Nice, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Byrne, D. (2005) *Social exclusion.* United Kingdom: McGraw – Hill Education.

Crenshaw, K. (1989) Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, (14), 538-554. Retrieved from: http://philpapers.org/archive/CREDTI.pdf

Csalog, Zs. (1976) *Kilenc cigány*. Budapest: Kozmosz Könyvek.

Csalog, Zs. (1979) Cigányfalu Baranyában. Jegyzetek a cigányság helyzetéről. *Kritika* (10), 13-16.

Csalog, Zs. (1991) A magyar-cigány együttélés múltja és jelene. *Phralipe* (8), 15-18.

Csalog, Zs. (1993) Magyar vagyok. *Kritika* (6), 41.

Csalog, Zs. (1995) Szkinhed támadás Gyöngyösön. (1), 4-5.

Csalog, Zs. (1996) Mit csináljunk a cigányokkal? *Lettre* (21), 77-80.

Csepeli, Gy. and Murányi, I. and Prazsák, G. (2011) Diszkrimináció és intolerancia a mai magyar társadalomban. *Kritika*. Retrieved from: http://www.kritikaonline.hu/kritika_11szept_okt-csepeli.html

Csepeli, Gy. and Simon, D. (2004) Construction of Roma Identity in Eastern and Central Europe: Perception and Self-identification. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 30 (1), 129-150.

Csepeli, Gy. and Örkény, A. and Székelyi, M. (1997) Szertelen módszerek. A megkülönböztetésmentes viselkedés lehetőségei és akadályai. In: Csányi, K. (ed.) *Szöveggyűjtemény a kisebbségi ügyek rendőrségi kezelésének tanulmányozásához*. Budapest: COLPI Alkotmány- és Jogpolitikai Intézet, 130–173.

Daly, M. (2006) *Social Exclusion as Concept and Policy Template in the European Union*. CES Working Paper, no. 135. Retrieved from: http://aei.pitt.edu/9026/1/Daly135.pdf

Daróczi, Á. (1997) „Kaptam a romáktól emberi gazdagságot...' Csalog Zsolttal Daróczi Ágnes beszélget. *Beszélő* 2(10), 36-37.

de Haan, A. (1999) *Social exclusion: towards an holistic understanding of deprivation*. London: Department for International Development. Retrieved from: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/sdd9socex.pdf

Diósi, Á. (1999) A cigányság ügye a demokratikus ellenzék történetében. Interjú Havas Gáborral. *Esély* (6), 83-91.

Diósi, Á. (2002) *Szemtől szembe a magyarországi cigánysággal*. Budapest: Pont Kiadó.

Dupcsik, Cs. (2010a) Mentalitások és kutatások. *Esély* (2), 73-83.

Dupcsik, Cs. (2010b) „Cigányképek" és „magyarképek". Presentation at the XIX. Congress of the Hungarian Psychological Association.

Dupcsik, Cs. (2009) *The history of the Hungarian Gypsies*. Budapest: Osiris.

Durst, J. (2001) Nekem ez az élet, a gyerekek' Gyermekvállalási szokások változása egy kisfalusi cigány közösségben. *Századvég* (3), 71-92.

Estiviil, Jordi (2003) *Concepts and Strategies for Combating Social Exclusion*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Eurobarometer 74.1 (2010). Poverty and Social Exclusion Report. Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_355_en.pdf. Belgium, Brussels: TNS Opinion and Social.

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2012) *The situation of Roma in 11 EU Member States* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from: http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/2099-FRA-2012-Roma-at-a-glance_EN.pdf.

European Network against Racism (ENAR). 2011. *ENAR Shadow Report. Racism and related discriminatory practices in Hungary.* Retrieved from: http://cms.horus.be/files/99935/MediaArchive/publications/shadow%20report%20 2010-11/12.%20Hungary.pdf

European Commission (2015a) *European platform against poverty and social exclusion.* Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=961

European Commission (2015b) *European Year 2010 for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion.* Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/2010againstpoverty/index_en.htm

European Commission (2008) Poverty and Social Exclusion in Rural Areas. The Final Study by the Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities.

European Commission (2002) *European social statistics. Income, poverty and social exclusion.* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/coded_files/KS-BP-02-008-EN.pdf

Felllegi, B. and Szegő, D. (2013) *Handbook for Facilitating Peacemaking Circles.* Budapest: Foresee Research Group.

Fenton, S. (2003) *Ethnicity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ferge, Zs. (2002) Az EU és a kirekesztés. *Esély.* (6), 3-13.

Ferge, Zs. and Tausz, K. and Darvas, Á. (2002) *Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion. Volume 1. A Case Study of Hungary.* Budapest: International Labour Office.

Finszter, G. and Korinek, L. (2009) Az elveszett közbiztonság. *Népszabadság. Hétvége Melléklet. 2009. december 19. p.1* Retrieved from: http://nol.hu/belfold/20091219-az_elveszett_kozbiztonsag-476001.

Fleck, Z. and Krémer, F. and Uszkievicz, E. (2012) *Technika vagy érték a jogállam?* Budapest: L'Harmattan.

Forsyth, D. R. (2010) *Group Dynamics.* Belmont: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Foss, E. M. and Hassan, S. C. and Hydle, I. and Seeberg, M. L. and Uhrig, B. (2012) *Deliverable 2.1.: Report on conflicts in intercultural settings.* Oslo: NOVA.

Fox, M. (2012) Arthur R. Jensen Dies at 89; Set Off Debate About I.Q. *New York Times.* 1st November 2012. Retrieved from:

http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/02/science/arthur-r-jensen-who-set-off-debate-on-iq-dies.html?pagewanted=1&_r=3&hpw

Fremlove, L. and Hera, G. (2014) Introduction to the situation of Roma youth. In: Fremlove, L. and Georgescu, M. (eds) *Barrabaripen / Equality: Young Roma speak about multiple discrimination.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 13-20.

Fridrik, J. (2007) *Sociological Questions of the Management of Ethnic Minority Conflicts in and in the area of Gyöngyös.* Thesis (PhD). Zrinyi Miklós Nemzetvédelmi Egyetem. Retrieved from: http://portal.zmne.hu/download/konyvtar/digitgy/phd/2008/fridrik_jozsef.pdf].

Fundamental Rights Agency of the European Union (FRA). 2012. *The situation of Roma in 11 EU Member States – survey results at a glance.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from: http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/2099-FRA-2012-Roma-at-a-glance_EN.pdf

Gábos, A. and Szívós, P. and Tátrai, A. (2013) Szegénység és társadalmi kirekesztettség Magyarországon, 2000-2012. In: Szívós, P. and Tóth István, Gy. (eds) *Egyenlőtlenség és polarizálódás a magyar társadalomban. Tárki monitoring jelentések 2012.* Budapest: TÁRKI, 37-61. Retrieved from: http://www.tarki.hu/hu/research/hm/monitor2012_teljes.pdf

Gardener, J. and Subrahmanian, R. (2006) *Tackling social exclusion in health and education. Case studies from Asia.* London: Institute for Development Studies. Retrieved from: http://www.eldis.org/fulltext/tackling-social-exclusion.pdf

Geskó, S. (2000) *Rendőrök és romák: konfliktusok vagy párbeszéd?* Mediátor Tanácsadó Iroda. Retrieved from: http://www.konszenzus.org/tanulmanyok/zarotanulmany.pdf.

Gibson, C. (2016) How 'politically correct' went from compliment to insult. *The Washington Post.* 13th January 2016. Retrieved from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/how-politically-correct-went-from-compliment-to-insult/2016/01/13/b1cf5918-b61a-11e5-a76a-0b5145e8679a_story.html

Gieryn, T. F (1983) Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists. *American Sociological Review.* (48), 781-795.

Gilbert, M. P. (1994) Remarks on Collective Belief. In: Schmitt, F. (ed.) *Socializing Epistemology: The Social Dimensions of Knowledge.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers. 235-257.

Gimes, G. and Juhász, A. and Kiss, K. and Krekó, P. (2009) *Látlelet 2009. Kutatási összefoglaló a magyar szélsőjobboldal megerősödésének okairól.* Budapest: Political Capital. Retrieved from: http://hu.scribd.com/doc/31261194/Latlelet-2009-Copyright-Political-Capital

Gimes, G. and Juhász, A. and Kiss, K. and Krekó, P. and Somogyi, Z. (2008) *Látlelet 2008. Kutatási összefoglaló az előítéletesség és intolerancia hazai helyzetéről*. Budapest: Political Capital. Retrieved from. http://www.euroastra.info/files/20081016_eloiteletesseg_tanulmany_081016.pdf

Gore C. (1994) *Social exclusion and Africa south of the Sahara: A review of the literature*. International Institute for Labour Studies. Retrieved from: http://ilo-mirror.library.cornell.edu/public/english/bureau/inst/papers/1994/dp62/index.htm

Green, C. (2015) Political correctness: Debate over whether it has gone too far rages at universities from Cambridge to Yale. *Independent*. 13th November 2015. Retrieved from: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/education/education-news/political-correctness-debate-over-whether-it-has-gone-too-far-rages-at-universities-from-cambridge-a6734086.html

Gross, A. G. (2006) *Starring the Text. The Place of Rhetoric in Science Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press

Gross, A. G. and Harmon, J. E. and Reidy, M. (2002) *Communicating Science. The Scientific Article from the 17th Century to the Present*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Govier, T. (2010) *A Practical Study of Argument*. Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Hancock, Ian. 2004. Romanies and the Holocaust: a Reevaluation and an Overview. Dan Stone (ed.) *The Historiography of the Holocaust*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 383-396.

Hardwig, J. (1991) Role of Trust in Knowledge. *The Journal of Philosophy*. (88), 693-708.

Havas, G. (1998) Csenyéte-blues. In: Kereszty Zs and Pólya U (eds). *Csenyéte Antológia*. Csenyéte, Budapest, Szombathely: Bár Könyvek, 32-40.

Hera, G. (2015) The relationship between Roma and Police: a Roma Perspective. *Policing and Society*. Online version: 24th July 2015.

Hera, G. and Arnold, P. (2014) Roma-police relationship from a Roma perspective. In: Kozary, A. (ed.) *Police - minority relations. Restorative Justice in police practice*. Budapest: L' Harmattan, 53-61.

Hera, G. and Benedek, G. and Szegő, D. and Balla, L. (2015). *Comprehensive final report on RJ in intercultural communities. Deliverable 5.5*. Budapest: Foresee Research Group.

Hera, G. and Szeger, K. (2015) Education for Democratic Citizenship and Social Inclusion in a Post-Socialist Democracy. In: Majhanovich, S. and Malet, R. (eds.) *Building Democracy through Education on Diversity*. Rotterdam - Boston - Taipei: Sense Publisher. p. 41-57.

Hera, G. (2013) Roma and non-Roma conflicts in the light of power relationships. *Temida* 16(3-4), 95-115.

Hera, G. and Liget, Gy. (2005) *Kutatásmódszertan. Bevezetés a társadalmi jelenségek kutatásába*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

Hera, G. (in press) Science, as the subject of historical and social analysis - a case study. *Periodica Polytechnica*.

Hogg, M. A. and Fielding, K. S. and Darley, J. (2004) Fringe Dwellers: Processes of Deviance and Marginalization in Groups. In: Abrams, D. and Hogg. M. A. and Marques, J. M (eds). *The Social Psychology of Inclusion and Exclusion*. New York – Hove: Psychology Press.

Horváth, K. (2002) Gyertek ki nálunk, hogy jobban megismerjük egymást! Epizódok egy falusi magyar cigányközösség életéből (antropológiai esettanulmány). *Tér és terep* (1), 241-325.

Hough, M. and Sato, M. 2011. *Trust in justice: why it is important for criminal policy, and how it can be measured. Final report of the Euro-Justis project*. [online]. Helsinki: European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control. Retrieved from: http://www.icpr.org.uk/media/31613/Final%20Euro-Justis%20report.pdf.

Huang, B. H. (2010) What is good action research? *Action Research* (8), 93-109.

Human Rights First. 2010. *Combating Violence Against Roma in Hungary*. Human Rights First. Retrieved from: http://www.humanrightsfirst.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/HungaryBlueprint.pdf.

Hydle, I. and Seeberg, M. L. (2013) *Deliverable 2.2.: Report on conflict transformation and security*. Oslo: NOVA.

Huszár, L. (1999) Roma fogvatartottak a büntetés-végrehajtásban. *Belügyi Szemle*. 7-(8), 124-133.

Ipsos (2015) *Pártok és politikusok népszerűsége*. Retrieved from: http://ipsos.hu/hu/partpref.

Jehoel-Gijsbers, G. and Vrooman, C. (2007) *Explaining social exclusion. A theoretical model tested in the Netherlands*. The Hauge: The Netherlands Institute for Social Research

Jensen, A. (1967) How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement? *Harvard Educatioin Review*. 39(1), 1-123.

Juhász, A. (2010a) A Jobbik politikájának szerepe a pártrendszer átalakulásában – különös tekintettel a cigánybűnözés kampányra. *Magyarország Politikai Évkönyve 2009*. Budapest: Demokrácia Kutatások Magyarországi Központja Közhasznú Alapítvány.

Juhász, A. (2010b) A 'cigánybűnözés', mint az igazság szimbóluma. *anBlokk,* 4(1), 12-19.

Kádár, A. and Tóth B. and Pap, L. A. (2008) Igazolt igazoltatás. *Belügyi Szemle*, 56 (5), 106-132.

Kállai, E. (2010) Egy kutatás margójára. Website of the Ombudsman for Minorities. Retrieved from: http://www.kisebbsegiombudsman.hu/hir-494-egy-kutatas-margojara.html

Kemény, I. (ed.) (2005) *Roma in Hungary*. Boulder, Colo.: Social Science Monogaphs ; Highland Lakes, N. J. : Atlantic Research and Publ. ; New York, [N.Y.] : Columbia Univ. Press, distrib.

Kemény, I. and Jánky, B. and Lengyel, G. (2004) *A magyarországi cigányság 1971-2003*. Budapest: Gondolat.

Kemény, I. (2002) Linguistic Groups and Usage among the Hungarian Gypsies/Roma. In: Kállai, E. (ed.) *The Gypsies/The Roma In Hungarian Society*. Budapest: Teleki László Foundation.

Kende, Á. (2000) A be nem vallott csőd. Interjú Szalai Júlia szociológussal. *Amaro Drom* (8), 5-8.

Kerezsi, K. (2011) *Konfrontáció és kiegyezés: a helyreállító igazságszolgáltatás szerepe a közpolitikában*. Akadémiai Doktori Értekezés Tézisei. Retrieved from: http://real-d.mtak.hu/492/1/dc_231_11_tezisek.pdf

Kerezsi, K. (2004) *Human Safety in Central-Eastern Europe*. Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös Nominatae. Sectio iuridica. Tomus XLV. Budapest, Faculty of Law, University of ELTE, 101-120.

Kertesi, G. (2005) Roma employment at millennium. *Szociológiai Szemle*. (15), 57-87. Retrieved from: http://www.mtapti.hu/mszt/20052/003.pdf

Kiss, J. and Szeger, K. and Hera, G. (2013) Prejudices, social competencies and political orientations in relation to schools' hidden curriculum. *Intercultural Education*. 24(3), 277-287.

Kitcher, P. (1985) Two approaches to explanation. *Journal of Philosophy*. (82), 632-639.

Kőszeg, F. and Králik, L. (2008) *Final report on the strategies for effective police stop and search (STEPSS) project*. Budapest: Hungarian Helsinki Committee. Retrieved from: http://helsinki.hu/wp-content/uploads/books/en/Controlled-group.pdf.

Kocsis, K. and Kocsis, Z. (1999) *The social geography of the gypsy population*. In: Kemény, I. (ed.): The Gypsies in Hungary. Hungarian Scientific Academy. Budapest.

Kovács, É. (2010) *Vélemény Solt Ágnes: Élet a reményen túl c. tanulmányáról*. Unpublished opponent's review.

Kovács, D. (1989) Régi kelet-európai csavar ez... Beszélgetés Csalog Zsolttal. *Kritika* (11), 17-19.

Kremmel, K. and Pelikan, C. (2013) *Deliverable 4.1: Theoretical research report on activating civil society*. Vienna: IRKS.

Központi Statisztikai Hivatal (2012). *Magyarország Helységnévtára*. Retrieved from: https://www.ksh.hu/Helysegnevtar

Krémer, F. and Valcsicsák, I. (2001) Előítéletesség a főiskolai hallgatók körében. Vélemények, meggyőződések a cigányságról. *Társadalom és Gazdaság Közép- és Kelet-Európában*. 23 (3-4), 91–126.

Krémer, F. and Valcsicsák, I., 2005a. Cigánysággal kapcsolatos attitűdök. *Magyar Rendészet*. 5 (2), 3-27.

Krémer, F. and Valcsicsák, I., 2005b. Cigánysággal kapcsolatos attitűdök. *Magyar Rendészet*. 5 (3), 39-58.

Kuhn, T (1996) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Kund, A. and Paksi, V. and Tibori, T. and Veres, V. (eds.) Books of Abstracts. Nationhood in the Carpathian Region Hungarians and their Neighbours – Sociological Perspectives Joint Conference of the Hungarian Sociological Association and the Department of Sociology and Social Work in Hungarian of Babeş-Bolyai University.

Kurt Lewin Foundation (2010) *Monitoring research concerning the implementation process of the objectives indicated by the Decade of Roma Inclusion Program in Hungary in the period of 2005-2009.* Budapest: Kurt Lewin Foundation. Retrieved from: http://heragabor.hu/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Decade_of_Roma_Inclusion_EN_fin.pdf

Latour, B. (1987) *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Ladányi, J. and Szelényi, I. (2002) Cigányok és szegények Magyarországon, Romániában és Bulgáriában. *Szociológiai Szemle*. (4), 72-94. Retrieved from: http://www.szociologia.hu/dynamic/0204ladanyi.htm

Lengyel, G. (1982) Települési és társadalmi különbségek egy falusi cigány közösségben. In: Andor M (ed) *Cigányvizsgálatok*. Budapest: Művelődéskutató Intézet, 144-157.

Lengyel, G. (2001) A letenyei muzsikuscigányok. In: Kovalcsik, K. and Csongor, A. and Bódi, Zs. (eds) *Tanulmányok a cigányság társadalmi helyzete és kultúrája köréből*. Budapest: IF Alapítvány, BTF, MKM, 115-136.

Lengyel, G. (2004) Tiszavasvári cigány népessége. In: Kemény, I. and Janky, B. and Lengyel, G. (eds) *A magyarországi cigányság. 1971-2003*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó and MTA Etnikai-nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 129-147.

Letenyei, L. and Varga, A. (eds) (2011) *"Roma Társadalom" TÁMOP – 5.4.1-8/1 „B" komponens*. Unpublished manuscript.

Levitas, R. and Pantazis, C. and Fahmy, E. and Gordon, D. and Lloyd, E. and Patsios, D. (2007) *The multi-dimensional analysis of social exclusion*. Department of Sociology and School for Social Policy Townsend Centre for the International Study of Poverty and Bristol Institute for Public Affairs University of Bristol Retrieved from: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/poverty/socialexclusion.html

Levitas, R. (2005). *The inclusive society? Social exclusion and new labour*. Second edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Ljujic, V. and Vedder, P. and Dekker, H. and Geel, V. M (2012) Romaphobia: A unique phenomenon? *Romani Studies*, 22(2): 141-152.

Lukács, Gy. (2010) A telepi cigány meg az ő kontextusa. *Szociológiai Szemle* (3), 78-79.

Mackie, D. M. and Hamilton, D. L. (Eds.) (1993) *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Marketing Centrum (MC) (2010) *Roma society 2010*. Unpublished manuscript. Retrievedf from: http://uccuprojekt.files.wordpress.com/2010/04/romak-marketing-centrum.pdf

Mathieson, J. and Popay, J. and Enoch, E. and Escorel, S. and Hernandez, M. and Johnston, H. and Rispel, L. (2008) *Social Exclusion. Meaning, measurement and experience and links to health inequalities. A review of literature*. World Health Organization. Retrieved from: http://www.who.int/social_determinants/publications/socialexclusion/en/

Meier, B. P. and Hinsz, V. B. and Heimerdinger, S. R. (2008). A framework for explaining aggression involving groups. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, (2), 298–312.

Mezey, B. (2002) A magyarországi cigányok rövid története. In: Kovalcsik, K. (ed.) *Tanulmányok a cigányság társadalmi helyzete és kultúrája köréből*. Budapest: Auktor Kiadó, 83-93.

Miliband, D. (2006) *Social exclusion: The next steps forward*. London: ODPM Publication. Retrieved from: http://www.revolving-doors.org.uk/documents/david-miliband-social-exclusion-speech/

Mohácsi, K. J. (1987) Magyar Hírlap interjú Dr. Tauber Istvánnal. A Cigányság bűnözéséről – reálisan. *Magyar Hírlap*. 20(92), 5.

Molnár, E. and Dupcsik, Cs. (2008) *Country Report on Education: Hungary*. Budapest: Center for Policy Studies CEU. Retrieved from: http://www.edumigrom.eu/sites/default/files/field_attachment/page/node-1817/edumigrombackgroundpaperhungaryeducation.pdf

Murard, N. (2002). Guilty victims: social exclusion in contemporary France. In: Chamberlayne, P., Rustin, M., and Wengraf, T. (eds.) *Biography and social exclusion in Europe. Experiences and life journeys*. Bristol: Policy Press, 41-60.

Nagy, P. (2004) A magyarországi cigányok korai története (14-17. század). Manuscript. Pécs. Retrieved from: www.tte.hu/_public/ttorszkonf/korai.rtf

National Social Inclusion Strategy – Extreme Poverty, Child Poverty, the Roma (2011-2020). Budapest: Ministry of Public Administration and Justice State Secretariat for Social Inclusion. Retrieved from: http://romagov.kormany.hu/download/5/58/20000/Strategy%20-%20HU%20-%20EN.PDF

NOL (Népszabadság On-Line) (2011) "*Még az LMP-szimpatizánsok fele is előítéletes*" Retrieved from: http://nol.hu/belfold/20111205-a_rejtett_ketharmad

Ortutay, G. (2010) Szakmaiatlannak tartja az OKRI roma kutatását a kisebbségi ombudsman. *Népszabadság On-line*. Retrieved from: http://nol.hu/belfold/szakmaiatlannak_tartja_az_okri_roma_kutatasat_a_kisebbse gi_ombudsman-515431

Oyen, E. (1997) The Contradictory Concepts of Social Exclusion and Social Inclusion. In: Gore, C., Figueiredo, B. José. (eds.) *Social Exclusion and Anti-Poverty Policy*. Geneva: International Institute of Labour Studies, 63-66.

Országos Tudományos Kutatási Alapprogram (2014). Information about the research programs were downloaded from the website: www.otka.hu.

Pali, B. (2014) *Intercultural RJ between justice and security*. Manuscript.

Pálos, D. (2006) "Megeszitek az életemet!" In: Prónai, Cs. (szerk.) *Cigány világok Európában*. Budapest: Nyitott Könyvműhely Kiadó, 76-103.

Papp, T. and Horváth, Z. (1989) Interjú egy szociológussal. A SZETA mindenekelőtt morális kényszer hatására jött létre. *HVG* (3), 78-79.

Pap, L. A. and Simonovits, B. (2006) Ahogy a lakosság és ahogy a rendőr látja: az igazoltatási gyakorlat tapasztalatai. *Fundamentum*. 10(2), 125-139.

Peace, R. (2001) Social exclusion: a concept in need of definition? Social Policy Journal of New Zealand. 16. Retrieved from: https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/journals-and-magazines/social-policy-journal/spj16/16-pages17-36.pdf

Póczik, Sz. 2000. Magyar és cigány bűnelkövetők a börtönben. *Magyar Tudomány*. 4. [online] Available from: http://epa.oszk.hu/00700/00775/00017/426-435.html.

Pogonyi, L. (2000) Az apátia nem robban. Beszélgetés F. Havas Gábor szociológussal. *Kritika* (3), 8.

Publicus Intézet (2009) *Cigányellenesség a norma*. Retrieved from: http://www.publicus.hu/blog/ciganyellenesseg_norma/

Pytlas, B. (2013) Radical-right narratives in Slovakia and Hungary: historical legacies, mythic overlaying and contemporary politics. *Patterns of prejudice*. 47(2), 162-183.

Room, G. (1995). Poverty and social exclusion: the new European agenda for policy and research. In: Room, G. (ed.) *Beyond the threshold. The measurement and analysis of social exclusion*. Bristol: Policy Press, 1-10.

Roma Sajtóközpont (RSK). 2014. *Nincs rajtuk kalap!* Retrieved from: http://romasajtokozpont.hu/nincs-rajtuk-kalap/.

Rushton, J. P. and Jensen, A. R. (2005) Thirty years of research on race differences in cognitive ability. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*. 11(2), 235-294.

Salmon, C. W. (1989) Four Decades of Scientific Explanation. In: Kitcher, P. and Salmon C. W. (eds) *Scientific Explanation. Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 3-220.

Saith, R. (2001) *Social Exclusion: the Concept and Application to Developing Countries*. QEH Working Paper Series. Retrieved from: http://www3.qeh.ox.ac.uk/pdf/qehwp/qehwps72.pdf

Saraceno, C. (2001). Social exclusion: Cultural roots and diversities of a popular concept, *Conference on Social Exclusion of Children*, Institute on Child and Family Policy, Columbia University, May 3 – 4 2001. Retrieved 15 July 2004, from http://www.childpolicyintl.org/publications/Saraceno.pdf

Schickore, J. (2008) Doing Science, Writing Science. *Philosophy of Science* (75), 323–343.

Schilling, D. (2015) Has politically correct culture gone too far? *The Guardian*. 14th December 2015. Retrieved from: http://www.theguardian.com/news/2015/dec/14/politically-correct-culture-millennials-generation

Schmitt, F. F. (1994) The Justification of Group Beliefs. In: Schmitt, F. (ed.) *Socializing Epistemology: The Social Dimensions of Knowledge*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 257-289.

Sen, A. (2000) *Social exclusion: concept, application, and scrutiny*. Manila: Asian Development Bank. Retrieved from: http://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/29778/social-exclusion.pdf

Shaaban, S. (2011) A Conceptual Framework Review of Social Exclusion, and its Relation with Social Cohesion and Poverty in Europe. *The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations*. Vol 11. 1.

Shahar, S. (2007) Religious minorities, vagabonds and gypsies in early modern Europe. In: Roni Stauber and Raphael Vago (eds.) *The Roma: Minority in Europe*, 1-18. Retrieved from: http://books.openedition.org/ceup/1411

Sibley, D. (1998) The Problematic Nature of Exclusion. *Geoforum*. 29 (2), 119-216.

Silver, H. (2006) *The process of social exclusion: the dynamical of an evolving concept*. Working paper. Providence: Chronic Poverty Research Centre. Retrieved from: http://www.chronicpoverty.org/uploads/publication_files/CP_2006_Silver.pdf

Silver, H. (1995) Reconceptualizing social disadvantage: Three paradigms of social exclusion. In: Rodgers, G. G.and Figueiredo, C. and José, B. (eds.) *Social exlcusion: rhetoric, reality, responses*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Silver, H. (1994) Social excluion and social solidarity: Three paradigms. *International Labour Review*. 133, 5-6.

Smith, L. and Lucinda B. and Debbie-Ann, C. and Jensen R. V. and Romero L. (2010) Between idealism and reality: Meeting the challenges of participatory action research. *Action research* (8), 407-25.

Solt, Á. (2009) *Élet a reményen túl. A szegregált telepen élők mentalitásvizsgálata*. Unpublished manuscript.

Solt, Á. (2010a) Válasz Dubcsik Csabának. *Esély* (2), 83-94.

Solt, Á. (2010b) Élet a reményen túl. A szegregált telepen élők mentalitásvizsgálatának összegzése. *Szociológiai Szemle* (3), 100-134

Solt, O. (1975) Cigányok és cigány gyerekek Budapesten. *Budapesti Nevelő* (2), 90-106.

Solt, O. (1976) Még egyszer a cigány osztályokról. *Élet és irodalo*m (40), 2.

Solt, O. (1979) Cigány gyerekek az iskolában. *Budapest* (6), 28-31.

Solt, O. (1991) Polgártársak, gondolkozzatok. Jegyzet Matuz Gábor Magyarok sírjatok! című interjújához. *Magyar Hírlap*, 5 November, 1991. 408-411.

Stewart, M. (1994) *Daltestvérek: az oláhcigány identitás és közösség továbbélése a szocialista Magyarországon.* Budapest: T-Twins Kiadó.

Strausz, L. (2014) Producing prejudice: The rhetoric of discourses in and around current films on Roma–Hungarian interethnic relations. *Romani Studies*, 24 (1), 1-24.

szociologia.hu (2014) Halmozott diszkrimináció és interszekcionalitás. Retrieved from: http://www.socio.mta.hu/esemeny/2014/11/halmozott-diszkriminacio-es-interszekcionalitas-konferencia

Szalai, J. (2000) Az elismerés politikája és a cigánykérdés. A többségi-kisebbségi viszony néhány jelenkori problémájáról. In: Horváth. Á. and Landau, E. and Szalai, J. (eds) *Cigánynak születni. Tanulmányok, dokumentumok.* Budapest: Új Mandátum, 531-571.

Szalai, J. (1998) A kényszerasszimiláció zsákutcája és a kisebbségi jogok. In: Szalai J (ed) *Uraim! A jogaimért jöttem! Esszék, tanulmányok.* Budapest: Új Mandátum, pp. 406-413.

Szuhay, P. (2002) Self-Definitions of Gypsy Ethnic Groups. In: Kállai, E. (ed.) *The Gypsies/The Roma In Hungarian Society.* Budapest: Teleki László Foundation. 24-28.

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. C. (1979) An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. Austin W. G. and Worchel S. (eds.) *The social psychology of intergroup relations?* CA: Brooks-Cole. 33-47.

Tauber, I. and Balogh, S. (1988) A cigányság bűnözése továbbra is aktuális társadalmi probléma. *Belügyi Szemle*. 26(3), 13-23.

Tarján, G. G. (1999) Milyenek is azok a cigányok…? In: Csányi, K. (ed.) *Szöveggyűjtemény a kisebbségi ügyek rendőrségi kezelésének tanulmányozásához.* Budapest: Alkotmány- és Jogpolitikai Intézet a Nyílt Társadalom Intézet Társintézete, 259–270.

Thiollent, M. (2011) Action Research and Participatory Research: An Overview. *International Journal of Action Research*, 7(2), 160-174.

Tót, É. (2000) A szegényeké a kisebbségi sors. Beszélgetés Havas Gáborral. *Eszmélet* (6), 125-135.

Tóth, M. B. and Kádár, A. (2011) Ethnic profiling in ID checks by the Hungarian police. *Policing and Society*, 21 (4), 383-394.

Walton, D. (1998) *Ad Hominem Arguments*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.

Walton, D. (1992) *The Place of Emotion in Argument*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Weber, M. (1968) *Economy and society; an outline of interpretive sociology*. New York: Bedminster Press.